

EDITORIAL

Understanding Orthopedic Knowledge Through Bibliometrics: Promises, Pitfalls, and Practical Applications

Raju Vaishya, MCh¹; Abhishek Vaish, MCh¹; Mohammad H. Ebrahimzadeh, MD²

¹ Department of Orthopaedics and Joint Replacement Surgery, Indraprastha Apollo Hospitals, Sarita Vihar, New Delhi, India

² Orthopedics Research Center, Ghaem Hospital, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran

Orthopedic surgery is an evidence-driven specialty in which clinical decisions rely on published research, guidelines, and collective experience. Although the specialty excels at generating new evidence through clinical trials, registries, and translational research, bibliometrics and scientometrics offer a valuable complementary perspective by quantitatively examining how orthopedic knowledge is produced, disseminated, evaluated, and adopted.^{1,2}

Bibliometrics focuses on the statistical analysis of publications and citations, whereas scientometrics examines broader patterns in scientific activity, collaboration, and impact. These approaches can reveal trends, knowledge gaps, influential networks, and systemic issues within the research ecosystem. Unlike systematic reviews and meta-analyses, which synthesize evidence addressing specific clinical questions, bibliometric analyses examine literature-wide patterns.³

The exponential growth of the orthopedic literature creates challenges for busy clinicians who must navigate thousands of new studies each year. Bibliometric tools can facilitate this process, but only when used responsibly and alongside clinical judgment. This editorial provides an overview for practicing surgeons, educators, and researchers, emphasizing the practical value of bibliometrics while addressing its limitations and criticisms.

Why Bibliometrics Matters in Orthopedics

Orthopedic research spans arthroplasty, trauma, sports medicine, spine surgery, pediatric orthopedics, and oncology. Bibliometric studies quantify growth, identify research hotspots, and highlight under-researched areas that may be aligned—or misaligned—with disease burden.⁴

Field-wide analyses demonstrate the growing use of bibliometric methods in orthopedics, reflecting broader trends in meta-research.⁵ During events such as the COVID-

19 pandemic, these studies documented publication surges in selected topics while underscoring the importance of evaluating quality alongside volume, because greater quantity does not necessarily yield stronger evidence.⁶ These macro-level insights help the orthopedic community assess whether research output is keeping pace with evolving clinical needs, including increasing demands in trauma care and degenerative conditions associated with aging.

Insights Beyond Citation Counts

Modern bibliometrics extends far beyond simple citation counts. It examines collaboration networks, keyword evolution, thematic clusters, and citation flows, thereby providing a dynamic view of the field.

Practical Example

Keyword and co-occurrence analyses of periprosthetic joint infection (PJI) research reveal clear shifts over time toward antimicrobial stewardship, biofilm management, and prevention bundles.⁷ Collaboration networks frequently show strong North American–European clusters but comparatively limited participation from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), despite the high burden of trauma and infection in these settings. Such visualizations can help researchers and clinicians identify genuine knowledge gaps, prioritize high-yield literature reviews, and avoid redundant studies in already well-investigated subtopics.⁸ Similar patterns are evident in research on patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs), where bibliometric trends have highlighted an increasing emphasis on functional recovery and quality-of-life outcomes in orthopedic research.⁹

Bibliometrics and Global Orthopedics

Musculoskeletal disorders impose a substantial global burden, yet orthopedic research output remains concentrated in high-income countries.¹⁰ Bibliometric

Corresponding Author: Raju Vaishya, Department of Orthopaedics and Joint Replacement Surgery, Indraprastha Apollo Hospitals, Sarita Vihar, New Delhi, India

Email: raju.vaishya@gmail.com



THE ONLINE VERSION OF THIS ARTICLE
ABJS.MUMS.AC.IR



studies consistently document the underrepresentation of LMICs despite their disproportionately high patient volumes and disease burdens. Contributing factors include limited research funding, language and infrastructure barriers that favor English-language, high-impact journals, and academic incentive structures that prioritize publication volume and visibility over local relevance.

These disparities have practical consequences: clinical guidelines and educational resources developed primarily in high-resource settings may not fully address challenges in resource-constrained environments, such as delayed presentation or limited access to advanced implants. Bibliometric analyses make these imbalances visible and may encourage targeted international collaborations, capacity-building initiatives, and equity-focused funding calls. Although awareness does not automatically translate into policy change, it is an important first step toward more inclusive orthopedic scholarship.

Applications for Clinicians, Educators, and Editors

When interpreted in conjunction with domain expertise and clinical context, bibliometrics offers several practical applications:

Clinicians: Bibliometric overviews can help distinguish areas supported by well-established evidence (e.g., standardized protocols in common fracture management) from those characterized by ongoing uncertainty (e.g., optimal strategies in complex PJI cases or selected regenerative approaches). This can streamline literature searches and support evidence-based decision-making amid information overload.⁹

Educators: Publication trends can inform curriculum updates and training priorities. For example, growing research on robotics and artificial intelligence in surgery supports the inclusion of foundational concepts and critical appraisal skills. However, publication volume alone should not determine educational priorities; educators must balance emerging trends against core competencies, disease burden, and long-term clinical relevance.⁹

Journal Editors: Maps of thematic evolution and citation patterns can help refine journal scope, identify timely special issues, and maintain scientific relevance in a rapidly evolving field.

Early-Career Researchers: Bibliometric analyses can help identify underexplored questions with potential impact. However, they also carry a risk of encouraging trend-chasing in fashionable areas (e.g., AI-driven imaging or robotic techniques) that may already be saturated with low-quality incremental work. Early-career investigators should combine bibliometric findings with direct assessment of

clinical needs and appropriate mentorship to ensure meaningful contributions.⁹

The Limitations of Metrics and Growing Criticisms

Citation-based indicators are imperfect proxies for research quality or clinical relevance.⁹ Common sources of bias include selective database coverage, English-language dominance, self-citation, and the Matthew effect, whereby established researchers and institutions receive disproportionate attention. Highly cited papers are not necessarily methodologically superior, whereas clinically transformative but less fashionable work may receive fewer citations.

An increasingly prominent criticism concerns the proliferation of relatively low-effort bibliometric papers facilitated by readily accessible software. Such studies may be repetitive and provide limited novel or actionable insight, raising concerns about the field's overall contribution to orthopedic advancement. To maintain credibility, bibliometric researchers must prioritize methodological rigor and practical relevance.⁹

Established frameworks provide important guidance. The Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics and the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) emphasize that quantitative indicators should support, rather than replace, qualitative expert judgment based on methodological rigor and real-world applicability.⁹

Looking Ahead

Emerging technologies may enhance the utility of bibliometric approaches. AI-driven tools, including natural language processing for automated topic modeling and predictive analytics, can provide more sophisticated and timely insights into research trajectories. These advances create opportunities for better-informed research planning and equity monitoring, but they also require sustained attention to transparency, algorithmic bias, reproducibility, and equitable global access.⁹

Conclusion

Bibliometrics complements traditional evidence synthesis by providing a quantitative overview of research trends, impact, and gaps, but its findings must be interpreted alongside methodological quality and clinical relevance [Table 1]. When applied judiciously and with full awareness of its promises, pitfalls, and limitations, it can support more strategic research planning, inclusive scholarship, effective education, and, ultimately, improved patient care. In an era of information abundance, a thoughtful examination of how knowledge evolves may be among the most effective ways to strengthen the scientific foundations of orthopedic practice.

Table 1. Key applications, strengths, limitations, and future directions of bibliometrics in orthopedics

Aspect	Summary	Key Message
Role	Maps publication trends, collaborations, and knowledge gaps.	Supports strategic research planning.
Applications	Assists clinicians, educators, editors, and researchers in identifying emerging topics and evidence gaps.	Facilitates evidence-based practice and academic decision-making.

Table 1. Continued

Global Perspective	Highlights disparities in research output, particularly underrepresentation of LMICs.	Encourages equitable collaborations and capacity building.
Limitations	Citation metrics are influenced by database, language, and citation biases.	Metrics should complement, not replace, expert judgment.
Future Directions	AI and advanced analytics will improve real-time bibliometric analyses.	Greater transparency and responsible use are essential.

Acknowledgement

N/A

Authors Contribution: Authors who conceived and designed the analysis: Raju Vaishya, Mohammad H. Ebrahimzadeh/ Authors who collected the data: Raju

Vaishya, Abhishek Vaish/Authors who contributed data or analysis tools: Raju Vaishya, Abhishek Vaish/Authors who performed the analysis: Raju Vaishya, Abhishek Vaish/Authors who wrote the paper: Raju Vaishya, Abhishek Vaish, Mohammad H. Ebrahimzadeh

References

1. Li Y, Xu G, Long X, Ho YS. A bibliometric analysis of classic publications in web of science category of orthopedics. J Orthop Surg Res. 2019;14(1):227.. doi:10.1186/s13018-019-1247-1.
2. Vaishya R, Gopinathan P, Gupta BM, Mamdapur GMN, Vaish A. Scholarly trends in global orthopedics research published through the journal of orthopaedics: A bibliometric analysis from 2013 to 2024. J Orthop. 2024;60:35-43. doi:10.1016/j.jor.2024.08.013.
3. Manoj Kumar L, George RJ, P S A. Bibliometric Analysis for Medical Research. Indian J Psychol Med. 2023;45(3):277-282. doi:10.1177/02537176221103617.
4. Vaishya R, Vaish A. Global trend of publications in orthopaedics and sports medicine: 1996 - 2021. Chin J Traumatol. 2024;27(6):368-371. doi:10.1016/j.cjtee.2023.10.006.
5. Sun J, Mavrogenis AF, Scarlat MM. The growth of scientific publications in 2020: a bibliometric analysis based on the number of publications, keywords, and citations in orthopaedic surgery. Int Orthop. 2021;45(8):1905-1910. doi:10.1007/s00264-021-05171-6.
6. Puia D, Ivanuta M, Pricop C. A Bibliometric Analysis of COVID-19 Publications Between January 2019 and February 2025 by Romanian Authors. Cureus. 2025;17(4):e82339. doi:10.7759/cureus.82339.
7. Li C, Ojeda-Thies C, Xu C, Trampuz A. Meta-analysis in periprosthetic joint infection: a global bibliometric analysis. J Orthop Surg Res. 2020;15(1):251.doi:10.1186/s13018-020-01757-9.
8. Zhang L, Li F, Zhao D, Duan L, Bai W, Yan B. Research trends and focus of prosthetic joint infections from 2013 to 2023: bibliometric and visualization studies. Front Microbiol. 2024;15:1507340. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2024.1507340.
9. Graham SM, Brennan C, Laubscher M, et al. Orthopaedic research in low-income countries: A bibliometric analysis of the current literature. SICOT J. 2019;5:41. doi:10.1051/sicotj/2019038.
10. Ninkov A, Frank JR, Maggio LA. Bibliometrics: Methods for studying academic publishing. Perspect Med Educ. 2022;11(3):173-176. doi:10.1007/s40037-021-00695-4.