INTRODUCTION
The field of prosthetics and orthotics (P&O) began focusing on increasing evidence-based practice (EBP) in the 1990’s and its importance has since increased due to pressure to improve patient outcomes and to justify component use (Andrysek et al., 2011). However, there is currently a divide between published research and the usefulness of that research to practitioners. Giel (2009) states that even clinically based research, which should be the most clinically applicable, often fails to meet the expectations of clinicians. Giel concluded that the more clinicians perform research, the more that research should be clinically applicable.

This study attempts to quantify the changing rates of P&O practitioners publishing research over the years 2007 to 2015. Visualizing the locations and type of research in a heat map provides insight into the current state of P&O literature. It was hypothesized that as the education standards rise and EBP becomes more important, the percentage of P&O professionals publishing literature should increase.

METHOD
P&O related articles from *JPO-Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics, Prosthetics and Orthotics International, Journal of Rehab Research and Development*, and *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehab* published from the years 2007 to 2015 were sorted into a database. Journals were selected from the list of the top-cited articles in limb prosthetics as set by Eshraghi et al. (2013). It is assumed that these four journals provide a nearly comprehensive amount of articles based on the percentage of the results of a PubMed search for prosthetic limb and orthotic device articles from the years 2007 to 2015. Data from each article was then sorted into key categories: Title, Journal, Issue, Volume, Publication Year, Sackett’s Rule of Evidence as described by Eshraghi et al., Research Design, Country, State (if US), City, P&O Professional as an Author, and as First or Second Author. Categories are based upon Ramstrand and Brodtkorb (2008) and their six year retrospective study of primary authors in *JPO and Prosthetics and Orthotics International* from 2000 to 2006.

Data Analysis: Data will be organized into heat maps according to publication location and year as well as bar graphs by year, P&O professional authorship percentages, and by type of study.

RESULTS
Preliminary results from 200 reviewed articles (Figure 1) indicate a trend toward fewer P&O professionals publishing relevant literature in the field.

DISCUSSION
The preliminary results show a trend toward a decreasing percentage of P&O professionals as authors on published literature which is a direct opposite of the findings of Ramstrand and Brodtkorb (2008) in their analysis from 2000 to 2006 who found a trend toward increasing percentages. This challenges the hypothesis that the percentage of P&O professionals publishing research would increase as education standards and the push for EBP increases. A possible explanation could be a lack of clinician funding or time to perform research or a greater increase in the amount of research produced by people outside of the prosthetics and orthotics field.

CONCLUSION
The preliminary data indicates that the percentage of P&O professionals publishing research is falling. This trend is worrying as it may indicate less clinically relevant data that could be used to justify clinical decisions.

CLINICAL APPLICATIONS
This study will help clinicians easily identify which journals have the highest percentages of P&O professionals as authors. This will help clinicians easily identify journals with potentially relevant research. In addition, it will show trends as to publication location and whether or not P&O professional contribution to EBP has been increasing or decreasing.
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