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# Article summary:

1. Arthroscopic-assisted coracoclavicular ligament reconstruction (AA-CCR) using free tendon grafts resulted in good clinical outcomes and a high rate of return to preinjury activity level.

2. Treatment failure occurred in 17.1% of patients, with 8.0% unable to return to activity, 5.7% having radiographic loss of reduction, and 3.4% undergoing revision surgery due to traumatic reinjury.

3. Return to preinjury activity level may be a more clinically relevant outcome measure than radiographic maintenance of acromioclavicular joint reduction.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article is generally reliable and trustworthy, as it provides detailed information about the study design, results, and conclusions drawn from the data collected from 88 patients over a mean 6-year follow-up period. The authors also provide evidence for their claims by citing previous studies that support their findings.

However, there are some potential biases that should be noted when considering the trustworthiness of this article. First, the study was conducted at a single institution which could lead to selection bias in terms of patient demographics or other factors that could influence the results of the study. Additionally, since this was a retrospective study relying on patient self-reporting for outcomes such as return to preinjury activity level, there is potential for recall bias or other inaccuracies in reporting due to lack of objective measures or verification methods used in the study design. Finally, while the authors do cite previous studies that support their findings, they do not explore any counterarguments or alternative explanations for their results which could limit the validity of their conclusions if these points are not considered when interpreting the data presented in this article.

# Topics for further research:

* Selection bias in medical studies
* Recall bias in medical studies
* Objective measures in medical studies
* Verification methods in medical studies
* Counterarguments in medical studies
* Alternative explanations in medical studies

# Report location:

<https://www.fullpicture.app/item/6f0eae40f9d01d91a8ce1fdcd13dd389>