

# The Gender Gap in Leading Medical Journals - a Computational Audit

Oscar Brück<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Hematoscope Lab, Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland*

## ABSTRACT

### Background:

Publication track record can impact careers of researchers. Therefore, monitoring gender representation in medical research is required to achieve equity in academia.

### Methods:

We gathered bibliometric data on original research articles published between 2010 and 2019 in *The New England Journal of Medicine*, *Nature Medicine*, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *The BMJ*, and *The Lancet* using the Web of Science indexing database. We associated publication and citation frequency with author gender, count, and institute affiliation, and research keywords.

### Findings:

We analyzed 10,558 articles and found that women published and were cited less than men. There were fewer women as senior (24.8%) than leading authors (34.5%,  $p < 0.001$ ). The proportion of female authors varied by country with 9.1% last authors from Austria, 0.9% from Japan, and 0.0% from South Korea. The gender gap decreased longitudinally and faster for last (-24.0 articles/year,  $p < 0.001$ ) than first authors (-14.5 articles/year,  $p = 0.024$ ). The trend varied by country and even increased in China and Israel. Author count was associated with higher citation count ( $R = 0.46$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) as well as with male first ( $n = 11$  vs.  $n = 10$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and last authors ( $n = 11$  vs.  $n = 10$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). We also discovered that usage of research keywords varied by gender, and it partly accounted for the difference in citation counts by gender.

### Interpretation:

Gender representation has increased both at the leading and senior author levels although with country-specific variability. The study frame can be easily applied to any journal and time period to monitor changes in gender representation in science.

## ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE

Dr. O. Brück, Hematoscope Lab, Helsinki University Hospital, Comprehensive Cancer Center, Haartmaninkatu 8, P.O. Box 700, Helsinki FIN-00290, Finland. E-mail: [oscar.bruck@hus.fi](mailto:oscar.bruck@hus.fi). ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7842-9419>.

**LENGTH** 2601 words, 3 figures and 1 table

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 51 BACKGROUND

52 Gender equity in medical research refers to the equal representation, recognition, and  
53 valuation of all researchers regardless of their gender. Women and other  
54 underrepresented groups continue to face barriers in diverse research fields. The  
55 proportion of graduating female medical students is equal to that of men<sup>1</sup>. Yet,  
56 publications are more frequently authored<sup>2,3</sup>, peer-reviewed<sup>4</sup>, and editorially evaluated  
57 by men<sup>5,6</sup>. Based on a report by the Association of American Medical Colleges, the  
58 proportion of women faculty had increased to 41% in 2019, while their proportion as  
59 department chairs remained at 18%<sup>7</sup>.

60  
61 Abrogating the gender gap in all levels of academia are official priorities of the National  
62 Institutes of Health<sup>8</sup> and the European Commission<sup>9</sup>. Promoting gender equity can lead  
63 to more representative and balanced research. In addition, it can help to reduce bias  
64 and discrimination in academic careers by ensuring that all researchers are treated  
65 fairly and given equal opportunities to succeed.

66  
67 We recently discovered previously undocumented Anglocentric bias in leading medical  
68 journals based on publication counts and their citation frequency<sup>10</sup>. We reasoned that  
69 gender underrepresentation could be studied with a similar approach and explore  
70 publication differences in research fields, scientific journals, and collaboration scope.

71  
72

## 73 METHODS

### 74 *Data collection*

75 For this study, we collected data from five medical journals that were ranked highest  
76 in the Journal Citation Reports 2022 and published primarily original articles (Fig. 1A).  
77 These were *The New England Journal of Medicine* (NEJM), *Nature Medicine*  
78 (NatMed), *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA), *The BMJ*, and *The*  
79 *Lancet*. We included all original articles published from 2010 to 2019 totaling to 10,558  
80 articles. We excluded more recent publications to avoid bias related to the COVID-19  
81 pandemic and to ensure equal opportunities for accumulating citations. We queried for  
82 articles in the Web of Science database by Clarivate Plc with the terms  
83 "(((SO=(NATURE MEDICINE OR LANCET OR NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF  
84 MEDICINE OR JAMA JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OR  
85 BMJ BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL)) AND DT=(Article)) AND PY=(2010-2019))". This  
86 allowed us to download metadata for each article, including the names of the authors,  
87 the address of the corresponding author, and the total number of citations.

88  
89

### 90 *Preprocessing variables of interest*

91 We measured the impact of an article by its average citation count per year. To  
92 determine the number of authors, we summed the frequency of the semicolon ";"  
93 delimiter between author names and then added 1. For author names, only the initials  
94 of the forename were available for 538 first (5.1%), 529 second (5.0%), 780 second  
95 last (7.4%) and 572 last authors (5.4%). In total, we identified 7,558 unique forenames  
96 and defined the gender for 7,113 (94.1%) forenames with the genderizeR library based  
97 on the genderize.io database.

98  
99 To determine the geographic location (latitude and longitude coordinates) of the  
100 primary institutes where the research was conducted, we applied the ggmap library  
101 and Google's Geocoding API to the corresponding author's address. If we were unable

102 to successfully match the address, we geolocated the text-mined city and country of  
103 the address. The combined approach resulted in successful geolocation of 10,730 out  
104 of 10,732 total unique address (100.0%).  
105

106 In the keyword analysis, we identified 21,820 unique keywords. As most of these were  
107 rarely used, we included only keywords employed in at least 20 articles (n=583, 2.7%).  
108

### 109 *Statistical analysis*

110 We used the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (unpaired, two-tailed) to compare two continuous  
111 variables and the Kruskal-Wallis test to compare three or more continuous variables.  
112 For categorical variables, we used the  $\chi^2$  test. We adjusted p values using the  
113 Benjamini-Hochberg correction. To compare two linear regression slopes, we tested  
114 the significance of the interaction term using T-test. All statistical analyses and  
115 visualizations were conducted using R 3.5.1. using base, tidyverse, fastDummies,  
116 maps, reshape2, ggmap, data.table, countrycode, ggpubr, ggrepel, rstatix, gg dendro  
117 and dendextend libraries.  
118

118

119

## 120 **RESULTS**

### 121 *The gender gap in productivity is declining but not the gap in citation count*

122 First, we interrogated how authoring patterns would differ between female and male  
123 researchers in original articles published in 2010-2019 in five leading medical journals  
124 (Fig. 1A). Publications with a male first author were two times and with a male last  
125 author three times as common compared to publications authored by a female first and  
126 last author, respectively (Table 1). In addition, publications with female first authors  
127 were 46.8% more likely to have a female last author compared to publications with a  
128 male first author ( $\chi^2$  p<0.001, Fig. 1B).  
129

130 Temporally, the publication count has gradually converged between women and men  
131 (Fig. 1C). We fitted a linear regression for publication count using publication year and  
132 gender as covariate. The interaction term of the regression model was significant  
133 (coefficient -14.5, p=0.024) indicating that the yearly decline of first authorships for  
134 male researcher was higher in comparison to female researchers. The decline was  
135 even more distinct for last authors (coefficient -24.0, p<0.001 for the interaction term;  
136 Fig. 1D). Collectively, the gender gap in top medical research has declined with an  
137 average 14.5 publications/year for first authors and 24 publications/year for senior  
138 authors.  
139

139

140 Female-authored articles gathered also fewer citations (Table 1). The median citation  
141 frequency by publication increased in line with rising medical journal impact factors  
142 (Fig. 1E-F). However, the ascent was equal between male and female researchers for  
143 both first (p=0.53 of the interaction term between publication year and gender; Fig. 1E)  
144 and last authors (p=0.67; Fig. 1F) implying no convergence in accumulated citations.  
145

145

146

### 147 *The gender gap in productivity varies by country*

148 The proportion of women authoring in leading medical journals varied by the country  
149 where the research had been conducted (Fig. 1G). Female authors were least common  
150 in publications originating from South Korea, Japan, Singapore, Germany, and Austria,  
151 whereas they were most frequent from South Africa and India. The gender gap was  
152 more pronounced for second last and last authors with 24.8% female authors in

153 median across countries compared to first and second authors with 34.5% female  
154 authors ( $p < 0.001$ ). Gender underrepresentation was highest in South Korea with 0.0%  
155 (0/28), Japan with 0.9% (1/106) and Austria with 9.1% (3/33) female last authors.

156  
157 Next, we examined longitudinal national trends in gender representation. The gender-  
158 associated difference in publication number decreased rapidly in UK, Canada, and  
159 Belgium both for first and last authors (Supplementary Fig. 1A-B). Yet, the gender gap  
160 remained evident at the end of the follow-up in many countries, such as in the USA,  
161 UK, and China, and particularly at the last author level. In opposite to the general trend,  
162 the gender gap rose for last authors of publications from Israel and both for first and  
163 last authors from China. Collectively, these findings imply that the longitudinal trend  
164 could guide in customizing national measures to mitigate gender underrepresentation.

165  
166  
167 *Collaboration scope varies by gender and is associated with publication and citation*  
168 *count*

169 Next, we interrogated the significance of collaboration scope over gender-related  
170 differences in citation count. The number of co-authors ( $R\ 0.46$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) correlated  
171 with citation count. Male first and last authors published in average with one author  
172 more than their female colleagues (Table 1). To measure the independent impact of  
173 author count and gender on citations, we applied a linear regression model using these  
174 and their interaction term as covariates. In parallel, we examined the association of  
175 gender and citations in subgroups of categorized authorship count. Both approaches  
176 revealed that author count and gender are independent but weak predictors of future  
177 citation count (Supplementary Table 1, Supplementary Fig. 2).

178  
179 When examining the temporal evolution of authorship patterns, we observed a stable  
180 median increase of 9 additional authors per article during the 10-year follow-up  
181 (Supplementary Fig. 3A). Publications with more than 11 authors doubled in that time  
182 and these accumulated faster citations per article (2.99 citations/article/year vs. 1.19  
183 citations/article/year; Fig. 2A-B). The inclination was also 55.3% steeper for men as  
184 first author and 94.1% for men as last authors during the 10-year follow-up compared  
185 to corresponding female authors (Supplementary Fig. 3B). Instead, the slope between  
186 first and last authors did not differ when comparing separately women and men  
187 (Supplementary Fig. 3B).

188  
189 To study national differences in collaboration scope, we compared the number of  
190 authors for publications by gender and by country (Fig. 2C). While the number of  
191 authors did not differ for most countries, almost all variation in the number of authors  
192 were related to the geographical origin of the research. Publications from USA, UK,  
193 Denmark, and Sweden shared the least authors (Fig. 2C). On the opposite,  
194 publications from France, Germany, China, and South Korea were associated with  
195 more numerous authors/article (Fig. 2C). Together, the findings emphasize that the  
196 geographical origin of the research has a more pronounced association with  
197 collaboration scope than gender.

198  
199  
200 *The thematic and journalistic disparity between female and male medical researchers*  
201 Previous reports have suggested differences in funding, mentorship training, and  
202 household and caregiving responsibilities between women and men to account for the  
203 gender gap in medical publishing<sup>2,11</sup>. We hypothesized whether the areas of research

204 would differ by gender. We observed a clear correlation between keyword-associated  
205 citation frequency and the proportion of male first ( $R$  0.40,  $p < 0.001$ ) and last authors  
206 ( $R$  0.40,  $p < 0.001$ ; Fig. 3A). Keywords associated with highest publication citations  
207 were related to phase II-III trials, oncology, immunotherapy, chemotherapy and  
208 antibody-based therapy, and were enriched with publications authored by men,  
209 especially at the senior author level. On the contrary, the 20 keywords associated with  
210 least citations were predominantly associated with female authorship, notably in the  
211 context of first authorship (Fig. 3A). The keywords covered healthcare-related themes  
212 such as patient involvement, insurance, quality-of-care, and access.

213  
214 Beside gender-associated distinctions in research subfields, we sought to understand  
215 whether publications sharing the same keyword would differ by their accumulated  
216 citation count. Out of 583 keywords, we included 579 for comparing first author and  
217 582 for last author gender comparison as these keywords were used by both genders.  
218 For first authors, 78/579 compared to 5/579 keywords resulted in higher citation count  
219 (adjusted  $p < 0.05$ ) when employed by men vs. women, respectively. For last authors,  
220 the corresponding proportion was 32/582 for men and 8/582 for women (adjusted  
221  $p < 0.05$ ). Collectively, the findings indicate that within the same fields of research,  
222 publications authored by women accumulate fewer citations compared to publications  
223 authored by men.

224  
225 To conclude, we investigated the proportion of female-authored publications by  
226 journals. The absolute difference in the proportion of first authors between the five  
227 journals was 14.8% for first and 10.2% for last authors (Fig. 3B). Female first and  
228 second authors were least frequent in articles published in *NEJM* and *Lancet*, whereas  
229 second last and last authors were least common in *NatMed*. According to this analysis,  
230 *BMJ* and *JAMA* were the most representative journals considering all four authorship  
231 positions.

232  
233

## 234 **DISCUSSION**

235 Available bibliometric data can reveal novel information on the equity and diversity of  
236 scientific research. Longitudinal data permits studying temporal trends, which can be  
237 crucial for monitoring purposes. Here, we presented publication disparity in five leading  
238 medical journals between 2010-2019. The study analyses can be easily replicated for  
239 any journals and any time period using data available at the Web of Science's database  
240 and codes published with this study.

241  
242 Gender underrepresentation in scientific publishing has been documented earlier.  
243 Women tend to obtain university-level degrees more commonly than male in OECD  
244 countries (47% vs. 32%)<sup>12</sup>. However, female doctoral students submit and publish less  
245 than their male colleagues<sup>2,3</sup>. The difference is largest in natural/biological sciences  
246 and engineering and has been hypothesized to result of unevenly distributed resources  
247 and support<sup>3</sup>. Gender disparities in publications have been shown to correlate with  
248 future academic rank signifying sustained impact on professional careers<sup>13</sup>, salary and  
249 job satisfaction<sup>14</sup>.

250  
251 Our findings in leading medical journals are in line with previous observations. For the  
252 first time to our knowledge, we report that the inequity is country-specific. While the  
253 distinction is visible across first, second, second last and last author positions, the  
254 gender gap is most pronounced at the senior author level. In particular, publications



255 with a corresponding author in Germany, Austria, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore  
256 had the fewest female authors. The finding implicate that the bias likely arises from  
257 national and cultural factors rather than editorial or peer-review processes, which had  
258 previously indicated mixed results<sup>15,16</sup>. Moreover, the gender gap in first and last  
259 authorships has steadily declined during the last decade in most countries, but the  
260 progress has been less evident or even contrary in some countries such as China and  
261 Israel. The gender disparity has decreased more rapidly in last authorships possibly  
262 reflecting a response to the more pronounced gender underrepresentation compared  
263 to first authors or dynamics in generation transition.

264  
265 Gender underrepresentation was observable in all top medical journals. However,  
266 female first and second authors were least frequent in articles published in *NEJM* or  
267 *Lancet*, whereas second last and last authors were least common in *NatMed*. The  
268 findings are in line with a previous study examining gender representation as first  
269 authors using 4 out of 5 similar journals during 1994-2014<sup>17</sup>. The trend was replicated  
270 also in an article examining author disparity in leading medical journals during the  
271 COVID-19 pandemic<sup>11</sup>. In that study, no difference was found when examining first and  
272 last author gender of COVID vs. non-COVID-related research<sup>11</sup>. Confirming our  
273 longitudinal findings, the proportion of female first (36.2% vs. 33.6%) and especially  
274 last (29.5% vs. 23.4%) authors has increased in 2020 compared to our data covering  
275 2010-2019. Similar findings were not evident between our and the earlier study  
276 covering 1994-2014 emphasizing that the gender representation has started to  
277 improve only recently.

278  
279 By comparing research keywords, first and especially last male authors tended to  
280 publish clinical trials and oncology-associated studies, which accumulated highest  
281 citation counts. The difference in research focus has not been demonstrated before  
282 and likely accounts for some of the journal-specific gender disparities. However, our  
283 data also indicated that publications first or last-authored by men tend to accumulate  
284 more citations implying that differences in research fields explain only limited  
285 variability.

286  
287 In line with results of our study, articles with a woman researcher as first or last author  
288 have been shown to accumulate fewer citations<sup>18</sup>. While medical research was not  
289 included, a previous study using 1.5 million interdisciplinary papers in 1779-2011 has  
290 indicated that male first authors tend to self-cite 56% themselves more commonly than  
291 their female colleagues, and even more during the last decades<sup>19</sup>. According to a  
292 recent preprint, males were more commonly quoted in Nature science journalism,  
293 which could skew the recognition and future citation probability of publications by  
294 gender<sup>20</sup>.

295  
296 Between 2010-2019 articles the number of authors increased by nine reflecting a  
297 fundamental change in research towards larger collaboration and building consortia.  
298 This correlated with higher citation frequency per article. While the general citation rate  
299 increased in the top medical journals, the rate was over 2.5 times faster in articles with  
300 more collaborators. We found that publications with male researchers had more  
301 authors in concordance with a previous study<sup>21</sup>. In our study, both author gender and  
302 number of collaborators were independent but weak predictors of future citation rate.

303  
304 Computational gender prediction could be a source of error as some names can be  
305 used by both women and men, especially in different countries. The name-based

306 analysis may also misclassify authors with non-binary genders. However, previously  
307 reported gender-related bibliometric observations were in line with our findings  
308 indicating that the gender prediction based on authors' first names provided realistic  
309 results. Inclusion of gender ethnicity and career stage were unavailable but could be  
310 important factors to further study gender representation.

311  
312 In summary, this computational audit indicated that gender disparity in medical  
313 research is country-specific, partly related to distinct research focus and more evident  
314 at the senior researcher level. The findings might reflect available financial resources  
315 and research support. The analysis also highlighted that the gender gap is decreasing  
316 with country-dependent variability.

317 **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

318

319 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

320 The author wishes to thank Susanna Lallukka-Brück for her patience, understanding,  
321 and insightful comments. The author is grateful for Olli Dufva and to the members of  
322 the Hematoscope Lab for discussion and comments. Certain data included herein are  
323 derived from Clarivate Web of Science. © Copyright Clarivate 2022. All rights reserved.  
324

325 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

326 Conception and design; Collection and assembly of data; Data analysis; Manuscript  
327 writing; Manuscript editing; Data interpretation; Final approval of manuscript: O.B.  
328

329 **ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE**

330 The study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki.  
331

332 **CODE AND DATA AVAILABILITY**

333 Codes and a 100-row data example are available at  
334 <https://github.com/obruck/International-Research-Impact>. Raw data can be  
335 downloaded from Clarivate Web of Science, with instructions provided in the Github  
336 repository.  
337

338 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

339 O.B. declares no Competing Non-Financial Interests but the following Competing  
340 Financial Interests: consultancy fees from Novartis, Sanofi, and Amgen, outside the  
341 submitted work.  
342

343 **FUNDING INFORMATION**

344 This study was supported by research grants from the Helsinki University Hospital.  
345



## 346 REFERENCES

- 347 1 Association of American Medical Collegues. [https://www.aamc.org/data-](https://www.aamc.org/data-reports/students-residents/interactive-data/2022-facts-enrollment-graduates-and-md-phd-data)  
348 reports/students-residents/interactive-data/2022-facts-enrollment-graduates-  
349 and-md-phd-data. 2022.
- 350 2 Nguyen M, Chaudhry SI, Asabor E, *et al.* Variation in Research Experiences  
351 and Publications During Medical School by Sex and Race and Ethnicity. *JAMA*  
352 *Netw Open* 2022; **5**: e2238520–e2238520.
- 353 3 Lubienski ST, Miller EK, Saclarides ES. Sex Differences in Doctoral Student  
354 Publication Rates. *Educ Res* 2017; **47**: 76–81.
- 355 4 Lerback J, Hanson B. Journals invite too few women to referee. *Nature* 2017;  
356 **541**: 455–7.
- 357 5 Wing DA, Benner RS, Petersen R, Newcomb R, Scott JR. Differences in  
358 Editorial Board Reviewer Behavior Based on Gender. *J Women's Heal* 2010;  
359 **19**: 1919–23.
- 360 6 Rochon PA, Davidoff F, Levinson W. Women in Academic Medicine  
361 Leadership: Has Anything Changed in 25 Years? *Acad Med* 2016; **91**.  
362 [https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Fulltext/2016/08000/Women\\_in\\_Ac-](https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Fulltext/2016/08000/Women_in_Academic_Medicine_Leadership__Has.14.aspx)  
363 *ademic\_Medicine\_Leadership\_\_Has.14.aspx*.
- 364 7 Association of American Medical Collegues. [https://www.aamc.org/data-](https://www.aamc.org/data-reports/data/2018-2019-state-women-academic-medicine-exploring-pathways-equity)  
365 reports/data/2018-2019-state-women-academic-medicine-exploring-pathways-  
366 equity. 2019.
- 367 8 National Institutes of Health (NIH) Gender Inequality Task Force.  
368 ADDRESSING GENDER INEQUALITY IN THE NIH INTRAMURAL  
369 RESEARCH PROGRAM ACTION TASK FORCE REPORT AND  
370 RECOMMENDATIONS. 2016  
371 [https://diversity.nih.gov/sites/coswd/files/images/2018-05/Gender Inequality](https://diversity.nih.gov/sites/coswd/files/images/2018-05/Gender_Inequality_Task_Force_final_AD_may_30_2018.pdf)  
372 *Task Force final AD may 30 2018.pdf*.
- 373 9 European Commission Directorate-General for Research and Innovation.  
374 Gender equality : achievements in Horizon 2020 and recommendations on the  
375 way forward. Publications Office, 2020 DOI:doi/10.2777/009204.
- 376 10 Brück O. The Geographical Gap in Leading Medical Journals - a Computational  
377 Audit. *medRxiv* 2022; : 2022.12.12.22283368.
- 378 11 Misra V, Safi F, Brewerton KA, *et al.* Gender disparity between authors in  
379 leading medical journals during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional  
380 review. *BMJ Open* 2021; **11**: e051224.
- 381 12 OECD. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Education  
382 at a Glance 2012. 2012.
- 383 13 Carr PL, Raj A, Kaplan SE, Terrin N, Breeze JL, Freund KM. Gender  
384 Differences in Academic Medicine: Retention, Rank, and Leadership  
385 Comparisons From the National Faculty Survey. *Acad Med* 2018; **93**.  
386 [https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Fulltext/2018/11000/Gender\\_Differ-](https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Fulltext/2018/11000/Gender_Differences_in_Academic_Medicine_.32.aspx)  
387 *ences\_in\_Academic\_Medicine\_.32.aspx*.
- 388 14 Holden C. General Contentment Masks Gender Gap in First AAAS Salary and  
389 Job Survey. *Science (80- )* 2001; **294**: 396–411.
- 390 15 Kern-Goldberger AR, James R, Berghella V, Miller ES. The impact of double-  
391 blind peer review on gender bias in scientific publishing: a systematic review.  
392 *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2022; **227**: 43-50.e4.
- 393 16 Fox CW, Burns CS, Muncy AD, Meyer JA. Gender differences in patterns of  
394 authorship do not affect peer review outcomes at an ecology journal. *Funct*  
395 *Ecol* 2016; **30**: 126–39.
- 396 17 Filardo G, da Graca B, Sass DM, Pollock BD, Smith EB, Martinez MA-M.

- 397 Trends and comparison of female first authorship in high impact medical  
398 journals: observational study (1994-2014). *BMJ* 2016; **352**: i847.  
399 18 Larivière V, Ni C, Gingras Y, Cronin B, Sugimoto CR. Bibliometrics: Global  
400 gender disparities in science. *Nature* 2013; **504**: 211–3.  
401 19 King MM, Bergstrom CT, Correll SJ, Jacquet J, West JD. Men Set Their Own  
402 Cites High: Gender and Self-citation across Fields and over Time. *Socius* 2017;  
403 **3**: 2378023117738903.  
404 20 Davidson NR, Greene CS. Analysis of science journalism reveals gender and  
405 regional disparities in coverage. *bioRxiv* 2022; : 2021.06.21.449261.  
406 21 Aksnes DW, Piro FN, Rørstad K. Gender gaps in international research  
407 collaboration: a bibliometric approach. *Scientometrics* 2019; **120**: 747–74.  
408  
409

410 **TABLES**

411 Table 1. Association of gender authorship with publication metrics. Median and 25-  
412 75% interquartile ranges are reported.

<b>Authorship</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>P-value</b>
First	# Publications	3311	6554	
First	# Citations	22.0 [10.9-46.4]	29.0 [13.6-60.9]	***
First	# Authors	10.0 [6.0-17.0]	11.0 [6.0-18.0]	***
Last	# Publications	2256	7366	
Last	# Citations	23.5 [11.0-52.4]	28.2 [13.4-58.3]	***
Last	# Authors	10.0 [5.0-17.0]	11.0 [6.0-18.0]	***








413

414 **FIGURE LEGENDS**




415 **Figure 1. Gender gap in medical publishing.** (A) Study design. (B) Bar plot on the  
416 association between first and last author gender. (C-D) Line plot and fitted linear  
417 regression for the number of publications and (E-F) number of yearly-averaged  
418 citations per publication by their publishing year and author gender. (G) Balloon plot  
419 on the association of the first, second, second last and last author gender distribution  
420 by the affiliation nationality of the corresponding author. The balloon color reflects the  
421 gender bias. To emphasize differences white color defines the median, i.e. men than  
422 women authors (red = more women, orange = balanced, blue = more men). The  
423 balloon size reflects the absolute deviation from a balanced gender distribution.  
424

425 **Figure 2. Scope of collaboration by genders.** (A) Line plot and fitted linear  
426 regression for the number of publications and (B) yearly-averaged citations per  
427 publication by their publishing year and number of authors. (C) Balloon plot on the  
428 association of the first and last author gender distribution by the affiliation nationality of  
429 the corresponding author. The balloon color reflects the number of authors by country  
430 (column) compared to all other countries and the balloon size the adjusted p value of  
431 that comparison.  
432


433 **Figure 3. Gender gap by subfields and journals.** (A) Left side spiral plots illustrate  
434 the keywords occurring  $\geq 20$  times and arranged by their citation impact starting from  
435 the outside layer (most cited) towards the inner core (least cited). Right side plots show  
436 the proportion (size of the bar) of the most and least cited keywords. The color of the  
437 bars in all spiral plots illustrate the gender balance. (B) Bar plot illustrating the  
438 proportion of publications in medical journals originating from different countries.







A



B

