

## Evidence of Gender Disparities in Citations and Altmetric Attention Score in Oncology

Rebecca A. Campbell<sup>1</sup>, Emma Helstrom<sup>2</sup>, Lauren Chew<sup>3</sup>, Renu Eapen<sup>4</sup>, Elizabeth Plimack<sup>2</sup>, Andres Correa<sup>2</sup>, Maarten Albersen<sup>5</sup>, Alexander Kutikov<sup>2</sup>, Philip Abbosh<sup>2</sup>, Adam Calaway<sup>3</sup>, Amanda Nizam<sup>1</sup>, Shilpa Gupta<sup>1</sup>, Sarah Psutka<sup>6</sup>, Pedro Barata<sup>3</sup>, Nazli Dizman<sup>7</sup>, Mohit Sindhani<sup>8</sup>, Christopher Weight<sup>1</sup>, Georges Haber<sup>1</sup>, Laura Bukavina<sup>3,8-9</sup>

1. Glickman Urologic and Kidney Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH
2. Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA
3. University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Cleveland, OH
4. Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, Australia
5. University of Leuven, Belgium
6. University of Washington, Seattle, WA
7. MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX
8. Case Western Reserve School of Medicine, Cleveland, OH
9. Drexel University Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, Philadelphia, PA

### Corresponding Author

Laura Bukavina, MD MPH MSc  
Assistant Professor Urologic Oncology  
University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center  
11100 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44106  
Email: [laura@bukavina.com](mailto:laura@bukavina.com)

Total word count: 3524

Figures and tables: 2

References: 17

Conflict of Interest:

**L.Bukavina:** consulting for Charite, UroGen Pharma. Associate Editor of European Urology, Editorial Board Member Urology Times. She has received funding from Bladder Cancer Advocacy Network and American Urologic Association.

Source of funding: None

Keywords (5): non-muscle-invasive bladder cancer, risk stratification, pathologic grade

**Abstract**

In this study, we assess gender disparities in both citation rates and Altmetric Attention Scores (AAS) within oncology, utilizing a dataset comprising over 600,000 articles from the past 15 years. The analysis focuses on the differential impact of gender on citation metrics and AAS, the latter of which expands the evaluation of research impact beyond traditional citation analysis to include digital engagement metrics such as social media mentions, news coverage, and policy discussions.

Methodologically, the study taps into the Altmetric database, using gender identification tools like the Gender Guesser API to classify articles by the gender composition of their first and last authors. Findings reveal a systemic over-citation of male-first and male-last author pairs (MM), with a mean citation difference (MCD) of +4.7. In stark contrast, female-first and female-last author pairs (WW) experience under-citation, with an MCD of -3.5.

A detailed examination of the Altmetric Attention Score shows that female-first authors receive a 7.19% lower AAS compared to male-first authors, indicating significant gender biases in the broader academic and public engagement. Delving deeper into the components of AAS, specifically news media coverage, reveals that female-first authors are covered 10.9% less in news media, 20.4% less patent references and 33.4% in Weibo mentions than their male counterparts. This disparity is significant and suggests a broader trend of underrepresentation and undervaluation of female-led research in more public-facing and influential media outlets.

These results underscore the persistent influence of gender on the recognition and valuation of scientific contributions within the field of oncology. They highlight the need for academia and publishing entities to implement more equitable practices to mitigate these disparities and ensure a balanced representation and recognition of scholarly work across genders.



## Introduction

1           Gender disparities in academia are a global concern, reflecting significant  
2 imbalances in the professional landscape of academic and research institutions.<sup>1-3</sup>  
3 Among the various indicators of these disparities, the differences in citation counts—  
4 referred to as "citation disparity"—is particularly troubling.<sup>4,5</sup> This phenomenon not only  
5 underscores potential biases in the recognition of scholarly contributions but also  
6 directly influences career advancement and the allocation of resources within academic  
7 communities.

8           Previous studies have indicated that publications authored by male researchers  
9 tend to garner more citations than those authored by females.<sup>6-9</sup> This trend can be partly  
10 attributed to cognitive biases where male scholars are more likely to recall and cite  
11 works by their male peers. Further compounding the issue, research has shown that  
12 works with women listed as first or last authors receive approximately 30% fewer  
13 citations than comparable works authored by men in similar positions. This discrepancy  
14 manifests what is often termed the "Matthew Effect," where male researchers'  
15 contributions are seen as more central and pivotal to their fields. In contrast, the  
16 "Matilda Effect" describes the relative under-recognition and undervaluation of scientific  
17 achievements when women are the principal researchers.<sup>10</sup>

18           The persistent citation disparity between male and female researchers has  
19 prompted various explanations, including differences in resource allocation for open  
20 access publications, collaboration dynamics, academic rank, areas of specialization,  
21 and the topics addressed in published works.<sup>11-13</sup> The continuation of these disparities  
22 may foster a simplistic view that the scholarly contributions of male and female  
23 scientists are fundamentally different. However, this perspective fails to consider the  
24 significant evidence of systemic barriers that impede women's progress in academia.  
25 Previous research highlights the biases in perceptions of excellence, which can  
26 influence opportunities for visibility and advancement provided to individuals.<sup>14</sup>

27           While citations are traditionally seen as a key indicator of academic productivity  
28 and often serve as a basis for research and academic promotions, the introduction of  
29 the Altmetric Attention Score (AAS) provides a more nuanced measure of research

30 impact. This score not only assesses the volume of citations but also evaluates the  
31 quality of attention that scholarly articles receive. It includes a range of complementary  
32 metrics, such as article downloads, mentions in policies and patents, media coverage,  
33 and engagement within professional networks (e.g., reference managers) and social  
34 media platforms like Twitter and mainstream media.<sup>15</sup> This expansive approach offers a  
35 more comprehensive assessment of an article's influence, presenting potential avenues  
36 to explore and address the intricate dynamics of citation and attention disparities in  
37 academia.<sup>8</sup> Despite its potential, AAS remains underutilized in examining gender  
38 disparities.

39 In this study, we aim to analyze potential disparities in the Altmetric Attention  
40 Score specifically within the field of oncology over the past 15 years, spanning over  
41 600,000 articles. We will examine the impact of research publications authored by  
42 female first and last authors compared to those authored by males. Furthermore, our  
43 study seeks to quantify the extent of over/under-citation in oncology literature, with an  
44 additional focus on differences across various subspecialties.

## 45 **Methodology**

### 46 **Sample creation**

47 The initial dataset was compiled from the Altmetric database through Application  
48 Programming Interface (API) obtained through Drexel University focusing on scholarly  
49 published articles that include specific keywords: 'sarcoma', 'radiation therapy', 'stem  
50 cell transplant', 'targeted therapy', 'immunotherapy', 'melanoma', 'malignancy',  
51 'lymphoma', 'chemotherapy', 'carcinoma', 'neoplasm', 'tumors', 'oncology', 'leukemia',  
52 'carcinogenesis', 'metastasis', 'adenocarcinoma', 'squamous cell carcinoma', 'glioma',  
53 'myeloma', 'cancer genetics', 'precision medicine', 'cancer screening', 'cancer  
54 prevention', 'cancer diagnosis', 'palliative care', and 'cancer epidemiology'. The search  
55 was focused on articles published between January 1, 2009, and January 31, 2024.  
56 This approach yielded an extensive dataset comprising 652,834 records across the  
57 various oncology subfields.

58 In addition to the gender of the authors, our dataset was enriched with a variety of fields  
59 to support our analysis. These can be accessed in eMethods.

60 The dataset was rigorously preprocessed to maintain data accuracy and  
61 pertinence to our research objectives. This involved normalizing author names and  
62 correcting discrepancies within the metadata. To enhance the scope of papers suitable  
63 for gender classification based on first names, we utilized the DOI crossref API for  
64 comprehensive name citation matching.<sup>16</sup> This process enabled us to associate  
65 abbreviated names, often represented by initials in certain journal entries, with their full-  
66 name counterparts. For instance, an entry such as L.B. Smith, accompanied by a DOI,  
67 was matched to its full form, Laura Bernice Smith, facilitating the application of the  
68 GenderGuesser API.<sup>17</sup>

69

## 70 **Name based assignment of author gender categories**

71 In our dataset, we established "author gender categories" based on the first  
72 names of the first and last authors of the papers. Using the Gender Guesser API—a  
73 commercial tool providing statistical name-gender correlations across 191 countries—  
74 we assigned gender to authors whose first names had at least a 99.9% probability of  
75 being associated with a particular gender, labeling them as 'man' or 'woman'  
76 accordingly.

77 Our comprehensive dataset consisted of 652,843 papers, and we were able to  
78 confidently assign gender to both first and last authors in 75.1% of the papers.  
79 Furthermore, for 19.2% of the papers, gender could only be ascribed to either the first or  
80 last author. Papers were then categorized based on the gender labels of the first and  
81 last authors. Those with at first and last author labeled 'woman' were categorized as  
82 WW, even if the other authors' genders were undetermined. Conversely, if both first and  
83 last authors were labeled 'man', the paper was categorized as MM.  
84 It is important to clarify that "author gender category" is a statistical tool and does not  
85 necessarily reflect the actual gender identities of the individuals. It is a proxy indicating a

86 correlation between a given name and gender identity as commonly recognized on  
87 social media or official documents. The actual gender identity of authors could only be  
88 discerned through self-identification or personal knowledge, which lies beyond the  
89 scope of an automated analytical process such as ours.

90 Nonetheless, the use of author gender categories serves as a practical  
91 approximation for our study since names significantly influence the perception of gender  
92 identity. Such perceptions can affect judgments of scientific merit and, by extension,  
93 citation practices—regardless of the true gender identity of the authors in question.

94 Furthermore, our study concentrated on the first and last authors due to a well-  
95 established norm in life sciences authorship. Typically, the first author of life science  
96 articles is the junior author responsible for conducting the research, whereas the last  
97 author is usually the senior author who conceptualizes and finances the research.

98

## 99 **AAS score**

100 For the first part of our analysis, we focused on the Altmetric Attention Scores  
101 (AAS) for each publication, analyzing the scores in relation to the gender of the first and  
102 last authors. This evaluation was critical to determine if the gender of the authors  
103 influenced the amount of attention their research garnered across all altmetric variables.  
104 We employed an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression approach to establish a  
105 model for investigating the dynamics between the logarithmically transformed AAS  
106 (independent variable) and the volume of Dimensions citations (dependent variable). In  
107 this construction, we accounted for variables such as the first author's gender, open  
108 access (OA) status, and the publication year, enabling a measured examination of their  
109 collective influence on the citation count. Our regression framework incorporated an  
110 intercept to capture the baseline effect beyond the scope of the explanatory variables. A  
111 constant term was introduced, facilitating the interpretation of the model's coefficients  
112 with respect to a null baseline of the independent variables. Upon fitting the OLS  
113 regression model, we evaluated the statistical significance of each coefficient to

114 determine the impact of gender, OA status, and AAS on the predicted number of  
115 citations.

116

### 117 **Subspecialty Delineation**

118 We compiled a roster of peer-reviewed publications across various oncological  
119 subspecialties for analysis, which includes sectors such as breast oncology,  
120 gastrointestinal oncology, gynecologic oncology, head and neck oncology, hematology-  
121 oncology, neuro-oncology, urological oncology, radiation oncology, general oncology,  
122 surgical oncology, and molecular oncology. These journals span the surgical, medical,  
123 and scientific domains within cancer research literature. The selection of journals was  
124 predicated on the availability of comprehensive data and their respective impact factors.  
125 To gauge citation impact, a baseline citation score of 1 was established, reflective of the  
126 significance of receiving at least one citation within the first two years post-publication.  
127 Each subspecialty was represented by a minimum of three journals. In instances where  
128 a journal was relevant to more than one category, it was retained only in the category  
129 where it was most contextually appropriate, thus avoiding redundancy. In total, 64  
130 journals were classified into eleven categories, with 451,881 total articles from 2009 to  
131 2024.

132

### 133 **Subspecialty Metrics**

134 Calculation of over/under citation was calculated as a percent difference of  
135 observed citation from the gender-blind expectations model. Gender blind expectations  
136 using generalized additive model on the binomial outcomes [MM, WW] (GAM)  
137 previously described was utilized.<sup>18</sup> Briefly, gender blind null model predicts the  
138 probability of citations based on publishing journal, categorization as a research, year of  
139 publication, combined number of authors in the dataset. For each article, one can define  
140 its over/under citation of each author gender category as the percent difference of  
141 observed citations from gender blind expectations. The degree to which papers  
142 authored by man-man (MM) pairs are over- or under-cited can be quantified using the  
143 formula  $(oMM - eMM)/eMM * 100$  where oMM represents the actual observed number of  
144 citations received by MM papers from the citing articles, and eMM the predicted count of



145 citations for MM papers, as forecasted by the gender-neutral model. Details regarding  
146 all these parameters and accompanying tests of significance can be found in  
147 documentation of the 'mgcv' package in R.<sup>19</sup>

148

## 149 **Results**

150 A total of 652,843 papers were retrieved using Altmetrics API. The distribution of  
151 our gender categories is as follows: 'UU' (unknown-unknown) pairs were the most  
152 common at 162,751, followed by 'MM' (man-man) pairs at 157,494, and 'WM' (woman-  
153 man) pairs at 92,245. 'WW' (woman-woman) pairs accounted for 61,329 papers, while  
154 'MW' (man-woman) pairs were present in 53,461 papers. Papers with one unknown  
155 gender paired with a known man ('UM') were 42,678, and those paired with a known  
156 woman ('WU') were 25,945. Lastly, 'MU' (man-unknown) and 'UW' (unknown-woman)  
157 pairs numbered 36,180 and 20,760 respectively.

158

### 159 **Gender differences in overall attention and source of attention**

160 The analysis shows a notable difference in the overall Altmetric Attention Score  
161 (AAS) and its individual components between women and men serving in the first and  
162 last author positions (as shown in Fig 1G for first authors and Fig 1H for last authors).  
163 Women in the first author position have a 7.19% lower AAS compared to their male  
164 counterparts, a statistically significant difference ( $p < 0.001$ ). The discrepancy is slightly  
165 less for last authors, with women exhibiting a 4.9 % lower AAS than men ( $p = 0.004$ ).

166 In terms of individual components measured by different sources of attention,  
167 first author women received less coverage by 10.9% in News ( $p < 0.0001$ ), 20.2% in  
168 policy discussions ( $p < 0.0001$ ), 20.4% in patent references ( $p < 0.0001$ ), 33.4% in Weibo  
169 mentions ( $p = 0.05$ ), and 8.2% in Twitter mentions ( $p = 0.001$ ). Similar trends were  
170 observed for women in the last author positions, with overall decreases in mentions  
171 across news ( $p = 0.03$ ), policy discussions ( $p < 0.001$ ), patents ( $p < 0.001$ ), Wikipedia  
172 references ( $p < 0.001$ ), and citation counts ( $p < 0.001$ ). Across all metrics within altmetrics,  
173 no single metric showed a statistically significant preferential mention of female first or  
174 last authors over males.

175 For the longitudinal analysis from 2009 to 2024, there has been an upward  
176 trajectory in engagement metrics across both gender lines. Nonetheless, our data  
177 reveal a persistent gender gap in the frequency of academic mentions. On social media,  
178 particularly Twitter, male authors outpaced female authors with an average of 12.5  
179 mentions compared to 8.6 ( $p < 0.001$ ) (Fig 1A). A similar trend emerged in news media,  
180 with male authors receiving slightly more mentions than female authors by a margin of  
181 0.2, peaking notably in 2022 (Fig 1C). Further examination of altmetric score highlights a  
182 gender discrepancy favoring male first authors, who scored an average of 1.8 points  
183 above female first authors (Fig 1E).

184 Within last authorship, male last authors were more frequently mentioned in  
185 Twitter conversations, averaging 13.2 mentions in contrast to 9.5 for their female  
186 counterparts ( $p < 0.001$ ) (Fig 1B). This gender imbalance was echoed in news coverage,  
187 where male last authors were mentioned nearly twice as often as female last authors  
188 (0.8 vs 0.42 mentions, respectively;  $p < 0.001$ ) (Fig 1D). Additionally, the altmetric scores  
189 for 2024 reinforced this trend, with male last authors achieving scores averaging 12.5,  
190 significantly higher than the 8.1 average for female last authors ( $p = 0.03$ ) (Fig 1F).

191

## 192 **Citation Imbalance by Specialty**

193 The proportion of papers in each author category (MM, WW, MW, WM) can be  
194 seen in Figure 2B as a function of publication. Note that percent of WM authorship  
195 represents the lowest total category with minimal growth from 2009 (10.2%) to 2024  
196 (13.0%). Similarly, WW represent a small proportion of authorship, with minimal growth  
197 from 2009 (9.5%) to 2024 (14.4%) (Fig 2B).

198 The representation of WW authorship in oncology subspecialties has relatively  
199 modest growth, with the exception of Breast Oncology and Gynecologic Oncology,  
200 where there has been a marked increase in female authorship. Gynecologic Oncology,  
201 for instance, nearly doubled its representation of women authors, escalating from 17.7%  
202 in 2009 to 35.4% in 2023. Urologic Oncology, though starting with a lower baseline, saw  
203 its female authorship proportion rise from 3.1% to 5.2% in the same timeframe,  
204 reflecting a measurable and consistent growth. Overall, none of the subspecialties

205 experienced a decline in women's authorship, with the majority showing at least a  
206 nominal increase over the past fourteen years, as detailed in Figure 2A.

207 Figure 2D elucidates distinct inter-journal variations in the representation of  
208 women-first and women-last authorship across various oncology subspecialties.  
209 Notably, while the *Journal of Neuro-Oncology and Neuro-Oncology* maintain a  
210 comparable average of 13% for women authorship, *World Neurosurgery* exhibits a  
211 markedly lower figure, with women authors constituting less than 4.5% of its  
212 publications. In the realm of surgical oncology, the *Annals of Surgical Oncology*  
213 demonstrates a consistent inclusion of women in authorship roles, unlike the *World*  
214 *Journal of Surgical Oncology* and the journal *Surgical Oncology*, where women's  
215 representation is significantly lower. These observations underscore the potential  
216 influence of individual journal policies and editorial practices on the prevalence of  
217 women's authorship within their publications.

218

## 219 **Citation Imbalance**

220 Our analysis of citation trends among gender combinations revealed strong  
221 evidence of gender bias. The MM combination has a striking over-citation value within  
222 oncologic academia, with a mean citation difference (MCD) of 4.7 (Figure 2C). In  
223 comparison, WW papers were found to be under-cited, with a MCD of -3.5.  
224 Furthermore, this trend generally persisted among all four gender combinations (Figure  
225 2E). WW papers were the only cohort to experience under-citation (MCD -3.6).  
226 Interestingly, MW papers experience the highest over-citation with a MCD of 6.3 in  
227 comparison to MM with a MCD of 4.7. However, the overall pattern of WW papers being  
228 routinely under-cited and male authorship facilitating increased citation was observed.  
229 Dissecting these trends further, Figure 2F,G reveals that these citation gaps are not  
230 uniform across all subfields. In urologic oncology, MM experiences over-citation rate of  
231 0.32%, while female-authored works are significantly undercited by 24.2%, bringing the  
232 total gender-based citation gap to 24.5%. Oncology stands out with the largest disparity,  
233 where MM pairs receive 19.0% more citations than anticipated, and WW pairs 22.9%  
234 fewer, cumulatively presenting a stark citation gap of 41.9%.

235           Nonetheless, the fields of gynecologic oncology and radiation oncology present  
236 an exception to this pattern. In these subspecialties, both WW and MM authorship  
237 configurations receive citations at rates exceeding expectations, with MM pairs at 59.5%  
238 and WW at 39.7% in gynecologic oncology, and 47.6% for MM and 39.5% for WW in  
239 radiation oncology. These exceptions indicate a potential for field-specific dynamics  
240 influencing citation practices, which may override the broader gender-based trends  
241 observed in citation behavior.

242  
243

244

245

## 246 **Discussion**

247           In our study encompassing an extensive dataset of 652,842 published  
248 manuscripts between 2009-2024, we sought to evaluate gender differences in  
249 proportions of papers published, citation metrics, and AAS across the field of oncology,  
250 an area which has not been extensively reported on in the literature. The data from our  
251 study reveal that publications authored by men, particularly those with male first and last  
252 authors (MM), are consistently cited more frequently than those authored by women.  
253 This trend was observed across various oncology subspecialties but was most  
254 pronounced in general oncology, where the gender citation gap was the largest. This  
255 could reflect a combination of cognitive biases where scholars are more likely to cite  
256 works from their male peers, as well as structural biases within the research community  
257 that might favor male principal investigators for clinical trials, research topics, or  
258 methodologies more commonly pursued by male researchers.

259           Interestingly, our results also showed that mixed-gender authorship pairs,  
260 specifically male first and female last authors (MW), experienced higher citation rates  
261 than expected. This suggests that the presence of a male author in a prominent position  
262 may mitigate some of the negative impacts of gender bias on citation rates. However,  
263 the fact that women-women (WW) pairs were consistently under-cited, even more so

264 than mixed pairs, underscores the specific challenges faced by female scholars,  
265 especially when they occupy both pivotal roles in research authorship.

266 The under-citation of female-authored papers is troubling not only because it  
267 reflects bias but also because it directly impacts the visibility and influence of women's  
268 research contributions. Lower citation rates have significant implications for career  
269 advancement, funding opportunities, and academic recognition. The "publish or perish"  
270 culture in academia places substantial weight on citation metrics. These metrics can  
271 influence a variety of professional outcomes, including graduate opportunities, funding  
272 success, career positions, awards, distinctions, and the critical processes of tenure and  
273 promotion.<sup>20</sup> These trends have been substantiated by research, including a critical  
274 evaluation of the Altmetric Top 100 lists from 2015 to 2019, which demonstrated a  
275 significant citation gap disadvantaging female authors.<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, an in-depth  
276 examination of more than 5000 articles from high-impact medical journals showed a  
277 recurring pattern of fewer citations for papers where women serve as first or last  
278 authors.<sup>7</sup> Particularly pronounced was the finding that papers with women occupying  
279 both the first and last authorship positions experienced a citation rate halved compared  
280 to their male counterparts. These studies echo our own findings, pointing to an average  
281 gender citation gap of -8 in articles authored by women when contrasted with those  
282 authored by men, highlighting a critical issue that the academic community must  
283 address to promote equitable recognition of all researchers, and not just in theory but in  
284 practice.

285 Our study examined direct consequences of under citation utilizing the AAS,  
286 which has provided a detailed perspective on how research is perceived and valued  
287 across different platforms, including social media, policy documents, and news outlets.<sup>8</sup>  
288 The AAS findings are indicative of a persistent gender gap when it comes to the visibility  
289 and recognition of academic work. Our results indicate that papers with women in the  
290 first author position were found to have an AAS that was 7.2% lower than those of their  
291 male counterparts—a significant difference that carries important implications for the  
292 reach and impact of their research. Last authors who are women also faced a deficit,  
293 with a 5.7% lower AAS compared to men.

294 More specifically, female first authors received lower coverage by 10.9% in news  
295 outlets, 20.2% in policy discussions, and 20.4% in patent references, with even more  
296 pronounced disparities observed in social media platforms such as Weibo and Twitter.  
297 Similar patterns were noted for women in last author positions, with reduced mentions  
298 and references across all examined media, suggesting a broad-based undervaluation of  
299 their contributions. In addition, over the fifteen-year period from 2009 to 2024, while we  
300 saw an overall increase in engagement metrics for academic work, the data underscore  
301 a gender divide, with male authors consistently receiving more mentions across the  
302 majority of platforms.

303 While there is a scarcity of research on AAS gender disparities specifically within  
304 oncology, other medical disciplines have begun to shed light on this phenomenon.  
305 Studies from cardiology, for instance, reveal that articles authored by women first  
306 authors are significantly less likely to achieve high AAS compared to those by men.<sup>8</sup>  
307 Yet, when women occupy senior authorship roles, this gap in AAS does not seem to  
308 persist, and the difference in AAS between WW and men-men MM authored articles is  
309 not significant.

310 With the rise of social media as a pivotal platform for the dissemination of  
311 scientific and medical knowledge, the relevance of AAS and their associated sources of  
312 attention has surged, given their established correlation with citation rates. In the field of  
313 oncology, this correlation has been particularly noted in randomized phase III cancer  
314 trials, where a higher AAS is often an indicator of a greater number of citations.<sup>22,23</sup> This  
315 trend is mirrored in gynecologic oncology research, where a robust positive relationship  
316 has been identified between median citation counts and median AAS.<sup>24</sup> Moreover,  
317 evidence suggests a growing link between an article's presence in high-impact journals  
318 and its AAS, implying that such publications tend to receive more media attention and,  
319 consequently, a higher citation rate. This correlation underscores the importance of  
320 amplifying the presence of female-authored research in prominent journals to bolster  
321 visibility and citation impact.<sup>25</sup>

322 This study faces several limitations. Primarily, the reliance on an online database  
323 to determine the gender of authors introduces the possibility of misclassification and  
324 incomplete data due to some authors being labeled as "unknown" or "excluded." In


325 addition, this approach does not account for the nuances of gender identity and self-  
326 identification, which transcend binary male or female categories. Such complexities are  
327 beyond the capacity of bioinformatical tools to discern, as they typically rely on name-  
328 based gender inference. The study also does not delve into the specifics of topics or  
329 publication types—such as videos or manuscripts—which can significantly influence  
330 AAS. For instance, studies have found that content related to treatment and quality of  
331 life, or the use of video abstracts, tends to attract more online engagement.<sup>26</sup> Future  
332 research into the impact of gender on AAS might consider these factors more closely,  
333 including examining the gender makeup of citation sources and the proportion of female  
334 authorship in papers, which could provide deeper insights into the nuances of academic  
335 influence and recognition.

336 Despite existing challenges, there are several effective measures that can be  
337 implemented to narrow the persistent gaps in citation rates and AAS related to gender  
338 disparities. Establishing transparent and equitable citation practices is crucial. Journals  
339 can play a significant role by encouraging or requiring the inclusion of diverse work,  
340 particularly by integrating more women and underrepresented groups into their reviewer  
341 and editor pools to enhance visibility. Additionally, there should be a deliberate effort to  
342 promote the work of female researchers through social media and press releases,  
343 which could involve partnerships with academic institutions to showcase a broader  
344 range of research through various communication channels and support of open access  
345 publishing. Furthermore, funding bodies are encouraged to consider AAS and citation  
346 data within the context of existing biases when assessing grant applications. By  
347 developing policies that account for the influence of gender bias on these metrics, it's  
348 possible to reduce their impact on funding decisions and support fairer research  
349 evaluation practices.


350 In conclusion, this manuscript has highlighted significant gender disparities in  
351 citation rates and AAS across various fields within oncology. Our findings highlight a  
352 systemic issue where female-authored research is under-cited and receives less  
353 attention compared to male-authored work, potentially impacting career advancement,  
354 funding opportunities, and academic recognition for women in science. As we advance,  
355 it will be essential to continue monitoring these metrics and implementing robust policies

356 that not only recognize but actively combat the biases that perpetuate gender disparities  
357 in academic research.  
358





**Figure 1.** Analysis of Almetric Attention Scores (AAS) over time and by source of attention, including: A) first author Twitter mentions by gender over time; B) last author Twitter mentions by gender over time; C) first author news mentions by gender over time; D) last author news mentions by gender over time; E) first author AAS by gender over time; F) last author AAS by gender over time; G) relative differences in AAS for woman first author compared to male first author by specific source of attention; H) relative differences in AAS for woman last author compared to male last author by specific source of attention.



**Figure 2.** Analysis of gender combinations (gender of first author and gender of last author) and citations, including: A) proportion of WW papers over time by oncologic specialty; B) gender combination proportions over time (including WW, WM, MM, MW); C) over/under citation by gender combination (including MM and WW); D) proportion of WW papers over time by oncologic specialty (including specific high impact journals within each category); E) over/under-citation by all gender combinations (including WW, WM, MM, MW); F) over/under-citation by oncologic specialty and gender combination (including MM and WW); G) graph illustrating imbalance between mean difference in citations for WW versus MM with each point illustrating a specific journal which is color-coded according to the oncologic field in which it belongs. MM = male first author/male last author; MW = male first author/women last author; WM = women first author/male last author; WW = women first author/women last author.

## References

1. Mamtani M, Shofer F, Mudan A, et al. Quantifying gender disparity in physician authorship among commentary articles in three high-impact medical journals: an observational study. *BMJ Open*. Feb 25 2020;10(2):e034056. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034056
2. Fournier LE, Hopping GC, Zhu L, et al. Females Are Less Likely Invited Speakers to the International Stroke Conference: Time's Up to Address Sex Disparity. *Stroke*. Feb 2020;51(2):674-678. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.027016
3. Boiko JR, Anderson AJM, Gordon RA. Representation of Women Among Academic Grand Rounds Speakers. *JAMA Intern Med*. May 01 2017;177(5):722-724. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.9646
4. Jaggi R, Guancial EA, Worobey CC, et al. The "gender gap" in authorship of academic medical literature--a 35-year perspective. *N Engl J Med*. Jul 2006;355(3):281-7. doi:10.1056/NEJMs053910
5. Budrikis Z. Growing citation gender gap. *Nature Reviews Physics*. 2020/07/01 2020;2(7):346-346. doi:10.1038/s42254-020-0207-3
6. Filardo G, da Graca B, Sass DM, Pollock BD, Smith EB, Martinez MA. Trends and comparison of female first authorship in high impact medical journals: observational study (1994-2014). *BMJ*. Mar 02 2016;352:i847. doi:10.1136/bmj.i847
7. Chatterjee P, Werner RM. Gender Disparity in Citations in High-Impact Journal Articles. *JAMA Netw Open*. Jul 01 2021;4(7):e2114509. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.14509

8. Brown KN, Goel R, Soman S, et al. Gender Disparity in Citations and Altmetric Attention Scores in High-Impact Cardiology Journals. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Aug 08 2023;82(6):572-573. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2023.05.044
9. Ajay PS, Sharperson CM, Shah SK, Kooby DA, Shah MM. The Gender Gap in Surgical Literature: Are We Making Progress? *J Surg Res*. Mar 2024;295:357-363. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2023.11.033
10. Schmidt C. Matilda and Matthew Effects and Sexism in Science. In: Schmidt C, ed. *The Invisible Hand of Cancer: The Complex Force of Socioeconomic Factors in Oncology Today*. Springer International Publishing; 2023:121-133.
11. Lerchenmueller MJ, Sorenson O, Jena AB. Gender differences in how scientists present the importance of their research: observational study. *BMJ*. Dec 16 2019;367:l6573. doi:10.1136/bmj.l6573
12. Lerchenmüller C, Lerchenmueller MJ, Sorenson O. Long-Term Analysis of Sex Differences in Prestigious Authorships in Cardiovascular Research Supported by the National Institutes of Health. *Circulation*. Feb 20 2018;137(8):880-882. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.117.032325
13. Bendels MHK, Müller R, Brueggmann D, Groneberg DA. Gender disparities in high-quality research revealed by Nature Index journals. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(1):e0189136. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0189136
14. Llorens A, Tzovara A, Bellier L, et al. Gender bias in academia: A lifetime problem that needs solutions. *Neuron*. Jul 07 2021;109(13):2047-2074. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2021.06.002
15. Lerchenmueller MJ, Schmallenbach L, Bley M, Lerchenmüller C. Gender disparities in altmetric attention scores for cardiovascular research. *Communications Biology*. 2023/07/17 2023;6(1):741. doi:10.1038/s42003-023-05058-9
16. API C. <https://github.com/CrossRef/rest-api-doc>
17. API GG. <https://gender-guesser.com/>
18. Teich EG, Kim JZ, Lynn CW, et al. Citation inequity and gendered citation practices in contemporary physics. *Nature Physics*. 2022/10/01 2022;18(10):1161-1170. doi:10.1038/s41567-022-01770-1
19. Wood SN. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation of semiparametric generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*. 2011;73(1):3-36. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2010.00749.x>
20. Davies SW, Putnam HM, Ainsworth T, et al. Promoting inclusive metrics of success and impact to dismantle a discriminatory reward system in science. *PLoS Biol*. Jun 2021;19(6):e3001282. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3001282
21. Rotenstein LS, Torre M, Cleary JL, Sen S, Guille C, Mata DA. Differences in Gender Representation in the Altmetric Top 100. *J Gen Intern Med*. Feb 2022;37(3):590-592. doi:10.1007/s11606-021-06829-y
22. Rooney MK, Sharifi B, Ludmir EB, Fuller CD, Warner JL. Factors Associated With Altmetric Attention Scores for Randomized Phase III Cancer Clinical Trials. *JCO Clin Cancer Inform*. Aug 2023;7:e2300082. doi:10.1200/CCI.23.00082
23. Abi Jaoude J, Kouzy R, Rooney M, et al. Impact factor and citation metrics in phase III cancer trials. *Oncotarget*. Aug 31 2021;12(18):1780-1786. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.28044

24. Chi AJ, Lopes AJ, Rong LQ, Charlson ME, Alvarez RD, Boerner T. Examining the correlation between Altmetric Attention Score and citation count in the gynecologic oncology literature: Does it have an impact? *Gynecol Oncol Rep*. Aug 2021;37:100778. doi:10.1016/j.gore.2021.100778
25. Huang W, Wang P, Wu Q. A correlation comparison between Altmetric Attention Scores and citations for six PLOS journals. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(4):e0194962. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0194962
26. Bonnevie T, Repel A, Gravier FE, et al. Video abstracts are associated with an increase in research reports citations, views and social attention: a cross-sectional study. *Scientometrics*. 2023;128(5):3001-3015. doi:10.1007/s11192-023-04675-9