

1 **Assessment of gender and geographical bias in the editorial decision-making**
2 **process of biomedical journals: A Case-Control study.**

3

4 Angèle Gayet-Ageron (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6164-9693>),^{1 2*} associate professor;
5 Khaoula Ben Messaoud (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8053-4672>),^{1 2*} postdoctoral
6 researcher; Mark Richards (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8689-5711>),³ Head of Content
7 Growth, BMJ; Cyril Jaksic (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5835-3480>),^{1 2} statistician; Julien
8 Gobeill (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9809-7741>),^{4- 5} data scientist; Jeevanthi
9 Liyanapathirana,^{4 5} research collaborator; Luc Mottin (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9614-9293>),^{4 5} research collaborator; Nona Naderi (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1272-7640>),⁶
10 associate professor; Patrick Ruch (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3374-2962>),^{4 5} full professor
11 and Group Leader; Zoé Mariot (<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-9238-888X>),⁷ medical resident;
12 Alexandra Calmy (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1137-6826>),^{8 9} full professor; Julia Friedman,¹⁰
13 CMI Editorial Office Manager; Leonard Leibovici (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9907-344X>),¹⁰
14 full professor & CMI Editor in chief; Sara Schroter (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8791-8564>),⁴
15 ¹¹ senior researcher BMJ.

17 *equal contribution

18 ¹Division of Clinical Epidemiology, University Hospitals of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

19 ²University of Geneva, School of Medicine, Geneva, Switzerland

20 ³BMJ, London, UK

21 ⁴SIB Text Mining, Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Geneva, Switzerland.

22 ⁵BiTeM group, Information Sciences, HES-SO / HEG Geneva, Carouge, Switzerland

23 ⁶Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire des Sciences du Numérique,
24 91400, Orsay, France

25 ⁷Internal medicine division, Hôpital Riviera-Chablais, Rennaz, Switzerland

26 ⁸HIV/AIDS Unit, Infectious Diseases Division, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva,
27 Switzerland

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

1 ⁹CRC Geneva, Geneva University Hospitals & University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

2 ¹⁰CMI Editorial Office

3 ¹¹Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,
4 London, UK

5 Correspondence to: Angèle Gayet-Ageron (angele.gayet-ageron@unige.ch)

6

7

8 **Abstract**

9 **Objectives:** To assess whether the gender (primary) and geographical affiliation (post hoc) of
10 the first and/or last authors of manuscripts is associated with publication decisions after
11 controlling for known confounders.

12 **Design:** Case-control (1:1) study.

13 **Setting:** Two large general medical journals and 20 specialist journals.

14 **Participants:** Original peer reviewed research manuscripts submitted between January 1,
15 2012, and December 31, 2019.

16 **Main outcomes measures and predictor:** Manuscripts accepted (cases) and rejected
17 (controls) were compared between women and men first authors (main predictor), and
18 between women and men last authors (secondary predictor).

19 **Results:** Of 7,000 included manuscripts 6,724 (96.1%) first and 6,768 (96.7%) last authors'
20 gender were identified; 3,056 (43.7%) and 2,214 (32.7%) were women, respectively. The
21 proportion of women first and last authors were respectively 46.7% (n=1,571) and 32.3%
22 (n=1,093) among cases and 44.2% (n=1,485) and 33.1% (n=1,121) among controls. In
23 univariate analysis, being a woman first author increased the likelihood of acceptance for
24 publication (odds ratio 1.11; 95% confidence interval 1.00 to 1.22). After adjustment for study
25 attributes, then post-hoc variables, the association between the first author's gender and
26 acceptance for publication became non-significant 1.04 (0.94 to 1.16). The likelihood of
27 acceptance for publication was significantly lower for first authors affiliated to Asia 0.58 (0.48
28 to 0.70) compared to Europe, and for first author affiliated to upper middle income 0.61 (0.47

1 to 0.78) and lower middle and low-income 0.65 (0.45 to 0.93) compared to high income
2 countries. Compared to papers where both first and last authors were from the same country,
3 acceptance for publication was significantly higher when both authors were affiliated to
4 different countries from the same geographical and income groups 1.39 (1.09 to 1.77), to
5 different countries, different geographical but same income groups 1.45 (1.14 to 1.84), or to
6 different income groups 1.59 (1.20 to 2.11). The study attributes (design, and funding) were
7 also independently associated with acceptance for publication.

8 **Conclusions:** The absence of gender inequalities during the editorial decision-making process
9 is reassuring. However, the underrepresentation of first authors affiliated to Asia and low-
10 income countries in manuscripts accepted for publication indicates poor representation of
11 global scientists' opinion and supports growing demands for improving diversity in biomedical
12 research.

13

14 **Keywords**

15 Meta-research, gender inequalities, diversity, geographical inequalities, editorial decision-
16 making process, gender bias, geographical bias

17

1 **Summary boxes**

2 **What is already known on this topic?**

- 3
- 4 • Published studies have revealed gender inequalities in academia, attainment of
5 leadership positions, successful grant funding and in biomedical research production
6 (including reported research contributions, attainment of key authorship positions in
7 submitted and published manuscripts, membership of editorial boards, and
8 participation in peer review).
 - 9 • Geographical inequalities have been reported in biomedical research production,
10 including membership of editorial boards, participation in peer review, and attainment
11 of key authorship positions in submitted and published articles.
 - 12 • Diversity in science is associated with better research quality and improved
13 representation of global scientists' opinions.

13

14 **What this study adds?**

- 15
- 16 • Gender inequality toward the first author of original research manuscripts disappeared
17 after adjusting for other important factors related to authorship (first authors'
18 geographical affiliation and income group), and the study attributes (funding and
19 medical specialty).
 - 20 • First authors affiliated to Asia compared to Europe and from low-income compared to
21 high-income countries had a lower chance of being accepted for publication.
 - 22 • Geographical and income diverse teams represented by the first and the last authors'
23 affiliations had a greater chance of being accepted for publication.

23

24

1 Introduction

2 The editorial decision-making process should be impartial and based on the quality of
3 manuscripts, compliance with the journal's requirements and relevance for its readership; the
4 study results and authors' characteristics should not be part of the decision to publish. Yet,
5 biases in editorial decision-making have been reported.(1–3) Studies have shown that
6 editorial decision-making is influenced by the methodology used in the reported study (such
7 as the study design, the sample size and the statistical methods used), (4,5) the strength of
8 the findings, (6); the source of funding, (4) positive findings, (7) and whether the
9 corresponding author is affiliated to the same country as the editor of the journal. (4) Editorial
10 decisions can further be influenced by the perceived high citation potential of the research in
11 a highly competitive editorial market (8,9) and potential reprint sales revenue (10).

12 It is not known whether first and/or last authors' gender is associated with the chance
13 of getting published. Authors' gender has been shown to be associated with the reported
14 types of contribution to research projects (11) and position on the authorship byline of
15 submitted manuscripts (12). Moreover, men first authors are more likely to present research
16 findings positively in the titles and abstracts of their articles compared to women first authors
17 (13) and this could potentially influence editorial decisions in favour of men first authors.
18 Although some studies concluded to the absence of implicit gender biases after finding no
19 difference on acceptance between anonymised vs non-anonymised peer review processes,
20 they were assessed in a single journal specialised in ecology.(14)

21 The objectives of the ATHENA case-control study were to assess in a large sample of
22 biomedical journals whether there is an association between the gender of the first (main
23 objective) and/or last author (secondary objective), and acceptance for publication
24 independently of known factors related to the methods and funding of the research described
25 in the manuscript.

26 Recently, the geographical location of researchers' affiliation has been identified as
27 being associated with knowledge dissemination, including authorship positions, publication
28 rates, citation counts and invitation to peer review (15-17). Geographical bias plays a role in
29 the assessment of the quality of research articles and helps explain the under-representation
30 of low- and middle-income country authors in published articles and subsequently in the

1 citations generated by this research.(15) The lack of diversity among editors and peer
2 reviewers in terms of gender, geographical affiliation, income group, race, and ethnicity could
3 also contribute to the paucity of diversity in research publications.(16,17) Because these
4 studies were published after the writing of our original protocol but prior to our data analyses,
5 we added a new secondary objective to test whether geographical affiliation and country's
6 income of authors was associated with acceptance for publication (Figure 1), as this outcome
7 had not been specifically studied yet.

8

9 **Methods**

10 **Study design and settings**

11 The ATHENA study was a case-control study nested in a prospective cohort study of all original
12 research manuscripts submitted for publication in 22 biomedical journals (21 from the BMJ
13 Publishing Group, and one from Elsevier – [Clinical Microbiology & Infection, CMI],
14 Supplementary Table 1 and Figure 1).

15 **Participants and data source**

16 We included all original research articles and systematic reviews submitted to 22 participating
17 journals between January 1, 2012, and December 31, 2019, and sent out for peer review, and
18 which had received a final editorial decision by 28 February 2022. Among eligible articles, we
19 randomly sampled our cases and controls from the BMJ Publishing Group database and the
20 CMI database. We extracted data from the manuscript submission systems for BMJ Publishing
21 Group journals and we received data directly from the CMI database for this specific journal.
22 Data related to the characteristics of the original research reported in these manuscripts were
23 automatically extracted using machine learning from the submitted PDFs by investigators
24 from the Swiss Institute for Bioinformatics (PR, NN, LM, JL, JG).

25 **Case and control definition**

26 Cases were manuscripts accepted for publication with at least one completed peer review
27 report. Controls were manuscripts rejected for publication with at least one completed peer

1 review report. Accepted and rejected articles (1:1) were randomly selected at the journal
2 level.

3 **Exposure factors explored and other variables**

4 For each submitted manuscript we collected details about the journal (impact factor (<5, 5-
5 10, >10) and type of peer review process (open vs. anonymised); manuscript (manuscript ID,
6 title, abstract, original submission date, first decision date, number of co-authors, editorial
7 decision); handling editor (first name, last name, country of affiliation); authors (authorship
8 position (where several co-authors held the first or last authorship position we used the first
9 and last declared author respectively), corresponding author status, salutation, first name,
10 middle name, last name, country of affiliation). We classified the countries of affiliation into
11 six geographical affiliation groups (Europe, Africa, Asia, South America, North America or
12 Oceania) and then further categorised this by country wealth using the four levels defined by
13 the World Bank Atlas method according to 2021's gross national income per capita (low
14 income; lower middle income; upper middle income; and high income).(18) For CMI
15 manuscripts we did not receive data on authors' and editors' country of affiliation, middle
16 names, nor salutation.

17 *Gender determination (main and secondary predictors)*

18 Editors' gender was provided by BMJ Publishing Group and was estimated for CMI using
19 Gender API based on editor's first name alone. We used a four-step sequential process to
20 determine authors' gender. Firstly, we used the first name and country of affiliation (except
21 for CMI) in Gender API (<https://gender-api.com/en>) website. Gender API provides gender
22 determination with an accuracy probability from 50% to 100% (under 50% an unknown status
23 is attributed). Secondly, for undetermined gender we used middle names and the country of
24 affiliation in Gender API (except for CMI). Thirdly, we used the online service genderize.io
25 (<http://genderize.io>) to determine gender based on first and middle names (except for CMI)
26 which also considers gender as unknown if accuracy is under 50%. Fourthly (except for CMI),
27 we used authors' salutation and attributed with 100% accuracy man to "Mr" or "M" and
28 woman to "Miss," "Mrs," and "Ms.". Where determined gender had an accuracy below 80%,
29 we retained the gender determined by salutation and attributed an accuracy of 100%. Finally,
30 we determined gender at three levels of accuracy: $\geq 60\%$, $\geq 70\%$ and $\geq 80\%$ for all authors and

1 reviewers. We used accuracy $\geq 60\%$ for all analyses. We cross-tabulated the gender of first and
2 last authors and created the variable “gender diversity between first and last author”.

3 **Adjustment variables**

4 We estimated the percentage of women authors among all authors on the byline with a
5 determined gender at three levels of accuracy: $\geq 60\%$, $\geq 70\%$ and $\geq 80\%$, and again used
6 accuracy $\geq 60\%$ for all analyses. We created a 4-category variable: no women authors, 0 to 49%,
7 50% to 99%, and 100% women authors.

8 We created a “Diversity of authors’ affiliations” variable using the country, geographical
9 affiliation group, and country income group of the first and last authors (post hoc variables).
10 We identified four groups: 1) first and last authors affiliated to the same country; 2) first and
11 last authors affiliated to different countries within the same geographical affiliation and
12 income groups; 3) first and last authors had same geographical affiliation and income groups;
13 4) first and last author had different income groups.

14 **Study attributes**

15 To identify medical specialty, funding type, study design and sample size of the study reported
16 in each submitted manuscript, we used machine learning procedures detailed in
17 Supplementary Materials 2-5 and Supplementary Table 2

18 **Study sample size estimation**

19 We chose an odds ratio (OR) of 0.85 to indicate a presence of gender bias towards women for
20 the association between first author’s gender and acceptance for publication. We assumed
21 the proportion of women first authors to be 40% among cases (44% among controls) using
22 OR=0.85. Considering a type-1 error at 5% (two-sided) with a study power of 90% and a
23 correlation coefficient for exposure between matched controls and cases at 0.03 (to consider
24 some clustering at the journal level), we approximated that 2,800 cases and 2,800 controls
25 were needed. Anticipating 20% missing values or exclusions we increased our sample size to
26 3500 cases/controls (1:1). We took a random selection of cases and controls by journal,
27 considering 159 journal-years across the study period and 20 cases/controls per journal-year
28 corresponding to a maximum of 160 cases/controls per journal.

29 **Statistical analysis**

1 We present continuous variables as means (standard deviations, SD) or medians (25th and 75th
2 percentiles), categorical variables as frequencies and relative frequencies by case/control
3 status. We describe data for CMI journal separately in Supplementary Table 3 as we did not
4 have all the data for primary analysis. For a randomly selected set of 100 manuscripts, we
5 evaluated the level of agreement between the studies' attributes as automatically extracted
6 by machine learning procedures– leveraging the SIB Literature Services (SIBiLS) (18)-
7 compared to a manual extraction performed by consensus between three independent raters
8 (AGA, KBM, ZM). We calculated unweighted kappa coefficients (κ) for the variables medical
9 specialty, and design; weighted kappa coefficient (κ_w) for the variables funding and sample
10 size. Primary and secondary analyses were conducted for BMJ Publishing Group manuscripts
11 only. For manuscripts with at least 2 co-authors, we performed unconditional logistic
12 regression models on complete cases with case/control status as the dependent variable. The
13 main predictor was the first author's gender, and the last author's gender was a secondary
14 predictor. Initially, the gender of the corresponding author was a secondary predictor,
15 however, in 81% of cases (n=1,282), they also held the position of first or last author, so we
16 did not test it. First authors' gender, prespecified variables (last author's gender, study
17 attributes) then post hoc variables (geographical affiliation group and income group of first
18 authors, and diversity of authors' affiliation) were introduced in the main model. The
19 conceptual framework for the selection of variables is shown in Figure 1. First authors' gender
20 was introduced first in the model, followed by the other prespecified variables (last author's
21 gender, study attributes), then the post hoc variables (geographical affiliation group, income
22 group of first authors, and diversity of authors' affiliation). We prespecified four interaction
23 terms between (1) gender of the editor and first author; (2) gender of the editor and last
24 author; (3) submission year and gender of the first author; (4) submission year and gender of
25 the last author. We report unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios, 95% confidence intervals
26 (95% CI), and p-values from univariate and multivariable models. We performed three
27 additional sensitivity analyses using levels of accuracy of $\geq 70\%$, and $\geq 80\%$ for gender
28 determination, and a multiple imputation model for missing gender of the first and last
29 authors. Missing gender of the first and last authors were considered at random, and 20
30 imputations were applied; adjustment of the imputation model was done for geographical
31 affiliation group of the first and last authors, and for the journal. For categorical predictors
32 with more than two modalities, a global p-value was computed. We interpreted global p-

1 values as significant if $p < 0.05$. As a post-hoc analysis, we calculated the likelihood ratio of the
2 null hypothesis of no gender bias over the alternative hypothesis of presence of gender bias
3 for the association between first author's gender and acceptance for publication (19). We
4 used Stata intercooled (STATA Corp., College Station, Texas, USA) 17.0 for analyses and R
5 software (version 4.1.2) for data management.

6 **Patient and public involvement**

7 We partnered and co-authored with the chair of BMJ's LGBTQ+ network (MR). MR
8 contributed to data collection, gender determination method, manuscript revision, and final
9 approval.

1 **Results**

2 We included 7,000 manuscripts from BMJ Publishing Group with all pre-specified variables
3 available for analysis (Figure 2, Table 1). We found a moderate level of agreement between
4 raters and automatic algorithm extraction on medical specialty identification ($\kappa=0.58$), funding
5 type ($\kappa_w=0.54$), study design ($\kappa=0.33$) and study sample size ($\kappa_w=0.84$).

6 ***Proportion of editorial, authorship and manuscript characteristics by accepted and rejected*** 7 ***status***

8 The distribution of editor's geographical affiliation was significantly different between
9 accepted and rejected manuscripts, and the mean duration from submission to first decision
10 was on average 2.5 days longer for accepted than rejected (Table 1). The proportion of women
11 first authors was 2.5 points higher, and the overall percentage of women co-authors 1.2%
12 higher in accepted than in rejected, both differences were statistically significant between
13 accepted and rejected. Accepted manuscripts had on average +0.3 co-authors compared to
14 rejected, and more rejected than accepted had only one author. There were significantly more
15 first or last authors with European, North American, or Oceanian affiliations and they were
16 more often affiliated with a high-income country among accepted than rejected. The
17 proportion of manuscripts with different geographical affiliation groups or income groups
18 between first and last authors was significantly higher for accepted compared to rejected.
19 Regarding the manuscript attributes, the proportion of studies stating no funding or where
20 funding was not declared were significantly lower among accepted than rejected. The
21 proportion of accepted manuscripts was significantly higher in 2012 compared to later years.

22 ***Association between gender of the authors and acceptance for publication (primary*** 23 ***objective)***

24 Table 2 shows univariate and multivariable analyses of the main analysis. The association
25 between gender of the first author and acceptance for publication became non-significant
26 once funding, and medical specialty were introduced in the model; it stayed non-significant
27 after adjustment for the post hoc variables (geographical affiliation group and income group
28 of first authors and diversity of authors' affiliations). Gender of the last author was non-
29 significantly associated with acceptance for publication in the univariate and multivariable
30 analyses. The interaction between the gender of the editor and first author ($p=0.158$), and

1 between the gender of the editor and last author ($p=0.160$) were both non-significant. The
2 interactions between the year of submission and respectively the gender of first ($p=0.637$) and
3 last authors ($p=0.662$) were non-significant. We found similar findings with the sensitivity
4 analyses (Supplementary Table 4). Acceptance for publication was also independently
5 associated with study design (higher acceptance for basic science studies compared with
6 clinical trials), study sample size (higher for studies with $>10,000$ participants compared to
7 ≤ 100 or no sample size), and with type of funding (higher for studies funded by international
8 organisations, non-profit & associations & foundations, and associations & foundations
9 compared to studies declaring no funding) (Table 2, and Figure 2). The likelihood ratio of no
10 gender bias (null hypothesis) over existence of gender bias (alternative hypothesis) was 909,
11 providing decisively strong evidence in favour of the null hypothesis.

12 ***Association between geographical affiliation of the authors and acceptance for publication***
13 ***(post hoc objective)***

14 Acceptance for publication was significantly associated with geographical affiliation group of
15 the first author: compared to Europe, the adjusted odds ratio was significantly lower for first
16 authors affiliated to Asia (Table 2). The likelihood of acceptance was significantly lower when
17 first author was affiliated to upper-middle or lower-middle and low-income groups. We found
18 similar results when using the affiliation group of the last author, except that the odds for
19 publication acceptance was not statistically different for the comparison between Africa and
20 Europe (data not shown). When high income group was the reference, the odds ratio was
21 lower for first authors affiliated to upper-middle, lower middle, and low-income group or
22 countries. Compared to when first and last authors were affiliated to the same countries, the
23 odds ratio was higher than 1 when both were affiliated to different countries but the same
24 geographical and income groups, when both were affiliated to different countries and
25 geographical affiliations but same income group or when both had different income groups
26 (Table 2).

1 **Discussion**

2 Manuscripts with a woman first author were not associated with lower manuscript acceptance
3 as hypothesised. Nor was the gender of the last author associated with acceptance for
4 publication. Post-hoc calculation of the likelihood ratio provided decisive evidence supporting
5 the absence of gender bias in publication acceptance. In the additional analyses, the
6 probability of being accepted for publication was lower when the first author was affiliated to
7 an Asian country than a European country, and when first author was affiliated with an upper-
8 middle or lower-middle/low-income compared to high income country. Nevertheless, the
9 geographical diversity among the first and last authors' affiliation was associated with a higher
10 probability of acceptance. Study design and type of funding were also independently
11 associated with acceptance for publication.

12 **Comparison with other studies**

13 Previous studies (4, 20, 21, 22) also failed to show an association between the gender of key
14 authorship positions and acceptance for publication. Those studies were mainly based on a
15 single medical specialty and used different research methods none of which adjusted for the
16 author and study attributes (23). Similar to our findings, Burns et al. demonstrated that papers
17 with a first author affiliated to Asia, Africa, or South America had a lower chance of acceptance
18 for publication than those with authors affiliated to North America. (22) The impact of the
19 diversity of authors' affiliations on manuscript outcomes, such as acceptance for publication,
20 has been little studied in science. However, Campbell et al explored submissions and
21 publications across American Geophysical Union journals from 2012-2018 in terms of national
22 affiliation, gender, career stage of individual authors and race/ethnicity for US-based authors
23 (24). Acceptance was +2.8% higher for cross-cultural collaborations compared to international
24 teams, and +4.5% higher for mixed-gender compared to single-gender teams. In line with our
25 findings, they found no significant difference in acceptance rates between manuscripts with a
26 woman or man first author. Although they used a more intersectional method for defining
27 diversity, they too found diverse teams to have higher acceptance rates than non-diverse
28 teams.

29 **Study strengths and limitations**

1 The inclusion of submissions from 21 journals over 8 years, including two large general medical
2 journals, and journals in a range of biomedical specialties attracting submissions from around
3 the world provided a rich and diversified sample. While inclusion of journals from BMJ
4 Publishing Group alone, which has a commitment to improving equality and diversity (25),
5 limits the generalisability of the findings to other journals, we sampled manuscripts submitted
6 from 2012 to 2019. Back then, equality, diversity and inclusion were less of a focus for
7 publishers than in recent years (25,26), particularly since the Royal Society of Chemistry
8 launched the Joint Commitment for Action on Inclusion and Diversity in Publishing in 2020 in
9 response to the Black Lives Matter movement.(27) Although our study initially planned to
10 include more biomedical journals from other publishers, we only managed to include one
11 other journal which could not provide the same set of data as the BMJ Publishing Group so we
12 presented this data separately.

13 To limit information bias, we chose a case-control design and randomly selected cases and
14 controls from eligible manuscripts using a computerised procedure. In the absence of self-
15 identified data from authors, we determined gender as binary and by doing so may have
16 misrepresented people with diverse gender identities. However, we applied a four step
17 sequential procedure already implemented in our two previous works (12,16) and used the
18 threshold accuracy of gender determination above 60% for our primary analysis. Our three
19 sensitivity analyses using higher threshold accuracies for gender determination and multiple
20 imputation to replace missing gender data were in line with our original results. Unlike
21 previous studies (23), we adjusted for author and study attributes which are important
22 confounders. However, we acknowledge that the quality of a study and its manuscript is a
23 major factor influencing publication acceptance and could be associated with many of our
24 predictors, making it an important confounding variable. However, in the absence of a
25 rigorous tool we could not robustly assess manuscript quality for such a large set of
26 manuscripts. We used an algorithm trained with machine learning to automatically extract
27 study attributes but the agreement between raters and the automatic algorithm extraction of
28 variables was only moderate. Discrepancies between manual and automatic extractions were
29 randomly distributed and should not have biased the estimated association between study
30 attributes and the outcome. Defining diversity is complex as it incorporates various
31 intersectional dimensions. We explored a definition of author team diversity by combining

1 information from two covariates (geographical area and income group of the first and last
2 authors' country of affiliation) and by adjusting for their gender. This definition is limited as it
3 is not based on the affiliation of all co-authors and only included the first institutional
4 affiliation for an author if there were multiple so teams may have been more diverse than
5 what we captured.

6 **Policy implications**

7 The fact that we did not identify gender inequalities during the editorial decision-making
8 process is reassuring but gender bias in research production still deserves further attention,
9 as gender inequalities have been demonstrated for submitted and published articles
10 particularly during the early covid-19 pandemic.(12) Our results need to be confirmed in a
11 randomised trial where the influence of known and unknown confounding factors can be
12 accounted for. The limited geographical representation among first authors in accepted
13 manuscripts heightens the potential for an inadequate reflection of the opinions of global
14 scientists. More crucially, it may also result in a lack of representation of patients and
15 populations requiring prevention and care.(15,16) The determinants and implications of lower
16 acceptance of manuscripts from Asia, and from low-income countries need to be further
17 explored. Our finding of a positive effect on publication acceptance of geographically and
18 gender diverse teams has been demonstrated by others.(28–31) Subjective and hidden
19 factors, such as implicit cognitive biases related to geographical affiliations, might also drive
20 perceptions of study quality and the judgements of peer reviewers and subsequently the final
21 editorial decision, however, they are more difficult to investigate.(32) Anonymising peer
22 review has been proposed to reduce bias against authors but a meta-analysis has shown it
23 does not affect the quality of peer reviewers' reports. (33) Moreover, open and published peer
24 review aims to restore trust in the integrity and fairness of the review process through
25 transparency to readers has also been shown not to affect the quality of review.(34) In
26 addition, double anonymising the peer review process has not been shown to improve
27 geographic diversity among authors(35), but triple-anonymised peer review (where even the
28 handling editor of a manuscript cannot see the identity of the authors) has provided some
29 evidence of reducing editorial bias.(36) Educating faculty members about implicit biases and
30 strategies for overcoming them has provided positive effects on implicit biases surrounding
31 women and leadership in academic medicine(37) and should be extended to geographical

1 implicit bias. As gatekeepers of publication decisions, editors have a crucial role to play in
2 improving global diversity in research through the acknowledgement of their own potential
3 implicit biases by monitoring sensitive diversity indicators for their peer reviewers and the
4 authors of manuscripts they choose to reject or peer review. They can also promote the
5 systemic detection of implicit biases in reviewers' comments, associate editors' decisions and
6 the content of the authors' research itself as recently advocated by *Nature* (39). Linguistic bias
7 is another barrier for non-native English-speaking researchers, especially from low- or middle-
8 income countries, and can lower the chance of acceptance for publication.(34) Other possible
9 solutions to facilitate the publication of high-quality research in regional languages include the
10 decentralisation of editorial boards, by including for example Spanish or Chinese board
11 members, publishing articles in regional languages, or decentralising the indexing of journals
12 by creating independent citation databases at regional level (for e.g. the African Citation
13 Index).(40)Provision of free or low-cost translation and support services promoted by high-
14 income universities or other public academic institutions and designed for non-native English
15 speaking authors is thus desirable.(41) Some journals are starting to experiment with AI-
16 powered scientific writing assistants (42) and uptake and beneficial effects of using these
17 should be monitored.

18 **Conclusions**

19 Absence of gender bias in the final editorial decision is reassuring. Research needs diverse
20 teams (43) and equitable partnerships with low resource countries (44) yet inclusivity in
21 biomedical research is currently insufficient. Funders, academic institutions, researchers,
22 biomedical journal editors and publishers are key to achieving this goal.

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 We thank the editors of the participating journals from the BMJ Publishing Group for giving us
3 access to the data. We thank Professor J. Peter Donnelly, editor-in-chief and Colin Drummond
4 for having evaluated the potential participation of the Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy
5 in the ATHENA case-control study. We thank Prof. Martin Richard Tramèr for having provided
6 a dataset for pilot study from the European Journal of Anaesthesiology, as well as M. Marco
7 De Ambrogi from the Lancet Infectious Diseases. We thank Prof. Thomas Perneger for
8 providing useful advice on the presentation of the results.

9

10 **Funding**

11 This study was supported by grant 10001A_192374 from the Swiss National Science
12 Foundation (SNSF) to Angèle Gayet-Ageron and Angela Huttner. We thank Angela Huttner for
13 her assistance with the grant application. The funders had no role in considering the study
14 design or in the collection, analysis, or interpretation of data, the writing of the report, or the
15 decision to submit the article for publication.

16

17 **Competing interests**

18 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at
19 www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare support from the university hospitals of
20 Geneva, Geneva medical school and the SNSF for the submitted work; no financial
21 relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the
22 previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced
23 the submitted work. SS and MR are full-time employees of BMJ Publishing Group, but they are
24 not involved in decision-making on research submissions.

25

26

1 **Ethical approval**

2 Ethical approval was received from the Institutional Review Board of the Geneva Canton on
3 April 16, 2018 for the ATHENA project (N° 2019-00540).

4

5 **Data sharing**

6 Data described in the manuscript, code book, and analytic code will be archived and preserved
7 on Yareta, the research data repository for Geneva's higher education institutions. Data will
8 not be made publicly available, but relevant anonymised data are available on reasonable
9 request from the corresponding author. The study was conducted under a confidentiality
10 agreement between BMJ Publishing Group and the medical school of Geneva University
11 represented by the Department of Health and Community Medicine and the Swiss Institute
12 for Bioinformatics and the HES-SO – HEG Genève.

13

14 **Contributors**

15 The ATHENA study was funded by the SNSF. AGA, LL, SS, and AC were involved in the study
16 concept and design of the ATHENA study. AGA (BMJ Publishing Group journals) and LL (CMI
17 journal) were responsible for the recruitment of the participating journals. SS (BMJ Publishing
18 Group) and JF (CMI) were responsible for data collection; PR, JL, NN, JG, LM (Swiss Institute
19 for Bioinformatics & HES-SO – HEG Genève) and CJ were responsible for data extraction. KBM
20 was responsible for updating the study method under AGA supervision. MR and KBM were
21 responsible for defining the methods for the gender determination. KBM determined the
22 gender. KBM was responsible for data management. AGA, KBM, and ZM were responsible for
23 validation of the automated data extraction. AGA was responsible for obtaining research
24 funding. AGA and KBM were involved in data analysis and interpretation. AGA generated the
25 figures; AGA and KBM the tables. AGA wrote the initial draft manuscript and managed the
26 versions. KBM provided the draft of the introduction and the method sections. All authors
27 were involved in critical revision of multiple drafts and approved the final version. AGA is the
28 guarantor. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria
29 and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

1 References

- 2 1. Scanff A, Naudet F, Cristea IA, Moher D, Bishop DVM, Locher C. Correction: A survey of
3 biomedical journals to detect editorial bias and nepotistic behavior. *PLOS Biol*
4 2022;**20**:e3001525. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3001525
- 5 2. Sverdlichenko I, Xie S, Margolin E. Impact of institutional affiliation bias on editorial
6 publication decisions: A bibliometric analysis of three ophthalmology journals. *Ethics Med*
7 *Public Health* 2022;**21**:100758. doi: 10.1016/j.jemep.2022.100758
- 8 3. Matías-Guiu J, García-Ramos R. Editorial bias in scientific publications. *Neurol* 2011;**26**:1-5.
9 doi: 10.1016/j.nrl.2010.12.001
- 10 4. Lee KP, Boyd EA, Holroyd-Leduc JM, Bacchetti P, Bero LA. Predictors of publication:
11 characteristics of submitted manuscripts associated with acceptance at major biomedical
12 journals. *Med J Aust* 2006;**184**:621-6. doi: 10.5694/j.1326-5377.2006.tb00418.x
- 13 5. Turcotte C, Drolet P, Girard M. Study design, originality and overall consistency influence
14 acceptance or rejection of manuscripts submitted to the Journal. *Can J Anaesth*
15 2004;**51**:549-56. doi: 10.1007/BF03018396
- 16 6. Dickersin K, Min YI, Meinert CL. Factors influencing publication of research results. Follow-
17 up of applications submitted to two institutional review boards. *JAMA* 1992;**267**:374-8.
18 doi:
- 19 7. Seehra J, Khraishi H, Pandis N. Studies with statistically significant effect estimates are
20 more frequently published compared to non-significant estimates in oral health journals.
21 *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2023;**23**:6. doi: 10.1186/s12874-022-01795-3
- 22 8. Chew M, Villanueva EV, Van Der Weyden MB. Life and times of the impact factor:
23 retrospective analysis of trends for seven medical journals (1994-2005) and their Editors'
24 views. *J R Soc Med* 2007;**100**:142-50. doi: 10.1177/014107680710000313
- 25 9. Schroter S, Weber WEJ, Loder E, Wilkinson J, Kirkham JJ. Evaluation of editors' abilities to
26 predict the citation potential of research manuscripts submitted to The BMJ: a cohort
27 study. *BMJ* 2022;**379**:e073880. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2022-073880
- 28 10. Lundh A, Barbateskovic M, Hróbjartsson A, Gøtzsche PC. Conflicts of Interest at Medical
29 Journals: The Influence of Industry-Supported Randomised Trials on Journal Impact
30 Factors and Revenue – Cohort Study. *PLoS Med* 2010;**7**:e1000354. doi:
31 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000354
- 32 11. Gayet-Ageron A, Poncet A, Perneger T. Comparison of the contributions of female and
33 male authors to medical research in 2000 and 2015: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*
34 2019;**9**:e024436. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024436
- 35 12. Gayet-Ageron A, Ben Messaoud K, Richards M, Schroter S. Female authorship of covid-19
36 research in manuscripts submitted to 11 biomedical journals: cross sectional study. *BMJ*
37 2021;**375**:n2288. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n2288

- 1 13. Lerchenmueller MJ, Sorenson O, Jena AB. Gender differences in how scientists present the
2 importance of their research: observational study. *BMJ* 2019;**367**:l6573. doi:
3 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045176
- 4 14. Fox CW, Meyer J, & Aimé E. Double-blind peer review affects reviewer ratings and editor
5 decisions at an ecology journal. *Functional Ecology* 2023;**37**:1144–1157. doi:
6 10.1111/1365-2435.14259
- 7 15. Skopec M, Issa H, Reed J, Harris M. The role of geographic bias in knowledge diffusion: a
8 systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Res Integr Peer Rev* 2020;**5**:2. doi:
9 10.1186/s41073-019-0088-0
- 10 16. Ben Messaoud K, Schroter S, Richards M, Gayet-Ageron A. Analysis of peer reviewers'
11 response to invitations by gender and geographical region: cohort study of manuscripts
12 reviewed at 21 biomedical journals before and during covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ*
13 2023;**381**:e075719. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2023-075719
- 14 17. Melhem G, Rees CA, Sunguya BF, Ali M, Kurpad A, Duggan CP. Association of International
15 Editorial Staff With Published Articles From Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *JAMA*
16 *Netw Open* 2022;**5**:e2213269. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.13269
- 17 18. Hamadeh N, Van Rompaey C, Metreau E. New World Bank country classifications by
18 income level: 2021-2022 [Internet]. World Bank Blogs. Disponible sur:
19 [https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-world-bank-country-classifications-income-](https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-world-bank-country-classifications-income-level-2021-2022)
20 [level-2021-2022](https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-world-bank-country-classifications-income-level-2021-2022)
- 21 19. Perneger TV. How to use likelihood ratios to interpret evidence from randomized trials. *J*
22 *Clin Epidemiol* 2021;**136**:235-42. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.04.010
- 23 20. Borsuk RM, Aarssen LW, Budden AE, Koricheva J, Leimu R, Tregenza T, et al. To Name or
24 Not to Name: The Effect of Changing Author Gender on Peer Review. *BioScience*
25 2009;**59**:985-9. doi: 10.1525/bio.2009.59.11.10
- 26 21. Squazzoni F, Bravo G, Farjam M, Marusic A, Mehmani B, Willis M, et al. Peer review and
27 gender bias: A study on 145 scholarly journals. *Sci Adv* 2021;**7**:eabd0299. doi:
28 10.1126/sciadv.abd0299
- 29 22. Burns CS, Fox CW. Language and socioeconomics predict geographic variation in peer
30 review outcomes at an ecology journal. *Scientometrics* 2017;**113**:1113-27. doi:
31 10.1007/s11192-017-2517-5
- 32 23. McGillivray, B., De Ranieri, E. Uptake and outcome of manuscripts in Nature journals by
33 review model and author characteristics. *Res Integr Peer Rev* 2018;**3**:5.
34 doi:10.1186/s41073-018-0049-z
- 35 24. Campbell LG, Mehtani S, Dozier ME, Rinehart J. Gender-Heterogeneous Working Groups
36 Produce Higher Quality Science. Larivière V. *PLoS ONE* 2013;**8**:e79147. doi:
37 10.1371/journal.pone.0079147

- 1 25. Richards M, Franco J, Bloom T. A commitment to equality, diversity, and inclusion for BMJ
2 and our journals [Internet]. *The BMJ Opinion*. 2021 [cited on 5 Oct 2023]. Available on:
3 [https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/07/23/a-commitment-to-equality-diversity-and-](https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/07/23/a-commitment-to-equality-diversity-and-inclusion-for-bmj-and-our-journals/)
4 [inclusion-for-bmj-and-our-journals/](https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/07/23/a-commitment-to-equality-diversity-and-inclusion-for-bmj-and-our-journals/)

- 5 26. Chatfield C, Cook S, Ladher N, Loder E, Hurley R, Richards M, et al. Ten steps to gender
6 equity: The BMJ's resolutions [Internet]. *The BMJ Opinion*. 2021 [cited on 5 Oct 2023].
7 Available on: [https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/03/08/ten-steps-to-gender-equity-the-](https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/03/08/ten-steps-to-gender-equity-the-bmjs-resolutions/)
8 [bmjs-resolutions/](https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/03/08/ten-steps-to-gender-equity-the-bmjs-resolutions/)

- 9 27. The Lancet. Feminism is for everybody. *The Lancet* 2019;**393**:493. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
10 6736(19)30239-9

- 11 28. Lerback JC, Hanson B, Wooden P. Association Between Author Diversity and Acceptance
12 Rates and Citations in Peer-Reviewed Earth Science Manuscripts. *Earth Space Sci*
13 2020;**7**:e2019EA000946. doi: 10.1029/2019EA000946

- 14 29. Yang Y, Tian TY, Woodruff TK, Jones BF, Uzzi B. Gender-diverse teams produce more novel
15 and higher-impact scientific ideas. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2022;**119**:e2200841119. doi:
16 10.1073/pnas.2200841119

- 17 30. Freeman RB, Huang W. Collaborating With People Like Me: Ethnic co-authorship within
18 the US. *Nature* 2014;**513**(7518):305-305. doi: 10.3386/w19905

- 19 31. Vargas EA, Scherer LA, Fiske ST, Barabino GA, eds. Advancing Antiracism, Diversity, Equity,
20 and Inclusion in STEMM Organizations: Beyond Broadening Participation [Internet].
21 Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2023 [cited 26 oct 2023]. (The National
22 Academies Collection: Reports funded by National Institutes of Health). Available on:
23 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK589214/>

- 24 32. Pritlove C, Juando-Prats C, Ala-leppilampi K, Parsons JA. The good, the bad, and the ugly
25 of implicit bias. *The Lancet* 2019;**393**:502-4. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32267-0

- 26 33. Bruce R, Chauvin A, Trinquart L, Ravaud P, Boutron I. Impact of interventions to improve
27 the quality of peer review of biomedical journals: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
28 *BMC Med* 2016;**14**:85. doi: 10.1186/s12916-016-0631-5

- 29 34. van Rooyen S, Godlee F, Evans S, Black N, Smith R. Effect of open peer review on quality
30 of reviews and on reviewers' recommendations: a randomised trial. *BMJ* 1999;**318**:23-7.
31 doi: 10.1136/bmj.318.7175.23


- 32 35. Thabit AK. Blinding of Peer Review and the Impact on Geographic Diversity of Authors in
33 the Medical Literature. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2023;**16**:1857-68. doi:
34 10.2147/JMDH.S415438

- 35 36. Kusumoto FM, Bittl JA, Creager MA, Dauerman HL, Lala A, McDermott MM, et al.
36 Challenges and controversies in peer review. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2023;**82**:2054-62. doi:
37 10.1016/j.jacc.2023.08.056


- 1 37. Girod S, Fassiotto M, Grewal D, Ku MC, Sriram N, Nosek BA, et al. Reducing Implicit Gender
2 Leadership Bias in Academic Medicine With an Educational Intervention. *Acad Med*
3 2016;**91**:1143-50. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000001099
- 4 38. Politzer-Ahles S, Girolamo T, Ghali S. Preliminary evidence of linguistic bias in academic
5 reviewing. *J Engl Acad Purp* 2020;**47**:100895. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100895
- 6 39. Nature publishes too few papers from women researchers - that must change. *Nature*
7 2024;**627**:7-8. doi: 10.1038/d41586-024-00640-5
- 8 40. Bol JA, Sheffel A, Zia N, Meghani A. How to address the geographical bias in academic
9 publishing. *BMJ Global Health* 2023;**8**:e013111. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2023-013111
- 10 41. Herrera AJ. Language bias discredits the peer-review system. *Nature* 1999;**397**:467-467.
11 doi: 10.1038/17194
- 12 42. Springer Nature. Springer Nature introduces Curie, its AI-powered scientific writing
13 assistant. *Spring Nature* 2013 [cited 26 Oct 2023]; Available on:
14 [https://group.springernature.com/gp/group/media/press-releases/ai-powered-](https://group.springernature.com/gp/group/media/press-releases/ai-powered-scientific-writing-assitant-launched/26176230)
15 [scientific-writing-assitant-launched/26176230](https://group.springernature.com/gp/group/media/press-releases/ai-powered-scientific-writing-assitant-launched/26176230)
- 16 43. Dajani R. Scientists in diaspora are a powerful resource for their home countries. *Nature*
17 2023;**622**:671. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-03300-2
- 18 43. Striving for equitable partnerships in health research. *Nat Med* 2023. doi:
19 10.1038/s41591-023-02680-2

20

1 **Figure 1.** Conceptual framework of the ATHENA project including primary/secondary predictors, pre-specified and post hoc adjustment
 2 variables to model acceptance for publication.



1 **Figure 2.** Description of all manuscripts submitted, eligible and selected for ATHENA study
2 between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2019 by publisher.



3

Table 1. Proportion of editorial, authorship, and study attributes for 21 BMJ Publishing Group journals by case and control status.

Variables	Cases n (%) (n=3,500)	Controls n (%) (n=3,500)	p-value ^b
Authorship			
First author's gender ^a (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	133 (3.8)	143 (4.1)	0.041
Woman	1,571 (46.7)	1,485 (44.2)	
Man	1,796 (53.3)	1,872 (55.8)	
Last author's gender ^a (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	121 (3.2)	111 (3.5)	0.592
Woman	1,093 (32.3)	1,121 (33.1)	
Man	2,286 (67.7)	2,268 (66.9)	
Corresponding author's gender ^a (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	131 (3.7)	123 (3.5)	0.429
Woman	1326 (39.4)	1361 (40.3)	
Man	2043 (60.6)	2016 (59.7)	
Position of corresponding author (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	48 (1.4)	42 (1.2)	<0.001
First author	2098 (60.8)	1934 (55.9)	
Last author	717 (20.8)	794 (23.0)	
Unique author)	30 (0.9)	55 (1.6)	
Other author	607 (17.6)	675 (19.5)	
Gender diversity between first and last authors (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	238 (6.8)	236 (6.7)	0.136
Man first author & man last author	1,240 (35.4)	1,261 (36.0)	
Woman first author & man last author	948 (27.1)	908 (25.9)	
Man first author & woman last author	484 (13.8)	541 (15.5)	
Woman first author & woman last author	590 (16.9)	554 (15.8)	
Mean number of authors (±SD, Q2: Q1-Q3)	6.6 (±2.75, 7:5-9)	6.3 (±2.75,6:4-9)	<0.001
Single author, n (%)	32 (0.9)	57 (1.6)	-
Mean percentage of women authors ^a (±SD, Q2: Q1-Q3)	40.1 (±25.5, 40.0:20.0-57.1)	38.9 (±26.4, 37.5:20.0-57.1)	0.020
Proportion of women authors (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	3 (0.09)	5 (0.14)	0.031
0% women	415 (11.9)	504 (14.4)	
Up to 49% women	1,692 (48.3)	1,629 (46.5)	
From 50 to 99% women	1,262 (36.1)	1,217 (34.7)	
100% women	128 (3.7)	145 (4.2)	
First author's geographical affiliation (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	38 (1.1)	34 (1.0)	<0.001
Africa	43 (1.2)	58 (1.7)	
Asia	485 (14.0)	874 (25.2)	
Europe	1,753 (50.6)	1,517 (43.8)	
North America	892 (25.8)	731 (21.1)	
Oceania	241 (7.0)	209 (6.0)	
South America	48 (1.4)	77 (2.2)	
Last author's geographical affiliation (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	8 (0.2)	6 (0.2)	<0.001

Africa	49 (1.4)	57 (1.6)	
Asia	473 (13.6)	847 (24.2)	
Europe	1,749 (50.1)	1,525 (43.7)	
North America	919 (26.3)	770 (22.0)	
Oceania	253 (7.2)	222 (6.3)	
South America	49 (1.4)	73 (2.1)	
First author's country incomes (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	39 (1.1)	34 (1.0)	<0.001
High income	3,141 (90.7)	2,815 (81.2)	
Upper middle income	233 (6.7)	491 (14.2)	
Lower middle income	82 (2.4)	146 (4.2)	
Low income	6 (0.2)	14 (0.4)	
Last author's country incomes (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	8 (0.2)	6 (0.2)	<0.001
High income	3,155 (90.3)	2,858 (81.8)	
Upper middle income	246 (7.0)	476 (13.6)	
Lower middle income	82 (2.4)	143 (4.1)	
Low income	9 (0.3)	17 (0.5)	
Diversity of authors' affiliation (<i>Missing</i>), n (%)	45 (1.3)	38 (1.1)	<0.001
Same country			
Different countries but same geographical affiliation/income groups	2,933 (84.9)	3,070 (88.7)	
Different countries and different geographical affiliation but same income group	185 (5.4)	127 (3.7)	
Different income groups	197 (5.7)	137 (4.0)	
Different income groups	140 (4.0)	128 (3.7)	
Editorial characteristics			
Editor gender ^a , n (%)			
Woman	1,035 (29.6)	1,090 (31.1)	0.213
Man	2,465 (70.4)	2,410 (68.9)	
Editor's geographical affiliation, n (%)			0.009
Africa	6 (0.2)	3 (0.1)	
Asia	201 (5.7)	214 (6.11)	
Europe	1,747 (49.9)	1,834 (52.4)	
North America	1,045 (29.9)	1,040 (29.7)	
Oceania	501 (14.3)	409 (11.7)	
Editor's country incomes, n (%)			0.700
High income	3481 (99.5)	3,484 (99.5)	
Upper middle income	8 (0.2)	5 (0.1)	
Lower middle income	11 (0.3)	11 (0.3)	
Mean interval from submission to first decision (\pm SD, Q2: Q1-Q3), days	55.6 (\pm 36.1, 47:31-70)	53.1 (\pm 35.2, 45:29-67)	0.003
Study attributes			
Submission year, n (%)			0.0022
2012	465 (13.3)	378 (10.8)	

2013	408 (11.7)	438 (12.5)	
2014	422 (12.1)	444 (12.7)	
2015	412 (11.8)	468 (13.4)	
2016	412 (11.8)	472 (13.5)	
2017	443 (12.7)	428 (12.2)	
2018	477 (13.6)	421 (12.0)	
2019	461 (13.2)	451 (12.9)	
Study design, n (%)			0.109
Randomized controlled trial	231 (6.6)	196 (5.6)	
Basic sciences studies	159 (4.5)	111 (3.2)	
Case-control study	81 (2.3)	82 (2.3)	
Cohort study	1,588 (45.4)	1,619 (46.3)	
Comparative study	318 (9.1)	336 (9.6)	
Cross-sectional study	511 (14.6)	529 (15.1)	
Medico-economics/simulation study	36 (1.0)	34 (1.0)	
Mixed/qualitative methods	457 (13.1)	461 (13.2)	
Systematic review & meta-analysis	119 (3.4)	132 (3.8)	
Sample size, n (%)			0.141
No sample size	93 (2.7)	97 (2.8)	
≤100	1,271 (36.3)	1,314 (37.5)	
101-1000	1,118 (31.9)	1,147 (32.8)	
1001-10 000	591 (16.9)	575 (16.4)	
>10 000	427 (12.2)	367 (10.5)	
Type of funding ^a , n (%)			<0.001
Non-profit only	632 (18.1)	655 (18.7)	
Associations and foundations	223 (6.4)	187 (5.3)	
For profit	101 (2.9)	98 (2.8)	
International organizations	151 (4.3)	79 (2.3)	
Non-profit & associations and foundations	806 (23.0)	695 (19.9)	
Non-profit & for-profit	129 (3.7)	112 (3.2)	
No information of the funding	1,153 (32.9)	1,288 (36.8)	
No funding	305 (8.7)	386 (11.0)	

^aGender identified with an accuracy above 60%; funding type is detailed in the supplementary material 3.

^bp-values from the univariate analyses (logistic regression models, except for the continuous variables where comparisons were done using Student t test).

Table 2: Acceptance for publication in a random sample of 7000 accepted/rejected manuscripts submitted to 21 BMJ Publishing Group journals between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2019 with at least two coauthors on the byline. Univariate and multivariable models ^{a,b}.

Independent variables	Univariate analyses			Multivariable analysis ^{a,b}		
	OR	95%CI	p-value	OR	95%CI	p-value
Author / Editor characteristics						
First author's gender ^c (ref= Man)			0.041			0.413
Woman	1.11	(1.00 to 1.22)		1.04	(0.94 to 1.16)	
Last author's gender ^c (ref= Man)			0.592			0.652
Woman	0.97	(0.88 to 1.08)		0.98	(0.88 to 1.09)	
Gender diversity between first and last authors (ref=men first & last)			0.136			-
Woman first author & man last author	1.06	(0.94-1.20)	0.347	-	-	-
Man first author & woman last author	0.91	(0.78-1.05)	0.198	-	-	-
Woman first author & woman last author	1.09	(0.95-1.26)	0.227	-	-	-
Proportion of women co-authors on byline ^c (ref= only men)			0.031			-
Up to 49% women	1.24	(1.07 to 1.44)	0.005	-	-	-
From 50 to 99% women	1.24	(1.06 to 1.45)	0.007	-	-	-
100% women	1.15	(0.86 to 1.52)	0.346			
First author's geographical affiliation ^e (ref=Europe)			<0.001			<0.001
Africa	0.65	(0.44 to 0.97)	0.036	0.91	(0.54 to 1.52)	0.716
Asia	0.48	(0.42 to 0.55)	<0.001	0.58	(0.48 to 0.70)	<0.001
North America	1.06	(0.94 to 1.20)	0.312	1.07	(0.94 to 1.22)	0.296
Oceania	1.00	(0.82 to 1.22)	0.990	1.05	(0.86 to 1.30)	0.623
South America	0.55	(0.38 to 0.79)	0.001	0.78	(0.50 to 1.23)	0.283
First author's country of affiliation income (ref=high income)			<0.001			<0.001
Upper middle income	0.42	(0.36 to 0.50)	<0.001	0.61	(0.47 to 0.78)	<0.001
Lower middle and low income	0.51	(0.39 to 0.67)	<0.001	0.65	(0.45 to 0.93)	0.019
Last author's geographical affiliation (ref=Europe)						-
Africa	0.76	(0.52 to 1.12)	0.169	-	-	-
Asia	0.49	(0.43 to 0.56)	<0.001	-	-	-
North America	1.05	(0.93 to 1.18)	0.439	-	-	-
Oceania	1.00	(0.82 to 1.21)	0.994	-	-	-
South America	0.59	(0.41 to 0.86)	0.005	-	-	-
Last author's country of affiliation income (ref=high income)			<0.001			-
Upper middle income	0.46	(0.39 to 0.55)	<0.001	-	-	-
Lower middle and low income	0.54	(0.41 to 0.70)	<0.001	-	-	-

Geographical/income diversity between first/last authors (ref=same country)			<0.001			<0.001
Different countries, but same geographical affiliation/income group	1.51	(1.20 to 1.91)	<0.001	1.39	(1.09 to 1.77)	0.008
Different countries and geographical affiliation but same income group	1.49	(1.19 to 1.87)	<0.001	1.45	(1.14 to 1.84)	0.002
Different income groups	1.14	(0.89 to 1.45)	0.308	1.59	(1.20 to 2.11)	0.001
Editor's gender ^c (ref= Man)			0.213			
Woman	0.94	(0.85 to 1.04)		-	-	-
Editor's geographical affiliation (ref=Europe)			0.009			
Africa	2.09	(0.52 to 8.38)	0.297	-	-	-
Asia	1.00	(0.82 to 1.24)	0.959	-	-	-
North America	1.06	(0.95 to 1.18)	0.306	-	-	-
Oceania	1.30	(1.12 to 1.51)	<0.001	-	-	-
Editor's country of affiliation income (ref=high income)			0.700			
Upper middle income	1.59	(0.52 to 4.86)	0.417	-	-	-
Lower middle income	0.90	(0.38 to 2.13)	0.816	-	-	-
Study attributes						
Submission year (ref=2012))			0.0022			-
2013	0.74	(0.61 to 0.90)	0.003	-	-	-
2014	0.77	(0.63 to 0.93)	0.007	-	-	-
2015	0.71	(0.59 to 0.86)	<0.001	-	-	-
2016	0.70	(0.69 to 1.01)	<0.001	-	-	-
2017	0.83	(0.75 to 1.10)	0.060	-	-	-
2018	0.91	(0.68 to 0.99)	0.341	-	-	-
2019	0.82	(0.68 to 0.99)	0.044	-	-	-
Study design (ref= Randomized controlled trial)			0.109			0.045
Basic sciences studies	1.21	(0.89 to 1.65)	0.224	1.43	(1.02 to 2.01)	0.040
Case-control study	0.82	(0.57 to 1.19)	0.295	0.87	(0.59 to 1.28)	0.483
Cohort study	0.83	(0.68 to 1.02)	0.076	0.85	(0.68 to 1.06)	0.149
Comparative study	0.80	(0.63 to 1.03)	0.084	0.90	(0.69 to 1.18)	0.448
Cross-sectional study	0.83	(0.66 to 1.04)	0.112	0.83	(0.65 to 1.06)	0.137
Medico-economics/simulation study	0.95	(0.57 to 1.59)	0.841	0.86	(0.50 to 1.48)	0.580
Mixed/qualitative methods	0.84	(0.67 to 1.06)	0.134	0.83	(0.65 to 1.07)	0.148
Systematic review & meta-analysis	0.75	(0.55 to 1.03)	0.077	0.83	(0.59 to 1.16)	0.276
Sample size (ref= ≤100 or no sample size)			0.141			0.064
101-1000	1.00	(0.90 to 1.12)	0.959	1.07	(0.95 to 1.21)	0.275
1001-10000	1.06	(0.92 to 1.22)	0.408	1.11	(0.95 to 1.29)	0.198

>10000	1.19	(1.02 to 1.40)	0.029	1.28	(1.07 to 1.53)	0.008
Type of funding (ref. No funding)			<0.001			<0.001
No information of funding	1.11	(0.93 to 1.31)	0.250	1.07	(0.89 to 1.28)	0.489
Non-profit	1.18	(0.98 to 1.43)	0.078	1.19	(0.98 to 1.46)	0.085
Associations and foundations	1.47	(1.15 to 1.88)	0.002	1.47	(1.14 to 1.92)	0.004
For-profit	1.25	(0.91 to 1.72)	0.165	1.13	(0.81 to 1.58)	0.484
International organizations	2.41	(1.76 to 3.29)	<0.001	2.30	(1.64 to 3.23)	<0.001
Non-profit & associations & foundations	1.43	(1.19 to 1.71)	<0.001	1.31	(1.08 to 1.60)	0.007
Non-profit & for-profit	1.40	(1.04 to 1.88)	0.025	1.30	(0.95 to 1.78)	0.102

^aModel performed for manuscripts with more than one author (n=6,428 observations). ^bModel adjusted for the speciality of the research topic (p=0.327). ^cGender determined with accuracy ≥60%.

Pre-specified variables

Post hoc variables

Study attributes
Sample size
Design
Funding
Medical specialty

First author's gender

Interaction by editor's gender
Interaction by submission year

Last author's gender

Interaction by editor's gender
Interaction by submission year

Acceptance for publication

First/Last author affiliation
Same country
Different countries but same geographical affiliation & income groups
Different countries and geographical affiliations but same income group
Different income groups

First author affiliation
Geographical affiliation
Income group

Primary & secondary predictors

Adjustment variables (prespecified & post hoc)

Outcome

21 participating BMJ Publishing Group journals

184 617 submitted manuscripts

71 712 eligible manuscripts

- 2012 : 6702
- 2013: 7734
- 2014: 8064
- 2015: 8325
- 2016: 9536
- 2017: 9970
- 2018: 10 666
- 2019: 10 715

7 000 selected manuscripts (analysed)

Clinical Microbiology & Infection journal
(Elsevier)

15 986 submitted manuscripts

10 804 eligible manuscripts

- 2012 : 1147
- 2013: 1164
- 2014: 1262
- 2015: 1368
- 2016: 1434
- 2017: 1446
- 2018: 1478
- 2019: 1505

320 selected manuscripts
(not included in main analyses)