

29 Abstract

30 **Background/Objectives:** To assess whether the type of peer-review (single-blinded vs double-blinded)
31 has an impact on nationality representation in journals.

32 **Methods:** A cross-sectional study analyzing the top ten nationalities contributing to the number of articles
33 across 16 ophthalmology journals.

34 **Results:** There was no significant difference in the percentage of articles published from the journal's
35 country of origin between the top single-blind journals and top double-blind journals (SB= 42.0%, DB =
36 26.6%, p=0.49) but there was a significant difference between the percentage of articles from the US
37 (SB=48.0%, DB=22.8%, p=0.02). However, there was no significant difference for both country of origin
38 (SB =38.0%, DB =26.6%, p=0.43) and articles from the US (SB=35.0%, DB=22.8%, p=0.21) when
39 assessing the top 8 double-blind journals matched with single-blind journals of a similar impact factor.
40 The countries that most commonly made the top ten lists for highest number of articles were the US
41 (n=16, 100%) and England (n=16, 100%). This held true even for journals established outside the United
42 States (US=11/12, England=11/12).

43 **Conclusions:** There was no statistically significant difference in country-of-origin representation between
44 single-blind journals and double-blind journals. However, higher income countries contributed most often
45 to the journals studied even among journals based outside the US.

46

47 Keywords: peer review, disparity, masking

48 Introduction:

49 Several studies have noted a geographic disparity in the publication of manuscripts, with a greater
50 proportion coming from countries with higher incomes.^{1,2} This is particularly relevant considering the
51 growing number of article submissions from outside the United States.³ One study showed that global
52 research output has increased annually by 4% between 2008 and 2018,⁴ while another found that
53 international submissions rose from 9% in 1988 to 24% in 2000.³ Since many of the major peer-reviewed
54 journals are established in high-income countries, one possible explanation is an associated geographical
55 bias where reviewers of a certain country are more likely to accept articles from their own country or
56 articles from nations with “track records.”^{2,5} Studies have shown that US-based reviewers are more likely
57 to accept US-based authors,¹ and 36.4% of authors from lower-income countries (non-members of the
58 Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development) believe there may be a bias against
59 manuscripts published by authors from their own countries.⁶

60
61 Peer-review is critical as it provides the scientific community with confidence that there has been an
62 examination of the scientific validity of the data and it is the gold-standard for evaluating work in
63 scientific journals.⁷ While the majority of articles published in academic fields, including ophthalmology,
64 are reviewed in a single-blinded manner, the ideal method of peer-review is often debated. Proponents of
65 single-blind review (where reviewers have access to the authors’ names and nationality, but the authors
66 are blinded to the reviewers) emphasize the high time/cost-burden associated with the double-blind peer
67 review process and a lack of strong evidence that it is beneficial.^{8,9} This stands in contrast to a double-
68 blinded review (where both reviewers and the authors are anonymized). In theory, a double-blinded
69 approach ensures that any implicit biases the reviewer may hold with regards to gender, institution,
70 geographic location, and ethnicity, etc. do not influence the decision to accept or reject a manuscript for
71 publication. Proponents of a double-blinded review system state that single-blind reviewers are more
72 likely to accept manuscripts published by well-known authors,^{10,11} creating a self-perpetuating cycle
73 where well-known authors continue publishing and further increase their visibility.

74

75 Several studies across a variety of fields have attempted to quantify the impact of single-blind peer review
76 vs double-blind peer review on the type of articles accepted. The effectiveness of masking from these
77 papers have been mixed; while some state that masking does not impact the quality of peer review,^{8,9}
78 others state that having a double-blinded peer review results in a higher number of acceptances for female
79 authors,¹² a higher rejection rate of well-known authors,^{11,13} and a higher number of authors from non-
80 English speaking countries.^{5,10} However, to the best of the authors' knowledge, no study has attempted to
81 survey the peer review process in ophthalmology-related journals. Given the rise of international article
82 submissions and the lack of concrete evidence on how reviewer behavior and submission acceptances
83 differ based on the method of peer-review in ophthalmology, the goal of this study is to assess whether
84 differences in national representation is dependent on the type of peer review process (single-blind vs
85 double-blind) the journal has across 16 ophthalmology journals.

86

87 Methods:

88 We identified all the double-blind ophthalmic journals (of which there were 8) in the top 60 journals by
89 impact factor as reported by the Institute of Scientific Information's annual Journal Citation Reports and
90 compared them to the top 8 single-blinded journals on the list.¹⁴ Journals were determined to be double-
91 blind or single-blind either through the journal website, the journal submission site, or by emailing the
92 editorial office. Journals that were invitation-only were excluded. Furthermore, we performed additional
93 analysis on 8 single-blind journals that were matched by impact factor to the top 8 double-blind journals.
94 The Journal of Citation Reports was also used to determine the top ten nationalities that contributed to
95 published articles in each journal between 2017 and 2019. If there was a tie for tenth place amongst
96 various nationalities, only the first alphabetically was included (so every journal only had ten countries
97 total). The Mann Whitney U Test was used to compare medians between single-blind journals and
98 double-blind journals.

99

100 Results:

101 *Top 8 Double-Blind vs Top 8 Single-Blind by Impact Factor*

102 Eight out of the 16 highest impact factor single-blinded/double-blind journals were based out of the
103 United States. The average impact factor of the top eight single-blind journals was 5.74, and the average
104 impact factor for double-blind journals was 1.55 ($p=0.001$). The top single-blinded journals were most
105 commonly based in the US (6/8) whereas the top double-blinded journals were most commonly based in
106 the Netherlands (3/8). The countries that most commonly made the top ten lists for highest number of
107 articles were the US ($n=16$, 100%), England ($n=16$, 100%), and China ($n=15$, 94%). Of the 32,081
108 articles included in this analysis, 46.2% were from the US, 8.5% were from China, and 7.5% were from
109 England. There was no significant difference in the percentage of articles published from the journal's
110 country of origin between the top single-blind journals and top double-blind journals (SB= 42.0%, DB =
111 26.6%, $p=0.49$) but there was a significant difference between the percentage of articles from the US
112 (SB=48.0%, DB=22.8%, $p=0.02$) (Table 1).

113

114 *Top 8 Double-Blind Matched with Top 8 Single-Blind by Impact Factor*

115 As there was a significant difference in impact factor between the top double-blind and top single-blind
116 studies, we matched the top double-blind studies with single-blind studies by impact factor. In this
117 analysis, there was no significant difference in impact factor between single-blind and double-blind
118 journals (SB=1.47, DB=1.55, $p=.46$). There was no significant difference between the top 8 double-blind
119 journals matched with single-blind journals of a similar impact factor for both country of origin (SB
120 =38.0%, DB =26.6%, $p=0.43$) and articles from the US (SB=35.0%, DB=22.8%, $p=0.21$) (Table 1).

121

122 *Top 6 Double-Blind International Journals Matched with Single-Blind International Journals of Similar*
123 *Impact Factor*

124 Amongst journals that were not based in the US, we matched journals by impact factor to see whether
125 there was any difference in US representation amongst international journals (Table 2). The average

126 impact factor of double-blind international journals was 1.52 and the average impact factor for matched
127 single-blind international journals was 1.31 ($p=0.42$). There was no difference between single-blind and
128 double-blind journals regarding both country of origin (SB=38.3%, DB= 23.8%, $p=0.37$) and US
129 representation (SB=14.1%, DB=18.8%, $p=0.38$). Of the journals that were based outside the US, England
130 ($n=11/12$) and the US ($n=11/12$) most frequently occurred in the top ten nations that contributed articles.
131 India contributed the majority of articles ($n=1,570$, 25.2%) followed by the US ($n=1,088$, 17.5%) and
132 Germany ($n=1,028$, 16.5%).

133

134 Discussion:

135 Our results demonstrate there was no difference in the number of articles published from the journal's
136 country of origin between single-blind journals and double-blind journals. These results are promising
137 given the importance of publishing in peer-review journals on an international stage, both for the
138 dissemination and creation of knowledge but also for academic advancement. Of note, we did find that
139 the top single-blind journals had a greater percentage of journals from the US, but we believe this is due
140 to the large number of high-impact factor, single-blind journals based in the US. In order to eliminate this
141 confounding, we matched the top double-blind journals by impact factor to single-blind journals and
142 found that this difference was eliminated. These results are in line with another study looking at abstracts
143 submitted to the American Heart Association conference which found that double-blind review helps
144 mitigate geographic disparities as significantly fewer abstracts were accepted from the US during double
145 blind review.^{5,10}

146

147 A previous study demonstrated that while both US and non-US based authors view “non-US” studies
148 similarly, US reviewers have a significant preference for US authors.¹ However, our study found that
149 single-blind journals and double-blind journals, when matched by impact factor, had similar rates of
150 article publication from the US. This is congruent with conclusions from other studies describing
151 increased representation of high-income countries in journals.^{2,5} Furthermore, we found that even when

152 considering only journals that were based outside of the US, England and the US (both high-income
153 countries) most commonly made the top-ten lists for contributing countries. These findings support
154 another study that determined 80% of published biomedical articles originate from ten countries.¹⁵ Of
155 note, the findings of our study may be confounded given that the populations submitting to the articles
156 may be different depending on the scope of the journal. However, a study evaluating submissions from
157 authors who had the option to elect single-blind or double-blind review in *Nature* journals found that
158 articles under double-blind review tended to get rejected more often. The authors of the aforementioned
159 study attributed the higher rejection rate of double-blind review to poorer quality of the articles.¹⁶ High-
160 income countries are more likely to have increased institutional funding,¹⁷ increased cross-collaboration
161 with other high-income countries,¹⁸ and prioritization of research by the institution, all of which positively
162 impact the quality of a manuscript. For similar reasons, it may also be that lower-income countries tend to
163 have lower research output. Furthermore, another study found that poor writing was one of the top six
164 reasons reviewers reject a manuscript.³ Considering the majority of high-impact journals are in English,
165 as was corroborated in this study, many countries whose native-language is not English may be at an
166 inherent disadvantage.³ Further studies investigating potential interventions to improve the quality of
167 manuscripts from international countries to increase the chances of publishing in these high-impact
168 journals are necessary.

169
170 Editors have long been a proponent of single-blind review. One commonly cited reason for this is the
171 importance of knowing the author's identity to highlight strengths and weaknesses of the work. For
172 example, having a statistician as a co-author on a manuscript could further validate the statistical methods
173 of a paper. Similarly, knowing the identity of the author could be important in order to distinguish
174 progress from previous works.¹⁹ Another commonly cited reason for masking reviewers is an
175 overwhelming burden on the journal to ensure that true masking is achieved. This is due to reviewers
176 being able to commonly guess the authors, time and labor costs required to educate the reviewers, and
177 issues regarding reconciling the blind with the unblinded manuscript. In fact, one of the biggest issues

178 with double-blind review is the issue of true masking. Often, the reviewer can infer the author,
179 particularly if the author is well-known in the field, due to references to study setting, pronouns used in
180 the manuscript, or the author's previous works. One study in economic journals showed that 45% of
181 reviewers can identify the author,²⁰ while another study found masking failure to be 32%.²¹ In
182 ophthalmology, specifically, this can be an even greater issue given the relatively small size of the field.
183 One suggested remedy for this is to use reviewers that have less research and reviewer experience, but
184 this may have unintended consequences regarding the quality of review.²² Our study appears to validate
185 further the use of single blind review among the top journals in the field. However, additional studies
186 evaluating other sources of potential bias are necessary.¹²

187
188 This study has limitations. First, while the journals are located in one country, the national representation
189 of the editorial boards/reviewers editing them could be from different countries which may affect article
190 acceptance. Second, this study does not account for article submission rates or researcher population rates
191 of countries as that data is not publicly available. Both of these factors could significantly influence the
192 number of articles published in a journal. We were also not able to take into account the reach of the
193 journal; while some journals may be known on an international level and thus receive submissions from
194 across the world, other journals may only be more prominent locally thus warranting more submissions
195 from the nation where that journal is based.

196
197 While our study found that double blind review did not impact the number of articles accepted from
198 outside the country of origin, our findings were consistent with other studies demonstrating a
199 predominance of articles from higher-income countries. This study evaluates one component of potential
200 disparities and implicit bias in the peer-review process. Further studies assessing the role of peer-review
201 on other possible disparities (i.e. prestige or gender of author) in ophthalmology journals are necessary.
202 Furthermore, additional studies taking into account submission and acceptance rates in single-blind vs

203 double-blind scenarios are warranted to more accurately quantify the existence of geographical disparities
204 so that we can ensure a more equitable publishing environment.

205 **References**

- 206 1. Link AM. US and non-US submissions: an analysis of reviewer bias. *JAMA*. 1998;280(3):246-
207 247.
- 208 2. Skopec M, Issa H, Reed J, Harris M. The role of geographic bias in knowledge diffusion: a
209 systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Res Integr Peer Rev*. 2020;5:2.
- 210 3. Iverson C. US medical journal editors' attitudes toward submissions from other countries. *Science*
211 *Editor*. 2002;25(3):75-78.
- 212 4. NSB NSF. Publication Output: US Trends and International Comparisons. *Science and*
213 *Engineering Indicators 2020*. 2019.
- 214 5. Opthof T, Coronel R, Janse MJ. The significance of the peer review process against the
215 background of bias: priority ratings of reviewers and editors and the prediction of citation, the
216 role of geographical bias. *Cardiovasc Res*. 2002;56(3):339-346.
- 217 6. Najjar W, Mouanness MA, Rameh G, Bazi T. International authorship in leading world journals
218 on incontinence and pelvic floor disorders: Is it truly international? *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod*
219 *Biol*. 2019;241:104-108.
- 220 7. Kelly J, Sadeghieh T, Adeli K. Peer Review in Scientific Publications: Benefits, Critiques, & A
221 Survival Guide. *EJIFCC*. 2014;25(3):227-243.
- 222 8. van Rooyen S, Godlee F, Evans S, Smith R, Black N. Effect of blinding and unmasking on the
223 quality of peer review: a randomized trial. *JAMA*. 1998;280(3):234-237.
- 224 9. Godlee F, Gale CR, Martyn CN. Effect on the quality of peer review of blinding reviewers and
225 asking them to sign their reports: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 1998;280(3):237-240.
- 226 10. Ross JS, Gross CP, Desai MM, et al. Effect of blinded peer review on abstract acceptance. *JAMA*.
227 2006;295(14):1675-1680.
- 228 11. Okike K, Hug KT, Kocher MS, Leopold SS. Single-blind vs Double-blind Peer Review in the
229 Setting of Author Prestige. *JAMA*. 2016;316(12):1315-1316.
- 230 12. Budden AE, Tregenza T, Aarssen LW, Koricheva J, Leimu R, Lortie CJ. Double-blind review
231 favours increased representation of female authors. *Trends Ecol Evol*. 2008;23(1):4-6.
- 232 13. Tomkins A, Zhang M, Heavlin WD. Reviewer bias in single- versus double-blind peer review.
233 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2017;114(48):12708-12713.
- 234 14. Journal Citation Reports. In: Institute for Scientific Information TS, ed. Philadelphia, PA.
- 235 15. Paraje G, Sadana R, Karam G. Public health. Increasing international gaps in health-related
236 publications. *Science*. 2005;308(5724):959-960.
- 237 16. De Ranieri E, McGillivray B, Swaminathan S, Samarasinghe M, Gruen L. Analysis of uptake and
238 outcome in author-selected single-blind vs double-blind peer review at Nature Journals.
239 Presentation. 2017.
- 240 17. Muula AS. Medical journalism and authorship in low income countries. *Croat Med J*.
241 2008;49(5):681-683.
- 242 18. Cash-Gibson L, Rojas-Gualdrón DF, Pericas JM, Benach J. Inequalities in global health
243 inequalities research: A 50-year bibliometric analysis (1966-2015). *PLoS One*.
244 2018;13(1):e0191901.
- 245 19. Working double-blind. *Nature*. 2008;451(7179):605-606.
- 246 20. Blank RM. The effects of double-blind versus single-blind reviewing: Experimental evidence
247 from the American Economic Review. *The American Economic Review*. 1991:1041-1067.
- 248 21. Justice AC, Cho MK, Winker MA, Berlin JA, Rennie D. Does masking author identity improve
249 peer review quality? A randomized controlled trial. PEER Investigators. *JAMA*. 1998;280(3):240-
250 242.
- 251 22. Cho MK, Justice AC, Winker MA, et al. Masking author identity in peer review: what factors
252 influence masking success? PEER Investigators. *JAMA*. 1998;280(3):243-245.
- 253
- 254

255 Table 1:

Top Double-Blind Journals					Top Single-Blind Journals					Matched Single-Blind Journals				
Name	Impact Factor	Country of Origin	% Articles from Country of Origin	% Articles from US	Name	Impact Factor	Country of Origin	% Articles from Country of Origin	% Articles from US	Name	Impact Factor	Country of Origin	% Articles from Country of Origin	% Articles from US
Contact Lens and Anterior Eye	2.578	Netherlands	0.00%	17.10%	Ocular Surface	12.336	Netherlands	0.00%	42.00%	JoN	2.513	US	66.20%	66.20%
CEO	1.918	US	6.90%	6.90%	Ophthalmology	8.47	US	52.70%	52.70%	Current Eye Research	1.754	US	21.00%	21.00%
Cutaneous and Ocular Toxicology	1.385	England	1.50%	13.80%	JAMA	6.198	US	68.90%	66.40%	CJO	1.369	Canada	47.80%	23.80%
JAAPOS	1.339	US	64.20%	62.50%	SoO	4.195	US	51.60%	54.20%	OPRS	1.331	US	62.40%	62.40%
IJO	1.33	China	58.30%	10.20%	AJO	4.013	US	53.20%	53.20%	IO	1.31	Netherlands	0.00%	9.20%
Ophthalmic Genetics	1.308	Netherlands	0.00%	37.50%	Retina	3.649	US	37.10%	37.10%	Perception	1.217	England	22.50%	13.80%
DO	1.294	Netherlands	0.00%	28.30%	BJO	3.611	England	18.10%	24.40%	SIO	1.205	US	34.30%	34.30%
Indian Journal of Ophthalmology	1.25	India	82.10%	6.10%	IOVS	3.47	US	54.30%	54.30%	JPOS	1.1	US	49.70%	49.70%
Average	1.55		26.60%	22.80%		5.74		42.00%	48.00%		1.47		38.00%	35.00%
					P-Value comparing Top Double-Blind Journals with Top Single-Blind Journals					P-Value comparing Top Double-Blind Journals with Matched Single-Blind Journals by Impact Factor				
					0.001					0.02				
					0.49					0.46				
										0.43				
										0.21				

CEO = Clinical and Experimental Ophthalmology, JAAPOS = Journal of AAPOS, IJO = International Journal of Ophthalmology, DO = Documenta Ophthalmologica, JAMA = JAMA Ophthalmology, SoO = Survey of Ophthalmology, AJO = American Journal of Ophthalmology, Retina = Retina - The Journal of Retinal and Vitreous Diseases, BJO = British Journal of Ophthalmology, IOVS = Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science, CJO = Canadian Journal of Ophthalmology, OPRS = Ophthalmic Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, IO = International Ophthalmology, JoN = Journal of Neuro-ophthalmology, SIO = Seminars in Ophthalmology, JPOS = Journal of Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus

*P-Values are calculated by the Wilcoxon Rank-Sum Test. Values less than 0.05 are considered significant.

256

257 Table 2:

Top International Double-Blind Journals					Matched International Single-Blind Journals				
Name	Impact Factor	Country of Origin	% Articles from Country of Origin	% Articles from US	Name	Impact Factor	Country of Origin	% Articles from Country of Origin	% Articles from US
Contact Lens and Anterior Eye	2.578	Netherlands	0.00%	17.10%	Vision Research	2.61	England	14.60%	42.00%
Cutaneous and Ocular Toxicology	1.385	England	1.50%	13.80%	Canadian Journal of Ophthalmology	1.369	Canada	47.80%	66.40%
IJO	1.33	China	58.30%	10.20%	International Ophthalmology	1.31	Netherlands	0.00%	53.20%
Ophthalmic Genetics	1.308	Netherlands	0.00%	37.50%	Perception	1.217	England	22.50%	37.10%
DO	1.294	Netherlands	0.00%	28.30%	Ophthalmologie	0.742	Germany	88.70%	24.40%
Indian Journal of Ophthalmology	1.25	India	82.10%	6.10%	Journal Francais d Ophthalmologie	0.636	France	56.40%	54.30%
Average	1.52		23.80%	18.80%		1.31		38.30%	14.10%
					P-Value Comparing Matched International Single-Blind Journals with Top International Double Blind Journals				
					0.71				
					0.37				
					0.38				

IJO = International Journal of Ophthalmology, DO = Documenta Ophthalmologica

*P-Values are calculated by the Wilcoxon Rank-Sum Test and are compared to the averages for the Top International Double-Blind Journals. Values less than 0.05 are considered significant.

258