

# 1 Can we see gender through the microscope? The research output using 2 menstrual blood cells has much to say

3

4 Daniela Tonelli Manica<sup>1</sup>; Karina Dutra Asensi<sup>2</sup>; Gaia Mazzarelli<sup>4</sup>; Germana  
5 Barata<sup>1</sup>; Regina Coeli dos Santos Goldenberg<sup>2,3</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Laboratory of Advanced Studies in Journalism, State University of Campinas,  
8 São Paulo, Brazil

9 <sup>2</sup> Carlos Chagas Filho Institute of Biophysics, Federal University of Rio de  
10 Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

11 <sup>3</sup> National Institute of Science and Technology for Regenerative Medicine -  
12 REGENERA, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

13 <sup>4</sup> Institute of Earth Sciences, State University of Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil

14

## 15 Summary

16 Despite proven scientific quality of menstrual blood mesenchymal cells, research and  
17 science output using those cells is still incipient and considered taboo. This study  
18 analyzes the literature of the menstrual blood mesenchymal stromal/stem cells  
19 (mbMSC) at PubMed database between (2008 – 2020) and the social attention it  
20 received on Twitter. A comparative analysis showed that mbMSC has a very small  
21 space within mesenchymal cells research (0.25%). Most first authors are women  
22 (53.2%), whereas most last authors are men (63.74%). Menstrual blood tends to be  
23 less used in experiments and its scientific value tends to be underestimated, which  
24 brings gender bias to a technical and molecular level. Although women are more  
25 positive in the mbMSC debate on Twitter, communication efforts toward visibility and  
26 public interest in menstrual cells has room to grow.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27

28 --

29

## 30 **Keywords**

31 mesenchymal stromal/stem cells, menstrual blood, gender, research policies,  
32 altmetrics, PubMed, science communication

33

## 34 **Introduction**

35 Studies in the last half century have broadly considered gender issues in  
36 science (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8). Feminist and postcolonial approaches to science  
37 have recently shown the complex interrelations between inequalities of  
38 gender, race/ethnicity, and class within scientific practices (9, 10). The  
39 presence of gender and racial bias in science is well-known, and many studies  
40 focus on the presence and proportion of women and other minorities in  
41 different social contexts within laboratories and universities.

42 Recent efforts have been trying to increase the visibility of the usual  
43 social dynamics that limit women and other minorities' scientific career,  
44 sometimes articulated to social movement's political agendas (#metoo,  
45 #blacklivesmatter). Reports show that women tend to have lower  
46 remuneration and peer acknowledgment, and that there is a bottleneck, or a  
47 glass ceiling, for women and other minorities to achieve a higher status in  
48 academic and other power hierarchies (11). Demands over women's  
49 evaluation tend to be higher (12), and experiments with non-blind reviews  
50 have shown that they tend to favor white men (13). Male authors may be  
51 associated with greater scientific quality (14) and gender bias influences the  
52 review process (15). Furthermore, gender and international diversity are  
53 related to lower acceptance rates in peer reviews (16).

54 In November 2020, the publication of a paper by Nature  
 55 Communications has shaken the scientific community (17). Based on an  
 56 analysis of shared authorship in papers and citation rates, the authors  
 57 concluded that “male” mentors and proteges had more benefits than  
 58 “females”. The paper had to be retracted after receiving criticism about what  
 59 counted as “informal mentorship”, and about the limitation of considering only  
 60 the metrics of citation rates and impact to evaluate careers in science. The  
 61 authors were accused of leaving aside important gender disparity issues like  
 62 underrepresentation; the smaller access of women to grants and leadership  
 63 roles, demonstrated in numerous studies and reports (18, 8, 19); and the  
 64 salary gender gap present even in science (11). The authors “did not  
 65 acknowledge their unjustified conclusions relating female gender to career  
 66 success and policy suggestions” (20).

67 Publishers and academic associations have been forced to review their  
 68 gender and racial biases, and publication and admission policies (21). Racism  
 69 and sexual harassment events came to be addressed institutionally. In recent  
 70 years, many journals and scientific associations have committed to reducing  
 71 inequalities in publishing procedures and towards the equality of gender and  
 72 the inclusion of diversities (22, 23, 19, 24, 25, among others). Bringing these  
 73 situations to the public and producing data about the inequalities made  
 74 publishing policies more explicit, and made inclusion and diversity into  
 75 important topics to be considered for good scientific practices. But we still  
 76 have a long way to go “to make significant changes for gender equality” (20).

77 Gender studies have contributed largely to legitimizing discussions  
 78 about equity and representation in many areas of social life, such as science  
 79 and technology. But “the question of science in feminism” (2) has also led to

80 analyses that situate scientific discourse and practices as socially, culturally,  
81 and politically marked (26, 5, 27). In that sense, the very concept of “sex” or  
82 “sexual differences” became historically and culturally situated, shifting  
83 criteria for what counts as “female” and “male” from a given-natural-material-  
84 bodily difference to processes that are more open, variable, complex, and co-  
85 produced (28). The way each culture and society defines “female” and “male”,  
86 “women” and “men” vary greatly (29).

87       Menstruation and menstrual blood are tied within this complexity (30),  
88 being mostly associated to “female” bodies, bodies understood as feminine  
89 and of cis women – although trans men, non-binary people, women on  
90 menopause, women without uterus complicate this association. We cannot  
91 reduce the relations between menstruation and gender identities. In this  
92 study, we assume menstrual blood is a bodily fluid that socially and culturally  
93 marks differences between women and men, being understood as a specific  
94 phenomenon that happens to most cis women during a long period of their  
95 lives. We will consider its presence in scientific laboratories, relating to  
96 mesenchymal stromal/stem cells and to the scientists that work with it in their  
97 research. What can we tell about the relations between menstrual blood and  
98 gender when we look at research on menstrual blood mesenchymal  
99 stromal/stem cells (mbMSCs)? How are microscopes, scientific papers,  
100 journals, social networks, and power relations between women and men,  
101 senior and junior, global North and South articulated to co-produce  
102 differences related to gender and science? To address these questions, we will  
103 focus on results from research with mbMSC.

104       In the 1970’s, Friedenstein and colleagues were the first to report the  
105 existence of a type of adult stem cell in the bone marrow stroma, different

106 from hematopoietic stem cells. These cells were clonogenic, adherent to the  
107 culture flask, of a fibroblastic shape (31, 32, 33), and named as mesenchymal  
108 stem cells (MSCs) (34). Since then, these cells have been extensively studied  
109 and their main mechanism of action has been described through paracrine  
110 secretion (35, 36). These cell-derived products, such as extracellular vesicles,  
111 trophic and immunomodulatory factors, have shown significant benefits in  
112 vivo(37, 38, 39, 40). Considering the growing publications demonstrating the  
113 beneficial paracrine effect promoted by the released factors, another proposed  
114 name for them was “Medicinal Signaling Cells” (41, 42).

115 The MSCs are found in a variety of tissues in the human body and in  
116 extra-embryonic attachments and are characterized according to the minimal  
117 criteria established by the International Society for Cell Therapy (43).  
118 However, the obtention of many of these MSCs needs invasive procedures,  
119 such as bone marrow and adipose MSCs. The MSC derived from extra-  
120 embryonic attachments are also only available once, at birth, or by invasive  
121 procedures during pregnancy, such as amniocentesis. In this context,  
122 menstrual blood is a unique MSC source, monthly available during all  
123 reproductive lives of cis women, and safely collected without invasive  
124 procedures by the donor. But we will demonstrate it is one of the least studied  
125 sources of MSCs despite all these advantages of working with mbMSC, such  
126 as its availability for decades throughout women’s lives and its easy and  
127 painless collection.

128 We analyzed the presence and prevalence of mbMSCs in scientific  
129 papers involving mesenchymal cells published in the past twelve years (2008 -  
130 2020) and included in the Pubmed database. We compared the uses of  
131 mbMSCs with other mesenchymal stromal/stem cells also being studied (like

132 bone marrow, umbilical cord, adipose tissue, placenta, dental pulp, amniotic  
133 fluid, and endometrium).

134 Our focus is on the relation between gender issues and the presence or  
135 absence of mbMSC in the group of bodily tissues usually employed in the  
136 fields of regenerative medicine, bioengineering, and cell therapy. How many  
137 of the papers published in the last twelve years about mesenchymal  
138 stromal/stem cells used menstrual blood as a source? Who were the scientists  
139 involved in these studies with menstrual blood in terms of gender? In which  
140 countries are their institutions located? Are they the same as mainstream  
141 publications in the field of stem cells? What is the impact factor of the journals  
142 that published research with mbMSCs? Do they look like the most important  
143 publications in the field? What is the social attention received by mbMSCs on  
144 Twitter? What could be improved in the communication of mbMSCs?

145 Our hypothesis is that menstrual blood is not a common source of  
146 mesenchymal stromal/stem cells, and that women scientists are responsible  
147 for most research using it. We also expect to see that research related to  
148 menstrual blood stem cells lacks social attention on Twitter, that the attention  
149 it gets is primarily by women, and that tweets may reveal bias against the use  
150 of mbMSC.

151

## 152 **Materials and Methods**

153

154 Our analysis is focused on research about mesenchymal stromal/stem  
155 cells in the PubMed database. Pubmed is one of the most important archives  
156 of scientific literature in the fields of biomedical and life sciences. It is a  
157 publicly available repository for medical literature and probably the main

158 source for medical literature (43) and, therefore, relevant to scientific  
159 research results on stem cells.

160 Considering the first studies about menstrual blood mesenchymal  
161 stromal/stem cells were published in 2007, we took 2008 as initial date for our  
162 search and applied a twelve-year period (2008 – 2020). The following terms  
163 and keywords were used: 2008 [Date – Publication]: 2020 [Date – Publication]  
164 AND human [Title/Abstract] OR mesenchymal [Title/Abstract] OR stromal  
165 [Title/Abstract] OR stem cell [Title/Abstract] AND menstrual blood  
166 [Title/Abstract]. A total of 229 results were found. All abstracts were  
167 individually read, and, in most of the publications, the item “materials and  
168 methods” too. Research that did not use menstrual blood as a source for  
169 mesenchymal cells was discarded. We have then selected 171 articles for the  
170 analysis.

171 The 171 articles were downloaded and tabulated with the following  
172 information: first author’s name, gender, country and university; last author’s  
173 name, gender, country and university; number of authors; journal in which the  
174 paper was published; year of publication; DOI; Pubmed ID; journal’s Impact  
175 Factor. The results allowed us to analyze the author’s profile, comparing  
176 gender, country and university, the journal’s Impact Factor, as well as the  
177 articles’ altmetrics in Twitter. We also mapped the flux of publications  
178 throughout the twelve years.

179 We considered “gender” as the social expression of a difference  
180 understood by western culture as “sexual”, and as something that can be  
181 represented by the person’s name and physical appearance. Genders of first  
182 and last authors were compared, along with the profiles of countries and  
183 universities. We aim at addressing the various scales or levels in which gender

184 dynamics are involved: considering how women and men are present among  
185 these scientists and how cells, such as menstrual blood cells, come to be  
186 gendered and what that implies in terms of scientific results and impacts.

187 Gender assignment was made by inference using the first name and the  
188 profiles in universities' websites, in academic social networks (academia.edu  
189 and researchgate.net), and in private social networks (Facebook and Twitter).  
190 Ambiguous names, especially of researchers from China and Japan, whose  
191 names do not have a gendered written form in Roman alphabet, were analyzed  
192 by using the software genderize.io. We have only considered the results with  
193 60% or higher probability of being right. Cases of non-binary and trans people  
194 were disregarded in this analysis. Moreover, a chi-square test was performed  
195 using R software (version 4.1.1) to analyze the differences between the  
196 author's genders. Table 1 shows the numbers for the three outcomes  
197 considered (female, male, and null) for the first and last author's.

198  
199 **Table 1.** Gender of first and last authors of studies about mbMSCs

	First Author	Last Author
Female	91	56
Male	69	109
Null	11	6

200  
201 To compare the presence and prevalence of menstrual blood with other  
202 tissues of the body that also have mesenchymal cells, the same PubMed  
203 search was made with the following terms, as substitutions to "menstrual  
204 blood": "bone marrow; umbilical cord; umbilical cord blood; umbilical cord  
205 vein; Wharton jelly; adipose; placenta; dental pulp; endometrium, and



206 amniotic fluid". The terms of search were: "2008" [Date - Publication]: "2020"  
 207 [Date - Publication] AND human [Title/Abstract] OR mesenchymal  
 208 [Title/Abstract] OR stromal [Title/Abstract] OR stem cell [Title/Abstract] AND  
 209 the name of the cell's origin [Title/Abstract].

210 As for the social attention analysis, we have used the DOIs, or PubMed  
 211 ID of the publications sampled to track them on Twitter using the free API  
 212 from Altmetric.com data provider. Altmetric.com is a data provider of social  
 213 attention of science literature online. The AAS (altmetric attention score)  
 214 measures how scientific publications (as articles, book chapters, preprints etc)  
 215 were mentioned on online platforms such as blogs, news, Wikipedia, Twitter,  
 216 and Facebook. We have used the DOIs or PubMed ID to track the 171 articles  
 217 on Twitter using the free application programming interface (API) from  
 218 Altmetric.com data provider.

219 We have manually collected 210 tweets (15.2%) mentioning 26 articles  
 220 from a total of 352 tweets, since Altmetric.com provides only a limited free  
 221 sample of tweets per paper for free. The tweets were then categorized by  
 222 geolocation, profile gender (female, male, group, other or non-identified),  
 223 profile type (science related, lay person, news, bot, non-identified) type of  
 224 tweet (comment, retweet, or title and link of the paper), and ton of the  
 225 comment (positive, negative, or neutral). The ton was considered neutral  
 226 when it was not for or against the use of msMSC as most retweets or titles  
 227 followed by the paper link; positive when optimistic, enthusiastic, or in favor  
 228 of the use of msMSC, like sharing its benefits, treatments, or positive results  
 229 in research; and negative when comments were demeaning, sarcastic, or  
 230 sharing negative results or limitations in research.

231

## 232 Results

233

234 Research with menstrual blood cells is minoritarian and mostly conducted by  
235 women

236

237 **Table 2** shows the number of articles found for each of the tissues  
238 menstrual blood, bone marrow, umbilical cord, adipose, placenta, dental pulp,  
239 endometrium, and amniotic fluid. We considered endometrial cells as different  
240 from menstrual blood cells because they are usually obtained by invasive  
241 procedures such as hysterectomy, which might result in a different type of cell  
242 population. But since both endometrial and menstrual blood cells come from  
243 the uterus, we analyzed a sample of 45 papers mentioning endometrial cells  
244 (the 15 first, 15 last, and 15 in the middle of search results) to assure that  
245 they were not talking about menstrual blood cells when they mentioned  
246 endometrium. We read the abstracts and materials and methods of these  
247 papers, and only 2 of the 45 showed this ambiguity.

248

249 **Table 2.** Menstrual blood stromal/stem cells (mbMSCs) represent 0.25% of studies  
250 published at PubMed (2008 – 2020)

Tissue	Number of results	Percentage
menstrual blood	229	0.25%
bone marrow	43355	47.71%
umbilical cord total	11013	12.12%
adipose	20131	22.16%
placenta	7721	8.50%
dental pulp	3179	3.50%

endometrium	3741	4.12%
amniotic fluid	1488	1.64%
<b>Total</b>	<b>90857</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

251

252 The comparative analysis shows an extremely low prevalence of  
 253 publications about menstrual blood mesenchymal stromal/stem cells (0.25% of  
 254 the research results for the period 2008-2020), in comparison with other  
 255 tissues, such as bone marrow, umbilical cord, adipose, placenta, dental pulp,  
 256 endometrium, and amniotic fluid.

257 Among the 171 articles published about mbMSCs selected from the  
 258 initial 229, we have noticed a prevalence of women as first authors and men  
 259 as last authors. We classified as “null” the authors whose gender identity we  
 260 could not infer. **Table 1** and **Figure 1** show 53.2% [91] of first authors were  
 261 women and 40.35% [69] were men, while men represented 63.74% [109] of  
 262 last authors and women, 32.74% [56]. The non-identified first and last authors  
 263 represent 6.43% [11] and 3.5% [6] of the studies, respectively. We established  
 264 the statistical significance of these results regarding gender identity of the  
 265 authors of mbMSC publications using a chi-square test ( $p = 0.00008303$ ).

266

## 267 **Figure 1. Gender of first and last authors of mbMSC publications**

268

269 Chinese scholars were the main authors (**Figure 2**), which represent 62  
 270 of the 171 articles analyzed (36.25%). The other authors come from  
 271 institutions located mostly outside of Europe and the United States: Iran (40,  
 272 23.39%), Australia (8, 4.67%), and Brazil (7, 4.09%). The United States has 10  
 273 publications, but they come from private research centers (2, 1.17%), and

from the University of South Florida (7, 4.09%) and Emory University (1, 0.58%). Spain (9) and the UK (5) represent 8.19% of the articles published.

## **Figure 2. Country of the institution of origin of the last author**

**Figure 3** shows the Impact Factors attributed to the journals that have published the papers involving menstrual blood cells varied mostly between 1 and 5, suggesting that these publications tend to appear in journals with low/medium impact. Most journals (45.03%) have an impact factor between 3 and 4.99.

## **Figure 3. Number of publications with mbMSCs per year**

**Figure 4** shows a trend of increasing number of publications, with most papers (83, 48.53%) published since 2018, indicating a growing potential for research involving menstrual blood mesenchymal stromal/stem cells, despite its still small participation among the most representative tissues in scientific research and medical therapies with mesenchymal cells.

## **Figure 4. Impact factors of journals that published mbMSCs papers**

### **Social attention of mbMSC on Twitter**

Within our sample, 40.9% of the papers received no social attention (AAS), which is a smaller number than observed for other publications (45), indicating social interest in mbMSC. Yet, the average AAS was 3.0 per paper,

300 which is lower than the score found in other analyses (idem). Only 8.2% got an  
301 altmetric score higher than 10, all of which published in open or free access  
302 papers, an advantage already reported on altmetrics research (46).

303 The analyses of these tweets showed that 35.5% of them were  
304 comments, which are the best type of engagement when compared to  
305 retweets (32.7%) or to simply sharing the paper title and link (31.8%). Most  
306 comments were positive about mbMSC (77.6%), neutral (20.8%), or negative  
307 (11.7%), like what stem cell tweet analysis showed (47, 48), and most of them  
308 were from lay people. Women with Twitter profiles related to civil rights or  
309 feminism made most of the positive comments (36.4%), followed by groups  
310 (15.6%) – many of which were surprisingly related to investments or stock  
311 market (8.1% among all tweets) –, and men (13%) – mostly scientists. Groups  
312 (news feed, labs, institutions, bots, for example) published most of the tweets  
313 (38.1%), but they were mainly retweets or just sharing paper titles and links.  
314 Therefore, these tweets’ goal is probably to disseminate new papers. All  
315 negative comments were made by men (6 profiles mainly made by non-  
316 scientists), mostly questioning the plausibility and sterility of using these cells  
317 [6 comments were related to the article “The Potential of Menstrual Blood-  
318 Derived Stem Cells in Differentiation to Epidermal Lineage: A Preliminary  
319 Report” (**Supporting Information Table 1**)]. But men also shared some  
320 positive (13%) or neutral (7.8%) comments.

321 Around 61.9% of the tweets were geolocated, a value close to what  
322 Robillard et al. (2015) (48) found in studies about stem cells (from 63% to  
323 65%). The most active countries were the USA (37.7%), Australia (7.7%), the  
324 UK (6.9%), Japan (6.1%), and Mexico (6.1%), which were different countries  
325 from the ones our results indicated as more engaged with mbMSC research.

326 According to the profile of tweet authorship, most (33.8%) were science  
327 related (scientists, professors, PhD students, doctor, institutions, journals, and  
328 so on), but with intense exchange with lay people (25.7%), investment groups  
329 (8%), news feeds (6.2%), bots (5.2%), and others (9%).

330

## 331 **Discussion**

332 Menstrual Blood Derived Mesenchymal Stem Cells: State of the Art

333

334 Studies published using mbMSCs or its products indicate a promising  
335 therapeutic potential for several disease models, showing significant benefits  
336 in vitro and in vivo. These cells have already been transplanted intracerebrally  
337 and intravenously in a rat model of ischemic stroke and reduced behavioral  
338 and histological disorders (49). In a mouse liver fibrosis model, mbMSC  
339 migrated to the injury site, improved liver function, inhibited activated hepatic  
340 stellate cells and reduced collagen deposition (50). The therapeutic capacity of  
341 mbMSC has also been tested in a pulmonary fibrosis mouse model. In this  
342 study, cells migrated to the lung and improved its structure, reducing collagen  
343 deposition and inflammatory response (51). The mbMSC also improved mouse  
344 embryonic development in vitro until the blastocyst stage (52). Additionally,  
345 mbMSC showed good results for in vivo models of myocardial infarction (53,  
346 54), acute liver injury (55), spinal cord injury (56), duchenne muscular  
347 dystrophy (57), limb ischemia (58), wound healing (59, 60), and female  
348 reproductive system disorders (61, 62, 63, 64).

349 However, despite these positive results, the accessibility of the cell, and  
350 its abundant availability, obtained by painless and non-invasive methods,

mbMSCs are not among the most studied sources in non-clinical and clinical studies. Until the year of 2020, only three clinical trials were registered in the clinicaltrials.gov database using mbMSCs (NCT01496339, NCT01483248, NCT01558908). Given the absence of technical explanations for that small number, we would like to suggest a gender bias concerning the choices of MSCs sources. In other words, menstrual blood's relation to gender, as a "feminine" bodily tissue, could explain mbMSC's lack of expressivity in MSC research.

Women in benchwork, men as lab chiefs

In Biological Sciences, first authors are usually researchers directly involved with benchwork and with most of the work of writing the paper and organizing the results, while last authors tend to be senior academics, the principal investigators, and tenured professors. Women are underrepresented among last authors, compared to men (15), who figure as most researchers and laboratory supervisors. Our results found that men are more prevalent as last authors, confirming the tendency of having less women among senior researchers, and occupying the higher hierarchical academic positions (18, 8).

Our results also showed that menstrual blood research is mostly conducted by women scientists, which is different from what other reports on gender and science have demonstrated. As West (2013) (15) argues, for example, men usually predominate as first authors in most fields. This result suggests women may be more willing to work with menstrual blood than men. And, as our qualitative research has shown, in contexts in which access to cells and research materials is restricted, women scientists often provide the

377 bodily material themselves, and they tend to have a greater ease to work with  
378 menstrual blood, despite jokes and demonstrations of disgust from other  
379 scientists (65). Concerns found in social media in commentaries made by men  
380 about the “sterility” of menstrual blood as a source for cells also confirm a  
381 well-known association between menstruation and dirt, impurity, and pollution  
382 in western culture (66).

383

384 Publications from the margins

385

386 Europe and the US have produced most of the research about stem cells  
387 between 2000 - 2010 (67). Our results show that the papers on menstrual  
388 blood cells were mainly published by Chinese scholars, situated in Chinese  
389 universities. Other research centers are in countries (Iran, Australia, and  
390 Brazil) less present among those that concentrate the production on stem cells  
391 and in mesenchymal stem cells (67, 68). The prevalent institutions in the field  
392 are Harvard University, University of California, Johns Hopkins, and Stanford  
393 (68), but none of them figure among the American institutions that published  
394 results with mbMSCs. This suggests that menstrual blood is unprivileged by  
395 the most renowned universities, and that the institutions that have been  
396 studying the potentials of mbMSC are less traditional in the stem cell research  
397 field.

398 Analysis of the journals’ impact factors include menstrual blood  
399 research within the array of a low/regular-impact scientific production, which  
400 confirms mbMSC’s absence in higher impact scientific journals (69, 68). Most  
401 papers were published in the last three years, which demonstrates a growing  
402 potential for menstrual blood mesenchymal stromal/stem cells research,



403 despite the obstacles to its inclusion among the most representative tissues in  
404 scientific research and medical therapies with mesenchymal cells.

405  
406 Menstrual blood cells research on Twitter: potentially interesting

407  
408         Studies have shown that women's scientific work is less cited and gets  
409 less visibility on social media than men's (70). Social media is an important  
410 space for gaining credibility, visibility, and success, therefore, relevant to  
411 strengthen the presence of women in science. Vásárhelyi and colleagues have  
412 concluded that even in fields where women are better represented, such as  
413 medical sciences, their online presence on social media remains lower (39%)  
414 than men's (61%).

415         Communication on social media has grown worldwide and became a key  
416 space to monitor social interaction with information. To measure the impact of  
417 science on society, altmetrics emerge as relevant complementary metrics to  
418 measure the social attention that scholarly literature receives on online  
419 platforms (71). It is a faster and more diverse way to measure the impact of  
420 science than the traditional metrics. Yet, the social attention that science  
421 outputs receive on social media may differ from that of scholarly interest (72).

422         Around 49% of the world population use social media, 397,000 people  
423 have a Twitter account (73), among which women correspond to 31.9% (74).  
424 Twitter has become one of the main social medias to track social attention  
425 scores (such as the Altmetric Attention Score, AAS) and it is widely used  
426 among scholars (75, 76).

427         Our analysis has confirmed that women are more engaged with the  
428 social debate related to menstrual blood stem cells, and that men, despite also

429 contributing with positive comments, are responsible for all the negative  
430 tweet comments. This could suggest that women researchers of mbMSC  
431 should be more active on Twitter to reinforce the visibility of their work and of  
432 their research field.

433 We found that scientists, institutions, and journals responsible for  
434 merely sharing paper titles and links could try to engage the audience in  
435 online debates and interactions, and this is required for increased visibility  
436 according to social media mechanics. Tweets about mbMSC papers tend to  
437 get social attention and interest, and therefore have great potential to  
438 communicate scientific results broadly, as suggested by the good number of  
439 tweets from lay people, including feminist and profiles related to investment  
440 or stock market.

441 Contrary to our hypothesis, tweets reveal no bias against the use of  
442 mbMSC, since positive comments were almost six times more frequent than  
443 negative comments.

444 Gender differences cannot be seen through the microscope, and despite  
445 mbMSCs attending all the required expectancies regarding the potential of  
446 mesenchymal stromal/stem cells, some work still needs to be done for  
447 menstrual blood to occupy its proper place in the universe of mesenchymal  
448 cell research.

449

450 Limitations of the study

451

452 Pubmed database presented instabilities and changes in the online  
453 platform during our research. Some papers appeared simultaneously in two  
454 years, especially when approved and published in different years. We have

455 identified and excluded them from the table.

456         Inferring gender by names disregards many important variables, like  
457 gender transition, non-binary or androgynous names or physical appearances.  
458 Gender cannot often be inferred for Chinese names in the Roman alphabet.  
459 Nonetheless, we have considered it was still important to look for differences  
460 between what could be considered as men and women among first and last  
461 authors, using the software genderize.io to help us infer gender in those  
462 cases, and others.

463         As for the analysis with altmetrics.com, we know the tweets analyzed  
464 cannot be generalized. Yet, our sample corresponds to 55.5% of the tweets  
465 received by the selected mbMSCs article and considering studies with more  
466 tweets and higher AAS, to select the most representative expressions about  
467 the studies.

468

469 ---

470

## 471 **Acknowledgments**

472 This research is funded by Fapesp (SP/Brazil), process number 2018/20651-3.  
473 We would like to thank Asura Enkhbayar, from #ScholCommLab at Simon  
474 Fraser University for providing Altmetrics data. We would also like to thank  
475 Bernardo Tura, from National Institute of Cardiology, Research and Teaching  
476 Department Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil, for providing statistical results. We  
477 thank Pedro Ferreira for a first review of the manuscript, and Clarissa Reche  
478 for a support with the graphics. The authors thank Espaço da Escrita (Pró-  
479 Reitoria de Pesquisa - UNICAMP) for the language services provided.

## 480 **Author contributions**

481 **Conceptualization:** Daniela Manica; Germana Barata

482 **Data Curation:** Daniela Manica; Gaia Mazzarelli; Karina Asensi

483 **Formal Analysis:** Karina Asensi; Germana Barata; Regina Goldenberg

484 **Funding Acquisition:** Daniela Manica

485 **Investigation:** Gaia Mazzarelli; Germana Barata

486 **Methodology:** Daniela Manica; Germana Barata

487 **Project Administration:** Daniela Manica

488 **Resources:** Daniela Manica

489 **Supervision:** Daniela Manica

490 **Visualization:** Gaia Mazarelli

491 **Writing - Original Draft:** Daniela Manica; Karina Asensi

492 **Writing - Review & Editing:** Daniela Manica; Karina Asensi; Germana

493 Barata; Regina Goldenberg

## 494 **Declaration of interests**

495 The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

## 496 **References**

- 497 1. Keller, EF. Reflections on Gender and Science. Yale University Press.  
498 1985.

2. Harding, S. The Science Question in Feminism. Cornell University Press. 1986.
3. Fausto-Sterling, A. Myths of Gender: biological theories about women and men. Basic Books. 1992.
4. Fausto-Sterling, A. Sexing the Body. Basic Books. 2000.
5. Haraway, D. Modest\_Witness@Second\_Millennium.FemaleMan\_Meets\_Oncomouse: Feminism and Technoscience. Routledge. 1997.
6. Keller, EF, Longino, H. Feminism and Science. Oxford University Press. 1996.
7. Schiebinger, L. Has Feminism Changed Science?. Harvard University Press. 1999.
8. Elsevier. Gender in the Global Research Landscape. Elsevier. 2017. [https://www.elsevier.com/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/265661/Elsevier-GenderReport\\_final\\_for-web.pdf](https://www.elsevier.com/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/265661/Elsevier-GenderReport_final_for-web.pdf)
9. Benjamin, R. People's Science: Bodies and Rights on the Stem Cell Frontier. Stanford University Press. 2013.
10. Roy, D. Molecular Feminisms: biology, becomings and life in the lab. University of Washington Press. 2018.
11. Woolston, C. Scientists' salary data highlight US\$18,000 gender pay gap. Nature 565, 2019. 527. 10.1038/d41586-019-00220-y.
12. Hengel, E. Publishing while Female. Are women held to higher standards? Evidence from peer review. Cambridge Working Papers in Economics 1753. Faculty of Economics: University of Cambridge. 2017. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/cam/camdae/1753.html>.
13. Budden, AE, Tregenza, T, Aarssen, LW, Koricheva, J, Leimu, R, Lortie, CJ. Double-blind review favours increased representation of female authors. Trends in ecol. & evol. 23, 4-6. 2008. 10.1016/j.tree.2007.07.008.
14. Knobloch-Westerwick, S, Glynn, CJ, Huge, M. The Matilda Effect in Science Communication: An Experiment on Gender Bias in Publication Quality Perceptions and Collaboration Interest. Sci. Comm. 35, 603-625. 2013. 10.1177/1075547012472684.
15. West, J, Jacquet, J, King, M, Correll, S, Bergstrom, C. The Role of Gender in Scholarly Authorship. PLoS ONE 8, e66212. 2013. 10.1371/journal.pone.0066212.

16. Murray, D, Siler, K, Larivière, V, Chan, WM, Collings, AM, Raymond, J, Cassidy, R, Sugimoto, CR. Author-Reviewer Homophily in Peer Review. *BioRxiv* 400515. 2019. 10.1101/400515.
17. AlShebli, B, Makovi, K, Rahwan, T. Retraction Note: The association between early career informal mentorship in academic collaborations and junior author performance. *Nat. Comm.* 11, 5585. 2020. 10.1038/s41467-020-19723-8.
18. Elsevier Gender Report 2020. The Researcher Journey Through a Gender Lens. Elsevier. 2020. [https://gender-spear.eu/assets/content/Gender-2020-report-A4-WEB %20%281%29.pdf](https://gender-spear.eu/assets/content/Gender-2020-report-A4-WEB%20%281%29.pdf).
19. Royal Society of Chemistry. Breaking the barriers: women's retention and progression in the chemical sciences. 2018. [https://www.rsc.org/globalassets/02-about-us/our-strategy/inclusion-diversity/womensprogression/media-pack/v18\\_vo\\_inclusion-and-diversity\\_womans-progression\\_reportweb-.pdf](https://www.rsc.org/globalassets/02-about-us/our-strategy/inclusion-diversity/womensprogression/media-pack/v18_vo_inclusion-and-diversity_womans-progression_reportweb-.pdf).
20. Mummery, C, Little, M, Lin, H, Clark, A, Zaret, K, Srivastava, D, Fuchs, E, Watt, F, Temple, S. Mentorship in Science: Response to AlShebli et al., *Nature Communications* 2020. *Stem Cells Rep.* 16, 1-2. 2021. 10.1016/j.stemcr.2020.12.016.
21. Wu, K. Scientific Journals Commit to Diversity but Lack the Data. *The New York Times*, Oct. 30. 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/30/science/diversity-science-journals.html>.
22. Heidari, S, Babor, TF, Castro, P, Tort, S, Curno, M. Sex and Gender Equity in Research: rationale for the SAGER guidelines and recommended use. *Res. Integr. Peer Rev.* 1, 2. 2016. 10.1186/s41073-016-0007-6.
23. Beeler, WH, Smith-Doody, KA, Ha, R, Aiyar, RS, Schwarzbach, E, Solomon, S, Jaggi, R. Institutional Report Cards for Gender Equality: Lessons Learned from Benchmarking Efforts for Women in STEM. *Cell Stem Cell* 25, 306-310. 2019. 10.1016/j.stem.2019.08.010.
24. Institute of Physics, Royal Astronomical Society, and Royal Society of Chemistry. Exploring the workplace for LGBT+ physical scientists. 2019. <https://www.rsc.org/newperspectives/talent/lgbt-report/>.

25. IOP Publishing. Diversity and Inclusion in Peer Review at IOP Publishing. 2018. <https://iopublishing.org/about-us/diversity-inclusion-peer-review-iop-publishing/>.
26. Martin, E. The woman in the body: a cultural analysis of reproduction. Beacon Press. 1987.
27. Barad, K. Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning. Duke University Press. 2007.
28. Jasanoff, S. States of knowledge: the co-production of science and social order. Routledge. 2004.
29. Strathern, M. The Gender of the Gift. Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia. University of California Press. 1988.
30. Bobel, C. New blood: third-wave feminism and the politics of menstruation Rutgers University Press. 2010.
31. Friedenstein, AJ, Chailakhjan, RK, Lalykina, KS. The development of fibroblast colonies in monolayer cultures of guinea-pig bone marrow and spleen cells. Cell Tissue Kinet 3, 393-403. 1970. 10.1111/j.1365-2184.1970.tb00347.x.
32. Friedenstein, AJ, Chailakhjan, RK, Latsinik, NV, Panasyuk, AF, Keiliss-Borok, IV. Stromal cells responsible for transferring the microenvironment of the hemopoietic tissues. Transplantation 17, 331-340. 1974.
33. Friedenstein, AJ, Gorskaja, JF, Kulagina, NN. Fibroblast precursors in normal and irradiated mouse hematopoietic organs. Ex. Hematol. 4, 267-274. 1976. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/976387/>.
34. Caplan, AI. Mesenchymal stem cells. J. Orthop. Res. 9, 641-650. 1991. 10.1146/annurevcellbio-100913-013
35. Caplan, AI, Dennis, J. E. Mesenchymal stem cells as trophic mediators. J. Cell Biochem. 98, 1076-1084. 2006. 10.1002/jcb.20886.
36. Caplan, AI, Correa, D. The MSC: an injury drugstore. Cell Stem Cell 9, 11-15. 2011. 10.1016/j.stem.2011.06.008.
37. Santamaria, G, Brandi, E, La Vitola, P, Grandi, F, Ferrara, G, Pischietta, F, Vegliante, G, Zanier, ER, Re, F, Uccelli, A. et al. Intranasal delivery of mesenchymal stem cell secretome repairs the brain of Alzheimer's mice. Cell Death Differ. 28, 203-218. 2021. 10.1038/s41418-020-0592-2.



38. Zhang, L, Zhu, XY, Zhao, Y, Eirin, A, Liu, L, Ferguson, CM, Tang, H, Lerman, A, Lerman, LO. Selective intrarenal delivery of mesenchymal stem cell-derived extracellular vesicles attenuates myocardial injury in experimental metabolic renovascular disease. *Basic Res. Cardiol.* 115, 16. 2020. 10.1007/s00395-019-0772-8.
39. Xia, X, Chan, KF, Wong, GTY, Wang, P, Liu, L, Yeung, BPM, Ng, EKW, Lau, JYW, Chiu, PWY. Mesenchymal stem cells promote healing of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug-related peptic ulcer through paracrine actions in pigs. *Sci. Transl. Med.* 11. 2019. 10.1126/scitranslmed.aat7455.
40. Nagaishi, K, Mizue, Y, Chikenji, T, Otani, M, Nakano M, Konari, N, Fujimiya, M. Mesenchymal stem cell therapy ameliorates diabetic nephropathy via the paracrine effect of renal trophic factors including exosomes. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 34842. 2016. 10.1038/srep34842.
41. Caplan, AI. What's in a name? *Tissue Eng. Part A* 16, p. 2415-2417. 2010. 10.1089/ten.tea.2010.0216.
42. Caplan, AI. Mesenchymal Stem Cells: Time to Change the Name! *Stem Cells Transl. Med.* 6, 1445-1451. 2017. 10.1002/sctm.17-0051
43. Williamson, PO, Minter, CIJ. Exploring PubMed as a reliable resource for scholarly communications services. *J. of the Med. Lib. Ass.*, 107, 16-29. 2019. 10.5195/jmla.2019.433.
44. Dominici, M, Le Blanc, K, Mueller, I, Slaper-Cortenbach, I, Marini, F, Krause, DS, Deans, RJ, Keating, A, Prockop DJ, Horwitz, EM. Minimal criteria for defining multipotent mesenchymal stromal cells. *Cytotherapy* 8, 315-317. 2006. 10.1080/14653240600855905.
45. Karmakar, M, Banshal, SK, Singh, VK. A large-scale comparison of coverage and mentions captured by the two altmetric aggregators: Altmetric.com and PlumX. *Scientometrics* 126, 4465-4489. 2021. 10.1007/s11192-021-03941-y.
46. Holmberg, K, Hedman, J, Bowman, TD, Didegah, F, Laakso, M. Do articles in open access journals have more frequent altmetric activity than articles in subscription-based journals? An investigation of the research output of Finnish universities. *Scientometrics* 122, 645-659. 2020. 10.1007/s11192-019-03301-x.



47. Kamenova, K, Reshef, A, Caulfield, T. Representations of Stem Cell Clinics on Twitter. *Stem Cell Reviews and Reports* 10, 753–760. 2014. 10.1007/s12015-014-9534-z.
48. Robillard, JM, Cabral, E, Hennessey, C, Kwon, BK, Illes, J. Fueling hope: stem cells in social media. *Stem Cell Rev. Rep.* 11, 540–546. 2015. 10.1007/s12015-015-9591-y.
49. Borlongan, CV, Kaneko, Y, Maki, M, Yu, SJ, Ali, M, Allickson, JG, Sanberg, CD, Kuzmin-Nichols, N, Sanberg, PR. Menstrual blood cells display stem cell-like phenotypic markers and exert neuroprotection following transplantation in experimental stroke. *Stem Cells Dev.* 19, 439–452. 2010. 10.1089/scd.2009.0340.
50. Chen, L, Zhang, C, Chen, L, Wang, X, Xiang, B, Wu, X, Guo, Y, Mou, Z, Yuan, L, Chen, B et al. Human Menstrual Blood-Derived Stem Cells Ameliorate Liver Fibrosis in Mice by Targeting Hepatic Stellate Cells via Paracrine Mediators. *Stem Cells Transl. Med* 6 (1), 272– 284. 2017. 10.5966/sctm.2015-0265
51. Chen, X, Wu, Y, Wang, Y, Chen, L, Zheng, W, Zhou, S, Xu, H, Li, Y, Yuan, L, Xiang, C. Human menstrual blood-derived stem cells mitigate bleomycin-induced pulmonary fibrosis through anti-apoptosis and anti-inflammatory effects. *Stem Cell Res. Ther.* 11, 477. 2020. 10.1186/s13287-020-01926-x.
52. Gonçalves, MF, Asensi, KD, Nascimento, ALL, De Barros, JHO, Santos, RA, Andrade, CBV, Kasai-Brunswick, TH, Frajblat, M, Ortiga-Carvalho, TM, Goldenberg, RCDS. (2020). 17 Human Menstrual Blood-Derived Mesenchymal Cells Improve Mouse Embryonic Development. *Tissue Eng. Part A* 26, 769–779. 2020. 10.1089/ten.tea.2020.0034.
53. Hida, N, Nishiyama, N, Miyoshi, S, Kira, S, Segawa, K, Uyama, T, Mori, T, Miyado, K, Ikegami, Y, Cui, C et al. Novel cardiac precursor-like cells from human menstrual blood-derived mesenchymal cells. *Stem Cells* 26, 1695–1704. 2008. 10.1634/stemcells.2007-0826.
54. Jiang, Z, Hu, X, Yu, H, Xu, Y, Wang, L, Chen, H, Chen, H, Wu, R, Zhang, Z, Xiang, C et al. Human endometrial stem cells confer enhanced myocardial salvage and regeneration by paracrine mechanisms. *J. Cell Mol. Med.* 17, 1247–1260. 2013. 10.1111/jcmm.12100.

55. Lu, S, Shi, G, Xu, X, Wang, G, Lan, X, Sun, P, Li, X, Zhang, B, Gu, X, Ichim, TE, Wang, H. Human endometrial regenerative cells alleviate carbon tetrachloride-induced acute liver injury in mice. *J. Transl. Med.* 14, 300. 2016. 10.1186/s12967-016-1051-1.
56. Wu, Q, Wang, Q, Li, Z, Li, X, Zang, J, Wang, Z, Xu, C, Gong, Y, Cheng, J, Li, H et al. Human menstrual blood-derived stem cells promote functional recovery in a rat spinal cord hemisection model. *Cell Death Dis.* 9, 882. 2018. 10.1038/s41419-018-0847-8.
57. Cui, CH, Uyama, T, Miyado, K, Terai, M, Kyo, S, Kiyono, T, Umezawa, A. Menstrual blood-derived cells confer human dystrophin expression in the murine model of Duchenne muscular dystrophy via cell fusion and myogenic transdifferentiation. *Mol. Biol. Cell* 18, 1586- 1594. 2007. 10.1091/mbc.e06-09-0872.
58. Murphy, MP, Wang, H, Patel, AN, Kambhampati, S, Angle, N, Chan, K, Marleau, AM, Pysznik, A, Carrier, E, Ichim, TE, Riordan, NH. Allogeneic endometrial regenerative cells: an 'off the shelf solution' for critical limb ischemia? *J. Transl. Med.* 6, 45. 2008. 10.1186/1479-5876-6-45.
59. Cuenca, J, Le-Gatt, A, Castillo, V, Belletti, J, Díaz, M, Kurte GM, Gonzalez, PL, Alcayaga-Miranda, F, Schuh, CMAP, Ezquer, F et al. The Reparative Abilities of Menstrual Stem Cells Modulate the Wound Matrix Signals and Improve Cutaneous Regeneration. *Front. Physiol.* 9, 464. 2018. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Ffphys.2018.00464>.
60. Dalirfardouei, R, Jamialahmadi, K, Jafarian, AH, Mahdipour, E. Promising effects of exosomes isolated from menstrual blood-derived mesenchymal stem cell on wound-healing process in diabetic mouse model. *J. Tissue Eng. Regen. Med.* 13, 555-568, 04. 2019. 10.1002/term.2799.
61. Lai, D, Wang, F, Yao, X, Zhang, Q, Wu, X, Xiang, C. Human endometrial mesenchymal stem cells restore ovarian function through improving the renewal of germline stem cells in a mouse model of premature ovarian failure. *J. Transl. Med.* 13, 155. 2015. 10.1186/s12967-015-0516-y.
62. Bu, S, Wang, Q, Zhang, Q, Sun, J, He, B, Xiang, C, Liu, Z, Lai, D. Human endometrial mesenchymal stem cells exhibit intrinsic anti-tumor

- properties on human epithelial ovarian cancer cells. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 37019. 2016. 10.1038/srep37019.
63. Tan, J, Li, P, Wang, Q, Li, Y, Li, X, Zhao, D, Xu, X, Kong, L. Autologous menstrual blood-derived stromal cells transplantation for severe Asherman's syndrome. *Hum. Reprod.* 31, 2723-2729. 2016. 10.1093/humrep/dew235.
64. Wang, Z, Wang, Y, Yang, T, Li, J, Xinyuan, Y. Study of the reparative effects of menstrual-derived stem cells on premature ovarian failure in mice. *Stem Cell Res. Ther.* 8, 11. 2017. 10.1186/s13287-016-0458-1.
65. Manica, DT, Goldenberg, RCDS, Asensi, KD. CeSaM: as células do sangue menstrual: gênero, tecnociência e terapia celular. *Interseções: Rev. de Est. Interd.* 20, 93-113. 2018. 10.12957/irei.2018.35862.
66. Buckley, T, Gottlieb, A. Blood magic: the anthropology of menstruation. University of California Press. 1988.
67. Karpagam, R, Gopalakrishnan, S, Babu, BR, Natarajan, M. Scientometric Analysis of Stem cell Research: A comparative study of India and other countries., *COLLNET J. of Scient. and Inf. Man.* 6, 229-252. 2012. 10.1080/09737766.2012.10700936.
68. Lin, C, Ho, YS. A bibliometric analysis of publications on pluripotent stem cell research. *Cell J.* 17, 59-70. 2015. 10.22074/cellj.2015.512.
69. Chen, C, Dubin, R, Kim, MC. Emerging trends and new developments in regenerative medicine: a scientometric update (2000 - 2014). *Expert Opin. Biol. Ther.* 14, 1295-1317. 2014. 10.1517/14712598.2014.920813.
70. Vásárhelyi, O, Zakhlebin, I, Milojević, S, Horvát, E-Á. Gender inequities in the online dissemination of scholars' work. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 118, e2102945118. 2021. 10.1073/pnas.2102945118.
71. Priem, J, Taraborelli, D, Groth, P, Neylon, C. Altmetrics: a manifesto. 2010. <http://altmetrics.org/manifesto>.
72. Banshal, SK, Basu, A, Singh, VK, Muhuri, PK. Scientific vs. Public attention: a comparison of top cited papers in WoS and top papers by Altmetric Score. In *AROSIM 2018, CCIS 856*, M. Erdt et al., ed. Singapore: Springer, pp. 81-95. 2018. 10.1007/978-981-13-1053-9\_7.

73. Statista. Distribution of Twitter users worldwide as of July 2021, by gender. 2021a. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/828092/distribution-of-users-on-twitter-worldwide-gender/>.
74. Statista. Most popular social networks worldwide as of July 2021, ranked by number of active users. 2021b. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/>.
75. Noorden, RV. Online collaboration: Scientists and the social network. *Nature* 512, 126-129. 2014. 10.1038/512126a.
76. Haustein, S. Twitter at scholarly communication. *Altmetric Blog*, 12th June. 2018. <https://www.altmetric.com/blog/twitter-in-scholarly-communication/>.

# Figure 1






Figure 2



## Figure 3



# Figure 4

