Title

Faster, Higher, Stronger – Together? A bibliometric analysis of author distribution in top medical education journals

Authors

Cynthia Whitehead
The Wilson Centre, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto and University Health Network, Toronto, Canada
Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
Women's College Hospital, Toronto, Canada
ORCID 0000-0002-0134-9074

Carrie Cartmill
The Wilson Centre, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto and University Health Network, Toronto, Canada
ORCID 0000-0001-6996-7293

Eloy Rodrigues
Documentation and Library Services, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal
ORCID 0000-0002-7862-2681

Antónia Correia
Documentation and Library Services, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal
ORCID 0000-0002-6610-8853

Dawit Wondimagegn
College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
ORCID 0000-0002-5035-3731

Tiago Salessie
Department of Health Promotion, Federal University of Paraiba, Paraiba, Brazil
ORCID 0000-0001-5587-4504

Manuel João Costa
School of Medicine, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal
ORCID ID 0000-0001-5255-4257

Correspondence

Manuel João Costa
Address: School of Medicine, Campus of Gualtar, University of Minho, 4710-057 Braga, Portugal;
Email: mmcosta@med.uminho.pt;
Phone: 351-253-601-191

Abstract

Background

Within medical education research, issues of equity, absence, and marginalization of diverse perspectives are becoming a growing area of scholarly focus. One area of absence that has been under-explored is that of published voices from low- and middle-income countries and non-English speaking scholars. Bibliometric analyses are one way to identify absences. We undertook a bibliometric analysis of five top medical education journals to determine which countries were represented in prestigious first and last authorship positions.

Methods

Web of Science was searched for all articles and reviews that were published between 2012 and 2018 within *Academic Medicine*, *Medical Education*, *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, *Medical Teacher*, and *BMC Medical Education*. Country of origin was identified for the first and last author of each publication, and the number of publications originating from each country were counted.

Results

Our analysis revealed a dominance of first and last authors from five countries: USA, Canada, United Kingdom, Netherlands, and Australia. Authors from these five countries had first or last authored 74% of publications. Of the 195 countries in the world, 53% were not represented by a single publication. Journals varied in their inclusion of authors from outside of these five dominant countries, with *BMC Medical Education* including more geographic diversity than other journals. There was a slight increase in the percentage of publications from outside of these five countries, from 22% in 2012 to 29% in 2018.

Conclusions

The dominance of wealthy nations within spaces that claim to be international is a finding that requires attention. As a bibliometric analysis, we were unable to unearth the reasons behind this dominance. However, we draw upon analogies from modern Olympic sport and our own collaborative research process to show how academic publishing continues to be a colonized space that advantages those from wealthy and English-speaking countries.

Key words

bibliometrics; knowledge production; medical education research; anticoloniality; Global North dominance; bibliodiversity

Background

The need for well-educated doctors, and other health professionals, who are able to provide high quality health care, is undisputed given the many health challenges societies face in the twenty-first century. Few would consider it controversial to position medical education as an academic endeavour, best achieved through well-planned delivery of science-informed education practices, tools, structures, and processes. As educators have looked to the sciences of medical education in order to advance and innovate, the field of medical education research (MER) has developed. Geoff Norman [1] recently tracked the significant expansion in the field of MER over the past half-century in terms of numbers of publications, international conference attendance, and increasing diversity of professions, perspectives, disciplines, and theoretical approaches being recognized as advancing new knowledge. These are exciting times for those of us who believe in the power of education to transform and see the sciences of education as key to shaping that transformation.

In considering the recent proliferation of MER activities, it is instructive to recall that ours is a relatively recent area of scholarship. MER first emerged as an academic field in the 1950s in North America at a time when there was an explosion of scientific medical knowledge, an influx of financial incentives to support research, and a mandate to demonstrate greater public accountability [2]. Journals dedicated to MER appeared: the sole medical education journal in the 1950s was the *Journal of Medical Education,* a precursor to *Academic Medicine. Medical Education* began in the United Kingdom in 1966, with other journals devoted to medical/health professions education in subsequent decades. While all of these journals now publish articles

related to multiple health professions, we have chosen to use the term MER rather than health professions education research as it more accurately reflects the history of the field. In so doing, we also recognize that the term is problematic in that it foregrounds the profession of medicine.

All terms set boundaries that can be exclusionary and these exclusions need further consideration. The notion that medical education is an academic enterprise that must take place in a university is linked in North America to Abraham Flexner's 1910 report, which led to the closing of non-university-based programs including most that provided training for women and Black students [3–5]. Flexner also examined medical education in several European countries to bolster this claim to academic legitimacy [6]. Framing medical education in this way largely ignores traditional and Indigenous healing practices developed in many different global contexts over millennia [7]. It also leaves aside the historically situated nature of higher education and biomedical healthcare structures internationally as being inextricably intertwined with European colonization of parts of Africa, the Americas, and Asia.

Within MER, issues of equity, absence, and marginalization of diverse perspectives have recently become a growing area of scholarly focus. Wide-ranging explorations of representation, discrimination, harassment, silencing, and power differentials are appearing in leading MER journals. Many of these are written as commentaries and perspectives pieces, providing thoughtful analyses of personal experiences and theoretical explorations of ways that dominant approaches (generally white and Euro-American-centric) constrain and limit the field

[8–16]. There are also an increasing—albeit still small—number of empirical studies examining various aspects of representation within medical education, with recent attention given to gender, sociocultural, and racial equity within academic medicine's leadership, student body, and curricula [17–21]. There is also growing recognition of the preponderance of authors representing English speaking and high-income countries in leading journals in many areas of academia, including health and education [12, 22–26]. Identifying absences in medical education research has been established as an effective way to consider what is included or excluded, and to determine who is heard or silenced [27]. Paton et al. [27] found three different types of absences within medical education, including absences related to content, research, and evidence, and suggested that attending to absences provided a rigorous way of challenging the implicit assumptions and limits of the field. One area of absence and under-representation that has been noted but is yet under-explored within MER is that of published voices from low- and middle-income countries and non-English speaking scholars [28–32].

Bibliometric analyses are one way to identify absences and document the current state of our field, and there are a growing set of such papers examining MER publications [26, 27, 33–35]. In a recent paper, Maggio et al. [35] outlined both the power and the complexities of conducting bibliometric analyses. In another, Maggio et al. [36] specifically examined authorship of knowledge syntheses by country, with authors from highly ranked North American institutions being dominant. Buffone et al. [25] similarly conducted a bibliometric analysis of publications within MER, categorizing lead author affiliations by UN region [37] and found that the majority were from North America, Northern Europe, Western Europe, or Australia. Thomas [26]

analysed authorship by country of affiliation over a two-year period, comparing medical education journals to those in education, medicine, and biomedical sciences. Examining for all authorship positions, he found that there was greater dominance of authors from high income countries and from the English-speaking countries of USA, United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia in medical education than in the other areas.

The increasing attention to the use of bibliometric methodologies for exploring the presence of diverse geographical perspectives within MER emphasizes the importance of this conversation within the medical education community. These bibliometric studies also draw attention to the multiplicity of complexities and decision points that must be made when conducting bibliometric analyses. For example, while some studies have relied on country-by-country measures of geographic origin, others have used broader geographical regions; while some studies have assigned geographic origin based on the affiliation of the corresponding author, others have made use of the geographic origin of all authors. There has not yet, however, been quantification of *prestigious* authorship positions by *country*.

In MER, first and last author positions are often considered more prestigious and desirable. It is common for the first author position to be held by an individual who conducted the majority of the writing, and for the last author position to be held by a senior investigator who conceptualized the project, obtained a supporting grant, or provided oversight and guidance throughout the project. While it is acknowledged that these first and last authorships positions denote a higher level of credit for the work, Hedt-Gauthier et al. [29] found that health research

conducted in Africa, or about Africa, was less likely to have first and last authors from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) when the publication included collaborating authors from high-income countries (HICs). While well-established guidelines for defining what constitutes authorship exist and are endorsed by many medical journal editors [24, 38, 39], guidelines for how authorship position should be distributed across authors are underdeveloped. Thatje [40] provided rules of thumb for determining first and last authorship positions within the natural sciences, noting that disciplinary and national culture may play a role in how decisions are made.

We undertook a bibliometric analysis of five top medical education journals to determine which countries were represented in the first and last authorship positions. In making this choice, we used a similar reasoning as Madden et al. [34], who conducted a gender analysis of first and last authorship across four top journals at selected times over several decades. For many researchers, numbers of first and last authored publications contribute to academic recognition including promotions, tenure, awards, salary support, and access to financial support for graduate students and research projects. In addition to individual academic accomplishment, regularly publishing in highly regarded journals in one's field allows authors to engage in academic debates and shape understandings of which topics are deemed meritorious, noteworthy, and interesting. Powerful voices in these academic journals thus help to map the academic landscape, drawing boundaries and labelling worthy areas of exploration. Mapping authorial voices in prominent authorship positions in leading journals is therefore essential in understanding the international nature of the field. Our aim was to provide empirical data as to

which countries or regions of the world were more or less prominent in the academic spaces dedicated to MER. While recognizing that many other journals, including predominantly clinical journals, also publish MER, we chose to focus on journals specifically designed to publish in this area. Thomas's [26] previous work was able to capture articles on the topic of medical education that were published within a broad range of clinical, specialty, and disciplinary journals with scopes not exclusive to medical education research. We aimed to build upon the work of Thomas [26] and chose to focus on journals that primarily published within the field of medical education and health professions education, as they constitute spaces where debates and critiques are intended for audiences who tend to live and breathe within the sphere of medical education. In doing so, our aim was to capture the boundaries of a field that asserts to be international in scope.

In addition to conducting the research, we recognized that the process of doing the research project was itself illustrative of issues that may affect publication trends. As a collaborative research team distributed across four continents, we chose to explicitly discuss these issues as part of our analysis meetings. As such, we have included description of relevant aspects of these reflections embedded in the manuscript, instead of providing separate sections on reflexivity, positionality and limitations.

Methods

The methodology for this study was conceptualized and designed by the three Portuguese authors on this paper. In July 2018 the authors performed a search of the Web of Science

database for citable items (reviews and articles) that had been published between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2016 in the five top ranking medical education journals at that time within the categories of Education and Educational Research; Education; Education Scientific Disciplines; and Health Care Sciences & Services: *Academic Medicine, Medical Education, Advances in Health Sciences Education, Medical Teacher*, and *BMC Medical Education*. We recognize that journal rankings have shifted since the original selection strategy was devised, and that journals such as *Medical Education Online* were excluded from our inclusion criteria despite its recent growth in impact. The resulting dataset was extracted into Microsoft Excel for data management and analysis. While Web of Science allowed for the export of author affiliations for all authors as a single data field, it was not possible to have author affiliation for first and last authors extracted separately. Consequently, there was the need to review each item and identify the country of author affiliation for first and last authors (when articles included multiple authors). The number of citable items (reviews and articles) for each country with affiliated first and last authors were counted and a second round of verification was undertaken. For items in which first and last author had a single country-affiliation and were from the same country, the item was counted only once. For items in which first and last authors were from different countries, or for which a first or last author had multiple country-affiliations, the item was counted the same number of times as the number of countries that were listed. Articles were counted separately for each year and for each journal. This allowed for further evaluation of longitudinal variations over the eight years of study and between publication sources.

Preliminary results were presented at the AMEE 2018 conference [41] and an opportunity emerged for further collaboration with researchers from Canada, Ethiopia and Brazil. The team decided to update the data collection, adding the years 2017 and 2018 to the dataset, following the same methodology as the original strategy. All aspects of data extraction, assignment of first and last author country of origin, and counting techniques were replicated from the earlier analysis. Final analyses treated all years of data as a single dataset. All tables and figures were prepared using Microsoft Office and Mapchart.net. No institutional ethics review was sought for this work since it did not involve human subjects. The datasets used and analysed during the current study are available as supplementary files.

Results

5,468 citable items were extracted from Web of Science. Of these items, the country of origin could not be identified for 70 items. After the country of origin of first and last author affiliations were identified for remaining items, and items counted multiple times to reflect first and last author combinations from more than one country or authors with multiple geographic affiliations, 6,173 unique items were included in subsequent analyses.

At the time of writing there were 195 countries in the world, including 193 UN Member States, the Holy See, and the State of Palestine [42]. For these 195 countries, across all five journals and seven years of analysis, the number of first or last authored publications originating from each country ranged from zero to 1,936. Over 53% of countries were not represented by a single first or last authored publication, approximately 10% were represented by a single first or

last authored publication, and under 4% were represented by over 100 first or last authored publications (see Table 1).

Table 1:
Number (percent) of countries by number of publications in top 5 medical education journals, 2012-2018

Number of first or last authored publications	Number of countries	Percent (%)
0 publications	105	53.85
1 publication	20	10.26
2-10 publications	35	17.95
11-50 publications	25	12.82
51-100 publications	8	4.10
101-493 publications	2	1.03
>493 publications	5	2.56

The five countries with the greatest number of first and last authored publications included the USA (1,936), Canada (878), the UK (721), Netherlands (532), and Australia (494). Figure 1 shows the percentage of all publications with first or last authors from these five countries, and the remaining percentage of publications that originated from all “other” countries combined.

Figure 1:
Percent first/last authored publications from USA, Canada, UK, Netherlands, Australia, all 'other' countries, all journals, 2012-2018



Together, these "big five" nations of USA, Canada, the UK, Netherlands, and Australia contributed 74% of all first and last authored publications across all journals and years of study. Figure 2 further shows the number of publications originating from each country across the globe.

Figure 2:
Number of first and last authored publications originating from each country, 2012-2018



The inequitable presence of first and last authored publications from these "big five' Global North countries was not evenly distributed across the five medical education journals under study. For example, within *Academic Medicine* approximately 96% of publications had first or last authors from these five countries. *BMC Medical Education* showed the most diversity in the origin of first and last authors: just over 50% of first and last authored publications in this journal originated from these five countries. As depicted in Table 2, even across these "big five" countries, there was substantial variation in how they were represented within each journal.

Table 2:
Number/percent first/last authored publications from USA, Canada, UK, Netherlands, Australia, "other" countries, by journal, 2012-2018

	Acad Med	Med Educ	AHSE	Med Teach	BMC Med Educ	Total
Impact Factor (2018)	4.937	4.619	2.761	2.706	1.87	
No. first & last authored publications	1505	794	494	1482	1898	6173
USA	1105 73.4%	164 20.7%	83 16.8%	331 22.3%	253 13.3%	1936 31.4%
Canada	226 15.0%	210 26.5%	114 23.1%	188 12.7%	140 7.4%	878 14.2%
UK	35 2.3%	143 18.0%	53 10.7%	275 18.6%	215 11.3%	721 11.7%
Netherlands	58 3.9%	88 11.1%	98 19.8%	153 10.3%	135 7.1%	532 8.6%
Australia	23 1.5%	80 10.1%	41 8.3%	121 8.2%	229 12.1%	494 8.0%
Other	58 3.9%	105 13.7%	926 21.3%	109 27.9%	414 48.8%	1612 26.1%

Legend:
Acad Med: Academic Medicine
Med Educ: Medical Education
AHSE: Advances in Health Sciences Education
Med Teach: Medical Teacher
BMC Med Educ: BMC Medical Education

We found a strong inverse relationship between the impact factor (2018) of each of these journals and the percentage of articles that were published by first and last authors in "other"

countries outside of the USA, Canada, the UK, Netherlands and Australia. Impact factor is usually considered one measure of prestige within academic publishing [43]. Our data showed that medical education journals with the highest impact factors included the lowest percentage of first and last authored publications from "other" countries, while the journals with lower impact factors included a higher percentage of first and last authored publications from these "other" countries (see Figure 3).

Figure 3:
Percent of articles published from 'other' countries, by 2018 Impact Factor, 2012-2018.



Legend:
BMC Med Educ: BMC Medical Education
Med Teach: Medical Teacher
AHSE: Advances in Health Sciences Education
Med Educ: Medical Education
Acad Med: Academic Medicine

While most of our analyses combined years 2012 to 2018 together, we also looked at how the percentage of first and last authored publications from "other" countries outside of the USA, Canada, the UK, Netherlands, and Australia may have changed over time. Across all journals, there was a slight increase in the percentage of first and last authored publications from "other" countries from 22% in 2012 to 29% in 2018. When each journal was considered separately, there were some differences in the change in representation of first and last authors from "other" countries between 2012 and 2018. These trends are presented in more detail in Figure 4. Given that we had only 7 data points to include in analyses of trends over time, it is not possible to determine whether these differences were meaningful or represented only minor deviations from a more enduring status quo.

Figure 4:
Percent of first/last authored publications from "other" countries, for each journals separately and combined, 2012-2018



Discussion

Our data revealed a dominance of first and last authors from five countries in five top ranked journals within the international field of medical education, for the years 2012 to 2018. Being a bibliometric analysis, the results do not provide an explanation for why there is such significant dominance by these five countries. Also, as we did not include middle authors in our research design, there may be greater presence of authors from the other 190 countries of the world than we were able to capture by looking only at first and last authorship positions. Nevertheless, the prominence of five countries in prestigious authorship positions is a finding that requires attention. While our research was not designed to identify how this dominance compared to other fields, Thomas [26] previously found that there were greater geographic disparities within MER than within education, medicine, and the biological sciences. Our current research reiterated this pattern when analyzing prestigious authorship positions. Our study only included articles that had been published in five medical education journals which had the highest impact factor at a single point in time in 2018. As a measure of journal importance, impact factor is only one metric, and one that is in constant flux. Future research might expand upon our strategy and include additional journals that publish on the topic of medical education, including journals which have experienced a significant increase in impact factor since we first devised our research strategy in 2018.

Tracking and decision-making about country assignation in bibliometric research is not always straightforward. As evidenced in previous bibliometric studies, there are many ways in which geographic origin might be determined. For the current study, we chose to double, or even

triple-count publications as unique items when first or last authors claimed affiliations in multiple countries. In some instances, this led to confusion in determining whether an author had more authentic cultural connections to the Global North or the Global South. We view this as a limitation of the bibliometric nature of our study: in quantifying the geographic representation of first and last authors, we were unable to more meaningfully determine the cultural perspective from which each author was writing.

As an international research team deliberately designed to include representation from HICs and LMICs across several continents, we tried to be reflexive as we collectively advanced this project. We explicitly discussed aspects of the research process in our team meetings. It was readily apparent that access to academic resources (both material resources and time) significantly shaped the research process. We realised that the two Canadian authors were the only members of the team with protected time to continue this work. While noting this as an equity issue, the team decided that we would accept the inequity of who had the privilege of time to able to do the “heavy lifting” in order to move the project forward. We also discussed the fact of English language fluency (including the genres of academic writing) and the extent to which that made the writing process easier and more efficient for the Canadian authors to lead. These decisions led to the Canadian authors contributing more work in the updating of the preliminary work of the Portuguese team, including shaping the analysis and discussion and drafting the manuscript. In discussions about authorship order and thinking about contributions and ICMJE [38] guidelines, we chose to have a Canadian first author and Portuguese last author based on authorship contributions. The irony of producing a manuscript with a “big five” first

author was not lost on us, and further highlights the structural issues that determine who can play the sport of international academic publishing. Our effort to showcase structural inequities in academia led to the reproduction of dominant voices. In thinking about ways to increase representation in MER, it is clear that neither recognition of inequities nor good intentions will in and of themselves lead to structural change.

The dominance of wealthy nations within spaces that claim to be international, though troubling, is not unique to medical education, the health professions, or academia in general. The prominence of the "big five" countries in medical education research brings to mind the colonization of many Global South countries during the 19th Century when Global North sportsmen hunted for "big five" trophy animals: elephants, lions, rhinos, leopards, and buffalo. Symbolically, the hunting of big game in Africa and India served the purpose of solidifying the triumph of colonists over those being colonized [44]. As a more modern sporting analogy, we are reminded of the recent Tokyo 2020/1 Olympic and Paralympic games, an event that represents one of the world's largest international events. Within the popular media, Tokyo 2020/1 was touted as one of the most equitable games in history. However, of the 206 nations and territories competing at the games, 98 countries had less than ten athletes participating. In contrast, the games were host to 613 athletes from the USA, 552 from Japan, 478 from Australia, 425 from Germany, 406 from China, 398 from France, 376 from Great Britain, 372 from Italy, and 370 from Canada [45].

Rather than being a recent phenomenon, modern Olympic history, especially after World War I, has been described as paradoxically espousing universal ideals and providing an opportunity for the colonized to participate and win against the colonizers, while simultaneously reinforcing exclusionary, elitist, and racist practices [46]. Houghton [47] traces the history of the inclusion of Indigenous Latin American athletes and other "recently conquered" Indigenous peoples in the early Twentieth Century Olympics. In addition to participating in primitive sideshows that were aimed at showcasing the "barbaric" sporting practices of Indigenous tribes, these Indigenous peoples were also then made to compete alongside developed nations in modern Olympic events that set themselves up for ridicule, infantilization, and as a way to prove the inferiority of Global South nations [47]. Of course, decisions about "what counts" as an Olympic sport also contribute to the dominance of wealthy nations. Sports with long colonial histories, such as football and athletics [48] continue to be included, as do sports with more recent histories that rely on extensive and expensive sporting infrastructure, such as velodrome cycling, bobsledding, and sailboat racing. However, traditional African sports such as Nguni (stick fighting), Capoeira, donkey-racing, and Dambe boxing continue to be absent, despite recognition of their value to local peoples [49]. We draw attention to this sporting analogy to show not only that North-South disparities are omnipresent and surreptitious, but that they are also engrained in structures and inequities that are built upon historical and colonial roots that continue to be perpetuated through international spaces, even those that aim to unite humanity and have the allure of being inclusive.

FASTER, HIGHER, STRONGER – TOGETHER?

In comparing MER to the Olympics, we do not wish to suggest that academic publishing is a sport. Instead, looking at structures elsewhere may open up new ways of seeing a space we take for granted. Bourdieu [50] very effectively examined sport as a way to highlight that in every sphere there are philosophical underpinnings that are inherently political. Bourdieu also emphasized social spheres as spaces of conflict and struggle, including the field of science [51]. Albert and Kleinman [51] drew upon Bourdieu's concepts in suggesting that it was necessary to understand how interactions that may appear to be based on cooperation may more accurately reflect domination and subordination. More recently, Martiminanakis et al. [52] drew attention to the need to consider the inevitable knowledge politics that inform discussions about research quality and rigour within MER. We suggest that representation in the academic literature is an area which would benefit from further exploration of the ways knowledge politics shape what is considered legitimate in these spaces. Acknowledging the skewed proportion of authors from different countries does not lead directly to solutions designed to "add" voices from LMICs without attention to the historical and colonial roots from which disparities have developed.

This leads to some potentially uncomfortable questions. For HIC researchers, it is pleasing to consider academic conversations with peers from other HICs to constitute international debates. But is it possibly a conceit to think that MER in its current form is truly globally relevant? To what extent is the new knowledge being shared in academic publications able to be implemented and evaluated in lower resource settings? Are important knowledges excluded from currently accepted content in MER journals? How relevant is the content of top medical

journals in diverse contexts? How willing might HIC academics be to probe the layers of privilege that serves them well in terms of impact factor, academic promotions, and claims of international recognition? Beyond individuals, are HIC academic institutions open to questioning the structures that maintain their high international rankings? LMIC academic institutions are also driven by academic rankings so individual LMIC researchers may be encouraged to preferentially aim for international journal publications. A related issue explored by others [53, 54] is how researchers from non-English speaking countries make choices about when to publish in "international" English-language journals vs reaching audiences in their own country and language. These are not decisions that English-language country researchers need to make, adding to the burden placed on those academics. The concept of bibliodiversity (or diversity in scholarly publishing) [55, 56] has been adopted by Global South authors as a way of supporting the decolonization of Southern knowledge, [57] and multilingual publishing may be one way that bibliodiversity can be achieved [58].

Conclusions

While these sorts of questions may not be easy to engage with, as a research team we believe that we should and must start and sustain these conversations. HIC academics, academic institutions, and academic publishers must not view the opening of cracks into privileged spaces as a way of being "nice" or as proof of benevolence. Strong arguments can be made for an ethical and moral imperative to examine and disassemble aspects of colonial structures. There has been a recent compelling call from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) [59] and the International Science Council [58] to consider

scientific advancement a global public good to which open access is required. Eight recommendations were recently endorsed by the International Science Council [60], including ensuring that new scientific knowledge is accessible to all without limitations based on institutional privilege, geography, an ability to pay, or language. UNESCO also calls for more collaborative and inclusive scientific practices aimed at the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals [61] and reducing global inequities.

HIC also have much to learn from LMIC colleagues, if only they have the humility and will to listen. As HIC countries face severe health human resource shortages, particularly in certain professions such as nursing, there will be learnings from LMIC colleagues who have chronically grappled with these issues. Many LMIC countries spectacularly outshone HIC countries in effectively managing successive waves of the COVID pandemic [62, 63] with far fewer resources. With emerging recognition of the limits of Euroamerican biomedical approaches to healthcare, making academic space for traditional knowledges from many global contexts, as well as deep examination of the effects of colonization on health, are opportunities we should embrace. For science to be truly universal, it must also be inclusive of a wider range of global knowledge [60]. If the medical education and MER communities are willing to re-envisage the rules of the game to focus on ways we can be faster, higher, and stronger **together**, we may well be able to harness the transformative aspects of education to contribute to a healthier world.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Declaration of interests

Cynthia Whitehead is the holder of the BMO Financial Group Chair in Health Professions Education Research at University Health Network. No other authors have any competing interests to declare.

Authorship contributions

CW, ER, AC, MJC made substantial contributions to the conceptualization of this work. ER, AC, CC made contributions to the acquisition and analysis of the study data. All authors made contributions to the interpretation of the data. CW, CC, MJC drafted this manuscript, and ER, AC, TS, DW critically reviewed the manuscript for intellectual content. All authors approved the final version of this manuscript, agreed to being accountable for all aspects of the work, and to investigating and resolving any questions that arise in relation to the accuracy and integrity of this work.

Availability of data and materials

All data produced in the present work have been archived as supplementary files within medRxiv.

References

1. Norman G. Where we've come from, where we might go. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 2020;25:1191-1201.
2. Kuper A, Albert M, Hodges BD. The origins of the field of medical education research. Acad Med. 2010;85(8):1347-53.
3. Flexner A. Medical education in Europe: A report to the Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching. Boston, MA: DB Updike, The Merrymount Press; 1912.
4. Ludmerer KM. Time to heal: American medical education from the turn of the century to the era of managed care. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press; 1999.
5. Whitehead C. The Good Doctor in Medical Education 1910-2010: A Critical Discourse Analysis. Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing; 2013.
6. Flexner A. (1910). Medical education in the United States and Canada. Washington, DC: Science and Health Publications, Inc.; 1910.
7. Pande I. Medicine, race and liberalism in British Bengal: Symptoms of empire. Abingdon, UK: Routledge; 2010.
8. Castillo EG, Isom J, DeBonis K, Jordan A, Braslow JT, Rohrbaugh R. Reconsidering systems-based practice: Advancing structural competency, health equity, and social responsibility in graduate medical education. Acad Med. 2020;95(12):1817-22.
9. Crampton PES, Afzali Y. Professional identity formation, intersectionality and equity in medical education. Med Educ. 2021;55(2):140-2.
10. Fernandez A. Further incorporating diversity, equity, and inclusion into medical education research. Acad Med. 2019; 94(11)(suppl): S5-6.

11. Naidu T. Modern medicine is a colonial artifact: Introducing decoloniality to medical education research. Acad Med. 2021; 96 Suppl 11:S9-12.
12. Naidu T. Southern exposure: Levelling the Northern tilt in global medical and medical humanities education. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 2021;26:739-52.
13. Norman G, Ellaway R. Looking back, looking forward? Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 2020;25:1-6.
14. Paton M, Naidu T, Wyatt TR, Oni O, Lorello GR, Najeeb U,et al. Dismantling the master's house: New ways of knowing for equity and social justice in health professions education. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 2020; Early online. Doi.10.1007/s10459-020-10006-x
15. Khan SA. Decolonising global health by decolonising academic publishing. BMJ Glob Health. 2022;7:e007811
16. Kusurker RA. The leaky pipeline of publications and knowledge generation in medical education. Perspect Med Educ. 2022;11:70-72.
17. Bhandal T. Ethical globalization? Decolonizing theoretical perspectives for internationalization in Canadian medical education. Can Med Educ J. 2018;9(2): e33-45.
18. Giuliani M, Frambach J, Broadhurst M, Papadakos J, Fazelad R, Driessen E, et al. A critical review of representation in the development of global oncology curricula and the influence of neocolonialism. BMC Med Educ. 2020;20(93):1-9.
19. Larkins S, Michielsen K, Iputo J, Elsanousi S, Mammen M, Graves L, et al. Impact of selection strategies on representation of underserved populations and intention to practise: International findings. Med Educ. 2015;49:60-72.

20. Lorello GR, Silver JK, Moineau G, McCarthy K, Flexman AM. Trends in representation of female applicants and matriculant in Canadian residency programs across specialties, 1995-2019. JAMA Netw Open. 2020;3(11):e2027938.
21. Soklaridis S, Kuper A, Whitehead CR, Ferguson G, Taylor VH, Zahn C. Gender bias in hospital leadership: A qualitative study on the experiences of women CEOs. J Health Organ Manag. 2017;31(2):253-68.
22. Abimbola S. The foreign gaze: Authorship in academic global health. BMJ Glob Health. 2019;4:e002068.
23. Balon R, Roberts LW, Coverdale J, Louie A, Beresin E. Globalization of medical and psychiatric education and the focus of Academic Psychiatry on the success of "international" authors. Acad Psychiatry. 2008;32(2):151-3.
24. Sam-Aguda NA, Abimbola S. Using scientific authorship criteria as a tool for equitable inclusion in global health research. BMJ Glob Health. 2021;6:e007632.
25. Buffone B, Djuana I, Yang K, Wilby KJ, El Hajj MS, Wilbur K. Diversity in health professional education scholarship: A document analysis of international author representation in leading journals. BMJ Open. 2020;10:e043970.
26. Thomas MP. The geographic and topical landscape of medical education research. BMC Med Educ. 2019;19(189):1-5.
27. Paton M, Kuper A, Paradis E, Feilchenfeld Z, Whitehead CR. Tackling the void: The importance of addressing absences in the field of health professions education research. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 2021;26:5-18.
28. Gibbs WW. Lost science in the third world. Sci Am. 1995;273(2): 92–9.

29. Hedt-Gauthier BL, Jeufack HM, Neufeld NH, Alem A, Sauer S, Odhiambo J, et al. Stuck in the middle: A systematic review of authorship in collaborative health research in Africa, 2014-2016. BMJ Glob Health. 2019;4:e001853.
30. Lancet Global Health. Closing the door on parachutes and parasites. Lancet Glob Health. 2018;6:e593.
31. Mbaye R, Gebeyehu R, Hossmann S, Mbarga N, Bih-Neh E, Eteki L, et al. Who is telling the story? A systematic review of authorship for infectious disease research conducted in Africa, 1980-2016. BMJ Glob Health. 2019;4:e001855.
32. Wondimagegn D, Soklaridis S, Yifter H, Cartmill C, Yeshak MY, Whitehead C. Passing the microphone: Broadening perspectives by amplifying underrepresented voices. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 2020;25(5):1139-47.
33. Albert M, Rowland P, Friesen F, Laberge S. Interdisciplinarity in medical education research: Myth and reality. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 2020;25:1243-53.
34. Madden C, O'Malley R, O'Connor P, O'Dowd E, Byrne D, Lydon S. Gender in authorship and editorship in medical education journals: A bibliometric review. Med Educ. 2021;55:678-88.
35. Maggio LA, Ninkov A, Frank JR, Costello JA, Artino Jr AR. Delineating the field of Medical Education: Bibliometric research approach(es). Acad Med. 2021; Early online. doi.10.111/medu.14677
36. Maggio LA, Ninkov A, Costello JA, Driessen EW, Artino Jr AR. Knowledge syntheses in medical education: Meta-research examining author gender, geographic location, and institutional affiliation. PLoS ONE. 2021;16(10):e0258925.

37. United Nations. Standard country or area codes for statistical use (M49). Department of economic and social Affairs. Geneva, Switzerland: Statistics Division, United Nations; 2018.

38. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). Defining the role of authors and contributors. 2022. http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html Accessed January 25, 2022.

39. Uijtdehaage S, Mavis B, Durning SJ. Whose paper is it anyway? Authorship criteria according to established scholars in health professions education. Acad Med. 2018; 93:1171-5.

40. Thatje S. Reaching out for scientific legacy: How to define authorship in academic publishing. Sci Nat. 2016;103:10.

41. Costa MJ, Van Schalkwyk S, Ho M-J, Carvalho-Filho MA, Schuwirth L. Equity in the global health sciences education community: Levelling the playing fields? Paper presented at the 2018 Association for Medical Education in Europe Annual Conference; August 2018; Basel, Switzerland.

42. United Nations. About us. 2021. https://www.un.org/en/about-us Accessed January 25, 2022.

43. Saha S, Saint S, Christakis DA. Impact factor: A valid measure of journal quality? J Med Libr Assoc. 2003;91(1):42-6.

44. Storey WK. Big cats and imperialism: Lion and tiger hunting in Kenya and Northern India, 1898-1930. J World Hist. 1991;2(2):135-73.

45. Whereig.com. List of participating countries in the Tokyo Olympics 2020-21. 2022. https://www.whereig.com/olympics/summer-olympics-participating-countries.html Accessed January 25, 2022.

46. Chatziefstathiou D. Paradoxes and contestations of Olympism in the history of the modern Olympic Movement. Sport Soc. 2011;14(3):332-44.

47. Houghton F. Latin America and the Olympic ideal of progress: An athletes perspective. Int J Hist Sport. 2005;22(2):158-76.

48. Charitas P. Imperialisms in the Olympics of the colonization in the postcolonization: Africa into the International Olympic Committee, 1910-1965. Int J Hist Sport. 2015;32(7):909-922.

49. Robertson ECJ. 7 traditional African sports that should be in the Olympics. Okayafrica. No Date. https://www.okayafrica.com/7-traditional-african-sports-olympics/ Accessed January 25, 2022.

50. Bourdieu P. Sport and social class. Soc Sci Info. 1978;17(6):819-40.

51. Albert M, Kleinman DL. Bringing Pierre Bourdieu to science and technology studies. Minerva. 2011;49:263-73.

52. Martimianakis MA, Mylopoulos M, Woods NN. Developing experts in health professions education research: Knowledge politics and adaptive expertise. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 2020;25:1127-38.

53. Englander K. The globalized world of English scientific publishing: An analytical proposal that situates a multilingual scholar. In: López-Bonilla G, Englander K, eds. Discourses and Identities in Contexts of Educational Change: Contributions from the United States and Mexico. Vol 387. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang AG. 2011:209-28.

54. Mu E, Pereyra-Rojas M. Impact on society versus impact on knowledge: Why Latin American scholars do not participate in Latin American studies. Lat Am Res Rev. 2015;50(2):216-38.

55. Jussieu Call for Open science and bibliodiversity. 2017. https://jussieucall.org/jussieu-call/ Accessed January 25, 2022.

56. Shearer K, Chan L, Kuchma I, Pierre M. Fostering bibliodiversity in scholarly communications: A call for action. 2020. https://zenodo.org/record/3752923#.Yehzky2z3s0. Accessed January 25, 2022.

57. Berger M. Bibliodiversity at the centre: Decolonizing open access. Dev Change. 2021; 52(2):383-404.

58. Balula A, Leão D. Multilingualism within scholarly communication in SSH. A literature review. JLIS.it. 2021;12(2):88-98.

59. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Recommendations on Open Science. UNESCO. 2021. https://en.unesco.org/science-sustainable-future/open-science/recommendation. Accessed January 25, 2022.

60. International Science Council. Opening the record of science: Making scholarly publishing work for science in the digital era. Paris, France: International Science Council; 2021.

61. United Nations General Assembly. Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations; 2015.

62. Kapata N, Ihekweazu C, Ntoumi F, Raji T, Chanda-Kapata P, Mwabe P, Mukonka V, et al. Is Africa prepared for tackling the COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) epidemic. Lessons from past outbreaks, ongoing pan-African public health efforts, and implications for the future. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;93:233-6.

63. Wondimagegn D, Petros A, Asrat Y, Aklilu T, Estifanos AS, Addissie A, et al. COVID-19 in Ethiopia: A contextual approach to explaining its slow growth. J Glob Health. 2020;10(2):020369.