Faster, higher, stronger – together? A bibliometric analysis of author distribution in top medical education journals

Dawit Wondimagegn,[1*] Cynthia Whitehead,[2,3,4 *] Carrie Cartmill[2], Eloy Rodrigues,[5] Antónia Correia,[5] Tiago Salessi Lins[6], Manuel João Costa[7**]

[1] College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

[2] The Wilson Centre, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto and University Health Network, Toronto, Canada

[3] Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

[4] Women's College Hospital, Toronto, Canada

[5] Documentation and Library Services, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal

[6] Department of Health Promotion, Federal University of Paraiba, Paraiba, Brazil

[7] School of Medicine, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal

* Co-First Authors
** Corresponding Author
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

Introduction: Medical education and medical education research are growing industries that have become increasingly globalized. Recognition of the colonial foundations of medical education has led to a growing focus on issues of equity, absence, and marginalization. One area of absence that has been under-explored is that of published voices from low- and middle-income countries. We undertook a bibliometric analysis of five top medical education journals to determine which countries were absent and which countries were represented in prestigious first and last authorship positions. Methods: Web of Science was searched for all articles and reviews 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 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. There was a slight increase in the percentage of publications from outside of these five countries from 22% in 2012 to 29% in 2018. Conclusion: The dominance of wealthy nations within spaces that claim to be international is a finding that requires attention. 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; medical education research; anticoloniality; Global North dominance; bibliodiversity

63 ## Key messages

64 **What is already known on this topic**

65 - Authors from a small number of high income countries are over-represented in published
66 journal articles on medical education.

67

68 **What this study adds**

69 - This study shows that almost three-quarters of first and last authorship positions in several
70 prominent medical education journals are held by authors from only five countries: USA,
71 Canada, UK, Netherlands, Australia.
72 - Authors from low- and middle-income countries, and from countries where English is not the
73 dominant language, are under-represented in prestigious first and last authorship positions
74 within the medical education literature.
75 - As a field that claims to be international in scope, perspectives from outside of these five
76 dominant countries are under-represented, limiting the breadth of views that make up the field
77 of medical education.

78

79 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy**

80 - This study provides support for academics, academic institutions, and academic publishers in
81 establishing policies that prioritize the inclusion of authors from low- and middle-income
82 countries and from countries in which English is not the dominant language.
83 -Explicitly including descriptions of the ways research teams address potential power
84 imbalances in research studies that involve collaboration between HIC and LMIC authors, as

well as fluent English and less-fluent English speakers in English language publications, may allow further development of more inclusive models of international research collaboration.

Introduction

The global 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. Scaling up of health professions education opportunities has been proposed as one means of generating an educated workforce for addressing health system needs and has been a priority of the World Health Organization since the 1950s.[1,2] With global recognition of significant health worker shortages,[3-6] this focus on increasing health worker output is necessary and unsurprising, leading to the creation of many new education programs worldwide.

Rizwan et al.[5,6] recently mapped trends in the globalization of medical education programs: India, Pakistan, China, and Brazil currently house the largest number of medical schools. While medical education programs in LMIC and transitional countries[7] are being established to improve health human resources within home countries, they are also drawing foreign students, both from countries lacking education opportunities and from countries where student selection is highly competitive.[5] Countries in Eastern Europe (such as Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic), Russia, Ukraine, and China have increasingly established English language medical education programs to attract international students.[5,6] Similarly, in an attempt to attract learners from Canada and the USA, medical education programs with curricula that emulate the American model have expanded within the Caribbean.[6] As a global phenomenon, educating doctors is a growth industry.

110 Medical education is generally conceptualised as an academic endeavour, best achieved
111 through well-planned delivery of science-informed education practices, tools, structures, and
112 processes.[8] To support this, research in medical and health professions education has become
113 an area of increasing scholarly attention. This has led to a proliferation of academic activity,
114 including publications, international conference attendance, and increasing diversity of
115 professions, perspectives, disciplines, and theoretical approaches being recognized as
116 advancing new knowledge in the field.[9] In examining the burgeoning literature, it is important
117 to recognise that medical education research is, by academic measures, a relatively recent area
118 of scholarship. It first emerged as an academic field in the 1950s in North America at a time
119 when there was an explosion of scientific medical knowledge, an influx of financial incentives to
120 support research, and a mandate to demonstrate greater public accountability.[10] As an area of
121 inquiry, its development was firmly entrenched in Euroamerican healthcare and higher
122 education structures. The colonial underpinnings of these structures is well documented,
123 including ways that notions of academic legitimacy are based in biomedicine (which ignore
124 traditional and Indigenous healing practices which developed in many different global contexts
125 over millennia[11]) and are inextricably intertwined with European colonization of parts of Africa,
126 the Americas, and Asia.[11-16] In North America and Europe, Abraham Flexner's 1910 report had
127 enormous impact, entrenching legitimacy of doctor education in high status university settings,
128 which led to the closing of non-university-based programs including most that provided training
129 for women and Black students.[17-20]
130

Recognising the colonial and Flexnerian foundations of medical education provides a helpful starting point for examining issues of equity, absence, and marginalization of diverse perspectives within current structures.[21] In recent years, explorations of representation, discrimination, harassment, silencing, and power differentials have begun to appear in medical education journals. Many are written as commentaries and perspectives pieces, providing reflections on personal experiences and theoretical explorations of ways that dominant approaches (generally white and Euroamerican-centric) constrain and limit the field.[22-30] There are some 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.[31-46] There is also growing documentation of the paucity of published voices from low- and middle-income countries and non-English speaking scholars in medical education journals that position their reach as international.[56–60] This parallels the relative absence of authors from LMIC and non-English speaking countries in leading academic journals in many other areas of academia, including health and education.[25, 47–55]

Bibliometric analyses are one way to identify imbalances, and a growing set of papers are exploring the underrepresentation of authors from outside of North America and Europe.[50, 51, 61,62] Maggio et al.[62] specifically examined authorship of knowledge syntheses by country, with authors from highly ranked North American institutions being dominant. By categorizing lead authors by UN region,[63] Buffone et al.[50] found that the majority of authors in the medical education literature were from North America, Northern Europe, Western Europe, or Australia.

153 Thomas[51] analysed authorship by country of affiliation over a two-year period, comparing
154 medical education journals to those in education, medicine, and biomedical sciences. Examining
155 for all authorship positions, he found that there was greater dominance of authors from the
156 USA, United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia in medical education than in other areas. While
157 these studies show that there is an overall dominance of authors from high-income English-
158 speaking countries, there has not yet been a quantification of *prestigious* authorship positions
159 by *country*.
160
161 In medical education research, first and last author positions are often considered more
162 prestigious and desirable. For many researchers, numbers of first and last authored
163 publications contribute to academic recognition including promotions, tenure, awards, salary
164 support, and access to financial support for graduate students and research projects. In
165 addition to individual academic accomplishment, regularly publishing in highly regarded
166 journals in one's field allows authors to engage in academic debates and shape understandings
167 of which topics are deemed meritorious, noteworthy, and interesting. Powerful voices in these
168 academic journals thus help to map the academic landscape, drawing boundaries and labelling
169 worthy areas of exploration. While it is acknowledged that first and last authorship positions
170 denote a higher level of credit for the work, Hedt-Gauthier et al.[57] found that health research
171 conducted in Africa, or about Africa, was less likely to have first and last authors from low- and
172 middle-income countries (LMICs) when the publication included collaborating authors from
173 high-income countries (HICs).
174

175 While well-established guidelines for defining what constitutes authorship exist and are
176 endorsed by many medical journal editors,[49, 66, 65] guidelines for how authorship positions
177 should be distributed across authors are underdeveloped. Thatje[66] provided rules of thumb for
178 determining first and last authorship positions within the natural sciences, noting that
179 disciplinary and national culture may play a role in how decisions are made. Rees et al.[67]
180 recently noted that while standards of authorship exist within global health research, they do
181 not address power imbalances that exist between authors from LMIC and HIC. A recent
182 consensus statement by Morton et al.[68] provided guidelines for determining author order in
183 partnerships between LMIC and HIC scholars. However, given the recency of these guidelines, it
184 is yet to be determined whether they will be incorporated into authorship decisions amongst
185 partnering researchers in the field of medical education.
186
187 We undertook a bibliometric analysis of five top medical education journals to determine which
188 countries were represented in first and last authorship positions. Our aim was to provide
189 empirical data about which countries or regions of the world were more or less prominent in
190 the academic spaces dedicated to medical education. While recognizing that many other
191 journals, including predominantly clinical journals, also publish medical education research, we
192 chose to focus on journals specifically designed to publish in this area. Thomas's[51] previous
193 work was able to capture articles on the topic of medical education that were published within
194 a broad range of clinical, specialty, and disciplinary journals with scopes not exclusive to
195 medical education research. We aimed to build upon the work of Thomas[51] and chose to focus
196 on journals that primarily published within the field of medical education and health

197 professions education, as they constitute spaces where debates and critiques are intended for
198 audiences who tend to live and breathe within the sphere of medical education. In doing so,
199 our aim was to capture the boundaries of a field that asserts to be international in scope.
200
201 In addition to conducting this research, we recognized that the process of doing the research
202 was itself illustrative of issues that may affect publication trends. As a collaborative research
203 team distributed across four continents, we realised that it is was important to explicitly discuss
204 issues of power and privilege as part of our analysis meetings. We recognised that we were
205 working our way through specific and concrete research processes and practices in which issues
206 of power, voice, legitimacy, and representation were ever-present. As such, we agreed to keep
207 an explicit focus on our research decisions, processes, and practices with a view to identifying
208 ways privilege and power were manifest and managed in the shared work. We have included
209 description of relevant aspects of these reflections in the manuscript, in addition to including a
210 structured statement on reflexivity, positionality and limitations.
211

212 **Materials and methods**

213 This study was conducted in two phases. In phase one, the methodology for this study was
214 conceptualized and designed by the three Portuguese authors (ER, AC, MJC) on this paper. In
215 July 2018 these authors performed a search of the Web of Science database for citable items
216 (reviews and articles) that had been published between January 1, 2012 and December 31,
217 2016 in the five top ranking medical education journals at that time within the categories of
218 Education and Educational Research; Education; Education Scientific Disciplines; and Health

219 Care Sciences & Services: *Academic Medicine, Medical Education, Advances in Health Sciences*
220 *Education, Medical Teacher*, and *BMC Medical Education*. The resulting dataset was extracted
221 into Microsoft Excel for data analysis. While Web of Science allowed for the export of author
222 affiliations for all authors as a single data field, it was not possible to have author affiliation for
223 first and last authors extracted separately. Consequently, there was the need to review each
224 item and identify the country of author affiliation for first and last authors (when articles
225 included multiple authors). Though time consuming, this manual process of identifying country
226 of origin for each first and last author allowed for a more accurate determination than what
227 might be expected from assigning country of origin through the use of geocoding tools or
228 software.[51,69] The number of citable items (reviews and articles) for each country with affiliated
229 first and last authors were counted: For items in which first and last author had a single
230 country-affiliation and were from the same country, the item was counted only once. For items
231 in which first and last authors were from different countries, or for which a first or last author
232 had multiple country-affiliations, the item was counted the same number of times as the
233 number of countries that were listed. Articles were counted separately for each year and for
234 each journal. This allowed for further evaluation of longitudinal variations over the eight years
235 of study and between publication sources. While some bibliometric studies include only a sub-
236 sample of publications, our inclusion of all published articles allowed for an extremely accurate
237 count of first- and last-authored publications originating from each country.[51]
238
239 Preliminary results from phase one were presented by the Portuguese team at the AMEE 2018
240 conference.[70] A few years later, this paper's co-first authors were writing a commentary for

241 which we wanted to cite the results presented at the conference. We learned that the
242 Portuguese-led work had not yet been able to move forward for publication (limited local
243 research resources and extra work required for authors from a non-English first language
244 setting), and, with approval of the Portuguese team, found resources in Canada to update the
245 search and move manuscript writing forward. While acknowledging that the ability to advance
246 the work was—ironically and problematically—contingent on specific high income country (HIC)
247 resource availability, we agreed that continuing this empirical work on publishing inequities was
248 important. In addition of two Canadians to the Portuguese team, we also embraced the
249 opportunity to include team members from Ethiopia and Brazil, as respected colleagues and as
250 part of a commitment to ensure representation of low and middle income country
251 perspectives in research being done about global research imbalances.
252
253 In phase two of this project, the reconstituted team decided to update the data collection,
254 adding years 2017 and 2018 to the dataset, while following the same methodology as the
255 original strategy. While we were aware that journal rankings within the field of medical
256 education had shifted since phase one of the study, we opted to limit our analysis to the five
257 journals originally identified to ensure consistency in methodology and in recognition of the
258 longstanding role these journals have played in shaping the field. All aspects of data extraction,
259 assignment of country of origin for first and last authors, and counting techniques were
260 replicated from the earlier analysis. Final analyses treated data from both phase one (years
261 2012-2016) and phase two (years 2017-2018) as a single dataset. Data analyses were conducted
262 using Microsoft Excel and differences in proportions were compared using 95% confidence

263 intervals.[71,72] No institutional ethics review was sought for this work since it did not involve
264 human subjects. Neither patients nor the public were engaged in the study design, conduct,
265 reporting, or distribution plans of the research. The datasets used and analysed during the
266 current study have been archived as supplementary files.
267

268 **Results**

269 5,468 articles were extracted from Web of Science and country of origin was assigned to first
270 and last authors based on listed institutional addresses. After articles were counted multiple
271 times to reflect multiple geographic affiliations for first and last authors, 6,173 unique items
272 remained for subsequent analyses.
273

274 At the time of writing there were 195 countries in the world, including 193 UN Member States,
275 the Holy See, and the State of Palestine.[73] For these 195 countries, across all five journals and
276 seven years of analysis, the number of first or last authored publications originating from each
277 country ranged from zero to 1,936. Over 53% of countries were not represented by a single first
278 or last authored publication, approximately 10% were represented by a single first or last
279 authored publication, and under 4% were represented by more than 100 first or last authored
280 publications (see Table 1).
281

282 The five countries with the greatest proportion of first and last authored publications included
283 the USA with 1,936 (31.4%) publications, Canada with 878 (14.2%) publications, the UK with
284 721 (11.7%) publications, Netherlands with 532 (8.6%) publications, and Australia with 494

285 (8.0%) publications (see Table 2). Figure 1 shows the percentage of all publications with first or
286 last authors from these five countries, and the remaining percentage (26.1%) of publications
287 that originated from all "other" countries combined. Together, these "big five" nations of USA,
288 Canada, UK, Netherlands, and Australia contributed 73.9% of all first and last authored
289 publications across all journals and years of study. Figure 2 further shows the number of
290 publications originating from each country across the globe between 2012 and 2018.
291
292 The inequitable presence of first and last authored publications from these "big five" Global
293 North countries was not evenly distributed across the five medical education journals.
294 Furthermore, there was a strong positive relationship between the impact factor (2018) of each
295 journal and the percentage of articles that were published by first and last authors from these
296 five dominant countries. For example, in 2018 (when our data collection ended), of the five
297 journals studied, *Academic Medicine* had the highest impact factor at 4.937 and the highest
298 percentage (96.1%) of articles with first and last authors from these five dominant countries
299 (Table 2). *BMC Medical Education*, on the other hand, had the lowest impact factor at 1.87 and
300 the lowest percentage (51.2%) of articles with first and last authors from these same countries
301 (Table 2). Impact factor is considered one measure of prestige within academic publishing,[74]
302 and these results suggest that only a small number of countries are represented in first and last
303 authorship positions within prestigious journals.
304
305 While most of our analyses combined years 2012 to 2018 together, we also looked at how the
306 percentage of first and last authored publications from "other" countries outside of the USA,

307 Canada, the UK, Netherlands, and Australia had changed over time. Across all journals, there
308 was a slight increase in the percentage of first and last authored publications from "other"
309 countries from 22.4% (95% CI 19.5-25.4%) in 2012 to 28.7% (95% CI 25.8-31.5%) in 2018. While
310 this significant increase in publications from countries outside of the dominant five is
311 encouraging, the overall proportion of publications from other countries remains low.
312

313 **Discussion**

314 Our data revealed a dominance of first and last authors from five countries in five top ranked
315 journals within the international field of medical education. Being a bibliometric analysis, the
316 results do not provide an explanation for why there is such significant dominance by these five
317 countries. Also, as we did not include middle authors in our research design, there may be
318 greater presence of authors from the other 190 countries of the world than we were able to
319 capture by looking only at first and last authorship positions. Nevertheless, the prominence of
320 five countries in prestigious authorship positions is a finding that requires attention. While our
321 research was not designed to identify how this dominance compared to other fields, Thomas[51]
322 previously found that there were greater geographic disparities within medical education
323 research than within education, medicine, and the biological sciences. Our current research
324 reiterated this pattern when analyzing prestigious authorship positions. Our study only included
325 articles that had been published in the five medical education journals which had the highest
326 impact factor at a single point in time in 2018. As a measure of journal importance, impact
327 factor is only one metric, and one that is in constant flux. Future research might expand upon
328 our strategy and include additional journals that publish on the topic of medical education,

329 including journals which have experienced a significant increase in impact factor since we first
330 devised our research strategy in 2018.
331
332 Tracking and decision-making about country assignation in bibliometric research is not always
333 straightforward. As evidenced in previous bibliometric studies, there are many ways in which
334 geographic origin might be determined. For the current study, we chose to double, or even
335 triple-count publications as unique items when first or last authors claimed affiliations in
336 multiple countries. In some instances, this led to confusion in determining whether an author
337 had more authentic cultural connections to the Global North or the Global South. We view this
338 as a limitation of the bibliometric nature of our study: in quantifying the geographic
339 representation of first and last authors, we were unable to more meaningfully determine the
340 cultural perspective from which each author was writing.
341
342 As an international research team deliberately designed to include representation from HICs
343 and LMICs across several continents, we tried to be reflexive as we collectively advanced this
344 project. We explicitly discussed aspects of the research process in our meetings. It was readily
345 apparent that access to academic resources (both material resources and time) significantly
346 shaped the research process. This included the fact that one of the Canadian authors holds a
347 research chair that was able to provide funds for the second phase of data collection. The two
348 Canadian authors therefore had more protected time to advance this project, which in and of
349 itself is evidence of unearned privilege and showcases research inequities. As a team, we
350 discussed this fact, recognized that it materially influenced the research process, while aiming

351 to watch that it did not manifest as greater voice for these authors. We also saw this privilege
352 as requiring greater responsibility from the Canadian authors to do the "heavy lifting" in order
353 to move the project forward. The team also discussed the fact of English language fluency
354 (including the genres of academic writing) and the extent to which that made the writing
355 process more efficient for the Canadian authors to lead. We recognized that no matter how
356 careful we were, the fact of writing in English made it easier for the Canadians to shape the
357 words, and spent time discussing details of language in our meetings. The team decided that it
358 was acceptable for the Canadian authors to update the preliminary research of the Portuguese
359 team. Given both time and English language facility, the Canadian authors also led the process
360 of manuscript writing, with the other team members making substantial edits and comments.
361 In discussions about authorship order and thinking about contributions and ICMJE guidelines,[64]
362 we initially thought it might be most appropriate to have a Canadian first author and
363 Portuguese last author based on currently accepted publishing practices and given the role that
364 MJC had played in the original design of the study. The irony of producing a manuscript in this
365 space with a "big five" first author was not lost on us, and we sought options to publish in other
366 spaces that would acknowledge the significant work of authors less easily represented in
367 current criteria. We know that HIC academics' ability to engage in critical global work is
368 significantly enabled by their learnings from and relationships with LMIC academic colleagues.
369 Current authorship guidelines do not fully recognize this invisible labour on the part of LMIC
370 academics, but as a team we decided that it was critical to incorporate these contributions into
371 authorship decisions. As a result, we determined that co-first authorship by a LIC and HIC
372 academic on the team was the most accurate representation of authorship. The need for such

373 conversations further highlights the structural issues that determine who can play the sport of
374 international academic publishing. The fact that our effort to showcase structural inequities in
375 academia had the potential to lead to the reproduction of dominant voices is telling. In thinking
376 about ways to increase representation in medical education research, it is clear that neither
377 recognition of inequities nor good intentions will in and of themselves lead to structural
378 change.
379
380 Attention to privilege and power across all aspects of a research project can lead to different
381 conversations and different choices, with potential to help trouble assumptions that maintain
382 HIC academic dominance. Engaging in these processes is essential; it also requires an effort
383 that in many cases will slow research output. We believe that this "extra" work is necessary to
384 improve knowledge creation and as a way to advance appropriate models of HIC-LMIC
385 collaborative research practice. We also realise that this form of academic activity is not
386 currently recognised in terms of academic metrics, and know there is more to do to find ways
387 for such work to be valued.
388
389 The dominance of wealthy nations within spaces that claim to be international, though
390 troubling, is not unique to medical education, the health professions, or academia in general.
391 The prominence of the "big five" countries in medical education research brings to mind the
392 colonization of many Global South countries during the 19th Century when Global North
393 sportsmen hunted for "big five" trophy animals: elephants, lions, rhinos, leopards, and buffalo.
394 Symbolically, the hunting of big game in Africa and India served the purpose of solidifying the

triumph of colonists over those being colonized.[75] As a more modern sporting analogy, we are reminded of the Tokyo 2020/1 Olympic and Paralympic games, an event that represents one of the world's largest international sporting 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.[76]

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.[77] Houghton[78] traced 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.[78] 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[79] continue to be included, as do sports with more recent histories that rely on extensive and expensive sporting infrastructure, such as velodrome cycling,

417 bobsledding, and sailboat racing. However, traditional African sports such as Nguni (stick
418 fighting), Capoeira, donkey-racing, and Dambe boxing continue to be absent, despite
419 recognition of their value to local peoples.[80] We draw attention to this sporting analogy to show
420 not only that North-South disparities are omnipresent and surreptitious, but that they are also
421 engrained in structures and inequities that are built upon historical and colonial roots that
422 continue to be perpetuated through international spaces, even those that aim to unite
423 humanity and have the allure of being inclusive.
424
425 In comparing medical education research to the Olympics, we hope that looking at structures
426 elsewhere may open up new ways of seeing a space we take for granted. Bourdieu[81] effectively
427 examined sport as a way to highlight that in every sphere there are philosophical underpinnings
428 that are inherently political. Bourdieu also emphasized social spheres as spaces of conflict and
429 struggle, including the field of science.[82] Albert and Kleinman[83] drew upon Bourdieu's concepts
430 in suggesting that it was necessary to understand how interactions that may appear to be
431 based on cooperation may more accurately reflect domination and subordination. More
432 recently, Martiminanakis et al.[83] drew attention to the need to consider the inevitable
433 knowledge politics that inform discussions about research quality and rigour within medical
434 education. We suggest that representation in the academic literature is an area which would
435 benefit from further exploration of the ways knowledge politics shape what is considered
436 legitimate in these spaces. Acknowledging the skewed proportion of authors from different
437 countries does not lead directly to solutions designed to "add" voices from LMICs without
438 attention to the historical and colonial roots from which disparities have developed.

439

440 This leads to some potentially uncomfortable questions. For HIC researchers, it is pleasing to
441 consider academic conversations with peers from other HICs to constitute international
442 debates. But is it possibly a conceit to think that medical education research in its current form
443 is truly globally relevant? To what extent is the new knowledge being shared in academic
444 publications able to be implemented and evaluated in lower resource settings? Are important
445 knowledges excluded from currently accepted content in medical education journals? How
446 relevant is the content of top medical education journals in diverse contexts? How willing might
447 HIC academics be to probe the layers of privilege that serves them well in terms of impact
448 factor, academic promotions, and claims of international recognition? Beyond individuals, are
449 HIC academic institutions open to questioning the structures that maintain their high
450 international rankings? LMIC academic institutions are also driven by academic rankings so
451 individual LMIC researchers may be encouraged to preferentially aim for international journal
452 publications. A related issue explored by others[84,85] is how researchers from non-English
453 speaking countries make choices about when to publish in "international" English-language
454 journals versus reaching audiences in their own country and language. These are not decisions
455 that English-language country researchers need to make, adding to the burden placed on those
456 academics. The concept of bibliodiversity (or diversity in scholarly publishing)[86, 87] has been
457 adopted by Global South authors as a way of supporting the decolonization of Southern
458 knowledge,[88] and multilingual publishing may be one way that bibliodiversity can be achieved.[89]
459

460 **Conclusions**

There have been a recent series of calls to action and incisive analyses, most prominent in critical global health spaces,[29,47,49,57,59,90,91] but also in medical education journals,[30,46,50,51,62,92] that are contributing to a body of literature that demonstrates the ways academic publishing structures continue to privilege HIC academics. Continued conceptual and empirical work in these spaces is essential. It is also important to ensure that academics from diverse contexts are included in teams undertaking this work, and that in these collaborations close attention is paid to privilege, voice, and representation.

As a research team we believe that we must start and sustain these conversations across all aspects of our scholarly work. 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. There is an ethical and moral imperative to examine and disassemble colonial structures. A recent call from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)[93] and the International Science Council[89] compels us to consider scientific advancement a global public good to which open access is required. Eight recommendations were recently endorsed by the International Science Council,[94] 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[95] and reducing global inequities.

482 HIC also have much to learn from LMIC colleagues, and must find the humility and will to listen.
483 As HIC countries face severe health human resource shortages, there will be learnings from
484 LMIC colleagues who have chronically grappled with these issues. Many LMIC countries
485 spectacularly outshone HIC countries in effectively managing successive waves of the COVID-19
486 pandemic[96,97] with far fewer resources. With growing recognition of the limits of Euroamerican
487 biomedical approaches to healthcare, making academic space for traditional knowledges from
488 many global contexts, as well as deep examination of the effects of colonization on health, are
489 opportunities we must embrace. For science to be universal, it must be inclusive of a wide
490 range of global knowledges.[94] If scholarly medical education communities are willing to re-
491 envisage the rules of the game to focus on ways we can be faster, higher, and stronger
492 **together**, we may better harness the transformative aspects of education to contribute to a
493 healthier world.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Contributors

DW,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. DW,CW, CC, MJC drafted this manuscript, and ER, AC, TSL 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.

Reflexivity statement

This research was conducted by an informal partnership of authors from high-income countries, low- and middle-income countries, countries where English is the dominant language, and countries where the dominant language is other than English. Throughout the study, conversations were held during team meetings to discuss inequities that existed across team members in terms of available funds, time, and personnel for conducting and writing up the findings of this research. When deciding on an appropriate authorship order, we were guided by both the ICMJE guidelines and by the Consensus statement on measures to promote equitable authorship in the publication of research from international partnerships. We also acknowledge that authorship guidelines can at times be used to advantage authors with greater

material resources to contribute to a project, and that English language fluency greatly advantages English as first language authors in making claims to authorship position. As a team, we recognised that we were able to have ongoing and sometimes challenging conversations about the ways privilege and power needed to be examined in mundane research practices because of pre-existing trusting relationships. CW and DW have worked together for many years. TSL spent a year as a visiting scholar in Canada working with CW. Both DW and TSL have worked closely with CC on research projects. MJC, ER, and AC are Portuguese colleagues at the same institution and led the initial stage of the research project. MJC and CW had built a collegial relationship through conversations at international medical education conferences.

Funding

This study did not receive external funding but did receive support from Cynthia Whitehead's BMO Chair.

Competing 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.

Ethics approval

No institutional ethics review was sought for this work since it did not involve human subjects.

538 **Data Availability**

539 The datasets generated and analysed during this study have been archived as supplementary

540 information files with medRxiv: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.29.22273128

541

542 **ORCID IDs**

543 Cynthia Whitehead 0000-0002-0134-9074

544 Carrie Cartmill 0000-0001-6996-7293

545 Eloy Rodrigues 0000-0002-7862-2681

546 Antónia Correia 0000-0002-6610-8853

547 Dawit Wondimagegn 0000-0002-5035-3731

548 Tiago Salessie 0000-0001-5587-4504

549 Manuel João Costa 0000-0001-5255-4257

550

551 **References**

552 1. Frenk J, Chen L, Bhutta ZA, et al. Health professionals for a new century: Transforming
553 education to strengthen health systems in an interdependent world. Lancet
554 2010;376:1923-58. doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61854-5
555 2. Weisz G, Nannestad B. The World Health Organization and the global standardization of
556 medical training, a history. Global Health 2021;17:96. doi.org/10.1186/s12992-021-00733-0
557 3. Nichols BL, Davis CR, Richardson DR, CGFNS International. Appendix J: International models
558 of nursing. In: The future of nursing: Leading change, advancing health [Internet].
559 Washington, DC, USA: National Academies Press, 2011 [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Available from:
560 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK209879/
561 4. Bates I, John C, Seegobin P, Bruno A. An analysis of the global pharmacy workforce capacity
562 trends from 2006 to 2012. Hum Resour Health 2018;16:3. doi.org/10.1186/s12960-018-
563 0267-y
564 5. Rizwan M, Rosson NJ, Tackett S, Hassoun HT. Opportunities and challenges in the current
565 era of global medical education. Int J Med Educ 2018;9:111-2.
566 doi.org/10.5116/ijme.5ad1.ce9a
567 6. Rizwan M, Rosson NJ, Tackett S, Hassoun HT. Globalization of medical education: Current
568 trends and opportunities for medical students [Internet]. J Med Educ Train 2019 [cited
569 2022 Dec 24];3(1):2:035. Available from:
570 http://www.scientificoajournals.org/pdf/jmet.1035.pdf
571 7. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. Next steps for development in
572 transition: A background paper [Internet]. Presented during the 18 May 2017 meeting in

573 Brussels, Belgium, co-hosted by the Directorate-General for International Cooperation and
574 Development of the European Commission, the OECD Development Centre and the
575 Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. 2017 [cited 2022 Dec 24].
576 Available from: https://www.oecd.org/dev/BackgroundPaper_DiT.pdf
577 8. Harden RM, Grant J, Buckley G, Hart IR. Best evidence medical education. Adv Health Sci
578 Educ Theory Pract 2000;5:71-90. doi.org/10.1023/A:1009896431203
579 9. Norman G. Where we've come from, where we might go. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract
580 2020;25:1191-1201. doi.org/10.1007/s10459-020-10018-7
581 10. Kuper A, Albert M, Hodges BD. The origins of the field of medical education research. Acad
582 Med 2010;85(8):1347-53. doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181dce9a7
583 11. Pande I. Medicine, race and liberalism in British Bengal: Symptoms of empire. Abingdon,
584 UK: Routledge, 2010.
585 12. Grosfoguel R, Hernandez R, Valasouez ER, eds. Decolonizing the Westernized University:
586 Interventions in philosophy of education from within and without. Lanham, Maryland:
587 Lexington Books, 2016.
588 13. Grosfoguel R. The structure of knowledge in Westernized Universities: Epistemic
589 racism/sexism and the four genocides/epistemicides of the long 16th Century [Internet].
590 Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge 2013 [cited 2022 Dec
591 24];11(1):73-90. Available from:
592 https://www.niwrc.org/sites/default/files/images/resource/2%20The%20Structure%20of%
593 20Knowledge%20in%20Westernized%20Universities_%20Epistemic.pdf

594 14. Stein S, Andreotti VDO. Higher education and the modern/colonial global imaginary. Cult
595 Stud Crit Methodol 2016;17(3):1-9. doi.org/10.1177/1532708616672673
596 15. Naidu T, Abimbola S. How medical education holds back health equity. Lancet
597 2022;400 :556-7. doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(22)01423-4
598 16. Bleakley A, Brice J, Bligh J. Thinking the post-colonial in medical education. Med Educ
599 2008;42:266-70. doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2007.02991.x
600 17. Flexner A. Medical education in Europe: A report to the Carnegie foundation for the
601 advancement of teaching. Boston, MA: DB Updike, The Merrymount Press, 1912.
602 18. Ludmerer KM. Time to heal: American medical education from the turn of the century to
603 the era of managed care. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
604 19. Whitehead C. The Good Doctor in Medical Education 1910-2010: A Critical Discourse
605 Analysis. Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2013.
606 20. Flexner A. Medical education in the United States and Canada. Washington, DC: Science
607 and Health Publications, Inc., 1910.
608 21. Paton M, Kuper A, Paradis E, Feilchenfeld Z, Whitehead CR. Tackling the void: The
609 importance of addressing absences in the field of health professions education research.
610 Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract 2021;26:5-18. doi.org/10.1007/s10459-020-09966-x
611 22. Castillo EG, Isom J, DeBonis K, Jordan A, Braslow JT, Rohrbaugh R. Reconsidering systems-
612 based practice: Advancing structural competency, health equity, and social responsibility in
613 graduate medical education. Acad Med 2020;95(12):1817-22.
614 doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003559

615 23. Crampton PES, Afzali Y. Professional identity formation, intersectionality and equity in
616 medical education. Med Educ 2021;55(2):140-2. doi.org/10.1111/medu.14415
617 24. Fernandez A. Further incorporating diversity, equity, and inclusion into medical education
618 research. Acad Med 2019; 94(11)(suppl):S5-S6. doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002916
619 25. Naidu T. Modern medicine is a colonial artifact: Introducing decoloniality to medical
620 education research. Acad Med 2021;94(11)(suppl):S9-S12.
621 doi.org/1097/ACM.0000000000004339
622 26. Naidu T. Southern exposure: Levelling the Northern tilt in global medical and medical
623 humanities education. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract 2021;26:739-52.
624 doi.org/10.1097.ACM.0000000000004339
625 27. Norman G, Ellaway R. Looking back, looking forward? Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract
626 2020;25:1-6. doi.org/10.1007/s10459-020-09961-2
627 28. Paton M, Naidu T, Wyatt TR, et al. Dismantling the master's house: New ways of knowing
628 for equity and social justice in health professions education. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory
629 Pract 2020;25:1107-26. doi.org/10.1007/s10459-020-10006-x
630 29. Khan SA. Decolonising global health by decolonising academic publishing. BMJ Glob Health
631 2022;7:e007811. doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2021-007811
632 30. Kusurkar RA. The leaky pipeline of publications and knowledge generation in medical
633 education. Perspect Med Educ 2022;11:70-2. doi.org/10.1007/s40037-022-00700-4
634 31. Calhoun A, Inginia G, Andres M, Donna W. Moving beyond implicit bias in antiracist
635 academic medicine initiatives. Acad Med 2022;97(6):790-2.
636 doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000004562

637 32. McKivett A, Paul D. How can medical educators be good ancestors? Med Educ
638 2022;56(11):1056-8. doi.org/10.1111/medu.14886
639 33. Sukhera J. Bridging health equity and quality improvement in medical education. Med Educ
640 2023;57(1):7-9. doi.org/10.1111/medu.14957
641 34. Slavin S. Is medical education systemically racist? J Natl Med Assoc 2022;114(5):498-503.
642 doi.org/10.1016/j.jnma.2022.06.002
643 35. Bhandal T. Ethical globalization? Decolonizing theoretical perspectives for
644 internationalization in Canadian medical education [Internet]. Can Med Educ J 2018 [cited
645 2022 Dec 24];9(2): e33-e45. Available from :
646 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6044296/pdf/CMEJ-9-e033.pdf
647 36. Giuliani M, Frambach J, Broadhurst M, et al. A critical review of representation in the
648 development of global oncology curricula and the influence of neocolonialism. BMC Med
649 Educ 2020;20(93):1-9. doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-1989-9
650 37. Larkins S, Michielsen K, Iputo J, et al. Impact of selection strategies on representation of
651 underserved populations and intention to practise: International findings. Med Educ
652 2015;49:60-72. doi.org/10.1111/medu.12518
653 38. Lorello GR, Silver JK, Moineau G, McCarthy K, Flexman AM. Trends in representation of
654 female applicants and matriculants in Canadian residency programs across specialties,
655 1995-2019. JAMA Network Open 2020;3(11):e2027938.
656 doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.27938

657 39. Soklaridis S, Kuper A, Whitehead CR, Ferguson G, Taylor VH, Zahn C. Gender bias in hospital
658 leadership: A qualitative study on the experiences of women CEOs. J Health Organ Manag
659 2017;31(2):253-68. doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-12-2016-0243
660 40. Soklaridis S, Black G, LeBlanc C, et al. Academic productivity of equity-deserving physician
661 scholars during COVID-19: A scoping review [Internet]. Acad Med 2022 [cited 2022 Dec 24].
662 Available from:
663 https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Abstract/9900/Academic_Productivity_of_Eq
664 uity_Deserving.200.aspx
665 41. Franks A, Calamur N, Dobrian A, et al. Rank and tenure amongst faculty at academic
666 medical centers: A study of more than 50 years of gender disparities. Acad Med
667 2022;97(7):1038-48. doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000004706
668 42. Jackson D, Ward D, Agwu JC, Spruce A. Preparing for selection success: Sociodemographic
669 differences in opportunities and obstacles. Med Educ 2022;56(9):922-35.
670 doi.org/10.1111/medu.14811
671 43. Mulder L, Wouters A, Twisk JWR, et al. Selection for health professions education leads to
672 increased inequality of opportunity and decreased student diversity in The Netherlands,
673 but lottery is no solution: A retrospective multi-cohort study. Med Teach 2022;44(7):790-9.
674 doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2022.2041189
675 44. Lee Cr, Gilliland KO, Dallaghan GLB, Tolleson-Rinehart S. Race, ethnicity, and gender
676 representation in clinical case vignettes: A 20-year comparison between two institutions.
677 BMC Med Educ 2022;22:585. doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03665-4

678 45. Sukhera J, Goez H, Brown A, Haddara W, Razack S. Freedom from discrimination or
679 freedom to discriminate? Discursive tensions within discrimination policies in medical
680 education. Adv Health Sci Educ 2022;27:387-403. doi.org/10.1007/s10459-022-10090-1
681 46. Yip SWL, Rashid MA. Editorial diversity in medical education journals. Clin Teach
682 2021;18:523-8. doi.org/10.1111/tct.13386
683 47. Abimbola S. The foreign gaze: Authorship in academic global health. BMJ Glob Health
684 2019;4:e002068. doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002068
685 48. Balon R, Roberts LW, Coverdale J, Louie A, Beresin E. Globalization of medical and
686 psychiatric education and the focus of Academic Psychiatry on the success of
687 "international" authors. Acad Psychiatry 2008;32(2):151-3.
688 doi.org/10.1176/appi.ap.32.2.151
689 49. Sam-Aguda NA, Abimbola S. Using scientific authorship criteria as a tool for equitable
690 inclusion in global health research. BMJ Glob Health 2021;6:e007632.
691 doi.org/10.1136%2Fbmjgh-2021-007632
692 50. Buffone B, Djuana I, Yang K, Wilby KJ, El Hajj MS, Wilbur K. Diversity in health professional
693 education scholarship: A document analysis of international author representation in
694 leading journals. BMJ Open 2020;10:e043970. doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043970
695 51. Thomas MP. The geographic and topical landscape of medical education research. BMC
696 Med Educ 2019;19(189):1-5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1639-2
697 52. Asplund K, Eriksson M, Persson O. Country comparisons of human stroke research since
698 2001: A bibliometric study. Stroke 2012;43:830-7.
699 https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.637249

700 53. Allik J, Lauk K, Realo A. Factors predicting the scientific wealth of nations. Cross Cult Res
701 2020;54(4):364-97. doi.org/10.1177/1069397120910982
702 54. Ravi K, Bentounsi Z, Tariq A, et al. Systematic analysis of authorship demographics in global
703 surgery. BMJ Glob Health 2021;6:e006672. doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2021-006672
704 55. Stockemer D, Wigginton MJ. Publishing in English or another language: An inclusive study
705 of scholar's language publication preferences in the natural, social and interdisciplinary
706 sciences. Scientometrics 2019;118:645-52. doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2987-0
707 56. Gibbs WW. Lost science in the third world [Internet]. Sci Am 1995 [accessed 2022 Dec
708 24];273(2): 92-9. Available from: https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/lost-science-
709 in-the-third-world/
710 57. Hedt-Gauthier BL, Jeufack HM, Neufeld NH, et al. Stuck in the middle: A systematic review
711 of authorship in collaborative health research in Africa, 2014-2016. BMJ Glob Health
712 2019;4:e001853. doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001853
713 58. Lancet Global Health. Closing the door on parachutes and parasites. Lancet Glob Health
714 2018;6:e593. doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30239-0
715 59. Mbaye R, Gebeyehu R, Hossmann S, et al. Who is telling the story? A systematic review of
716 authorship for infectious disease research conducted in Africa, 1980-2016. BMJ Glob Health
717 2019;4:e001855. doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001855
718 60. Wondimagegn D, Soklaridis S, Yifter H, Cartmill C, Yeshak MY, Whitehead C. Passing the
719 microphone: Broadening perspectives by amplifying underrepresented voices. Adv Health
720 Sci Educ Theory Pract 2020;25(5):1139-47. doi.org/10.1007/s10459-020-10012-z

721 61. Maggio LA, Ninkov A, Frank JR, Costello JA, Artino Jr AR. Delineating the field of Medical
722 Education: Bibliometric research approach(es). Med Educ 2022;56:387-94.
723 doi.org/10.1111/medu.14677
724 62. Maggio LA, Ninkov A, Costello JA, Driessen EW, Artino Jr AR. Knowledge syntheses in
725 medical education: Meta-research examining author gender, geographic location, and
726 institutional affiliation. PLoS ONE 2021;16(10):e0258925.
727 doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258925
728 63. United Nations. Standard country or area codes for statistical use (M49) [Internet].
729 Department of economic and social Affairs. 2018 [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Geneva, Switzerland:
730 Statistics Division, United Nations. Available from:
731 https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/
732 64. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). Defining the role of authors
733 and contributors [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Available from:
734 http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-
735 role-of-authors-and-contributors.html [Accessed September 27, 2022].
736 65. Uijtdehaage S, Mavis B, Durning SJ. Whose paper is it anyway? Authorship criteria
737 according to established scholars in health professions education. Acad Med 2018;
738 93:1171-5. doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002144
739 66. Thatje S. Reaching out for scientific legacy: How to define authorship in academic
740 publishing. Sci Nat 2016;103:10. doi.org/10.1007/s00114-016-1335-6
741 67. Rees CA, Sirna SJ, Manji HK, Kisenge R, Manji KP. Authorship equity guidelines in global
742 health journals. BMJ Glob Health 2022;7:e010421. doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-010421

743 68. Morton B, Vercueil A, Masekela R, et al. Consensus statement on measures to promote
744 equitable authorship in the publication of research from international partnerships.
745 Anaesthesia 2022;77:364-76. doi.org/10.1111/anae.15597
746 69. Geocoding API. Developer Guide [Internet]. Google Developers. 2022 [cited 2022 Dec 24].
747 Available from: https://developers.google.com/maps/documentation/geocoding/intro.
748 70. Costa MJ, Van Schalkwyk S, Ho M-J, Carvalho-Filho MA, Schuwirth L. Equity in the global
749 health sciences education community: Levelling the playing fields? Paper presented at:
750 Association for Medical Education in Europe Annual Conference; 2018 August; Basel,
751 Switzerland.
752 71. Williams R, Bornmann L. Sampling issues in bibliometric analysis. J Informetr 2016;10:1225-
753 32. doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2015.11.004
754 72. Koepsell TD, Weiss NS. Epidemiologic methods: Studying the occurrence of illness. New
755 York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press, 2003.
756 73. United Nations. About us [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Available from:
757 https://www.un.org/en/about-us [accessed July 11, 2022].
758 74. Saha S, Saint S, Christakis DA. Impact factor: A valid measure of journal quality [Internet]? *J*
759 *Med Libr Assoc* 2003 [cited 2022 Dec 24];91(1):42-6. Available from:
760 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC141186/
761 75. Storey WK. Big cats and imperialism: Lion and tiger hunting in Kenya and Northern India,
762 1898-1930 [Internet]. J World Hist 1991 [cited 2022 Dec 24];2(2):135-73. Available from:
763 https://www.jstor.org/stable/20078498

764 76. Whereig.com. List of participating countries in the Tokyo Olympics 2020-21 [Internet]. 2022
765 [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Available from: https://www.whereig.com/olympics/summer-
766 olympics-participating-countries.html [Accessed July 11, 2022].
767 77. Chatziefstathiou D. Paradoxes and contestations of Olympism in the history of the modern
768 Olympic Movement. Sport Soc 2011;14(3):332-44. doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2011.557269
769 78. Houghton F. Latin America and the Olympic ideal of progress: An athletes perspective. Int J
770 Hist Sport 2005;22(2):158-76. doi.org/10.1080/09523360500035719
771 79. Charitas P. Imperialisms in the Olympics of the colonization in the postcolonization: Africa
772 into the International Olympic Committee, 1910-1965. Int J Hist Sport 2015;32(7):909-22.
773 doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2015.1027153
774 80. Robertson ECJ. 7 traditional African sports that should be in the Olympics [Internet].
775 Okayafrica. No Date [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Available from: https://www.okayafrica.com/7-
776 traditional-african-sports-olympics/ [Accessed July 11, 2022]
777 81. Bourdieu P. Sport and social class. Soc Sci Info 1978;17(6):819-40.
778 doi.org/10.1177/053901847801700603
779 82. Albert M, Kleinman DL. Bringing Pierre Bourdieu to science and technology studies.
780 Minerva 2011;49:263-73. doi.org/10.1007/s11024-011-9174-2
781 83. Martimianakis MA, Mylopoulos M, Woods NN. Developing experts in health professions
782 education research: Knowledge politics and adaptive expertise. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory
783 Pract 2020;25:1127-38. doi.org/10.1007/s10459-020-10014-x
784 84. Englander K. The globalized world of English scientific publishing: An analytical proposal
785 that situates a multilingual scholar. In: López-Bonilla G, Englander K, eds. Discourses and

786 Identities in Contexts of Educational Change: Contributions from the United States and
787 Mexico, Vol 387 [Internet]. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang AG, 2011 [cited 2022 Dec 24]:
788 209-228. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/42980952
789 85. Mu E, Pereyra-Rojas M. Impact on society versus impact on knowledge: Why Latin
790 American scholars do not participate in Latin American studies. Lat Am Res Rev
791 2015;50(2):216-38. doi.org/10.1353/lar.2015.0021
792 86. Jussieu Call for Open science and bibliodiversity [Internet], 2017 [cited 2022 Dec 24].
793 Available from: https://jussieucall.org/jussieu-call/
794 87. Shearer K, Chan L, Kuchma I, Pierre M. Fostering bibliodiversity in scholarly
795 communications: A call for action [Internet], 2020 [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Available from:
796 https://zenodo.org/record/3752923#.Yehzky2z3s0
797 88. Berger M. Bibliodiversity at the centre: Decolonizing open access. Dev Change 2021;
798 52(2):383-404. doi.org/10.1111/dech.12634
799 89. Balula A, Leão D. Multilingualism within scholarly communication in SSH. A literature
800 review. JLIS.it 2021;12(2):88-98. doi.org/10.4403/jlis.it-12672
801 90. Naidu T. Says Who? Northern ventriloquism, or epistemic disobedience in global health
802 scholarship. Lancet 2021;9:e1332-5. doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(21)00198-4
803 91. Sayegh H, Harden C, Khan H, et al. Global health education in high-income countries:
804 confronting coloniality and power asymmetry. BMJ Glob Health 2022;7:e008501.
805 doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-008501

806 92. Wyatt TR. "The sins of our forefathers": Reimagining research in health professions
807 education. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract 2022;27:1195-1206.
808 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-022-10111-z
809 93. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).
810 Recommendations on Open Science [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Available from:
811 https://en.unesco.org/science-sustainable-future/open-science/recommendation
812 94. International Science Council. Opening the record of science: Making scholarly publishing
813 work for science in the digital era [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Paris, France:
814 International Science Council. Available from: https://council.science/wp-
815 content/uploads/2020/06/202104_Opening-the-Record-of-Science-Summary_01-ENGLISH-
816 online.pdf [Accessed July 11, 2022]
817 95. United Nations General Assembly. Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for
818 sustainable development [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Geneva, Switzerland: United
819 Nations. Available from: https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda
820 96. Kapata N, Ihekweazu C, Ntoumi F, et al. Is Africa prepared for tackling the COVID-19 (SARS-
821 CoV-2) epidemic. Lessons from past outbreaks, ongoing pan-African public health efforts,
822 and implications for the future. Int J Infect Dis 2020;93:233-6.
823 doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.02.049
824 97. Wondimagegn D, Petros A, Asrat Y, et al. COVID-19 in Ethiopia: A contextual approach to
825 explaining its slow growth. J Glob Health 2020;10(2):020369.
826 doi.org/10.7189/jogh.10.020369
827

828 **Table 1:**
829 **Number (percent) of countries by number of publications in top 5 medical education journals,**
830 **2012-2018**
831

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

832

833 **Table 2:**
834 **Number and percent* of first/last authored publications from USA, Canada, UK, Netherlands,**
835 **Australia, and "other" countries, by journal, 2012-2018**
836

	Acad Med	Med Educ	AHSE	Med Teach	BMC Med Educ	**Total**
Impact Factor (2018)	4.937	4.619	2.761	2.706	1.87	
USA	1105 73.4% *(71.2-75.7%)*	164 20.7% *(17.8-23.5%)*	83 16.8% *(13.5-20.1%)*	331 22.3% *(20.2-24.4%)*	253 13.3% *(11.8-14.8%)*	**1936** **31.4%** ***(30.2-32.6%)***
Canada	226 15.0% *(13.2-16.8%)*	210 26.5% *(23.4-29.5%)*	114 23.1% *(19.4-26.8%)*	188 12.7% *(11.0-14.4%)*	140 7.4% *(6.2-8.6%)*	**878** **14.2%** ***(13.3-15.1%)***
UK	35 2.3% *(1.6-3.1%)*	143 18.0% *(15.3-20.7%)*	53 10.7% *(8.0-13.5%)*	275 18.6% *(16.6-20.6%)*	215 11.3% *(9.9-12.7%)*	**721** **11.7%** ***(10.9-12.5%)***
Netherlands	58 3.9% *(2.9-4.8%)*	88 11.1% *(8.9-13.3%)*	98 19.8% *(16.3-23.4%)*	153 10.3% *(8.8-11.8%)*	135 7.1% *(5.9-8.3%)*	**532** **8.6%** ***(7.9-9.3%)***
Australia	23 1.5% *(0.9-2.1%)*	80 10.1% *(8.0-12.2%)*	41 8.3% *(5.9-10.7%)*	121 8.2% *(6.8-9.6%)*	229 12.1% *(10.6-13.6%)*	**494** **8.0%** ***(7.3-8.7%)***
Other	58 3.9% *(2.9-5.0%)*	109 13.7% *(11.3-16.1%)*	105 21.3% *(17.6-24.9%)*	414 27.9% *(25.6-30.0%)*	926 48.8% *(46.6-51.0%)*	**1612** **26.1%** ***(25.0-27.2%)***
Total	**1505**	**794**	**494**	**1482**	**1898**	**6173**

837 * Percentages were calculated with a 95% confidence interval
838
839 Legend:
840 Acad Med: Academic Medicine
841 Med Educ: Medical Education
842 AHSE: Advances in Health Sciences Education
843 Med Teach: Medical Teacher
844 BMC Med Educ: BMC Medical Education

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



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



Figure 3:
Percent* of first/last authored publications from "other" countries outside of USA, Canada, UK, Netherlands and Australia, for each journal separately and for all journals combined, from 2012 to 2018



	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
All 5 journals combined	22.4%	25.1%	24.8%	25.4%	26.7%	28.8%	28.7%
Academic Medicine	5.1%	2.5%	5.8%	2.0%	2.4%	6.5%	2.8%
Advances in Health Sciences Education	27.3%	26.3%	15.9%	22.8%	24.4%	13.8%	17.9%
BMC Medical Education	51.0%	50.3%	41.6%	50.4%	49.4%	54.5%	46.8%
Medical Education	10.7%	20.7%	6.7%	11.5%	13.7%	14.2%	18.5%
Medical Teacher	26.0%	28.6%	31.3%	25.4%	23.9%	28.6%	31.8%

* Error bars were calculated using a 95% confidence interval