

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Science without meritocracy. Discrimination among European specialists in infectious diseases and clinical microbiology: a questionnaire survey
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Tacconelli, Evelina; Poljak, Mario; Cacace, Marina; Caiani, Giovanni; Benzonana, Nur; Nagy, Elisabeth; Kortbeek, Titia

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr. Pilar Arrizabalaga Nephrology Consultant Hospital Clinic. Barcelona. Spain Secretary of Barcelona Official Medical Council
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	26-Sep-2012

<b>THE STUDY</b>	Methods: should detail more precisely the homogenization of followed parameters to compare wages between males and females  Can see the gap on specific scientific production: Aleixandre Benavente Rafael, González-Alcaide Gregorio, Alonso-Arroyo Adolfo, Castellano-Gómez Miguel, Valderrama-Zurián Juan Carlos. Valoración de la paridad en la autoría de los artículos publicados en la Revista Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología Clínica durante el quinquenio 2001-2005. Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología Clínica. 2007; 25: 619-26.
<b>RESULTS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	Results: the differences between figures 1 and 2 should comment more precisely  In relation to professional development could perhaps refer Alcon A, Peña T, Arrizabalaga P. Women physician and health research. Med Clin 2012; 138: 343-8.

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Winnifred Louis School of Psychology University of Queensland St Lucia, QLD, Australia
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	12-Oct-2012

<b>THE STUDY</b>	patients, supplementary - n/a  Regarding the analyses, the present data are very interesting, and are presented in a way suitable for the readers of BMJ to understand (i.e., univariate, proportions of categories).
<b>RESULTS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	Future pubs from the same data could be written to an audience in a different journal with multivariate statistics (so that the roles of the different factors can be compared, and their inter-relationships

	<p>assessed) and using continuous measures (not trichotomising the dependent measures, etc.).</p> <p>I hope the authors will make the data public to social science researchers to ensure that the future analyses / follow-up publications occur. For example it should be possible to compare what proportion of variance differences between men and women in publication explain in promotion and salary, vs # of children, etc..</p>
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	A highly important piece of research documenting a socially problematic and scientifically interesting phenomenon. Great work.

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

#### Reviewer's #1 comments

“Methods: should detail more precisely the homogenization of followed parameters to compare wages between males and females”

According to the reviewer's suggestion we detailed in the Methods section the variable “salary” (page 5, lines 21-24).

“Can see the gap on specific scientific production: Aleixandre Benavente Rafael, González-Alcaide Gregorio, Alonso-Arroyo Adolfo, Castellano-Gómez Miguel, Valderrama-Zurián Juan Carlos. Valoración de la paridad en la autoría de los artículos publicados en la Revista Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología Clínica durante el quinquenio 2001-2005. Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología Clínica. 2007; 25: 619-26.”

and

“In relation to professional development could perhaps refer Alcon A, Peña T, Arrizabalaga P. Women physician and health research. Med Clin 2012; 138: 343-8”

We thank the reviewer for pointing our attention out to these references that were added to the revised version of the text (new references 11 and 15).

“Results: the differences between figures 1 and 2 should comment more precisely”

Figures 1 and 2 were further commented in the discussion section (page 8, lines 23-30)

#### Reviewer's #2 comments

“Regarding the analyses, the present data are very interesting, and are presented in a way suitable for the readers of BMJ to understand (i.e., univariate, proportions of categories). Future pubs from the same data could be written to an audience in a different journal with multivariate statistics (so that the roles of the different factors can be compared, and their inter-relationships assessed) and using continuous measures (not trichotomising the dependent measures, etc.). I hope the authors will make the data public to social science researchers to ensure that the future analyses / follow-up publications occur. For example it should be possible to compare what proportion of variance differences between men and women in publication explain in promotion and salary, vs # of children, etc..A highly important piece of research documenting a socially problematic and scientifically interesting phenomenon. Great work.”

We thank the reviewer for his comments. We will definitively share these data with colleagues and hope our results will be used as background for further studies.