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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

It seems you performed multiple Chi-squared tests to compare the proportion of papers published in the US at different time points. How did you adjust for multiple comparisons?

Minor essential revisions

Please reference these relevant publications:


Methods section for some reason comes at the end of the paper.

I note that in the 2010 Journal Citation Report there are 20 journals with impact factors of over 1, rather than 19 as mentioned in your methods – I think just a typo as you included Anaesthesia and Intensive Care – the 20th ranked with an IF of 1.128.

Why not simply include all journals in the category which are English language and not specific to pain medicine? The choice of an IF of 1 seems somewhat arbitrary, as of course papers in journals with low impact factors can be highly cited and vice versa. With this methodological choice you have only excluded the Journal of Anesthesia but I think you should justify this apparently arbitrary choice.

Discussion

You write - “Szokol et al observed an approximately 50% reduction in the percentage of US basic science and clinical research articles published in Anesthesiology and Anesthesia and Analgesia in 1980 compared with 2000” – is “1980” and “2000” the wrong way round here?

Discretionary revisions
Table 1 – it would be helpful if this table included percentages

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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