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Reviewer’s report:

The paper by Oertelt-Prigione et al. performed a detailed and informative analysis of publication trends for gender-related studies. It appears that gender-influenced works are rising over time. However, a specific lack of data on differences in clinical management between female and male patients could be identified.

The data are certainly interesting and may help defining the current status and the future research needs in the nascent field of gender medicine.

The work is well-written and contains clear and informative figures, thus it deserves to be published. However, I suggest that the authors address the minor points reported below in order to make the methodology at the base of the study clearer and easily understandable also to a broader and non-statistical savvy audience.

Major Compulsory Revision
none

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Article retrieval: explanatory sentences and background information have to be added regarding the designed search tool. What is a “text-mining algorithm”? What is the “Lucene Platform”? What it the “MeSH vocabulary”?

2) Statistical analysis: the performed analysis should be described in a more clear and understandable way. What is a “MySQL database”? What does it do and why was this chosen? What does it mean that the statistics were performed using “the Query Browser tool included in the MySQL GUI programs”? What is this tool and which kind of analysis does?

Discretionary Revisions

3) Studies involving human subjects: please add a few sentences commenting on these results in the results or discussion sections. Why is it relevant that human studies are conducted on large cohort? Can you add some speculative sentences about the implications for the field? In the abstract it is stated that “studies involving human subjects are frequently conducted in large cohorts with more than 1000 patients (24%).” What is 24% referring to? If it is referring to the number of studies with more than 1000 patients, than it does not appear to be a very high percentage and thus can not support the idea reported in the text.
Please rephrase the concept in order to clarify the data and their implications.

4) Please enter the page number at the bottom of each page.

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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