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Author’s response to reviews:

We would like to thank the reviewer for all these comments. We have tried to address all the points raised by the reviewer, and a new version of the manuscript is being submitted.

Reviewer #2: This is a novel study on research imbalances in addressing health needs at global scale. The study uses state-of-the art bibliometric methods and makes a number of novel empirical funding. It is also commendable that the authors make their dataset publicly available in open access. Given its global scope and robust study design, it has strong potential to make impact on policy and practice. It is with no hesitation that I recommend it for publication. Before publication, the authors may wish to consider making three minor revisions:

Response 1. Data related to disease burden is freely available as well as publication related information extracted from MEDLINE. Our license agreement with Clarivate Analytics does not allow us to make the data extracted from Web of Science freely available. Readers can contact Clarivate Analytics to obtain the data (https://clarivate.com/webofsciencegroup/solutions/web-of-science/).

The sources used in the study have been mentioned in the manuscript, and we tried to provide a detailed methodology aiming at providing all information needed for its replication.

We made available aggregate results in accompanying excel files.

1) Abstract. Given that it is a research article, it would benefit from structuring the Abstract (Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusions) as per submission guidelines: https://health-policy-systems.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/research
Response 2. The abstract has been modified, following the suggestion of the reviewer.

2) Discussion. Provide references for this sentence: "Third, we do not find, as sometimes it is argued in the literature, diseases more prevalent in LoMICs and LICs (types 2 and 3) to be underrepresented in the most prestigious journals of disciplines (in the top quartile of journal impact factor)."

Response 3. We have rephrased the sentence as follows:

‘Third, we do not find diseases more prevalent in LoMICs and LICs (types 2 and 3) to be underrepresented in the most prestigious journals of disciplines (in the top quartile of journal impact factor) – against the expectations of the literature studying marginalisation in mainstream journals of the topics specifically relevant to developing countries (Vessuri et al., 2014; Bianco et al. (2016), Chavarro et al. (2017)."

Three relevant references have been added:


3) Consider introducing a subheading "Limitations and further research" before the last paragraph of Discussion.

Response 4. We added the subheading, as suggested by the reviewer.