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Gender bias in publishing

- eLife: acceptance rates for female corresponding authors were lower than for men
- Royal Society of Chemistry: papers with female corresponding authors have a lower chance of being accepted
- Elsevier: women publish fewer papers on average than men
Thank you for submitting your manuscript, “The Utility of the Structured Clinical Interview for the DSM-5 Axis I Disorders (SCID-I) for the Assessment of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder in African Americans” to the journal *Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*. I read your manuscript carefully and unfortunately, I am not able to send it for review. I was concerned about the sample and the incremental contribution of the paper. I realize this is likely disappointing news but I do hope you are able to publish your manuscript elsewhere as it is well written. You might try the journal *Assessment* or a more specialized journal. I would like to thank you for forwarding your manuscript to us for consideration and wish you every success with your future work. – The Editor

Dr Monnica T Williams
Women and ethnic minorities are underrepresented at PI level, receive less funding on average.

Women are underrepresented as reviewers; reviewers favour authors of the same gender.

Papers with female corresponding authors have a lower chance of being accepted.

Male author papers are cited more, especially by men, who also cite themselves more.

Open access publishing mitigates gender based citation bias.

Dissemination and Access
Works are distributed in print or online, through libraries, retailers, and the web.

Preservation
Copies or versions of the work may be saved for posterity.

Reuse
Works get read, cited, and recombined.

Creation
Research gets proposed, funded, and reported on.

Evaluation
Academic works are evaluated for quality and edited by their peers.
Peer review

• Editors are more likely to appoint reviewers of the same gender, and assign reviewers papers written by authors of the same gender
  • Homophilic tendencies are widespread among male editors
  • A small number of strongly homophilic female editors exist, with most other female editors showing only minimal baseline homophily

• Men were more successful than women when the reviewers were all male, but have similar success rates to women when there was a mixed review panel
  • The acceptance rate for female authors was not lower for all-male reviewer teams compared with mixed reviewer teams

• Papers are more likely to be accepted if at least one of the reviewers was from the same country as the corresponding author
Examples of unprofessional peer reviews from survey respondents:

• The author’s status as a trans person has distorted his view of sex beyond the biological reality.
• Despite being a woman, the PI was trained by several leading men in the field and is thus likely adequately prepared to lead the proposed research.
• This is obviously written by a group from a lower standardized institution based on the quality of work.
• The author’s last name sounds Spanish. I didn’t read the manuscript because I’m sure it’s full of bad English.

(Silbiger and Stubler, 2019)
Dworkin et al 2020

Citing authors: man and man (MM)

Citing authors: woman or woman (WW)
Going forwards

• Journals
  • Increase diversity on editorial boards
  • Provide resources and training for reviewers to avoid bias
  • Avoid non-diverse reviewer panels

• Scientists
  • As a reviewer, ask about the diversity of the review group
  • Be mindful of who you cite
Any questions?
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