

1 **Trends in the Proportion of Women as peer reviewers in JAMA, 2009-2018**

2

3 Lisa Kipersztok, MD, MPH<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Gwinyai Masukume, MB ChB, MSc<sup>3</sup>, Julio González-

4 Álvarez, PhD<sup>4</sup>, Victor Grech, MD, PhD<sup>3</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup>Virginia Garcia Memorial Health Center, Beaverton, Oregon, United States

7 <sup>2</sup>Oregon Health and Sciences University, Tuality Hospital, Hillsboro, Oregon, United States

8 <sup>3</sup>Academic Department of Paediatrics, Medical School, Mater Dei Hospital, Malta

9 <sup>4</sup>Department of Basic and Clinical Psychology and Psychobiology, University Jaume I,

10 Castellón de la Plana, Spain

11

12 \*Corresponding author: [lisakip@gmail.com](mailto:lisakip@gmail.com)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 The achievement of gender equity by 2030 is one of the international Sustainable  
28 Development Goals adopted by United Nations member states. Peer review is crucial to  
29 academia and diverse perspectives add significant value by avoiding publication biases. We  
30 investigated the trend in female peer reviewers in *JAMA*, a globally influential medical  
31 journal, over the past decade. Based on publicly available data with a sample size of 33,745,  
32 we found an increased proportion of female peer reviewers from 23.9% in 2009, to a peak of  
33 29.1% in 2018. Despite an increase in the proportion of female peer reviewers over the past  
34 decade, if we assume a linear trend, gender equity in peer reviewers for *JAMA* would not be  
35 reached until 2065, beyond the 2030 Sustainable Development Goal target.

36

37 **Key words**

38 gender equity, peer review, academic medicine, journalology

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

## 51 **Introduction**

52 The achievement of gender equity by 2030 is one of the international Sustainable  
53 Development Goals adopted by United Nations member states, an avowed means to improve  
54 health and wellbeing for all populations.<sup>1</sup> Although women remain underrepresented in  
55 academic medicine, their representation has improved over the past decade.<sup>2</sup> Just one decade  
56 ago, the proportion of female peer reviewers was less than 30% for *JAMA* and five other  
57 leading international general medical journals.<sup>3</sup> Peer review is crucial to academia and  
58 diverse perspectives add significant value by avoiding publication biases.<sup>4</sup> We investigated  
59 the trend in female peer reviewers in *JAMA*, a globally influential medical journal, over the  
60 past decade.

61

## 62 **Methods**

63 We used publicly available data on *JAMA* peer reviewers from 2009 through 2018.<sup>5</sup>  
64 Institutional review board approval was not required because of the public nature of this  
65 dataset. We determined reviewer gender by way of their first name, using [https://gender-](https://gender-api.com/)  
66 [api.com/](https://gender-api.com/), which has an extensive database of forenames linked to gender. Given our sample  
67 size of 33,745, assuming a 5% error margin and a 95% confidence interval, we randomly  
68 selected 400 reviewers for manual gender identification through online searches for pronouns  
69 like he/she and photographic information.

70

## 71 **Results**

72 From the random sample of 400, after several attempts, the gender of nine peer reviewers  
73 were unable to be determined. The remaining 391 reviewers corresponded to 274 males  
74 (70.1%) and 117 females (29.9%). The agreement between manual and automatic gender  
75 classification was statistically adequate at 96.9%.

76 The proportion of female reviewers increased over the study period, from 23.9% in 2009, to a  
77 peak of 29.1% in 2018 as depicted in the **Figure**. Assuming a linear trend, the percentage of  
78 women reviewers increased by 0.4% annually (Spearman's rho,  $p = 0.008$ ) over the decade.

79

## 80 **Discussion**

81 We found an increased proportion of female peer reviewers from 2009 to 2018. However, if  
82 the current trend is maintained, in 2030, only 34% of *JAMA* peer reviewers will be females.  
83 Assuming the same trend, gender equity in peer reviewers for *JAMA* would not be reached  
84 until 2065.

85 The limitations of this study include the assessment of one journal. Additionally, we were  
86 unable to determine non-binary representation using our gender assessment method.

87 We suspect that the trend and proportion of female peer reviewers would be similar in other  
88 international and local medical journals, given the global underrepresentation of females in  
89 academic medicine.<sup>1,3</sup> Given the equivalent enrolment of females and males in United States  
90 medical schools and other jurisdictions for over two decades,<sup>6</sup> the low numbers of female  
91 peer reviewers persisting over the last decade (albeit with some improvement), is heartening  
92 but troubling. Given that peer reviewers tend to be older physicians, there may be a  
93 substantial lag period between increasing female physicians in academia and reaching equity.  
94 Continuing to measure and quantify female representation in academic medicine is a key step  
95 in achieving gender equity.<sup>1,6</sup>

96

## 97 **Conflict of interest**

98 None declared.

99

## 100 **Funding**

101 This study did not receive specific funding.

102

### 103 **References**

104 1. Friedrich MJ. Sustainable Development Goals Launched. *Jama*. 2016;315(7):647-.

105 2. Hart KL, Perlis RH. Trends in Proportion of Women as Authors of Medical Journal  
106 Articles, 2008-2018. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2019;179(9):1285-7.


107 3. Erren TC, Groß JV, Shaw DM, Selle B. Representation of Women as Authors,  
108 Reviewers, Editors in Chief, and Editorial Board Members at 6 General Medical Journals in  
109 2010 and 2011. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2014;174(4):633-5.

110 4. Glonti K, Boutron I, Moher D, Hren D. Journal editors' perspectives on the roles and  
111 tasks of peer reviewers in biomedical journals: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open*.  
112 2019;9(11):e033421.

113 5. JAMA Peer Reviewers in 2009. *Jama*. 2010;303(8):781-93.

114 6. Morgan AU, Chaiyachati KH, Weissman GE, Liao JM. Eliminating Gender-Based  
115 Bias in Academic Medicine: More Than Naming the "Elephant in the Room". *J Gen Intern  
116 Med*. 2018;33(6):966-8.

117



118

119 **Figure.** Temporal trends for female peer reviewers.