

## **An evolving case for centering health equity as a research priority in predominantly White academic medical centers**

Elizabeth A. Bonney, MD, MPH<sup>1</sup>, Gagan Deep Bajaj PhD<sup>2</sup>, Olivia O. Darko BA<sup>1</sup>, Maria Mercedes Avila, PhD<sup>3</sup>, and Brittany M. Williams, PhD<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences, University of Vermont, Larner College of Medicine, <sup>2</sup>Office of the Vice President for Research, University of Vermont, <sup>3</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Larner College of Medicine, University of Vermont, <sup>4</sup>Department of Education, College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT USA

Corresponding author:

Elizabeth A Bonney, MD, MPH

University of Vermont, Larner College of Medicine

Given Building Rm C-246

86 Beaumont Avenue

Burlington, Vermont, 05405

[elizabeth.bonney@med.uvm.edu](mailto:elizabeth.bonney@med.uvm.edu)

Keywords: Health Equity, Vermont, Research Capacity, Health Disparities, Social Justice

### **ABSTRACT:**

Purpose: Health disparities impact those minoritized by race, class, gender nonconformance, and rurality. There is an urgent need to shift scholarly focus from merely documenting health disparities to effecting change

through health equity research. The present mixed-methods study explores the motivation, opportunities, and barriers in performing health equity research in a majority white college of medicine.

Methods: We use landscape analysis: surveys, focus groups, and interviews with expressly interested faculty.

Results: Our findings suggest there are barriers to communication, access, and recognition for health equity research that impact and influence the existence and possibilities of health equity scholarship in Vermont.

Conclusion: Colleges of medicine are increasingly recognized as being responsible for advancing Health Equity. Our findings underscore the necessity of this work within the state of Vermont and offer recommendations to remove barriers at our institution and others similarly situated.

## BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The healthcare system has played a vital role in slavery<sup>1</sup>, forced sterilization<sup>2</sup>, providing the intellectual basis for discrimination, inappropriate clinical trials<sup>3</sup>, unethical medical experimentation, and lack of intervention against group-targeted societal violence<sup>4</sup>. This history governs the basis of the societal issues affecting our current healthcare system, and further contributes to factors that have eroded trust between healthcare providers, marginalized patients and their communities. For example, Black and Hispanic patients are more likely to report distrust in their healthcare providers compared to their white peers<sup>5</sup>, which might contribute to poor health and mental healthcare outcomes in these patients and communities. Research suggests a complex interaction between different variables, including socioeconomic factors, city of residence, and race/ethnicity and provider distrust<sup>6</sup>.

Solving the complexities of marginalized group health requires approaches beyond superficially recognizing differences in disease outcomes. Scholars must use a holistic lens to shift from a focus on health disparity towards a health equity<sup>7</sup>. This requires contextualization beyond access to care<sup>8,9</sup> and broad examination of health system-related factors including the diversity of the healthcare workforce and disease de-stigmatization<sup>10</sup>.

Provider groups differ in their belief that health disparities exist and are based on income, English literacy, education, or race/ethnicity<sup>11</sup>. White and Asian physicians are less likely to acknowledge healthcare disparities compared to physicians of other groups: most believe that health insurance status is the principal driver of healthcare disparities<sup>11</sup>, suggesting that while they understand potential gaps in healthcare access, they have yet to connect this to systemic causes, which cannot be corrected by provider education alone. Evidence suggests that when healthcare providers are educated on bias and its role in perpetuating health disparities, generated changes in bias awareness are often not sustained<sup>12</sup>. This waning awareness occurs concurrently with structural and systemic forces that maintain health inequities<sup>12</sup> and further does not fully explain why individual providers retain prejudices against marginalized communities that negatively impact their care. Another explanation can be found in the very nature of academia itself: who gets to participate, who is supported and meaningfully

heard, whose trauma is adequately addressed, who does work that is valued<sup>13</sup>, and who gets to lead<sup>14</sup>. Black women across academe have (in)formally asked these questions<sup>15</sup>.

Yet, the onus of asking and answering questions relevant to health equity cannot rest squarely on those marginalized in the medical profession. Research not only into health disparities, but also health equity must be seen as vital to systematically enhancing the health of the entirety of medicine. Health equity research is the critical route by which we derive, test, and assess evidence-based interventions to alleviate health inequities and uplift and center marginalized communities. It encompasses all critical methods and approaches to intentional, disciplined and scientific inquiry that could be harnessed in achieving true health equity. Such research must also substantively involve healthcare consumers and communities—making no conclusions without consulting their members. If done appropriately such work is a mechanism to acknowledge and interrogate historical wrongs and heal relationships with the healthcare system<sup>16,17</sup>. It must ensure community access to information, opportunities for project oversight, authorship and training, and pathways to incorporate change<sup>18</sup>.

Despite the existence of organizationally diverse groups that are actively engaged in health equity research, many academic environments persist in a state of relative underdevelopment in this area<sup>19</sup>. We believe Vermont to be one of those environments. Here, historically unserved and underserved communities, including former refugee, immigrant, aboriginal, migrant farm-working, and Hispanic/Latinx communities have experienced negative interactions with healthcare centers, providers and researchers<sup>5,6</sup>. This discord has a historical context. For example, Vermont supported forced sterilization of indigenous peoples<sup>20</sup> and lagged in its formal recognition of members of this group.

We sought to determine Vermont's academic medical environment and its trajectory in elevating health equity as one of its strategic priorities. Through an examination of publication data, surveys, focus groups and interviews we sought to answer the specific questions: (1) what is the current landscape of health equity research in and on the State of Vermont; and (2) how do scholars who espouse a commitment towards diversity, equity, and inclusion in Vermont understand and operationalize health equity? Our findings suggest that Vermont is ripe for further investment in mentorship, collaboration, and innovation in health equity scholarship.

## **METHODS**

### *Human subjects.*

The Research Protections Office of the University of Vermont deemed the project to be “not human-subjects research”.

### *Literature search.*

We searched English language literature from medicine, science, and health-related databases (Medline Ovid, World of Science, and CINHALL) using the terms health disparities, health equity, health equity research, social justice, and Vermont. We read the citation titles/abstracts for relevance and catalogued author affiliations. Six searches were done including two per database: one for Vermont-affiliated publications; the second for all publications. Searches were conducted June 23rd, 2022. Each probe was time-limited to January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2021 (few Vermont-related articles met criteria before 2000). Our refined Web of Science search included citations related to medicine and public health from the “Science Citation Index Expanded” collection. We imported chosen citations into EndNote, removed duplicates and removed non-peer-reviewed article citations. After cleaning, citations were exported to Microsoft Excel for analysis. Two investigators (Authors 1 and 3) reviewed the list of VT-affiliated articles and removed those deemed irrelevant.

A list of scholars in collaborating institutions was used to further validate the articles.

### *Interest in pursuing Health Equity research at the Larner College of medicine (LCOM):*

1) *Survey* : To gauge faculty interest in health equity research, we connected with the developing administrative network driven by the Office of Diversity Equity and Inclusion within LCOM. This office supports “diversity champions” for each department. A survey was sent out to diversity champions and other key stakeholders who had participated in the 2019 cohort of the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Certificate program at LCOM. The respondents were from all career stages within LCOM. Interested participants were invited back for focus groups.

2) *Faculty focus groups*: To further understand interest in health equity research we conducted four online, focus group sessions<sup>21</sup> from December 14, 2020 to February 11, 2021. Each 1.5-hour focus group session comprised up to 8 participants, and included at least one facilitator. Participants (15) were from eight academic units. Twelve identified as women or gender minorities, 3 identified as male, 14 as white, and one of color.

Discussion built on questions similar to those in the diversity champion survey. All participants received a summary of orienting definitions, purpose, questions to which to respond in advance. Definitions used were scholarly-based composites that synthesized the current landscape and best practices<sup>22</sup> The sessions were recorded and transcribed later for analysis. We analyzed the group findings for the presence of themes as they spontaneously evolved<sup>21</sup>.

## RESULTS

### *Trends in publications focused on health equity research in Vermont.*

**Figure 1** shows encouraging trends in publications in Health Equity from Vermont (**Figure 1B**). We estimate that over 80% of the 56,297 English language journal articles published from 2000 to 2021 found using our search criteria were critically relevant to aspects of health equity. We also found and manually verified that 252 of these were published in affiliation with VT or UVM. Despite the significant difference in the volume of VT-affiliated journal articles in comparison to all English articles (**Figure 1A**), both analyses demonstrate a notable increase in cumulative publications following 2012. ***This suggests a possible push for health equity research over the past 10 years.*** We also compiled a list of investigators in or affiliated with Vermont academic or health-related institutions such as the Vermont Department of Health and the VA Medical Center at White River Junction. We estimate that approximately 60 published investigators related to Vermont institutions are engaged or might be interested in health equity research.

### *Survey of Diversity Champions.*

We invited all LCOM departmental diversity champions and participants in a recent diversity training program to participate in a survey. Of the 31 invited participants, 17 responded, and 15 (48.4%) completed this survey. 73% of the respondents were interested in performing health disparity/equity research, while 47% indicated departmental support for this work. 46% of respondents identified other colleagues potentially working or interested in this work. From the responses, we identified names of 12 additional faculty to invite for the focus groups. In all, we invited 19 faculty to participate in the focus groups.

### *Faculty focus groups.*

Fifteen faculty (12 women and 3 men) from 8 academic departments participated, and were mostly white-identified.

We used a conversational style that facilitated dissemination of information, including establishing definitions<sup>22</sup>. In addition to definitions, the group discussed feasibility, barriers and opportunities related to doing this work for a career (**Table 1**).

Many participants were concerned about the definitions of health disparity and health equity. Moreover, some participants were more willing to attribute lack of healthcare access to rurality and age rather than categorize barriers as mechanisms of discrimination against marginalized groups.

The idea that health-equity research is a mechanism to develop and implement interventions to attain health equity generated strong feelings of inadequacy. This led to discussions about measurement and methodology. For example, some were uncomfortable with the idea of measuring racism and discrimination but were more comfortable with the quantitative idea of measuring representation, although they acknowledged that lack of representation may be driven by racism and discrimination.

Some participants faced major barriers and frustrations and noted specific and critical needs and lack of support for investigators in this area, from idea to funding to project completion and publication. Concerns included the structural biases that decrease the perceived value of this work; the inherent career costs relative to other pathways in academic medicine; the important but under-recognized value of advocacy in general; and advocacy's lack of a place in standard notions of scholarship, career advancement, and promotion.

Participants discussed the costs for faculty members from marginalized groups, including undue expectations to support institutional DEIA efforts, which further exacerbates the burden of research in this difficult area. One of the participants noted the gender representation of the focus groups and observed: **“It's actually a national issue when we look at how these priorities and health-equity research or social-justice work is generally led by, most often, women and not men. So that's another area that we need to advocate for, because when you look at who are the directors of [research] centers is generally men...”**

Despite the stated barriers, all participants felt that this area needs to be addressed and that doing so would benefit patients and the institutions that serve them.

Participants identified the need for intentional and positive ongoing engagement with marginalized communities and community partners.

Participants also recognized the need for a strong community of investigators who are committed to this topic; will incorporate health equity into their current research program; will engage experts in the field; and will collaborate with, mentor, and support those who are seeking to pursue this work.

Overall, the participants expressed interest and commitment to this area of research and desire for further engagement and support.

## **DISCUSSION**

### *Increasing diversity in Vermont and in the healthcare workforce.*

Vermont's population exhibits increases in racial and other elements of diversity. In highly populated areas, such as Chittenden county there has been an increase, in numbers and proportions, of Hispanic, Black/African, Aboriginal, Native Hawaiian/islander, and multiracial peoples (<https://datausa.io/profile/geo/chittenden-county-vt#demographics>) (data and analyses available on request).

### *Health-care workforce diversity data from Vermont.*

We have observed similar trends in diversity within the healthcare workforce through an analysis of census data of Vermont providers (AHS.VDHPPhysicianCensus@vermont.gov). Only since 2014 has there been data allowing estimation of the diversity of the state's healthcare workforce (Courtesy Jessica Moore, [jessica.moore@vermont.gov](mailto:jessica.moore@vermont.gov); data and analyses available on request). However, the relevant retention rate is unmeasured and thus not known<sup>12</sup>.

Growing a diverse academic workforce will need enhanced mechanisms of recruitment and retention. An important retention factor is success in scholarly activities. The success rate of federal funding by investigators in marginalized groups is less than that in white-identified groups<sup>23</sup>. While this is likely related to structural racism in academic medicine, one clearly defined factor is that faculty of color seek to do research in areas relevant to health equity and care of marginalized populations. This is less-well funded than other areas<sup>23</sup> and may contribute to the overall decreased success<sup>24</sup>. Therefore, an increase in federal sources of support for such



research could increase the diversity of academic faculty, provided it does not solely incentivize majority investigators to seek additional funding for their ongoing research programs. To diversify, academic institutions in states such as Vermont must provide financial support for this work in addition to building other resources to further support, embed, and center diversity and benefit faculty of color and from marginalized groups. Even incrementally enhanced support may yield significant productivity, portfolio, and engaged participants.

### *Redefinition and revitalization.*

Much existing research focuses on health disparities driven by rurality<sup>25</sup> and reduced access to care, patient behavior, or race as denoting genetic predisposition, with limited assessment of social determinants and societal mechanisms of marginalization. Few Vermont investigators focus on the intricate role potentially played by systemic factors in health inequity. However, Vermont's academic medical center is affiliated with a larger academic community with researchers focused on issues such as environmental and criminal justice and food systems, which may be incorporated into the examination of Health Equity.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Further work is needed to:**

1. Identify and implement appropriate guidelines, “roadmaps” and strategies to improve health equity research
2. Refocus and revitalize existing infrastructure to build robust, integrated capacity in health equity research
3. Apply the highest standards of cultural and linguistic guidelines to the existing IRB structure.
4. Building on work already initiated through collaborations between the UVM Office of Diversity and the UVM Medical Center, create additional mechanisms to connect the Health Equity research community, including information clearinghouses, websites and opportunities for round table discussions.
5. Increase direct support for Health Equity research through internal funding, assignment of administrative (e.g., pre and post grant award) resources, and building dedicated infrastructure with specific funding allocated to support Health Equity research initiatives.
6. Align institutional funding and financial priorities with Health Equity

## **CONCLUSION**

A move towards health equity would enable Vermont health educators and providers to facilitate conditions wherein equity permeates every process and workflow, including biomedical research. While there are no simple one-size-fits-all solutions, there are specific and measurable goals that Vermont scholars, educators and practitioners can take to move towards health equity. Considering these issues for all Vermonters has never been more important.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge that the University of Vermont *sits within a place of gathering and exchange, shaped by water and stewarded by ongoing generations of Indigenous peoples, in particular the Western Abenaki.*

We also acknowledge support from the Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) program (to EAB), the LCOM Equity & Inclusion Excellence Certificate Cohort program (to GB), and to the University of Vermont Office of the Vice President for Research, Departments of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences and Pediatrics and Vermont Leadership Education in Neurodevelopmental Disabilities Program.

Transcription Services were provided by Maria Clara Avila, RN, MS.

**Table 1. Themes that emerged during faculty focus groups' discussions**

**Theme 1: Health equity as a process and health-equity research as a mechanism are difficult to understand...The difference between inequity and disparity? It is difficult to measure elements like racism, easier to measure and mitigate elements like representation.**

*“Social exclusion, marginalization, discrimination, and disadvantage can't be measured. I thought that they could, but [it's] just that there's a lot of confounders.”*

*“Institutional systemic racism... I felt like that definitely could be measured in qualitative research. Quantitative research would be difficult, but I wouldn't say—I wouldn't say impossible, and I think important in terms of mainstream journals.”*

**Theme 2: Lack of recognition of health disparities research as “real research”; not felt to be of the same academic value for career trajectory; lack of pilot funding; lack of designated research time**

*[Participant 2, session 1] “So, I would say that, when I get a grant or something to do the work, it's often... I often get the sense that it's a burden on the system... I definitely have not always felt supported in words... in actions, no... So...I'm just going to be really honest about that.”*

*[Participant 2, Session 3] “I'm just thinking out loud here about the types of things that are supported in academic medicine. I don't know if there's always this type of work. I think that falls along almost, like, advocacy lines where there may not be as much power in your promotional packet.”*

*[Participant 1, session 3] “I know we could measure differences between institutions that do recognize exactly what you just said, advocacy and policy work, which is traditionally—at least in many institutions—not sort of recognized in the criteria for promotion... And yet some institutions are turning to that and are becoming more quantitative about measuring that and using it as, you know, as criteria for promotion.”*

*[Participant 2, session 3] “It also reminds me of the divide between, like, just the perception of community practice and community medicine versus academic medicine and that when you're talking about improvement of health of populations and these kind of lighter policy things that affect health disparities, like... it does kind of fall more into that realm. And I think within academics, there's a lot of, like, kind of turning up noses at community work, if that makes sense. But I think that's kind of speaking to a cultural divide.”*

*[Participant 4, session 1] “I just wanted to make an observation that just came to me, which is that all of us that are doing work in this area—if we were at a school of public health, we would be supported.”*

**Theme 3: The tension between advocacy and academia**

*[Participant 1, Session 1] “I feel like I would need to collaborate...it would be not easy but possible to incorporate into the other things that I do...I would have to give up some duties, possibly, but that would be OK [pause]...And I do have leadership and institutional support, but not financial.”*

*[Participant 4, session 1] “And I see my junior colleagues kind of walk that line: if I get a grant, will this really change what I’m doing? How does the math all work out? So, I think that research is not always encouraged, as you would think it would be, at an academic medical center... Yes, you can find praise when you get a grant, but then you know the difference of the kind of the pom-poms kind of support versus the time kind of support. So, I can certainly echo that.”*

*[Participant 2, session 1] “I feel like I get the support of leadership verbally but not financially and not when it comes down to actually doing the work. I think that there’s a desire to support it, but sometimes it’s just the desire is a little bit different than the actual doing of the work.”*

*[Participant 2, session 1] “The most recent project I started with... I mean, that nearly broke me getting that going. It was really an uphill battle. I would call people; they would say to me, ‘Frankly, I’ve been told not to help you.’ And I don’t mean to be critical of anybody. I just think the mechanism of the system is in place. There isn’t the support.”*

**Theme 4: The burden for supporting initiatives related to diversity, equity, and inclusion often falls on women and underrepresented minorities within the college**

*[Participant 5, session 1] “It’s actually a national issue when we look at how these priorities and health-equity research or social-justice work is generally led by, most often, women and not men. So that’s another area that we need to advocate for, because when you look at who are the directors of [research] centers, [it] is generally men.”*

**Theme 5: Unmet needs:**

- **Support from idea to grant (e.g., funding-opportunity newsletter, IRB, statistics, grant writing and application process)**
- **There is an unmet need to provide comprehensive support from award to study (e.g., budget and human resources)**

**Theme 6: There is a lack of awareness about sensitive community concerns by institutional review boards, clinicians, and clinician researchers**

**Theme 7: There is strong support for and strong need to coalesce the health-equity research community around shared goals**

*[Participant 1, session 3] “I think we need more focused efforts to address [health disparities] and develop responses that will lead to achieving health equity for our Vermont population.”*

*[Participant 2, session 3] “I really think that an investment in this kind of research is a really key way to make UVM and LCOM a more reliable ally for disenfranchised groups in our community.”*

*[Participant 5, session 1] “It’s certainly [that] Vermont and a regional community would benefit from research and health equity. But I would say definitely even beyond the regional benefit, [I] can see Vermont really having a leading role in this, and it*

*could benefit, you know, nationally or internationally, depending on the scope of the specific area of research.”*

*[Participant 2, session 3] “I think a health-equity lens would help existing research programs because it would include a huge population that we're probably missing unless people have really targeted and set aside things in their budget to pay interpreters to consent and do research”*

**Theme 8: Need for connections among trainees, junior faculty, mentors, and experts in the field (~80% of focus group participants identified this as a need)**

*[Participant 3, Session 2] “I think those building those relationships and breaking down the silos would be helpful too...just across departments and within departments—to know what we're all doing, what each other is doing. So, and I would absolutely be happy to help advocate for it at the College of Medicine and network level as well.”*

**Theme 9: Community—lack of meaningful ongoing engagement and partnerships, but this research stands to provide great benefit**

*[Participant 1, Session 3] “As I said, I do feel we have great community partnerships with the state of Vermont—the health department, in particular—agency of human services, lots of community organizations that serve kids and serve kids and families. But those have come with many, many years that we've invested in developing those relationships.”*

*“And so, I think one thing, that it's helpful to have mentorship in different areas, but I still think it would be more helpful if it was relevant to topics that I am interested in researching.”*

*[Participant 6, session 1] “I think, oftentimes, faculty are passionate about doing research and passionate about social change. But then as soon as it comes to these small barriers that feel insurmountable, they may back off, and they kind of lose that momentum. And so, I think that's something that can really help with that social dimension.”*

*[Participant 4, session 1] “So, if there's a center for health-equity research, it gets recognized as a leader. It has a name; it has a place. It has some place that people can go for resources, for mentorship, for advice...But I'd love to... I'd love to see a Center for Health Disparities Research, there is a Center for Health Services research... I think that challenge there is that you might end up with a lot of centers. And again, at that point, it might as well all end up at school of public health. But that's just me.”*

## REFERENCES:

- 1 Savitt, T. L. The Use of Blacks for Medical Experimentation and Demonstration in the Old South. *The Journal of Southern History* **48**, 331-348 (1982). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2207450>
- 2 Black, K. A., Rich, R. & Felske-Durksen, C. Forced and Coerced Sterilization of Indigenous Peoples: Considerations for Health Care Providers. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* **43**, 1090-1093 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jogc.2021.04.006>
- 3 Piller, C. Failure to protect? *Science* **373**, 729-733 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.373.6556.729>
- 4 Hardeman, R. R., Medina, E. M. & Kozhimannil, K. B. Structural Racism and Supporting Black Lives — The Role of Health Professionals. *New England Journal of Medicine* **375**, 2113-2115 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1609535>
- 5 Birkhäuser, J. *et al.* Trust in the health care professional and health outcome: A meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **12**, e0170988 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0170988>
- 6 Hostetter M, K. S. Understanding and ameliorating medical mistrust among Black Americans. (2021).
- 7 Srinivasan, S. & Williams, S. D. Transitioning from health disparities to a health equity research agenda: the time is now. *Public Health Rep* **129 Suppl 2**, 71-76 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549141291s213>
- 8 Dehlendorf, C., Bryant, A. S., Huddleston, H. G., Jacoby, V. L. & Fujimoto, V. Y. Health disparities: definitions and measurements. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* **202**, 212-213 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2009.12.003>
- 9 Woolf, S. H. Necessary But Not Sufficient: Why Health Care Alone Cannot Improve Population Health and Reduce Health Inequities. *Ann Fam Med* **17**, 196-199 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.2395>
- 10 Schiff, D. M. *et al.* Perinatal Opioid Use Disorder Research, Race, and Racism: A Scoping Review. *Pediatrics* **149** (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2021-052368>
- 11 Foundation, T. K. F. National Survey of Physicians Part I: Doctors on Disparities in Medical Care. (2002).

- 12 Vela, M. B. *et al.* Eliminating Explicit and Implicit Biases in Health Care: Evidence and Research Needs. *Annu Rev Public Health* **43**, 477-501 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-052620-103528>
- 13 Kwon, D. The rise of citational justice: how scholars are making references fairer. *Nature* **603**, 568-571 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-00793-1>
- 14 Wyatt, T. R., Taylor, T. R., White, D. & Rockich-Winston, N. "When No One Sees You as Black": The Effect of Racial Violence on Black Trainees and Physicians. *Acad Med* **96**, S17-s22 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0000000000004263>
- 15 Bowleg, L. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House": Ten Critical Lessons for Black and Other Health Equity Researchers of Color. *Health Education & Behavior* **48**, 237-249 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1177/10901981211007402>
- 16 Eniasivam, A., Pereira, L. & Dzens, E. A Call for Restorative and Transformative Justice Approaches to Anti-Racism in Medicine. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* **37**, 2335-2336 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-022-07605-2>
- 17 Gewin, V. How to include Indigenous researchers and their knowledge. *Nature* **589**, 315-317 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-00022-1>
- 18 Long, R. *et al.* "Community engagement via restorative justice to build equity-oriented crisis standards of care". *Journal of the National Medical Association* **114**, 377-389 (2022). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnma.2022.02.010>
- 19 Alberti, P. M. *et al.* Communities, Social Justice, and Academic Health Centers. *Acad Med* **93**, 20-24 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0000000000001678>
- 20 Kaelber, L. *Eugenics: Compulsory Sterilization in 50 American States (Vermont)*, <https://www.uvm.edu/~lkaelber/eugenics/VT/VT.html> (2011).
- 21 Kitzinger, J. Qualitative Research: Introducing focus groups. *BMJ* **311**, 299-302 (1995). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.311.7000.299>



- 22 Braveman P, A. E., Orleans T, Proctor D, Plough A What is Health Equity? , (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 2017).
- 23 Ginther, D. K. *et al.* Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards. *Science* **333**, 1015-1019 (2011).  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1196783>
- 24 Hoppe, T. A. *et al.* Topic choice contributes to the lower rate of NIH awards to African-American/black scientists. *Sci Adv* **5**, eaaw7238 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw7238>
- 25 Wallace, A. E., Weeks, W. B., Wang, S., Lee, A. F. & Kazis, L. E. Rural and urban disparities in health-related quality of life among veterans with psychiatric disorders. *Psychiatr Serv* **57**, 851-856 (2006).  
<https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.2006.57.6.851>

## FIGURE LEGEND

**Figure 1:** Comparison of cumulative publications relevant to Health disparities and Health equity in Vermont. **1A:** Analysis of all publications through 2021. **1B:** Vermont-associated publications.

