PMID	TITLE	AUTHORS	JOURNAL/BOOK	PUBLICATION YEAR	SUMMARY	CATEGORY	TYPE
31548337	Women in Pediatrics: Progress, Barriers, and Opportunities for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion	Nancy D. Spector	Pediatrics	2019	The fair treatment of women pediatricians will require enhanced and simultaneous commitment from leaders in 4 key gatekeeper groups: academic medical centers, hospitals, health care organizations, and practices; medical societies; journals; and funding agencies. In this report, we describe the 6-step equity, diversity, and inclusion cycle, which provides a strategic methodology to (1) examine equity, diversity, and inclusion data; (2) share results with stakeholders; (3) investigate causality; (4) implement strategic interventions; (5) track outcomes and adjust strategies; and (6) disseminate results. Next steps include the enforcement of a climate of transparency and accountability, with leaders prioritizing and financially supporting workforce gender equity. This scientific and data-driven approach will accelerate progress and help pave a pathway to better health care and science.	salary expectations expectations of external funded time distribution of institutional resources	program evaluation
31633016	Topic choice contributes to the lower rate of NIH awards to African-American/black scientists	Travis A Hoppe, Aviva Litovitz, Kristine A Willis, Rebecca A Meseroll, Matthew J Perkins, B Ian Hutchins, Alison F Davis, Michael S Lauer, Hannah A Valantine, James M Anderson, George M Santangelo	Sci Adv.	2019	Despite efforts to promote diversity in the biomedical workforce, there remains a lower rate of funding of National Institutes of Health R01 applications submitted by African-American/black (AA/B) scientists relative to white scientists. To identify underlying causes of this funding gap, we analyzed six stages of the application process from 2011 to 2015 and found that disparate outcomes arise at three of the six: decision to discuss, impact score assignment, and a previously unstudied stage, topic choice. Notably, AA/B applicants tend to propose research on topics with lower award rates. These topics include research at the community and population level, as opposed to more fundamental and mechanistic investigations; the latter tend to have higher award rates. Topic choice alone accounts for over 20% of the funding gap after controlling for multiple variables, including the applicant's prior achievements. Our findings can be used to inform interventions designed to close the funding gap. 	expectations of external funded time other contributions	data driven