



EDITORIAL

Toward the elimination of bias in *Pediatric Research*

Pediatric Research (2019) 86:680–681;
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41390-019-0583-5>

There is increasing evidence that unconscious bias can affect real-world decision-making processes in publication just as in many other fields.¹ In response, the editorial board of *Pediatric Research* is working to investigate and reduce the bias in the publication acceptance rates in order to preserve the integrity of the peer review process and publication. As news items have suggested that gender bias is a major problem in academia,² we reviewed papers submitted between 1 November 2017 and 9 August 2018 to *Pediatric Research*. Encouragingly, we found that the acceptance rates of manuscripts were not significantly different between corresponding authors who were male or female. However, we incidentally uncovered a higher rejection rate in the manuscripts where the corresponding author had a name that could not be identified as either male or female and did not have a picture on their website so that we could identify their gender.³ It is important to point out that we do not know the reason for this, but its identification is the first step to further exploration, including assessing whether unconscious bias may play a role.

Diversity, including gender diversity leads to better science and may contribute to the “innovation dividend.”⁴ Many institutions are tackling unconscious bias through training. UK and Irish universities have to fulfill specific requirements under the Athena SWAN (Scientific Women’s Academic Network) Charter, a formalized agreement that acknowledges and rewards good practices in higher education and research institutions to improve ethnic, racial, and gender equality: representation, progression, and success for all.^{2,5} Universities and medical institutions worldwide have encouraged unconscious bias training including both the areas of equality and diversity. Some courses are available online (<https://www.tcd.ie/equality/training/lead-online-training/>; <http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/implicit-bias-training/>; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v015xXui9XQ&t=62s&app=desktop>; https://www.aamc.org/members/leadership/catalog/178420/unconscious_bias.html) making compliance relatively easy.

In a subsequent correspondence to our editorial, Jaggi et al.⁶ pointed out that the medical academy still has a long way to go in eliminating bias in publication rates. *Pediatric Research* agrees with this conclusion and would like to describe the efforts being taken to eliminate bias. We feel it is important to assess a more complete picture of potential gender bias by having essential data. Our actions are as follows:

First, the managing editor is collecting gender information of the first, last, and corresponding authors, as well as authors applying for and receiving our early career investigator publication award. Using these data, in the next few years, we will re-examine gender bias in acceptance rates at *Pediatric Research* for first and senior authors and early career investigators separately. This information will only be seen by the managing editor and is not revealed to the editors or reviewers as it is for internal use only.

Second, we are encouraging current members of the editorial board to participate in an unconscious bias course. All new

members of the editorial board will be required to take an online unconscious bias course as will our editorial apprentices.

Third, we are analyzing the reasons for rejection of manuscripts. Rejection can occur as Reject without Review (rejected before peer review), Reject (reviewers found a fatal flaw in the paper), or Reject and Resubmit (Reject and resubmit is used when the reviewers feel that revisions will take longer than the normal time for a resubmission but are enthusiastic about the manuscript). While we are gathering data to determine if papers that are novel and have merit are being rejected with repairable flaws, this analysis will also allow us to determine whether, unconsciously, gender plays a role in any of the “rejection” categories we have.

Many articles that are rejected come from low or very low resource countries. In some cases, these may be more appropriately handled by a “country advisor,” someone from the country of origin that could assist in developing the manuscript to a publishable form.⁷ We currently refer papers with merit but need attention to a Springer-Nature English editing resource to deal with language issues for manuscripts we wish to publish. *Pediatric Research* will identify first or last authors from accepted manuscripts from these nations in our new feature on Global Pediatric Research Community. They will be featured each month in a commentary and invited to join a resource to other authors in their countries who wish to publish in *Pediatric Research*.

However, many manuscripts will not be acceptable to *Pediatric Research*. There are many reasons for rejection. Some do not meet our rigorous scientific or ethical standards and many are simply beyond the scope of the topics we cover. In an effort to assist these latter manuscripts still to be published, we are developing a transfer desk with Springer-Nature, a formal mechanism to re-route these manuscripts to journals more suitable for their scope, either content-wise or articles that do not have a global impact.

In sum, *Pediatric Research* is combating bias, including unconscious bias, on multiple levels. Stay tuned for updates!

Cynthia Bearer¹, Carlo Agostoni², Kanwaljeet J. S. Anand³,
 Namasivayam Ambalavanan⁴, Vineet Bhandari⁵, Joseph M. Bliss⁶,
 Frank Bloomfield⁷, Sonia L. Bonifacio⁸, Irina Buhimschi⁹,
 Maria Roberta Cilio¹⁰, Max Coppes^{11,12}, Steven J. Czinn¹³,
 Afif EL-Khuffash¹⁴, Nicholas Embleton¹⁵,
 Ursula Felderhoff-Müser¹⁶, Donna M. Ferriero¹⁷, Todd Florin¹⁸,
 Elena Fuentes-Afflick¹⁹, William Gardner²⁰, Sidney M. Gospe Jr.²¹,
 Alistair Gunn²², Pierre Gressens²³, Dino Guissani²⁴, Nadja Haiden²⁵,
 Marissa Hauptman²⁶, Kwang Sik Kim²⁷, Mark Klebanoff²⁸,
 Peter Lachman²⁹, Bruce Lanphear³⁰, Seza Ozen³¹, Charles Roehr³²,
 Damian Roland³³, Norman Rosenblum³⁴, Margaret Schwarz³⁵,
 Annamaria Staiano³⁶, Annemarie Stroustrup³⁷,
 Enza Maria Valente³⁸, Dee Wilson-Costello³⁹, James Wynn⁴⁰ and
 Eleanor Molloy⁴¹

¹Department of Pediatrics, University of Maryland, Baltimore, MD, USA; ²Department of Pediatrics, IRCCS Ospedale Maggiore, Policlinico, University of Milan, Milan, Italy; ³Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA; ⁴University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA; ⁵Department of Neonatology, St. Christopher’s Hospital for Children, Philadelphia, PA, USA; ⁶Brown University, Women and Infants Hospital, Providence, RI, USA; ⁷Liggins

Received: 30 August 2019 Accepted: 30 August 2019
 Published online: 18 September 2019

Institute, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand; ⁸Neonatal and Developmental Medicine, NICU, Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto, CA, USA; ⁹Center for Perinatal Research, Nationwide Childrens Hospital, Columbus, OH, USA; ¹⁰Department of Neurology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA; ¹¹Pediatrics; UNSOM – Pediatrics, University of Nevada School of Medicine, Reno, NV, USA; ¹²Renown Health, Renown Children's Hospital, Reno, NV, USA; ¹³University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA; ¹⁴The Rotunda Hospital, Neonatology, The Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, Dublin, Ireland; ¹⁵Newcastle Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Royal Victoria Infirmary, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK; ¹⁶Department of Pediatrics I, University Hospital Essen, University of Duisburg-Essen, Essen, Germany; ¹⁷Weill Institute for Neurosciences, San Francisco, CA, USA; ¹⁸Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Pediatrics – Pediatric Emergency Medicine, Cincinnati, OH, USA; ¹⁹Department of Pediatrics, San Francisco General Hospital, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA; ²⁰CHEO Research Institute, Ottawa, ON, Canada; ²¹Seattle Children's Hospital, Neurology, Seattle, WA, USA; ²²Dept of Physiology, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand; ²³Hopital Robert Debre, Paris, France; ²⁴Physiology Development and Neuroscience, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; ²⁵Department of Clinical Pharmacology, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; ²⁶General Pediatrics, Children's Hospital Boston, Boston, MA, USA; ²⁷Pediatrics Infectious Diseases, Baltimore, MD, USA; ²⁸Nationwide Children's Hospital, Center for Perinatal Research, Columbus, OH, USA; ²⁹International Society for Quality in Health Care, Dublin, Ireland; ³⁰Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada; ³¹Hacettepe University School of Medicine, Pediatrics, Ankara, Turkey; ³²John Radcliffe Hospital, Newborn Care, Oxfordshire, UK; ³³College of Life Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK; ³⁴Sickkids Research Institute, Toronto, ON, Canada; ³⁵Indiana University School of

Medicine, Pediatrics, South Bend, IN, USA; ³⁶Department of Pediatrics, University of Naples, Naples, Italy; ³⁷Friedman Brain Institute, Pediatrics, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA; ³⁸Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Salerno, Baronissi, Italy; ³⁹Division of Pediatrics, UH Rainbow Babies and Children's Hospital, Cleveland, OH, USA; ⁴⁰University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA and ⁴¹Paediatrics and Child Health, Trinity College, Trinity Academic Centre, Tallaght Hospital, The University of Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
Correspondence: Cynthia Bearer (cbearer@som.umaryland.edu)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

REFERENCES

1. Oberai, H. & Anand, I. Unconscious bias: thinking without thinking. *Human Resource Management International Digest* **26**, 14–17 (2018).
2. Lundine, J., Bourgeault, I. L., Clark, J., Heidari, S. & Balabanova, D. The gendered system of academic publishing. *Lancet* **391**, 1754–1756 (2018).
3. Bearer, C. F. & Molloy, E. J. Gender bias at Pediatric Research? *Pediatr. Res* **86**, 2 (2019).
4. Nielsen, M. W. et al. Opinion: gender diversity leads to better science. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 1740–1742 (2017).
5. Donald, A., Harvey, P. H. & McLean, A. R. Athena SWAN awards: bridging the gender gap in UK science. *Nature* **478**, 7367 (2011).
6. Jagsi, R., Rivkees, S. & Opiari, V. P. An unbiased view about bias: not yet. *Pediatr. Res.* **86**, 10–11 (2019).
7. Woolston, C. & Osório, J. When English is not your mother tongue. *Nature* **570**, 265–267 (2019).