

KEY IDEAS

Bias Mitigation Training for Program
Staff and Reviewers

References

Bias Mitigation in Peer Review Training

This handout is a companion to the asynchronous Bias Mitigation in Peer Review Training for program staff developed by the Health Research Alliance. This handout lists the references cited within and used to inform the Bias Mitigation in Peer Review Training.

[Learn more about the Bias Mitigation in Peer Review Training](#)

References

Bias trainings that informed the development and design of the HRA Bias Mitigation Training

1. National Institutes of Health Center for Scientific Review. (n.d.). Bias Awareness and Mitigation Training. Retrieved May 10, 2023, from <https://public.csr.nih.gov/AboutCSR/Address-Bias-in-Peer-Review>
2. Biddinger, J. (2021). American Heart Association Peer Reviewer Unconscious Bias Training. Retrieved May 10, 2023, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pw96o8-hhmE>
3. American Institute of Biological Sciences. (2018). Reviewer Bias Training. Retrieved May 10, 2023, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Sg4n8wC_M
4. Canadian Institutes of Health Research. (2019). Bias in Peer Review. Retrieved May 10, 2023, from <https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/bias/module-eng.aspx?pedisable=true>
5. Carnes, M. Bias Reduction in Scientific Peer Review Training. Personal communication.

References that informed Module 1: Basics of Bias

1. Kahneman, D. [Thinking, Fast and Slow](#). (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011).
2. What is Unconscious Bias? (n.d.). Unconscious Bias Project. Retrieved May 9, 2023, from <https://www.unconsciousbiasproject.org/resources/explain-unconscious-bias>.
3. American Psychological Association. (n.d.). [Bias](#). In APA Dictionary of Psychology.

References cited in Module 2: Bias in Peer Review

1. Banchevsky, S., Westfall, J., Park, B. & Judd, C. M. [But You Don't Look Like A Scientist!: Women Scientists with Feminine Appearance are Deemed Less Likely to be Scientists](#). Sex Roles 75, 95–109 (2016).
2. Nosek, B. A. et al. [Pervasiveness and correlates of implicit attitudes and stereotypes](#). European Review of Social Psychology 18, 36–88 (2007).
3. Carli, L. L., Alawa, L., Lee, Y., Zhao, B. & Kim, E. [Stereotypes About Gender and Science: Women ≠ Scientists](#). Psychology of Women Quarterly 40, 244–260 (2016).
4. Bornmann, L., Mutz, R. & Daniel, H.-D. [Gender differences in grant peer review: A meta-analysis](#). Journal of Informetrics 1, 226–238 (2007).
5. Severin, A. et al. [Gender and other potential biases in peer review: cross-sectional analysis of 38 250 external peer review reports](#). BMJ Open 10, e035058 (2020).
6. Kaatz, A. et al. [Analysis of NIH R01 Application Critiques, Impact and Criteria Scores: Does the Sex of the Principal Investigator Make a Difference?](#) Acad Med 91, 1080–1088 (2016).

7. Kaatz, A., Dattalo, M., Regner, C., Filut, A. & Carnes, M. [Patterns of Feedback on the Bridge to Independence: A Qualitative Thematic Analysis of NIH Mentored Career Development Award Application Critiques](#). *J Womens Health (Larchmt)* 25, 78–90 (2016).
8. Lauer, M. S. & Roychowdhury, D. [Inequalities in the distribution of National Institutes of Health research project grant funding](#). *eLife* 10, e71712 (2021).
9. Murray, D. L. et al. [Bias in Research Grant Evaluation Has Dire Consequences for Small Universities](#). *PLOS ONE* 11, e0155876 (2016).
10. Tomkins, A., Zhang, M. & Heavlin, W. D. [Reviewer bias in single- versus double-blind peer review](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114, 12708–12713 (2017).
11. Ginther, D. K. et al. [Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards](#). *Science* 333, 1015–1019 (2011).
12. Ginther, D. K., Haak, L. L., Schaffer, W. T. & Kington, R. [Are Race, Ethnicity, and Medical School Affiliation Associated With NIH R01 Type Award Probability for Physician Investigators?](#) *Acad Med* 87, 1516–1524 (2012).
13. 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).
14. Ginther, D. K. et al. [Publications as predictors of racial and ethnic differences in NIH research awards](#). *PLoS One* 13, e0205929 (2018).
15. Nakamura, R. K. et al. [An experimental test of the effects of redacting grant applicant identifiers on peer review outcomes](#). *eLife* 10, e71368 (2021).
16. Eaton, A. A., Saunders, J. F., Jacobson, R. K. & West, K. [How Gender and Race Stereotypes Impact the Advancement of Scholars in STEM: Professors' Biased Evaluations of Physics and Biology Post-Doctoral Candidates](#). *Sex Roles* 82, 127–141 (2020).
17. Chapman, B. V. et al. [Linguistic Biases in Letters of Recommendation for Radiation Oncology Residency Applicants from 2015 to 2019](#). *J Canc Educ* 37, 965–972 (2022).
18. Powers, A. et al. [Race- and Gender-Based Differences in Descriptions of Applicants in the Letters of Recommendation for Orthopaedic Surgery Residency](#). *JB JS Open Access* 5, e20.00023 (2020).
19. Ross, D. A. et al. [Differences in words used to describe racial and gender groups in Medical Student Performance Evaluations](#). *PLOS ONE* 12, e0181659 (2017).
20. Wennerås, C. & Wold, A. [Nepotism and sexism in peer-review](#). *Nature* 387, 341–343 (1997).
21. Sandström, U. & Hällsten, M. [Persistent nepotism in peer-review](#). *Scientometrics* 74, 175–189 (2008).
22. Boudreau, K. J., Guinan, E., Lakhani, K. R. & Riedl, C. [The Novelty Paradox & Bias for Normal Science: Evidence from Randomized Medical Grant Proposal Evaluations](#). in *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2012).
23. Bromham, L., Dinnage, R. & Hua, X. [Interdisciplinary research has consistently lower funding success](#). *Nature* 534, 684–687 (2016).
24. Gallo, S. A., Sullivan, J. H. & Glisson, S. R. [The Influence of Peer Reviewer Expertise on the Evaluation of Research Funding Applications](#). *PLOS ONE* 11, e0165147 (2016).
25. Li, D. [Expertise vs. Bias in Evaluation: Evidence from the NIH](#). Harvard Business School Working Paper, No. 16-053 (2015).
26. Garcia, J. A., Rodriguez-Sánchez, R. & Fdez-Valdivia, J. [Confirmatory bias in peer review](#). *Scientometrics* 123, 517–533 (2020).
27. Manoogian III, J., & Benson, B. (2021). *Cognitive Bias Codex*. Visual Capitalist. Retrieved May 9, 2023, from <https://www.visualcapitalist.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/all-188-cognitive-biases.html>

References that informed Module 3: Strategies to Mitigate Bias

1. Uhlmann, E. & Cohen, G. L. [Constructed criteria: redefining merit to justify discrimination](#). *Psychol Sci* 16, 474–480 (2005).
2. Culpepper, D., White-Lewis, D., O'Meara, K., Templeton, L. & Anderson, J. [Do Rubrics Live up to Their Promise? Examining How Rubrics Mitigate Bias in Faculty Hiring](#). *The Journal of Higher Education* 1–28 (2023).
3. Blair-Loy, M., Mayorova, O. V., Cosman, P. C. & Fraley, S. I. [Can rubrics combat gender bias in faculty hiring?](#) *Science* 377, 35–37 (2022).
4. Liu, Z. [Does Reason Writing Reduce Decision Bias? Experimental Evidence from Judges in China](#). *The Journal of Legal Studies* 47, 83–118 (2018).
5. Mitchell, N. S., Stolzmann, K., Benning, L. V., Wormwood, J. B. & Linsky, A. M. [Effect of a Scoring Rubric on the Review of Scientific Meeting Abstracts](#). *J Gen Intern Med* 36, 2483–2485 (2021).
6. Parker, T. H. et al. [Empowering peer reviewers with a checklist to improve transparency](#). *Nat Ecol Evol* 2, 929–935 (2018).
7. De Winde, C. M. et al. [Towards inclusive funding practices for early career researchers](#). *JSPG* 18, (2021).
8. Yen, J. W. [De-biasing the evaluation process of in-person review panels for a postdoctoral fellowship](#). *Nat Astron* 3, 1041–1042 (2019).
9. Sievertsen, H. H., Gino, F. & Piovesan, M. [Cognitive fatigue influences students' performance on standardized tests](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113, 2621–2624 (2016).
10. Hirshleifer, D., Levi, Y., Lourie, B. & Teoh, S. H. [Decision fatigue and heuristic analyst forecasts](#). *Journal of Financial Economics* 133, 83–98 (2019).
11. Danziger, S., Levav, J. & Avnaim-Pesso, L. [Extraneous factors in judicial decisions](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108, 6889–6892 (2011).
12. Office of the Chief Diversity Officer, Tufts University. *Interrupting Bias: Calling Out vs. Calling In*. Diversity and Inclusion. Retrieved May 4, 2023, from <https://diversity.tufts.edu/resources/interrupting-bias-calling-out-vs-calling-in/>
13. Parkas, V., Maysonet, J., Chudow, J., Hess, L. & Swartz, T. H. ["Time-In": A Tool for Interrupting Bias in Medical School Admissions Committee Meetings](#). *Academic Medicine* 98, 580 (2023).