

1 **Gender disparities in international COVID-19 clinical trial leadership**

2
3 **Authors:** Muge Cevik^{1,2}, Syed Arefinul Haque³, Jennifer Manne-Goehler⁴, Krutika Kuppalli⁵, Paul
4 E. Sax^{4,6}, Maimuna S. Majumder⁷, Chloe Orkin^{8,9}

5
6 **Affiliations:**

- 7 1. Division of Infection and Global Health Research, School of Medicine, University of St Andrews, United
8 Kingdom
9 2. NHS Lothian Infection Service, Regional Infectious Diseases Unit, Western General Hospital,
10 Edinburgh, United Kingdom
11 3. Network Science Institute, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, United States
12 4. Division of Infectious Diseases, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, United States
13 5. Division of Infectious Diseases, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina,
14 United States
15 6. Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, United States
16 7. Boston Children's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, United States
17 8. Blizzard Institute, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom
18 9. Royal London Hospital, Barts Health NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

24 **Author of correspondence:**

25 Name: Dr Muge Cevik

26 Address: Division of Infection and Global Health Research, School of Medicine, University of St Andrews,
27 Fife, KY16 9TF

28 Telephone number: +447732800814

29 Email address: mc349@st-andrews.ac.uk

31 **Abstract**

32 The COVID-19 pandemic offers considerable possibilities for research and leadership that might equalize
33 opportunity in a new field; however, our study finds instead that more than two-thirds of investigators
34 leading COVID-19-related clinical studies are predicted to be men. These gender disparities in trial
35 leadership during the pandemic suggest that the structural reproduction of inequalities in research has
36 taken place once again in this new academic field. This indicates that policies are needed to facilitate
37 the identification and implementation of strategies to correct gender bias. The active participation of
38 women, trans and gender-nonconforming individuals are needed in research to drive scientific discovery
39 and innovation as well as to better address health disparities.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54 **Key words:** COVID-19, coronavirus, pandemic, SARS-CoV-2, novel coronavirus, gender

55 **Introduction**

56

57 In addition to the human and financial loss associated with the novel Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-
58 19) pandemic, COVID-19 has also had a significant impact on both the personal and professional life of
59 the global workforce, including that of the scientific research community [1-3]. Before COVID-19,
60 women occupied fewer leadership positions, led a fewer funded studies, and applied for and received
61 less grant funding than men when they did apply [4-7]. The employment gap that occurs when women
62 take parental leave impacts the rate of academic advancement and in turn the receipt of institutional
63 support to apply for and secure funding [6, 7]. These imbalances contribute to systemic inequalities that
64 hamper women's access to and progress in science [2, 7, 8]. A review of the gender distribution of 24
65 COVID-19 national task forces suggests that many committees are comprised of less than a quarter
66 women, indicating that women's voices and expertise have been excluded from decision making during
67 this unprecedented public health emergency [9].

68

69 For example, emerging data suggest that across all disciplines, despite an increased number of peer-
70 reviewed articles submitted to journals during the pandemic, women have published fewer papers than
71 men thus far this year [10]. This may indicate a similarly reduced involvement of women in research
72 leadership positions and an imbalanced distribution of grants and funding -- important indicators of
73 advancement in a scientist's academic career [4-7, 10, 11]. Being principal investigator (PI) on a clinical
74 trial is strongly associated with advancement to full professor among women academics in infectious
75 diseases [8].

76

77 The COVID-19 pandemic offers numerous opportunities in clinical research. These include trials to assess
78 the safety and efficacy of medical interventions, with protocols in various stages of implementation.

79 Here, we provide a timely analysis to compare the gender distribution of clinical trial leadership in
80 COVID-19 clinical trials.

81

82 **Materials and Methods**

83 We systematically searched <https://clinicaltrials.gov/> and retrieved all clinical trials on COVID-19
84 registered from January 1, 2020 to June 26, 2020 using “COVID” as a keyword. As a comparator group,
85 we have chosen two fields that are not related to emerging infections: breast cancer and type 2 diabetes
86 mellitus (T2DM). We retrieved all clinical trials related to these comparator conditions registered at
87 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/> within the aforementioned study period as well as those registered in the
88 preceding year (pre-study period: January 1, 2019 and December 31, 2019). Gender of the investigator
89 was predicted using the genderize.io API (application programming interface). This tool has been used to
90 predict the gender of first names in studies regarding gender bias [12, 13] and achieves a minimum
91 accuracy of 82%, with an F1 score of 90% for women and 86% for men [14]. Clinical trials were excluded
92 if i) investigator information was not provided; ii) the genderize.io API could not predict any of the
93 investigators’ gender from their first name; or iii) organization or company names were provided as the
94 investigator. The number of studies that were excluded for the above reasons are reported in the
95 supplementary flow diagram. An exploratory temporal analysis was conducted with the available data.
96 Categorical variables were summarized by frequencies and percentages. We compared groups using Chi-
97 square testing for equality of proportions with continuity correction.[15] The analysis was performed
98 using R (Version 4.0.2). The repository of the datasets used to collect and analyse the data available at
99 <https://osf.io/k2r57/>.

100

101 **Results**

102 We identified 2 345 COVID-19-related clinical trials. Of those, 1 448 had at least one investigator (i.e.,
103 principal investigator, study director, or study chair) identified whose gender could be predicted. In the
104 comparator group, we identified 449 trials on breast cancer and 272 on T2DM that were registered. Of
105 those, 274 breast cancer studies and 139 T2DM studies had at least one investigator whose gender
106 could be predicted.

107
108 Overall 27.8% of PIs among COVID-19-related studies were predicted to be women, which is significantly
109 different compared to 54.4% and 42.1% for breast cancer ($p<0.005$) and T2DM ($p<0.005$) trials over the
110 same period, respectively (Table 1). While there has been a small increase in the proportion of PIs who
111 were predicted to be women in May 2020, clinical research leadership for COVID-19 among this group
112 was below 25% for the remainder of the study period (Supplementary Material). While 31.4% of study
113 chairs were predicted to be women in COVID-19-related studies, 32.1% ($p=0.7$) and 63.6% ($p<0.01$) were
114 predicted to be women in breast cancer and T2DM trials, respectively. Proportion of study chairs were
115 not significantly different across the three fields.

116
117 We also reviewed comparator group studies registered before January 1, 2020 to determine whether
118 the pandemic might have affected gender distribution of trial leadership. We identified 839 clinical trials
119 related to breast cancer and 533 on T2DM over a 12-month period prior to January 1, 2020. Of those,
120 573 breast cancer studies and 359 T2DM studies yielded at least one investigator whose gender could
121 be predicted. During this “pre-study” period, the proportion of PIs who were predicted to be women
122 were 49.7% and 44.4% for breast cancer and T2DM trials, respectively and the difference was not
123 statistically significant when compared to results from the study period ($p>0.05$).

124

125 **Discussion**

126 In this study, we demonstrate that less than one-third of COVID-19-related clinical trials are led by PIs
127 who were predicted to be women, half the proportion observed in non-COVID-19 (breast cancer and
128 T2DM) trials over the same period. The proportion of PIs in breast cancer and T2DM studies also
129 remained similar to the pre-study period. These gender disparities during the pandemic may indicate
130 not only a lack of women’s leadership in international clinical trials and involvement in new projects, but
131 also may reveal imbalances in women's access to research activities and funding during health
132 emergencies [2, 16].

133
134 The COVID-19 pandemic offers numerous opportunities for research and leadership that could equalize
135 opportunity in a new field, but our results suggest the opposite. The pandemic has reinforced the
136 prevailing gender norms in which men continue to be allocated a disproportionate share of the funding,
137 as well as leadership and authorship roles [9, 10, 16]. One potential contributor for this discrepancy is
138 the speed demanded by the research agenda during the pandemic. The sense of urgency in starting
139 clinical trials may lead to an abandonment of any checks and balances around equality and inclusion
140 that would have otherwise encouraged the involvement of women scientists. Many women scientists
141 have already raised concerns about institutional funding distribution lacking gender balance or being left
142 out of research activities despite their expertise [2, 16]. During COVID-19 pandemic, a UK study showed
143 that women were more than twice as likely to take on childcare and schooling responsibilities of
144 children than men, while male academic counterparts leverage professional relationships and networks
145 more effectively [1, 2, 16].

146
147 As a community, we must recognise that there is a tendency to “turn to men” in times of crisis both for
148 leadership and scientific expertise [2, 3, 16, 17], highlighting the need to challenge this culture. Research
149 and academia are already competitive; being in the central decision-making group is often challenging

150 due to gender norms, along with roles and rules on how these groups are established and maintained;
151 during health emergencies, these same authoritative circles become more difficult for women scientists
152 to join [2, 16]. Our findings suggest that there is a need for transparency in opportunities and funding
153 that requires actively identifying and addressing the structurally implicit and unconscious biases that
154 favour men.

155
156 Our analysis has some limitations. We could include only ~50-75% of trials for which an investigator's
157 gender could be algorithmically predicted. Furthermore, while such algorithms allow for the rapid
158 analysis of gender disparities such as those conducted here, they can also be exclusionary to gender
159 non-conforming, non-binary, and trans individuals. Because of this, we have taken care to use the term
160 "predicted gender" throughout the text whenever discussing algorithm-based gender assignment in
161 acknowledgement of gender non-conforming, non-binary, and trans investigators. Beyond these
162 limitations, we did not consider studies that received private funding, which may not have been
163 registered on [clinicaltrials.gov](#); however, it is worth noting that [clinicaltrials.gov](#) is an international
164 database with widespread international representation.

165
166 In summary, while the COVID-19 pandemic has thus far provided many new opportunities for research,
167 with numerous clinical trials initiated worldwide, a disproportionate proportion of PIs leading COVID-19
168 related studies are predicted to be men, despite women accounting for 70% of the global health
169 workforce [16]. Our demonstration of gender differences in trial leadership and grant allocation argue
170 for revised policies and strategies that encourage the participation of women in pandemic research. Not
171 only can these women drive discovery and innovation, but they can act to address health disparities and
172 provide role models for the next generation of women scientists [2, 16, 18, 19]. Ensuring gender
173 representation would also reflect the commitment of the global community to promoting gender

174 equality in academic medicine and research: inclusion, diversity, representation, progression, and
175 success for all. A health emergency is not an excuse for disregarding the importance of equitable
176 representation and given the disproportionate burden of such outbreaks for communities who are
177 marginalized due to their gender, sexuality, class, ethnicity, and ability an even greater reason we must
178 advocate for it [20-22].

179

180

181

182

183 **Authors contributions**

184 MC: conceptualisation, methodology, investigation, literature review, data curation, writing – original
185 draft. SH and MM: investigation, data curation, formal analysis, writing – review and editing; JS, KK, PS:
186 methodology, writing – review and editing, supervision. CO: conceptualisation, methodology,
187 investigation, literature review, writing – original draft, supervision.

188

189 **Financial support and sponsorship**

190 None

191

192 **Conflict of interests**

193 MC, SH, JS, KK, MM have none to disclose. CO has received honoraria, fees for lectures, and advisory
194 boards from Gilead, MSD, Viiv, and Janssen. She has also received research grants to her institution from
195 the above-mentioned companies. PES has received honoraria, fees for lectures, and advisory boards
196 from Gilead, Merck, Janssen, and ViiV; he has also received research grants to his institution from Gilead
197 and ViiV.

198 **Table 1: Proportion of women leadership in clinical trials between January 1, 2020 and June 26, 2020**
 199 **and before January 1, 2020**
 200

	Jan 1, 2020 - June 26, 2020					before Jan 1, 2020		
	COVID-19	Breast Cancer	p value	T2DM	p value	Breast Cancer	T2DM	p value
PI	27.8%	54.4%	<0.001	42.1%	< 0.001	49.7%	44.4%	0.158
Study Director	28.7%	48.9%	0.0103	22.2%	0.751	30.5%	47.6%	0.028
Study Chair	31.4%	32.1%	1	36.36%	0.98	33.3%	40.4%	0.54

201

202

203 **Supplementary material:**

204 Flow diagram of process of selection

205 Gender distribution over time (months)

206

207

208 **References:**

- 209 1. Villadsen A, Conti, G. and Fitzsimons, E. Parental involvement in home schooling and
 210 developmental play during lockdown - Initial findings from the COVID-19 Survey in Five
 211 National Longitudinal Studies. . London: UCL Centre for Longitudinal Studies. 2020.
 212 2. Education TH. Women in science are battling both Covid-19 and the patriarchy
 213 2020 [cited 2020 June 6]. Available from: [https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/women-](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/women-science-are-battling-both-covid-19-and-patriarchy#survey-answer)
 214 [science-are-battling-both-covid-19-and-patriarchy#survey-answer](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/women-science-are-battling-both-covid-19-and-patriarchy#survey-answer).
 215 3. Brubaker L. Women Physicians and the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA. 2020. doi:
 216 10.1001/jama.2020.14797.
 217 4. Head MG, Fitchett JR, Cooke MK, Wurie FB, Atun R. Sex discrepancies in infectious
 218 disease research funding 1997–2010: a systematic analysis. The Lancet. 2013;382:S44.
 219 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62469-1.
 220 5. Hoa NT, Thuong NTT, Clapham HE, Thu TTA, Kestelyn E, Thwaites CL. Increasing
 221 women's leadership in science in Ho Chi Minh City. The Lancet. 2019;393(10171):523-4. doi:
 222 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32090-7.
 223 6. Blake M LVI. Who Applies for Research Funding?

- 224 7. Jefferson L, Bloor K, Maynard A. Women in medicine: historical perspectives and recent
225 trends. *British Medical Bulletin*. 2015;114(1):5-15. doi: 10.1093/bmb/ldv007.
- 226 8. Manne-Goehler J, Kapoor N, Blumenthal DM, Stead W. Sex Differences in Achievement
227 and Faculty Rank in Academic Infectious Diseases. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.
228 2019;70(2):290-6. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciz200.
- 229 9. Rajan D, Koch K, Rohrer K, Bajnoczki C, Socha A, Voss M, et al. Governance of the
230 Covid-19 response: a call for more inclusive and transparent decision-making. *BMJ Global
231 Health*. 2020;5(5):e002655. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002655.
- 232 10. Andersen JP, Nielsen MW, Simone NL, Lewiss RE, Jagsi R. COVID-19 medical papers
233 have fewer women first authors than expected. *eLife*. 2020;9:e58807. doi: 10.7554/eLife.58807.
- 234 11. D'Armiento J, Witte SS, Dutt K, Wall M, McAllister G. Achieving women's equity in
235 academic medicine: challenging the standards. *The Lancet*. 2019;393(10171):e15-e6. doi:
236 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30234-X.
- 237 12. Holman L, Stuart-Fox D, Hauser CE. The gender gap in science: How long until women
238 are equally represented? *PLoS Biol*. 2018;16(4):e2004956. Epub 2018/04/20. doi:
239 10.1371/journal.pbio.2004956. PubMed PMID: 29672508; PubMed Central PMCID:
240 PMC5908072.
- 241 13. Huang J, Gates AJ, Sinatra R, Barabasi AL. Historical comparison of gender inequality in
242 scientific careers across countries and disciplines. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2020;117(9):4609-
243 16. Epub 2020/02/20. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1914221117. PubMed PMID: 32071248; PubMed
244 Central PMCID: PMC7060730.
- 245 14. Karimi F WC, Lemmerich F, Jadidi M, Strohmaier M. . Inferring gender from names on
246 the web: a comparative evaluation of gender detection meth- ods. *Proceedings of the 25th
247 international conference companion on world wide web, WWW'16 companion*. 2016.
- 248 15. Newcombe RG. Interval estimation for the difference between independent proportions:
249 comparison of eleven methods. *Stat Med*. 1998;17(8):873-90. Epub 1998/05/22. doi:
250 10.1002/(sici)1097-0258(19980430)17:8<873::aid-sim779>3.0.co;2-i. PubMed PMID: 9595617.
- 251 16. Gabster BP, van Daalen K, Dhatt R, Barry M. Challenges for the female academic during
252 the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10242):1968-70. Epub 2020/06/22. doi:
253 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31412-4. PubMed PMID: 32563275; PubMed Central PMCID:
254 PMC7302767.
- 255 17. WEP. Women Expert Project 2020. Available from: <https://expertwomenproject.com>.
- 256 18. Nielsen MW, Bloch CW, Schiebinger L. Making gender diversity work for scientific
257 discovery and innovation. *Nature Human Behaviour*. 2018;2(10):726-34. doi: 10.1038/s41562-
258 018-0433-1.
- 259 19. A call for more inclusive Covid-19 research: Tackling disparities during a pandemic
260 2020. Available from: [https://www.statnews.com/sponsor/2020/05/22/a-call-for-more-inclusive-
261 covid-19-research-tackling-disparities-during-a-pandemic/](https://www.statnews.com/sponsor/2020/05/22/a-call-for-more-inclusive-covid-19-research-tackling-disparities-during-a-pandemic/).
- 262 20. Koma W, Artiga, S., Neuman, T., Claxton, G.,Rae,M.,Kates,J.,Michaud, J. . Low-Income
263 and Communities of Color at Higher Risk of Serious Illness if Infected with Coronavirus
264 2020 [cited 2020 July 21]. Available from: [https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-
265 brief/low-income-and-communities-of-color-at-higher-risk-of-serious-illness-if-infected-with-
266 coronavirus/](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/low-income-and-communities-of-color-at-higher-risk-of-serious-illness-if-infected-with-coronavirus/).
- 267 21. Finch WH, Hernández Finch ME. Poverty and Covid-19: Rates of Incidence and Deaths
268 in the United States During the First 10 Weeks of the Pandemic. *Frontiers in Sociology*.
269 2020;5(47). doi: 10.3389/fsoc.2020.00047.

270 22. Chen J, Krieger, N. Revealing the unequal burden of COVID-19 by income,
271 race/ethnicity, and household crowding: US county vs. ZIP code analyses: Harvard Center for
272 Population and Development Studies; 2020 [cited 2020 July 26]. Available from:
273 [https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1266/2020/04/HCPDS_Volume-](https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1266/2020/04/HCPDS_Volume-19_No_1_20_covid19_RevealingUnequalBurden_HCPDSWorkingPaper_04212020-1.pdf)
274 [19_No_1_20_covid19_RevealingUnequalBurden_HCPDSWorkingPaper_04212020-1.pdf](https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1266/2020/04/HCPDS_Volume-19_No_1_20_covid19_RevealingUnequalBurden_HCPDSWorkingPaper_04212020-1.pdf).
275