medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Training the Next Generation of Physician-Scientists: A Cohort-Based Program for MD-only Residents & Fellows

Tina A. Solvik, PhD*[1]; Alexandra M. Schnoes, PhD*[2]; Thi A. Nguyen, PhD*[2]; Shannon Behrman, PhD[2]; Elie Maksoud, PhD[2]; Sarah S. Goodwin, PhD[2]; Ethan J. Weiss, MD[3]; Arun Padmanabhan, MD, PhD[1,3,4]; David N. Cornfield, MD[1,5]

[1]Physician-Scientist Fellowship Program, Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, California, USA 94158

[2]Science Communication Lab, Berkeley, California, USA 94704

[3]Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA 94143

[4]Gladstone Institutes, San Francisco, California, USA 94158

[5]Stanford University School of Medicine and Lucile Salter Packard Children's Hospital at Stanford, Palo Alto, California, USA 94304

*These authors contributed equally to this work

Corresponding Author

David N. Cornfield

Stanford University

770 Welch Rd, Mail Code 5882

Stanford, California 94304

Phone: 650-498-0929

Email: davidco@stanford.edu

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Acknowledgments

We thank Bill Burkholder [CZ Biohub], Elliot Kirschner [Science Communication Lab], Roger Nys [CZ Biohub], and Lubert Stryer [CZ Biohub, Stanford University] for their support and contributions to the program. We also thank our colleagues at Stanford University, UCSF, UC Berkeley, and CZ Biohub who have provided their time and support as speakers, panelists, mentors, advisors, reviewers, and interviewers, and the administrative support for the program provided by our university partners.

Word Counts

Abstract: 350

Manuscript: 2994

Abstract

Importance: Despite the importance of clinician-scientists in propelling biomedical advances, the proportion of physicians engaged in both hypothesis-driven research and clinical care continues to decline. Recently, multiple institutions have developed programs that promote MD-only physicians pursuing careers in science, but few reports on the impact of these are available.

Objective: To assess if a cohort-based training program for MD-only physician-scientists that includes didactic and experiential curricula favorably informs participants' scientific development.

Design: The Chan Zuckerberg Biohub (CZB) Physician-Scientist Fellowship Program (PSFP) conducted a study from July 2020 to August 2022.

Participants: 24 inaugural program participants at UCSF and Stanford University (median postgraduate year at program start, 5.5; 17 clinical specialties represented; 10 [42%] identified as female; 7 [29%] identified as underrepresented in medicine).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Exposures: The CZB PSFP is a selective two-year career development program for MD-only physicians. Participants attended a two-week immersive training at the program outset, and subsequently, weekly curricular and scientific meetings throughout the program while conducting research.

Main Outcomes and Measures: Primary outcome measurements included pre-, 1-month, and 12-month assessments of confidence in research skills, career skills, and self-identification as scientists. Program satisfaction and feedback related to program curriculum and community were collected at 1 month, 6 months, and 12 months.

Results: After 12 months, 94% reported satisfaction with the program and participants demonstrated increased confidence in research skills (mean [SD] pre vs. post, 3.79 [0.59] vs. 5.09 [0.42], $P<0.01$), confidence in career skills (4.00 [0.52] vs. 5.20 [0.38] $P<0.01$), personal identification as a researcher (4.71 [1.41] vs. 6.00 [1.33], $P<0.01$), and sense of belonging to a community of scientists (3.53 [1.40] vs. 5.75 [1.41] $P<0.001$).

Conclusion and Relevance: Participants demonstrated significant gains in confidence in core research and career skills as well as personal identification as scientists, demonstrating the efficacy of a longitudinal curriculum, peer support, and community building in fostering development as an investigator. The highly portable nature of this strategy may facilitate ready adoption and implementation at other institutions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Over the past 100 years, physician-scientists have created important new knowledge across the entire spectrum of biomedical inquiry. Increasingly, successful development and application of novel therapies require the engagement of expert investigators from multiple disciplines.[1,2] Moreover, creation of durable knowledge that can enhance human health demands testing at the bedside as well as in the laboratory. Well-trained physician-scientists are uniquely equipped to pose scientific questions that link the biomedical sciences to bedside care of patients.[3]

Unfortunately, since the 1980s, the percentage of physicians dedicating significant components of their professional lives to research has declined from approximately 5% to 1.3%.[4,5] Despite training more physicians, the absolute number of physician-scientists is declining while their average age is increasing.[4–7] Indeed, the relative percentage of research program grants awarded to MDs over 50 more than doubled from under 25% in 1977 to >70% in 2012.[6,7] To apply the power of fundamental scientific discovery to human health, the pipeline of early-career physician-scientists must be replenished and sustained.

Reports on the physician-scientist workforce have identified major challenges in entry to and persistence in the workforce, including the impact of research funding, length and structure of training, influence of mentoring, and tension between clinical and research responsibilities.[7,8] We have built a unique program that seeks to address these challenges and provides training and meaningful expertise to physicians interested in creating new knowledge focused on significant problems in human health. The Chan Zuckerberg Biohub (CZB) Physician-Scientist Fellowship Program (PSFP), is a collaboration between the CZB, Stanford University, and the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF), with curriculum co-developed by the Science Communication Lab. The program targets MD-only physicians interested in undertaking hypothesis-driven, investigator-initiated scientific discovery while continuing to engage in clinical medicine.

The primary outcome goal of the CZB PSFP is to develop and support a pool of physician-scientists with fluency in the language of science and the ability to pose and answer biological questions

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

to promote translation of basic science research into patient care. The program seeks to train and motivate participants to pursue a discovery-guided career, whether it is leading their own research group, acting as a clinical collaborator on research studies led by other scientists, or by being an engaged consumer of basic research studies that provides clinical care informed by new research findings. Importantly, the program seeks to serve as a model for academic institutions to adopt for facilitating physician-scientist development. As this program was only started in 2020, additional time will be required to effectively evaluate the long-term career outcomes of participants. Here, we present our initial evaluation of the CZB PSFP and its immediate impact on physician trainees' development and identity as investigators.

Methods

Program Design

To address the barriers to physicians' entry to and retention within the physician-scientist career path, we developed a structured two-year fellowship program for MD-trained physician-scientists at Stanford and UCSF to receive formal training to develop as independent investigators. After considering the most critical determinants of long-term success for a discovery-guided career, the CZB PSFP was designed to promote: research and critical thinking skills (i.e., defining a research vision, identifying and filling a gap in the field, designing experiments, research resilience, and technical skills), career and professional development skills (i.e., strategic planning, identifying and recruiting diverse mentors, writing competitive grants, and designing and delivering high-quality research talks), and scientific identity (i.e., self-identification as a researcher, normalizing imposter fears, sense of belonging to scientific community).[9–11] To achieve these goals, three primary methods were utilized: cultivating a community of physician-scientists at similar career stages that provide peer-to-peer mentorship and teaching through a cohort model, intensive introductory training in core scientific principles and tools through a two-week "bootcamp," and a longitudinal curriculum that focuses on progressive skill-building in professional and research skills (**Figure 1**). In addition, the program provided financial support to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

motivate dedicated research time, guidance related to mentorship and laboratory experiences, and coaching from invested senior, non-supervising physician-scientists.

Participants

Fellows held an MD, had not received nor were seeking a PhD, and were currently enrolled in or had completed an accredited post-graduate clinical training program at UCSF or Stanford. Participants committed to a 24-month program , with not less than 75% of their time dedicated to research and maintained a minimal clinical effort of 20%.

Funding

Annual salary and benefits for the Fellows were split between the CZB PSFP and the home department/division. Awardees additionally received an annual $5,000 stipend for professional development purposes (i.e., supplies, research course/training fees, and conference travel). Participant attendance above 75% at program meetings was required to maintain funding.

Curriculum and Content

The PSFP curriculum focused on research and critical thinking, and career and professional development (**Figure 2**). To develop the curriculum, titled "The Researcher's Handbook," we utilized free training courses produced by iBiology (an initiative of the non-profit Science Communication Lab), which are designed to enhance career and professional development for researchers: (1) "Planning Your Scientific Journey" helps learners develop and plan a research project;[12] (2) "Let's Experiment" teaches frameworks to help learners design experiments in biological research;[13] (3) "Share Your Research" gives strategies to create and deliver an engaging research talk;[14] (4) "Business Concepts for Life Scientists" teaches business fundamentals to conduct research more effectively and prepare scientists to start their own labs.[15,16] Lab-based training and didactic research training, including RNA sequencing,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

bioinformatics, computational microscopy, and CRISPR-based approaches were led by either CZB researchers or program participants in a peer-taught manner.

Delivery

At the start of the program in July, participants attended nine 2-hour group-based trainings that were administered via a video conferencing platform in 2020 and 2021. In 2022, the training was adapted to be in-person for six 5-hour sessions. From August through June, participants attended weekly 90-minute virtual sessions. Fellows received instruction to complete pre-session work, including videos and writing assignments, to prepare for the group meetings. Synchronous sessions included didactic teaching, facilitated group discussion, and practice or personal application of the skills in breakout rooms.

Procedures

We examined learning outcomes using pre- and post-course surveys. Assessments used a 7-point Likert scale from “not at all confident” to “very confident.” The questions included assessments of the concepts of self-efficacy and self-identity as a scientist adapted from Estrada et al.[9]

Statistical Analysis

Pre- and post- results were compared using paired t-tests. We used GraphPad statistical software, version 9, to analyze data.

Results

Program Participants

The characteristics of the Fellows of the program’s first three years (2020-2022) are in **Table 1**. The program sought a diversity of participants in gender, representation, postgraduate year (PGY), and clinical specialty. Across all three cohorts, Fellows included 10 (41.7%) female participants and 7

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(29.2%) participants who self-identify as underrepresented in medicine according to the AAMC definition.[17] The average PGY for Fellows at the start of the program was 5.8 (SD 1.4) and the most common clinical specialties included cardiology, hematology/oncology, infectious disease, pulmonary and critical care medicine, and surgery.

Confidence in Research Skills

For the overall category of confidence in critical thinking and experimental design & methods, the Fellows experienced a statistically significant increase in confidence at 1 month (post-bootcamp), corresponding to a mean difference of 1.40 ($P<0.0001$, N=23) on a 7-point Likert scale (**Figure 3**). For the two cohorts that have been in the program for over 12 months (2020 and 2021 cohorts), this increase in confidence after bootcamp was maintained at 12 months (mean difference = 1.30, $P<0.002$, N=12-17). The overall category of research skills was calculated from the average of eight elements of research skills (e.g. identifying experimental bias, choosing a good research question, and acquiring new experimental methods). Individually, there were statistically significant increases reported in seven of the eight elements at 12 months, relative to pre-program levels (**Supplemental Table 1**).

Confidence in Career and Professional Development Skills

For the overall category of career and professional development skills, post-bootcamp, the fellows perceived an increase of confidence with a mean difference of 1.00 ($P<0.0002$, N=23). At 12 months, a similar increase was maintained (mean difference = 1.20, $P<0.01$, N=12-17) (**Figure 2)**. The overall category of career and professional development skills was calculated from the average of six defined elements that were intentionally addressed in the year-long curriculum (e.g., defining strategic goals for myself, writing grants that can be successfully funded, identifying and recruiting diverse mentors, and designing and delivering high-quality research talks). For all but one skill area, we saw statistically significant increases in confidence at 12 months (**Supplemental Table 1**).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Self-perception as a Scientist

The community building efforts and training had a statistically significant impact on the fellows' perceptions of belonging to the scientific community and of themselves as "researchers" (**Figure 2**). Post-bootcamp, the fellows (2020, 2021, and 2022 cohorts) saw a mean increase of 1.52 ($P<0.0001$, N=23) in agreement with the statement "I have a strong sense of belonging to the community of scientists." This was maintained at 12 months (2020 and 2021 cohorts) with a mean difference of 2.22 ($P<0.0001$, N=12-17). Their agreement with the statement "I have come to think of myself as a researcher" was increased, was statistically significant post-bootcamp (mean difference = 0.78, $P<0.01$, N=23), and was maintained at 12 months for the 2020 and 2021 cohorts (mean difference = 1.29, $P<0.01$, N =12-17).

Satisfaction with the Program

Fellows report being satisfied with the program at all timepoints measured (**Table 2**). Using a 7-point Likert scale that ranges from "extremely satisfied (7)" to "extremely dissatisfied (1)," where "satisfied" is 5 and above, the fellows consistently reported satisfaction with the program: 6.3 (SD 0.65) at 1 month (post-bootcamp), 6.0 (SD 0.86) at 6 months, and 5.9 (SD 0.93) at 12 months. At no time did any fellow report themselves "dissatisfied" with the training.

In response to open-ended questions about their satisfaction with the program and the perceived value added, participants emphasized the community and curriculum as program highlights, saying:

> *"I really appreciate the sense of community with the fellows program. Outside of this program, I would have very limited exposure to other MD-only physician-scientists in training, so it is great to be part of this community!"*

> *"The structure, community, and consistency of the program have been very useful over the past year. The talks have been poignant, on topic, and tailored to our specific needs as young career physician scientists."*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

"The camaraderie was the best part. Hearing the stories from everyone normalized my own feelings, and the community atmosphere was really special."

I know that I will use the skills I learned from [the program] in my future academic career – including research planning, design, and implementation, and also presentation skills, critical thinking, and career planning. (email communication from a 2020 cohort participant, shared with permission)

Discussion

Physician-scientists are at the nexus of clinical care and scientific discovery. Despite the palpable importance of physicians capable of asking and answering scientific questions with clinical significance and contributing meaningfully to team science, relatively fewer physicians are pursuing a discovery-intensive career path. The challenges to a physician-scientist career are myriad and well documented; furthermore, MD-only physician-scientists face additional hurdles compared to their MD-PhD counterparts, as they receive significantly less dedicated time for research and formal training in research skills.[7] In recognition of both the challenges and the considerable opportunities of increasing the pool of physician-scientists, new programs have been designed and developed in an effort to fill this critical gap.[18–24] Though each program has considerable merit, the components most likely to increase the number of physician-scientists in the workforce remain uncertain. The present report details the early results of the CZB PSFP and the components that have contributed most favorably to the development of scientific identity, literacy, and competency within the cohort.

Among the significant challenges for physicians seeking to pursue a research-focused career path are (1) the time required to gain scientific competence, (2) the perceived need to choose either science or medicine, (3) the paucity of similarly inclined peers, and (4) the absence of role models.[24] Our program

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

design sought to explicitly address each of these challenges. Given that training is lengthy with a median age of 37 years at time of initial faculty appointment at US medical schools[25] and the average age of 46 years for first independent NIH award,[5] the two-year CZB PSFP was designed to maximize, without significantly prolonging, the training experience. Second, woven into the program was a requirement for ongoing engagement in clinical medicine for no less than 20% effort, which was designed to demonstrate that scientific and clinical competence and engagement remain possible and efforts in one domain potentiate efforts in the other. Third, the program placed a premium and emphasis on fostering community and providing peer-to-peer and near-peer interactions. Finally, to address the issue of role modeling, the program directors were each engaged clinicians directing NIH-funded, discovery-based research programs and attended over 90% of the cohort meetings.

The program prioritized building and maintaining community. Implicit in the design of the program was the notion that offering aspiring physician-scientists a similarly inclined community of peers might serve to normalize imposter fears and bolster the determination to pursue both science and medicine. As a cohort, Fellows completed classroom-style research training through the intensive bootcamp and weekly curriculum. In these sessions, participants had the space to discuss the experiences of pursuing a discovery-focused path, and build self-confidence by giving research presentations and peer teaching technical concepts. The findings in this report suggest that these efforts were successful, as the sense of belonging to a community of scientists increased markedly after the two-week bootcamp alone. While difficult to correlate directly with community building, the overall satisfaction was high, with a durable level of satisfaction across the entire time in the program. Further evidence of the success of the community creation derives from the narrative comments from participants, with a high value placed on belonging to a community. Though the present report does not include data to address the near-peer mentoring between cohorts, interactions between years favorably informed career decisions, grant submissions, and manuscript preparation, much in the manner that graduate students from different years informally exchange important information.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

To build skills, confidence, and provide exposure to essential research methods, the program included an immersive introductory two-week curriculum in July of the matriculating year and a longitudinal curriculum provided in weekly seminars from August through June. The formal curriculum was designed to provide Fellows with experiences and training not typically included in medical school with the intent of leveling the 'playing field' for MD-only investigators. The data in the present report suggests that Fellows found value, and even identity in the curriculum, with progressive improvement in each of the research and critical thinking-related metrics assessed. The effects on career and skill development were similarly pronounced, progressive, and durable.

Arguably, the aggregate responses to "I have come to think of myself as a researcher" represent the most compelling data in support of the program. After 12 months in the program, Fellows strongly agreed with the sentiment. Self-identification as a scientist has been found to be a significant predictor of a trainee's persistence in science.[26–31] That the participants developed a strong scientific identity is consistent with the growing research showing that programmatic interventions (e.g., curricula, research experiences, mentoring) can directly and positively develop a trainee's evolving science identity.[31–34]

The present findings are limited by the relatively small sample size and the short duration of follow-up. Nonetheless, the number of participants is non-trivial given the time commitment from Fellows, faculty, and staff. Though the duration of the study was circumscribed, the program targeted participants at an especially vulnerable point in training. Though a longer trial period would be optimal, the scope of the problem and highly favorable early outcomes motivate the present report.

The program was specifically designed with the hope of portability and the creation of similar programs at Medical Schools interested in promoting physician-scientist training. By identifying those components that best promoted formation of a researcher identity for MD-only investigators, CZB developed a template that may enable academic institutions to efficiently craft similar training programs to increase the supply of MD-trained scientists. The advantages of implementing or adapting this program at other institutions are numerous: (1) as a two-year program with a two-week introductory curriculum and subsequent 90-minute weekly meetings, it is a relatively small time commitment compared to a PhD

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

program, yet demonstrates significant gains in participants' scientific skills and identity development, (2) the curriculum can be delivered virtually while still building community among participants, (3) it utilizes free online resources to deliver curriculum in effective research and career practices, and (4) it serves trainees across clinical specialties, creating a new peer support community that otherwise may not have developed. This pilot showed that iterative, structured scientific training paired with intentional community building leads to physicians gaining competence and confidence in doing research and pursuing a research career. Whether the successes of the present program can be translated to other institutions remains unknown, but the participation of physicians from two universities and a wide array of medical and surgical disciplines argues that the present strategy possesses broad applicability.

Conclusions

Overall, we report the early results of a novel physician-scientist training program that suggests by concentrating on creating a cohort of aspiring MD-trained scientists and providing curriculum over an extended time interval, physicians can develop a scientific identity, buttressed by skills, that will motivate a discovery-guided career. A route to a research-intensive career without substantially prolonging the training experience represents a novel and viable strategy to replenish the pool of physician-scientists at a time when the need to be fluent in both medicine and science has never been more essential.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Nathan DG, Wilson JD. Clinical research and the NIH--a report card. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;349(19):1860-1865.

2. Nathan DG, for the National Institutes of Health Director's Panel on Clinical Research, for the National Institutes of Health Director's Panel on Clinical Research. Clinical Research: Perceptions, Reality, and Proposed Solutions. *JAMA*. 1998;280(16):1427-1431.

3. Faxon DP. The chain of scientific discovery: the critical role of the physician-scientist. *Circulation*. 2002;105(15):1857-1860.

4. Garrison HH, Deschamps AM. NIH research funding and early career physician scientists: continuing challenges in the 21st century. *FASEB J*. 2014;28(3):1049-1058.

5. Garrison HH, Ley TJ. Physician-scientists in the United States at 2020: Trends and concerns. *FASEB J*. 2022;36(5):e22253.

6. Zemlo TR, Garrison HH, Partridge NC, Ley TJ. The physician-scientist: career issues and challenges at the year 2000. *FASEB J*. 2000;14(2):221-230.

7. National Institutes of Health. *Physician-Scientist Workforce (PSW) Working Group Report, June 2014*.; 2014. Accessed October 18, 2022. https://www.acd.od.nih.gov/documents/reports/PSW_Report_ACD_06042014.pdf

8. Salata RA, Geraci MW, Rockey DC, et al. U.S. Physician-Scientist Workforce in the 21st Century: Recommendations to Attract and Sustain the Pipeline. *Acad Med*. 2018;93(4):565-573.

9. Estrada M, Woodcock A, Hernandez PR, Schultz PW. Toward a Model of Social Influence that Explains Minority Student Integration into the Scientific Community. *J Educ Psychol*. 2011;103(1):206.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

10. Vale RD, DeRisi J, Phillips R, Mullins RD, Waterman C, Mitchison TJ. Interdisciplinary Graduate Training in Teaching Labs. *Science*. 2012;338(6114):1542-1543.

11. Verderame MF, Freedman VH, Kozlowski LM, McCormack WT. Competency-based assessment for the training of PhD students and early-career scientists. *Elife*. 2018;7. doi:10.7554/eLife.34801

12. Planning Your Scientific Journey. iBiology Courses. Accessed November 22, 2022. https://courses.ibiology.org/catalog/PYSJ/SP/

13. Let's Experiment: A Guide for Scientists Working at the Bench. iBiology Courses. Accessed November 22, 2022. https://courses.ibiology.org/catalog/LE/SP/

14. Share Your Research: How to Give a Good Talk. iBiology Courses. Accessed November 22, 2022. https://courses.ibiology.org/catalog/SYR/SP/

15. Nguyen TA, Nguyen AD. Applying Business Strategies to Establish Your Research Program. *Curr Protoc Essent Lab Tech*. 2020;20(1). doi:10.1002/cpet.41

16. Business Concepts for Life Scientists. iBiology Courses. Accessed November 22, 2022. https://courses.ibiology.org/catalog/BCLS/SP/

17. Underrepresented in Medicine Definition. Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC). Accessed November 23, 2022. https://www.aamc.org/what-we-do/equity-diversity-inclusion/underrepresented-in-medicine

18. McElvaine AT, Hawkins-Salsbury JA, Arora VM, et al. Innovations in MD-only physician-scientist training: experiences from the Burroughs Wellcome Fund physician-scientist institutional award initiative. *J Clin Invest*. 2021;131(10). doi:10.1172/JCI149948

19. Muslin AJ, Kornfeld S, Polonsky KS. The physician scientist training program in internal medicine at Washington University School of Medicine. *Acad Med*. 2009;84(4):468-471.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

20. Physician Scientist Fellowship. Doris Duke Charitable Foundation. Accessed November 23, 2022. https://www.ddcf.org/funding-areas/medical-research/physician-scientist-fellowship/

21. Physician Scientist Training Program. Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC). Accessed November 23, 2022. https://students-residents.aamc.org/applying-md/phd-programs/physician-scientist-training-program

22. Price Rapoza M, McElvaine A, Conroy MB, et al. Early Outcomes of a New NIH Program to Support Research in Residency. *Acad Med*. 2022;97(9):1305-1310.

23. Physician-Scientist Training Award Overview. Damon Runyon Cancer Research Foundation. Accessed December 9, 2022. https://www.damonrunyon.org/for-scientists/application-guidelines/physician-scientist

24. Simpson RL, Cornfield DN, Burris JE. Novel Prescriptions From Medical Schools for Physician-Scientist Training and Engagement in the Twenty-First Century. *Acad Med*. 2021;96(4):512-515.

25. U.S. Medical School Faculty Trends: Average Age. Associate of American Medical Colleges (AAMC). Accessed December 2, 2022. https://www.aamc.org/data-reports/interactive-data/us-medical-school-faculty-trends-average-age

26. Syed M, Zurbriggen EL, Chemers MM, et al. The Role of Self-Efficacy and Identity in Mediating the Effects of STEM Support Experiences. *Anal Soc Issues Public Policy*. 2019;19(1):7-49.

27. Chemers MM, Zurbriggen EL, Syed M, Goza BK, Bearman S. The Role of Efficacy and Identity in Science Career Commitment Among Underrepresented Minority Students. *J Soc Issues*. 2011;67(3):469-491.

28. Faupel-Badger JM, Raue K, Nelson DE, Tsakraklides S. Alumni perspectives on career preparation during a postdoctoral training program: a qualitative study. *CBE Life Sci Educ*. 2015;14(1):ar1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

29. Robinson KA, Perez T, Nuttall AK, Roseth CJ, Linnenbrink-Garcia L. From science student to scientist: Predictors and outcomes of heterogeneous science identity trajectories in college. *Dev Psychol*. 2018;54(10):1977-1992.

30. Chang MJ, Kevin Eagan M, Lin MH, Hurtado S. Considering the Impact of Racial Stigmas and Science Identity: Persistence Among Biomedical and Behavioral Science Aspirants. *J Higher Educ*. 2011;82(5):564.

31. Merolla DM, Serpe RT. STEM enrichment programs and graduate school matriculation: the role of science identity salience. *Soc Psychol Educ*. 2013;16(4):575-597.

32. Eagan MK Jr, Hurtado S, Chang MJ, Garcia GA, Herrera FA, Garibay JC. Making a Difference in Science Education: The Impact of Undergraduate Research Programs. *Am Educ Res J*. 2013;50(4):683-713.

33. Burton GS, Kennedy E, Vicente M da GH. Results from a 14-Year Intervention Program Designed to Impact Pursuit of a PhD in Research among Underrepresented Students in STEM Disciplines. *J STEM Educ Res*. 2019;2(2):128-153.

34. Maton KI, Beason TS, Godsay S, et al. Outcomes and Processes in the Meyerhoff Scholars Program: STEM PhD Completion, Sense of Community, Perceived Program Benefit, Science Identity, and Research Self-Efficacy. *CBE Life Sci Educ*. 2016;15(3). doi:10.1187/cbe.16-01-0062

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figures and Tables



Figure 1. PSFP utilizes peer community and two curriculum methods to support the development of physician-scientists

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 2. PSFP teaches key research and career skills throughout the curriculum

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. Characteristics of participants to date, 2020-2022

Characteristic	**Participant No. (%)**
Total participants	24 (100.0)
Total applicants	76 (316.7)
Gender	
Female	10 (41.7)
Male	14 (58.3)
Representation in medicine	
Underrepresented	7 (29.2)
Well-Represented	15 (62.5)
Prefer not to answer	2 (8.3)
Institution	
Stanford University	10 (41.7)
UCSF	14 (58.3)
PGY at program start	
Mean (SD)	5.8 (1.4)
3	1 (4.2)
4	2 (8.3)
5	8 (33.3)
6	7 (29.2)
7	2 (8.3)
8	3 (12.5)
9	1 (4.2)
Clinical Specialty	
Allergy and Immunology	1 (4.2)
Cardiology (Pediatric, Adult)	1 (4.2), 2 (8.3)
Clinical Pathology/Laboratory Medicine	1 (4.2)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Dermatology	1 (4.2)
Gastroenterology	1 (4.2)
Hematology/Oncology (Pediatric, Adult)	4 (16.7), 2 (8.3)
Infectious Disease (Pediatric, Adult)	1 (4.2), 1 (4.2)
Neurology	1 (4.2)
Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine (Pediatric, Adult)	2 (8.3), 2 (8.3)
Rheumatology	1 (4.2)
Surgery	
General	1 (4.2)
Neurological	1 (4.2)
Vascular	1 (4.2)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 3. Participants report increased confidence in research skills, career and professional development skills, and research identity after 1-month and 1-year in the program.
Learning Outcomes for Immersive, 1-mo training include all cohorts (N=23, 2020, 2021, 2022) while outcomes from Longitudinal, 12-mo include two cohorts (N=12-17, 2020, 2021), because 2022 is still mid-year in their training. Pre survey is given in July when each cohort starts. 7-point Likert scale. Statistical significance for unpaired t-tests, $*P \leq 0.05$, $**P \leq 0.01$, $***P \leq 0.001$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Satisfaction with program after 1 month, 6 months, and 12 months in program.
Participants include 2020, 2021, and 2022 cohorts. Pre survey taken in July when each cohort started. 7-point Likert scale, from "extremely satisfied (7)" to "extremely dissatisfied (1)." Satisfied is 5 and above. Cohorts entering *a*. 2020, *b*. 2021, *c*. 2022

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the CZ Biohub Physician Scientist Fellowship Program overall.		
TIME IN PROGRAM	**MEAN (SD)**	**N Satisfied (%)**
1 month, after the SUMMER intensive training (N=23[a,b,c])	6.3 (0.65)	23 (100)
6 months, after weekly FALL training (N=17[a,b])	6.0 (0.86)	16 (94)
12 months, after weekly SPRING training (N=12[a,b])	5.9 (0.93)	11 (94)

7-point Likert type scale from "extremely satisfied (7)" to "extremely dissatisfied(1)". Satisfied is 5 and above. No fellows were dissatisfied with training.
Cohorts entering *a*. 2020, b. 2021, c. 2022

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Material

Supplemental Table 1. Increased Confidence in Skills after 12-months in program.
Participants include 2020 and 2021 cohorts during the first year of the program. Pre survey taken in July when each cohort started. Post survey taken in June the following year. 7-point Likert scale. Statistical significance for unpaired t-tests, $*P \leq 0.05$, $**P \leq 0.01$, $***P \leq 0.001$

TOPIC, mean (SD)	PRE (N=17)	POST 12-mo (N=12)
Research Critical Thinking, Experimental Design & Methods, N=12-17		
Defining my research vision	4.62 (1.07)	5.38 (1.19)
Describing how my research will fill a gap in the field	4.76 (1.08)	5.75 (0.87)*
Choosing a good research question	4.00 (1.05)	5.38 (0.77)***
Designing experiments that will provide interpretable results	3.44 (0.95)	5.25 (1.08)***
Acquiring new experimental methods	3.41 (1.20)	4.50 (1.33)*
Choosing appropriate model systems for my research	3.29 (1.13)	5.00 (1.17)***
Identifying experimental bias	3.44 (1.34)	4.75 (1.50)*
Discussing the impact of racial bias in research	3.41 (1.70)	4.75 (1.50)*
Career and Professional Development & Goals, N=12-17		
Developing a strategic plan for my research	3.71 (1.09)	5.13 (1.13)**
Defining strategic career goals for myself	4.03 (1.15)	5.50 (1.28)**
Identifying and recruiting diverse mentors	4.18 (1.14)	5.38 (1.19)*
Writing grants that could be successfully funded	3.09 (0.83)	4.75 (1.20)***
Designing and delivering high quality research talks	4.53 (1.30)	5.75 (0.87)**
Writing papers that could be accepted for publication	4.41 (1.48)	4.88 (1.49)
You and Your Research Identity, N=12-17		
I have a strong sense of belonging to the community of scientists.	3.53 (1.40)	5.75 (1.41)***
I have come to think of myself as a researcher.	4.71 (1.43)	6.00 (1.33)*

Preprint not peer reviewed. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.19.22.235 Posted on 20 December 2024 by The copyright holder for this preprint is the author/funder. It is made available under a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Methods

Peer Community and Peer-to-Peer Mentorship
cohort model with high engagement between participants with similar career goals

Immersive Introductory Curriculum ("Bootcamp")
intensive 2-week training in research skills

Longitudinal Curriculum
weekly 90-minute meetings over 2 years

→

Short-Term Outcomes

Scientific Identity
think of oneself as a scientist and as a member of the scientific community

Research & Critical Thinking Skills
able to define a research vision, choose good questions, and design relevant experiments

Career & Professional Development Skills
deliver research talks, compete effectively for funding

→

Long-Term Outcome

Discovery-guided career that promotes translation of basic science to the clinic through 1 of 3 paths:

- Lead basic/ translational research lab
- Act as clinical collaborator on basic/translational studies
- Provide clinical care that is informed by and up to date with basic/ translational research studies' findings

	Bootcamp	Year 1	Year 2
Research and Critical Thinking Curriculum	**Research Process** • Defining research plan • Critically evaluating research design and experiments	**Seeking and Incorporating Feedback on Research** • Sharing specific aims with peers and senior mentors for substantial feedback • Giving research-in-progress talks to peers to seek feedback, suggested next steps, collaborations	
	Research Techniques and Tools • Hands-on laboratory training from CZ Biohub in genomics and data science • Didactic training from CZ Biohub in techniques in computational microscopy, proteomics, protein sciences, genomics, and data science • Peer-to-peer teaching of special interest topics including CRISPR, scRNA-seq		
Career and Professional Development Curriculum	**Working with Mentors** • Assessing mentoring needs and identifying appropriate research and career mentors	**Science Communication** • Delivering an effective research talk • Writing competitive grant applications	**Leadership** • Strengths-based leadership • Accountable and inclusive mentoring
	Career Development and Strategic Planning • Workshops and Q&As with senior physician-scientists on navigating career milestones, balancing research and clinical responsibilities in their careers, responding to and managing failures and setbacks, and advice for strategically planning research, papers, and grants		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. Characteristics of participants to date, 2020-2022

Characteristic	**Participant No. (%)**
Total participants	24 (100.0)
Total applicants	76 (316.7)
Gender	
Female	10 (41.7)
Male	14 (58.3)
Representation in medicine	
Underrepresented	7 (29.2)
Well-Represented	15 (62.5)
Prefer not to answer	2 (8.3)
Institution	
Stanford University	10 (41.7)
UCSF	14 (58.3)
PGY at program start	
Mean (SD)	5.8 (1.4)
3	1 (4.2)
4	2 (8.3)
5	8 (33.3)
6	7 (29.2)
7	2 (8.3)
8	3 (12.5)
9	1 (4.2)
Clinical Specialty	
Allergy and Immunology	1 (4.2)
Cardiology (Pediatric, Adult)	1 (4.2), 2 (8.3)
Clinical Pathology/Laboratory Medicine	1 (4.2)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Dermatology	1 (4.2)
Gastroenterology	1 (4.2)
Hematology/Oncology (Pediatric, Adult)	4 (16.7), 2 (8.3)
Infectious Disease (Pediatric, Adult)	1 (4.2), 1 (4.2)
Neurology	1 (4.2)
Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine (Pediatric, Adult)	2 (8.3), 2 (8.3)
Rheumatology	1 (4.2)
Surgery	
General	1 (4.2)
Neurological	1 (4.2)
Vascular	1 (4.2)


Learning Outcomes from Immersive, 1-mo training
Research Skills
Career Skills
Belonging
Scientific Identity
***
***
***
**
Pre
Post
1
3
5
7
Confidence Scale


Learning Outcomes from Longitudinal, 12-mo training
Research Skills (8)
Career Skills (6)
Belonging
Scientific Identity
**
**
***
**
Pre
Post
1
3
5
7
Confidence Scale

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283532; this version posted December 20, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Satisfaction with program after 1 month, 6 months, and 12 months in program. Participants include 2020, 2021, and 2022 cohorts. Pre survey taken in July when each cohort started. 7-point Likert scale, from "extremely satisfied (7)" to "extremely dissatisfied (1)." Satisfied is 5 and above. Cohorts entering *a*. 2020, *b*. 2021, *c*. 2022

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the CZ Biohub Physician Scientist Fellowship Program overall.		
TIME IN PROGRAM	**MEAN (SD)**	**N Satisfied (%)**
1 month, after the SUMMER intensive training (N=23[a,b,c])	6.3 (0.65)	23 (100)
6 months, after weekly FALL training (N=17[a,b])	6.0 (0.86)	16 (94)
12 months, after weekly SPRING training (N=12[a,b])	5.9 (0.93)	11 (94)

7-point Likert type scale from "extremely satisfied (7)" to "extremely dissatisfied(1)". Satisfied is 5 and above. No fellows were dissatisfied with training.
Cohorts entering *a*. 2020, b. 2021, c. 2022