





individual scientists can take to change STEM culture (13) by making a deliberate effort to incorporate gender diversity into editorial board structure, being cognizant of the value of diversity in the decision-making process, and recognizing and rooting out language bias in all aspects of the editorial process. Most importantly, we can continue to publish the highest-quality papers on the science of science publication to ensure that policies aimed at overcoming bias are evidence based.

As Kuhn (ref. 14, p. 209) aptly stated in his classic book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, “Scientific knowledge, like language, is intrinsically the common property of a group or else nothing at all. To understand

it we shall need to know the special characteristic of the groups that create and use it.” Because the groups that create and use scientific knowledge include women, they must have a place in the curation and promulgation of that knowledge through the editorial process. For the record, though, in the entirety of Kuhn’s transformational treatise on the nature of science, the word “woman” never appeared in the first edition; in the second edition, published 8 years later, it appears only once—and that’s in the postscript.

### Acknowledgments

Thanks to Joan Bennett, who provided helpful comments on this manuscript.

- 1 Linkov F, Lovalekar M, Laporte R (2006) Scientific journals are “faith based”: Is there science behind peer review? *J R Soc Med* 99:596–598.
- 2 Amrein K, Langmann A, Fahrleitner-Pammer A, Pieber TR, Zollner-Schwetz I (2011) Women underrepresented on editorial boards of 60 major medical journals. *Gend Med* 8:378–387.
- 3 Helmer M, Schottdorf M, Neef A, Battaglia D (2017) Gender bias in scholarly peer review. *eLife* 6:e21718.
- 4 West JD, Jacquet J, King MM, Correll SJ, Bergstrom CT (2013) The role of gender in scholarly authorship. *PLoS One* 8:e66212.
- 5 Ioannidou E, Rosania A (2015) Under-representation of women on dental journal editorial boards. *PLoS One* 10:e0116630.
- 6 Moss-Racusin CA, Dovidio JF, Brescoll VL, Graham MJ, Handelsman J (2012) Science faculty’s subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 109:16474–16479.
- 7 Nosek BA, et al. (2009) National differences in gender-science stereotypes predict national sex differences in science and math achievement. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 106:10593–10597.
- 8 Nittrouer CL, et al. (2018) Gender disparities in colloquium speakers at top universities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 115:104–108.
- 9 Atir S, Ferguson MJ (2018) How gender determines the way we speak about professionals. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 115:7278–7283.
- 10 Garg N, Schiebinger L, Jurafsky D, Zou J (2018) Word embeddings quantify 100 years of gender and ethnic stereotypes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 115:E3635–E3644.
- 11 Campbell LG, Mehtani S, Dozier ME, Rinehart J (2013) Gender-heterogeneous working groups produce higher quality science. *PLoS One* 8:e79147.
- 12 Nielsen MW, et al. (2017) Opinion: Gender diversity leads to better science. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 114:1740–1742.
- 13 Asplund M, Welle CG (2018) Advancing science: How bias holds us back. *Neuron* 99:635–639.
- 14 Kuhn TS (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Univ Chicago Press, Chicago), 2nd Ed.