

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

APPENDIX

Supplementary Table 1. Workforce & pipeline trends (n=8)						
Study	Year	Country	PMID/PMCID	Design/data source	Population	Key finding
Findlay BL, Path to parity (<i>Urology</i>)	2023	U.S.	36495948	Cross-sectional trends (AAMC)	US urologists & trainees, 2007–2019	Practicing female urologists doubled (+104%); resident growth +28% → parity still distant.
Jackson EM, how female is the future of urology? (<i>Urology</i>)	2023	U.S.	37244431	Projection model (workforce + trainee inputs)	US workforce through 2062	Female urologists projected ≈38% by 2062 under status-quo trends. ²
Nam CS, projected urology workforce per capita (<i>JAMA Netw Open</i>)	2021	U.S.	34783827	Simulation/projection	US per-capita supply	Per-capita urology shortage persists; diversification occurs within overall scarcity.
Sierra A, gender demographics in urology in Europe (<i>Eur Urol Focus</i>)	2024	Europe (9 nations)	39477704	National trainee/consultant datasets	Trainees & consultants, 2012–2022	Female trainee share rising; consultant growth slower; wide country variation.
Wang CN, AUA 2021 Census: differential treatment by	2023	U.S.	37003473	AUA Census 2021	Practicing urologists	Women more likely to report differential treatment &

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

gender (<i>Urology</i>)						constrained scope.
Saltzman A, Women urologists: changing trends (<i>Urology</i>)	2016	U.S.	26952567	National survey	Practicing female urologists	Women younger; clustered in academic/urban settings; high weekly hours despite part-time reports. ⁶
Oberlin DT, gender divide: Practice patterns (<i>J Urol</i>)	2016	U.S.	27177426	Case-log analysis	US urologists	Female surgeons' panels skew toward women & gender-neutral procedures; men do more male-specific cases. ⁷
Grutman AJ, Voices of change: experiences of early women urology residents — a single institution qualitative research study (<i>BMC Medical Education</i>)	2025	U.S.	39915762	Qualitative analysis	Early women residents (single-institution)	Context on training climate; notes 44.9% female 2024 match vs ~11.8% women in practice. ⁸

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

Supplementary Table 2. Academic promotion & leadership (n=7)						
Study	Year	Country	PMID/PMCID	Design	Population	Key finding
Breyer BN, Promotion disparities in academic urology (<i>Urology</i>)	2020	U.S.	31917291	Cross-sectional + regression	2,926 academic urologists	Women took ~1.2 yrs longer to reach Associate; men 3× likelier to be rapid-promoted; no diff. Associate→Full.
Awad MA, gender differences in promotion & productivity (<i>Can J Urol</i>)	2017	U.S./Canada	28971789	Cross-sectional	Academic urologists	Senior-rank underrepresentation among women; productivity strongly associated with rank. ¹⁰
Cancian M, representation of women in urological leadership (<i>Urol Pract</i>)	2018	U.S.	37300232	Cross-sectional audit	Societies, boards, chairs	~10% leadership overall; ~1–2% dept chairs at snapshot; committees more balanced than top posts.
Dullea AD, female representation on AUA subspecialty boards (<i>Cureus</i>)	2022	U.S.	35371808	Longitudinal audit	AUA subspecialty societies	Board representation rose modestly (~11→14%, 2014–2020); some boards had 0 women.
Casals RK, diversity within academic urology leadership (<i>Urology</i>)	2022	U.S.	35969723	Cross-sectional (AAMC data)	Urology leaders vs med leadership	Women 7.4% of urology leaders vs 22% in academic urology overall (p<0.0001). ¹³

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

Nettey OS, gender representation in urologic subspecialties (<i>Urology</i>)	2018	U.S.	29331304	ABU certification dataset	Certifying urologists	Women 16.7% of first-time certifiers; more likely in academia (23.6% vs 13.7%). ¹⁴
Marco BB, glass ceilings at EAU/ESPU meetings (<i>EU Open Science</i>)	2023	Europe	37284042	Congress analytics	EAU/ESPU 2012–2022	Female chairs/speakers increased but remain minority; incremental change.

Supplementary Table 3. Authorship & citation impact (n=8)

Study	Year	Country	PMID/PMCID	Design/dataset	Population	Key finding
Mayer EN, publication productivity & gender (<i>Urology</i>)	2017	USA	28232174	Bibliometric (Scopus/GS)	1,922 academic urologists	Men higher h-index; m-quotient similar → gaps reflect shorter careers/representation. ¹⁶
Prunty M, redefining gender gap in authorship (<i>Eur Urol Focus</i>)	2022	USA	34975008	Bibliometric (10 journals; 59k+ papers)	2002–2020	Female first authorship ~15%→29%; senior ~10%→19%; senior gap persists. ¹⁷
Prunty M, authorship vs editorial board composition (<i>Eur Urol Focus</i>)	2022	USA	35534391	Correlational bibliometric	8 high-impact journals	More women on editorial boards correlated with higher female authorship. ¹⁸
Suárez-Arbeláez MC, Authorship gender composition (<i>Urology</i>)	2022	USA	34995564	Bibliometric (18 journals)	2015–2020	≈21% of authors were women; lower share in higher-impact journals; gradual increase. ¹⁹

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

Burg ML, gender disparities on urology journal editorial boards (<i>Eur Urol Focus</i>)	2022	Int'l	35504837	Cross-sectional audit (105 journals)	5,989 editors	Women 14.6% overall; regional & quartile differences.
Nguyen AX, editorial boards of major urology Journals (<i>CUAJ</i>)	2021	USA/Canada	3509938	Cross-sectional	29 journals, 1,364 editors	Women 7.5%→11.9% (2015→2020); leadership still heavily male.
Singh A, Women on CUA guideline panels (<i>CUAJ</i>)	2025	Canada	40637624	Authorship audit	CUA guideline committees	Female guideline authorship underrepresented; growth not proportional to workforce. ²²
Demir DÖ, Women in urology publishing in EU & JU (<i>Urol Int</i>)	2023	Europe/USA	36330955	Bibliometric	Eur Urol & J Urol output	Women's academic presence rising yet comparatively low; subspecialty patterns differ. ²³

Supplementary Table 4. Compensation & industry payments (n=6)

Study	Year	Country	PMID/PMCID	Design	Population	Key finding
Spencer ES, gender differences in compensation (<i>J Urol</i>)	2016	U.S.	26384452	National survey (AUA)	848 urologists	Adjusted salary gap ≈\$70–80k/yr disadvantaging women; hour differences didn't explain.
North AC, gender pay gap in urology (<i>Urol Pract</i>)	2021	U.S.	37145431	AUA Census 2017	2,323 urologists	Men more likely to earn >\$350k (57% vs 40%) despite similar weekly hours.
Cone EB, salary expectations & contract	2021	U.S.	32540301	Residency survey	705 residents	Women expected lower starting salaries; felt less

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

preparedness (<i>Urology</i>)						prepared for contracts.
Wang Y, gender gap in industry payments (<i>Investig Clin Urol</i>)	2024	U.S.	38978221	Quantitative observational study	15,980 urologists	Women urologists were found to be significantly less likely than men to receive high-value consulting or honoraria payments, highlighting persistent gender disparities in industry engagement despite some progress. ²⁷
Reed J, open payments: urologists vs APPs (<i>Urology</i>)	2023	U.S.	37517679	Retrospective cross-sectional observational design	Urologists & APPs	Urologists received significantly higher total and category-specific industry payments compared to APPs. Women urologists received significantly less compensation on average compared to men urologists.
Nam CS, practice patterns & reimbursements (<i>JAMA Netw Open</i>)	2019	U.S.	34783827	Retrospective cohort study using fee-for-service Medicare claims	US urologists	Female urologists cared for more female patients and received lower payments per

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

						wRVU (context for pay gap). ²⁹
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Supplementary Table 5. Patient preferences & clinical outcomes (n=7)						
Study	Year	Country	PMID/PMCID	Design	Population	Key finding
Amir H, do urology male patients prefer same-gender urologist? (<i>Am J Men's Health</i>)	2018	Israel	27222116	Clinic survey	119 male pts	42.8% preferred male urologist; skills/experience outweighed gender; embarrassment drove preference. ³⁰
Wynn J, patient preference for urologist gender (<i>Int J Urol</i>)	2021	Australia	33150602	Clinic survey	400 outpatients	Most had no strong preference; preference rose for intimate exams/procedures. ³¹
Tamalunas A, How do patients choose their urologist? (<i>Eur J Med Res/Patient Prefer Adherence</i>)	2022	Germany	36353408	Multisite survey	1,012 pts	~65% reported some gender preference; strong same-gender preference for intimate/embarrassing conditions. ³²
Razdan S, Provider gender preference in urology (<i>BJUI Compass</i>)	2022	U.S.	36816153	Single-center survey	540 pts	60% no preference; 37% preferred male, 3% female; preferences attenuate with positive experience. ³³
Ficko Z, Urology is a sensitive area: Assessing preferences (<i>Urol Pract</i>)	2018	U.S.	37300200	Survey	457 pts	80% no preference; 18% same-gender preference; modest effect sizes overall.
Steinkohl F, Acceptance of female urologists (<i>Patient Prefer Adherence</i>)	2021	Germany	3440396	Survey (stones cohort)	1,025 pts	83% of male pts had no gender preference; 17% preferred male urologist. ³⁵

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

Passarelli N, Are women urologists caring for predominantly women patients? (<i>Urology</i>)	2025	U.S.	40122293	Case-log analysis	93k minimally invasive cases	Female urologists' panels ~54% women vs. 23% for male urologists; pronounced gender-concordance in case mix. ³⁶
--	------	------	----------	-------------------	------------------------------	--

Supplementary Table 6. Perceptions of reverse bias, burnout & well-being (Male-focused signals) (n=8)

Study	Year	Country	PMID/PMCID	Design	Population	Key finding
Martin B, Perceptions of gender equity by urologic subspecialty (<i>Urology</i>)	2023	U.S.	36702444	National survey	536 urologists	Perceptions of inequity varied by subspecialty; male and female responses diverged on fairness and opportunity. ³⁷
Martin B, Perceptions of gender equity among endourologists (<i>J Endourol</i>)	2022	U.S./Int'l	36112672	Society survey	Endourology community	Reported gender-related barriers; baseline perceptions data to track equity efforts. ³⁸
Koo K, burnout among urologists (<i>Urology</i>)	2021	U.S.	34174271	Survey analysis	Practicing urologists	High burnout; identified institutional drivers; informs male burnout context alongside female. ³⁹
Cheng JW, Burnout and career regret in trainees (<i>Urology</i>)	2020	U.S.	32032685	National resident survey	Urology residents	Significant burnout and career-choice regret; program factors associated.
Narang SK, Personality traits and burnout: A survey of practicing US urologists (<i>Urology</i>)	2022	U.S.	35292294	Cross-sectional survey	US Urologists	Burnout was prevalent across genders, with about 49.1% of respondents meeting criteria for burnout. ⁴¹
Reeson E, burnout in pediatric urology	2024	U.S.	38582728	Survey	Pediatric urology fellows	High burnout; workload & institutional support salient; not sex-

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

fellows (<i>J Pediatr Urol</i>)						limited but relevant to male experience.
Payne K, Sexual harassment & discrimination in training (<i>Urol Pract</i>)	2025	U.S.	40517820	Multi-center survey	Pediatric urologists	Increased prevalence of burnout among pediatric urologists since the 2016 AUA census, with 43% meeting criteria for high burnout (compared to 25.5% in 2016).
de Mazancourt ES, discrimination during pregnancy in training (<i>Prog Urol</i>)	2024	France	38909782	National survey	FR trainees	High discrimination reports (mostly women); sets context for climate; male trainees also report inequities.

REFERENCES

1. Findlay BL, Berrick EN, Granberg CF, et al: Trends in female representation among physicians, trainees, and applicants in urology and surgical specialties. *Urology* 2023;172:228-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2022.11.033>
2. Jackson EM, Sellke N, Rhodes S, et al. How female is the future of urology? Projecting various trajectories of the United States urology workforce. *Urology* 2023;178:180-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2023.04.028>
3. Nam CS, Daignault-Newton S, Kraft KH, et al. Projected US urology workforce per capita, 2020-2060. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;4:e2133864. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.33864>
4. Sierra A, Pagés R, Sinha M, et al. Gender demographics in urology in Europe: Trend analysis over a 10-year period. *Eur Urol Focus* 2024:S2405-456900214-1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2024.10.008>
5. Wang CN, Cohen ZC, Fang R, et al. Factors related to differential treatment and practice limitations amongst urologists: A report of American Urological Association 2021 census data . *Urology* 2023;176:74-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2023.03.024>
6. Saltzman A, Hebert K, Richman A, et al. Women urologists: Changing trends in the workforce. *Urology* 2016;91:1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2016.01.035>
7. Oberlin DT, Vo AX, Bachrach L, et al. The gender divide: The impact of surgeon gender on surgical practice patterns in urology. *J Urol* 2016;196:1522-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2016.05.030>
8. Grutman AJ. Voices of change: Experiences of early women urology residents - a single institution qualitative research study. *BMC Med Educ* 2025;25:194. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-06789-5>
9. Breyer BN, Butler C, Fang R, et al. Promotion disparities in academic urology. *Urology* 2020;138:16-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2019.10.042>
10. Awad MA, Gaither TW, Osterberg EC, et al. Gender differences in promotions and scholarly productivity in academic urology. *Can J Urol* 2017;24:9011-6. PMID: 28971789.
11. Cancian M, Aguiar L, Thavaseelan S. The representation of women in urological leadership. *Urol Pract* 2018;5:228-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urpr.2017.03.006>
12. Dullea AD, Gonzalez DC, Reddy R, et al. Do women have a seat at the table: Trends in female representation among the board of directors in American Urological Association subspecialty societies. *Cureus* 2022;14:e22502. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.22502>
13. Casals RK, Overholt TL, Matthews CA, et al. An analysis of diversity within academic urology leadership. *Can J Urol* 2022;29:11204-8. PMID: 35969723.
14. Nettey OS, Fuchs JS, Kielb SJ, et al. Gender representation in urologic subspecialties. *Urology* 2018;114:66-70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2017.12.034>
15. Bañuelos Marco B, 't Hoen L, O'Kelly F, et al. Primum non discernere: Glass ceilings and female representation at the European Association of Urology and European Society for Paediatric Urology annual meetings, 2012-2022. *Eur Urol Open Sci* 2023;52:60-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euros.2023.04.010>

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

16. Mayer EN, Lenherr SM, Hanson HA, et al. Gender differences in publication productivity among academic urologists in the United States. *Urology* 2017;103:39-46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2016.12.064>
17. Prunty M, Rhodes S, Sun H, et al. Redefining the gender gap in urology authorship: An 18-year publication analysis. *Eur Urol Focus* 2022;8:1512-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2021.12.001>
18. Prunty M, Rhodes S, Sun H, et al. A Seat at the table: The correlation between female authorship and urology journal editorial board membership. *Eur Urol Focus* 2022;8:1751-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2022.04.009>
19. Suarez Arbelaez MC, Nassau DE, Kuchakulla M, et al. Authorship gender composition in urology literature from 2015 through 2020. *Urology* 2022;165:81-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2021.11.041>
20. Burg ML, Sholkapper T, Kohli P, et al. Gender disparities among editorial boards of international urology journals. *Eur Urol Focus* 2022;8:1840-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2022.04.007>
21. Nguyen AX, Zorigtbaatar A, Bouhadana D, et al. Gender disparity on editorial boards of major urology journals. *Can Urol Assoc J* 2022;16:E328-32. <https://doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.7690>
22. Singh S, MacIntyre OC, Bhojani N, et al. Gender differences in authorship of Canadian Urological Association guidelines. *Can Urol Assoc J* 2025;8. <https://doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.9155>
23. Demir DÖ, Karagöz MA. Women in urology: Gender differences in urologists' authorship in high impact journals. *ANZ J Surg* 2023;93:90-7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ans.18143>
24. Spencer ES, Deal AM, Pruthi NR, et al. Gender differences in compensation, job satisfaction and other practice patterns in urology. *J Urol* 2016;195:450-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2015.08.100>
25. North AC, Fang R, Anger J, et al. The gender pay gap in urology. *Urol Pract* 2021;8:149-54. <https://doi.org/10.1097/UPJ.0000000000000169>
26. Cone EB, Westerman ME, Nguyen DD, et al. Gender-based differences in career plans, salary expectations, and business preparedness among urology residents. *Urology* 2021;150:65-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2020.04.123>
27. Wang Y, Davis MJ, Rogers A, et al. Assessment of the gender gap in urology industry payments: An open payments program data analysis. *Investig Clin Urol* 2024;65:411-9. <https://doi.org/10.4111/icu.20240021>
28. Reed S, Singh A, Hyman MJ, et al. Industry payments to urologists and urologic advanced practice providers in 2021. *Urology* 2023;180:121-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2023.06.032>
29. Nam CS, Daignault-Newton S, Kraft KH, et al. Projected US urology workforce per capita, 2020-2060. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;4:e2133864. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.33864>
30. Amir H, Beri A, Yechiely R, et al. Do urology male patients prefer same-gender urologist? *Am J Mens Health* 2018;12:1379-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557988316650886>
31. Wynn J, Johns Putra L. Patient preference for urologist gender. *Int J Urol* 2021;28:170-5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iju.14418>

Khan et al. Re-examining equity in urology: Evaluating the emergence of unintended bias against male clinicians and academics

32. Tamalunas A, Lenau P, Stadelmeier LF, et al. Gender bias in urology: How do patients really choose their urologist? *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2022 3;16:3001-13. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S384967>
33. Razdan S, Ho P, Bieber C, et al. Factors that influence preference for male or female urologist among underserved patients in New York City. *BJUI Compass* 2022;4:167-72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bco2.196>
34. Ficko Z, Li Z, Hyams ES. Urology is a sensitive area: Assessing patient preferences for male or female urologists. *Urol Pract* 2018;5:139-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urpr.2017.02.005>
35. Steinkohl F, Luger AK, Gruber L, et al. Acceptance of female urologists among patients with suspected prostate disease. *Transl Androl Urol* 2021;10:2938-43. <https://doi.org/10.21037/tau-21-131>
36. Passarelli N, Steckler A, Homer B, et al. Are women urologists caring for predominantly women patient populations? Exploring the role of patient-physician gender concordance in robotic and laparoscopic urological surgery. *Urology* 2025;201:174-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2025.03.031>
37. Martin LH, Haslam RE, Agnor R, et al. Perceptions of gender equity by urologic subspecialty. *Urology* 2023;174:35-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2022.12.039>
38. Martin LH, Best SL, Semins MJ, et al. Perceptions and experiences of gender equity among endourologists. *J Endourol* 2022;36:1632-9. <https://doi.org/10.1089/end.2022.0236>
39. Koo K, Javier-DesLoges JF, Fang R, et al. Professional burnout, career choice regret, and unmet needs for well-being among urology residents. *Urology* 2021;157:57-63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2021.05.064>
40. Cheng JW, Wagner H, Hernandez BC, et al. Stressors and coping mechanisms related to burnout within urology. *Urology* 2020;139:27-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2019.11.072>
41. Narang G, Wymer K, Mi L, et al. Personality traits and burnout: A survey of practicing US urologists. *Urology* 2022;167:43-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2022.03.004>
42. Reeson EA, Salevitz D, Alcanzo B, et al. Prevalence of and factors associated with burnout in pediatric urology fellows. *J Pediatr Urol* 2024;20:609.e1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpuro.2024.03.012>
43. Payne NG, Salevitz D, Dvorak N, et al. Prevalence, risk factors, and coping strategies for burnout among pediatric urologists. *Urology* 2025:S0090-429500592-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2025.06.025>
44. Seizilles de Mazancourt E, Cotte J, Pinar U, et al. Barriers for pregnancy and perceptions of gender discrimination of urologists in training in France: Results of a national survey. *Fr J Urol* 2024;34:102671. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fjurol.2024.102671>