

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Markers of achievement for assessing and monitoring gender equity in translational research organisations: a rationale and study protocol
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Ovseiko, Pavel; Edmunds, Laurel; Pololi, Linda; Greenhalgh, Trisha; Kiparoglou, Vasiliki; Henderson, Lorna; Williamson, Catherine; Grant, Jonathan; Lord, Graham; Channon, Keith; Lechler, Robert; Buchan, Alastair

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Michael D Fischer University of Melbourne, Australia University of Oxford, UK
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	21-Sep-2015

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>The authors of this study have developed an important and interesting protocol for assessing gender equity in translational research organisations. Their research has potential to advance very limited evidence base for monitoring gender equity as well as potentially increasing the uptake of gender equity practices in other healthcare organisations.</p> <p>Their proposed development of an adapted balanced scorecard approach is an appropriate (and rather novel) approach for assessing/monitoring gender equity over time and between settings. The diverse population of this study protocol (academic, clinical and administrative staff) and its proposal to compare data with the wider university and National Health Service trust suggest that its findings might indeed be translated to other higher education and healthcare organisations, as the authors suggest.</p> <p>The following questions and suggestions might help to further bring out the significant potential of this study:</p> <p>The selection of appropriate measures is germane to developing an effective tool for data assessment and monitoring. However, it is not really obvious whether the proposed performance dimensions (of leadership, talent, funding and outputs) are necessarily the most appropriate dimensions for assessing gender equity. Whereas data on funding and outputs are likely to be useful indicators of outcomes, the protocol rather overlooks the opportunity to investigate practices and mechanisms that influence gender equity. I appreciate the intention is to use the framework to compare and monitor existing datasets, but given this potential study's importance, my suggestion is that more could be done to develop performance dimensions likely to be important as mechanisms and contexts of change, rather than necessarily outcomes.</p> <p>The authors propose to develop the framework through online</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>survey “may include semi-structured interviews” (p.6). The protocol later specifies methods for conducting interviews (on pp. 15-16), however this should be consistent throughout. Conducting semi-structured interviews is likely to be important for identifying performance dimensions, as well as the practices and mechanisms that influence gender equity in this organisation in a variety of ways (especially given such an interesting setting and range of participants, spanning healthcare and higher education contexts).</p> <p>Finally, whereas this adaptation of the balanced scorecard approach is to allow a retrospective evaluation of two funding periods, a minor comment is that the authors might wish to discuss how their framework could be developed or later adapted as part of a prospective processes of organisational change. Although this may not be immediately relevant for the purposes of the retrospective evaluation, it is likely to be of wider relevance and interest in developing a framework for accelerating gender equity in translational research organisations.</p> <p>In summary, this is an important and timely study that is likely to be of interest across a range of healthcare and higher education settings internationally. A well-developed balanced scorecard framework (and arguably, one that is also sensitive to mechanisms/processes as well as outcomes) should have significant potential to advance not just evidence, but also accelerate gender equity practices in related settings.</p>
--	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Kyoko Nomura Teikyo University School of Medicine, department of Hygiene and Public Health, Tokyo, Japan
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	05-Dec-2015

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The author have done very good job. This study adds one evidence of gender equity and I support what this study has tried to do.
-------------------------	--

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

The authors of this study have developed an important and interesting protocol for assessing gender equity in translational research organisations. Their research has potential to advance very limited evidence base for monitoring gender equity as well as potentially increasing the uptake of gender equity practices in other healthcare organisations. Their proposed development of an adapted balanced scorecard approach is an appropriate (and rather novel) approach for assessing/monitoring gender equity over time and between settings. The diverse population of this study protocol (academic, clinical and administrative staff) and its proposal to compare data with the wider university and National Health Service trust suggest that its findings might indeed be translated to other higher education and healthcare organisations, as the authors suggest.

Author response: We would like to thank the Reviewer for careful and thorough consideration of the manuscript and for providing us with valuable comments and suggestions.

The following questions and suggestions might help to further bring out the significant potential of this study:

The selection of appropriate measures is germane to developing an effective tool for data assessment

and monitoring. However, it is not really obvious whether the proposed performance dimensions (of leadership, talent, funding and outputs) are necessarily the most appropriate dimensions for assessing gender equity. Whereas data on funding and outputs are likely to be useful indicators of outcomes, the protocol rather overlooks the opportunity to investigate practices and mechanisms that influence gender equity. I appreciate the intention is to use the framework to compare and monitor existing datasets, but given this potential study's importance, my suggestion is that more could be done to develop performance dimensions likely to be important as mechanisms and contexts of change, rather than necessarily outcomes.

Author response: We are grateful to the Reviewer for pointing out this opportunity to investigate practices and mechanisms that influence gender equity. We have amended our online survey to include in the online stakeholder consultation and semi-structured interviews open-ended questions regarding such practices and mechanisms (Abstract p.3, Study Overview p.6, Face Validity p.16, Strengths and Limitations p.19).

The authors propose to develop the framework through online survey "may include semi-structured interviews" (p.6). The protocol later specifies methods for conducting interviews (on pp. 15-16), however this should be consistent throughout. Conducting semi-structured interviews is likely to be important for identifying performance dimensions, as well as the practices and mechanisms that influence gender equity in this organisation in a variety of ways (especially given such an interesting setting and range of participants, spanning healthcare and higher education contexts).

Author response: We agree with the importance of conducting semi-structured interviews. We have amended our study protocol to include semi-structured interviews unconditionally. We have specified that they would be used to refine the proposed dimensions as well as to investigate practices and mechanisms that influence gender equity in the given settings (Abstract p.3, Study Overview p.6, Face Validity p.16, Strengths and Limitations p.19).

Finally, whereas this adaptation of the balanced scorecard approach is to allow a retrospective evaluation of two funding periods, a minor comment is that the authors might wish to discuss how their framework could be developed or later adapted as part of a prospective processes of organisational change. Although this may not be immediately relevant for the purposes of the retrospective evaluation, it is likely to be of wider relevance and interest in developing a framework for accelerating gender equity in translational research organisations.

Author response: We agree that discussing how the study could be used to support prospective processes of organisational change is of value. To this effect, we have included an additional paragraph specifying that our study would help identify interventions that are most relevant to UK TROs and would propose a rigorous tool to measure their efficacy as part of prospective organisational development and change (Strengths and Limitations, pp.19-20).

In summary, this is an important and timely study that is likely to be of interest across a range of healthcare and higher education settings internationally. A well-developed balanced scorecard framework (and arguably, one that is also sensitive to mechanisms/processes as well as outcomes) should have significant potential to advance not just evidence, but also accelerate gender equity practices in related settings.

Author response: Thank you.

Reviewer: 2

The author have done very good job. This study adds one evidence of gender equity and I support what this study has tried to do.

Author response: Thank you.