An article by Kerry Grens titled " Peer Reviewers Less Likely to Be Women" was published in The Scientist in 2017. There is a lack of female reviewers due to editors' recommendations, according to an examination of American Geophysical Union publications. This underrepresentation is especially troubling when compared to the percentages of female authorship and presence in the field, which are both higher. However, she immediately clarifies the ambiguities in this statement, and the report also clarifies that the proportion is low because women decline offers to review papers at a higher rate than males, and because they receive fewer invites from editors to evaluate manuscripts than men do. The sources are cited extensively in places where they are required, such as the study's co-authors Jory Lerback of the University of Utah and Brooks Hanson of the American Geophysical Union (AGU) put it, "These findings underscore the need for efforts to increase female scientists' engagement in manuscript reviewing to aid in the advancement and retention of women in science." (Ref-s022457). The authors looked at the authorship, reviews, and acceptances of papers submitted to any of the 20 journals published by the American Geophysical Union between 2012 and 2015, and they found a pattern.

The writer's tone is professional throughout the entire piece, and there is no outpouring of emotions on his or her part. The facts, as well as the sources, are presented straightforwardly. The researchers discovered that, even though 27 percent of original authors were female and 28 percent of the AGU membership is female, editors and writers only recommended female reviewers 15 percent to 22 percent of the time. The essay also explains that ageism is more prevalent than genderism when it comes to discrimination. "We anticipated that women would be recommended as reviewers at a lower rate than males, but we assumed that this would be primarily due to age-related factors, as editors would be picking more experienced scientists to review, who are more likely to be male" (Ref-f329454). "However, the bias in dividing this data by age group was more than we had anticipated."

When it comes to gender discrimination, the article presents all sides of the story and is impartial in terms of opinion. For example, papers by women as first authors were approved at a higher rate than papers by men as first authors. According to Lerback and Hanson, this might be because women prepare their articles more thoroughly, anticipating publishing difficulties that men do not always face, according to the authors. They also think that this could be due to reverse discrimination. "A better understanding and awareness of the issue of unconscious bias throughout career-building activities will lead to better progression and retention of women in the sciences," said the author of the article. The essay is highly educational, and it describes gender prejudice in great depth, backed up by statistical evidence, thus it should be included in a library's collection of resources.