

1 **The Nature of Race in Germany: A systematic**  
2 **literature review of human classifications in German**  
3 **life sciences**

4  
5 Isabelle Bartram<sup>1¶\*</sup>, Laura Schnieder<sup>¶1</sup>, Nils Ellebrecht<sup>1</sup>, Florian Ruland<sup>2,3</sup>, Tino Plümecke<sup>1</sup>,  
6 Andrea zur Nieden<sup>1</sup>

7  
8  
9  
10 <sup>1</sup> Institute of Sociology, University of Freiburg, Germany

11 <sup>2</sup> Department of Biology, Chemistry, Pharmacy, Institute of Biology, Freie Universität Berlin,  
12 Germany.

13 <sup>3</sup> Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB), Berlin, Germany.

14  
15  
16 \* Corresponding author

17 E-mail: [isabelle.bartram@soziologie.uni-freiburg.de](mailto:isabelle.bartram@soziologie.uni-freiburg.de)

18  
19  
20 ¶¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

21

## 22 **Abstract**

23 The use of human diversity classifications like race, ethnicity, ancestry, or migration  
24 background entails a range of scientific as well as social consequences, therefore, a careful  
25 application is vital. In this article, we present results from a systematic literature review and  
26 subsequent quantitative content analysis based on 546 papers focusing on classifications  
27 applied in life sciences studies at German research institutions. Our aim is to capture a snap-  
28 shot of current classification practices applied to categorize humans across various  
29 disciplines and fields in a specific national context that remains underexposed in this regard.  
30 The review substantiates a) the results from earlier studies that point to heterogeneity,  
31 inconsistency and vagueness of human classifications used in the life sciences, and b)  
32 underlines the presumed specificity of the German science context, where the term “race” is  
33 comparatively little used. Our findings stress the need for German researchers to partake in  
34 the ongoing international debate on the practice of human classification in the life sciences to  
35 advance the international and interdisciplinary transferability of scientific results and, first and  
36 foremost, to avoid unintended effects such as overgeneralization, racialization, and  
37 stigmatization.

38

## 39 **Key words**

40 Race, ethnicity, ancestry, migration background, human diversity, human classifications

41

## 42 **Introduction**

43 In life science research on humans, it is common to divide human diversity using categories  
44 that carry more than mere systematizing meanings. The use of terms like race, ethnicity,  
45 ancestry, or migration background can therefore result in a range of scientific as well as  
46 social consequences beyond the mere designatory function. Firstly, human categorizations

47 such as race and ethnicity have often been criticized for not adequately reflecting biological  
48 diversity (Marks 1995; Lewontin 1972; Livingstone and Dobzhansky 1962; Roberts 2011;  
49 M'charek 2021). Secondly, classifications such as race, ethnicity, etc. inextricably contain  
50 social meanings and socio-cultural conditions of origin (Bourdieu 2018; Bowker and Star ca.  
51 2008; Brubaker 2002; Duster 2003; M'charek 2010; Fleck 1981; Weber 1978). Thirdly, most  
52 classification terms are loaded with historical injustice, which can also make their  
53 unquestioned use in nowadays research problematic.

54 As a result of these criticisms editors from a variety of life science journals have sought to  
55 address these issues by publishing guidelines for potential authors (see for example  
56 Flanagin et al. 2021; Palermo et al. 2021). Beyond that, the largest professional body  
57 representing medical professionals and students in the United States, the American Medical  
58 Association, stresses that race and ethnicity are social constructs and recommend that  
59 "specific racial and ethnic categories are preferred over collective terms". Furthermore,  
60 should the method section of articles state how participant race and ethnicity was assessed  
61 (Flanagin et al. 2021). Such kind of commitment by editors are the strongest predictor of  
62 authors following recommendations, according to a study by Sankar et al. (2015). However,  
63 Sankar et al. examine only high impact journals based in US and UK. In contrast other  
64 reviews also show that the publishing of guidelines has not necessarily led to the inclusion  
65 and/or a higher quality of reporting race/ethnicity data in the past few decades (Bokor-  
66 Billmann et al. 2020; Ma et al. 2007; Moore 2020b; Maduka et al. 2021).

67 In our study we give an overview of classification practices at work at German-based  
68 research institutions, elaborating mainly on the particularities of the more German versus  
69 more internationally positioned research teams and analyze the differences in the use of  
70 each term in different disciplines. This reconstruction of the respective classification practices  
71 contribute to an ongoing debate on the social repercussions of human differentiations in  
72 science.

73

## 74 **The seemingly absence of race in Germany**

75 The German research context is particularly interesting because of its special relationship to  
76 the term “race” and possibly racializing human classifications. “Rasse” is today by no means a  
77 commonly used word in the German-speaking context. In contrast to the British and especially  
78 the US usage (race), it is now used only rarely concerning people and has almost exclusively  
79 a biological meaning (Lipphardt et al. 2018; zur Nieden 2014). There are two main reasons for  
80 this limited usage of the term in current writing. Firstly, its association with race legislation and  
81 the persecution of Jews in the Third Reich; the term “Rasse” itself is therefore discredited, and  
82 this resulted, secondly, in political and scientific attempts from the 1980s onwards to avoid the  
83 term and to use alternative concepts for human differentiation like ethnicity or recently  
84 migration background. In addition to the life sciences, there are also extensive efforts to replace  
85 the term race from official documents and legal texts, such as the German constitution as well  
86 as the state constitutions.

87 However, the race term is not simply extinguished, instead the concept and racialisations  
88 through alternative terms continue to exist, as M'charek, Schramm, and Skinner (2014) have  
89 shown also for life science research in other European countries. This is reflected by the  
90 recurring pronouncements against biological race, like the recent Jena Declaration, that can  
91 be interpreted as a persistence rather than the end of this concept. This declaration was  
92 published in 2019 by leading German zoologists and human geneticists on the occasion of the  
93 annual meeting of the German Zoological Society, and its authors demanded that “[t]oday and  
94 in the future, not using the term race should be part of scientific decency” (Fischer et al. 2019);  
95 the aim was to overcome biological justifications for racial discrimination. Evidently, statements  
96 like these continue to be necessary as the complex relationship between the life sciences and  
97 race is far from over. A wide variety of studies, mostly from the social sciences, have  
98 investigated the contemporary history of continuities of race and racializations for different life  
99 science fields in Germany such as biology (Kattmann 2002; Palm 2013; Lipphardt 2012; AG  
100 gegen Rassismus in den Lebenswissenschaften 2009), medicine (Bauer 2009; zur Nieden

101 2014) genetics (Plümecke 2013; Lipphardt et al. 2020; Sommer 2014) and psychology  
102 (Wandert 2009). But the majority of these studies provide rather glancing or anecdotal insights  
103 into the respective discipline and the practices of human classification in the life sciences in  
104 Germany. Up to now, no comprehensive empirical assessment of the use of human  
105 classifications in the German life sciences exists.

106

107 To address this research gap, we performed a systematic overview of studies published in  
108 recent years by German research institutions. Our aim is to provide a first overview of how  
109 human classification is currently applied in the German life sciences, under which terms, with  
110 which meanings and with what kind of differences to the international and mainly US-  
111 dominated classification schemas.

112

## 113 **Materials and Methods**


### 114 **Systematic Literature Review**

115 We performed a systematic literature search using PubMed and Web of Science (WoS) with  
116 the aim of identifying German life sciences studies that applied race and other possibly  
117 racializing classifications to human research subjects. In terms of method, we followed the  
118 PRISMA-P 2015 guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (see Fig.1 and  
119 checklist in supplementary material 1) (Moher et al. 2009). In our preliminary explorative  
120 research we had identified “race”, “ethnicity”, “migration background” and “ancestry” or  
121 related terms as the terms most commonly used in the life sciences to represent human  
122 diversity, and thus chose these words as search terms. The often-used term “population”  
123 was not included in our analysis because the search string led to a large number of articles  
124 that were not relevant to our research question (e.g. population-wide studies) and that could  
125 only be processed with a disproportionate amount of time.

126 We limited our review to primary research in English and German and excluded meta-  
127 analysis and case reports, but included studies where the authors used existing datasets to  
128 address their own research questions. We thus focused on studies where the authors  
129 themselves designed study and/or analysis protocols and potentially chose a system and  
130 terms to describe and/or differentiate research subjects.

131 To focus only on current studies, the search was limited to articles published between 2018  
132 and 2020. The chosen timeframe opens up the possibility to test the potential influence of the  
133 Black Lives Matter movement in 2020 on the choice of classification terms, as indicated by  
134 interview partners from the field. This crucial question will be the focus of future  
135 investigation. The last search was performed on the 13 April 2021 to consider possible lag  
136 time from publication date to articles being indexed in scientific databases. The laborious  
137 coding process goes beyond a usual systematic review (see below) and was finished in early  
138 2022. Using the search term “((race) OR (migra\*) OR (ethnic\*) OR (ancestry)) AND  
139 (German\*)” we identified 3,982 records in the Pubmed database published within the  
140 selected time frame. For the WoS database the search term “race OR migra\* OR ethnic\* OR  
141 ancestry” was used, and the resulting search results refined to studies from Germany and  
142 from life science disciplines. 6,235 records were identified in this way. From the total of  
143 10,217 records from both databases, 9,415 records could be excluded from further analysis  
144 because they were duplicates, the record did not meet our search criteria, or the article did  
145 not fit the scope of our review: because no human subjects were studied or artificial data was  
146 used, it did not report primary research results or addressed only single case reports, or  
147 because the subjects were not categorized or described using human diversity  
148 classifications. This strategy returned 802 relevant publications that were then read  
149 thoroughly. Another 256 publications were excluded because no full text was available via  
150 internet, library access or an email request to the authors, the studies were not from the life  
151 sciences, or any of the previously listed exclusion criteria were met (Fig. 1). The final article

152 database contained 546 articles matching the scope of our review, 45 of them were German  
153 language (8.2%) and the rest written in English.  
154



155

156 **Fig. 1: Flow chart for the selection of studies for the systematic literature review.**

157 Adapted from Moher et al. (2009)

158

159 **Quantitative analysis**

160 To perform a quantitative content analysis (Coe and Scacco 2017), we used MAXQDA  
161 Standard 2020 20.1.0 (VERBI GmbH Berlin) software. We developed a coding system  
162 including the following categories: authors (sub-codes: all, first and last author, or first or last  
163 author affiliated to German institutes), discipline (by research institutions of first and last  
164 author), categories (which terms were used to classify or define groups of subjects), and  
165 study location (country where the samples or data were collected).

166 Concerning the classification terms, we focused on terms used in the methods sections to  
167 describe or stratify research subjects but also coded terms that were used by authors in the  
168 interpretation of results in the discussion section to describe the cohort they had previously  
169 analysed. Where studies did not name the location where research subjects were examined  
170 or sampled, we coded them either as “not specified” when the information was not available  
171 without guessing or as “information provided elsewhere” when the authors pointed to further  
172 research articles. Using this approach, i.e. explicitly focusing on the respective cohort, we  
173 look at the terms in context beyond a mere counting of terms.

174 Focusing on the methods, results and discussion sections, all articles were read thoroughly  
175 and coded by members of our research group. When uncertainties arose the publications  
176 and codes in question were discussed within our group until a consensus was achieved.  
177 The absolute and relative frequencies of coded studies were calculated for each sub-code.

178  
179 We created seven generalized linear models with binomial error distribution using one of the  
180 seven most common terms (“ethnicity”, “migration”, “ancestry”, “race”, “population”, “origin”  
181 and “refugee/asylum seeker”) as respective response variable. Predictors were authors,  
182 sampling location, their interaction and the three most common disciplines (medicine,  
183 epidemiology and psychology). We performed model comparison with all possible parameter  
184 combinations and considered all predictors appearing in models with a relative model weight  
185  $\geq 0.05$ . We built the final models using only those predictors and calculated their adjusted  
186  $R^2$  values. All analyses were conducted using R (R Core Team 2020), models were created

187 with the package “lme4” (Bates et al. 2015), model comparisons were performed using the  
188 “MuMIn” package (Bartoń) and adj.  $R^2$  were calculated with the package “rsq” (Zhang 2021).

## 189 Results

### 190 Great diversity of classification terms used in the German life sciences

<b>Search terms in literature review</b>	<b># of studies</b>	<b>% of studies</b>
Ethnicity	249	45.5
Migration	184	33.6
Ancestry	97	17.7
Race	76	13.9
<b>Additional terms identified</b>		
Population	152	27.8
Origin	80	14.6
Refugee / asylum seeker	58	10.6
(Sub)group	36	6.6
Descent	30	5.5
Nationality	17	3.1
Natives	17	3.1
Resettler / Aussiedler	17	3.1
Background	13	2.4
Language speakers	13	2.4
Reference group	12	2.2
Foreigner	11	2.0


191 With our broad search strategy, we were able to build a dataset that gives a substantial  
192 overview of the current research landscape in the respective fields. The 546 studies  
193 identified included a great variety of terms employed to stratify or describe research subjects.  
194 Within our dataset we registered 189 different classifications used. Different derivatives were  
195 coded with umbrella terms, e.g. “immigrant”, “migrant”, “migration background”, and all  
196 variations and German equivalents of these terms were subsumed under the term  
197 “migration”. After merging related terms in this way, 34 different classifications could be  
198 identified within our database. Those that were applied in more than 2% of the studies  
199 analysed, and the frequency in which they were used, are listed in Table 1. The majority of  
200 studies applied several different terms to describe a cohort (54.8%), e.g. stating that people  
201 have a certain “ethnicity” or a “migration background”, often using the terms interchangeably.  
202 Of the original search terms in our systematic literature review, the classification “ethnicity”  
203 was used most often to describe the cohort studied (45.5%), followed by “migration” (33.6%),  
204 “ancestry” (17.7%) and “race” (13.9%). We identified additional terms that were used in a  
205 large proportion of studies within our database. Of these, the most common were  
206 “population” (27.8%), “origin” (14.6%), and “refugee” or “asylum seeker” (10.6%).

207

### 208 **German influence on classifications**

209 We recorded whether all authors (238 studies) or the first *and* last author (119) or the first *or*  
210 last author (189) were affiliated with a German research institution. The terms used varied  
211 noticeably with the degree of ‘German-basedness’ of the author teams (Fig. 2) as well as  
212 where the study was conducted (Fig. 3). Most notably, the term “race” was not very  
213 commonly applied in studies by all-German author teams or teams with a German first and  
214 last author (4.6% and 9.2%), but used in nearly 30% of studies published by only a German  
215 first or last author. This divide was also noticeable for the terms “ethnicity” and “ancestry”. As  
216 described above, “ethnicity” was overall a more popular term than “race” within our database,  
217 and was often used alongside other terms. But while it was used in 28.6% of studies of all-


218 German author teams, around 60% of studies by author teams less affiliated to German  
219 research institutions used it. “Ancestry” was used in only 6.3% of studies by all-German  
220 author teams, while research subjects were classified using this term in 31.1% and 23.8% of  
221 studies by a German first and last author or German first or last author. In contrast, the  
222 majority of all-German author teams used the term “migration” (57.1%) while this term was  
223 much less often used in studies by ‘less German’ author teams (22.7% and 11.1%) within our  
224 database. All above descriptive results are backed up by our quantitative analyses, as the  
225 author institution was a significant predictor in our models of the use of “ethnicity”, “race”,  
226 “ancestry” and “migration” (see supplementary material 2).  
227



228  
229 **Fig. 2: Frequency of classification terms used in relation to affiliation of author teams**  
230 **to German research institutions.**

231  
232 The articles analysed human samples collected in 62 different countries. Most of them  
233 studied research subjects in Germany or the USA (50.6% and 11.2% of articles).  
234 Interestingly, in 35 studies (6.4%), the authors did not make sufficiently clear in which country  
235 their research subjects were examined or sampled, either by using extremely broad terms  
236 like “Europe” or “Africa” or by not mentioning a location at all.

237 While study authors who recruited research subjects in Germany most often described and  
238 stratified them as “migrants” or people with “migration background” (58.5%), in studies with  
239 sampling in the USA only 6.6% of studies used such a category. In contrast, 63.9% of  
240 datasets collected in the USA used the term “race” while only 3.3% of studies performed in  
241 Germany used “race” to describe research subjects (Fig. 3). Our quantitative analyses  
242 confirm this assessment as the sampling location was a significant predictor of the use of  
243 "race" (see supplementary material 2), but also for all other terms. The exceptions are  
244 population and ancestry, where the use is similar for samples from Germany or the USA, but  
245 more common if the sampling location was "other".  
246




247  
248 **Fig. 3: Frequency of classification terms used in relation to sampling location.** Some  
249 studies examined research subjects in several countries, thus there is an overlap between  
250 articles categorized as “German”, “USA” and “other”.

251  
252 **Different uses of classifications between disciplines**

253 According to our dataset, research from different life science disciplines applies human  
254 classifications in varying frequencies to describe and differentiate research subjects (Fig. 4).  
255 Summarizing medical disciplines, we coded 42 different life science disciplines by the first

256 and last author's institutional or departmental affiliation. Most of the articles analysed were  
257 written by authors from the field of medicine (74.0%), followed by epidemiology (24.7%) and  
258 psychology (14.5%), with many of them published by scientists from more than one discipline  
259 (44.9%). While in the field of medicine nearly half of the author teams sorted their research  
260 subjects by their "ethnicity" (48.3%), in the epidemiology and psychology papers analysed  
261 "migration" was the most frequently used term (58.5 and 44.3%). However, neither of these  
262 terms was used frequently in the field of archaeogenetics, where "ancestry" or "population"  
263 were most often applied when grouping human research subjects (90% and 80). Our  
264 quantitative analyses confirm these observations (see supplementary material 2),  
265



266  
267 **Fig. 4: Frequency of classification terms used in different research areas.** Many of the  
268 analysed studies were assigned to several disciplines, thus there is an overlap between  
269 research areas.

## 270 Discussion

271 Our quantitative analysis of 546 studies published between 2018 and 2020 by authors  
272 affiliated to German institutions confirms results from smaller or more selective/specialized  
273 meta studies interested in both the wide range and the vagueness, underdetermination and

274 inadequacy of human classifications used in the life sciences. On the other hand, our results  
275 substantiate the presumed specificity of the German science context, where the use of the  
276 term “race” is relatively low.

277

### 278 **Variety and inconsistencies**

279 In their literature review, Zhang and Finckelstein examined the different racial and ethnic  
280 categories used in pharmacogenetic research (Zhang and Finkelstein 2019). They concluded  
281 that there is a high degree of heterogeneity in the categories that are used to investigate the  
282 distributions of certain genotypes. In the field of epidemiology, Bokor-Billmann et al. analysed  
283 articles in top-ranking journals for their use of ethnicity and race and identified 81 different  
284 methods authors used to classify race or ethnicity (Bokor-Billmann et al. 2020). A recent  
285 review of studies in the field of ophthalmology concluded that “the categories used were  
286 heterogeneous and often inconsistent” (Moore 2020a). Our analysis confirms these previous  
287 observations: research subjects were classified by 189 different terms, and even after we  
288 had grouped them 34 different classifications remained. Interestingly, many authors in our  
289 database used several terms next to each other (see supplementary material 2), sometimes  
290 even as proxy or synonyms. For example, Monsees et al. studied the prevalence of dementia  
291 in people with “migration background”, referencing the official definition of the German  
292 census (a person’s parents or themselves born with a different nationality). But in the caption of  
293 a table summarizing the results “*Ethnien*” is used and these ethnicities are then differentiated  
294 by “*Nationalität*”, nationality (Monsees et al. 2019). While a comprehensive analysis of *how*  
295 the studies in our database defined and applied these classifications is still in progress, this  
296 finding points to a lack of awareness that terms like ethnicity, migration background and race  
297 are based on different social and academic concepts and notions.

298 One factor responsible for the observed divergence between studies is that while English is  
299 the standard science language, different national and cultural contexts influence  
300 classifications. For example, Zhang and Finckelstein noted a high degree of heterogeneity in

301 the number of ethnic categories used in different countries to classify research subjects as  
302 “Asian” or “White” (Zhang and Finkelstein 2019). As anticipated, we observed a noticeable  
303 association between the degree of ‘German-basedness’ of author teams and which terms  
304 they used.

305

### 306 **No race in German science?**

307 At first glance our analysis may give the impression that the German research landscape is  
308 post-racial because, firstly, the German term “*Rasse*” appears in none of the 45 research  
309 publications written in German and, secondly, the term “race” is rarely used by author teams  
310 where all members are affiliated to German research institutions compared to more  
311 international research teams (4.6 vs. 28.6%). Thirdly, race was also very rarely applied to  
312 research subjects that were sampled or examined in Germany, compared to other study  
313 locations.

314 However, apart from a formal application of race in the method section to classify the  
315 research subjects in the respective studies, we often observed an additional, less precise  
316 use of the term, also in the context of the cohort investigated: race is still used by many  
317 authors in the discussion section of publications when the author’s own results are compared  
318 with the findings of other studies. Kridin et al., for example, investigated specific health  
319 differences between people with Jewish and Arab ethnicity in Israel. In the discussion section  
320 the authors contrasted their results for “patients of Jewish ancestry” with a study on people of  
321 “African race”, implying that the differentiations of these two studies are comparable (Kridin  
322 et al. 2020). This kind of switching and equating of human classifications in the discussion of  
323 results is not currently covered by the usual journal guidelines. For example, the  
324 recommendations of the International Committee of Journal Editors (International Committee of  
325 Medical Journal Editors 2021) clearly only refer to the respective study participants when  
326 recommending defining how race or ethnicity should be determined and the use of precise  
327 language.

328

329 Instead of race and ethnicity, author teams affiliated to German research institutions often  
330 use the term “migration” (including migrant, immigrant, migrant background etc.) to describe  
331 and stratify their research subjects. Further investigation would be needed to establish  
332 whether “migration” is simply used as a synonym to replace socially controversial terms, or  
333 the use of race and ethnicity is low because German scientists seldomly see any scientific or  
334 ethical benefit in applying it. Preliminary results of our analysis for the field of epidemiology  
335 show that, on the one hand, the choice of categories also relates to which categories of  
336 differentiation are used in the political sphere. Germany, unlike the US, has no ethnic census  
337 categories but recently introduced the variable “migration background” for the micro census  
338 to record first, second or third generation immigrants to Germany that may have German  
339 citizenship and are no longer trackable by the former category “*Ausländer*” (foreigner) (zur  
340 Nieden and Bartram 20.08.2020; zur Nieden 2014). Subsequently, German epidemiological  
341 studies have begun to apply this category if samples are collected in Germany instead of  
342 race or ethnicity, arguing e.g. that Germany is “an immigration country without post-colonial  
343 migration and without numerically relevant autochthonous ethnic minorities” (Schenk 2007).  
344 On the other hand migration background is often used interchangeably with ethnicity, maybe  
345 to ensure compatibility with the international discussion (zur Nieden and Bartram  
346 20.08.2020).

347 Finally, it can be noted that the terms “refugee” and “origin” are used more frequently the  
348 more German authors are involved in the study. The use of the former possibly reflects the  
349 research interest in the situation of refugees after the increased social debates on  
350 immigration from 2015 on. The predilection for the English term “origin”, which is rarely used  
351 by native speakers, can in turn be understood as an expression of linguistic uncertainty. One  
352 can even suspect that the underdetermined nature of the term encourages its deliberate use.

353 **Disciplinary classification cultures**

354 Our literature review yielded studies from a broad variety of fields in the life sciences,  
355 including clinical studies of pharmaceutical/biotech companies. Nearly half of them were  
356 published by authors from different research fields, speaking to a relatively high degree of  
357 interdisciplinarity of the German research landscape on human diversity. However, nearly 3/4  
358 of studies were affiliated to medical departments. Whether this dominance of medical studies  
359 is due to a general dominance of medicine in German life science research (due to research  
360 funding allocation and publication cultures), or whether medical studies are more likely to  
361 apply human classifications, is unclear. Due to the low number of studies from disciplines  
362 besides medicine, epidemiology, and psychology our results should be taken with a grain of  
363 salt. Nonetheless, while these three disciplines show a rather similar frequency distribution of  
364 the classification terms ethnicity, ancestry, race and migration; we observed a different  
365 practice in other disciplines. Studies from archaeogenetics and human genetics, for example,  
366 mainly refer to “ancestry” to describe or divide their research subjects. Here, “ancestry” is  
367 usually genetically determined, and interestingly is sometimes even used to verify the self-  
368 reported ethnicity of research subjects (Degenhardt et al. 2019). This is in accordance with  
369 observations by Fujimura and Rajagopalan, who studied population geneticists in the US  
370 [29]. Most studies in these fields, especially when they are investigating human genetic  
371 history, are conceived by large international author teams. Thus, the unpopularity of the term  
372 race can be attributed to disciplinary culture and not to German scientific culture (Byeon et al.  
373 2021; Popejoy et al. 2020).

374 In contrast, one third of the 17 clinical studies by pharmaceutical companies within our  
375 database used the term race (only 13.9% on average in the whole database). This is most  
376 certainly driven by US standards, as the US Food and Drug Administration demands  
377 reporting of race/ethnicity for drug approvals. How this classification is then applied to a  
378 German study population and to what effect remains to be investigated.

379

380 **Limitations**

381 Certainly, important classification terms like population and origin are underrepresented in  
382 our review sample, as the terms generated a plethora of non-specific search results that we  
383 did not want to include in our review or could not meaningfully evaluate with the resources  
384 available to us. In addition, the decisions we took in determining what constitutes the  
385 “German life sciences” may have had an effect on the inclusion or exclusion of some  
386 research papers. Publication language is not a useful indicator as, apart from epidemiological  
387 studies, today relevant scientific results from German research institutions are published  
388 almost exclusively in English-language journals (Baethge 2008). Additionally, research teams  
389 at German institutions are frequently very international, e.g. in 2017 nearly half of the  
390 scientists employed at the Max Planck Society did not have German nationality (Deutscher  
391 Akademischer Austauschdienst and Deutsches Zentrum für Hochschul- und  
392 Wissenschaftsforschung 2020). In addition, scientific résumés demand work abroad during  
393 the postdoctoral phase of German scientists, possibly with a lasting impact on their research  
394 activity. Thus, affiliation to a German institution might be an imprecise surrogate marker in  
395 studying historical and cultural differences along national and language lines. Similarly, it was  
396 sometimes difficult to determine the discipline of a given study without expertise in some of  
397 the specific research topics. Thus, as this article is published in a science journal by an  
398 interdisciplinary author team, mainly affiliated to a sociological institute, we are aware that  
399 disciplinary subtleties might have been overlooked by our approach. However, we are  
400 confident that the search strategy of our literature review captured a broad overview of life  
401 science studies affiliated to German research institutes regarding our research question.

## 402 **Conclusion**

403 Our quantitative content analysis of research literature illustrates that current German life  
404 sciences are prone to the same heterogenous use of human classifications that was found in  
405 the international studies cited. Additionally, we identified a unique relationship with the term  
406 “race” that was used less the more German-based an author team was. The often

407 interchangeable use of terms like race, ethnicity, ancestry, migration etc. we registered within  
408 the same studies is an indication of a confusion and underdetermination of concepts that can  
409 lead to overgeneralization and stigmatization. Regardless of whether human classifications  
410 are included in research to measure and combat health inequalities, trace human history or  
411 identify population-specific therapeutic targets, terms like race, ethnicity and migration  
412 background cannot be separated from their social meanings. Furthermore, imprecise and  
413 vague classifications also impede the national and international transferability of scientific  
414 results, thereby diminishing even the intended impact of the research in question.  
415 We are very well aware that the negotiation and decision-making processes inherent in every  
416 step of our analysis from outline to coding practices to the formulation of results gives this  
417 review a very specific angle. And of course, some of the decisions made (e.g. how to  
418 demarcate which publications count in as *German* research) are as imperfect and as much  
419 subject to negotiation as the classifications analysed themselves. Still, we are convinced that  
420 this overview and the aspects we highlighted serve as a worthwhile basis to get involved into  
421 a trans- and international debate about the potentials and pitfalls of classification practices in  
422 the current life sciences.

## 423 **Acknowledgments**

424 We thank Isabel Schön, Felix Fink and Charlotte Schulze-Marmeling for their assistance in  
425 compiling and coding the articles in our database.

426 This study was supported by a grant by the German Federal Ministry of Education and  
427 Research (BMBF), funding number 01GP1790.

## 428 **References**

429 AG gegen Rassismus in den Lebenswissenschaften (Ed.) (2009). *Gemachte Differenz:*  
430 *Kontinuitäten biologischer »Rasse«-Konzepte.* Unrast Verlag.

- 431 Baethge, Christopher (2008). The languages of medicine. *Deutsches Arzteblatt international*  
432 105 (3), 37–40. <https://doi.org/10.3238/arztebl.2008.0037>.
- 433 Bartoń, Kamil. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. Version R package version 1.43.17. Available  
434 online at <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn> (accessed 4/14/2022).
- 435 Bates, Douglas/Mächler, Martin/Bolker, Ben/Walker, Steve (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-  
436 Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67 (1).  
437 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>.
- 438 Bauer, Susanne (2009). Politik Mit Kategorien. Zur Produktion Von Differenz in  
439 Epidemiologie Und Biomedizin. In: AG gegen Rassismus in den Lebenswissenschaften  
440 (Ed.). *Gemachte Differenz: Kontinuitäten biologischer »Rasse«-Konzepte*. Unrast  
441 Verlag, 240–255.
- 442 Bokor-Billmann, Therezia/Langan, Ewan A./Billmann, Franck (2020). The reporting of race  
443 and/or ethnicity in the medical literature: a retrospective bibliometric analysis confirmed  
444 room for improvement. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 119, 1–6.  
445 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.11.005>.
- 446 Bourdieu, Pierre (2018). Classification struggles. Lectures at the Collège de France (1981-  
447 1982). Hg. von Patrick Champagne/Julien Duval/Franck Poupeau et al. Cambridge,  
448 UK/Medford, MA, Polity.
- 449 Bowker, Geoffrey C./Star, Susan Leigh (ca. 2008). *Sorting things out. Classification and its*  
450 *consequences*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- 451 Brubaker, Rogers (2002). Ethnicity without groups. *European Journal of Sociology* 43 (2),  
452 163–189. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003975602001066>.
- 453 Byeon, Yen Ji Julia/Islamaj, Rezarta/Yeganova, Lana/Wilbur, W. John/Lu, Zhiyong/Brody,  
454 Lawrence C./Bonham, Vence L. (2021). Evolving use of ancestry, ethnicity, and race in  
455 genetics research-A survey spanning seven decades. *American journal of human*  
456 *genetics* 108 (12), 2215–2223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2021.10.008>.

- 457 Coe, Kevin/Scacco, Joshua M. (2017). Content Analysis, Quantitative. In: Jörg  
458 Matthes/Christine S. Davis/Robert F. Potter (Eds.). The International Encyclopedia of  
459 Communication Research Methods. Wiley, 1–11.
- 460 Degenhardt, Frauke/Wendorff, Mareike/Wittig, Michael/Ellinghaus, Eva/Datta, Lisa  
461 W./Schembri, John/Ng, Siew C./Rosati, Elisa/Hübenthal, Matthias/Ellinghaus,  
462 David/Jung, Eun Suk/Lieb, Wolfgang/Abedian, Shifteh/Malekzadeh, Reza/Cheon, Jae  
463 Hee/Ellul, Pierre/Sood, Ajit/Midha, Vandana/Thelma, B. K./Wong, Sunny H./Schreiber,  
464 Stefan/Yamazaki, Keiko/Kubo, Michiaki/Boucher, Gabrielle/Rioux, John D./Lenz,  
465 Tobias L./Brant, Steven R./Franke, Andre (2019). Construction and benchmarking of a  
466 multi-ethnic reference panel for the imputation of HLA class I and II alleles. Human  
467 molecular genetics 28 (12), 2078–2092. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/ddy443>.
- 468 Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst/Deutsches Zentrum für Hochschul- und  
469 Wissenschaftsforschung (Eds.) (2020). Wissenschaft weltoffen kompakt 2020. Daten  
470 und Fakten zur Internationalität von Studium und Forschung in Deutschland. Bielefeld,  
471 wbv Media GmbH & Co. KG.
- 472 Duster, Troy (2003). Buried alive. The concept of race in science. In: Genetic nature/culture.  
473 Berkeley [u.a.], University of California Press, 2003.
- 474 Fischer, Martin S./Hoßfeld, Uwe/Krause, Johannes/Richter, Stefan (2019). Jena Declaration.  
475 The concept of race is the result of racism, not its prerequisite. Available online at  
476 <https://www.uni-jena.de/190910-jenaererklaerung> (accessed 2/4/2022).
- 477 Flanagin, Annette/Frey, Tracy/Christiansen, Stacy L. (2021). Updated Guidance on the  
478 Reporting of Race and Ethnicity in Medical and Science Journals. JAMA 326 (7), 621–  
479 627. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.13304>.
- 480 Fleck, Ludwik (1981). Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact. Chicago, Chicago  
481 University Press.

- 482 International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (Ed.) (2021). Recommendations for the  
483 Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals.  
484 Update December 2021. Available online at [http://www.icmje.org/icmje-](http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf)  
485 [recommendations.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf).
- 486 Kattmann, Ulrich (2002). Menschenrassen. Lexikon der Biologie of 2002.
- 487 Kridin, Khalaf/Damiani, Giovanni/Ludwig, Ralf J./Tzur-Bitan, Dana/Cohen, Arnon D. (2020).  
488 Quantification of the relationship between pyoderma gangrenosum and Crohn's  
489 disease: a population-based case-control study. Scandinavian journal of  
490 gastroenterology 55 (7), 814–818. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00365521.2020.1786849>.
- 491 Lewontin, R. C. (1972). The Apportionment of Human Diversity. In: Theodosius  
492 Dobzhansky/Max K. Hecht/William C. Steere (Eds.). Evolutionary Biology. New York,  
493 NY, Springer US, 381–398.
- 494 Lipphardt, Veronika (2012). Isolates and crosses in human population genetics; or, a  
495 contextualization of German race science. The biological anthropology of living human  
496 populations.
- 497 Lipphardt, Veronika/Lipphardt, Anna/M'charek, Amade/Momsen, Carsten/Pfaffelhuber,  
498 Peter/Mupepele, Anne-Christine/Plümecke, Tino/Reardon, Jenny/Schredelseker,  
499 Theresa/Surdu, Mihai/Syndercombe-Court, Denise/Wienroth, Matthias (2018). Lost in  
500 Translation. Süddeutsche Zeitung of 5/18/2018, 13. Available online at  
501 <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/rassismusdebatte-lost-in-translation-1.3983863>  
502 (accessed 1/26/2022).
- 503 Livingstone, Frank B./Dobzhansky, Theodosius (1962). On the Non-Existence of Human  
504 Races. Current Anthropology 3 (3), 279–281. <https://doi.org/10.1086/200290>.
- 505 M'charek, Amade (2021). Traces of Race, Roots of Gender: A Genetic History. In: Janell  
506 Hobson (Ed.). The Routledge Companion to Black Women's Cultural Histories. Milton  
507 Park, Abingdon, Oxon/New York, NY: Routledge, 2021., Routledge.

- 508 M'charek, Amade/Schramm, Katharina/Skinner, David (2014). Technologies of Belonging.  
509 Science, Technology, & Human Values 39 (4), 459–467.  
510 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243914531149>.
- 511 Ma, Irene W. Y./Khan, Nadia A./Kang, Anna/Zalunardo, Nadia/Palepu, Anita (2007).  
512 Systematic review identified suboptimal reporting and use of race/ethnicity in general  
513 medical journals. Journal of clinical epidemiology 60 (6), 572–578.  
514 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2006.11.009>.
- 515 Maduka, Richard C./Broderick, Michael/White, Erin M./Ballouz, Dena/Sandhu,  
516 Harminder/Kwakye, Gifty/Chen, Herbert/Sandhu, Gurjit (2021). The Reporting of Race  
517 and Ethnicity in Surgery Literature. JAMA surgery 156 (11), 1036–1041.  
518 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamasurg.2021.3752>.
- 519 Marks, Jonathan (1995). Human Biodiversity. Genes, Race, and History. Somerset, Taylor  
520 and Francis.
- 521 M'charek, Amade (2010). Fragile differences, relational effects: Stories about the materiality  
522 of race and sex. European Journal of Women's Studies 17 (4), 307–322.  
523 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506810377698>.
- 524 Moher, David/Liberati, Alessandro/Tetzlaff, Jennifer/Altman, Douglas G. (2009). Preferred  
525 reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement.  
526 PLoS medicine 6 (7), e1000097. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>.
- 527 Monsees, Jessica/Hoffmann, Wolfgang/Thyrian, Jochen René (2019). Prävalenz von  
528 Demenz bei Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund in Deutschland. Zeitschrift für  
529 Gerontologie und Geriatrie 52 (7), 654–660. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00391-018-01469-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00391-018-01469-0)  
530 [0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00391-018-01469-0).
- 531 Moore, Daniel B. (2020a). Reporting of Race and Ethnicity in the Ophthalmology Literature in  
532 2019. JAMA ophthalmology 138 (8), 903–906.

- 533 Moore, Daniel B. (2020b). Reporting of Race and Ethnicity in the Ophthalmology Literature in  
534 2019. JAMA ophthalmology. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2020.2107>.
- 535 Palermo, Tonya M./Alderfer, Melissa A./Boerner, Katelynn E./Hilliard, Marisa E./Hood, Anna  
536 M./Modi, Avani C./Wu, Yelena P. (2021). Editorial: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion:  
537 Reporting Race and Ethnicity in the Journal of Pediatric Psychology. Journal of  
538 pediatric psychology 46 (7), 731–733. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpepsy/isab063>.
- 539 Palm, Kerstin (2013). Der Rassebegriff in der Biologie nach 1945. In: Rassismus auf gut  
540 Deutsch. Frankfurt am Main, Brandes & Apsel, 2013.
- 541 Plümecke, Tino (2013). Rasse in der Ära der Genetik. Die Ordnung des Menschen in den  
542 Lebenswissenschaften. Bielefeld, Transcript.
- 543 Popejoy, Alice B./Crooks, Kristy R./Fullerton, Stephanie M./Hindorff, Lucia A./Hooker, Gillian  
544 W./Koenig, Barbara A./Pino, Natalie/Ramos, Erin M./Ritter, Deborah I./Wand,  
545 Hannah/Wright, Matt W./Yudell, Michael/Zou, James Y./Plon, Sharon E./Bustamante,  
546 Carlos D./Ormond, Kelly E. (2020). Clinical Genetics Lacks Standard Definitions and  
547 Protocols for the Collection and Use of Diversity Measures. American journal of human  
548 genetics 107 (1), 72–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2020.05.005>.
- 549 R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,  
550 Austria, R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available online at [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)  
551 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/) (accessed 4/14/2022).
- 552 Roberts, Dorothy (2011). Fatal invention. How science, politics, and big business re-create  
553 race in the twenty-first century. New York, New Press.
- 554 Sankar, Pamela/Cho, Mildred K./Monahan, Keri/Nowak, Kamila (2015). Reporting Race and  
555 Ethnicity in Genetics Research: Do Journal Recommendations or Resources Matter?  
556 Science and engineering ethics 21 (5), 1353–1366. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-014-9596-y)  
557 [014-9596-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-014-9596-y).

- 558 Schenk, Liane (2007). Migration und Gesundheit—Entwicklung eines Erklärungs- und  
559 Analysemodells für epidemiologische Studien. *International journal of public health* 52  
560 (2), 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-007-6002-4>.
- 561 Sommer, Marianne (2014). History in the Gene? How Biohistories are Implicated in  
562 Biopolitics and Biosocialities. In: Naomi Segal/Daniela Koleva (Eds.). *From Literature to*  
563 *Cultural Literacy*. London, Palgrave Macmillan UK, 216–231.
- 564 Lipphardt, Veronika/Rappold, Gudrun/Surdu, Mihai (2020). Representing vulnerable  
565 populations in genetic studies: The case of the Roma.  
566 <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13286.04165>.
- 567 Wandert, Timo (2009). Der „Rasse“-Begriff in Der Psychologie. In: AG gegen Rassismus in  
568 den Lebenswissenschaften (Ed.). *Gemachte Differenz: Kontinuitäten biologischer*  
569 *»Rasse«-Konzepte*. Unrast Verlag, 338–365.
- 570 Weber, Max (1978). *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley,  
571 University of California Press.
- 572 Zhang, Dabao (2021). ‘rsq’: R-Squared and Related Measures. Version R package version  
573 2.2. Available online at <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rsq> (accessed 4/14/2022).
- 574 Zhang, Frederick/Finkelstein, Joseph (2019). Inconsistency in race and ethnic classification  
575 in pharmacogenetics studies and its potential clinical implications. *Pharmacogenomics*  
576 *and personalized medicine* 12, 107–123. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PGPM.S207449>.
- 577 zur Nieden, Andrea (2014). The Presence of the Past: Transnational Differences in  
578 Categories of ‘Race’ and ‘Ethnicity’. In: Sahra Gibbon/Joseph Galen/Jessica Mozersky  
579 et al. (Eds.). *Breast cancer gene research and medical practices. Transnational*  
580 *perspectives in the time of BRCA*. London, Routledge, 17–34.
- 581 zur Nieden, Andrea/Bartram, Isabelle (2020). Categories of Diversity in Precision Medicine  
582 and Epidemiology – Contrasting Germany and the US VirPrag, 4S annual meeting,  
583 20.08.2020. Available online at <http://tinyurl.com/yyxdxea> (accessed 1/28/2022).

584

585

## 586 **Supporting information**

587

### 588 **Supplementary Material 1: PRISMA 2009 checklist.**

589 From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred  
590 reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. PLoS

591 Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

592 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225898.s002>

593

### 594 **Supplementary Material 2: Model selection**