

Perspectives of Osteopathic Medical Students on Preclinical Urology Exposure: A Single Institution Cross Sectional Survey

Authors

Ryan Wong¹, Harvey N. Mayrovitz, PhD²

Author Affiliations

¹ Medicine, Nova Southeastern University Dr. Kiran C. Patel College of Osteopathic Medicine, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA.

² Medical Education, Nova Southeastern University Dr. Kiran C. Patel College of Allopathic Medicine, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA.

Correspondence Address:

Harvey N. Mayrovitz, PhD, Dr. Kiran C. Patel College of Allopathic Medicine, Nova Southeastern University, 3200 S. University Drive, Davie, 33328-5326, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA, E-mail: mayrovit@nova.edu

Keywords: medical curriculum, medical education, osteopathic medical schools, urology

ABSTRACT

Context: There is an increasing number of medical school graduates opting for surgical specialties and the osteopathic applicant match rate for urology is lower than that of allopathic applicants. Factors influencing this may include a lack of interest, perceived challenges in matching into urology, insufficient urology mentorship, limited research opportunities, and inadequate osteopathic representation in urology.

Objective: To assess osteopathic medical students' perspectives on pursuing urology and enhancing preclinical exposure to and knowledge of urology.

Methods: A 20-question survey addressing experiences and the factors influencing osteopathic medical students' specialty selection and their interest in and perception of urology was designed by the investigators on Research Electronic Data Capture software. This survey was distributed via email listserv to all current osteopathic medical students attending Nova Southeastern University Dr. Kiran C. Patel College of Osteopathic Medicine over two months. Responses were collected and analyzed using Fisher's exact test.

Results: Of 150 respondents, 91% found mentors crucial in selecting a medical specialty, 95% emphasized the importance of early exposure, and 68% lacked familiarity with urology, with more M1 students unfamiliar compared to M2 (70.37% vs. 59.02%). A larger proportion of combined M1 and M2 (preclinical) students are considering urology as a specialty compared to M3 and M4 (clinical) students who are actively on rotations (56.52% vs. 28.57%; $p = 0.0064$). Also, a greater percentage of males are considering urology compared to females (64.15% vs. 42.71%; $p = 0.0164$). Among those considering urology ($n = 75$), 57.3% lack awareness of urology's scope, and 84% report no preclinical discussions with urologists. Those students who report they are considering urology value early exposure significantly more than others (98.67% vs. 78.67%; $p = 0.0001$). They also express greater interest in having a core urology course (73.33% vs. 38.67%; $p < 0.0001$). More urology considering students are interested in extracurricular urology-related workshops, seminars, or conferences (61.33% vs. 17.33%; $p <$

0.0001). Students who are considering urology as a specialty show greater interest in having a mentorship program (85.33% vs. 28%; $p < 0.0001$).

Conclusion: Results suggested that increased urology exposure during the preclinical years is important. Urology elective offerings and urology mentorship are of high interest among those considering urology. However, additional investigation is needed to determine the impact of preclinical urology curricula implementation on urology match outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Urology stands as an independent residency program in the United States, open to medical students who have completed either allopathic or osteopathic medical school. It is widely regarded as a highly competitive surgical sub-specialty.¹ Urology residency programs engage in a unique early match process, distinct from the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP), facilitated through the American Urological Association (AUA). In 2020, the American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine (AACOM) and the American Osteopathic Association (AOA) merged, resulting in the establishment of a unified graduate medical education accreditation system.² According to data provided by the AUA, the match rate for urology in 2023 was 75.39%, offering a total of 383 available residency positions.³ Prior to the 2024 urology match, the AUA did not report on the distinction between allopathic and osteopathic medical students within the match data.

Before the merger of the match system, there were 11 programs exclusively available to osteopathic medical students.⁴ In contrast to allopathic medical schools, many osteopathic institutions lack urology residency programs within their campuses.⁴ Consequently, this situation underscores the obstacles faced by aspiring urology trainees who seek proximity to their academic institutions for educational opportunities. Moreover, it has been reported that an enduring bias against osteopathic medical students has persisted over time, largely influenced by the historical prevalence of osteopathic physicians predominantly entering primary care fields.⁵ This bias has occasionally led to misconceptions regarding the qualifications of osteopathic graduates, with their credentials not always being viewed as equivalent to those of their allopathic counterparts. A recent study has shed light on this issue by revealing that there is no

discernible difference in the outcomes of orthopedic in-training exam scores between DO and MD degree-holding residents.⁶

While there is a growing number of medical school graduates opting for surgical specialties today and low historical match rates for osteopathic medical students in competitive specialties, the osteopathic medical student match rate in urology is also lower than allopathic applicants.^{2,7} Possible contributing factors may include a lack of interest, perceived difficulty in securing a urology residency, insufficient support for osteopathic medical students in this field, limited research opportunities, or inadequate exposure to the full scope of what urology entails.^{4,8} Studies have underscored the significance of the preclinical years in medical school as a crucial phase for exposing students to various specialties.^{9,10}

To the best of our knowledge, there is no study examining osteopathic medical students' attitudes and perspectives on preclinical exposure to urology. The objective of our present study is to determine whether a lack of preclinical exposure to and knowledge of urology impacts osteopathic medical student's decision to pursue urology as a specialty based on a single institutional analysis.

METHODS

This study was approved and deemed exempt by Nova Southeastern University's Institutional Review Board (NSU IRB Study: 2023-391). A survey-based methodology was utilized for this study. Twenty multiple choice questions were created on Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap), a secure web-based software, containing categorical variables in the answer choices as shown in Supplementary Table S1. Survey questions were designed to assess osteopathic medical students' interest in and perception of urology and preclinical exposure. The

first two questions asked for the respondent's medical school year and gender. The next four questions pertained to the respondent's perspectives regarding overall medical specialty decisions. The final 14 questions gauged the respondent's attitudes and perspectives on urology interest and preclinical exposure.

The survey was disseminated through university email lists to all current first, second, third, and fourth year osteopathic medical students enrolled at Nova Southeastern University Dr. Kiran C. Patel College of Osteopathic Medicine. Students at both campuses (Davie and Tampa) were included. Responses were voluntary and anonymous. Over the course of two months, five emails were sent. Responses that respondents completed that took them more than one minute and also had all questions answered were included in the final analysis. If the respondent answered the questions in less than one minute these responses were excluded from analysis to mitigate against responses that did not have time for thoughtful consideration.

Statistical Analyses

Descriptive statistics were employed to analyze all of the data, while more detailed data quantification involved the use of Fisher's exact test for categorical data. The analysis encompassed the comparison of specific groups: M1/M2 vs M3/M4 (preclinical vs clinical status), M1 vs M2, and Male vs Female. Additionally, the distinction between those considering urology and not considering urology was derived from responses to the question: "Are you currently considering urology as a potential specialty choice?" Those who responded with "Yes, I am seriously considering urology as a specialty" or "I am open to considering urology but exploring other options as well" were classified as considering urology.

To enhance data interpretation, scaled survey responses were transformed into binary categories for analysis in this study. The specific survey questions and their corresponding binary outcomes are presented in Supplementary Table S1. This categorization facilitated the use of Fischer's exact test to explore potential associations between the binary variables. GraphPad Prism® 10 Software was utilized for all statistical analyses. All p values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

A total of 152 responses were received. One was excluded due to an incomplete response, and another one was excluded due to a survey completion time of less than one minute. 150 responses were included in the study for analysis. 53 (35.3%) respondents identified as male, 96 (64%) respondents identified as female, and 1 (0.7%) respondent identified as other (Table 1). When looking at the distribution of respondents' current year in medical school, 54 (36%) were M1, 61 (40.67%) were M2, 19 (12.67%) were M3, and 16 (10.67%) were M4 (Table 1). 62% of respondents indicated personal interest and passion as the most important factors when deciding a medical specialty while 34.67% of respondents indicated lifestyle and work-life balance as the most important factor (Table 1).

Factors Influencing Specialty of Choice

A majority of respondents (91%) express the belief that mentors and advisors play a significant role in shaping their decision to pursue a specific medical specialty. Notably, a higher proportion of females (62%) perceive mentors as influential compared to males (30%) ($p=0.0271$). Regarding the importance of early exposure in the decision of pursuing a certain

medical specialty, 95% of respondents affirm its significance. Gender-wise, a larger percentage of females (62%) emphasize the importance of early exposure compared to males (34%). First and second-year osteopathic medical students hold similar views on the influence of mentors and the importance of early exposure.

Preclinical Experience in and Knowledge of Urology

The most intriguing aspect of urology selected by 47.33% of participants was surgical interventions whereas 27.33% of participants believe diagnostic procedures are the most intriguing. Sixty eight percent of respondents lack familiarity with the field of urology. Among those contemplating urology, 65.33% express a similar lack of familiarity. Upon examination of class differences, 70.37% of M1 students demonstrate unfamiliarity with urology, slightly higher than the 59.02% observed among M2 students. Notably, male, and female respondents exhibit comparable levels of unfamiliarity. When evaluating awareness of urology's scope of practice, 65% of respondents admit to being unfamiliar with it. Among those considering urology, 57.33% share this lack of awareness regarding urology's scope of practice.

When assessing for urology exposure preceding medical school, a substantial 76% of respondents report no exposure before entering medical school. Among females, a higher proportion (80.21%) lacks prior exposure to urology compared to males (67.92%). Furthermore, when evaluating discussions or interactions with urologists/urology residents during the preclinical year, a greater percentage of females (81.25%) indicates no such interactions compared to males (79.25%). Specifically, among those contemplating urology, a notable 84% report no discussions or interactions with urologists or urology residents during their preclinical years.

Preferences and Attitudes Toward Preclinical Urology Exposure

A significantly greater percentage of preclinical students (56.52%) are considering urology compared to clinical students who are actively on rotations (28.57%) ($p = 0.0064$). A greater percentage of males (64.15%) are considering urology compared to females (42.71%) ($p = 0.0164$). Although not statistically significant, a greater percentage of M1 (62.96%) are considering urology compared to M2 (50.82%). 89% of respondents believe that early urology exposure is useful in deciding whether to pursue urology as a specialty. Furthermore, of the students that are considering urology, 98.67% believe that early urology exposure is useful. This was significantly greater than that of respondents not considering urology (78.67%) ($p = 0.0001$). (Figure 1)

In evaluating the inclination to pursue a preclinical urology elective if offered the opportunity, individuals considering urology (77%) exhibit significantly greater interest compared to those not considering urology (32%) ($p < 0.0001$). (Figure 1) Similar responses were observed between male and female groups, as well as among M1 and M2 participants. When asked whether or not to include a core urology course as part of the preclinical curriculum, 56% would include one. No differences were observed in male and female responses. However, a significantly greater percentage of M1 (68.52%) would include a core urology course compared to M2 (49.18%) ($p = 0.0395$). Moreover, of those that are considering urology, 73.33% believe that a core urology course should be included contrary to only 38.67% of those not considering urology share the same view ($p < 0.0001$). (Figure 1)

Interest in Urology-Related Extracurricular Activities and Mentorship Programs

When looking at osteopathic medical student's interest in attending extracurricular urology-related workshops, seminars, or conferences during preclinical years, those considering urology (61.33%) were significantly more interested compared to those not considering urology (17.33%) ($p < 0.0001$). (Figure 1) There were no differences in interest in male vs. female respondents, students currently in preclinical years vs. those in clinical years, and between first and second year osteopathic medical students. Respondents' interest in participation in a urology mentorship program where preclinical osteopathic medical students are paired with urologists was also assessed. Those that are considering urology (85.33%) had significantly higher interest compared to those that were not considering urology (28%) ($p < 0.0001$). (Figure 1) There were no significant differences observed in the responses between the other three comparison groups.

Opinions regarding the most important step to enhance exposure and interest in urology during preclinical years were variable. Of the respondents that are considering urology, 24% believe that offering elective rotations were the most important and 24% believe that mentorship programs with urologists were the most important. Twenty percent believed that organizing urology-related workshops or simulations was the most important.

DISCUSSION

The current study assessed osteopathic medical students' perspectives on preclinical urology exposure and interest in approaches to increase exposure. The findings indicate that personal interest and passion, as well as lifestyle and work-life balance, are considered to be of the greatest importance when choosing a medical specialty. This result aligns with findings from studies in the literature. One study found that specialty appeal was the most chosen factor, and family time with fewer on-call duties was also important.¹¹ Another study found that job

satisfaction and "lifestyle following training" were the highest-rated considerations when choosing a specialty.¹² While the present findings support previous results on overall medical specialty choice, the present study expands the scope by further investigating urology-specific perspectives.

Upon assessment of respondents' familiarity with and consideration of urology, a greater percentage of first year students lacked familiarity compared to second year students. This discrepancy may be attributed to the fact that first-year students have not yet covered the material in their curriculum, considering that this survey was disseminated during their initial semester of medical school. Interestingly, a study found that medical students in their first month of school, have already contemplated a medical specialty preference despite minimal exposure.¹² However, these students were open to considering other specialties. Concurrently, the present findings reveal that a lower proportion of osteopathic medical students currently in their clinical years are considering urology compared to those in the preclinical years. This result underscores the significance of early exposure to urology during the preclinical phase.

Of the respondents that are considering urology, more than half lacked awareness of urology's scope and 84% had no preclinical discussions with urologists. This result highlights the need to increase preclinical urology exposure. Studies have corroborated this finding by indicating that urology interest groups, research opportunities between first and second year, and mentorship are strategies to encourage medical students' interest in urology.⁸ While urology is heavily research driven field, a study found that osteopathic medical students face barriers to attaining research experiences that can make them less competitive and also affect the specialty that they ultimately want to end up in.¹³ The present results indicate that of those considering urology, inclusion of preclinical urology elective, core urology course, extracurricular urology

related workshops, and a urology mentorship program is of high interest. These results may provide a basis for designing the preclinical medical education curriculum, aiming to enhance urology exposure among osteopathic medical students. This initiative may contribute to reducing the disparity in urology match rates between osteopathic and allopathic medical students.

When examining the gender cohorts, the data reveal similarities in the responses between male and female participants. Notably, a statistically significant higher proportion of males express an inclination towards urology compared to their female counterparts. Though urology is one of the most male dominated subspecialties, females exhibit a considerable interest in this specialty and gender disparities currently exist. Among practicing female surgeons, urology had one of the lowest representations and the growth rate for entering female urology residents falls behind compared to most specialties.¹⁴ A study found that females are more interested in pursuing OB/GYN and pediatrics than surgery.¹⁵ According to the 2021 AUA census data, females represent 10.9% of practicing urologists in the United States with 8.1% in the southeastern section. The present study contributes to the existing literature by emphasizing that there are inherent barriers for female individuals pursuing urology and targeting this at the medical school level is crucial. It is important to note that our study only included one respondent identifying as “Other”, preventing us from discerning perspectives from non-binary gender-identifying individuals. Further investigation may be warranted to better understand potential barriers in medical education for this demographic.

There are several limitations inherent to the present study. Firstly, the investigation exclusively captured the perspectives of students from a single osteopathic medical institution located in Florida. Considering that there are currently 37 osteopathic medical schools in the United States and only two in Florida, there may be distinct institutional experiences that could

yield contrasting results compared to this study. Additionally, regional variations, particularly in the number of practicing urologists, could contribute to differences in the level of exposure students receive at their respective institutions. Based on the 2021 AUA census data, there were 13,790 number of urologists practicing in the United States, with 81.9% in the northeastern section and 59.5% in the southeastern section. Therefore, the level of exposure reported in our study might be influenced by these regional disparities. Another limitation is that a majority of the respondents were preclinical students which may not entirely encompass the perspectives of those in their clinical years. However, given that the survey questionnaire was designed to ascertain experiences specific to past or current experiences during the preclinical years, this is adequate to gain insights into perspectives on urology exposure during this particular phase of their education.

An avenue for future research involves exploring the perspectives of osteopathic medical students regarding preclinical urology exposure on a longitudinal scale. Such a study could shed light on how individual viewpoints evolve as students transition into their clinical rotations and how their exposure to urology in the preclinical years might influence their choice of specialty during the application process.

CONCLUSION

Currently, there is a disparity in the representation of osteopathic and allopathic urologists. Insight into the perspectives of osteopathic medical students' urology preclinical exposure is important for identifying barriers to pursuing urology and strategies to enhance urology exposure prior to clinical rotations. Results show that there is a lack of familiarity and knowledge of urology among osteopathic medical students considering urology in the preclinical

years and early preclinical exposure to urology is important. Increased efforts should be made at the preclinical curriculum level to engage female individuals in urology exposure. Targeted early preclinical educational strategies are also needed to provide access for heightened urology mentorship and urology research opportunities for osteopathic medical students. Additional longitudinal research is needed to determine the sustained impact of early preclinical urology exposure on clinical rotation elective choices and residency match outcomes of osteopathic medical students.

Table 1: Characteristics of survey respondents

<i>n</i> = 150		
Gender, No. (%)	Male	53 (35.3)
	Female	96 (64)
	Other	1 (0.7)
Year in medical school, No. (%)	1	54 (36)
	2	61 (40.67)
	3	19 (12.67)
	4	16 (10.67)
Most important factor when deciding a medical specialty, No. (%)	Personal interest and passion	93 (62)
	Lifestyle and work-life balance	52 (34.67)
	Job market and demand	3 (2)
	Potential earnings	2 (1.33)
	Influence of mentors	0 (0)




Figure 1. Proportion of preclinical urology exposure among respondents considering urology.

Considering urology, n=75; Not considering urology, n=75. ***p=0.0001; ****p<0.0001.

Supplementary Table S1: Participant survey questionnaire and schema of outcome ascertainment

Survey question	Response	Outcome within the study
What year are you in medical school?	a) M1 b) M2 c) M3 d) M4	
What is your gender?	a) Male b) Female c) Other	

When deciding on a medical specialty, which one factor is most important to you?	a) Personal interest and passion b) Lifestyle and work-life balance c) Potential earnings d) Job market and demand e) Influence of mentors	
How influential would faculty advisors or mentors be in shaping your interest in a medical specialty?	a) Very influential b) Moderately influential c) Not influential	Influential defined as “very influential” and “moderately influential”
How important to you is early exposure to different medical specialties in making an informed choice of specialty?	a) Very important b) Moderately important c) Not very important	Early exposure importance defined as “very important” and “moderately important”
How satisfied are you with the overall exposure to different medical specialties provided to you during your preclinical years?	a) Very satisfied, I feel adequately exposed to a variety of specialties b) Somewhat satisfied, but I would have liked more exposure to certain specialties c) Not satisfied, I feel the exposure to different specialties was lacking	Preclinical exposure dissatisfaction defined as “Not satisfied, I feel the exposure to different specialties was lacking”
How familiar are you with the field of urology?	a) Very familiar b) Moderately familiar c) Minimally familiar d) Not familiar	Not familiar with urology defined as “minimally familiar” and “not familiar”
How aware are you of the current clinical scope of practice of urology?	a) Very aware b) Moderately aware c) Not very aware d) Not aware at all	Not aware of urology scope of practice defined as “not very aware” and “not aware at all”
Are you currently considering urology as a potential specialty choice?	a) Yes, I am seriously considering urology as a specialty b) I am open to considering urology but exploring other options as well c) No, I have already ruled out urology as a potential specialty	Open to considering urology defined as “Yes, I am seriously considering urology as a specialty” and “I am open to considering urology but exploring other options as well”
Which aspect of urology is most intriguing or appealing to you?	a) Surgical interventions b) Diagnostic procedures c) Research opportunities d) Patient population e) Collaboration with other specialties	

Have you received any exposure to the field of urology prior to entering medical school?	a) Yes, I have shadowed a urologist before b) Yes, I know a urologist c) No, I have not been exposed to urology at all	No prior exposure defined as “No, I have not been exposed to urology at all”
Have you received any formal education or exposure to urology in medical school?	a) Yes, a comprehensive course dedicated to urology b) Yes, a brief introduction to urology as part of another course c) No, urology was not covered in our preclinical curriculum d) Not sure	
Have you had any discussions or interactions with urologists or urology residents during your preclinical years?	a) Yes b) No	
Are you currently involved in any specific urology-related organizations or societies?	a) Yes b) No	
How likely would you be to pursue preclinical elective exposure to urology if given the opportunity?	a) Very likely, I am highly interested in urology b) Somewhat likely, I would consider exploring urology c) Neutral, I would not have a strong preference d) Somewhat unlikely, I am not particularly interested in urology e) Very unlikely, I have no interest in urology	Interest in preclinical urology exposure defined as “Very likely, I am highly interested in urology”, “Somewhat likely, I would consider exploring urology”, and “Neutral, I would not have a strong preference”
Do you believe that early exposure to urology during your preclinical years would be useful in deciding whether to pursue urology as a specialty?	a) Yes, it would be very useful to me b) Yes, it would be somewhat useful to me c) No, it would not be useful	Usefulness of preclinical urology exposure defined as “Yes, it would be very useful to me” and “Yes, it would be somewhat useful to me”
If you had the opportunity to design the preclinical curriculum, would you include a core urology course?	a) Yes b) No	
What is your interest in attending extracurricular	a) High b) Moderate	Interest in urology extracurricular defined as “high” and “moderate”

urology-related workshops, seminars, or conferences during your preclinical years?	c) Low d) None	
In your opinion, what is the MOST important step to increase exposure and interest in urology among preclinical osteopathic medical students.	a) Offering elective urology rotations b) Inviting guest speakers from the field of urology c) Incorporating urology case studies in preclinical coursework d) Providing mentorship programs with urologists e) Organizing urology-related workshops or simulations	
How interested are you, or would you have been, in participating in a mentorship program that pairs preclinical osteopathic medical students with urologists or urology residents?	a) Very interested b) Moderately interested c) Not interested	Interest in preclinical urology mentorship defined as “very interested” and “moderately interested”

Financial Disclosures: None reported

Support: None reported

Ethical Approval: This study was determined to be exempt from IRB review (NSU IRB Study: 2023-39)

Informed Consent: Informed consent was not obtained.

Author Contributions

RW and HNM provided substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; RW and HNM drafted the article or revised it critically for important intellectual content; RW and HNM gave final approval of the version of the article to be published; and RW and HNM agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring

that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

References

1. Mirza S, Williamson T, Mirza M, Arnce RD. Evaluating PubMed-Indexed Publications of Applicants Successfully Matching into the Top 50 Urology Residency Programs in the 2021-2023 Cycles. *Cureus*. 2023;15(4):e37996.
2. Bello G, Lyles E, Owens S, et al. Equal but Separate: The Slow Assimilation of Osteopathic Surgery Residents Two Years After the Unified Match. *Journal of Surgical Education*. 2023;80(9):1195-1206.
3. Urology and Specialty Matches. American Urological Association. <https://www.auanet.org/meetings-and-education/for-residents/urology-and-specialty-matches>. Published 2024. Accessed February 2 2024.
4. McCormick Mallory E, Seideman Casey A. Are We There Yet? Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine Students and the Urology Match. *Journal of Urology*. 2022;208(3):517-518.
5. Cummings M. Osteopathic Students' Graduate Medical Education Aspirations Versus Realities: The Relationship of Osteopathic Medicine and Primary Care. *Acad Med*. 2016;91(1):36-41.
6. Gomez C, Ranson R, Gianakos A, Miskimin C, Mulcahey MK. Allopathic and Osteopathic Residents Perform Similarly on the Orthopedic In-Training Examination (OITE). *J Surg Educ*. 2023;80(5):714-719.
7. Craig E, Brotzman E, Farthing B, Giesey R, Lloyd J. Poor match rates of osteopathic applicants into ACGME dermatology and other competitive specialties. *J Osteopath Med*. 2021;121(3):281-286.
8. Matloubieh JE, Eghbali M, Abraham N. Strategies to Encourage Medical Student Interest in Urology. *Curr Urol Rep*. 2020;21(10):34.
9. Kallail KJ, Shaw P, Hughes T, Berardo B. Enriching Medical Student Learning Experiences. *J Med Educ Curric Dev*. 2020;7:2382120520902160.
10. Tannenbaum AP, Lilley CM. Perspectives from two recent medical school graduates on exposure to pathology during undergraduate medical education: A narrative inquiry. *Acad Pathol*. 2023;10(4):100094.
11. Al-Zubi M, Ali MM, Alzoubi S, et al. Preference of and factors that influence future specialty among medical students in Jordan: A cross-sectional study. *Ann Med Surg (Lond)*. 2021;67:102527.
12. Vo A, McLean L, McInnes MDF. Medical specialty preferences in early medical school training in Canada. *Int J Med Educ*. 2017;8:400-407.
13. Ho A, Auerbach A, Faulkner JJ, Guru SK, Lee A, Manna D. Barriers to research opportunities among osteopathic medical students. *J Osteopath Med*. 2023;123(4):187-194.
14. Findlay BL, Bearrick EN, Granberg CF, Koo K. Path to Parity: Trends in Female Representation Among Physicians, Trainees, and Applicants in Urology and Surgical Specialties. *Urology*. 2023;172:228-233.

15. Burkhardt J, DesJardins S, Gruppen L. Diversity of the physician workforce: Specialty choice decisions during medical school. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(11):e0259434.