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[^0]Table S-1. Astrophysics Explorer-class Missions 2008-2016

| A0 Category | Year | PI-Managed Mission Cost Cap |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| SMEX | 2008 | $\$ 105 \mathrm{M}$, not including Expendable Launch Vehicle (ELV) (FY08 \$) |
| M0 | 2008 | $\$ 70 \mathrm{M}$ (FY08 \$) |
| EX | 2011 | $\$ 200 \mathrm{M}$, not including ELV (FY11 \$) |
| M0 | 2011 | $\$ 55 \mathrm{M}$ (FY11 \$) |
| M0 | 2012 | $\$ 60 \mathrm{M} ;$ \$30 M for balloons excluding launch (FY13 \$) |
| SMEX | 2014 | $\$ 125 \mathrm{M}$ not including ELV, or \$175M with Pl-provided access to space (FY15 \$) |
| M0 | 2014 | $\$ 65 \mathrm{M} ; \$ 35 \mathrm{M}$ for suborbital class, including CubeSats (FY15 \$) |
| MIDEX | 2016 | $\$ 250 \mathrm{M}$, not including ELV (FY17 \$) |
| M0 | 2016 | $\$ 70 \mathrm{M} ; \$ 35$ for suborbital class, including CubeSats (FY17 \$) |

Table S-2. Submitted Astrophysics Ex/MO proposals 2008-2016, shown with PI gender. This data is displayed in graphical form in Figure 1 in the white paper [1].

| Opportunity | Number of Proposals |  | Total number of Proposals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F PI | M PI |  |
| 2008 M0 | 1 | 10 | 18 |
| 2008 SMEX | 1 | 17 | 15 |
| 2011 EX | 0 | 15 | 11 |
| 2011 M0 | 1 | 10 | 9 |
| 2012 M0 | 1 | 8 | 7 |
| 2014 M0 | 0 | 7 | 13 |
| 2014 SMEX | 0 | 13 | 9 |
| 2016 MIDEX | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| 2016 M0 | 0 | 9 | $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{9 8}$ |  |

Table S-3. Number and gender of Pls for submitted Astrophysics Ex/MO proposals 2008-2016

|  | Total Pls | Unique Pls |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 4 | 3 |
| Male | 98 | 58 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ |

Table S-4. Science team size for Ex/MO proposals

| Proposal Type | \#Sci Team Members |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Min | Max | Median | Mean |
| M0 | 6 | 42 | 15 | 17 |
| SMEX | 9 | 45 | 22 | 23 |
| MIDEX (includes EX) | 11 | 77 | 22 | 26 |

Table S-5. Submitted and selected proposals in three Astrophysics ROSES elements, shown by PI gender. This data was compiled by D. Evans. Some of this data is displayed graphically in Figure 7 in the white paper [1].

| ROSES Element | Submitted Proposals |  |  | Selected Proposals |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | $\%$ M PI | $\%$ F PI | Total | $\%$ M PI | $\%$ F PI |
| ADAP <br> 2013-2015 | 832 | $78 \%$ | $22 \%$ | 163 | $79 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| APRA <br> 2012-2014 | 515 | $91 \%$ | $9 \%$ | 140 | $95 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| ATP <br> 2012-2014 | 586 | $82 \%$ | $18 \%$ | 84 | $87 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Overall | 1933 | $83 \%$ | $17 \%$ | 387 | $86 \%$ | $14 \%$ |

Table S-6. Submitted and selected proposals for the initial RTF program, shown by PI gender. This table was composed by N. Barghouty.

| Roman Technology Fellowship | Submitted Phase 1 Proposals |  |  | Selected Phase 1 Proposals |  |  | Selected Phase 2 Proposals |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total \# | \# M Pl | \# F Pl | Total \# | \# M P | \# F PI | Total \# | \# M P | \# F PI |
| 2011 | 19 | 17 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 2012 | 12 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2013 | RTF Program not offered |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 2015 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 44 | 35 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 1 |

Table S-7. Submitted and selected proposals for the restructured RTF program, shown by PI gender. This table was composed by N. Barghouty.

| Roman <br> Technology <br> Fellowship | APRA Submitted <br> \& RTF Qualified |  |  | APRA Selected <br> \& RTF Qualified |  |  | RTF Selected |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total \# | \# M PI | \# F PI | Total \# | \#M PI | \# F PI | Total \# | \# M PI | \# F PI |
| 2016 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2017 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Total | 18 | 14 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 |

Number and Percentage of Proposals by Opportunity and Org Type


Figure S-1. Number and percentage of Astro Ex/MO proposals 2008-2016 by opportunity and organization type. The column shown for each opportunity reaches to the $100 \%$ level to encompass all proposals submitted. Within each bar, the percentage of proposals submitted by each organization type is shown in the color-coded segments relative to the $y$-axis, and the number of proposals from each type is printed within the segments.

## Total Distribution of Science Roles

All Ex/MO Proposals 2008-2016


Figure S-2. Total distribution of science roles (with both genders combined) for all Ex/MO proposals 2008-2016. This is a graphical representation of the data shown in the fourth column of Table 1 in the white paper [1]. The total distribution of science roles among female participants and male participants taken separately (data in columns 2 and 3, respectively, in Table 1 in [1]) do not show large scale differences from this plot.

Number and Percentage of Females and Males in Sci Roles


Figure S-3. Overall number and percentage of participants in science roles is shown for Ex/MO opportunities. The column shown for each opportunity reaches to the $100 \%$ level to encompass all science participants. Within each bar, the percentage of participants by gender is shown in the color-coded segments relative to the $y$-axis, and the number of participants by gender is printed in each segment. The total participation by gender (rightmost column) is recapitulated in the pie chart.


Figure S-4. Number and percentage of Astro Ex/MO proposals having zero females in science roles submitted to AOs during 20082016. The column shown for each opportunity reaches to the $100 \%$ level to encompass all proposals submitted. Within each bar, the percentage of proposals submitted with either zero females or at least one female in a science role is shown in the color-coded segments relative to the $y$-axis, and the number of proposals in each of these cases is printed in the segments.


Figure S-5. Number and percentage of Astro Ex/M0 proposals having zero females in science roles. The column shown for each organization type reaches to the $100 \%$ level to encompass all proposals submitted. Within each bar, the percentage of proposals submitted with either zero females or at least one female in a science role is shown in the color-coded segments relative to the $y$-axis, and the number of proposals in each of these cases is printed in the segments.

## Overall APRA/SAT Roles 2006-2017 for All Ex/MO Pls



Figure S-6. Bar chart showing all APRA/SAT roles held by the 61 unique Ex/MO Pls during 2006-2017.
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