<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Status shuffled</th>
<th>With status</th>
<th>Mentor status correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Median homophily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S2. Alternative thresholds for gender classification. Each row shows median gender homophily across all fields and years, marginal effect of trainee and mentor gender on trainee continuation to mentorship (see Fig. 3), and change in the effect of mentor gender after controlling for mentor aggregate status for a single threshold. Threshold refers to the minimum/maximum probability of a first name identifying a man for classification as a man/woman. Excluded indicates the percent of individual excluded for having ambiguous names according to that threshold. For all thresholds, effects of mentor gender were not significant in models that accounted for status (see Fig. 4). **: \( p < 0.0001 \), *: \( p < 0.05 \).