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**Table S1.** Author affiliations from the Special Feature *Advances in Neotropical Ornithology* published in 2020 in The Auk: Ornithological Advances (Vol. 137) and The Condor: Ornithological Applications (Vol. 122).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paper | Number of authors | Number of authors by primary institutional affiliation | Country of 1st author affiliation |
| USA, Europe or Canada | Latin America and Caribbean |
| Dayer et al. (2020) | 10 | 6 | 4 | USA |
| Jahn et al. (2020) | 7 | 4 | 3 | USA |
| Lees et al. (2020) | 6 | 6 | 0 | UK |
| Lindell and Huyvaert (2020) | 2 | 2 | 0 | USA |
| Michel et al. (2020) | 3 | 3 | 0 | USA |
| Neate-Clegg and Şekercioğlu (2020) | 2 | 2 | 0 | USA |
| Pizo and Tonetti (2020) | 2 | 0 | 2 | Brazil |
| Robinson and Curtis (2020) | 2 | 2 | 0 | USA |
| Sherry et al. (2020) | 4 | 4 | 0 | USA |
| Stouffer (2020) | 1 | 1 | 0 | USA |
| Total | 39 | 30 | 9 |  |

**Table S2.** The initial contributors to this project coalesced through discussions of the Lees et al. (2020) paper over email and on social media; several people suggested writing a formal critique. A core team of 5 people (across career stages, genders, and ~6 countries: Chile, Mexico, Argentina/Colombia, Canada/Argentina, and Brazil/Canada) was formed *ad hoc* to collect and organize the comments and move the project forward. The core team compiled the comments from social media and emails, wrote an outline, and circulated it to people who had expressed an interest, inviting them to co-author the manuscript. We also circulated a country-specific questionnaire, in which coauthors were invited to contribute details on the biggest research challenges in their country. The form was handled differently by coauthors in each country: for example, in Paraguay and Ecuador, groups of ornithologists worked together to fill in the form; in Chile, authors created a survey for (non-author) colleagues and used the data to complete the questionnaire.

The core group used the comments and suggestions on the outline, literature suggestions from coauthors, and country-specific details from questionnaires, to write a first draft of the manuscript. Noticing biases in our authorship, we specifically sought to include more people from under-represented regions (e.g., Caribbean, Amazon, Central America), genders (women, gender non-conforming), and careers outside academia, and to ensure that their perspectives were centered. We made an effort to contact people beyond those we knew personally, for example, by searching for published literature on birds from countries that were not represented in our authorship at the time, such as Cuba. We circulated the first draft of the manuscript to all co-authors and new invites, with an invitation to comment, approve, or withdraw. At the same time, we circulated a survey asking co-authors for basic demographic information. Upon receiving more than 100 copies of the commented manuscript, the core group invited four additional members (from Colombia, Bolivia, Argentina, and Ecuador) to help incorporate these comments. The core group of nine worked on a final draft, which was sent to coauthors for submission approval, along with a survey for authors to indicate their contributions to the paper, to help decide author order. Final authorship order was determined based on contributions to the paper; to break ties, we used social location from the demographic data to up-list people from groups under-represented in ornithology because of gender, LGBTQIA+ status, disability status, first language, career stage, or race (Liboiron et al. 2017).

Our manuscript suffers from a lack of representation from some parts of the Neotropics (e.g., Peru, Haiti, Guianas, Nicaragua, Jamaica, Panama). This lack of representation was produced by the same processes and systems that created the biased representation of authorship in the Lees et al. paper and the Special Feature: editors and authors tend to invite our friends—especially male friends and prominent male “authorities”—to participate in publications. Our paper started from discussions on Twitter and email, primarily in academic circles in Argentina and Mexico. As people added their voices to the discussion and invited their friends, we noticed that our authorship was biased toward white men working on ecology in those two countries. We wanted to diversify the authorship, so we sought to include gender and racialized minorities in under-represented regions, people working on under-represented topics, and non-academics who publish on birds. But it is difficult to remedy a lack of representation when one already has a long list of authors. New people continued to invite or suggest we invite male colleagues from countries that were already well-represented. People who have been systemically marginalized from publishing are much less visible in international research networks, so we were less likely to find and invite them.

In future, a much better approach would be to ensure diversity from the beginning of projects, for example by intentionally inviting women and people of color and then adding the colleagues they suggest. For a large, multi-author, international paper such as this one, we recommend having one lead author focus primarily on inclusion in authorship, a task that does not just require finding and inviting representative authors, but also investigating and lowering barriers to participation in the manuscript.

Here, we summarize demographic information about our authors, including country of affiliation (all 124 authors) and responses to an optional online survey (August 2021–March 2022; 119 responses; not all respondents answered every question).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Demographic parameter** | **Number of respondents** |
| ***Native language(s)*** |  |
|  Spanish | 87 |
|  Portuguese | 26 |
|  English | 11 |
|  Guarani | 4 |
|  Dutch | 1 |
|  Italian | 1 |
|  |  |
| ***Disability status*** |  |
|  Disabled | 4 |
|  Able-bodied | 108 |
|  |  |
| ***Highest university degree*** |  |
|  None | 3 |
|  Technical diploma | 3 |
|  Undergraduate | 13 |
|  Masters | 11 |
|  Doctorate | 87 |
|  |  |
| ***Current position*** |  |
|  Non-academic | 15 |
|  Student | 14 |
|  Post-doc | 13 |
|  Professor or Research Scientist | 78 |
|  |  |
| ***Country of affiliation*** |  |
|  Argentina | 33 |
|  Bahamas | 1 |
|  Bolivia | 1 |
|  Brazil | 21 |
|  Canada | 1 |
|  Chile | 3 |
|  Colombia | 5 |
|  Costa Rica | 1 |
|  Cuba | 2 |
|  Ecuador | 6 |
|  Finland | 1 |
|  France | 1 |
|  Germany | 1 |
|  Mexico | 25 |
|  Paraguay | 6 |
|  Puerto Rico | 3 |
|  St. Eustatius  | 1 |
|  USA | 10 |
|  Venezuela | 1 |
|  |  |
| ***Woman or other marginalized gender identity?*** |
|  Yes | 50 |
|  No | 68 |
|  |  |
| ***LGBTQIA+?*** |  |
|  Yes | 4 |
|  No | 110 |
|  |  |
| ***Race / ethnicity*** |  |
|  Asian or South Asian | 1 |
|  Black African | 3 |
|  Indigenous | 1 |
|  White or European | 38 |
|  Mixed (Indigenous/Black/White/Middle Eastern) | 31 |
|  Not sure | 13 |
|  Other: (Latin American)\* | 10 |
|  |  |

 \* 10 authors added the category “Latin American,” which was not included in the survey.
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Sherry, T. W., C. M. Kent, N. V. Sánchez, and C. H. Şekercioğlu (2020). Insectivorous birds in the Neotropics: ecological radiations, specialization, and coexistence in species-rich communities. The Auk: Ornithological Advances 137:ukaa049.

Stouffer, P. C. (2020). Birds in fragmented Amazonian rainforest: lessons from 40 years at the Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project. The Condor: Ornithological Applications 122:duaa005.