

106 out of 176 invitees signed up as co-authors & 13 volunteered as section leaders






6250 words were summarised into 4540 words to meet journal requirements










461 comments were provided in 15352 words

97 remained as co-authors, as 9 out of 106 resigned due to time constraints


61 out of 97 co-authors gave feedback



Supplementary information, Figure S1. The workflow. Here, we provide a detailed description of how the manuscript was developed, how work tasks were divided, and which tools were used. In panels A-C, the barplots represent the comments provided by the authors from a numerical point of view. In panel C, comments that were not implemented were mainly in contrast to other comments or additional references.



Supplementary information, Figure S2. The author demographics. Here, we provide background information on the authors of the manuscript. In panels A-B, the barplots represent how contributions were distributed among authors. The maps present the geographical distribution of the authors' institutions. Here, the yellow circle represents the location of the conference that initiated the manuscript. In panel G, the barplot represents collaborations with the first-author prior to the manuscript. Here, "Network" refers to collaboration via network publications, and "Close" refers to collaboration via other publications and projects. Note that 61 out of 97 authors gave information presented in panels C-F.



Supplementary information, Figure S3. Anonymous feedback from authors. Here, we provide a summary of feedback from the authors on the manuscript writing process. In panels A-J, the barplots represent answers to the given questions. Note that 61 out of 97 authors gave feedback.