

Table S1*Author Contributions*

Section of paper	Author Names (Listed Alphabetically Within Each Category)
Introduction and Motivation	Deanna Barch (checking/editing) Lisa Feldman Barrett (checking/editing) Eliza Bliss-Moreau June Gruber Jutta Joormann Katherine Kinzler Kristen Lindquist Jane Mendle Joan Monin (checking/editing) Darby Saxbe (checking/editing) Toni Schmader Bethany Teachman Lisa Williams (checking/editing)
Issue #1: Career advancement	Ozlem Ayduk Deanna Barch (checking/editing) Silva Bunge Belinda Campos June Gruber Hedy Kober Kristen Lindquist Toni Schmader
Issue #2: Financial compensation	Belinda Campos Kate Harkness (checking/editing) Sheri Johnson Ann Kring Stella Lourenco Renee Thompson (checking/editing) Lauren Weinstock
Issue #3: Service assignment and practices	Modupe Akinola (checking/editing) Ozlem Ayduk Deanna Barch (checking/editing) Alia Crum Brett Ford Jill Hooley (checking/editing) Kristen Lindquist

Issue #4: Lifestyle roles and work-family conflict	Jessica Borelli Belinda Campos Sherryl Goodman (checking/editing) Kateri McRae Joan Monin Misaki Natsuaki Jennifer Pfeifer Darby Saxbe
Issue #5: Gender biases	Eliza Bliss-Moreau Lila Davachi Melissa Ferguson June Gruber Wendy Heller Lily Jampol Virginia Sturm (checking/editing)
Issue #6: Barriers to power	Silvia Bunge Serena Chen Michelle Craske June Gruber Pamela Smith Virginia Sturm (checking/editing)
Issue #7: Intersectionality	Modupe Akinola Belinda Campos Rona Carter Adrienne Carter-Sowell Valerie Purdie Greenaway Kate Harkness (checking/editing) Renee Thompson (checking/editing)
Issue #8: Harassment and incivility	Jessica Cantlon Amy Cuddy Sunny Dutra Barbara Fredrickson June Gruber Nicole Prause
Issue #9: Self-esteem and self-promotion	Eliza Bliss-Moreau (checking/editing) June Gruber (checking/editing) Kristen Lindquist Jane Mendle (checking/editing) Toni Schmader
Issue #10: Lack of belonging	Lauren Atlas Tiffany Brannon

	Barbara Fredrickson (checking/editing) Lisa Williams (checking/editing)
The path forward	Deanna Barch Lisa Feldman Barrett Angela Duckworth Michelle “Mikki” Hebl Gabriele Oettingen Betsy Levy Paluck Lisa Williams (checking/editing)
Conclusion	Eliza Bliss-Moreau Sherryl Goodman (checking/editing) June Gruber Hedy Kober Kristen Lindquist Jane Mendle
Review and editing across sections	Ozlem Ayduk Lisa Feldman Barrett Eliza Bliss-Moreau Silvia Bunge Belinda Campos Lee Anna Clark Lila Davachi Naomi Eisenberger Alison Gopnik Sherryl Goodman June Gruber Sheri Johnson Michelle “Mikki” Hebl Wendy Heller Jill Hooley Hedy Kober Kristen Lindquist Tania Lombrozo Jane Mendle Joan Monin Judith Moskowitz Darby Saxbe Toni Schmader Barbara Spellman Lisa Williams
References	Eliza Bliss-Moreau Sunny Dutra

	June Gruber Hedy Kober Barbara Spellman
Tables and figures	Belinda Campos June Gruber Kristen Lindquist Jane Mendle Toni Schmader Lisa Williams
Supplementary materials	Lauren Atlas Silvia Bunge Belinda Campos June Gruber Kristen Lindquist Jane Mendle Toni Schmader Lisa Williams
Coordinating work across paper and authors ("core author team")	Eliza Bliss-Moreau Lee Anna Clark June Gruber Kristen Lindquist Jane Mendle Toni Schmader

Note. The idea for this paper came from a series of discussions at psychology conferences. Many female psychologists were interested in exploring women's roles and status within psychological science, signed up to co-author, and offered suggestions for other authors to include. Very quickly, we had a large and active authorship group. Given the large number of authors contributing to this paper, it was important to find a way to organize authors and to ensure each author could play a substantial role in the production of the final product. Because it is unusual in psychology to have so many authors on a paper and because our process may be of interest to others for future large-scale collaborations, we describe our writing and authorship process in detail.

At the outset, a smaller core group of authors agreed to coordinate the framework of the paper and oversee organization of writing assignments among the broader group. The writing of the paper then occurred in several phases. First, we formed 13 smaller working groups ranging from four to 10 authors, which were responsible for generating the first draft of individual sections for each of the top 10 issues, the introduction, the “path forward” section, and the conclusion. Authors volunteered for working groups based on expertise or interest in the topic. Each working group had a team leader, who coordinated the efforts of that particular group. Shared Google documents were created for the paper outline and manuscript. The working groups continually added and updated the Google document for the manuscript as they wrote, which ensured all authors had access to the entire manuscript and could see what material other groups had produced, avoid overlap across sections, and comment directly on other sections. The great advantage of the working groups was that they functioned like authorship collaborations that are more typical in psychology papers, only each group produced a portion of the paper rather than an entire paper.

Second, a separate subgroup of authors served as writers and editors across the entire manuscript. This group of authors reviewed the first drafts produced by the working groups, provided substantive contributions focused on bigger picture conceptualization and organization of the paper, and unified the writing style across sections.

Third, during a second cycle of pre-submission edits, additional ad hoc authors provided substantive feedback and original content to specific sections and/or across the entire manuscript. This same approach was applied for the manuscript revision process, except we also added a Google document for the response to reviewers, so each working group could respond to reviews pertaining to their sections and see how other working groups may have addressed similar

comments. We also had a second round of authors conduct a detailed “second-pass check” of all content and references within each section, in addition to general feedback across sections.

The corresponding author and core group continuously tracked the manuscript progress, communicated regularly with each working group, and also edited, organized and shaped the paper throughout the process. The corresponding author and small core group regularly discussed and updated all authors with manuscript updates, action items, and timelines.

All author names for the full manuscript are listed alphabetically by last name after the corresponding author and the “core author team” (i.e., the first six authors).

We note that all authors provided written confirmation of their compliance with COPE’s Committee on Authorship which includes the following: (1) Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; (2) Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; (3) Final approval of the version to be published; (4) Agreement 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; and (5) All researchers that are named in an article must have contributed substantially to the research.