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Fig. S1: Breakout group mural output, part 1
Fig. S2: Breakout group mural output, part 2
Fig. S3: Slido poll answers to the question at the start of the workshop, “What do you expect from this meeting?” Answers are presented in a word cloud, with repeated answers increasing in size.

**Slido poll questions and results**

**Slido poll day one**

Q1.1. As an author or reader, how do you use scientific publishing? (17 responses, average ranking in parentheses, rankings calculated according to [https://help.surveyhero.com/faq/how-are-scores-calculated-on-the-ranking-question/](https://help.surveyhero.com/faq/how-are-scores-calculated-on-the-ranking-question/))

*To share my scientific findings (3.24)*
*To learn about methods (2.47)*
*To stay up-to-date (2.29)*
*To push my field forward (1.65)*
*To build trust in the methods I use (1.00)*
*To demonstrate my productivity and advance my career (0.29)*

Q1.2. How satisfied are you with the current publication process? (1=not at all, 5 extremely; 20 responses)

Average score: 2.8

1: 0%
2: 30%
3: 60%
4: 10%
5: 0%

Q1.3. How much of an impact do you think animal methods bias has on scientific publishing? (1=no impact, 5=very large impact; 21 responses)

Average score: 3.7

1: 0%
2: 14%
3: 24%
4: 38%
5: 24%

Q1.4. What do you expect from this meeting?

*See Fig. S3*
**Slido poll day two**

Q2.1. How much of an impact do you think animal methods bias has on scientific publishing? 1=no impact, 5=very large impact (14 responses)

Average score: 3.9

1: 0%
2: 14%
3: 14%
4: 43%
5: 29%

Q2.2. Would you be interested in taking part in any of the following post-workshop actions (immediate and long term)?

- Participating in a follow-up meeting: 18%
- Joining a taskforce: 41%
- Working on the workshop report publication: 35%
- Other: 6%

Q2.3. What is the main take home message you bring from this meeting?

- A bias that needs to be taught!
- Need journal buy in
- Training of ethics committees
- Time to take concrete action to mitigate this bias
- Capacity building
- Evidence
- Need for broader training on non-animal methods
- Don’t be scared to change things!
- Evidence on animal bias is missing and needs to be shown!
- Collaboration
- Need funding!
- It’s time to act
- Communication across all sectors
- We need to raise awareness
- Multi-stakeholder collaboration needed
- Educating
- That you can’t separate journal publishing from other aspects of replacing animal use
- Lots of funding needed!
- Awareness
- Community building
- Lots of work ahead