



Evaluating the Quality Assurance Process in Scholarly Publishing

Final Report – Appendix B

February 6th 2023

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7612214>

Appendix B – Codebook of the EQUAP² Survey

Variable Name	Variable Label	Answer Label	Answer Code
cntry	Country		
		Germany	0
		Swiss	1
mode	survey mode		
		desktop	0
		mobile	1
language	Language	Open ended	
editor	was editor (f11a)		
		No	0
		Editor	1
		Editor >12 months	2
		empty	
reviewer	was reviewer (f11b)		
		No	0
		Reviewer	1
		Reviewer >12 months	2
		empty	
author	was author (f11c)		
		No	0
		Author	1
		Author >12 months	2
		empty	
revII	additional participation as Reviewer		
		No	0
		Yes, I also complete as R	1
autII	additional participation as Author		
		No	0
		Yes, I also complete as A	1
f1_1	f1_bestpractice: Extensive reviews		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_2	f1_bestpractice: At least two reviews		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_3	f1_bestpractice: More than two reviews in case of different judgments		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1

Variable Name	Variable Label	Answer Label	Answer Code
cntry	Country		
		Germany	0
		Swiss	1
mode	survey mode		
		desktop	0
		mobile	1
language	Language	Open ended	
editor	was editor (f11a)		
		No	0
		Editor	1
		Editor >12 months	2
		empty	
reviewer	was reviewer (f11b)		
		No	0
		Reviewer	1
		Reviewer >12 months	2
		empty	
author	was author (f11c)		
		No	0
		Author	1
		Author >12 months	2
		empty	
revll	additional participation as Reviewer		
		No	0
		Yes, I also complete as R	1
autll	additional participation as Author		
		No	0
		Yes, I also complete as A	1
f1_1	f1_bestpractice: Extensive reviews		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
f1_2	f1_bestpractice: At least two reviews		
		very important	5
		Not answered	-9
f1_3	f1_bestpractice: More than two reviews in case of different judgments		
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_3	f1_bestpractice: More than two reviews in case of different judgments		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1

		very important	5
f1_4	f1_bestpractice: Professional suitability of the reviewers		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_5	f1_bestpractice: Quick decisions by the editors about the start of the review pr		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_6	f1_bestpractice: Standardization of the review process (e.g. with the help of a		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_7	f1_bestpractice: Comprehensibility of the review		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_8	f1_bestpractice: Authors may propose reviewers		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_9	f1_bestpractice: Compensation for reviewers (e.g. with vouchers)		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_10	f1_bestpractice: Quick final decision on acceptance, rejection or revision (with		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f1_11	f1_bestpractice: Authors may oppose certain reviewers		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all important	1
		very important	5
f2_1	f2_fachpractice: Double blind review process		

		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		mostly	3
		completely	4
f2_2	f2_fachpractice: Single blind review process		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		mostly	3
		completely	4
f2_3	f2_fachpractice: (partially) standardized evaluation form (questionnaire and con		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		mostly	3
		completely	4
f2_4	f2_fachpractice: Reviews as continuous text		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		mostly	3
		completely	4
f2_5	f2_fachpractice: Reviews in bullet points		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		mostly	3
		completely	4
f2_6	f2_fachpractice: Other procedure (open peer review / non-blind)		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		mostly	3
		completely	4
f3_1	f3_PAllgemein: Reviewers should always be able to read the reviews of other rev		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all desirable	1

		very desirable	5
f3_2	f3_PRallgemein: Reviewers should always receive feedback from the editors on the		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all desirable	1
		very desirable	5
f3_3	f3_PRallgemein: Revisions (major and minor revisions) should always be submitted		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all desirable	1
		very desirable	5
f3_4	f3_PRallgemein: Revisions should always be assessed by new reviewers (independen		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all desirable	1
		very desirable	5
f4_1	f4_JournalQuality: The journal has a high impact factor		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_2	f4_JournalQuality: Journal is published exclusively in Open Access format		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_3	f4_JournalQuality: High frequency of special issues in a journal		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_4	f4_JournalQuality: Journal is published by a professional society		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_5	f4_JournalQuality: Editors publish in their own journal		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5

f4_6	f4_JournalQuality: High degree of interdisciplinarity		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_7	f4_JournalQuality: Journal is indexed in relevant directories (e.g. PubMed, Scop		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_8	f4_JournalQuality: Journal displays annual number of submissions, acceptances, a		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_9	f4_JournalQuality: Names of editors/reviewers will be published upon publication		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_10	f4_JournalQuality: Appendices (supplementary material/appendix) are available on		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_11	f4_JournalQuality: The types of contributions that are appropriate for the journ		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_12	f4_JournalQuality: The journal's website indicates whether all submissions will		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_13	f4_JournalQuality: Authors are allowed to provide the names of reviewers they op		
		Not answered	-9

		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_14	f4_JournalQuality: Author(s) and reviewer(s) are asked to disclose potential con		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_15	f4_JournalQuality: Standards of publication ethics are highlighted on the journa		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f4_16	f4_JournalQuality: Published papers include information about the date of origin		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all significant	1
		very significant	5
f5_1	f5_AnnahmeBP: Gradation of judgements by reviewers in at least 4 categories (e.g		
		Not answered	-9
		inappropriate	1
		appropriate	5
f5_2	f5_AnnahmeBP: Decision on acceptance by the editor, independent of the judgement		
		Not answered	-9
		inappropriate	1
		appropriate	5
f5_3	f5_AnnahmeBP: Simplified assessment of an article by reviewers (only acceptance		
		Not answered	-9
		inappropriate	1
		appropriate	5
f5_4	f5_AnnahmeBP: Limited options for decision by reviewers (e.g. no rejection optio		
		Not answered	-9
		inappropriate	1
		appropriate	5

f5_5	f5_AnnahmeBP: Feedback on the outcome of the review process to all parties invol		
		Not answered	-9
		inappropriate	1
		appropriate	5
f12	f12 Review time limit (Reviewer)		
		can not refuse	-1
		no time limits	0
		<2 weeks	1
		>2 to 4 weeks	2
		>4 to 6 weeks	3
		>6 to 8 weeks	4
		>8 to 12 weeks	5
		>12 to 25 weeks	6
		>25 weeks	7
f13	f13 Review time limit ok? (Reviewer)		
		Not answered	-9
		much too short	1
		rather too short	2
		optimal	3
		rather too long	4
		much too long	5
f14	f14 Review time limit (authors)		
		<2 weeks	1
		>2 to 4 weeks	2
		>4 to 6 weeks	3
		>6 to 8 weeks	4
		>8 to 12 weeks	5
		>12 to 25 weeks	6
		>25 weeks	7
f15	f15 Review duration ok? (authors)		
		Not answered	-9
		much too short	1
		rather too short	2
		optimal	3
		rather too long	4
		much too long	5
f16_publishers	f16_ed Publisher Editors		
		Copernicus	1
		De Gruyter	2
		Elsevier	3
		Frontiers	4
		MDPI	5
		OUP	6

		PLOS	7
		SAGE	8
		Springer Nature	9
		Taylor & Francis	10
		Wiley	11
		Other	12
f17	f17_ed Editor role		
		Not answered	-9
		Regular Editor	1
		Guest Editor	2
		Editor-in-Chief	3
f18_1	f18_ed_rolerate: I can hand over the supervision of a manuscript to other editor		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f18_2	f18_ed_rolerate: Manuscripts submitted to me as editor always fall within the sc		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f18_3	f18_ed_rolerate: Manuscripts are assigned to editors by the publisher.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f18_4	f18_ed_rolerate: Manuscripts are assigned to editors by the editor-in-Chief.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f18_5	f18_ed_rolerate: Editors may forward manuscripts (before or after review) to ano		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f19_1	f19_ed_jourrate: The publisher provides editors with clear criteria as to when a		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1

		fully applies	5
f19_2	f19_ed_jourrate: Editors receive suggestions for possible reviewers from the pub		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f19_3	f19_ed_jourrate: The decision about a desk reject is the sole responsibility of		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f19_4	f19_ed_jourrate: Editors select reviewers without suggestions on their own.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f19_5	f19_ed_jourrate: Authors can make suggestions for possible reviewers.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f19_6	f19_ed_jourrate: Reviewers are automatically selected and contacted by the publi		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f19_7	f19_ed_jourrate: Editors often directly invite authors to submit manuscripts.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f19_8	f19_ed_jourrate: Reviewers receive feedback on the decision after the review and		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f20	f20_ed time limit DeskReject		
		can not refuse	-1
		No specification	0

		1-3 days	1
		4-7 days	2
		8-14 days	3
		15-28 days	4
		29 days or longer	5
f21	f21_ed time limit ok?		
		Not answered	-9
		much too short	1
		rather too short	2
		optimal	3
		rather too long	4
		much too long	5
f22	f22_ed Reviewer suggestions Publisher		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f23	f23_ed Share of expertise of proposed reviewers		
		Not answered	-9
		don't know	-1
		0 to <20%	1
		20 to <40%	2
		40 to <60%	3
		60 to <80%	4
		80 to 100%	5
f24_1	f24_ed_journal: The anonymity of the review process is always guaranteed.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f24_2	f24_ed_journal: The publisher imposes very tight time constraints.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f24_3	f24_ed_journal: Editors often have to remind reviewers to complete a review.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f24_4	f24_ed_journal: The search for reviewers is very time consuming.		

		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f24_5	f24_ed_journal: The publisher specifies how many reviewers must review an article		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f24_6	f24_ed_journal: Editors are pressured by the publisher to speed up the review process		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f25	f25_ed mean # of reviewer in J		
		Not answered	-9
		No specification from the publisher	-1
		1	1
		2	2
		3	3
		4	4
		5	5
		more than 5	6
f26	f26_ed Review time limit (Reviewer)		
		can not refuse	-1
		no time limit	0
		<2 weeks	1
		>2 to 4 weeks	2
		>4 to 6 weeks	3
		>6 to 8 weeks	4
		>8 to 12 weeks	5
		>12 to 25 weeks	6
		>25 weeks	7
f27	f27_ed Review duration ok? (editors)		
		Not answered	-9
		much too short	1
		rather too short	2
		optimal	3
		rather too long	4
		much too long	5

f28_1	f28_ed_wiggleroom: Possibility to accept an article regardless of reviewer judgm		
		no	0
		yes	1
f28_2	f28_ed_wiggleroom: Possibility to reject an article in case of at least one reje		
		no	0
		yes	1
f28_3	f28_ed_wiggleroom: Acceptance of the article despite one rejection		
		no	0
		yes	1
f28_4	f28_ed_wiggleroom: Proposal for resubmission to another journal of the publisher		
		no	0
		yes	1
f29_1	f29_ed_jourfinal: Editors are allowed to publish in the same journal		
		no	0
		yes	1
f29_2	f29_ed_jourfinal: Editors receive financial incentives (e.g. discount on process		
		no	0
		yes	1
f29_3	f29_ed_jourfinal: Reviewers receive non-publisher-specific incentives (e.g. expe		
		no	0
		yes	1
f29_4	f29_ed_jourfinal: Reviewers receive publisher-specific incentives (e.g. vouchers		
		no	0
		yes	1
f29b	f29b_ed # Special issues		
		Not answered	-9
		0 (no special issues)	1
		1	2
		2	3
		3	4
		4	5

		5 or more	6
f30_publisher	f30_rev publisher Reviewer		
		Copernicus	1
		De Gruyter	2
		Elsevier	3
		Frontiers	4
		MDPI	5
		OUP	6
		PLOS	7
		SAGE	8
		Springer	9
		Taylor & Francis	10
		Wiley	11
		Other	12
		IEEE	13
		American Societies	14
f30_publisher_plus2	f30_rev Publisher Reviewer PLUS		
		Copernicus	1
		De Gruyter	2
		Elsevier	3
		Frontiers	4
		MDPI	5
		OUP	6
		PLOS	7
		SAGE	8
		Springer	9
		Taylor & Francis	10
		Wiley	11
		Other	12
		IEEE	13
		American Societies	14
f30_journal_oa	f30_rev OA-Journal Reviewer	Open ended	
f33_1	f33_rev_jourasked: The review request was made personally by the editor of the j		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f33_2	f33_rev_jourasked: The review request was made by the publisher.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5

f33_3	f33_rev_jourasked: The review request fell within the scope of my professional e		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f33_4	f33_rev_jourasked: I had the option to decline the review request.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f34	f34_rev How much time for review?		
		can not refuse	-1
		No time limit	0
		<2 weeks	1
		>2 to 4 weeks	2
		>4 to 6 weeks	3
		>6 to 8 weeks	4
		>8 to 12 weeks	5
		>12 to 25 weeks	6
		>25 weeks	7
f35	f35_rev Did you perceive the time span as ...		
		Not answered	-9
		much too short	1
		rather too short	2
		optimal	3
		rather too long	4
		much too long	5
f36	f36_rev Anonymity of the review process		
		double blind	1
		single blind	2
		other procedures	3
		don't know	
f37_1	f37_rev_revanford: Reviews as continuous text		
		not selected	0
		selected	1
f37_2	f37_rev_revanford: Reviews in bullet points		
		not selected	0
		selected	1

f37_3	f37_rev_revanford: Standardized evaluation questionnaire		
		not selected	0
		selected	1
f37_4	f37_rev_revanford: Partially standardized evaluation questionnaire (single choic		
		not selected	0
		selected	1
f38_1	f38_rev_wiggleroom: Differentiated assessment of an article (i.e., reject, minor		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f38_2	f38_rev_wiggleroom: Simplified assessment - either acceptance or rejection		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f38_3	f38_rev_wiggleroom: Either acceptance of an article or recommendation for resubm		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f38_4	f38_rev_wiggleroom: Suggestion to resubmit to another journal by the same publis		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f39	f39_rev publisher-specific incentives		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f40	f40_rev publisher-related expense allowance		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f41	f41_rev paper reviewed again, although rejected		
		no	0

		yes	1
		don't know	
f42	f42_rev paper published, although rejected		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f43_1	f43_rev_process: There was pressure applied during the review process to finish		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f43_2	f43_rev_process: The final decision of the editor was communicated transparently		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f43_3	f43_rev_process: The reviews of other reviewers were made available to me.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f43_4	f43_rev_process: I had the opportunity to reject the article.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f44	f44_au Review process completed		
		Not answered	-9
		yes	1
		no, I have not submitted anything	2
		no, the review process is still ongoing	3
f45_1	f45_au_general: Reviewers are always experts on the subject of the article.		
		Not answered	-9
		fully disagree	1
		rather disagree	2
		partly	3
		rather agree	4
		fully agree	5

f45_2	f45_au_general: The anonymity of the review process is always guaranteed.		
		Not answered	-9
		fully disagree	1
		rather disagree	2
		partly	3
		rather agree	4
		fully agree	5
f45_3	f45_au_general: Revisions (major and minor revision) have always been submitted		
		Not answered	-9
		fully disagree	1
		rather disagree	2
		partly	3
		rather agree	4
		fully agree	5
f45_4	f45_au_general: Revisions (major and minor revision) were always assessed by new		
		Not answered	-9
		fully disagree	1
		rather disagree	2
		partly	3
		rather agree	4
		fully agree	5
f45_5	f45_au_general: I do not care about the peer review process, my main concern is		
		Not answered	-9
		fully disagree	1
		rather disagree	2
		partly	3
		rather agree	4
		fully agree	5
f46	f46_au last article accepted?		
		Not answered	-9
		accepted (if applicable after minor or major revision)	1
		rejected after a standard peer-review process	2
		rejected by the editor (desk-reject)	3
f47_publisher	f47_au Publisher Author		
		Copernicus	1

		De Gruyter	2
		Elsevier	3
		Frontiers	4
		MDPI	5
		OUP	6
		PLOS	7
		SAGE	8
		Springer Nature	9
		Taylor & Francis	10
		Wiley	11
		Other	12
f47_journal_oa	f47_au OA-Journal Author	Open ended	
f48_1	f48_au_reason: High impact factor of the journal		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f48_2	f48_au_reason: Recommendation of the journal by colleagues or superiors		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f48_3	f48_au_reason: Existence of publication contracts with my institution or library		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f48_4	f48_au_reason: Request for submission by members of the journal's editorial board	Open ended	
f48_5	f48_au_reason: Thematic fit - the paper would not have fit in (almost) any other		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f48_6	f48_au_reason: Submission due to a specific call-for-papers for a special issue.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f48_7	f48_au_reason: Call for submission by the journal (e.g., after publication of a		

		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f48_8	f48_au_reason: Publication advice from my institution or library		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f49_1	f49_au_ratereview: The reviews were professionally relevant/suitable.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f49_2	f49_au_ratereview: The reviews were detailed.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f49_3	f49_au_ratereview: The final decision to accept or reject was based on the review		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f49_4	f49_au_ratereview: The final decision to accept or reject was arbitrary.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f50	f50_au Duration 1st feedback (authors)		
		<2 weeks	1
		>2 to 4 weeks	2
		>4 to 6 weeks	3
		>6 to 8 weeks	4
		>8 to 12 weeks	5
		>12 to 25 weeks	6
		>25 weeks	7
		don't know	.
f51	f51_au Duration 1st feedback ok? (authors)		
		Not answered	-9
		much too short	1
		rather too short	2

		optimal	3
		rather too long	4
		much too long	5
f52	f52_au Duration 1. review (authors)		
		<2 weeks	1
		>2 to 4 weeks	2
		>4 to 6 weeks	3
		>6 to 8 weeks	4
		>8 to 12 weeks	5
		>12 to 25 weeks	6
		>25 weeks	7
		don't know	.
f53	f53_au Duration 1. review ok? (authors)		
		Not answered	-9
		much too short	1
		rather too short	2
		optimal	3
		rather too long	4
		much too long	5
f54	f54_au Anonymity of the review process (authors)		
		double blind	1
		single blind	2
		other procedures	3
		don't know	
f55_1	f55_au_revanford: review as continuous text		
		no	0
		yes	1
f55_2	f55_au_revanford: reviews in bullet points		
		no	0
		yes	1
f55_3	f55_au_revanford: standardized evaluation questionnaire		
		no	0
		yes	1
f55_4	f55_au_revanford: (partially) standardized review form (single-choice questionna		
		no	0
		yes	1
f56_1	f56_au_standards: factual and detailed reviews		

		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f56_2	f56_au_standards: at least two reviews		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f56_3	f56_au_standards: more than two reviews in case of different judgments		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f56_4	f56_au_standards: professional suitability of the reviewers		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f56_5	f56_au_standards: quick decision by the editor about the start of the review pro		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f56_6	f56_au_standards: standardization of the review process (e.g. with the help of a		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2

		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f56_7	f56_au_standards: comprehensibility of the content of the review		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f56_8	f56_au_standards: possibility to suggest / oppose reviewers		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f56_9	f56_au_standards: financial compensation for reviewers (e.g. as voucher)		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f56_10	f56_au_standards: quick final decision on acceptance, rejection or revision (wit		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f57_1	f57_au_wiggleroom: Differentiated assessment of the article		
		no	0
		yes	1
f57_2	f57_au_wiggleroom: Simplified assessment - acceptance or rejection		
		no	0

		yes	1
f57_3	f57_au_wiggleroom: Request for resubmission of the article to the same journal		
		no	0
		yes	1
f57_4	f57_au_wiggleroom: Proposal for resubmission in another journal of the same publ		
		no	0
		yes	1
f57_5	f57_au_wiggleroom: Offer to publish in a special issue of the same journal		
		no	0
		yes	1
reviewer2	filled out Q for Reviewer	Open ended	
author2	filled out f45 as Author	Open ended	
author3	filled Q as Author (has submitted)	Open ended	