EQUAP[2]

Evaluating the Quality Assurance Process in Scholarly Publishing

Final Report – Appendix B

February 22th 2023

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7669497

Appendix B – Codebook of the EQUAP^2 Survey (Version 1.01)

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	How important do you consider the following features of the review process to ensure best practice?		
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
		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	Do the following procedures correspond to the usual standards of your discipline?		
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	With respect to your discipline, do you consider the following features of the peer review process to be desirable?		
f3_1	f3_PRallgemein: 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	Which of the following characteristics of a scientific journal do you think are most significant to its quality?		
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	To what extend do you consider the following conditions for a decision on a manuscript (acceptance, rejection or resubmission) as appropriate?		
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 option)		
		Not answered	-9
		inappropriate	1
		appropriate	5
f5_5	f5_AnnahmeBP: Feedback on the outcome of the review process to all parties involved		
		Not answered	-9
		inappropriate	1
		appropriate	5
f12	In general, how much time do you get to complete a review of a paper?		
	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	Do you consider this time span as ...		
	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	As an author, how much time does it take on average for you to receive your first reviews from a journal?		
	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	Do you feel that this period of time is …		
	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	For which of the following publishers have you served as an editor or co-editor of a journal?		
	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	You have indicated that you are an editor for a journal published at <u>%EdVerlag%</u>. Were or are you at this journal ...		
	f17_ed Editor role		
		Not answered	-9
		Regular Editor	1
		Guest Editor	2
		Editor-in-Chief	3
f18	Thinking about your role as <u>%EdRolle%</u> at <u>%EdVerlag%</u>, to what extent do the following statements apply?		
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 scope of my professional expertise.		

		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 another journal of the publisher.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f19	To what extent do the following statements apply with regard to your role with the journal <u>%EdVerlag%</u>?		
f19_1	f19_ed_jourrate: The publisher provides editors with clear criteria as to when a desk reject can be made.		
		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 publisher.		
		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 the editor		
		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 publisher.		
		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 are given access to the other reviews.		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f20	How much time do you usually get to decide whether to reject a manuscript outright or pass it on to reviewers?		
	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	Do you consider this time span to be ...		
	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	Do you receive suggestions for reviewers from the publisher?		
	f22_ed Reviewer suggestions Publisher		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f23	When you think about the proposed reviewers: What percentage of them do you think have sufficient professional expertise on the subject of the article?		
	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	In your opinion, to what extent do the following aspects apply to the journal <u>%EdVerlag%</u>.		
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 articl		
		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 pr		
		Not answered	-9
		does not apply at all	1
		fully applies	5
f25	How many reviewers usually review an article submitted to the <u>%EdVerlag%</u> journal?		
	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	How much time do reviewers typically get to complete the review of an article at the journal of <u>%EdPublisher%</u>?		
	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	Do you consider this time span to be ...		
	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	What leeway do editors have at the journal of <u>%EdVerlag%</u> when the judgments of reviewers are not consistent (e.g., reject vs. minor revision)?		
f28_1	f28_ed_wiggleroom: Possibility to accept an article regardless of reviewer judgments		
		no	0
		yes	1
f28_2	f28_ed_wiggleroom: Possibility to reject an article in case of at least one rejection		
		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	What are additional features of the journal you served at?		
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 processing fees)		
		no	0
		yes	1
f29_3	f29_ed_jourfinal: Reviewers receive non-publisher-specific incentives (e.g. expense allowance)		
		no	0
		yes	1

f29_4	f29_ed_jourfinal: Reviewers receive publisher-specific incentives (e.g. vouchers)		
		no	0
		yes	1
f29	How many special issues appeared in the journal last year (2021)?		
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	For which of the following publishers did you last serve as a reviewer?		
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	How would you rate the following statements in light of your role as a reviewer at the journal <u>%REJournal%</u>?		
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	How much time were you given to review the paper for the journal <u>%REJournal%</u>?		
	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	Do you consider this time span as ...		
	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	What was the degree of anonymity during the review process in the journal <u>%REJournal%</u>?		
	f36_rev Anonymity of the review process		
		double blind	1
		single blind	2
		other procedures	3
		don't know	
f37	What were the formal requirements for the reviews at the journal?		
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 choice questions and continuous text).		
		not selected	0
		selected	1
f38	As a reviewer at the journal <u>%REJournal%</u>, what leeway did you possess for your judgment?		
f38_1	f38_rev_wiggleroom: Differentiated assessment of an article (i.e., reject, minor revision, major revision, accept)		
		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 resubmission (no option to reject)		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f38_4	f38_rev_wiggleroom: Suggestion to resubmit to another journal by the same publisher		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f39	Did you receive a publisher-specific incentive from <u>%REJournal%</u> (e.g., voucher)?		
	f39_rev publisher-specific incentives		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f40	Did you receive a non-publisher-specific expense allowance from <u>%REJournal%</u>?		
	f40_rev publisher-related expense allowance		
		no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f41	As a reviewer for <u>%REJournal%</u>, did you have to review an article again, even though it had already been rejected by you?		
	f41_rev paper reviewed again, although rejected	no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f42	Has an article you reviewed been published in <u>%REJournal%</u>, even though it was previously rejected by you?		
	f42_rev paper published, although rejected	no	0
		yes	1
		don't know	
f43	How would you rate the following statements with respect to the review and decision-making process at <u>%REJournal%</u>?		
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	Have you gone through a full review process in the past 12 months (regardless of the decision)?		
	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	Thinking generally about your experience as an author: To what extent do you agree with the following statements?		
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	Was your last article under review accepted or rejected?		
	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	In which journal did you last complete an entire peer review process of one of your articles?		
	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	To what extent did the following features influence your decision to submit an article to <u>%AUTJournal%</u>?		
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 boar	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	As an author, how would you rate the following statements in light of the completed review process at the <u>%AUTJournal%</u>?		
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 revie		
		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	How long did you have to wait for initial feedback from the <u>%AUTJournal%</u>?		
	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
		weiß nicht	
f51	Do you consider this time span as...		
	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	Approximately how much time passed before you received the first reviews from the <u>%AUTJournal%</u>?		
	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
		weiß nicht	
f53	Do you consider this time span as...		
	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	What degree of anonymity was the review process at the <u>%AUTJournal%</u> subject to?		
	f54_au Anonymity of the review process (authors)		
		double blind	1
		single blind	2
		other procedures	3
		don't know	
f55	What were the formal requirements for reviews in the <u>%AUTJournal%</u>?		

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 questionnaire and continuous text).		
		no	0
		yes	1
f56	To what extent did <u>%AUTJournal%</u> adhere to the following characteristics of the review process?		
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 process (desk-reject yes/no)		
		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 questionnaire)		
		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 (within 1 month)		
		Not answered	-9
		not at all	1
		hardly	2
		partly	3
		mostly	4
		completely	5
f57	What form of feedback did you receive from <u>%AUTJournal%</u> at the various stages of the review process?		
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 publisher		
		no	0
		yes	1

f57_5	f57_au_wiggleroom: Offer to publish in a special issue of the same journal		
		no	0
		yes	1