Welcome to OpenAIRE's survey on Open Peer Review. Thank you for participating.
The survey should take about 15 minutes to complete - please answer all the questions as this will enable us to derive the most value from your responses. If needed, you can pause the survey by pressing the "pause the interview" button. You'll then be able to resume at any time.
Participation in the survey is voluntary. All data will be kept confidential and evaluated anonymously in compliance with the principles of the European Data Protection Directive. In accordance with the EC's Open Research Data Pilot, the anonymized data will be made openly accessible.

1. Please tell us your age *[one answer]*

- under 24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- Over 65

2. What region are you living in? *[one answer]*

- Africa
- America
- Asia
- Europe
- Oceania / Australia

3. What subject discipline are you specialized in *[one answer]*

- Choose the most suitable category
- Agriculture and Food sciences
- Arts and Architecture
- Biology and Life sciences
- Chemistry
- Computer Sciences / IT
- Earth and environmental Sciences
- Economics
- Health Sciences
- History and Archeology
- Languages and Literature
- Law and Political science
- Mathematics and Statistics
- Physics and Astronomy
- Psychology and Philosophy
- Social Sciences
- Technology and Engineering
- None of the above

4. In which scholarly communication roles do you have experience? *[multiple answers incl. freetext + none]*

(Tick as many as apply)

- Editor
- Author
- Publisher
- Reviewer
- Other(s), please specify: *free text*
- None of the above *[exclusive]*

5. Do you have personal experience of open peer review as *[multiple answers incl. freetext + none]*

(Tick as many as apply)

- Editor
- Author
- Publisher
- Reviewer
- Other(s), please specify: *free text*
- None of the above *[exclusive]*

6. Overall, how satisfied are you with the peer review system used by scholarly journals? *[one answer]*

- Very dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very satisfied
- Don't know

7. There are many ways peer review processes can be modified. Here we define some of these innovations. *[one answer]*

Do you think they will make peer review better, worse, or have no effect?

- *Much worse*
- *Worse*
- *Neither better nor worse*
- *Better*
- *Much better*
- *Don't know*

1. Open Reports: Peer review where review reports are published alongside the relevant article.
2. Open Identity: Peer review where authors and reviewers are aware of each other's identity.
3. Open Participation: Peer review that allows the wider community to contribute to the review process.
4. Open Interaction: Peer review that allows and encourages direct reciprocal discussion between author(s) and reviewers, as well as between reviewers.
5. Open pre-review manuscripts: Manuscripts are made immediately available (e.g., via pre-print servers like ArXiv) in advance of any formal peer review procedures.
6. Open final-version commenting: Review or commenting on final "version of record" publications.
7. Open platforms: Peer review that is de-coupled from publishing in that it is facilitated by a different organisational entity than the venue of publication.

8. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. *[one answer]*

- *Strongly disagree*
- *disagree*
- *neither agree nor disagree*
- *agree*
- *strongly agree*
- *Don't know*

1. The overall current system of scholarly communications works well.
2. Making research publications open access should be common scholarly practice.
3. Making research data open access should be common scholarly practice.
4. Open Peer Review should be common scholarly practice.

In this section, we'd like to go deeper into your aţtudes towards open identities, open reports and open participation.

9. We defined "Open Reports" as peer review where review reports are published alongside the relevant article. *[multiple answers]*
Have you taken part in a review process with open reports as a

- reviewer
- author
- neither *[exclusive]*

10. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. *[one answer]*

- *Strongly disagree*
- *disagree*
- *neither agree nor disagree*
- *agree*
- *strongly agree*
- *Don't know*

1. Published review reports provide useful information for the reader.
2. Publishing review reports will make reviewers less likely to make strong criticisms.
3. Publishing review reports will increase the quality of reviews.
4. Potential reviewers are less likely to agree to review for journals that publish review reports.
5. Potential authors are less likely to submit to journals that publish review reports.

11. We defined "Open Identity" as peer review where authors and reviewers are aware of each other's identity *[multiple answers]*
Have you taken part in a review process with open identities as a

- reviewer
- author
- neither *[exclusive]*

12. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. *[one answer]*

- *Strongly disagree*
- *disagree*
- *neither agree nor disagree*
- *agree*
- *strongly agree*
- *Don't know*

1. Making reviewer identities open will make reviewers less likely to make strong criticisms.
2. Making reviewer identities open will increase the quality of reviews.
3. Reviewers should be allowed to choose whether or not to make their identities open.
4. Making reviewer identities open is fairer to authors.
5. Potential reviewers are less likely to agree to review for journals that make reviewer identities open.
6. Potential authors are less likely to submit to journals that make reviewer identities open.

13. We defined "Open Participation" as peer review that allows the wider community to contribute to the review process. *[multiple answers]*
Have you taken part in a review process with open participation as a

- reviewer
- author
- neither *[exclusive]*

14. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. *[one answer]*

- *Strongly disagree*
- *disagree*
- *neither agree nor disagree*
- *agree*
- *strongly agree*
- *Don't know*

1. Everybody with sufficient knowledge should be able to participate in the review process regardless of their formal qualifications or area of work.
2. Close circles of reviewers and editors hold back innovative research.
3. Reviewers are more likely to review if they are invited.

15. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. *[one answer]*

- *Strongly disagree*
- *disagree*
- *neither agree nor disagree*
- *agree*
- *strongly agree*
- *Don't know*

1. Increased interaction between authors & reviewers will result in better publications
2. Manuscripts should be made openly accessible before peer review begins.
3. Blog articles, online journal clubs and social media commentary on final-version publications are part of peer review.

16. Do you agree with this definition of Open Peer Review *[one answer]*
An umbrella term describing a variety of innovations which "open up" the traditional peer review process by modifying one or more aspects to make it more inclusive, transparent and/or accountable. Primary aspects are Open Identities, Open Reports and Open Participation (possession of one of these traits is usually sufficient to qualify a system as "Open Peer Review"). Secondary characteristics include Openness in Time, Open Interaction, Open Platforms and others (these aspects are usually insufficient in themselves to qualify a system as "Open Peer Review", but are often included in many definitions nonetheless).

- Yes, I agree
- No, I don't agree

17. If you do not agree, why? *[free text]*

18. Do you have any other comments? *[free text]*

Thank you for completing this questionnaire!

We would like to thank you very much for helping us.

For questions regarding OpenAIRE or its Open Peer Review activities please contact Dr. Tony Ross-Hellauer

Your answers have now been received by OpenAIRE, you may now close your browser tab or window.