

1. From your perspective as a REVIEWER, what is your overall impression of the CCCTG manuscript review process?

- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent

2. How strong do you believe that there was a "good fit" between your expertise/interests and the manuscripts that you reviewed?

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

3. Do you believe that you had ample time to review the manuscripts that you reviewed?

- Yes
- No
- Undecided

4. Do you agree with the current "open review process" in which manuscript authors are aware of who is reviewing their documents?

- Yes
- No
- Undecided

5. Would you prefer a structured or unstructured format for reviews of manuscripts?

- Structured
- Unstructured
- Undecided

6. How often do you review manuscripts for various journals? Please choose the response that most closely reflects the frequency of your reviews.

- None
- 1 - 3/year
- 4 - 8/year
- 9 - 12/year
- > 12/year

7. Which of the following do you believe are the roles of the CCCTG manuscript reviewers? (Please check ALL that apply)

- Word-smithing
- Document organization
- Enhancing the clarity of key messages
- Reviewing consistency of the data presented
- Improving/shaping the key scientific arguments as are typically found in the Introduction and Discussion sections of manuscripts
- Providing additional references
- Optimizing presentation of tables and figures
- Description of methodology
- Framing of the study question
- Overarching comments regarding design and/or interpretation

Other (please specify)

8. Would you have liked to have seen your co-reviewer's review of the submitted manuscript?

- Yes
- No
- Undecided

9. Would you like constructive written feedback about the quality of your review from the CCCTG Grants and Manuscripts committee regarding the manuscript(s) that you reviewed?

- Yes
- No
- Undecided

10. Do you prefer to review ONLY manuscripts that are about topics within your areas of interest/expertise?

- Yes
- No (any topic)
- Undecided

11. What works well in your current manuscript review process?

12. What needs improvement in the current manuscript review process?

13. Any other suggestions?