

Appendix B. Participant Characteristics

	Responses (N)	(%)
How would you rank level of familiarity with rapid reviews? (n=63)		
Extremely familiar	12	19%
Very familiar	12	19%
Somewhat familiar	24	38%
Not so familiar	11	17%
Not at all familiar	4	6%
In what capacity have you previously participated in a rapid review? (Please check all that apply) (N=63)		
Lead author of a rapid review	20	32%
Co-author of a rapid review	22	35%
Information specialist	7	11%
Statistician	2	3%
Methodologist/Epidemiologist	22	35%
Clinical expert	4	6%
Stakeholder (e.g., policymaker, consumer, health professional)	2	3%
None	24	38%
Other research capacity (please specify)	1	2%
To what extent do you agree or disagree that the production of Cochrane RRs should be driven primarily by requests for timely evidence for decision-making. (N=59)		
Strongly agree	31	53%
Agree	25	43%
Neither agree nor disagree	3	5%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly disagree	0	0%
Cochrane Affiliation (Entities) (N=53)		
Cochrane EMD	6	11%
Cochrane ITS	2	4%
Cochrane Response	1	2%
Coordinating Editor	7	13%
Council member	1	2%
Editorial Board member	4	8%
Field Executive member	3	6%
Geographical Centre Executive member	3	6%
Handbook Editor	4	8%
Information Retrieval Methods Group convenor	2	4%
Information Specialist Executive member	0	0%
Managing Editors Executive member	2	4%
MECIR Author	2	4%
Methods Executive member	2	4%
Network Senior Editor	3	6%
Network Associate Editor	1	2%
Network Support Fellow	4	8%
Rapid Reviews Advisory Committee member	6	11%
Rapid Reviews Methods Group convenor	4	8%
Scientific Committee member	8	15%