

Supporting Information

S1 File. Copy of Full Survey Text

Survey is listed below.

What is your gender?

Please choose all that apply:

Male

Female

Prefer not to answer

What is your age?

Please choose only one of the following:

Under 30

30–39

40–49

50–59

60+

Please specify your race/ethnicity

Please choose all that apply:

American Indian or Alaska Native

Asian or Asian American

Black or African American

Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Hispanic or Latino

Non-Hispanic White/Caucasian

Other

Prefer not to answer

What type of degree(s) do you have?

Please choose all that apply:

PhD or other research doctorate

MD

DDS

DVM or VMD

Other

Prefer not to answer

What type of an organization do you work for?

Please choose only one of the following:

Academia

Government

Industry

Other

What stage of career have you reached?

Please choose only one of the following:

Early career

Mid career

Late career/tenured

Emeritus

On average, how many hours do you work each week?

Please choose only one of the following:

40 h

40–50 h

50–60 h

60–70 h

70 + h

Please provide any comments that justify your responses under Section 1, Demographics.

Please write your answer here:

Section 2: Grant submission and peer review experience

Have you submitted a grant for peer review in the last 3 years?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

If you answered yes to submitting a grant for peer review in the past 3 years, how many grant applications have you submitted in that time frame?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 or more

Did you receive reviewer feedback on your last grant submission?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

Was your last application successful, i.e., were you funded?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

Have you served on a peer review panel in the last 3 years?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

If you answered yes to serving on a peer review panel in the last 3 years, how many peer review panels have you served on in that time frame?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 or more

If you answered yes to serving on a peer review panel in the past 3 years, please select the mode of your last peer review panel meeting.

Please choose only one of the following:

Face-to-face

Remote (video/teleconference)

Internet-assisted

Other

How many ad-hoc reviews (usually one or two grant applications reviewed telephonically that are being evaluated in a panel meeting setting) have you performed in the past 3 years?

Please choose only one of the following:

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 or more

Have you reviewed for a journal in the last 3 years?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

If you answered yes to reviewing for a journal in the past 3 years, how many submissions have you reviewed in that time frame?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 or more

What is a higher personal priority: grant review or journal review?

Please choose only one of the following:

Grant review

Journal review

Both are equal priority

Neither is a priority

Please elaborate on your responses under Section 2, Grant submission and peer review experience.

Please write your answer here:

Section 3: Investigator attitudes toward grant review

If you answered yes to receiving feedback on your last grant submission, please answer Section 3 of the questionnaire. If you answered no, please proceed to Section 4.

On a scale of 1–5 (1 most useful, 5 least useful), overall how useful was the reviewer feedback you received on your last grant submission?

Please choose only one of the following:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

On a scale of 1–5 (1 most useful, 5 least useful), how useful was the reviewer feedback in improving your grantsmanship?

Please choose only one of the following:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

If you were not funded, on a scale of 1–5 (1 most useful, 5 least useful), how useful was the reviewer feedback in improving your future submissions?

Please choose only one of the following:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

On a scale of 1–5 (1 most useful, 5 least useful), how useful was the reviewer feedback in informing your future scientific endeavors in the proposed research area?

Please choose only one of the following:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Did you feel the reviewer feedback was well written, cohesive, and balanced?

Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No

Did you feel the reviewer feedback was fair and unbiased?

Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No

Overall, in what area(s) did the reviewer feedback primarily focus?

Please choose all that apply:

Potential impact of research

Hypothesis

Research methodology

Innovation potential

Preliminary data

Responsiveness to funding mechanism

Statistical issues

Qualifications of research team

Budget

Other

Did the reviewers comment on the riskiness of the research project?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

Based on the reviewer feedback you received, do you feel that the reviewers had the appropriate expertise to evaluate your grant application?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

Please elaborate on your responses under Section 3, Investigator Attitudes Towards Grant review.

Please write your answer here:

Section 4: Reviewer attitudes towards grant review

What are your reasons for accepting an invitation to serve on a peer review panel?

Please choose all that apply:

Desire to give back to the scientific community

Networking opportunities

Informing your own grantsmanship

Gaining exposure to new and innovative scientific areas

Enhancing your career/resume

Expectation from the funding agency

Honorarium

Other

Do you feel that serving as a reviewer on peer review panels has positively impacted your career?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

If you feel that serving as a peer reviewer has positively impacted your career, in what ways has serving as a reviewer influenced your career?

Please choose all that apply:

Bolstered your career

Improved your grantsmanship

Increased your exposure to new scientific ideas

Improved your networking/collaboration opportunities

Other

In general, which type of panel meeting format do you prefer?

Please choose only one of the following:

Face-to-face

Virtual [teleconference/videoconference]

Internet-assisted

On a scale of 1–5, (1 most influential, 5 least influential), please rate the following factors in influencing your selection of preferred panel meeting format:

Please write your answer(s) here:

Logistical convenience

Level of communication among panel members

Networking opportunities

Likelihood to participate on panel

In the last 3 years, how many times have you declined an invitation to serve on a peer review panel?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 or more

What were your reasons for declining an invitation to serve on a peer review panel?

Please choose all that apply:

Limited free time

Poor expertise match

Personal reasons (holiday, sickness, travel)

Review timeline too compressed

Conflict of interest

Issue with funding agency

Other

What is the maximum number of peer review panels/committees you prefer to serve on per year?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

More than 3

What is the maximum number of days you prefer to attend a peer review panel meeting?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

More than 3

What is the maximum number of R01-type grant applications you prefer to be assigned for a peer review panel meeting?

Please choose only one of the following:

1–2

3–4

5–6

7

More than 7

What was the actual number of days of your last peer review panel meeting?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

More than 3

What was the actual number of R01-type grant applications you were assigned to review at your last peer review panel meeting?

Please choose only one of the following:

1-2

3-4

5-6

7-8

More than 8

On average, how many hours did you spend reviewing each grant application before the panel meeting?

Please choose only one of the following:

1-2

2-3

3-4

4-5

5-6

7 or more

Please elaborate on your responses under Sect. 4, Reviewer attitudes towards grant review.

Please write your answer here:

Section 5: Peer review panel meeting proceedings

Please answer the following questions in relation to your last peer review meeting. On a scale of 1-5 (1 most definitely, 5 not at all), was your scientific expertise necessary and appropriately used in the review process?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

On a scale of 1-5 (1 most definitely, 5 not at all), from your perspective was the expertise of the other panel members necessary and appropriately used in the review process?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

Did the grant application discussions facilitate reviewer participation?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

Were the grant application discussions fair and balanced?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

On a scale of 1–5 (1 most useful, 5 least useful), how useful were the grant application discussions in clarifying differing reviewer opinions?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

On a scale of 1–5 (1 extremely effective, 5 no effect), did the grant application discussions affect the outcome?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

On a scale of 1–5 (1 most appropriate, 5 least appropriate), were the evaluation criteria appropriate to judge the best science and move the field forward?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

On a scale of 1–5 (1 extremely important, 5 of no importance), how important is the PI's track record to assessing an investigator initiated (R01)-type application?

Please choose only one of the following:

1

2

3

4

5

In general, does a PI's track record temper your assessment of any detected methodological weaknesses?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

On a scale of 1–5 (1 most definitely, 5 not at all), did the grant application discussions promote the best science?

Please choose only one of the following:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Was innovation factored into selecting the best science?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

Did you view innovation as an essential component of scientific excellence when evaluating the grant applications?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

Did the risks associated with innovative research impact the scores you assigned to the grant applications?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

On a scale of 1–5 (1 completely, 5 not at all), how much did the seniority of your fellow panel members influence your evaluations during the panel deliberations?

Please choose only one of the following:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Was the format and duration of the grant application discussions sufficient to allow the non-assigned reviewers to cast well informed merit scores?

Please choose only one of the following:

Yes

No

On a scale of 1–5 (1 extremely useful, 5 not useful at all), how useful was the Chair in facilitating the application discussions?

Please choose only one of the following:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please elaborate on your responses under Section 5, Peer review panel meeting proceedings.

Please write your answer here:

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the survey. Have a wonderful day!

Submit your survey.

Thank you for completing this survey.