## AUTHOR SURVEY: PERCEPTION OF REVIEW QUALITY

Please fill in the blanks or use the pull-down menus to answer the questions

Manuscript number: .....

## Manuscript Disposition .....

Country of origin: .....

	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4
The reviewer's comments are accurate: The critique reflects a careful reading of the manuscript.				
The reviewer's comments are informed: The review reflects and understanding of the material presented in the manuscript.				
The reviewer's comments are impartial: The critique is unbiased and impartial.				
The reviewer's comments are important: The critique focused on the important issues presented in the manuscript, not minor details.				
The reviewer's comments are respectful: The comments reflect respect for the ideas and work presented in the manuscript.				
The reviewer's comments are constructive: The review provided helpful suggestions as to how the research or its presentation could be improved.				
Submission procedures: The process was straightforward and easy to use.				
<b>Turnaround time for review:</b> The time from submission to decision was reasonable.				
Support form journal staff: Journal staff was courteous and helpful.				
<b>Overall Satisfaction:</b> Overall the review process met expectations.				
Willingness to resubmit: Based on the reviews of my manuscript, I would be more or less interested in submitting again to Obstetrics & Gynecology.				

Respondents indicated ratings from pull-down menus. For the first six questions regarding editorial comments from reviewers, and the following three questions regarding review processes, menus provided a Likert Scale from 1 (Not True) to 5 (True). The response options for the final two questions were Yes or No.

Online appendix to Gibson M, Spong CY, Simonsen SE, Martin S, Scott J. Author perception of peer review. Obstet Gynecol 2008;112:646–51.

© 2008 by The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.