

## Suppl. 1. Survey questions: the value of Crossref

---

### About you

Thank you for taking part in this short survey. Your feedback will be really valuable in helping Crossref to understand the value you derive from working with them.

Completion time: 10-12 minutes

Please note that your responses are strictly confidential and anonymous. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact [feedback@crossref.org](mailto:feedback@crossref.org). Thanks again for your help!

#### 1) Which of these best describe the organization you work for? Select all that apply.\*

- Publisher
- Government agency
- Library
- University press
- Service or tool for researchers
- Research funder
- Service or tool for publishers
- Society
- Data repository

#### 2) What is your current relationship with Crossref? Select all that apply.\*

- Direct Member (we are a member of Crossref and we register our content with you)
- Sponsored Member (we are a member of Crossref and we work with you via a Sponsoring Organisation)
- Sponsoring Organisation (we are not a member and we have

no content, but we represent and register content on behalf of Sponsored Members)

- Metadata User of a paid service (we pay for a Crossref subscription service)
- Metadata User of a free service (we use search or open APIs)
- Collaborator (we have no official relationship but we work on the same community initiatives)
- None (we are hosting platform or manuscript tracking system that works with Crossref members)
- None (we have no relationship with Crossref or its members but are involved in the research community)

#### 3) In which region of the world are you based?\*

- Africa
- Asia
- Central America
- Eastern Europe
- Middle East
- North America
- Oceania
- South America
- The Caribbean
- Western Europe

#### 4) In US Dollars, approximately what is your parent organisation's total annual revenue or expenses (use whichever is higher)?\*

- \$0-1 million
- \$1-10 million
- \$11-100 million
- \$101-500 million
- \$501 million+

General feelings about Crossref

Thank you, now we'd like to get your general views of Crossref.

5) On a scale from 0-10, how likely would you be to recommend Crossref to another organization or colleague?\*

0 \_\_\_\_\_ [ ] \_\_\_\_\_ 10

Comments:

6) To what extent do you agree with the following statements?\*

0=Strongly disagree 10=Strongly agree

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Not sure

Through Crossref, I feel part of a community

Being a member or user of Crossref gives me credibility within my community

Crossref's communications are clear

Crossref support documentation is helpful

Crossref is good value for money

Crossref is affordable

Crossref favours large established members

Crossref favours small or new types of members

Crossref is neutral and treats all its members the same

Crossref is transparent about what they are working on

Crossref offers ways for me to input on development plans

Crossref infrastructure and services are high quality

Comments:

7) On a scale from 0-10, how likely are you to continue your current relationship with Crossref?\*

0 \_\_\_\_\_ [ ] \_\_\_\_\_ 10

8) You stated you would be likely to continue your current relationship with Crossref. Why is that?

\_\_\_\_\_

9) You stated you would be unlikely to continue your current relationship with Crossref. Why is that?

\_\_\_\_\_

## Crossref services

Thank you, we'd like to move on to understand your satisfaction with Crossref's services.

### 10) How satisfied are you with the following Crossref services? (Please select not applicable if you do not use a service)\*

0=Very dissatisfied 10=Very satisfied

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Not applicable
Content Registration (registering metadata and assigning DOIs)												
Cited-by (getting citation counts for your content)												
Crossmark (displaying corrections and retractions to readers)												
Metadata Retrieval (e.g. Search or REST API)												
Similarity Check (manuscript comparisons to check for overlap)												
Funder Registry (identifiers for funding organisations)												
Event Data (tracking mentions and shares of content)												

### 11) What works well and not well with each Crossref service?

	What is working well?	What is not working well?
Event Data (tracking mentions and shares of content)	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>
Crossmark (displaying corrections and retractions to readers)	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>
Content Registration (registering metadata and assigning DOIs)	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>
Metadata Retrieval (e.g. Search or REST API)	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>
Funder Registry (identifiers for funding organisations)	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>
Cited-by (getting citation counts for your content)	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>
Similarity Check (manuscript comparisons to check for overlap)	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>

## Crossref's mission and strategy

Finally, we'd like to hear your thoughts on Crossref's mission and future direction.

### 12) On a scale from 0-10, to what extent do you think Crossref is meeting its stated mission:

"Crossref makes research outputs easy to find, cite, link, and assess. We're a not-for-profit membership organization that exists to make scholarly communications better. We rally the community; tag and share metadata; run an open infrastructure; play with technology; and make tools and services—all to help put scholarly content in context."\*

0 \_\_\_\_\_ [ ] \_\_\_\_\_ 10

Comments:

### 13) How important do you feel Crossref's four strategic activity areas are?\*

1=Not at all important 10=Extremely important

\_\_\_\_\_ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Not sure

"Simplify & enrich existing services" →(e.g. consolidating tools, and making services easier to use and participate in.)

"Improve our metadata" →(e.g. clearer guidelines on how/why to add rich metadata, and adding value to users of our metadata including members.)

"Adapt to expanding constituencies" →(e.g. engaging with funders, including research grants in Crossref, and enabling participation from organisations in lower income countries.)

"Selectively collaborate and partner" →(e.g. working with community initiatives like ROR, FREYA, Metadata 2020, SCHOLIX, and co-developing with partners such as DataCite, PKP, Wikimedia, ORCID.)

Comments:

### 14) How successful do you feel Crossref is in progressing their four strategic activity areas, so far?\*

1=Not at all successful 10=Extremely successful

\_\_\_\_\_ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Not sure

"Simplify & enrich existing services" →(e.g. consolidating tools, and making services easier to use and participate in.)

"Improve our metadata" →(e.g. clearer guidelines on how/why to add rich metadata, and adding value to users of our metadata including members.)

"Adapt to expanding constituencies" →(e.g. engaging with funders, including research grants in Crossref, and enabling participation from organisations in lower income countries.)

"Selectively collaborate and partner" →(e.g. working with community initiatives like ROR, FREYA, Metadata 2020, SCHOLIX, and co-developing with partners such as DataCite, PKP, Wikimedia, ORCID.)

**15) To what extent do you agree with the following statements about Crossref?\***

1=Strongly disagree 10=Strongly agree

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Not sure
Crossref is important for all kinds of organisations involved in research, not only publishers											
Crossref is helping to grow discoverability of published content											
Crossref metadata is essential for research communications											
Crossref helps establish evidence for scholarly research											
Crossref helps establish the provenance of scholarly research											
Crossref is improving research communications											
Crossref is innovative and encourages progress by leading on new initiatives											
Crossref is collaborative and participates in other important community initiatives											
Crossref is sustainable and reliable; I trust it will be around long-term											
Crossref understands the needs of my organisation											

**Thank You!**

That's it! Thanks for your time.

We really value your input and also want to remind you that your responses in this research are confidential and anonymous.