

## **Cornell University Library arXiv Vision Setting Survey**

Help us create a cohesive vision for arXiv. The goal of this survey is to discover the general direction you envision for arXiv. The results of the survey will inform the user study that we will start designing in a few weeks, and will also help us to articulate our fundraising goals.

We would like your input on what sorts of services arXiv should be providing. Currently, to provide a repository that is a useful resource for authors and readers, arXiv's core functionality revolves around accepting and serving e-prints in six broad subject areas, focused on combining rapid dissemination of content with a significant amount of quality control (broadly construed).

More peripherally, arXiv provides mechanisms for interfacing to other services and content, such as related scientific gateways that rely on arXiv content (e.g., INSPIRE, ADS), publishers that can ingest arXiv papers for consideration in peer-reviewed journals, and bloggers who wish to link to arXiv papers and have those links reciprocated. In the questions below, we would like your input regarding both those services that arXiv currently provides, as well as others that might be considered. Our primary goal here is getting feedback on "what arXiv should be doing" rather than "how is arXiv doing it", although assessing such feedback will obviously require how to prioritize and accommodate competing goals in the face of constraints.

This survey has four sections: Quality control and rapid dissemination; subject area expansion; developing new services and improving on current services; and the future of arXiv. The survey should take you about 20 - 30 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential and we do not collect identifying information.

Are you affiliated with the Member Advisory Board (MAB) or the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB)?

- Member Advisory Board (MAB) (1)
- Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) (2)

### **Section 1: Quality Control and Rapid Dissemination**

arXiv strives to maintain the quality of accepted papers in a number of different areas. For each of these different areas, please indicate how important it is that arXiv maintain or develop policies and procedures to assure the quality of arXiv submissions.

How important is it that arXiv keeps content of little scientific value out of arXiv?

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

How important is it that arXiv ensures optimal category placement of arXiv papers?

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

How important is it that arXiv flags announced papers containing excessive reuse of text from authors' own previously deposited content ("self-plagiarism")?

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

How important is it that arXiv flags announced papers containing excessive reuse of unattributed text from other authors (plagiarism)?

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

How important is it that arXiv keeps out altogether submissions containing excessive reuse of unattributed text from other authors (plagiarism)?

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

How important is it that arXiv identifies format-related problems (line numbers in text, missing references, oversize submissions, etc.) and requires authors to fix them prior to announcement?

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

How important is it that arXiv provides a traceback mechanism to link papers back to blogs and commentaries that cite those papers, given that there may be other web-based tools and systems for connecting arXiv content to external material?

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

If arXiv wishes to support linking of arXiv papers to external commentaries (e.g., via trackbacks), how important is it that arXiv assesses and/or moderates the scientific content of those external commentaries?

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

To maintain or develop policies and procedures to assure quality of arXiv submissions, please rank the importance of the following areas, from 1 (highest) to 8 (lowest) by numbering each statement.

- Content of little scientific value should be kept out of arXiv (1)
- arXiv should ensure optimal category placement of arXiv papers (2)
- arXiv should flag announced papers containing excessive reuse of text from authors' own previously deposited content ("self-plagiarism") (3)
- arXiv should flag announced papers containing excessive unattributed reuse of text from other authors (plagiarism) (4)
- arXiv should keep out altogether submissions containing excessive unattributed text reuse by other authors (plagiarism) (5)
- arXiv should identify format-related problems such as line numbers in text, missing references, oversized submissions, etc., and require authors to fix them prior to announcement (6)
- arXiv should provide a traceback mechanism to link papers back to blogs and commentaries that cite those papers, given that there may be other web-based tools and systems for connecting arXiv content to external material (7)
- To support linking of arXiv papers to external commentaries (e.g., via trackbacks), arXiv should assess and/or moderate the scientific content of those external commentaries (8)

Please choose any ONE of the following statements that you agree with the most:

- arXiv does not need to engage in quality control at all; arXiv should focus on rapid dissemination and let readers filter content as they see fit. (1)
- arXiv should focus on selected aspects of quality control, and prioritize rapid dissemination. (2)
- arXiv needs to maintain quality control across several fronts and, if necessary, should consider extending its dissemination timeline to accommodate those quality control activities. (3)
- arXiv should prioritize both rapid dissemination and quality control, even if that makes it more difficult to engage in other new activities. (4)

Do you have any additional comments on quality control and rapid dissemination?

**Section 2: Subject area expansion arXiv currently accepts submissions in Physics, Math, Computer Science, Quantitative Biology, Quantitative Finance and Statistics.**

Please choose any ONE of the following statements that you agree with the most:

- arXiv should be proactive in expanding into new subject areas. (4)
- arXiv should only expand into new subject areas when approached by members of those communities. (5)
- arXiv does not need any new subject areas. (6)

If arXiv does not need any new... Is Selected, Then Skip To Do you have any additional comments...

How important is it that arXiv requires groups representing new subject areas to bring some level of financial support (e.g., planning grant or society contribution) to assist with integration into arXiv?

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Not at all important (4)
- No opinion (5)

How important is it that arXiv expands to include the following subject areas?

	Very important (1)	Important (2)	Somewhat important (3)	Not at all important (4)	No opinion (5)
Biology (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Chemistry (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Economics (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engineering (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify) (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Do you have any additional comments on subject area expansion?

### Section 3: Developing New Services and Improving on Current Services

Considering enhanced and/or new services for arXiv, please indicate how important each one is for arXiv to develop.

Better support for research data, code, supplementary materials, etc. directly associated with papers

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

Support for adding other user-curated links related to papers (videos, slides, similar papers, etc.)

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

Improved search interface/functionality

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

Better integration with journal submission sites (e.g., to support submission of papers posted on arXiv)

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

Improved alerting system with greater customization of reader interests and recommendations for related content

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

Citation analysis

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

Reference extraction

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

Support to comply with funding public access mandates (listing funding source / grant numbers, better linking to published version of record, etc.)

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

Enable interoperability with Institutional Repositories and other repositories

- Very important (1)
- Important (2)
- Somewhat important (3)
- Should not be doing this (4)
- No opinion (5)

Considering enhanced and/or new services for arXiv, please rank the importance of the following nine services from 1 (highest) to 9 (lowest) by numbering each statement.

- Better support for research data, code, supplementary materials, etc. directly associated with papers (1)
- Support for adding other user-curated links related to papers (videos, slides, similar papers, etc.) (2)
- Improved search interface/functionality (3)
- Better integration with journal submission sites (e.g., to support submission of papers posted on arXiv) (4)
- Improved alerting system with greater customization of reader interests and recommendations for related content (5)
- Citation analysis (6)
- Reference extraction (7)
- Support to comply with funding public access mandates (listing funding source/grant numbers, better linking to published version of record, etc.) (8)
- Enable interoperability with Institutional Repositories and other repositories (9)

Are there any additional current services you would like to see enhanced?

Are there any additional new services you would like to see developed?

Do you have any additional comments on developing new services and improving on current services?



#### **Section 4: The future of arXiv**

Which of the following BEST describes your opinion of how arXiv needs to position itself moving forward?

- arXiv should focus on its core mission of rapid dissemination of e-prints with light moderation and quality control, which is sufficient to ensure its continued value. (1)
- arXiv should expand its core mission, and support the integration of a broader range of services beyond serving e-prints, to ensure its future value. (2)

Do you have any additional comments on the future of arXiv or how to best articulate a vision for that future?