***Evolution* journal survey – summary outcomes.**
Survey was run in May 2021.
487 respondents (not all questions were answered by all respondents).

Q1. Which societies are you a member of?

SSE	80%
Non SSE	20%

Q2. Which terms best describe your main areas of research specialisation?

Category	% of respondents mentioning specified category out of total
Lab-based	39
Field-based	45
Computational-based	26
theory	16
ecology	41
evolution	96
genetics	34
genomics	36
systematics	13

Q3. In which country are you currently based?

Country	% of total respondents
USA	52
Central & South America	6
Europe	29
Australia & New Zealand	3
Canada	6
Rest of world	1
Not stated	3

Q4 Which best describes your current (or most recent, if between positions) career position?

Position	Frequency	%
Not stated	6	1
Assistant Professor	69	14
Associate Professor	73	15
Educator (e.g. teacher, professional development, etc)	1	0
Graduate student (Masters or PhD student)	56	11
Other	40	8
Postdoc	68	14
Professor	174	36

Q5 Have you ever submitted to the Journal Evolution?

Answer	Frequency	%
No	116	24
Yes	366	75
No answer	5	1

Q6. If Yes to 5, when was your most recent submission?

Answer	Frequency	%
More than 10 years ago	77	21
Within the last 5 years	164	45
Within the last year	124	34

Q7: Please rank up to 6 of the most influential factors in choosing where to submit your scientific papers.

Table 1. N is number of individuals selecting this factor as one of top 6 (out of 486 responses). Mean is mean ranking of this factor among responses ranking it in top 6.

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev
Impact factor	330	3.14	1.51
Society owned	297	3.34	1.57
Broad vs. specialized	193	3.37	1.65
Editorial Board	93	4.10	1.50
Previous Experience	261	3.92	1.57
Journal Reputation	431	1.95	1.40
Personal Recommendation	42	4.17	1.62
Reviewing Quality	251	3.92	1.37
Reviewing Speed	166	4.31	1.38
International Reach	134	3.72	1.52
BioRxiv etc.	47	4.23	1.70
Publishing Model	76	4.26	1.56
Reviewing mode	23	4.52	1.65
Publisher	85	4.35	1.31
Cost to publish	272	3.79	1.63
Other	44	2.25	1.74

Q8. Please rank up to 5 journals where you would send your next paper of broad interest to the evolutionary biology community.

Table 2. N is number of individuals selecting this factor as one of top 6 (out of 486 responses). Mean is mean ranking of this factor among responses ranking it in the top 6.

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev
American Naturalist	262	2.85	1.33
Evolution	419	2.52	1.23
Evolution Letters	209	2.91	1.39
Genetics	73	3.18	1.29
J. Evol. Biol.	227	3.74	1.26
Mol. Bio. Evol.	135	2.79	1.41
Mol. Ecology	178	3.05	1.35
Mol. Phyl. Evol.	38	3.92	1.19
Nature Ecol & Evol	202	2.37	1.54
New Phytologist	70	2.94	1.40
Proceedings B	319	3.29	1.31
Systematic Biol.	67	2.48	1.45
Other	70	3.21	1.61

Q9. Which of the following review modes to you most favor?

Table 3. Review mode preferences.

Mode	Number favoring
Single blind	133
Double blind	186
Author has option	91
Fully open	57
Post publication	5
Other	8

Table 4. Review mode preferences by career stage.

	Number favoring							
Review mode	**Professor**	**Associate Professor**	**Assistant Professor**	**Postdoctoral Researcher**	**Educator**	**Graduate Student**	**Undergraduate Student**	**Other**
Single blind	14	14	78	14	0	4	0	9
Double blind	30	34	40	30	0	33	0	18
Author has option	17	17	25	14	0	13	0	5
Fully open	4	8	25	10	0	7	0	7
Post publication	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
Other	1	0	5	0	1	1	0	0

Q10. Do you think reviews should be published?

Table 5. Preferences regarding whether reviews should be published.

Response	Number favoring
Yes, reviewer identity blind	127
Yes, reviewer identity known	49
No	178
Not sure	125

Table 6. Preferences on publishing reviews by career stage.

	Number favoring							
Response	**Professor**	**Associate Professor**	**Assistant Professor**	**Postdoctoral Researcher**	**Educator**	**Graduate Student**	**Undergraduate Student**	**Other**
Yes, reviewer identity blind	22	19	29	31	0	17	0	9
Yes, reviewer identity known	2	7	15	10	1	8	0	6
No	28	28	92	10	0	6	0	14
Not sure	16	19	38	17	0	24	0	11

Q12. Do you think that Evolution journal papers should be grouped into monthly issues, or continuously published?

Table 7. Numbers favoring publishing monthly vs. continuously.

Response	Number favoring
Monthly	200
Continuous	172
Don’t know	109

Table 8. Numbers favoring publishing monthly vs. continuously by career stage.

	Number favoring							
Response	**Professor**	**Associate Professor**	**Assistant Professor**	**Postdoctoral Researcher**	**Educator**	**Graduate Student**	**Undergraduate Student**	**Other**
Monthly	22	24	88	25	0	22	0	19
Continuous	30	29	50	29	1	23	0	10
Don’t know	17	20	36	14	0	11	0	11

Q14. If Evolution was fully Open Access, would you be more or less likely to submit to it?

Table 7. Number indicating more or less likely to submit if open access.

Response	Number favoring
More likely	92
Less likely	30
Depends on cost	285
Neither more nor less likely	73

Table 8. Number indicating more or less likely to submit if open access by career stage.

	Number favoring							
Response	**Professor**	**Associate Professor**	**Assistant Professor**	**Postdoctoral Researcher**	**Educator**	**Graduate Student**	**Undergraduate Student**	**Other**
More likely	18	11	30	12	0	17	0	8
Less Likely	3	7	9	3	0	4	0	4
Depends on cost	34	44	105	48	1	31	0	22
Neither more nor less likely	13	11	30	5	0	4	0	10

Q15 challenges: What do you think are the greatest challenges in the near future for society journals such as Evolution?

Category of challenge	**Frequency of mention**
competition (with other journals)	88
costs	77
OA & access to journal content	65
maintaining and grow submissions, relevance & quality	52
maintaining viable and acceptable business model	36
maintaining brand & reputation as society journal	30
publishing mode	15
finding good reviews	11
good quality editors & editorial board	11
differentiating and maintaining place among near competitors	8
grow impact factor	8
speed	8
achieving equity, inclusivity and transparency	6
growing effectively into new topic areas	6
reliance on impact factor	5
inappropriate use of desk reject or scope decisions	3
maintaining publishing standards (code, data, 'omics)	3
parasitism	2
maintain print edition	1
better define 'Version of Record'	1

Q16. What are the strengths of the journal *Evolution*?

Category of Strength	**Frequency of mention**
reputation	138
quality of papers	103
society-owned	75
rigorous review	67
breadth & accessibility	65
history	44

editorial board	30
affordability	27
focus on solid research	10
flexible length / good format	8
strong community	6
Impact Factor	5
papers stand test of time	2
speed	2
focus on evolution	2
commitment to equity, diversity and inclusion	2
support for early career researchers	2
syntheses	1
double blind review	1
print copies	1
theory papers	1
latest developments	1
international reach	1

Q17: How can the journal *Evolution* improve?

Improvement	**Frequency of mention**
new / 'modern' topics ('omic evolution, molecular population genetics, evo-devo, evolutionary medicine)	27
faster decision times	22
go (affordably) open access	22
maintain quality and consistency of reviews and decisions	17
new sections: reviews, syntheses, special issues, natural /evo history miscellany	16
maintain broad scope and recapture lost areas (e.g. behavioral evolution, ecological evolution)	15
good reputation and broad expertise of editorial board	12
increase publicity / visibility	11
stay strong as society journal, challenge external forces	10
increase quality submissions	7
publish reviews	7
increase equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI), analyse performance	7
change publisher	6
drop double blind review	5
option to opt out of double blind review	5
relax on 'novelty', 'significant advance' criterion, but maintain high quality	5
remain a society journal / emphasise benefits of	4
increase impact factor	4
don't go fully open access under current high-cost model	4
better define the journal (also with respect to separation from *Evolution Letters*)	4
integration with bioRxiV, *Peer Community In*, and open reviews	4
good reputation of handling editors	3

keep double blind review	3
improve formatting	3
more open access (but keep hybrid model)	3
new sections broader topics (education, EDI, etc)	3
more graduate student and lower income country support	3
more early career researchers on the editorial board	3
train the editorial board in avoiding bias, diversify editorial board	3
become more international	3
consider to innovate in publishing mode (e.g. Elife)	3
do not increase submissions (create new journal if more papers)	2
keep reasonable costs	2
open peer review	2
more application papers	2
continue print copies	2
discontinue print copies	2
keep flexible length	2
promote open research	2
faster publication times (continuous publication)	2
innovate (format-free)	1
go back to self-publishing	1
team up with other societies to split costs of e.g. managing / handling editors	1
solicit more papers from competitors	1
more transparency about the status of submitted MSs (as per *Nature* journals)	1
podcast	1
graphical abstracts	1
support for authors with english as non-preferred language	1
decrease desk reject	1
maintain community	1
code deposition	1
merge with *J Evol Biol*	1

END