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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No. Item** | **Guide questions/description** | **Reported on Page #** |
| **Domain 1: Research team and reﬂexivity** |  |  |
| *Personal Characteristics* |  |  |
| 1. Inter viewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?  *We used a World Café study design. Although assigned table hosts (MMG, SLC, LP, FP, AB) were responsible for facilitating exchanges, participants were encouraged to discuss freely.* | Page 7 |
| 2. Credentials | What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD  *Research team members have experience in conducting qualitative health research.* | Not reported as not required by the journal on the title page |
| 3. Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study?  *Members of the research team included researchers, research professionals, masters, and doctoral students.* | Not reported as not required by the journal on the title page |
| 4. Gender | Was the researcher male or female?  *The research team was composed of 11 members. Four female-identifying and 7 male-identifying members.* | Not reported |
| 5. Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have?  *Most research team members (MMG, SLC, AB, JH, JFS, MD) have experience in conducting qualitative health research. HF and JFS are MD. Table hosts (MMG, SLC, LP, FP, AB) were previously trained for the event.* | Page 7 |
| *Relationship with participants* |  |  |
| 6. Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?  *No*  *Table hosts met the participants on the day of the event.* | Page 7 |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research  *Participants did not know the table hosts. However, ethical requirements required the principal investigator to describe the project, project goals, and answer questions in the invitation email.*  *The principal investigator introduced the research team, including table hosts and note-takers, at the beginning of the event only.* | Pages 6 and 7 |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic  *Table hosts were trained for the event and were asked to remain neutral about the topic.* | Page 7 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain 2: study design** |  |  |
| *Theoretical framework* |  |  |
| 9. Methodological orientation and Theory | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis  *Content analysis* | Pages 6 and 7 |
| *Participant selection* |  |  |
| 10. Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball  *Purposive sampling* | Page 5 |
| 11. Method of approach | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email  *Targeted email invitations* | Page 5 |
| 12. Sample size | How many participants were in the study?  *15 participants were anticipated, 16 participated.* | Page 8 |
| 13. Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?  *Three participants were unable to attend the event due to illnesses (COVID-19), although they had previously provided consent to participate.* | Page 8 |
| *Setting* |  |  |
| 14. Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace  *Data was collected by note-takers during the event at the event hall (Université Laval).* | Page 7 |
| 15. Presence of non-participants | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?  *No* | Not applicable |
| 16. Description of sample | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date  *Important characteristics include sex, age, palliative care profession and experience.* | Table 1 and page 8 |
| *Data collection* |  |  |
| 17. Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?    *A discussion guide was previously developed, discussed and agreed upon by the authors.* | Page 6 |
| 18. Repeat interviews | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?  *No* | Not applicable |
| 19. Audio/visual recording | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  *No*  *Given the nature of the topic, we did not use audio or visual recording to avoid negatively affecting the free flow of exchanges.* | Page 7 |
| 20. Field notes | Were ﬁeld notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  *Yes, note-takers documented the exchanges.* | Page 7 |
| 21. Duration | What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?  *The Word Café had two discussion rounds; 30 mins each.* | Page 7 |
| 22. Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed?  *Yes, data saturation was discussed.* | Page 18 |
| 23. Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?  *No*  *Transcripts were not returned to participants although table host and note-takers held a wrap-up summary at the end of each round with table participants. MMG (first author) also debriefed with note-takers in a follow-up meeting to verify the content.* | Pages 7 and 8 |
| **Domain 3: analysis and ﬁndings** |  |  |
| *Data analysis* |  |  |
| 24. Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data?  *Two data coders coded the data. MMG coded the data and AB coded 10% for an intercoder agreement of 84%.* | Page 8 |
| 25. Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  *Codification followed Braun and Clark’s 6-step approach.* | Page 8 |
| 26. Derivation of themes | Were themes identiﬁed in advance or derived from the data?  *An inductive approach was followed and themes emerged from the data.* | Page 7 |
| 27. Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  *Nvivo* | Page 7 |
| 28. Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the ﬁndings?  *Yes*  *A small wrap-up summary discussion took place with the table participants at the end of each 30 min discussion round.* | Page 7 |
| *Reporting* |  |  |
| 29. Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/ﬁndings? Was each quotation identiﬁed? e.g. participant number  *Yes, participant quotes are presented. However, to keep participant confidentiality, we did not identify them.* | Tables 2 and 3 |
| 30. Data and ﬁndings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the ﬁndings?  *Yes* | Pages 9–13  Tables 2 and 3 |
| 31. Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the ﬁndings?  *Yes* | Pages 9–13  Tables 2 and 3 |
| 32. Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?  *Yes, minor themes are described as sub-themes and are related to major themes.* | Pages 9–13  Tables 2 and 3 |