# Supplementary material A

## S.1: Clarification of Methods the in-depth interviews with stakeholders

### Epistemology

Pragmatism was the epistemology used, it views that all research is focused on answering the research question. It is frequently used in health systems research as it allows for abduction in research and aims at producing knowledge which is socially beneficial, and can be applied.(1-6) Pragmatism finds the truth through assuming that all knowledge is empirical and that there is one truth which differs due interpretations or perspectives.(1-3) The epistemology applies to the study as the research falls within health system research as well as there being a clear research question to be addressed that is part of a larger research project, i.e., to create an MMA evaluation module to adapt HTA frameworks.

### Information power

The aim of the interviews was not to develop theory in the area but instead to identify barriers and facilitators to MMA integration into the Australian health system funding model. Since this is a developing area throughout the world there are a limited number of stakeholders with experience. Rather than seeking data saturation,(7; 8) we sought high information power to meet the aims of the study.(9)

#### Background information on information power

Information power is a qualitative research concept used to determine an estimated number participants need to ensure that aim of study could be achieved. There is an inverse relationship between information power and the number of participants needed in order to achieve the aim of the study. For example the higher the information power, the smaller the number of participants necessary.

According to Malteured, Siersma,& Guassora(9) information power can be determined by five dimensions. These dimensions are: the aim of the study; the specificity of the participants used in the study; how established the theory used in the study was used; the quality of the dialogue between the facilitator(s) and the participant(s); and finally, the strategy utilised to analyse the interview.

#### Information power in the in-depth interviews with stakeholders

Information power used in the in-depth interviews with stakeholders to identify pathways and impediments to MMA reimbursement was high as the study design and method used the aforementioned dimensions. Firstly, the study aim was narrow. Secondly, study design enabled the use of a dense sample specificity of the participants as they were purposefully recruited from a limited pool of stakeholders who had experience with MMAs and health systems funding. The theory used during the analysis was pragmatism. This is an established epistemology which has been used within the communicative and dynamic technology in health system research.(1; 4-6) There was a strong dialogue between the facilitator (MM) and the participants. Though the facilitator (MM) can appear shy, she had detailed knowledge in MMAs as well as the Australian reimbursement and regulation structures. As these were semi-structured interviews, she was able to probe and adapt the interview schedule when required to attain the empirical data. Finally, regarding the analysis strategy chosen was a case study. The case study was aimed at an in-depth exploration and analysis of selected patterns between MMAs and their relationships with the relevant selected stakeholders, and not an investigative cross-case appraisal of various discourse details and/or narratives.
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