

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 1

Recommendations for the Conducting and Reporting of Delphi Studies (CREDES)

Adapted from: Jünger S, Payne SA, Brine J, Radbruch L, Brearley SG. Guidance on Conducting and REporting DELphi Studies (CREDES) in palliative care: Recommendations based on a methodological systematic review. Palliat Med. 2017;31(8):684-706.

CREDES Item	Location in text
<p>Rationale for the choice of Delphi (or other consensus generating technique) Justification: A clearly defined purpose of the study and a discussion of the appropriateness of the use of the Delphi technique.</p>	Introduction (p2)
<p>Planning and design Process: Methods and analyses employed need to be comprehensible and any modification should be justified and applied systematically. Definition of consensus: A priori criteria for consensus should be defined, including: how to proceed with items or topics in the next round; the required threshold to terminate the Delphi process; procedures to follow when consensus is not reached.</p>	Methods (p4-5) Methods, Delphi design (p4) Results, Delphi panel (p5-6)
<p>Study conduct Information input: All material provided to the expert panel should be carefully reviewed and piloted prior to use. Prevention of bias: Independent researchers should be involved if any conflicts of interest. Interpretation and processing of results: Consensus does not necessarily imply the correct answer/judgement. Non-consensus as stable disagreement should be reported. External validation: Recommended to have the final draft of resulting guidance reviewed and approved by an external board before publication and dissemination.</p>	Methods (p4-5) Conflicts of interest (declarations) Results (p5-10) Methods, patient and public involvement (p5) Results, Delphi panel (p5-6)
<p>Reporting Purpose and rationale: Purpose clearly defined and appropriate. Rationale for Delphi as the most suitable method to achieve research aim. Expert panel: Criteria for selection of experts and transparent information on recruitment, socio-demographics and response rates for each iteration. Description of the methods: Including preparatory steps, how the available evidence was synthesised, piloting material, design of number of rounds, methodological decisions during the process. Procedure: Use a flow chart to illustrate the stages Definition and attainment of consensus: How was consensus achieved throughout the process, including strategies to deal with non-consensus. Results: Reporting of results for each round separately to show evolving consensus. Limitations: Includes critical reflection of potential limitations and their impact on the resulting guidance. Adequacy of conclusions: Conclusions should adequately reflect the outcomes of the study with a view to the scope and applicability of the resulting practice guidelines. Publication and dissemination: Should include endorsement of the guidance by professional associations to facilitate implementation.</p>	Introduction (p2-3) Methods, Eligibility and recruitment (p4-5) Results, Delphi panel (p5-6) Methods (p4-5) 2 rounds, response rates provided in Table 1 Methods, Delphi design (p4) Results (p5-10) Discussion, Limitations (p13-14) Conclusions (p13) Funding (declarations)