Multimedia Appendix

This is a Multimedia Appendix to a full manuscript published in JMIR Mental Health. For full copyright and citation information see http://dx.doi.org/10.2196/jmir.55921.

Multimedia Appendix 3: Results of the complete sample analysis.

Table S5: Conditional logit regression results for the complete sample of the discrete choice experiment, showing significant attributes and levels as well as the relative importance of attributes in comparison.^a

Attributes and Levels	Coefficient (SE) ^b 95% CI ^c		Relative Importance	
Information Source			8.29%	
Student Service Centre	-0.02 (0.04)	[-0.10, 0.06]	3.2770	
Student Council	0.14 (0.04)	[0.05, 0.22]		
University Lecturers	-0.12 (0.04)	[-0.20, -0.04]		
Delivery Mode			24.21%	
Social Media	0.23 (0.05)	[0.13, 0.33]		
E-Mail	0.13 (0.05)	[0.04, 0.22]		
Seminar	0.15 (0.06)	[0.04, 0.26]		
Print Media	-0.52 (0.06)	[-0.62, -0.41]		
Timing			31.48%	
Freshman Week	0.26 (0.05)	[0.16, 0.35]		
Pre-Clinic	0.43 (0.05)	[0.33, 0.53]		
Clinic	-0.14 (0.05)	[-0.23, -0.06]		
Practical Year	-0.54 (0.06)	[-0.65, -0.43]		
Recommendation			20.88%	
HCP ^d	0.19 (0.04)	[0.11, 0.28]		
Students	0.26 (0.05)	[0.17, 0.35]		
Users	-0.07 (0.04)	[-0.15, 0.005]		
No Review	-0.38 (0.05)	[-0.48, -0.29]		
Quality Criterion			15.14%	
Data Security	-0.09 (0.05)	[-0.19, 0.01]		
Evidence-Based	0.27 (0.05)	[0.17, 0.36]		

Quality Seal	0.03 (0.05)	[-0.06, 0.12]	
Background of Developers	-0.20 (0.05)	[-0.30, -0.10]	

^aRegression is estimated without repeated choice-set 9. Results based on n=309.

Table S6: Latent class model regression results for the complete sample of the discrete choice experiment, showing significant attributes and levels as well as the relative importance of attributes in comparison for two identified groups varying in information preferences.^a

Attributes and Levels	Class 1			Class 2		
zeveis	Coefficient (SE) ^b	95% CI ^c	Relative Importanc e	Coefficient (SE)	95% CI	Relative Importanc e
Information Source			11.17%			5.70%
Student Service Centre	-0.21 (0.10)	[-0.41, - 0.004]		0.10 (0.07)	[-0.03, 0.23]	
Student Council	0.34 (0.10)	[0.15, 0.54]		0.08 (0.07)	[-0.04, 0.21]	
University Lecturers	-0.14 (0.09)	[-0.31, 0.04]		-0.18 (0.07)	[-0.33, -0.04]	
Delivery Mode			29.21%			28.24%
Social Media	0.68 (0.13)	[0.43, 0.93]		-0.01 (0.11)	[-0.23, 0.22]	
E-Mail	0.47 (0.14)	[0.20, 0.75]		-0.14 (0.09)	[-0.31, 0.03]	
Seminar	-0.77 (0.22)	[-1.19, -0.34]		0.77 (0.14)	[0.50, 1.04]	
Print Media	-0.39 (0.12)	[-0.63, -0.14]		-0.63 (0.09)	[-0.80, -0.45]	
Timing	, ,		35.66%	,		13.75%
Freshman Week	0.43 (0.11)	[0.22, 0.65]		0.17 (0.08)	[0.02, 0.32]	
Pre-Clinic	0.79 (0.15)	[0.50, 1.09]		0.35 (0.09)	[0.18, 0.53]	
Clinic	-0.26 (0.11)	[-0.47, -0.05]		-0.19 (0.09)	[-0.37, -0.02]	
Practical Year	-0.97 (0.15)	[-1.26, -0.69]		-0.33 (0.11)	[-0.55, -0.10]	
Recommendation			8.06%			23.67%
HCP ^d	0.25 (0.09)	[0.06, 0.43]		0.20 (0.07)	[0.06, 0.34]	
Students	-0.14 (0.13)	[-0.40, 0.12]		0.51 (0.10)	[0.31, 0.72]	
Users	-0.15 (0.11)	[-0.37, 0.06]		-0.05 (0.07)	[-0.19, 0.09]	

^bSE = standard error.

^cCI = confidence interval.

^dHCP = healthcare professionals.

No Review	0.05			-0.66		
	(0.18)	[-0.30, 0.40]		(0.11)	[-0.88, -0.45]	
Quality Criterion			15.91%			18.01%
Data security	0.20			-0.34		
	(0.15)	[-0.10, 0.51]		(0.10)	[-0.53, -0.15]	
Evidence-Based	-0.11			0.55		
	(0.13)	[-0.36, 0.14]		(0.10)	[0.35, 0.75]	
Quality Seal	0.35			-0.20		
	(0.13)	[0.09, 0.60]		(0.11)	[-0.40, 0.01]	
Background of	-0.44		_	-0.02		
Developers	(0.11)	[-0.66, -0.22]		(0.08)	[-0.18, 0.15]	

^aBayesian Information Criterion and consistent Akaike Information Criterion were minimized at two classes. Regression is estimated without repeated choice-set 9. Results based on n=309.

bSE = standard error.

^cCI = confidence interval.

^dHCP = healthcare professionals.