

Checklist for survey report

Below we have completed the checklist provided by Burns and Kho (2015) as requested by the editors. Please note as context that we are reporting secondary analysis of Family Medicine Longitudinal Survey data. The College of Family Physicians of Canada (CFPC) provided these data for research purposes but we did not have input into the design, contents or piloting of the questionnaire.

This secondary analysis is a first step in an ongoing study practice patterns among early-career primary care physicians that will complement the CFPC survey data with analysis of linked administrative data and qualitative interviews. We believe the results of analysis presented in the submitted manuscript on their own have relevance for policy and planning as well as for future research.

1. Was a clear research question posed? **Yes – do practice intentions of family medicine residents differ among regions in Canada?**
 - 1a. Does the research question or objective specify clearly the type of respondents, the topic of interest, and the primary and secondary research questions to be addressed? **Yes**
2. Was the target population defined, and was the sample representative of the population? **Yes**
 - 2a. Was the population of interest specified? **Yes**
 - 2b. Was the sampling frame specified? **Yes – complete sample of all FMRs**
3. Was a systematic approach used to develop the questionnaire? **Survey questions were generated by CPSBC as part of the evaluation of Triple C curriculum. We present secondary analysis for research purposes. We cite references with additional detail on survey development.**
 - 3a. *Item generation and reduction*: Did the authors report how items were generated and ultimately reduced? **No**
 - 3b. *Questionnaire formatting*: Did the authors specify how questionnaires were formatted? **No**
 - 3c. *Pretesting*: Were individual questions within the questionnaire pretested? **Yes, a pilot survey was distributed among a subset of institutions in 2015.**
4. Was the questionnaire tested? **Yes, in 2015.**
 - 4a. *Pilot testing*: Was the entire questionnaire pilot tested? **Yes, in 2015.**
 - 4b. *Clinimetric testing*: Were any clinimetric properties (face validity or clinical sensibility testing, content validity, inter- or intra-rater reliability) evaluated and reported? **We do not have this information.**
5. Were questionnaires administered in a manner that limited both response and nonresponse bias? **Yes**
 - 5a. Was the method of questionnaire administration appropriate for the research objective or question posed? **Yes**
 - 5b. Were additional details regarding prenotification, use of a cover letter and an incentive for questionnaire completion provided? **No**
6. Was the response rate reported, and were strategies used to optimize the response rate? **Yes**
 - 6a. Was the response rate reported (alternatively, were techniques used to assess nonresponse bias)? **Yes, and comparison with CAPER was used to assess nonresponse bias.**
 - 6b. Was the response rate defined? **Yes**

- 6c. Were strategies used to enhance the response rate (including sending of reminders)? **We do not have this information.**
- 6d. Was the sample size justified? **N/A – Analysis included all respondents in a survey that was sent to all members of the target population, so there was no ability to influence the sample size.**
- 7. Were the results clearly and transparently reported?
 - 7a. Does the survey report address the research question(s) posed or the survey objectives? **Yes**
 - 7b. Were methods for handling missing data reported? **Yes**
 - 7c. Were demographic data of the survey respondents provided? **Yes**
 - 7d. Were the analytical methods clear? **Yes**
 - 7e. Were the results succinctly summarized? **Yes**
 - 7f. Did the authors' interpretation of the results align with the data presented? **Yes**
 - 7g. Were the implications of the results stated? **Yes**
 - 7h. Was the questionnaire provided in its entirety (as an electronic appendix or in print)? **Yes – please refer to appendix 1.**

Reference: Burns KEA, Kho ME. How to assess a survey report: a guide for readers and peer reviewers. CMAJ. 2015 Apr 7; 187(6): E198–E205. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4387061/>