Article details: 2018-0155	
Title	The information needs of patients, professionals and the public with regards to medical aid in dying: a qualitative study
Authors	Antoine Boivin MD PhD, François-Pierre Gauvin PhD, Geneviève Garnon PhD, Agustina Gancia PhD, Ghislaine Rouly, Isabelle Marcoux PhD, Pascale Lehoux PhD
Reviewer 1	H. Roeline Pasman
Institution	VU University Medical Center, EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, Expertise Center for Palliative Care, Department of Public and Occupational Health, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
General comments (author response in bold)	I would prefer some more information about the forums in the methods section itself. Now the details are in the the appendix, but would it be possible to describe some of them also in the methods section? Such as that video's were used, that the face to face forum was moderated and discussions took place in small groups, that the online forum was also moderated. However I don't know if that fits with the limited word count. **See above responses for comments #4 and #8 as they pertain to the same topic. (#4: Comparing online and face-to-face deliberation was not an objective of this study, which did not aim at contrasting deliberation methods, but identify differences and commonalities between information needs of professionals and the public. All data were analyzed together, without accounting for its source (face-to-face or online). Information was added in the results section : "We did not identify (nor did we explicitly seek) differences in themes between the online and face-to-face deliberation forums". #8: Although the deliberation forums were conducted in two manners (face-to-face and online), they each addressed the following topics, each introduced by a short video capsule: 1) what is MAiD; 2) what are the eligibility criteria; 3) how MAiD is practiced; 4) how practices are evaluated and monitored. Participants were then asked to reflect on what information was new to them, and what questions were left unanswered. This has been added in the texts)** I would prefer to see the characteristics of the participants for the two forums separately: how many members of public and how many health professionals participated in the face to face forum and how many of them in the online forum. **The goal of the study was not to compare deliberation methods, but to contrast themes identified by professionals and the public. Therefore, results were presented by the "role" as member of the public or professional rather than method (online vs face-to-face).** It is not clear to me how 'active' the 42 people that participated in the online forum were: How often did they react, were there participants that just reacted once? **We did not record this information. However, the moderators for the online and face-to-face forums ensured all participants had the opportunity to provide their perspective, opinions and questions. line 132, p.6** Is there information about the representativeness of the sample? Is there for instance information about the variables in table 1 from the whole population? Is there for instance data on attitudes towards MAiD for Canada/province of Québec? Those data could be used in the limitations sections.

	We used purposive sampling to recruit our participants: our goal was therefore not to reach statistical representativeness, but to identify a diverse group of participants, based on predefined socio-demographic criteria (now described in the recruitment section of the methods). To our knowledge, no study has documented, for Quebec and Canada, the attitudes toward MAiD or what information is needed to support meaningful conversations between patients and professionals on MAiD. line 105, p.5
Reviewer 2	Daryl Bainbridge
Institution	Department of Oncology, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.
General comments (author response in bold)	The authors have placed part of the methods description in an appendix. I would prefer to have the participant sampling and recruitment component in the main text, which I think could be done with the addition of a couple sentences. The appendix could focus on the format of the in-person session. **This was corrected and added. line 98, p. 4** The authors state in the Interpretation section that the majority of information needs expressed were common to both health professionals and the public. Were there any notable differences between these two groups or between different healthcare professions? **We did not conduct a sub-group analysis between healthcare professionals. Differences between professionals and the public are mentioned in the result section. Table #2 has a specific column describing information needs specifically identified by members of the public (but not by health professionals). line 224, p.12** What specific steps were taken to ensure rigour in the analysis? Audit trail, member checking, etc. **We did coding by two independent researchers (GG and FPG), both of whom were directly supervised by the PI (AB). Disagreements among coders were brought to the broader research team for reconciliation. Participants were sent a short synthesis of the data and were asked to provide feedback. line 126, p.6** Some of the types of information requested would be easier to provide than others, for example, questions regarding the set legislation of MAID vs those for which the answers are more uncertain or variable. Can the authors comment on the extent to which the information needs expressed have the potential to be fulfilled? **A sentence was added to the end of the "main findings" section: "While some of the identified information needs are relatively straightforward to address (eg. MAiD definitions and legal criteria), others would be more complex to implement (eg. information on wait time and availability of MAiD in specific regions)." line 235, p. 15**