

Supplementary Data

TABLE

Framework of the Adapted NGT Study

Items	Details and Operationalization
Definition of the purpose by the leaders of the study (A.M., L.P.T.), to guide the selection of experts and the preparation of information (empirical and scientific)	Formalized ascertainment of potential problems related to residents' participation in medical education research as subjects, define stakes and formulate recommendations to the program direction team. ³⁷
Nominal question agreed on by all collaborators	Reformulation of the purpose in general terms, to ensure openness and avoid the introduction of biases before experts could respond to the defined problem, as suggested in the literature on consensus development methods. ^{57,58}
Background information and scientific evidence	Have been done early in the process, for the preparation of the group discussion meetings and continuously during and after the process, for the analysis and for the writing of the article.
Criteria for selecting experts	The selection of experts was based on experience, expertise and insight into the problem being explored. ⁴⁹ Discussion groups: regular attendees of the monthly program meeting. Experts: Diverse knowledgeable individuals, representative of the area of inquiry, with practical experience and knowledge of the program and the institution.
Definition of consensus and predetermined criteria for terminating the process ^{37,50}	1) Unanimous agreement on current problems and potential problems to prevent. 2) Consensus reached on recommendations for each problem and confirmation that no further comments or suggestions for adjustments were necessary. 3) Unanimous approval of documents by discussion group stakeholders, experts and program direction.
Anonymity	Not necessary for this process, which involved a regular working group (monthly meeting of the program committee) and guests experts meeting face-to-face.
Ethical approval	The study involved the Chair of the Research Ethics Board of SJUHC, who is also co-author of the article (GC). The study did not meet the criteria for a research on human participants, thus not necessitating formal approval by the Research Ethics Board. People contributing to this research were considered as collaborators rather than research subjects.

Thibault L-P, Bourque CJ, Luu TM, et al. Residents as research subjects: balancing resident education and contribution to advancing educational innovations. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2022;14(2):191-200. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-21-00530.1>

Methodological audit	Verification of conformity to plan process by an expert methodologist (CJB). Evaluation of rigor as a qualitative criterion was based on trustworthiness (addressed in the discussion segment of the article), confirmability (documents and artefacts in the form of preparation documentation and meeting notes and synthesis), credibility (participants credentials and institutional roles), transferability (transparency and systematic documentation of the procedures) and dependability (quality and precision of the framework), as suggested in literature. ^{36,37}
----------------------	--