

## Supplementary Data

### Interviewee survey

#### Part 1: Effectiveness

Please rate your level of agreement with the statements below regarding the comfort and effectiveness of the virtual interviews: (Likert scale: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree)

1. I felt comfortable interviewing virtually as opposed to in-person
2. I was able to connect with the interviewers (e.g. share important personal values, find common ground)
3. I was able to demonstrate my strengths as a candidate.
4. I was able to learn about the culture of the program.
5. I was able to have my questions answered.

Rate your agreement with the following statements regarding virtual tours/information about our social and physical environment: (Likert scale: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree)

1. The virtual tour of the work environment was adequate.
2. I got the information I needed regarding the social environment at OHSU.
3. I have sufficient information to assess the living and social environment of Portland.
4. I feel like I would still need to visit Portland to make a decision about program selection.

Please share your comments, if any, regarding the effectiveness of the virtual interview day and informational materials:

#### Part 2: Carbon Emissions

The following information will be used to estimate the quantity of carbon emissions savings of the virtual interview season.

If interviews at OHSU were in person and there were no pandemic, I would most likely:

1. Still have applied to OHSU (Yes/No)
2. Be travelling from: (City; State; Country, if outside the US)
3. Use the following modes of transportation (select all that apply):
  - Airplane
  - Passenger automobile (e.g. Uber, Lyft, car, truck, van)
  - Bus
  - Train
  - Light rail, metro, or subway
  - Bike
  - Walk
  - Other: \_\_\_\_

#### Part 3: Equity

Please help us assess the equity of the virtual interview process by answering the questions below:

Your Age

Domingo A, Rdesinski RE, Stenson A, et al. Virtual residency interviews: applicant perceptions regarding virtual interview effectiveness, advantages, and barriers. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2022;14(2):224-228.

DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-21-00675.1>

- Under 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55+

Race/Ethnicity (select all that apply)

- Black
- Native American (American Indian or Alaska Native)
- Pacific Islander (including Native Hawaiian)
- Latinx
- Asian
- White
- Please enter how you identify if not represented above: \_\_\_

Gender identity (select all that apply)

- Transgender
- Nonbinary
- Female
- Male
- Please enter how you identify if not represented above: \_\_\_
- Prefer not to answer

Location you interviewed from:

- Urban
- Suburban
- Rural

What significant personal barriers did you face with participation in the virtual interview format as opposed to in-person interviews? (select all that apply)

- Obtaining access to equipment or software
- Technological issues (Please briefly describe): \_\_\_
- Reliable access to internet
- Access to an appropriate interview setting
- Time zone differences
- Increased stress/anxiety with virtual vs. in-person format
- Caregiving duties
- Challenges related to pregnancy or breastfeeding
- Sensory impairment (e.g. visual, auditory)
- Mental or emotional condition
- Other (please describe): \_\_\_

What were significant personal advantages of the virtual interview format as opposed to having an in-person interview? (select all that apply)

- Time efficiency
- Cost savings
- Reduced burden of travel in setting of pregnancy or breastfeeding
- Reduced burden of obtaining child/dependent care
- Reduced stress/anxiety with virtual vs in-person format
- Reduced carbon footprint
- Less burdensome to schedule
- Reduced burden in the setting of a mobility impairment
- Reduced burden related to mental or emotional condition

Domingo A, Rdesinski RE, Stenson A, et al. Virtual residency interviews: applicant perceptions regarding virtual interview effectiveness, advantages, and barriers. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2022;14(2):224-228.

DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-21-00675.1

- Reduced burden related to a sensory impairment (e.g. visual, auditory)
- Other (please describe):\_\_

If you would like to further describe personal barriers or advantages to the virtual interview format please do so below:\_\_

Part 4: Overall Experience

Imagine that travel is no longer restricted due to COVID19. In this case which of the following scenarios do you think would be best? [Choose one]

- Interviews continue to be held entirely virtually.
- Applicants have the option to interview virtually or face to face
- Two stages: Interviews are conducted virtually with programs having the option of inviting a subset of applicants for subsequent face to face visits.
- All interviews are conducted face to face

If you would like to further elaborate on your answer or suggest an alternative above please do so below:\_\_

What suggestions do you have for improving our virtual interview process?

Supplement Table 1. Perceived effectiveness of virtual interviews by demographic for interviewees. †

		I felt comfortable interviewing virtually as opposed to in-person.		I was able to connect with the interviewers (share important personal values, find common ground).		I was able to demonstrate my strengths as a candidate.		I was able to learn about the culture of the program.		I was able to have my questions answered.	
	N	Median	p	Median	p	Median	p	Median	p	Median	p
<b>Gender</b>											
Female	361	4.0	0.691	4.0	0.2946	4.0	0.4225	4.0	0.7771	4.0	0.6179
Male	181	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0	
<b>URM Designation</b>											
URM	108	4.0	0.0205	4.0	0.1765	4.0	0.013	4.0	0.1708	4.0	0.2971
Non-URM	437	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0	
<b>Racial/Ethnic Identity</b>											
Black	29	<b>5.0</b>	0.1204	4.0	0.1102	<b>5.0</b>	0.0081	4.0	0.0442	<b>5.0</b>	0.2298
Latinx	32	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		<b>4.5</b>	
Asian	106	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0	
Native American	6	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0	
White	306	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0	
Multiracial	55	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0	
Other	11	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0	
<b>Location</b>											
Urban	331	4.0	0.7965	4.0	0.3622	4.0	0.9128	4.0	0.2201	4.0	0.4581
Suburban	185	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0	
Rural	35	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0	

† Unknown and categories with a count < 5 excluded from analysis.

Domingo A, Rdesinski RE, Stenson A, et al. Virtual residency interviews: applicant perceptions regarding virtual interview effectiveness, advantages, and barriers. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2022;14(2):224-228.

DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-21-00675.1>

Supplement Table 2. Perceived effectiveness of tours and social activities by demographic for interviewees not residing in our institution home city.†

	The virtual tour of the work environment was adequate.			I got the information I needed regarding the social environment at OHSU.		I have sufficient information to assess the living and social environment of Portland.		I feel like I would still need to visit Portland to make a decision about program selection.	
	N	Median	<i>p</i>	Median	<i>p</i>	Median	<i>p</i>	Median	<i>p</i>
<b>Gender</b>									
Female	361	4	0.2099	4	0.1767	4	0.3801	3	0.0055*
Male	181	4		4		4		4	
<b>URM Designation</b>									
URM	108	4	0.3222	4	0.0413	4	0.2766	3	0.6054
Non-URM	437	4		4		4		3	
<b>Racial/Ethnic Identity</b>									
Black	29	4	0.0257	4	0.0036*	4	0.0644	2	0.0009*
Latinx	32	4		4		3.5		3.5	
Asian	106	4		4		4		4	
Native American	6	4		4.5		4.5		3	
White	306	4		4		4		3	
Multiracial	55	4		4		4		3	
Other	11	5		4		4		4	
<b>Location</b>									
Urban	331	4	0.1763	4	0.8679	4	0.2568	3	0.0025*
Suburban	185	4		4		4		4	
Rural	35	3		4		4		3	

† Unknown and categories with a count < 5 excluded from analysis.

\*Statistically significant after adjusting for multiple comparisons.

Supplement Table 3. Interviewee preference for future interview format by demographic variable.†

	Interviews continue to be held entirely virtually.	Applicants have the option to interview virtually or face to face.	Two stages: Interviews are conducted virtually with programs having the option of inviting a subset of applicants for subsequent face to face visits.	All interviews are conducted face to face	p-value
<b>Gender</b>					
Female	54 (15.34)	64 (18.18)	184 (52.27)	50 (14.2)	0.0759
Male	31 (17.32)	39 (21.79)	73 (40.78)	36 (20.11)	
<b>URM Designation</b>					
URM	18 (16.82)	21 (19.63)	56 (52.34)	12 (11.21)	0.4910
Non-URM	68 (15.93)	81 (18.97)	204 (47.78)	74 (17.33)	
<b>Racial/Ethnic Identity</b>					
Black	8 (28.57)	3 (10.71)	13 (46.43)	4 (14.29)	0.4164
Latinx	3 (9.38)	9 (28.13)	17 (53.13)	3 (9.38)	
Asian	16 (15.24)	20 (19.05)	53 (50.48)	16 (15.24)	
Native American	1 (16.67)	0 (0)	5 (83.33)	0 (0)	
White	49 (16.5)	52 (17.51)	142 (47.81)	54 (18.18)	
Multiracial	7 (12.73)	13 (23.64)	27 (49.09)	8 (14.55)	
Other	2 (18.18)	5 (45.45)	3 (27.27)	1 (9.09)	
<b>Location</b>					
Urban	53 (16.31)	51 (15.69)	164 (50.46)	57 (17.54)	0.1457
Suburban	29 (16.02)	47 (25.97)	82 (45.3)	23 (12.71)	
Rural	4 (11.43)	6 (17.14)	19 (54.29)	6 (17.14)	

All Respondents

86 (15.87)      104 (19.19)      266 (49.08)      86 (15.87)      0.0384

† Unknown and categories with a count < 5 excluded from analysis.