

Article title: Researchers' and Research Users' Experiences With and Reasons for Working Together in Spinal Cord Injury Research Partnerships: A Qualitative Study

Journal name: International Journal of Health Policy and Management (IJHPM)

Authors' information: Femke Hoekstra^{1,2*}, Lee Schaefer³, Peter Athanasopoulos⁴, SCI Guiding Principles Consensus Panel#, Heather L. Gainforth^{1,2}

¹School of Health and Exercise Sciences, University of British Columbia, Kelowna, BC, Canada.

²International Collaboration on Repair Discoveries (ICORD), University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

³Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada.

⁴Spinal Cord Injury Ontario, Toronto, ON, Canada.

#Members of the SCI Guiding Principles Consensus Panel are listed in the Acknowledgments (*Corresponding author: heather.gainforth@ubc.ca)

Supplementary file 5: Role of Critical Friends in the Analyses Process.

The table below outlines key topics discussed during reflective discussions between first author and co-authors, who acted as critical friends.

Activity	Who	Reflective discussions and key decisions
<i>Discussions of narrative summaries</i>	FH + HG	Lead authors discussed narrative summaries of participants, in which HG asked critical questions about data and provided interpretation. HG provided several suggestions for several theories/framework and relevant literature that could be linked to the data (e.g., transformational leadership theory and social cognitive theory). HG + FH decided to not present narrative types in the manuscript, as that would potentially breach participants' confidentiality.
<i>Discussion of narrative approaches</i>	FH + LS	FH + LS discussed findings and options to organize and present the narrative data.
<i>Discussions of threads and sub-threads</i>	FH + HG	Lead authors discussed identified threads and sub-threads, and decided to link the data to components of the transformational leadership theory.
<i>Discussions of threads and sub-threads</i>	FH + LS	First author discussed the identified threads, sub-threads, and the link with transformational leadership theory with LS. LS mentioned that the link with the theory was not very clear from the presented data.
<i>Discussions of threads and sub-threads</i>	FH + PA	First author discussed the findings with PA (community partner). Figure 1 guided the discussion. PA suggested to distinguish findings between researchers, research users and people with SCI.
<i>Refinement of threads and sub-threads</i>	FH + HG	Lead authors re-organized the threads and sub-threads using pieces of papers (with quotes and threads) and scissors. HG + FH discussed potential capacity building strategies for research partnerships based on the findings and decided to focus the discussion section on these potential capacity building strategies.
<i>Refinement of threads and sub-threads</i>	FH + LS	FH + LS discussed the findings and re-ordered the threads. LS provided specific suggestions to improve the structure of the result section in a way that it better aligned with our narrative approach. LS also provided suggestions to clarify Figure 1.
<i>Finalizing manuscript</i>	All authors	All co-authors provided feedback and editorial changes to the manuscript via email.