

COREQ Checklist

Submission to CMAJ Open

Title: Developing Canadian Oncology Goals and Objectives for Medical Students: A National Delphi Study

Authors: Vincent C Tam MD BSc(Hon), Paris-Ann Ingledew MD MHPE, Scott Berry MD MHSc, Sunil Verma MD MEd, Meredith E. Giuliani MBBS MEd

Domain 1: Research Team and Reflexivity

Personal Characteristics

1. Interviewer/facilitator: Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?

Vincent Tam

2. Credentials: What were the researcher's credentials?

MD

3. Occupation: What was their occupation at the time of the study?

Clinical Assistant Professor, Medical Oncologist

4. Gender: Was the researcher male or female?

Male

5. Experience and training: What experience or training did the researcher have?

Vincent Tam is a Clinical Assistant Professor in the Department of Oncology, University of Calgary. He also is a medical oncologist at the Tom Baker Cancer Centre. He completed medical school at the University of Ottawa, internal medicine residency at McMaster University and medical oncology residency at the University of Toronto. He completed an additional year of fellowship focusing on GI medical oncology and education at the Sunnybrook Odette Cancer Centre. Additional advice regarding the modified-Delphi process was obtained from Meredith Giuliani who has a Masters of Education degree and has previously used this process for another study.

Relationship with participants

6. Relationship established: Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?

Yes, the participants were contacted via e-mail and asked if they were interested in participating in a survey study to develop oncology goals and objectives for medical students.

7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer: What did the participants know about the researcher?

Some of the participants knew the researcher from his medical training, while others did not know the researcher at all. The researcher's occupation and contact details were identified in the initial e-mails.

8. Interviewer characteristics: What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator?

Some of the participants knew the researcher from his medical training, while others did not know the researcher at all. The researcher's occupation and contact details were identified in the initial e-mails.

Domain 2: Study Design

Theoretical framework

9. Methodological orientation and Theory: What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study?

We used a modified-Delphi technique. (see reference 15. Powell C. The Delphi technique: Myths and realities. J Adv Nurs 2003;41:376-82.)

Participant selection

10. Sampling: How were participants selected?

Participants were identified by a colleague at their cancer centre as a person with an academic interest in undergraduate oncology education.

11. Method of approach: How were participants approached?

Email

12. Sample size: How many participants were in the study?

34

13. Non-participation: How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?

3 (One initially agreed to participate and then did not complete the surveys while the other 2 did not reply to the original e-mail request)

Setting

14. Setting of data collection Where was the data collected?

E-mail and online web conference / teleconference

15. Presence of non-participants Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?

No

16. Description of sample What are the important characteristics of the sample?

Participants included physicians with an academic interest in oncology education for medical students.

Data collection

17. Interview guide: Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?

There were no formal interviews. The first and third Delphi rounds consisted of an e-mailed survey. The second Delphi round was a web conference / teleconference where objectives from round one with a mean score of 4.0 to 6.9 and any newly suggested objectives proposed during the previous round were discussed.

18. Repeat interviews: Were repeat interviews carried out?

No

19. Audio/visual recording: Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?

No

20. Field notes: Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?

Yes, written notes were taken during the web conference / teleconference.

21. Duration: What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?

2 hours

22. Data saturation: Was data saturation discussed?

Yes, data collection ended when saturation was achieved.

23. Transcripts returned: Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?

Yes, the written notes taken during the web conference / teleconference were sent to all the participants and additional comments or corrections were requested.

Domain 3: Analysis and Findings

Data analysis

24. Number of data coders: How many data coders coded the data?

1 researcher (VT)

25. Description of the coding tree: Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?

No

26. Derivation of themes: Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?

Themes were identified in advance.

27. Software: What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?

Microsoft Excel

28. Participant checking: Did participants provide feedback on the findings?

Yes

Reporting

29. Quotations presented: Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings?

Was each quotation identified?

A small number of quotes were presented to illustrate the themes and findings. We did not identify who the quote originated from.

30. Data and findings consistent: Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?

Yes

31. Clarity of major themes: Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?

Yes

32. Clarity of minor themes: Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?

Yes