

# Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES)

<i>Item Category/ Checklist Item</i>	<i>Explanation</i>	<i>Location in paper</i>
<b>Design</b>		
Describe survey design	Describe target population, sample frame. Is the sample a convenience sample? (In “open” surveys this is most likely.)	A convenience sample was not used, please see Methods, 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph.
<b>IRB (Institutional Review Board) approval and informed consent process</b>		
IRB approval	Mention whether the study has been approved by an IRB.	This study was approved by PHO Ethics and Privacy, please see Methods, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph.
Informed consent	Describe the informed consent process. Where were the participants told the length of time of the survey, which data were stored and where and for how long, who the investigator was, and the purpose of the study?	The first page of the survey described this information in detail. Details are not included in the paper manuscript.
Data protection	If any personal information was collected or stored, describe what mechanisms were used to protect unauthorized access.	No personal information was collected.
<b>Development and pre-testing</b>		
Development and testing	State how the survey was developed, including whether the usability and technical functionality of the electronic questionnaire had been tested before fielding the questionnaire.	Please see Methods, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph.
<b>Recruitment process and description of the sample having access to the questionnaire</b>		
Open survey versus closed survey	An “open survey” is a survey open for each visitor of a site, while a closed survey is only open to a sample which the investigator knows (password-protected survey).	Please see Methods, 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph.  While not password-protected, respondents were required to submit hospital name which enabled identification and reconciliation of unintended duplicate responses.
Contact mode	Indicate whether or not the initial contact with the potential participants was made on the Internet. (Investigators may also send out questionnaires by mail and allow for Web-based data entry.)	Please see Methods, 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph.
Advertising the survey	How/where was the survey announced or advertised? Some examples are offline media (news papers), or online (mailing lists – If yes, which ones?) or banner ads (Where were these banner ads	Please see Methods, 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph.

<i>Item Category/ Checklist Item</i>	<i>Explanation</i>	<i>Location in paper</i>
	posted and what did they look like?). It is important to know the wording of the announcement as it will heavily influence who chooses to participate. Ideally the survey announcement should be published as an appendix.	
<b>Survey administration</b>		
Web/E-mail	State the type of e-survey (eg, one posted on a Web site, or one sent out through e-mail). If it is an e-mail survey, were the responses entered manually into a database, or was there an automatic method for capturing responses?	Please see Methods, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph.
Context	Describe the Web site (for mailing list/news group) in which the survey was posted. What is the Web site about, who is visiting it, what are visitors normally looking for? Discuss to what degree the content of the Web site could pre-select the sample or influence the results. For example, a survey about vaccination on an anti-immunization Web site will have different results from a Web survey conducted on a government Web site	Please see Methods, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph.
Mandatory/voluntary	Was it a mandatory survey to be filled in by every visitor who wanted to enter the Web site, or was it a voluntary survey?	This was a voluntary survey. Please see Introduction, last sentence.
Incentives	Were any incentives offered (eg, monetary, prizes, or non-monetary incentives such as an offer to provide the survey results)?	No incentives were offered. Please see Methods, 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph.
Time/Date	In what timeframe were the data collected?	Please see Methods, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph.
Randomization of items or questionnaires	To prevent biases items can be randomized or alternated.	Due to the nature of this survey, including the use of adaptive questioning, randomization of items was not performed.
Adaptive questioning	Use adaptive questioning (certain items, or only conditionally displayed based on responses to other items) to reduce number and complexity of the questions.	Methods, 5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph.
Number of Items	What was the number of questionnaire items per page? The number of items is an important factor for the completion rate.	There were 1 to 3 questions per page depending on the length of the question.  This was not explicitly stated in the paper
Number of screens (pages)	Over how many pages was the questionnaire distributed? The number of items is an important factor for the completion rate.	Not described in paper  (total of 18 pages)
Completeness check	It is technically possible to do consistency or completeness checks before the questionnaire is submitted. Was this done, and if "yes",	It was mandatory for the respondent

<i>Item Category/ Checklist Item</i>	<i>Explanation</i>	<i>Location in paper</i>
	how (usually JavaScript)? An alternative is to check for completeness after the questionnaire has been submitted (and highlight mandatory items). If this has been done, it should be reported. All items should provide a non-response option such as “not applicable” or “rather not say”, and selection of one response option should be enforced.	to select a response option to all questions in order to move to the next question. All items had a non-response option (e.g. “unknown”)  This was not explicitly described in the paper.
Review step	State whether respondents were able to review and change their answers (eg, through a Back button or a Review step which displays a summary of the responses and asks the respondents if they are correct).	Respondents were able to review and change through a back button.  This was not explicitly described in the paper.
<b>Response rates</b>		
Unique site visitor	If you provide view rates or participation rates, you need to define how you determined a unique visitor. There are different techniques available, based on IP addresses or cookies or both.	Please see methods, 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph – respondents were required to submit hospital name. Therefore the targeted list enabled us to track which hospital had responded.
View rate (Ratio of unique survey visitors/unique site visitors)	Requires counting unique visitors to the first page of the survey, divided by the number of unique site visitors (not page views!). It is not unusual to have view rates of less than 0.1 % if the survey is voluntary.	This is not available from the survey platform we used.
Participation rate (Ratio of unique visitors who agreed to participate/unique first survey page visitors)	Count the unique number of people who filled in the first survey page (or agreed to participate, for example by checking a checkbox), divided by visitors who visit the first page of the survey (or the informed consents page, if present). This can also be called “recruitment” rate.	This is not available from the survey platform we used.
Completion rate (Ratio of users who finished the survey/users who agreed to participate)	The number of people submitting the last questionnaire page, divided by the number of people who agreed to participate (or submitted the first survey page). This is only relevant if there is a separate “informed consent” page or if the survey goes over several pages. This is a measure for attrition. Note that “completion” can involve leaving questionnaire items blank. This is not a measure for how completely questionnaires were filled in. (If you need a measure for this, use the word “completeness rate”.)	This metric was not tracked.  This was not reported in this paper.
<b>Preventing multiple entries from the same individual</b>		
Cookies used	Indicate whether cookies were used to assign a unique user identifier to each client computer. If so, mention the page on which the cookie was set and read, and how long the cookie was valid. Were duplicate entries avoided by preventing users access to the survey twice; or	Cookies were not used as user identifier. Methods section (5 <sup>th</sup>

<i>Item Category/ Checklist Item</i>	<i>Explanation</i>	<i>Location in paper</i>
	were duplicate database entries having the same user ID eliminated before analysis? In the latter case, which entries were kept for analysis (eg, the first entry or the most recent)?	paragraph) described how we eliminated duplicated responses.
IP check	Indicate whether the IP address of the client computer was used to identify potential duplicate entries from the same user. If so, mention the period of time for which no two entries from the same IP address were allowed (eg, 24 hours). Were duplicate entries avoided by preventing users with the same IP address access to the survey twice; or were duplicate database entries having the same IP address within a given period of time eliminated before analysis? If the latter, which entries were kept for analysis (eg, the first entry or the most recent)?	IP address was not used to identify duplicate entries. However, hospital corporation name and work contact information were required.
Log file analysis	Indicate whether other techniques to analyze the log file for identification of multiple entries were used. If so, please describe.	Please see above
Registration	In “closed” (non-open) surveys, users need to login first and it is easier to prevent duplicate entries from the same user. Describe how this was done. For example, was the survey never displayed a second time once the user had filled it in, or was the username stored together with the survey results and later eliminated? If the latter, which entries were kept for analysis (eg, the first entry or the most recent)?	While respondents was not required to log in, entering hospital corporation name and work contact information was required. Methods section (5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph) described how we eliminated duplicated responses.
<b>Analysis</b>		
Handling of incomplete questionnaires	Were only completed questionnaires analyzed? Were questionnaires which terminated early (where, for example, users did not go through all questionnaire pages) also analyzed?	Please see Methods, 5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph
Questionnaires submitted with an atypical timestamp	Some investigators may measure the time people needed to fill in a questionnaire and exclude questionnaires that were submitted too soon. Specify the timeframe that was used as a cut-off point, and describe how this point was determined.	There was no time restriction for this survey. Due to the detailed nature of the survey respondents were encouraged to print out a working paper copy of the survey and then submit their responses online once they gathered the required information.  This was not explicitly described in the paper.
Statistical correction	Indicate whether any methods such as weighting of items or propensity scores have been used to adjust for the non-representative sample; if so, please describe the methods.	No statistical correction was used.

<i>Item Category/ Checklist Item</i>	<i>Explanation</i>	<i>Location in paper</i>
		This was not explicitly described in the paper.