

Title: Controlling symptoms versus minimizing negative treatment impact: A grounded theory study of heterogeneity in patient preferences for psoriasis treatments

Authors: Shelagh M. Szabo, MSc; Neil S. Hawkins, PhD; Evi Germani, PhD.

Health Economics & Health Technology Assessment (HEHTA), School of Health and Wellbeing,
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, UK

Corresponding author: Shelagh M. Szabo, MSc (sszabo@broadstreetheor.com)

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Appendix A: Interview guide

Preference heterogeneity in psoriasis: High-level interview guide by topic

1. Demographic details
 - Age, age at diagnosis
 - Employment status
2. Clinical details
 - Current psoriasis medications
 - Number of other medications
3. Health insurance details
 - Cost sensitivity for paying healthcare
 - Magnitude of co-payments for medication
 - Ever could not afford a medication prescribed / ever told you would not be prescribed a medication due to costs
4. Living with psoriasis
 - Symptom history
 - Progression to moderate psoriasis
 - Impact of psoriasis on daily life / routine
 - Treatment history
 - Most bothersome symptoms
5. Treatments received for psoriasis
 - Initial treatment, and options recommended
 - Preferences for initial treatment and drivers
 - Likes, dislikes, reasons, examples
 - Adherence to initial treatment; how participant takes their medicines
 - Perceived importance of being adherent
 - Reasons for discontinuation (if applicable)
 - Perceived role in effectively managing psoriasis
 - *Repeat for all treatments received*
6. Treatments not received for psoriasis
 - Other treatments of which the participant had heard
 - Reasons interested in other treatments; reasons disinterested
 - Benchmarks for efficacy, safety, other features that the participant would want
7. Agency and autonomy in decision making
 - Preferred level of involvement in psoriasis decision-making
 - Composition of clinical team for psoriasis care
 - Preferred role of clinical team
 - Ideal style of relationship with clinical team
 - Conducting own research into health
 - Preferences for this, sources of information
 - Taking charge of your own health
 - Definition, preferences for this, sources of information
8. Perceived burden of current medication load
 - Importance of reduced medication load
9. Changes to lifestyle to accommodate/manage psoriasis
 - Preferences for this
 - Attempts made

- Perceptions of efficacy
 - Ability to lead a 'normal' life on treatment
10. Preferences for psoriasis treatment attributes
- Most/least important features when selecting a treatment
 - Review importance of / define drivers of treatment preferences
 - Importance of 'convenience'
 - Selecting a treatment that maximizes efficacy or minimizes inconvenience
 - Treatment deal breakers
 - Role of treatment features and preferences in medication adherence

Appendix B: COREQ checklist

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal characteristics</i>		
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 4, line 1
Credentials	2	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 4, line 1
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 4, line 1
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 4, line 1
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 4, line 1
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? Methods, section 2.2, paragraph 2, line 3
Participant's knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research Methods, section 2.2, paragraph 2, line 2
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons, and interests in the research topic – Methods, section 2.5, paragraph 1, lines 2-3
Domain 2: Study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis Methods, section 2.1, lines 2-3
<i>Participant selection</i>		
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball Methods, section 2.2, paragraph 1, line 1
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, Methods, section 2.2, paragraph 2, line 1
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study? Results, section 3.1, paragraph 1, line 1
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? Results, section 3.1, paragraph 1, line 1
<i>Setting</i>		
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 2, line 1
Presence of non-participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 2, line 8

Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date Results, section 3.1, paragraph 1, figure 1, and table 1.
<i>Data collection</i>		
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? Appendix A and Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 1, line 1.
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 2, line 8
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 2, line 7
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? – Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 2, line 6
Duration	21	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 2, line 7
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 4, line 3
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? - Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 2, line 5
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 4, line 1
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? Methods section 2.3, paragraph 3, and Figures 2 and 3
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? Methods section 2.3, paragraph 3, line 3
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? Methods section 2.3, paragraph 3, line 2
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings? Methods, section 2.3, paragraph 2, line 5
<i>Reporting</i>		
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number Yes, throughout the results and in Table 2
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? Yes, throughout the results and in Table 2 and Figures 2 and 3
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? Figure 3
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? Figure 2 and Results sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6