

Supplementary material

PARITY Collaboration Study

Focus Group Discussion Guide MSTs Meeting

Saturday October 10/2015 @ 6:30 am

Marriott Hotel, Orlando, Florida

Welcome, Introductions & Informed Consent

The focus group will begin with the Principal Investigator welcoming participants to the focus group, reviewing the purpose of the focus group, and introducing the focus group facilitator and research assistant. The Principal Investigator will leave after the welcome and introductions.

The facilitator will review the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form, provide an opportunity for questions about the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form and then obtain written informed consent from all participants.

The facilitator will then ask focus group participants to briefly introduce themselves, to describe their role in the PARITY study and how long they have been involved in the PARITY study.

The focus group facilitator will review a few “ground rules” for the focus group discussion including:

- Ask participants to speak one at a time;
- Ask participants to identify themselves each time they speak to facilitate tracking of comments throughout the discussion and avoid misattribution (explain process to protect identity)
- Encourage participants to avoid the “round robin” Q/A approach and discuss questions amongst the group
- Ask participants to respect the confidentiality of each other’s participation in the research study and the confidentiality of the discussion; and
- Ask participants to respect views that may be different from their own – the purpose of the focus group discussion is to explore and capture the perceptions and experiences of the people in the room.

Discussion Topics

- 1) I’d like to begin by asking you to share your views about the importance of collaboration in orthopaedic oncology research – do you think collaboration is important?

(probes: why/why not; necessary/essential)

 - a) do you think that all orthopaedic oncologists should participate in collaborative research?

(probes: why/why not; what might encourage oncologists to collaborate)
 - b) why do you think some orthopaedic oncologists might not participate?

(probes: time constraints, lack of resources, lack of interest, lack of institution recognition)
- 2) Can you tell me about the opportunities available for research collaboration in your field?

(probes: experience with these opportunities, are there enough opportunities or should there be more? What other opportunities could be created?)
- 3) Does your institution have any policies related to recognition for participation in multi-center prospective research?
 - a) If yes – what are the policies? Are they used? If used – how are they used? If not, why do you think they aren’t used?
 - b) If no – why do you think your institution doesn’t have policies to recognize participation in multi-centre prospective research?
 - c) Do you think policies that recognize participation in multi-centre prospective research would encourage more orthopaedic surgeons to be involved in this kind of research? Why/Why not?
- 4) I’d like to ask you to think back in time to when you first heard about the PARITY study – what were your initial thoughts/reaction?

(probes: where do you think these thoughts/reaction came from? Past experiences? Wanting to join and not be left behind? Pessimism because never done before vs excitement of being part of something new)

 - a) Did the fact that someone else had assumed the role of Lead Principal Investigator for the PARITY trial evoke any reaction for you?

(probe: Relief? Confidence? Envy? Other?)
- 5) Now I’d like to ask you describe your experience as a collaborator on the PARITY study?
 - a) What has worked well or been positive for you/your site?
 - b) What has been challenging or not worked as well for you/your site?

(probes: clinical equipoise/time)
 - c) What could be done to improve the experience of collaborating on the PARITY trial?
- 6) In terms of barriers to collaboration in orthopaedic oncology research, so far you’ve discussed (w,x,y,z – facilitator to summarize barriers discussed). What other factors do you think are at play which limit or prevent orthopaedic surgeons from participating in prospective collaborative research in the field of orthopaedic oncology?

(probes: individual level barriers, institution level barriers, barriers related to the culture/field of orthopaedic oncology, lack of leadership).
- 7) Considering all of the barriers that have been discussed this morning (facilitator to summarize all of the barriers discussed)
 - a) Which of these barriers do you think have the most influence on your behavior/decision-making around prospective collaborative research?
 - b) Which of these barriers do you believe are amenable to change (i.e. could be overcome)? Why do you believe these barriers are amenable to change?

(probes: strategies/resources for overcoming these barriers)
 - c) Which of these barriers do you believe are not amenable to change (i.e. cannot be overcome)? Why do you believe these barriers are not amenable to change?
- 8) During the discussion this morning this group has identified the following factors as facilitators for participating in prospective, collaborative orthopaedic research (w,x,y,z, facilitator to summarize)

Are there any other factors, processes or resources that you believe would facilitate the participation of other surgeons and sites in this research? (probes: access to a dedicated, skilled research assistant and what that access would look like/being involved in developing and selecting the research question/central infrastructure Methods Centre/authorship opportunities to boost your CV/being part of a collaboration – developing connections and friendships)

 - a) What would you say to one of your colleagues to try to convince them to participate in a prospective collaborative research study?
- 9) We have just discussed a number of factors – both barriers and facilitators – related to participating in collaborative multi-centred research in the field of orthopaedic oncology. Now I’d like to ask you to tell me about factors related to sustaining involvement in this type of research.
 - a) what keeps you involved/interested/engaged/motivated/sustains your participation in the PARITY trial? (probes: leadership/investigator meetings/newsletters/other?)
 - b) what challenges your participation in the PARITY trial? (probes: delayed gratification/personal barriers)
- 10) If you were in an elevator with a key decision maker at your institution and they asked you to describe the benefits of your involvement in the PARITY trial, what would you tell them?

Review of Next Steps in the Sub-Study Research

Closing and Thank You