

Appendix 1: CJ-Check checklist

Note this Checklist is not part of the EQUATOR checklist set. It is derived from preliminary work published in Thomas R, Sims R, Degeling C, Street JM, Carter SM, Rychetnik L, Whitty JA, Wilson A, Ward P, Glasziou P. CJCheck Stage 1: development and testing of a checklist for reporting community juries - Delphi process and analysis of studies published in 1996-2015. Health Expect. 2017 Aug;20(4):626-637.

Planning	
Was the stakeholder/committee's role clearly described?	Our community juries are part of a larger study about stakeholder perspectives on sharing general practice data for secondary purposes. We formed an Advisory Group to provide guidance for the development of the overall study, including the community juries. The members were from government, general practice, academia and a consumer organisation, with all members have expertise in the study area. The research team reflected a diverse range of academic and professional backgrounds relevant to the charge, including researchers who use linked general practice record data sets; experts in the legal, social and ethical considerations of linked data sets; organizations providing oversight and facilitation of data linkage research; practising and academic general practitioners; and representatives from a consumer organization who advocate to inform, influence and represent the interests of patients, carers and their families. The research team met fortnightly over the duration of this phase of the project. The jurors were told that, although there was no guarantee their findings would influence policy, the findings would be incorporated into subsequent phases of the project, and presented at the final stakeholder roundtable, which Commonwealth and State government representatives would attend.
Was the selection of experts (who was chosen and why) adequately described?	The expert witnesses were chosen to reflect a diverse range of academic and professional backgrounds relevant to the charge, including researchers who use linked general practice record data sets; experts in the legal, social and ethical considerations of linked data sets; organizations providing oversight and facilitation of data linkage research; practising and academic general practitioners; and representatives from a consumer organization who advocate to inform, influence and represent the interests of patients, carers and their families.
Were the experts' roles clearly defined?	Information on the expert witness presentations may be found in Appendix 4, Table 1.

Was the jury 'charge' or instruction clearly described?	Each jury considered the charge: <i>Under what conditions, if any, should general practice data be used for research in Australia?</i>
Jurors	
Was the study recruitment strategy clearly described?	We recruited 22 Australians <u>for Australians</u> for each community jury, via an experienced market research company, CRNRStone Australia from their opt-in online panel. For each jury, CRNRStone Australia recruited twenty jurors and two 'standby' jurors, available in the event of jurors dropping out. Selected jurors were contacted by CRNRStone Australia three weeks in advance to confirm their attendance and were sent the Participant Information Sheet (PIS). A member of the UOW research team (LC) phoned the jurors to record their verbal consent to participate, giving jurors the opportunity to ask questions about the process directly of a research team member. Jurors were offered a practice Zoom session.
Were inclusion/exclusion criteria reported?	We sought a diverse sample with respect to gender, age, Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander status, educational qualifications, employment, rurality and cultural background. Only panel members 18 years and older were invited and those with current or previous experience(s) working in a general practice setting were excluded. No further exclusion or inclusion criteria were applied.
Was the type of participant/juror described (unaffected public, affected public, advocate)?	Jurors were recruited to ensure diversity with respect to gender, age, Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander status, educational qualifications, employment, rurality and cultural background. As over 80% of Australians attend a general practice at least once each year, we did not specifically recruit to ensure participants had previous experience attending a GP.
Were the demographics of the jurors reported (age, gender, educational attainment)?	Almost half the jurors identified as female (45%) or male (45%) with the remainder identifying as non-binary (10%). Thirty-five percent of jurors were aged 18-39 years, 35% 40-59 years and 30% aged 60 years or older. Around one third of jurors had a university or post grad degree (35%) and three jurors identified as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (15%). Juror demographics may be found in <u>Appendix 7: Table 2.</u>
Was the number of jurors reported?	In total 40 jurors attended the juries: 20 attended the Sydney jury and 20 attended the Melbourne jury.
Were the jurors paid?	Each juror received \$AUD690 to cover their time. In addition, we provided a \$100 Visa gift card to cover travel to and from the venue, and all meals for the face-to-face meeting. Travel expenses were covered, and accommodation and meals were provided at the venue for rural participants. Jurors were supported with Zoom training,

	assistance with logistics, and additional funding for special travel needs and child minding.
Procedure	
Was the role and experience of the facilitator described (e.g. impartial, informed, member of the research team, independent)?	Facilitation was led by an independent facilitator (MWS) with extensive experience in community engagement. Several times over the jury processes, the facilitator asked the jurors to reason together on behalf of their communities and with the good of the Australian public in mind.
Were materials provided to the jurors adequately described and accessible?	An online version of the participant information sheet (PIS) was provided to jurors approximately 2 weeks prior to the jury, with a hardcopy version provided on the Friday night. The PIS described the study aims and premises, funding source and research team's areas of activity. In addition, this information was provided in the Participant Information Booklet and shared by the research team during the Friday night introductions. Seven days before the jury, jurors received a hard copy of the Participant Information Booklet (Appendix 3) to provide background on the jury process and a balanced overview of the expert witness material, including the potential benefits and risks related to general practice records for research. The jurors were not required to read the booklet before attending the jury; rather, the booklet supported participants as an additional source of information to increase their understanding of the topic.
Were the expert cross-examination opportunities described?	Throughout the expert witness presentations time was allocated for jurors to ask questions both directly to the expert witness as well as more broadly to the research team. All expert witnesses were available to be contacted by phone during the jury. At the close of Saturday, jurors had an opportunity to highlight information they felt was 'missing' and which would impact their ability to deliberate on the jury charge. During this time, expert witnesses and the research team provided answers immediately or, in the event of an expert witness no longer being on hand or information being unknown, answers were provided to the jurors at the beginning of the third day.
Was the jury outcome reported?	The jury outcomes have been reported to the funding body and Advisory Group and shared with several relevant stakeholders in relation to the following phases of the larger study. A more formal approach to sharing the jury outcomes will be developed once the manuscript is published.
Was the jury outcome reported?	Jury results are reported in the current publication.

What was the influence of the jury outcome on policy?	Unknown at this stage.
What was the influence of the commission body on the jurors?	Jurors were aware that the research was funded partially by the Digital Health CRC.
Was the framing/nature of the jury deliberations described?	The jury deliberations were framed by a set of additional questions (Appendix 4), provided to jurors in the Information Booklet and at the beginning of each jury. Jurors worked in small and plenary groups to address these questions and any additional topics that they raised. They were encouraged to focus on constructive dialogue that arrived at clear recommendations. In the final sessions of each jury, jurors voted on the acceptability of each recommendation using 'yes', 'no' and 'not sure' cards. Recommendations, voting patterns and reasons for recommendations were recorded and are presented in the current paper.
Scheduling	
Was the schedule of events (meeting frequency, timing of deliberations) described?	Each jury began on a Tuesday evening, with a 90-minute online Zoom meeting scheduled three days before the face-to-face component of the jury. This gave the jurors the opportunity to meet the facilitator, the research team and their fellow jurors, learn about the jury charge and process, develop 'group rules' and take part in relationship building and critical thinking skill exercises. We convened the face-to-face jury over 2.5 consecutive days, beginning on a Friday evening (5pm – 8pm), followed by Saturday (9am – 5pm) and Sunday (9am – 4pm). The jurors convened on the Friday evening to meet one another, and jurors were reminded on the jury proceedings and the charge they would consider. Friday evening and Saturday morning were primarily information provision with time allocated for discussion and Q&A sessions with the experts. Saturday afternoon and all-dayall-day Sunday were spent in deliberation and development of recommendations, guided by a set of questions that reflected key policy and governance issues (Appendix 4). The jurors alternated between plenary and small group activities, with small groups randomly re-allocated to ensure cross-fertilisation of perspectives. In plenary sessions, a member of the research team typed up the recommendations from each small group as they presented. These recommendations were then presented back to the jury and jurors revised them together, supported by the facilitator. Finally, the jurors voted on each recommendation. Votes and reasons for and against each recommendation were recorded. At

	the completion of the jury, jurors were asked to complete a post jury survey (Appendix 45) and evaluation survey (Appendix 56).
Was the daily schedule of events described	The jury process (schedule of events) is provided in the Participant Information Booklet (Appendix 3, page 7-8) and in Table 1.
Was the number of presenters and their topics described?	Information about the expert witness presentations may be found in Appendix 4. The number of presenters and their topics are outline in Table 1.
Are the expert presentations available?	Expert presentations are not available. An outline of each expert witness presentation is provided in the Participant Information Booklet (Appendix 3).
Were the length of the presentations reported?	Information about the expert witness presentations may be found in Appendix 4. Table 1.