Supplement 1. Synthesis process of the 912 responses to the recommendations task

Three analysts (authors Matt Woodward and Natalie Richards, and analyst Emily Ryen Gloinson) with a background in qualitative analysis and/or healthcare human factors engineering worked in parallel on an iterative qualitative analysis process of assigning recommendations to pre-defined categories, coding them, re-assigning them to categories more closely fitting with the codes, and synthesising similar recommendations. An overview is provided in the figure below. Abductive coding was applied to distil the responses received into a set of recommendations to be presented back to participants for rating. Text was classified as either a recommendation or a comment/observation and only concrete recommendations were taken forward for coding. Recommendations were first grouped into categories that corresponded to the sequence of practice portrayed in the video or to the design of equipment, workstations or physical environment. Two categories were used to include recommendations regarding the content and structure of the video itself. A descriptive code was then assigned to group similar recommendations together. The three analysts reviewed a sample of recommendations as a team to check for consistency of approach, to discuss instances where coding could be ambiguous, and encourage triangulation for the codes applied. The recommendations raised most frequently were provided in a list to clinical stakeholders for review, who for example adjudicated on clarity of phrasing, and on the final categorisation of the recommendations.

Recommendation generation (105 participants)

912 responses

Assign recommendations to pre-defined categories
Code by recommendation or comment/support

Comments (62)
Support (32)

818 recommendations

Assign sub-categories for large categories
Code to group similar recommendations together

| Alarm and first response (7) | Communication (9) | Human factors / design (12) | Doffing (8) | Video format (3) |

| Donning (16) | Algorithm (6) | Grab bag (8) | | Other (5) |

Select most frequently raised recommendations.

26 recommendations

Stakeholder review

22 recommendations

Round I rating (71 participants)

Review distributions and apply consensus criteria

Recommendations met consensus (12)

Recommendations without consensus (10)

Round 2 rating (57 participants)

Recommendations met consensus (16)

Recommendations without consensus (6)