Supplemental Methods

Description of Rationale for Factor Analysis for Item 9

| Item 9 | Question                                                                 | Response Choices |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 9      | Please rate the PRO information you have consulted in your practice on the following metrics: |
|        | **Accessibility**                                                          | a. Excellent     |
|        | **Usefulness**                                                            | b. Very good     |
|        | **Scientific rigour**                                                      | c. Good          |
|        | **Interpretability**                                                      | d. Satisfactory  |
|        |                                                                           | e. Poor          |
|        |                                                                           | f. Unsure        |

Item 9 allowed us to quantify respondent’s overall views of PRO data using a composite score based on their ratings of **accessibility**, **interpretability**, **usefulness** and **scientific rigour** (Q9). This composite score was computed and validated using weights from a factor analysis. Hypothesis testing compared the scores derived from the factor analysis across different populations of oncologists (See Table 2 of manuscript). As theorized, there was evidence that oncologists, who believe that PRO data is widely available and those who use PRO data to prescribe medications, rated it higher on average.

**Factor Analysis Summary**

We could not reject the null hypothesis that one factor was sufficient for our data from Q9, so one factor was used in the analysis to create the weights for the composite score.

Weights for the composite score:

|                       | Factor 1 |
|-----------------------|----------|
| PRO Accessibility     | 0.831    |
| PRO Interpretability  | 0.886    |
| PRO Usefulness        | 0.840    |
| PRO Scientific rigour | 0.869    |
**Factor Analysis Output, Including Cronbach’s Alpha and Reliability Statistics**

Reliability analysis
Call: alpha(x = data4.r2)

| raw_alpha | std.alpha | G6(smc) | average_r | S/N | ase | mean | SD | median_r |
|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----|-----|------|----|----------|
| 0.92      | 0.92      | 0.89    | 0.73      | 11  | 0.0086 | 2.8  | 1  | 0.75     |

95% confidence boundaries

| Low | Alpha | Upper |
|-----|-------|-------|
| 0.9 | 0.92  | 0.93  |

Reliability if an item is dropped:

| Accessibility | raw_alpha | std.alpha | G6(smc) | average_r | S/N | Alpha se | Var.r | Med.r |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----|----------|-------|-------|
| Interpretability | 0.90      | 0.90      | 0.86    | 0.75      | 9.0 | 0.011    | 4.1e-05 | 0.75 |
| Usefulness    | 0.88      | 0.88      | 0.84    | 0.71      | 7.5 | 0.013    | 1.8e-03 | 0.73 |
| Scientific rigor | 0.90      | 0.90      | 0.85    | 0.74      | 8.8 | 0.011    | 8.1e-05 | 0.75 |

Item statistics

| N   | Raw.r | std.r | r.cor | r.drop | Mean | SD |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|----|
| Accessibility | 254 | 0.88  | 0.88  | 0.82   | 0.78 | 2.7 |
| Interaptability | 254 | 0.91  | 0.91  | 0.87   | 0.84 | 2.8 |
| Usefulness   | 254 | 0.88  | 0.88  | 0.83   | 0.79 | 2.9 |
| Scientific rigor | 254 | 0.91  | 0.90  | 0.86   | 0.82 | 2.6 |

Non missing response frequency for each item

|     | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | Miss |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|------|
| Accessibility | 0.20 | 0.24 | 0.30 | 0.20 | 0.07 | 0    |
| Interpretability | 0.12 | 0.33 | 0.28 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0    |
| Usefulness   | 0.09 | 0.30 | 0.28 | 0.23 | 0.10 | .    |
| Scientific rigor | 0.22 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0    |