

Supplementary Material

Barriers and facilitators to the assessment of cognitive-communication disorders in children and adolescents after traumatic brain injury: a survey of Australian clinical practice

L. Crumlish^{A,}, A. Copley^A, S. J. Wallace^{A,B} and T. A. Rose^{A,B}*

^ASchool of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

^BQueensland Aphasia Research Centre, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

*Correspondence to: Email: lauren.crumlish@uqconnect.edu.au

Supplementary Material 1

Checklist for web-based survey design and reporting (Eysenbach, 2004)¹

Item Category	Checklist Item	Y/N	Comments
Design	Describe survey design	Y	Convenience and snowball sampling. Target population was Australian speech-language pathologists.
Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval and informed consent process	IRB approval	Y	Ethics approval was obtained from The University of Queensland's Human Research Ethics Committee. This study was developed in accordance with and adhered to the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.
	Informed Consent	Y	Participants accessed the Participant Information Sheet (PIS) and Participant Consent Form prior to undertaking the survey.

	Data protection	Y	The survey was developed on the Qualtrics platform and encrypted using Transport Layer Security. Only the research team had access to the password-protected data on Qualtrics.
Development and pre-testing	Development and testing	Y	The survey was piloted with a group of five (5) practising speech-language pathologists.
Recruitment process and description of the sample having access to the questionnaire	Open survey vs closed survey	Y	Open and closed survey
	Contact mode	Y	Participants were contacted through direct email
	Advertising the survey	Y	
	Web/E-mail	Y	Web
	Context	Y	Australian speech-language pathologists
	Mandatory/voluntary	Y	Voluntary
Survey administration	Incentives	Y	Financial or compensatory incentives were not offered. A summary of results was offered to participants if their contact details were provided and at their request.
	Time/Date	Y	August–September

2020

	Randomisation of items or questionnaires	Y	Items included in Block 4 (TDF analysis) were randomised to prevent bias from occurring.
	Number of items	Y	34 questions
	Number of screens (pages)	Y	10 screens/pages
	Completeness check	Y	Qualtrics settings forced-response settings were applied.
	Review step	Y	Yes, participants were able to review and amend their answers prior to submitting their survey
	Unique site visitor	N	IP addresses were not collected and cookies were not enabled to ensure the anonymity of participants.
Response rate	View rate (Ratio of unique survey visitors/ unique site visitors)	N	

	Participation rate (Ratio of unique visitors who agreed to participate/ unique first survey page visitors)	N	
	Completion rate (Ratio of users who finished the survey/users who agreed to participate)	Y	83%
Preventing multiple entries from the same individuals	Cookies used	N	Cookies were not enabled. Responses provided to demographics questions were checked to ensure duplicate submissions from participants were not received.
	IP check	N	IP addresses were not collected to ensure the anonymity of participants.
	Log File Analysis	N	
	Registration	N	An open survey was used.
Analysis	Handling of incomplete questionnaires	Y	Responses that completed more than the demographics questions were included in the final analysis.

Questionnaires submitted with an atypical timestamp	N
--	---

Statistical correction	N	Statistical corrections were not applied to the data set.
------------------------	---	---

1 Eysenbach, G. (2004). Improving the quality of web surveys: The Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet ESurveys (CHERRIES). *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 6(3), e34.
<https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.6.3.e34>

© Gunther Eysenbach. Originally published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research (<http://www.jmir.org>), 29.9.2004. Except where otherwise noted, articles published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, including full bibliographic details and the URL, and this statement is included.

Supplementary File 2

Percentage of Australian SLPs within specific workplaces providing agreement responses (agree and strongly agree) to Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) domains (n = 89)

TDF Domain	% Agreement						
	Private Practice (n = 32)	Health (n = 20)	Department of Education (n = 15)	Non-Government Organisation (n=10)	Other (n = 7)	Child Development Service (n = 3)	Juvenile Justice (n = 2)
Optimism	98.4%	97.5%	90%	100%	92.9%	100%	100%
Social/Professional role and identity	87.5%	95%	100%	95%	100%	100%	100%
Beliefs about consequences	84.4%	95%	90%	95%	85.7%	100%	75%
Goals	67.2%	85%	63.4%	80%	71.4%	83.3%	100%
Intentions	57.8%	52.5%	46.7%	50%	64.3%	66.6%	100%
Knowledge	50%	75%	33.3%	35%	78.6%	50%	75%

Environmental resources and context	43.7%	50%	26.7%	15%	57.1%	100%	0%
Social Influences	35.9%	72.5%	23.4%	45%	35.7%	50%	75%
Memory, attention, and decision processes	26.6%	55%	23.4%	20%	57.1%	33.3%	25%
Beliefs about capabilities	23.4%	37.5%	20%	20%	21.4%	33.3%	50%
Reinforcement	23.4%	32.5%	13.4%	30%	21.4%	33.3%	25%
Skills	18.7%	55%	20%	20%	35.7%	33.3%	75%
Emotion	15.6%	37.5%	20%	15%	35.7%	0%	25%
Behavioural regulation	10.9%	35%	6.7%	5%	42.9%	33.3%	50%

Note. Agreement percentages reflect the percent of participants reporting ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ to TDF statements within domains. Facilitators (i.e., domains with >50% agreement) are shown in green. Barriers (i.e., domains with ≤ 50% agreement) are shown in red.

Supplementary File 3.

Percentage of Australian SLPs providing agreement responses (agree and strongly agree) to Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) domains according to years of clinical experience (n = 90)

TDF Domain	% Agreement				
	0 - < 1 year (n = 50)	1 - 3 years (n = 14)	4 - 6 years (n = 7)	7 - 10 years (n = 8)	> 10 years (n = 11)
Optimism	98%	100%	100%	100%	81.8%
Social/Professional role and identity	93%	92.9%	92.9%	93.7%	100%
Beliefs about consequences	92%	85.7%	85.7%	93.7%	81.8%
Goals	61%	96.2%	85.7%	93.7%	81.8%
Intentions	47%	57.1%	78.6%	75%	63.6%
Knowledge	34%	78.6%	78.6%	68.7%	90.9%
Environmental resources and context	38%	25%	71.4%	50%	54.5%

Social Influences	36%	71.4%	42.9%	75%	31.8%
Memory, attention, and decision processes	20%	46.4%	42.9%	56.2%	68.2%
Beliefs about capabilities	20%	25%	42.9%	43.7%	40.9%
Reinforcement	20%	25%	21.4%	62.5%	27.3%
Skills	10%	50%	42.9%	62.5%	72.7%
Emotion	6%	17.9%	28.6%	62.5%	68.2%
Behavioural regulation	5%	25%	7.1%	56.2%	63.6%

Note. Agreement percentages reflect the percent of participants reporting ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ to TDF statements within domains. Facilitators (i.e., domains with >50% agreement) are shown in green. Barriers (i.e., domains with ≤ 50% agreement) are shown in red.