Supplementary Material

Co-developing 'The CyberABIlity Scale' to assess vulnerability to cyberscams for people with acquired brain injury: Delphi and cognitive interviews with clinicians and people with acquired brain injury

Jao-Yue J. Carminati[A,B,*], *Jennie L. Ponsford*[A,B] and *Kate Rachel Gould*[A,B]

[A]Turner Institute for Brain and Mental Health, School of Psychological Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, Vic. 3800, Australia

[B]Monash-Epworth Rehabilitation Research Centre, Epworth Healthcare, Richmond, Vic. 3121, Australia

*Correspondence to: Email: Jao.Carminati@monash.edu

The Cognitive Interviewing Reporting Framework (Boeije & Willis, 2013)

Item	Reported on Page #
Research objectives	3-6
What are the aims of the study?	
What is the context that gave rise to pretesting the instrument?	
What is the theoretical perspective for the cognitive interviewing study?	
Research design	7
What was the basis for each feature of the design?	
Ethics	13-15
Was the study approved by an ethics committee or IRB? (consent procedures)	
How was the research project introduced to settings and participants?	
How were people motivated to participate?	
How was confidentiality and anonymity of participants/sources protected?	
Participant selection	13-14, tables
What are participants details with respect to demographics and other project-specific items of information	
Did the selection of participants satisfy the study objectives?	
Data collection	14-15
Who conducted the interviews and how many interviewers were involved?	
How were the interviewers trained?	
Were sessions recorded and if so, was audio or video used?	
Were notes taken and how was this employed?	
What type of verbal reporting method was employed, that is, think-aloud, probing, or combinations?	
Was the interview protocol adjusted during the research process and if so, how?	
Was saturation achieved?	
Data analysis	15
Describe methods of data analysis in this research project	
How were raw data transformed into categories representing problem areas and solutions?	
What software programs were used?	
Has reliability been considered, including the repetition of (parts of) the analysis by more than one researcher?	
How did researchers work together and how were systematic analysis procedures encouraged, especially between laboratories or testing locations?	
Were there any efforts for seeking diverse observations, that is, triangulation?	
Was quantitative evidence used to supplement qualitative evidence?	
Findings	15-17
Present findings in a systematic and clear way, either per-item, per meaningful part of the questionnaire, or per entire questionnaire	
What was observed concerning subject behavior with respect to each evaluated item?	
To what extent did results differ as a function of subject characteristics, behaviors, or status?	
Conclusions, implications, and discussion	18-22
Address the realization of the objectives	
If possible, include a copy of the modified questions if one was produced as a product of testing.	
How do findings and solutions relate to previous evidence?	

Strengths and limitations of the study   18-22

     Discuss strengths and limitations of the design and employment of the study and how these could have affected the findings

     What were relevant a priori expectations or previous experiences?

     What are the implications of findings for generalization to the wider population from which the participants were drawn, or applicability to other settings?

     What is the study's contribution to methodological development and future practice?

Report format   Tables and
                                                                          appendices

     Use a structured and accepted format for organizing the report

     Include main study documents that are relevant for independent inspection by others as appendix or online materials.

Appendix A

Cognitive Interviewing Probing Questions

Section	Domain*	Probing Question
Instructions		*Tell me in your own words what these instructions are asking you to do.*
Rating scale		*What do you think about the rating scale? Is it easy/challenging? Why? How could this be improved?*
Scale items	**General comprehension:** *Does the respondent understand the question?*	*In your own words, what does this statement mean/what is this statement asking? Is anything unclear in the wording of this item? Is there anything unclear about this example? How well did you understand this scenario?*
	Retrieval process: *Is the respondent able to retrieve the information from memory correctly from the correct time-period?*	*Can you give me an example of [thought/behaviour] from the last 1-month that led you to a rating of [X]? What type of thought or behaviour is your rating of [X] based on?*
	Decision process: *How does the respondent decide on the answer, for example, do they have a hidden agenda, do they give sufficient mental effort to the task, or do they want to give a socially desirable answer?*	*Why did you decide on a rating of [X] for this item? What does this rating mean to you? Was it easy to decide to choose that rating? Or why are you unsure of which rating to choose? For this item… [e.g. I stop and check it's safe before I click on links] how often does the rating of… [e.g. agree] mean you do this behaviour?*
	Response process: *Does the respondent manage to map their desired response onto the scale without introduction of error? For example, do they understand the scale, and are the scale responses available appropriate?*	*What parts of this example made you think it was [REAL or a SCAM]? Why are you confident/not confident/unsure for this example?*
Face validity		*What do you think this survey is measuring? How well do you think the questions reflect your safety and risk behaviours? Is there anything missing that we need to include?*
General feedback		*What do you think about the length of this scale? What would be the ideal length? What did you like/dislike/find challenging about the scale? Do you have any recommendation for how this scale should be formatted? Would you prefer to do this scale online or on paper? How would you like your score to be shown? (a number, category, safety vs risk score) How would you feel if someone asked you to do this scale? Do you have suggestions on how it should be presented? Any other general feedback?*

Note. *Based on Tourangeau et al.'s (2000) four stage model of survey responding.