

Supplemental Material S2. Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES; Eysenbach, 2004).

Checklist Item	Explanation	Response
Design		
Survey design	Describe the target population. Is the sample a convenience sample? (In “open” surveys, this is most likely.)	The target population was clinically practicing speech-language pathologists with some experience assessing and treating individuals with aphasia. The sample was a convenience sample.
IRB & Informed Consent		
IRB approval	Was the study approved by an IRB?	This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Iowa.
Informed consent	Describe the informed consent process. What were participants told (e.g., the length of time of the survey, which data were stored, where and for how long, who the investigator was, and the purpose of the study)?	<p>Prior to beginning survey, a consent document explained the study, specifying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the investigator as Jean K. Gordon; • the purpose of the study, as: “to gain information about the factors that contribute to listeners’ perceptions of fluency in people with aphasia. This information will be used to develop a novel and freely available tool for assessing fluency that is both reliable and accounts for the multiple dimensions of fluency”; • the length of the study was specified as 1 and ½ hours for the original version (45 minutes to 1 hour for the revised version); • that only de-identified data would be transmitted to the investigators. • The length of time the data would be retained was not specified.
Data protection	If any personal information was collected or stored, describe what mechanisms were used to protect unauthorized access.	Respondents answered questions about their age, level of education, work setting(s), years of experience as an SLP, proportion of caseload consisting of PwA, and number of PwA interacted with professionally. Participants were also asked for their email address for gift card compensation, but these responses were not made available to the research team to preserve respondents’ anonymity. Programming and dissemination of survey, collation of responses, and disbursement of remuneration to respondents were managed by the University of Iowa Social Science Research Center (ISRC; https://ppc.uiowa.edu/isrc).

Development and Testing		
Development and testing	How the survey was developed, including whether its usability and technical functionality were tested before fielding the questionnaire.	The survey was programmed by the ISRC using Qualtrics (https://www.qualtrics.com/). The functionality of the survey was tested by the ISRC staff prior to its dissemination.
Recruitment		
Open versus closed survey	An “open survey” is a survey open for each visitor of a site, while a closed survey is only open to a sample which the investigator knows (password-protected survey).	The survey was open to any potential participants who received an invitation sent from various mailing lists (described below) or directly from the authors.
Contact mode	Indicate whether or not the initial contact with potential participants was made on the internet. (Investigators may also send out questionnaires by mail and allow for web-based data entry.)	The link was distributed by both email and postal mail.
Advertising the survey	<p>How/where was the survey announced or advertised? Some examples are offline media (newspapers), or online (mailing lists – If yes, which ones?) or banner ads (Where were these banner ads posted and what did they look like?).</p> <p>It is important to know the wording of the announcement as it will heavily influence who chooses to participate. Ideally the survey announcement should be published as an appendix.</p>	<p>A link to the online survey was disseminated through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the list-serve of ASHA’s Special Interest Group 2 (Neurogenic Disorders) • the Google Group of AphasiaBank • word of mouth (e.g., at conferences) • emailing larger SLP departments in rehabilitation facilities) • postal mail to a list of 3714 addresses associated with Standard Industrial Codes of “speech specialists”, “speech therapists”, or “speech pathologists” (list generated by Dynata, a marketing research company). • The invitation was as follows: “Speech-language pathologists and researchers who work with and/or study individuals with aphasia are invited to participate in a research study about the measurement of fluency in aphasia. The goal of the study is to improve the reliability of techniques for diagnosing and describing problems with fluency in aphasia. The study will be administered as an online survey and will take approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour in total, at your convenience. Please note that speech samples within the web survey may not be accessible using the Microsoft Edge web browser. If you experience difficulties playing the files, it is recommended that you try a different browser (e.g., Chrome or Firefox). Compensation will be provided in the form of a voucher for Amazon.com. If you are interested in participating, please follow this link: https://uiowa.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6inrAnCKHpJ0fxH.”

Survey Administration		
Web/E-mail	State the type of e-survey (e.g., posted on a website, sent out through e-mail). For e-mail surveys, were responses entered manually into a database, or was there an automatic method for capturing responses?	Responses were collected via Qualtrics.
Context	Describe the website (for mailing list/newsgroup) in which the survey was posted. Discuss to what degree the content of the website could pre-select the sample or influence the results.	The ASHA SIG 2 list-serve includes members of the Special Interest Group interested in neurogenic communication disorders. The AphasiaBank list-serve includes individuals interested in aphasia research. Membership on both lists is voluntary. Members of either group may have more interest in aphasia therapy and research than SLPs who are not members.
Mandatory/voluntary	Was it a mandatory survey to be filled in by every visitor who wanted to enter the website, or was it a voluntary survey?	Participation was voluntary.
Incentives	Were any incentives offered (e.g., monetary, prizes, or non-monetary incentives such as an offer to provide the survey results)?	Survey respondents were paid \$25 in the form of a gift certificate if they completed the survey and were entered into a drawing for a \$100 gift certificate.
Time/Date	In what timeframe were the data collected?	Responses were collected from September 2018 to April 2020.
Randomization	To prevent biases, items can be randomized or alternated.	Participants were randomly assigned to rate 10 or 20 audio samples from a set of 185 people with aphasia. Fluency rating scales were presented in the same order for each sample (FLUENCY, SPEECH RATE, PAUSING, EFFORT, MELODY, PHRASE LENGTH, GRAMMATICALITY, LEXICAL RETREIVAL), but participants had access to all scales simultaneously and could respond to each scale in any order they chose.
Adaptive questioning	Adaptive questioning (e.g., items are conditionally displayed based on responses to other items) can be used to reduce the number and complexity of the questions.	Adaptive questioning was used in one question. Participants were asked to select methods of fluency assessment that they used. Following this, they were asked to rank the importance of the selected items.
Number of Items	What was the number of questionnaire items per page? The number of items is an important factor for the completion rate.	Participants first completed 7 demographic questions. This was followed by a practice sample and 10 or 20 randomly selected samples in which participants completed 8 rating scales each. Each set of ratings for a given sample were on the same page. At the end, participants completed an additional 11 questions about their current practices for measuring fluency in the clinic.

Number of screens (pages)	Over how many pages was the questionnaire distributed? The number of items is an important factor for the completion rate.	The survey was distributed over about 15 or 25 pages, depending on the survey version participants completed (The first version of the survey sent out had 20 audio samples but due to low response rate, a second version with 10 samples was used).
Completeness check	Were consistency or completeness checks conducted before the questionnaire was submitted, and if "yes", how (usually JavaScript)? An alternative is to check for completeness after the questionnaire has been submitted (and highlight mandatory items. All items should provide a non-response option such as "not applicable" or "rather not say", and selection of one response option should be enforced.	The survey required responses to all items before the participant was able to proceed. However, for all demographic questions, participants were able to select an option to decline to provide the information or provide an alternate text response. For all rating scales, participants were able to respond, "unable to rate."
Review step	Were respondents able to review and change their answers (e.g., through a Back button or a Review step which displays a summary of the responses and asks the respondents if they are correct)?	Participants could play each audio-sample as many times as they liked, but they were unable to review or change their answers after advancing to the next survey page.
Response Rates		
Unique site visitors	If you provide view rates or participation rates, you need to define how you determined a unique visitor. There are different techniques available, based on IP addresses or cookies or both.	Unique participants were identified based on IP addresses.
IP check	Mention the period of time for which no two entries from the same IP address were allowed (e.g., 24 hours). Were duplicate entries avoided by preventing users with the same IP address access to the survey twice; or were duplicate database entries having the same IP address within a given period of time eliminated before analysis? If the latter, which entries were kept for analysis (e.g., the first entry or the most recent)?	Participants were able to stop and resume the survey if they logged on from the same IP address. Users from the same IP address were prevented from retaking the survey.
View rate	Unique visitors to the first page of the survey, divided by unique site visitors (not page views!). It is not unusual to have view rates of less than 0.1 % if the survey is voluntary.	<i>Not available</i>

Recruitment rate	Unique number of people who filled in the first survey page (or agreed to participate, for example by checking a checkbox), divided by visitors who visit the first page of the survey (or the informed consents page, if present).	<i>Not available</i>
Participation rate	Unique number of people who provided data, divided by number who agreed to participate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 249 individuals accessed the survey and agreed to participate. • Of these, 114 individuals completed at least some of the ratings, yielding an actual participation rate of $114/249 = 46\%$.
Completion rate	Users who completed the last questionnaire page, divided by users who agreed to participate. This is only relevant if there is a separate “informed consent” page or if the survey goes over several pages. This is a measure of attrition, not of how completely questionnaires were filled in.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 92 people completed the survey (28 completed the 20-sample version, and 64 completed the 10-sample version). • 22 individuals started but did not complete the survey. • Of those who agreed to participate, the completion rate was $92/249 = 37\%$. • Two of the 92 responses were discarded (one who was not a speech-language pathologist and one who had never interacted with a PwA).
Incomplete surveys	Were only completed questionnaires analyzed? Were questionnaires which terminated early also analyzed?	Responses from partial surveys were analyzed.
Survey timestamps	Some investigators may measure the time people needed to fill in a questionnaire and exclude questionnaires that were submitted too soon. Specify the timeframe that was used as a cut-off point and describe how this point was determined.	There was no cut-off timepoint for excluding responses.
Statistical correction	Indicate whether any methods such as weighting of items or propensity scores have been used to adjust for the non-representative sample; if so, please describe the methods.	No statistical correction was applied to responses. The sample was considered to be representative.

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