Additional file 1: Completed COREQ checklist

For the paper Lalova-Spinks et al., *"What patients value in data reuse for oncology research: a multi-stakeholder qualitative study to inform the European Health Data Space implementation in Belgium and beyond",* Archives of Public Health (2026), doi: 10.1186/s13690-026-01884-5

No	Item	Guiding questions	Description
		Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity	
		Personal characteristics	
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	TLS conducted all interviews, IVZ led two focus groups (in Dutch) and co-led one interview, PC led one focus group (French). In addition, LB, WD, and BC participated as observers in at least one interview, and WD and BC – in one focus group. FH, SL and BT were note-takers in one focus group each. TLS joined one focus group as observer.
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	TLS, FH, BT, and MS hold a PhD. PC holds a masters' degree and was in the final year of her PhD during the conduct of this study. SL holds a masters' degree. IVZ, LB, BC, and WD are patient-researchers in this project, and IVZ holds a PhD.
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	TLS, FH, and BT are postdoctoral researchers. SL is a researcher. PC is a PhD researcher. MS is an associate professor. IVZ, LB, BC, and WD are patient-researchers in this project, and IVZ is a postdoctoral researcher (independent of the Symphony of Us project).

4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	TLS, IVZ, FH, SL, PC, LB, and MS are female. BT, BC, and WD are male.
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	TLS, PC, and MS – law. TLS also holds an interdisciplinary PhD in Pharmaceutical Sciences and Laws. BT - social sciences. SL – nursing sciences. FH – biomedical sciences. IVZ, LB, BC, and WD are patient-researchers in this project, and IVZ has an academic background. TLS, FH, SL, BT, IVZ, PC, MS have previous experience in qualitative research methodologies. All patient-researchers received training in research methodologies at the start of their collaboration with the Symphony of Us team.
Relationship with participants			
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	No prior relationship was established between the researchers and participants.
7.	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	All participants had to sign an informed consent form, in which information about the team, project, and the aims of the study was included. At the start of each interview/focus group, the researchers presented themselves and reminded about the goals of the research.
8.	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic.	All researchers and patient-researchers had interest in this research.
<u>Domain 2: Study design</u> ***Theoretical framework***			
9.	Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	Analysis was based on the framework method.
Participant selection			

10.	Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Interviewees were recruited via a combination of purposive and snowball sampling. Focus group participants were recruited through a non-probability, self-selection sampling approach.
11.	Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Interviewees were approached via email. Focus group participants could register their willingness to participate via an online form, and were subsequently contacted via email. The call to participate in focus groups was broadly distributed via the professional networks of the research team, the website of the Symphony of Us project, as well as on social media. Interested patients could register to participate via an online form.
12.	Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	In total, there were 49 participants, of which 39 were interviewees (experts with diverse backgrounds), and 10 were patients and/or patient representatives.
13.	Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Sixty-nine professionals were invited to participate as interviewees, of which 30 refused. The majority did not specify reasons to not participate, and among those who did, the cause was lack of time. Twenty-six individuals registered for the focus groups, of which two were refused participation by the team as they were not patients or patient representatives. Fourteen didn't join the focus groups, with the majority not providing a reason. Among those who did, the reasons were personal.
		Setting	
14.	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	The majority of the interviews were conducted online via Microsoft Teams, with two taking place at the workplaces of the experts. One focus group

			was conducted at the office of the Symphony of Us team, and two were conducted online via Microsoft Teams.
15.	Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	Only the researchers and the patient-researchers were present.
16.	Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	The information is included in Tables 1-2, and Figures 1-2 in the manuscript.
Data collection			
17.	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	An interview guide, a focus group questionnaire, and a demographic survey (for the patients and patient representatives) were used. All such questionnaires were developed by TLS. They were further discussed with academics with different disciplinary backgrounds (SL, FH, MS, PC) and patient-researchers (IVZ, LB, BC, WD), and were revised based on their feedback.
18.	Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	No repeat interviews, nor focus groups were required.
19.	Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Interviews and focus groups were audio-recorded.
20.	Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes.
21.	Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	Interviews: 60 min on average, with the shortest being 30 min and the longest being 120 min. Focus groups: between 120-180 min.
22.	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Data saturation was reached.
23.	Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	Transcripts were not returned to participants for comments or corrections. Participants could request a copy of their transcript, if the wished so.
<u>Domain 3: Analysis and findings</u> ***Data analysis***			
24.	Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	The coding of all transcripts was performed by TLS. In the pilot coding (3 transcripts) all

			academic researchers (TLS, PC, MS, SL, FH, BT) and one of the patient-researchers (IVZ) were involved.
25.	Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	The coding tree is included in Additional file 7.
26.	Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Data was analyzed using a combination of inductive and deductive approaches. Initially, transcripts were coded openly in a data-driven manner, allowing themes and patterns to emerge freely from the material. These codes were then grouped into broader categories, which facilitated the identification of recurring concepts across the dataset. In a subsequent step, the emergent categories were compared with the pre-defined categories from the topics' guides, ensuring that both novel insights and anticipated themes were captured and systematically integrated.
27.	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	NVivo© 15
28.	Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	No.
		Reporting	
29.	Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Quotations have been presented throughout the paper, with participant codes assigned to all participants and used against quotations.
30.	Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	We aimed to report the study findings in a clear, consistent manner in order to accurately reflect the data that have been collected.
31.	Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes, major themes are clearly presented in the article.
32.	Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes, minor themes are clearly presented in the article.