

Table 2. Case scenarios and the responses from clinician and researcher experts for Rounds 1 and 2

Case scenarios				Number (%) who agreed the scenario described a meaningful difference	
Name ≠	Baseline score	Description of treatment effects	Number of points difference	Round 1 (n=61)	Round 2 (n=51)
Harry	SAPS-H 7 UM-PDHQ 8	↓ frequency of some visual hallucinations, but emergence of others	SAPS-H 0 UM-PDHQ 0	No 51 (83.6) Yes 1 (1.6) Not sure 9 (14.8)	NA
Sheila:	SAPS-H 8 UM-PDHQ 11	↓ frequency of visual hallucinations, no change in distress or impact.	SAPS-H 1 UM-PDHQ 1	No 21 (34.4) Yes 34 (55.7) Not sure 6 (9.8)	No 36 (70.6) Yes 15 (29.4)
Aaron:	SAPS-H 14 UM-PDHQ 13	↓ frequency, distress and impact of visual and auditory hallucinations.	SAPS-H 4 UM-PDHQ 3	No 3 (4.9) Yes 56 (91.8) Not sure 2 (3.3)	NA
Juan:	SAPS-H 10 UM-PDHQ 12	↓ distress and impact of visual hallucinations, no change in frequency.	SAPS-H 3 UM-PDHQ 2	No 2 (3.3) Yes 55 (90.2) Not sure 4 (6.6)	NA
†Evangeline:	SAPS-H 10 UM-PDHQ 13	Husband reports ↓ distress and impact, subjectively she reports no difference.	SAPS-H 2 UM-PDHQ 2	No 13 (21.3) Yes 36 (59.0) Not sure 12 (19.7)	No 3 (5.9) Yes 48 (94.0)
†Abdul:	SAPS-H 10 UM-PDHQ 11	↓ frequency of highly distressing visual hallucinations, no difference in distress or impact.	SAPS-H 1 UM-PDHQ 1	No 27 (44.3) Yes 27 (44.3) Not sure 7 (11.5)	No 41 (80.4) Yes 10 (19.6)
Jackson:	SAPS-H 15 UM-PDHQ 12	Wife reports ↓ impact of visual hallucinations.	SAPS-H 1 UM-PDHQ 1	No 22 (36%) Yes 25 (41%) Not sure 14 (23%)	No 35 (68.6) Yes 16 (31.4)
Mei:	SAPS-H 14 UM-PDHQ 12	↓ frequency and impact of hallucinations, but she still believes her family perceive her as 'crazy'	SAPS-H 3 UM-PDHQ 2	No 24 (39.3) Yes 29 (47.4) Not sure 8 (13.1)	No 8 (15.7) Yes 43 (84.3)

≠All names given are not the real names of patients.

† Scenario was subsequently presented to focus group participants with lived experience, who reached >75% consensus.