

Appendix 1: RESULTS TABLES

Table 1: Distribution of % completeness of reports prepared **pre** implementation of proforma reporting

% completeness	Overall		Lung		Prostate		Cervical		Endometrial		Colon		Rectal	
	No. of reports	% (n=787)	No. of reports	% (n=125)	No. of reports	% (n=156)	No. of reports	% (n=117)	No. of reports	% (n=112)	No. of reports	% (n=142)	No. of reports	% (n=135)
0% ≤ 20%	46	6%	0	0%	8	5%	8	7%	6	5%	8	6%	16	12%
>20% ≤ 40%	278	35%	4	3%	64	41%	26	22%	49	44%	74	52%	61	45%
>40% ≤ 60%	275	35%	32	26%	56	36%	56	48%	46	41%	41	29%	44	33%
>60% ≤ 80%	109	14%	30	24%	16	10%	21	18%	11	10%	19	13%	12	9%
>80% ≤ 100%	79	10%	59	47%	12	8%	6	5%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%
Total	787		125		156		117		112		142		135	
Median	46.2%		76.5%		41.7%		47.1%		44.1%		38.5%		40.0%	
IQR	33.3% to 60.0%		60.0% to 100.0%		30.8% to 58.3%		35.7% to 58.8%		33.3% to 50.0%		30.8% to 46.2%		27.9% to 50.0%	

Table 2: Distribution of % completeness of reports prepared **post** implementation of proforma reporting

Tumour site	Overall		Lung		Prostate		Cervical		Endometrial		Colon		Rectal	
	No. of reports	% (n=496)	No. of reports	% (n=84)	No. of reports	% (n=108)	No. of reports	% (n=46)	No. of reports	% (n=59)	No. of reports	% (n=88)	No. of reports	% (n=111)
0% ≤ 20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
>20% ≤ 40%	12	2%	0	0%	12	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
>40% ≤ 60%	26	5%	2	2%	13	12%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	8	7%
>60% ≤ 80%	97	20%	7	8%	18	17%	15	33%	25	42%	9	10%	23	21%
>80% ≤ 100%	361	73%	75	89%	65	60%	28	61%	34	58%	79	90%	80	72%
Total	496		84		108		46		59		88		111	
Median	92.9%		93.8%		90.0%		88.2%		94.4%		92.3%		92.9%	
IQR	78.6% to 100.0%		87.5% to 100.0%		63.6% to 100.0%		70.6% to 94.1%		72.2% to 100.0%		84.6% to 100.0%		78.6% to 100.0%	

Table 3: Data fields missing from reports prepared pre and post implementation of proforma reporting - Lung

Data fields	Pre proforma				Post proforma			
	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=125)*	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=84)*
Tumour morphology (pre n=123)	82	41	2	33%	76	8	0	10%
Tumour location (pre n=123)	99	24	2	20%	82	2	0	2%
Tumour dimensions (pre n=123, post n=80)	114	9	2	7%	80	0	4	0%
Differentiation from local consolidation (pre n=95, post n=35)	68	27	30	28%	22	10	52	31%
Endobronchial disease (pre n=119)	69	50	6	42%	78	6	0	7%
Tumour locally invades (pre n=121)	97	24	4	20%	68	16	0	19%
Distal lung/lobe atelectasis (pre n=121)	70	51	4	42%	69	14	1	17%
Regional lymph nodes (pre n=125)	117	8	0	6%	84	0	0	0%
Metastatic disease – liver (pre n=124)	118	6	1	5%	83	1	0	1%
Pulmonary nodules	114	11	0	9%	79	5	0	6%
Adrenal metastatic disease (pre n=124)	114	10	1	8%	83	1	0	1%
Bone metastatic disease (pre n=124)	107	17	1	14%	81	3	0	4%
Cerebral metastatic disease (pre n=29, post n=82)	5	24	96	83%	60	12	12	17%
Pleural disease	86	39	0	31%	82	2	0	2%
Pericardial effusion	67	58	0	46%	61	23	0	27%
Other sites of metastases (pre n=118)	101	17	7	14%	66	18	0	21%
Overall stage	81	44	0	35%	82	2	0	2%

*variations in n are stated next to the applicable data field

Table 4: Data fields missing from reports prepared pre and post implementation of proforma reporting – **Lung modified proforma**

Data fields	Post proforma			
	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=10)*
Tumour morphology	4	6	0	60%
Tumour location	10	0	0	0%
Tumour dimensions	10	0	0	0%
Differentiation from local consolidation (n=7)	3	4	3	57%
Endobronchial disease	7	3	0	30%
Tumour locally invades	4	6	0	60%
Distal lung/lobe atelectasis (n=9)	4	5	1	56%
Regional lymph nodes	10	0	0	0%
Metastatic disease – liver	10	0	0	0%
Pulmonary nodules	8	2	0	20%
Adrenal metastatic disease	10	0	0	0%
Bone metastatic disease	8	2	0	20%
Cerebral metastatic disease (n=0)	0	0	10	n/a
Pleural disease	8	2	0	20%
Pericardial effusion	0	10	0	100%
Other sites of metastases	7	3	0	30%
Overall stage	10	0	0	0%

*variations in n are stated next to the applicable data field

Table 5: Data fields missing from reports prepared pre and post implementation of proforma reporting - **Prostate**

Data fields	Pre proforma				Post proforma			
	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=156)*	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=108)*
Prostate gland dimensions/volume	29	127	0	81%	86	22	0	20%
BPH	32	124	0	79%	73	35	0	32%
Lesion location (post n=89)	114	42	0	27%	87	2	19	2%
Organ confined (post n=88)	106	50	0	32%	71	17	20	19%
Extending beyond prostate (post n=88)	101	55	0	35%	61	27	20	31%
Extending into seminal vesicles (post n=89)	96	60	0	38%	85	4	19	4%
Extending into bladder neck (post n=88)	16	140	0	90%	57	31	20	35%
Fixed or into adjacent organs or pelvic wall (post n=88)	15	141	0	90%	57	31	20	35%
Neurovascular bundle (post n=88)	25	131	0	84%	62	26	20	30%
Pelvic nodes	146	10	0	6%	105	3	0	3%
Nodes benign or malignant (pre n=146, post n=18)	97	49	10	34%	13	5	90	28%
Anatomic location if positive (pre n=82, post n=18)	37	45	74	55%	14	4	90	22%
TNM staging	71	85	0	54%	100	8	0	7%

*variations in n are stated next to the applicable data field

Table 6: Data fields missing from reports prepared pre and post implementation of proforma reporting - **Endometrial**

Data fields	Pre proforma				Post proforma			
	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=112)*	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=59)*
Size of uterus	48	64	0	57%	59	0	0	0%
Endometrial thickness (post n=59)	31	81	0	72%	56	2	1	3%
Tumour dimensions (pre n=108, post n=58)	55	53	4	49%	57	0	2	0%
Depth of myometrial invasion (pre n=109, post n=57)	84	25	3	23%	59	0	0	0%
Benign myometrial pathology	28	84	0	75%	35	24	0	41%
Uterine serosal involvement	29	83	0	74%	57	2	0	3%
Cervix	64	48	0	43%	59	0	0	0%
Ovarian involvement	75	37	0	33%	55	4	0	7%
Peritoneal involvement	23	89	0	79%	34	25	0	42%
Vaginal involvement	9	103	0	92%	59	0	0	0%
Bladder involvement	8	104	0	93%	59	0	0	0%
Rectum involvement	4	108	0	96%	59	0	0	0%
Hydronephrosis	29	83	0	74%	33	26	0	44%
Ascites	48	64	0	57%	34	25	0	42%
Pelvic nodes	107	5	0	4%	59	0	0	0%
Para-aortic nodes (pre n=110)	85	25	2	23%	58	1	0	2%
FIGO stage (pre n=111)	82	29	1	26%	58	1	0	2%
iTNM stage (pre n=111)	14	97	1	87%	31	28	0	47%

*variations in n are stated next to the applicable data field

Table 7: Data fields missing from reports prepared pre and post implementation of proforma reporting - **Cervical**

Data fields	Pre proforma				Post proforma			
	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=117)*	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=46)*
Tumour size (pre n=87, post n=31)	70	17	30	20%	29	2	15	6%
Tumour position (pre n=87, post n=31)	44	43	30	49%	29	2	15	6%
Morphology (pre n=87, post n=31)	31	56	30	64%	26	5	15	16%
Depth of invasion (post n=31)	68	49	0	42%	27	4	15	13%
Vaginal involvement	53	64	0	55%	44	2	0	4%
Pelvic side wall involvement	33	84	0	72%	45	1	0	2%
Hydronephrosis	66	51	0	44%	30	16	0	35%
Bladder involvement	43	74	0	63%	46	0	0	0%
Rectum involvement	38	79	0	68%	46	0	0	0%
Ascites	34	83	0	71%	33	13	0	28%
Pelvic nodes	111	6	0	5%	45	1	0	2%
Para-aortic nodes	93	24	0	21%	39	7	0	15%
Endometrium	39	78	0	67%	30	16	0	35%
Myometrium	45	72	0	62%	29	17	0	37%
Right & left adnexae	74	43	0	37%	33	13	0	28%
FIGO stage (pre n=106, post n=44)	63	43	11	41%	34	10	2	23%
iTNM stage (pre n=106)	13	93	11	88%	31	15	0	33%

*variations in n are stated next to the applicable data field

Table 8: Data fields missing from reports prepared pre and post implementation of proforma reporting - **Rectal**

Data fields	Pre proforma				Post proforma			
	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=135)*	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=111)*
Tumour morphology stated (pre n=134, post n= 109)	51	83	1	62%	108	1	2	1%
Height from anal verge (post n=109)	79	56	0	41%	109	0	2	0%
Distal edge to PR sling (post n=109)	31	104	0	77%	102	7	2	6%
Muscularis propria breached (post n=110)	123	12	0	9%	104	6	1	5%
Extramural spread depth given (pre n= 115, post n=109)	34	81	20	70%	86	23	2	21%
T sub stage (pre n=134)	64	70	1	52%	96	15	0	14%
Description low rectal tumours (pre n=64, post n=29)	19	45	71	70%	15	14	82	48%
Extramural invasion (post n=110)	45	90	0	67%	102	8	1	7%
Site of closest CRM (pre n=123)	46	77	12	63%	79	29	3	27%
Tumour distance to mesorectal fascia (pre n=121, post n=109)	30	91	14	75%	65	40	6	38%
Peritoneal deposits (pre n=132)	5	127	3	96%	92	19	0	17%
Pelvic side wall lymph nodes stated and characterised (pre n=134)	46	88	1	66%	107	4	0	4%
MRI overall stage T substage N stage	80	55	0	41%	109	2	0	2%
CRM clear/involved (pre n=133)	56	77	2	58%	98	13	0	12%
EMVI positive/negative	35	100	0	74%	98	13	0	12%

*variations in n are stated next to the applicable data field

Table 9: Data fields missing from reports prepared pre and post implementation of proforma reporting - **Colon**

Data fields	Pre proforma				Post proforma			
	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=142)*	Yes	No	N/a	% missing (n=88)*
Location in colon (pre n=140, post n=86)	124	16	2	11%	85	1	2	1%
Advancing edge tumour (pre n=129, post n=85)	5	124	13	96%	83	2	3	2%
Bowel wall confined or not (pre n=130, post n=86)	59	71	12	55%	83	3	2	3%
Peritoneal infiltration (pre n=130, post n=87)	15	115	12	88%	80	7	1	8%
Tumour extension distance (pre n=129, post n=86)	33	96	13	74%	62	24	2	28%
Tumour diameter/thickness (pre n=131, post n=86)	19	112	11	85%	68	18	2	21%
Peritoneal disease	13	129	0	91%	83	5	0	6%
Retroperitoneal lymphadenopathy	87	55	0	39%	85	3	0	3%
Metastatic disease in liver	134	8	0	6%	87	1	0	1%
Pulmonary metastatic disease (pre n=136)	123	13	6	10%	84	4	0	5%
Overall stage T substage & N stage (pre n=140)	37	103	2	74%	88	0	0	0%
Resectable irresectable	0	142	0	100%	73	15	0	17%
M0/M1	58	84	0	59%	88	0	0	0%

*variations in n are stated next to the applicable data field

Table 10: Proformas implemented

	Number of proformas implemented							Total
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
No. of centres	6	0	2	4	4	2	3	21

Table 11: Workshop Plenary session feedback

	No. of centres					
	% Strongly agree or agree (n=33)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The REASONS behind the CASPAR project were well explained	76%	1	2	5	22	3
The OBJECTIVES of the CASPAR project were made clear	67%	1	2	8	20	2
The overall METHODOLOGY of the project was clearly explained	33%	1	6	15	11	0
The DEMONSTRATION of the proformas was helpful	55%	1	4	10	13	5

Table 12: Workshop Breakout session LUNG

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
The presentation given in this session was very clear	1	3	0	4	0	8
The presentation covered everything I needed to know about completing the proforma	0	5	1	3	0	9
All my questions in relation to proforma use were answered	2	6	1	0	0	9
I feel confident to explain the use of this proforma to colleagues	2	3	2	2	0	9
I can see how I can use this proforma in my clinical practice	1	2	3	3	0	9
I will need more support to help me use this proforma before I can take part in the pilot	0	3	1	3	2	9
There are some parts of the proforma that I will be unable to complete	0	1	4	3	1	9

Table 13: Workshop Breakout session RECTAL & COLON

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
The presentation given in this session was very clear	0	0	0	12	4	16
The presentation covered everything I needed to know about completing the proforma	0	0	5	10	1	16
All my questions in relation to proforma use were answered	0	0	3	10	2	15
I feel confident to explain the use of this proforma to colleagues	0	0	6	8	2	16
I can see how I can use this proforma in my clinical practice	0	1	0	11	4	16
I will need more support to help me use this proforma before I can take part in the pilot	0	8	3	4	1	16
There are some parts of the proforma that I will be unable to complete	1	7	3	4	0	15

Table 14: Workshop Breakout session PROSTATE

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
The presentation given in this session was very clear	0	0	0	3	3	6
The presentation covered everything I needed to know about completing the proforma	0	2	0	2	2	6
All my questions in relation to proforma use were answered	0	1	1	3	1	6
I feel confident to explain the use of this proforma to colleagues	0	1	2	3	0	6
I can see how I can use this proforma in my clinical practice	0	1	0	4	1	6
I will need more support to help me use this proforma before I can take part in the pilot	0	2	2	1	1	6
There are some parts of the proforma that I will be unable to complete	0	2	0	3	1	6

Table 15: Workshop Breakout session CERVIVAL & ENDOMETRIAL

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
The presentation given in this session was very clear	0	0	0	1	2	3
The presentation covered everything I needed to know about completing the proforma	0	1	1	0	1	3
All my questions in relation to proforma use were answered	0	1	1	0	1	3
I feel confident to explain the use of this proforma to colleagues	0	0	1	1	1	3
I can see how I can use this proforma in my clinical practice	0	0	0	2	1	3
I will need more support to help me use this proforma before I can take part in the pilot	0	1	1	1	0	3
There are some parts of the proforma that I will be unable to complete	0	1	2	0	0	3

Table 16: Workshop Afternoon session

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
I know what retrospective reports I need to provide for CASPAR and how I will submit these	0	1	6	23	1	31
I know what approval I need to obtain to release these data to CASPAR	1	0	1	22	8	32
I have been given enough help to allow me to seek this approval	0	0	5	20	6	31
I understand the technical aspects of implementing the proforma(s)	1	5	11	14	1	32
I know what to do to seek help in the technical implementation of the proforma(s)	1	6	11	13	1	32
I know WHO to send the proforma-based data to for the CASPAR pilot	0	0	2	24	5	31
I know WHEN to send data for the CASPAR pilot	0	0	6	20	5	31
All my questions about CASPAR were answered	2	3	14	11	0	30
I Know who to contact if I have any queries about the project once we begin	0	0	4	22	4	30

Table 17: Overall evaluation of Workshop meeting

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
The meeting was a comprehensive introduction to the CASPAR pilot project	0	2	8	23	0	33
I feel equipped to implement the project at my centre	1	4	15	13	0	33
I anticipate major hurdles in implementing the CASPAR pilot in my hospital	0	8	14	11	0	33
I would like to attend another meeting for further support	2	12	13	5	1	33
There needs to be another similar meeting for my colleagues to attend	1	10	16	5	1	33
I no longer feel able to volunteer to participate in the CASPAR pilot	8	19	5	0	0	32
The meeting was well organised	0	0	5	25	2	32
The meeting was too long	3	22	7	0	0	32
The venue was suitable	0	0	6	24	3	33
The location of the meeting was convenient	0	1	10	19	3	33
The pre-meeting arrangements were efficient	0	0	6	24	3	33

Table 18: Tumour MDT responders to feedback questionnaire

Tumour sites	No. of respondents	% (n=32)
Lung	7	22%
Prostate	6	19%
Endometrial	11	34%
Cervical	10	31%
Rectal	10	31%
Colon	9	28%
Not recorded	3	

Not mutually exclusive

Table 19: Position of MDT responders to feedback questionnaire

Position	No. of respondents	% (n=32)
Surgeon	16	50%
Physician	4	13%
Medical oncologist	2	6%
Clinical oncologist	7	22%
Clinical nurse specialist	1	3%
MDT co-ordinator	2	6%
Not recorded	3	
Total	35	

Table 20: Site of MDT

Site of MDT	No. of respondents	% (n=32)
Cancer Centre	18	56%
Cancer Unit	11	34%
Both	3	9%
Not recorded	3	
Total	35	

Table 21: MDT user rating of impact of proforma reporting

Areas	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	Not recorded	Total
Diagnosis	15	9	4	6	1	35
Stage	7	5	9	13	1	35
Tumour resectability	11	5	9	5	5	35
Non-surgical treatments	11	6	9	4	5	35
Overall management plan	8	5	12	6	4	35
Efficiency of MDT working	7	5	10	12	1	35
MDT data collection	5	4	12	12	2	35
Clinical trial entry and/or documentation	10	6	8	9	2	35

Table 22: Radiology MDT Lead rating of proforma - overall

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Not recorded	Total
The proforma report was easy to complete	1	6	8	13	2	2	32
The proforma report was self explanatory	0	4	8	17	2	1	32
The proforma report included all appropriate key items	0	0	4	20	7	1	32
The proforma report included appropriate categories within each item	0	3	5	19	3	2	32
The order of items on the proforma report corresponded to the order in which I review the images	0	5	8	14	3	2	32
The proforma report improved the overall quality of my reports	1	4	9	13	3	2	32
The guidance notes provided with the proforma reports were not necessary	3	16	7	4	0	2	32
I had no technical difficulties in completing the proforma reports	0	9	3	15	3	2	32
I will consider using the proforma for MDT reports in my clinical practice in the future	1	3	10	11	5	2	32

Table 23: Radiology MDT Lead rating of proforma - Lung

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The proforma report was easy to complete	0	0	1	2	0	3
The proforma report was self explanatory	0	1	0	2	0	3
The proforma report included all appropriate key items	0	0	0	3	0	3
The proforma report included appropriate categories within each item	0	0	0	3	0	3
The order of items on the proforma report corresponded to the order in which I review the images	0	1	1	1	0	3
The proforma report improved the overall quality of my reports	0	0	0	2	0	3
The guidance notes provided with the proforma reports were not necessary	0	2	1	0	0	3
I had no technical difficulties in completing the proforma reports	0	0	1	2	0	3
I will consider using the proforma for MDT reports in my clinical practice in the future	0	0	1	2	0	3

Table 24: Radiology MDT Lead rating of proforma - **Prostate**

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The proforma report was easy to complete	1	2	0	2	1	6
The proforma report was self explanatory	0	1	0	4	1	6
The proforma report included all appropriate key items	0	0	0	3	3	6
The proforma report included appropriate categories within each item	0	1	1	2	2	6
The order of items on the proforma report corresponded to the order in which I review the images	0	1	1	4	0	6
The proforma report improved the overall quality of my reports	1	1	1	2	1	6
The guidance notes provided with the proforma reports were not necessary	2	2	1	1	0	6
I had no technical difficulties in completing the proforma reports	0	1	0	4	1	6
I will consider using the proforma for MDT reports in my clinical practice in the future	1	2	1	0	2	6

Table 25: Radiology MDT Lead rating of proforma – Endometrial/cervical

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Not recorded	Total
The proforma report was easy to complete	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
The proforma report was self explanatory	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
The proforma report included all appropriate key items	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
The proforma report included appropriate categories within each item	0	1	0	1	0	1	3
The order of items on the proforma report corresponded to the order in which I review the images	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
The proforma report improved the overall quality of my reports	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
The guidance notes provided with the proforma reports were not necessary	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
I had no technical difficulties in completing the proforma reports	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
I will consider using the proforma for MDT reports in my clinical practice in the future	0	0	0	2	0	1	3

Table 26: Radiology MDT lead rating of proforma – Rectal/colon

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The proforma report was easy to complete	0	1	1	2	0	4
The proforma report was self explanatory	0	1	1	1	1	4
The proforma report included all appropriate key items	0	0	1	2	1	4
The proforma report included appropriate categories within each item	0	0	1	2	1	4
The order of items on the proforma report corresponded to the order in which I review the images	0	1	0	3	0	4
The proforma report improved the overall quality of my reports	0	0	1	2	1	4
The guidance notes provided with the proforma reports were not necessary	0	3	0	1	0	4
I had no technical difficulties in completing the proforma reports	0	2	0	2	0	4
I will consider using the proforma for MDT reports in my clinical practice in the future	0	0	2	1	1	4

Table 27: Radiology MDT Lead rating of proforma – **10 or less reports** completed

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Not recorded	Total
The proforma report was easy to complete	1	4	5	6	0	1	17
The proforma report was self explanatory	0	3	6	8	0	0	17
The proforma report included all appropriate key items	0	0	1	13	3	0	17
The proforma report included appropriate categories within each item	0	1	2	14	0	0	17
The order of items on the proforma report corresponded to the order in which I review the images	0	4	6	6	1	0	17
The proforma report improved the overall quality of my reports	1	2	7	6	1	0	17
The guidance notes provided with the proforma reports were not necessary	1	11	5	0	0	0	17
I had no technical difficulties in completing the proforma reports	0	6	2	8	1	0	17
I will consider using the proforma for MDT reports in my clinical practice in the future	0	1	9	6	1	0	17

Table 28: Radiology MDT Lead rating of proforma – **more than 10 reports** completed

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Not recorded	Total
The proforma report was easy to complete	0	2	2	5	2	0	11
The proforma report was self explanatory	0	1	2	6	2	0	11
The proforma report included all appropriate key items	0	0	2	5	4	0	11
The proforma report included appropriate categories within each item	0	2	2	4	3	0	11
The order of items on the proforma report corresponded to the order in which I review the images	0	0	2	7	2	0	11
The proforma report improved the overall quality of my reports	0	1	2	6	2	0	11
The guidance notes provided with the proforma reports were not necessary	2	5	1	3	0	0	11
I had no technical difficulties in completing the proforma reports	0	3	1	6	1	0	11
I will consider using the proforma for MDT reports in my clinical practice in the future	1	1	1	4	4	0	11

Table 29: Radiologist feedback on number of proforma reports produced during the pilot

No. of reports	No. of respondents	% (n=28)
0	1	4%
1 to 5	9	32%
6 to 10	7	25%
More than 10	11	39%
Not recorded	4	
Total	32	

Table 30: Radiologist feedback on time to complete

Time to complete	No. of respondents	% (n=30)
Much longer	11	37%
A bit longer	10	33%
About the same length of time	6	20%
A bit quicker	3	10%
Much quicker	0	0%
Not recorded	2	
Total	32	

Table 31: Radiologist feedback on time to complete – stratified by number of reports completed

Time to complete	Completed < 10 reports		Completed > 10 reports	
	No. of respondents	% (n=16)	No. of respondents	% (n=11)
Much longer	7	44%	4	36%
A bit longer	6	38%	3	27%
About the same length of time	2	13%	3	27%
A bit quicker	1	6%	1	9%
Much quicker	0	0		
Not recorded	1			
Total	17		11	

Table 32: Radiologist rating of guidance notes - overall

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Not recorded	Total
The guidance notes were clear and concise	0	1	6	24	0	1	32
The guidance notes helped me to complete the proforma report	0	1	10	19	1	1	32
Including the sample images would improve the quality of the guidance notes	0	3	11	14	3	1	32
The length of the guidance notes was appropriate	0	2	12	17	0	1	32
The amount of detail in the guidance notes was appropriate	0	2	10	19	0	1	32

Table 33: Radiologist rating of guidance notes - lung

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The guidance notes were clear and concise	0	0	1	2	0	3
The guidance notes helped me to complete the proforma report	0	0	1	2	0	3
Including the sample images would improve the quality of the guidance notes	0	0	3	0	0	3
The length of the guidance notes was appropriate	0	0	2	1	0	3
The amount of detail in the guidance notes was appropriate	0	0	1	2	0	3

Table 34: Radiologist rating of guidance notes - prostate

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The guidance notes were clear and concise	0	0	0	3	0	3
The guidance notes helped me to complete the proforma report	0	0	1	1	1	3
Including the sample images would improve the quality of the guidance notes	0	0	1	1	1	3
The length of the guidance notes was appropriate	0	0	1	2	0	3
The amount of detail in the guidance notes was appropriate	0	0	1	2	0	3

Table 35: Radiologist rating of guidance notes – endometrial/cervical

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The guidance notes were clear and concise	0	0	1	2	0	3
The guidance notes helped me to complete the proforma report	0	1	2	0	0	3
Including the sample images would improve the quality of the guidance notes	0	0	0	3	0	3
The length of the guidance notes was appropriate	0	2	1	0	0	3
The amount of detail in the guidance notes was appropriate	0	2	1	0	0	3

Table 36: Radiologist rating of guidance notes – rectal/colon

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The guidance notes were clear and concise	0	0	0	1	0	1
The guidance notes helped me to complete the proforma report	0	0	0	1	0	1
Including the sample images would improve the quality of the guidance notes	0	0	0	1	0	1
The length of the guidance notes was appropriate	0	0	0	1	0	1
The amount of detail in the guidance notes was appropriate	0	0	0	1	0	1

Table 37: Radiologist overall evaluation of project

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Overall this exercise was worthwhile to me	0	1	5	20	6	32
I would consider participating in a similar exercise in the future	0	1	5	18	8	32