**Appendix 1** Example of an audit trail: Main categories (column 5) derived from the thematic content analysis, partly illustrated for the main categories 'conference design' and 'skepticism'.

Text fragment	Open coding	Axial coding Sub-categories Main categories	]
<ul> <li>"as soon as you invite a collaborator, you are on the same team" [RL]</li> <li>"I felt equal to all others and I was stimulated to participate" [RH]</li> <li>"as part of the team I was considered an equal coresearcher" [PG]</li> <li>"I don't remember feeling us and them" [PM]</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Co-researcher</li><li>Equality</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Participation ladder: partnership</li> <li>Co-creation</li> <li>Equality</li> <li>Multistakeholder approach</li> <li>Spirit of OMERACT</li> <li>Full &amp; equal participation</li> <li>Interactive breakouts</li> <li>Strong LEADERSHIP</li> <li>SELECTION PROCEDURE</li> <li>CONFERENCE DESIGN</li> <li>Multistakeholder approach</li> <li>SELECTION PROCEDURE</li> <li>CONFERENCE DESIGN</li> <li>MODERATION STYLE</li> <li>PEER SUPPORT</li> </ul>	FACILITATORS
<ul> <li>"New stakeholders often don't have knowledge about clinimetry" [RE]</li> <li>Clinicians who do not accept patients' influence, are difficult to change [PI]</li> <li>"there is still an undercurrent that questions the issue of the added value of patient input" [PN]</li> </ul>	• (low) expectations of patients' contribution	<ul> <li>Resistance to change</li> <li>Perspective on potential contributions of patients</li> <li>Resistance to tokenism</li> <li>Doubts         about added value</li> <li>Imperceptibility of contributions</li> <li>Lack of continuity</li> </ul> INTENSITY OF THE PROGRAM  SKEPTICISM  COMPOSITION PATIENT GROUP	BARRIERS