## 1 Supplemental Table 1. Translated digital evaluation form

Sta	atement	Type of question	Response options
1.	Your profession:	Multiple choice	○ General practitioner
			<ul> <li>General practitioner resident</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Intellectual disability physician</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Intellectual disability physician resident</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Physician assistant</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Nurse specialist</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>No response</li> </ul>
2.	Number of years working	Multiple choice	o 0-3
	experience in profession:		o <b>3-10</b>
			o <b>10-25</b>
			o >25
3.	Number of times	Multiple choice	○ This is my first time
	participated in current		<ul> <li>2-5 times, including this one</li> </ul>
	course:		<ul> <li>&gt; 5 times</li> </ul>
4	You are:	Multiple choice	o Male
ч.			<ul> <li>Female</li> </ul>
5.	Your age:	Multiple choice	• 25-35 years
5.	lour uge.		o 35-45 years
			• 45-55 years
6.			<ul> <li>&gt; &gt; 55 years</li> </ul>
	You are working in the	Multiple choice	Region Middle (Midden-Nederland)
	region:	wattpie choice	<ul> <li>Region North (Groningen)</li> </ul>
	region.		<ul> <li>Region North (Friesland)</li> </ul>
			Region North (Drenthe)     Basian North (Zwella (Eleveland)
			<ul> <li>Region North (Zwolle/Flevoland)</li> <li>Region North (Neord Holland Neord)</li> </ul>
			Region North (Noord-Holland Noord)     Destine North (Neord Helland Midden)
			Region North (Noord-Holland Midden)
			• Region North (Amsterdam/Almere)
			• Region East (Twente)
			• Region East (Gelre-IJssel)
			• Region East (De Gelderse Rivieren)
			• Region West (Rijnland & Midden-Holland)
			• Region West (Haaglanden)
			<ul> <li>Region West (Westland/Schieland/Delfland)</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Region West (Rotterdam)</li> </ul>
			• Region South (Nijmegen e.o.)
			<ul> <li>Region South (Zuidoost Brabant)</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Region South (Limburg)</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Region South (Kring Zuid-Holland Zuid)</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Region South (Zeeland)</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Region South (West-Brabant)</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Region South (Midden-Brabant)</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Region South (Noord-Brabant)</li> </ul>
1.	My overall impression of	Opinion-based or	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
	this course is positive	Prediction-based	○ Disagree
			<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
			o Agree
			<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>
2.	The course is well-	Opinion-based or	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
	organized	Prediction-based	<ul> <li>Disagree</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
			○ Agree

			○ Strongly agree
3.	The quality of the	Opinion-based or	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
	teachers/speakers is good	Prediction-based	○ Disagree
			<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
			○ Agree
			<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>
4.	The content of the course	Opinion-based or	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
	met my expectations	Prediction-based	○ Disagree
	, ,		<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
			o Agree
			<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>
5.	The content of the course is	Opinion-based or	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
	relevant to me	Prediction-based	○ Disagree
			<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
			o Agree
			<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>
6.	The programme is	Opinion-based or	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
-	sufficiently varied to stay	Prediction-based	<ul> <li>Disagree</li> </ul>
	actively involved		<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
			o Agree
			<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>
7.	The goal of this course (to	Opinion-based or	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
	update on new and	Prediction-based	<ul> <li>Disagree</li> </ul>
	practically relevant		<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
	developments) has been		<ul> <li>Agree</li> </ul>
	achieved		<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>
8.	I would recommend this	Opinion-based or	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
0.	course to colleagues	Prediction-based	<ul> <li>Disagree</li> </ul>
	course to concagaes		<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Agree</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>
9.	The location for this course	Opinion-based or	<ul> <li>Strongly dgree</li> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
5.	was good.	Prediction-based	<ul> <li>Disagree</li> </ul>
	was good.	Frediction-based	<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
			• Agree
			<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>
10	The in denth sessions on	Opinion-based or	
10.	The in-depth sessions on Thursday and Friday were	Prediction-based	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> <li>Disagree</li> </ul>
	of additional value because	Prediction-based	<ul> <li>Disagree</li> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> </ul>
	topics could be discussed in detail		• Agree
11	I like this method of	Opinion based only	Strongly agree
11.		Opinion-based only	<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>
	evaluation.		• Disagree
			<ul> <li>Neither agree nor disagree</li> <li>Agree</li> </ul>
			• Agree
10	The most immentant	Open guestier	<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>
12.	The most important	Open question	
	message of this course that		
	I will take home is:		
13.	Tips and wishes for	Open question	
	continuing medical		
	education on this course's		
	topics or other topics:		

Question	Mean weighted scores per question compared with MANOVA					Mean weighted scores per question compared with t-test				
	Opinion-based method		Prediction-based method		p-value	Opinion-based method		Prediction-based method		p-value
	N	Mean score ± SD	N	Mean score ± SD		N	Mean score ± SD	N	Mean score ± SD	
1	160	4.08 ± 0.73	62	3.90 ± 0.50	0.090	160	4.08 ± 0.73	111	3.86 ± 0.50	<0.01
2	160	4.51 ± 0.61	62	4.14 ± 0.44	<0.001	160	4.51 ± 0.61	108	4.06 ± 0.47	<0.001
3	160	3.91 ± 0.75	62	3.77 ± 0.47	0.159	160	3.91 ± 0.75	107	3.73 ± 0.46	0.01
4	160	3.73 ± 0.85	62	3.72 ± 0.46	0.978	160	3.73 ± 0.85	107	3.69 ± 0.51	0.71
5	160	3.74 ± 0.76	62	3.83 ± 0.51	0.372	160	3.74 ± 0.76	107	3.77 ± 0.49	0.66
6	160	3.84 ± 0.78	62	3.77 ± 0.53	0.486	160	3.84 ± 0.78	111	3.76 ± 0.50	0.28
7	160	3.79 ± 0.90	62	3.76 ± 0.52	0.779	160	3.79 ± 0.90	102	3.71 ± 0.50	0.32
8	160	3.96 ± 0.88	62	3.88 ± 0.54	0.485	160	3.96 ± 0.88	107	3.83 ± 0.52	0.12
9	160	4.26 ± 0.73	62	3.99 ± 0.50	0.009	160	4.26 ± 0.73	102	3.96 ± 0.48	<0.001
10	160	3.04 ± 1.11	62	3.14 ± 0.64	0.484	160	3.04 ± 1.11	109	3.17 ± 0.59	0.21

## 7 Supplemental data: Code used for bootstrap analysis

```
8
       # NB Data is organized per likert-scale question.
 9
       # Rows are respondents, columns are id plus likert-scale options.
10
       # In opinion-based files, the chosen likert-scale option is assigned 100, the others zero.
11
       # In prediction-based files the percentages for the different likert-scale options add up to 100.
12
       # example row opinion-based file:
13
       # id q1_1 q1_2 q1_3 q1_4 q1_5
14
       #1 0 0 0 100 0
15
       # example row prediction-based file:
16
       # id q1_1 q1_2 q1_3 q1_4 q1_5
17
       #1 0 20 50 30 0
18
19
       # Load libraries
20
       library(rms)
21
       library(foreign)
22
       library(boot)
23
24
       # Set working directory
25
       setwd("***")
26
27
       # Load data opinion-based method per guestion
28
       data om = read.spss("data q1 om.sav")
29
       # Load data prediction-based method per question
30
       data_pm = read.spss("data_q1_pm.sav")
31
32
       # Make dataframes
33
       df1 <- data.frame(data_pm)
34
       dd=datadist(df1)
35
       options=(datadist='dd')
36
       attach(df1)
37
38
       df2 <- data.frame(data_om)
39
       dd=datadist(df2)
40
       options=(datadist='dd')
41
       attach(df2)
42
43
44
45
       # Bootstrap 95% CI for minimum number of subjects needed for stable outcomes
46
47
       # Make function to determine minimum number of subjects required
48
       numberneeded<- function(data, indices)
49
                {
50
51
                d <- data[indices,]
52
53
                # save overall mean per column
54
                v1means<-colMeans(d[2:6])
55
56
                # determine difference between cumulative mean and overall mean
57
                deviation= vector(length=nrow(d))
58
                for (n in 1:nrow(d))
59
                          {
60
                          deviation[n]<-sum(abs(colSums(d[1:n,2:6])/n-v1means))
61
                          }
62
63
64
                # determine with how many subjects the average deviates less than 10 from overall mean
65
                minnumber <- NULL
66
                for (i in nrow(d):1)
67
68
                          if deviation[i] >= 10)
```

69 { 70 minnumber = i+1 71 break 72 } 73 } 74 return(minnumber) 75 } 76 77 78 # Set random seed 79 set.seed(123456) 80 81 # bootstrapping opinion-method data with R replications 82 results\_om <- boot(data=df2, statistic=numberneeded, R=1000) 83 results\_omperc <- results\_om\$t/nrow(df2) 84 85 # bootstrapping prediction-method data with R replications 86 results pm <- boot(data=df1, statistic=aantalnodig, R=1000) 87 results\_pmperc <- results\_pm\$t/nrow(df1) 88 89 # computing difference opinion and prediction method 90 results\_dif <- results\_om\$t-results\_pm\$t 91 results\_dif\_perc <- results\_omperc - results\_pmperc 92 93 94 95 # view results voor numbers 96 plot(results\_dif) 97 98 # get median of bootstrap draws (to use as point estimate) 99 median(results om\$t) 100 median(results\_pm\$t) 101 median(results\_dif) 102 103 # get 95% confidence interval based on percentile method 104 ci\_dif<-quantile(results\_dif, probs = seq(0.025, 0.975, 0.95), names=FALSE) 105 ci\_dif 106 107 108 109 # view results for percentages 110 plot(results\_dif\_perc) 111 112 # get median of bootstrap draws (to use as point estimate) 113 median(results omperc) 114 median(results\_pmperc) 115 median(results\_dif\_perc) 116 117 # get 95% confidence interval based on percentile method 118 ci\_dif\_perc<-quantile(results\_dif\_perc, probs = seq(0.025, 0.975, 0.95), names=FALSE) 119 ci\_dif\_perc 120