

Supplementary data:

SD 1 Nominal Group Data:

	Propositions
Consensus	<p>The study is acceptable to me (N=7/7)</p> <p>The tools are acceptable to me (N=7/7)</p> <p>After the day of testing, I prefer the combination of tools (N=7/7)</p> <p>Addition of a QR code (N=5/7)</p> <p>Presence of the phrase 'speak to your doctor' (N=5/7)</p> <p>Presence of information on the dates and places of collection (N=5/7)</p> <p>The GP is a good person to speak about blood donation (N=7/7)</p> <p>The Dr's surgery is a good place to promote blood donation (N=6/7)</p> <p>The information must be able to be suggested by the treating doctor during consultation (N=6/7)</p> <p>Information should be available in the waiting room during the promotional campaign (N=7/7)</p> <p>The appearance of the tool is very important for the promotional campaign (N=7/7)</p> <p>The tool would be more visible with more contrast (N=6/7)</p> <p>The appearance of the poster (as is currently proposed) allows information to be added to the tool (N=5/7).</p> <p>The appearance of the badge (as currently proposed) does not allow extra information to be added to the tool (N=5/7)</p>
Ambiguous	<p>The message - Blood donation: what questions do you have? (N=3/7)</p> <p>The doctor can start with a question like 'have you seen the poster/badge/other tool, and would you like to talk about it?' and thus open the discussion if the patient wishes (N=4/7)</p> <p>It is the patient themselves who should start the discussion (N=4/7)</p> <p>Speaking about blood donation could make the patient who does</p>

	not wish to donate feel guilty (N=4/7) (N=3/7) I prefer the matt badge (N=4/7)
Rejected	Add a 'shocking' image(N=0/7) It is the doctor who should broach the subject of blood donation during the consultation (N=1/7)

SD 2 : Comparison of sociodemographic characteristics of the study population with the French GP population

Variable	Sample n (%[IC95])	France n (%[IC95])	p*
Sex	217 (0)	63859 (0)	$p < 0.0001$
Male	93 (42.9 [36.2 - 49.7])	37069 (58.0 [57.7 - 58.4])	
Female	124 (57.1 [50.3 - 63.8])	26790 (42.0 [41.6 - 42.3])	
Age (yrs)	217 (0)	63859 (0)	$p < 0.0001$
25-34	52 (24.0 [18.4 - 30.2])	7923 (12.4 [12.2 - 12.7])	
35-44	78 (35.9 [29.6 - 42.7])	11220 (17.6 [17.3 - 17.9])	
45-54	37 (17.1 [12.3 - 22.7])	11755 (18.4 [18.1 - 18.7])	
55-64	42 (19.4 [14.3 - 25.2])	21805 (34.1 [33.8 - 34.5])	
>65	8 (3.7 [1.6 - 7.1])	11156 (17.5 [17.2 - 17.8])	

*Comparison between our sample and French GP characteristics (RPPS 2020) were conducted with one sample proportion test.

SD 3 : Sociodemographic characteristics of general practitioners (onlinesurvey)

	N= 217, (%)
Sex	

Male	93 (42.9)
Female	124 (57.1)
Age (yrs), mean \pm SD	43.9 \pm 11.0
Age (yrs)	
25-34	52 (24.0)
35-44	78 (35.9)
45-54	37 (17.0)
55-64	42 (19.4)
65 and over	8 (3.7)
Practice Area	
35-Ille-et-Vilaine	155 (71.4)
56-Morbihan	27 (12.4)
22-Côtes d'Armor	26 (12.0)
29-Finistère	9 (4.2)
Practice location	
Rural zone	46 (21.2)
Semi-rural zone	104 (47.9)
Urban zone	67 (30.9)
Practitioner status	
Substitute	7 (3.2)
Substitute MD	7 (3.2)
Collaborator	13 (6.0)
Associate	159 (73.3)
Single practitioner practice	20 (9.2)
Employee	1 (0.5)
Mixed employee-private practice	10 (4.6)
	N=203
Stated practice patient numbers, mean	1064 (681)

(standard deviation)

Years of practice, mean (standard deviation) 12.9 (11.9)

Supervisor of medical students, n (%)

Yes 124 (61.1)

No 79 (38.9)

SD4. Interview guide for GP

Characteristics of the doctor interviewed :

Sex: M - F

Age: M - F

Place of practice: rural - semi-rural - urban

Length of time in practice/partnership :

Numerical estimate of his/her patient base :

Estimated percentage of known donors in the patient base, if possible:

Acceptability of the study :

1°) How do you perceive the approach of the study?

2°) About the practical evaluation of the tools, did you find them useful? If so, which ones? If so, why? Has the course of your consultation been influenced by the tool?

Which one is the most practical for GPs in your opinion?

Feasibility of the study :

Would you use a tool a whole day again? Longer? If yes which one(s)?

Do you find using a tool like these too time consuming?

Does the recurrent use of the tool in consultation seem compatible with your professional practice?

Would an organised annual campaign make it easier for you to use the tool again?

Efficiency of the study :

How do you rate the effectiveness of each tool?

Did the tools provoke discussion with the patient? Did the patients ask questions? What were the patients' reactions? Rather favourable or unfavourable?

Which of the tools, in your opinion, has/have elicited the most reactions? positive reactions? negative reactions?

Which one caused the most requests for information? Did you hand out brochures/flyers? Did you find them useful information materials?

Did you notice a moment during the consultation that was more conducive to discussion with the patient about the tool? If so, which one?

Which tool do you think would have the best impact on patients? Do you have any suggestions for improving the tool?

SD5. Interview guide for patients.

Did you notice anything new during the consultation (badge/posters)? In the waiting room (poster)?

YES	NO
<p>What is it about? What did you learn from it? In your opinion, what is the purpose of this tool? What was your feeling/reaction when you saw the tool?</p> <p>What do you think of the tool? In terms of visual (shape, colour, support, message, clarity, attractiveness)? In terms of impact (engaging, intrusive, effective)?</p> <p>Do you think its use by your GP is appropriate?</p> <p>Have you asked your GP any questions about it? If yes, which ones? If not, why not?</p> <p>Have you consulted the internet link (for waiting room display) / the brochure?</p> <p>(For the brochure) What did you do with the brochure? What did you do with the brochure? Did you note or remember any information? How do you feel about this brochure compared to others? Did you see the associated poster? Did you make the connection and why?</p> <p>Did the presence of the tool help you to discuss this topic with your GP?</p> <p>Had you ever discussed blood donation</p>	<p>If I show it to you, what do you think? In terms of visual (shape, colour, message, clarity, attractiveness)? In terms of impact (engaging, intrusive, effective)?</p> <p>Why do you think you have not seen this tool?</p> <p>What do you think was the purpose of this tool?</p> <p>Do you think that its use by your GP is appropriate?</p> <p>Do you agree or disagree with discussing blood donation in general practice?</p> <p>Have you ever discussed blood donation with your GP before?</p>

with your GP before?

Do you agree or disagree that blood donation should be discussed in a GP consultation?

If I show you 2 (or 3) other tools, which of the three (or 4) do you think would be the most suitable to promote blood donation? Why or why not?

Would you have preferred a tool that gave the information directly? If yes, why?

Would you have preferred your GP to present blood donation to you systematically during the consultation (as he could have talked about vaccination or organ donation)?

Do you have any suggestions for improving the tool that will be used?

What do you think about blood donation? Do you think you can give blood?