

Supplementary table 1. Characteristics of participating GPs by case-finding mechanisms

	Prospective case-finding n (%)	Retrospective case-finding n (%)	Comparisons by prospective vs. retrospective case-finding (P-value)*
Total number by case-finding mechanism	41	22	
Gender			
Male	20 (48.8)	15 (68.2)	0.19
Female	20 (48.8)	7 (31.8)	
Missing	1 (2.4)	0 (0)	
Age group (years)			
< 30	2 (4.9)	0 (0)	0.20
30 - 39	8 (19.5)	3 (13.6)	
40 - 49	11 (26.8)	2 (9.1)	
50 - 59	12 (29.3)	12 (54.6)	
60 - 69	7 (17.1)	3 (13.6)	
70 +	1 (2.4)	2 (9.1)	
Country of Birth			
Australia	20 (48.8)	14 (63.6)	0.42
Outside Australia	20 (48.8)	8 (36.4)	
Missing	1 (2.4)	0 (0)	
Country of primary medical training			
Australia	27 (65.9)	20 (90.9)	0.06
Outside Australia	13 (31.7)	2 (9.1)	
Missing	1 (2.4)	0 (0)	
Locality of practice			
City (inner and outer suburbs)	13 (31.7)	17 (77.3)	< 0.001
Regional (including country towns)	7 (17.1)	5 (22.7)	
Rural and remote	21 (51.2)	0 (0)	
GP Registrar			
Yes	3 (7.3)	3 (13.6)	0.66
No	34 (82.9)	19 (86.4)	
Missing	4 (9.8)	0 (0)	
Years of GP work			
Mean (standard deviation)	20 (12)	30 (13)	0.003

Usual work hours/week			
Mean (standard deviation)	42 (13)	39 (11)	0.37
Received formal palliative care training			
Yes	12 (29.3)	7 (31.8)	1.00
No	28 (68.3)	15 (68.2)	
Missing	1 (2.4)	0 (0)	
Use of symptom assessment tool			
Yes	5 (12.2)	2 (9.1)	1.00
No	36 (87.8)	19 (96.4)	
Missing	0 (0)	1 (4.5)	
Right to admit patients to public hospital			
Yes	13 (31.7)	0 (0)	0.002
No	26 (63.4)	20 (90.9)	
Missing	2 (4.9)	2 (9.1)	
Right to admit patients to private hospital			
Yes	7 (17.1)	1 (4.5)	0.24
No	31 (75.6)	19 (86.4)	
Missing	3 (7.3)	2 (9.1)	
Right to admit patients to hospice			
Yes	12 (29.3)	5 (68.2)	0.76
No	25 (61.0)	15 (22.7)	
Missing	4 (9.7)	2 (9.1)	

NOTE: Bold indicates significant value $P < 0.05$.

* Comparisons between prospective and retrospective case-finding mechanisms were conducted using Fisher-exact test and Independent t-test (for years of work and work hours/week)

Supplementary table 2. Characteristics of reported patients with expected death by case-finding mechanisms

	Prospective case-finding n (%)	Retrospective case-finding n (%)	Comparisons by prospective vs. retrospective case-finding (P-value) ^a
Number of expected deaths	115	105	0.19
Gender			
Male	49 (42.6)	49 (46.7)	0.35
Female	66 (57.4)	51 (48.6)	
Missing	0 (0)	5 (4.7)	
Age at Death			
Median (interquartile range)	80 (70 - 89)	84 (72 - 91)	0.14
Principal Diagnosis			
Cancer	49 (42.6)	31 (29.5)	0.08
Cardiovascular disease	16 (13.9)	21 (20.0)	
Respiratory disease	12 (10.4)	13 (12.4)	
Neurological disease	10 (8.7)	19 (18.1)	
Other	27 (23.5)	19 (18.1)	
Missing	1 (0.9)	2 (1.9)	
Place of death			
Hospital apart from palliative care	24 (20.9)	17 (16.2)	0.65
Private residence	22 (19.1)	24 (22.8)	
Residential aged care facility	42 (36.5)	35 (33.3)	
Inpatient palliative care	26 (22.6)	27 (25.7)	
Other	0 (0)	1 (1.0)	
Missing	1 (0.9)	1 (1.0)	

^a Comparisons between prospective and retrospective case-finding mechanisms were conducted using Chi-square test and Mann–Whitney U test (for Age at death only)

Supplementary table 3. GPs' involvement in care and continuity of care by case-finding mechanisms

	Prospective case-finding n (%)	Retrospective case-finding n (%)	Comparisons by prospective vs. retrospective case-finding (P-value) ^a
Provision of services involving the GP	N = 115	N = 105	
Home visit	97 (84.4)	87 (82.9)	0.77
Consultation by phone	92 (80.0)	79 (75.2)	0.40
Family meeting	83 (72.3)	72 (68.6)	0.60
Care plans/team-care arrangements	82 (71.3)	47 (44.8)	< 0.001
Counselling	62 (53.9)	39 (37.1)	0.01
Hospital consultation	64 (55.7)	12 (11.4)	< 0.001
Case conference	53 (46.1)	20 (19.1)	< 0.001
Telehealth/videoconference	39 (33.9)	3 (2.9)	< 0.001
GPs' perceived role	N = 114	N = 74	
Primary care coordinator	61 (53.5)	39 (52.7)	0.73
Part of the team	47 (41.2)	29 (39.2)	
Referral	6 (5.3)	6 (8.1)	
Number of patients for whom GPs received feedback on care from external services	N = 115	N = 73	
Yes	61 (53.0)	53 (72.6)	0.007
No	22 (19.1)	13 (17.8)	
Not applicable	32 (27.8)	7 (9.6)	
If yes, from which services? (multiple answers)^b			
Hospital apart from palliative care unit	16 (23.5)	12 (17.1)	0.89
Inpatient palliative care	16 (23.5)	18 (25.7)	
Community palliative care service	14 (20.6)	14 (20.0)	
Community nursing services	4 (5.9)	6 (8.6)	
Residential aged care facility	18 (26.5)	20 (28.6)	
Total responses	68	70	
Level of satisfaction with feedback	Median (interquartile range)^b	Median (interquartile range)^b	
Hospital apart from palliative care unit	4 (3.5 - 5)	4 (4 - 5)	0.52
Inpatient palliative care	5 (4 - 5)	5 (4 - 5)	0.56
Community palliative care service	5 (5 - 5)	5 (4 - 5)	0.01

Community nursing services	4.5 (3.5 - 5)	4 (4 - 5)	0.79
Residential aged care facility	5 (5 - 5)	5 (4 - 5)	0.004
Total responses	60	65	

NOTE: Bold indicates significant value $P < 0.05$.

^a Comparisons between prospective and retrospective case-finding mechanisms were conducted using Fisher-exact test and Mann–Whitney U test (for Level of satisfaction with feedback only)

^b This is a multiple-answer question. For each patient, GPs could indicate that they received feedback for the last week of care from more than one external service. Percentages were calculated based on the total responses

Supplementary table 4. Aspects of end-of-life care identified as difficult or challenging* compared by case-finding mechanisms

	Prospective case-finding n (%)	Retrospective case-finding n (%)	Comparisons by prospective vs. retrospective case-finding (P-value) ^a
Whether care could have been improved (n = 208)	N = 115	N = 105	
Yes	42 (36.5)	30 (28.6)	0.23
No	73 (63.5)	74 (70.5)	
Missing	0 (0)	1 (0.9)	
Different aspects of end-of-life care ^b			
Physical treatment and care of the patient	45 (18.9)	43 (29.5)	0.008
Psychological, social and existential treatment and care of the patient	47 (19.7)	29 (19.9)	
Support of family and informal caregivers	38 (16.0)	12 (8.2)	
Communication, planning and decision-making with the patient	28 (11.8)	17 (11.6)	
Communication, planning and decision-making with the family and other informal caregivers	26 (10.9)	14 (9.6)	
Support of the patient to stay at home/be cared at home	26 (10.9)	12 (8.2)	
Communication/information exchange with other services	20 (8.4)	5 (3.4)	
Coordination with other services and continuity of care	8 (3.4)	14 (9.6)	
Total responses	238	146	

NOTE: Bold indicates significant value $P < 0.05$.

^a Comparisons between prospective and retrospective case-finding mechanisms were conducted using Fisher-exact test

^b GPs were requested to select up to three most challenging tasks for care of each patient. Percentages were calculated based on total responses.

Supplementary table 5. Presence of symptoms and symptom relief for patients in the last week of life by case-finding mechanisms

	Pain n(%)		Sleep problems n(%)		Nausea n(%)		Fatigue n(%)		Loss of appetite n(%)		Breathing problems n(%)		Bowel problems n(%)		Psychological problems n(%)	
	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R
Data collection mechanisms																
Presence of symptoms	N = 115	N = 100	N = 115	N = 87	N = 115	N = 94	N = 115	N = 98	N = 115	N = 96	N = 115	N = 91	N = 115	N = 86	N = 115	N = 90
Yes	64 (55.7)	61 (61.0)	50 (43.5)	34 (39.1)	41 (35.6)	45 (47.9)	90 (78.2)	76 (77.5)	93 (80.9)	77 (80.2)	64 (55.6)	57 (62.6)	28 (24.4)	39 (45.3)	45 (39.1)	47 (52.2)
No	40 (34.8)	30 (30.0)	53 (46.1)	42 (48.3)	60 (52.2)	36 (38.3)	17 (14.8)	13 (13.3)	13 (11.3)	10 (10.4)	40 (34.8)	27 (29.7)	68 (59.1)	39 (45.3)	47 (40.9)	34 (37.8)
Unknown	11 (9.5)	9 (9.0)	12 (10.4)	11 (12.6)	14 (12.2)	13 (13.8)	8 (7.0)	9 (9.2)	9 (7.8)	9 (9.4)	11 (9.6)	7 (7.7)	19 (16.5)	8 (9.4)	23 (20.0)	9 (10.0)
Comparisons by prospective vs. retrospective case-finding (P-value) ^a	0.72		0.78		0.13		0.81		0.91		0.60		0.006		0.07	
If symptom reported, to what degree was it addressed*	N = 64	N = 53	N = 50	N = 31	N = 41	N = 39	N = 90	N = 66	N = 93	N = 68	N = 64	N = 51	N = 28	N = 32	N = 45	N = 45
Well addressed	22 (34.4)	14 (24.4)	28 (56.0)	12 (38.7)	15 (36.6)	10 (25.7)	52 (57.8)	33 (50.0)	57 (61.3)	34 (50.0)	30 (46.9)	10 (19.6)	20 (71.4)	10 (31.3)	31 (68.9)	18 (40.0)
Not well addressed	42 (65.6)	36 (67.9)	20 (40.0)	17 (54.8)	25 (61.0)	24 (61.5)	28 (31.1)	29 (43.9)	22 (23.7)	29 (42.7)	34 (53.1)	36 (70.6)	8 (28.6)	20 (62.5)	14 (31.1)	22 (48.9)
Unknown	0 (0)	3 (5.7)	2 (4.0)	2 (6.5)	1 (2.4)	5 (12.8)	10 (11.1)	4 (6.1)	14 (15.0)	5 (7.3)	0 (0)	5 (9.8)	0 (0)	2 (6.2)	0 (0)	5 (11.1)
Comparisons by prospective vs. retrospective case-finding (P-value) ^a	0.13		0.31		0.19		0.19		0.03		< 0.001		0.006		0.004	

Abbreviations: P - Prospective case-finding; R - Retrospective case-finding

NOTE: Bold indicates significant value P < 0.05.

* We assigned scores 1 – 3 as “not well addressed” and 4 – 5 as “well addressed”.

^a Comparisons between prospective and retrospective case-finding mechanisms were conducted using Chi-square test. Data relating to “unknown” were not included in the analyses.

Supplementary table 6. Sensitivity analyses for symptom relief for patients in the last week of life by case-finding mechanisms

	Pain n(%)		Sleep problems n(%)		Nausea n(%)		Fatigue n(%)		Loss of appetite n(%)		Breathing problems n(%)		Bowel problems n(%)		Psychological problems n(%)	
	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R
Data collection mechanisms																
<i>If symptom reported, to what degree was it addressed*</i>	N = 64	N = 53	N = 50	N = 31	N = 41	N = 39	N = 90	N = 66	N = 93	N = 68	N = 64	N = 51	N = 28	N = 32	N = 45	N = 45
Well-addressed	8 (12.5)	7 (13.2)	14 (28.0)	3 (9.7)	6 (14.6)	5 (12.8)	33 (36.7)	13 (19.7)	43 (46.2)	16 (23.5)	12 (18.8)	2 (3.9)	7 (25.0)	2 (6.3)	15 (33.3)	5 (11.1)
Not well-addressed	56 (87.5)	43 (81.1)	34 (68.0)	26 (83.9)	34 (82.9)	29 (74.4)	47 (52.2)	49 (74.2)	36 (38.7)	47 (69.1)	52 (81.3)	44 (86.3)	21 (75.0)	28 (87.5)	30 (66.7)	35 (77.8)
Unknown	0 (0)	3 (5.7)	2 (4.0)	2 (6.5)	1 (2.4)	5 (12.8)	10 (11.1)	4 (6.1)	14 (15.0)	5 (7.4)	0 (0)	5 (9.8)	0 (0)	2 (6.2)	0 (0)	5 (11.1)
Comparisons by prospective vs. retrospective case-finding (P-value) ^a	0.81		0.09		0.97		0.01		< 0.001		0.04		0.08		0.04	

Abbreviations: P - Prospective case-finding; R - Retrospective case-findings

NOTE: Bold indicates significant value P < 0.05.

* We assigned scores 1 – 2 as “not well addressed” and 3 – 5 as “well addressed”

^a Comparisons between prospective and retrospective case-finding mechanisms were conducted using Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test. Data relating to “unknown” were not included in the analyses.