

**Table S1.** HoryzonsCa pilot study—focus group coding framework.

Codes	Sub-Codes
1.General	1.1 General comments (e.g., likes and dislikes—related to Horyzons)
	1.1.1 Expectations (in joining Horyzons)
	1.1.1.1 To connect with others with similar experiences
	1.1.1.2. To improve myself / life
	1.1.1.3 Out of curiosity—not otherwise specified
	1.1.1.4. Other
	1.1.2. Impact of Horyzons on your daily life
	1.1.3. Comments related to the future direction of Horyzons
	1.2. General questions (related to Horyzons)
	1.3 General comments and questions (unrelated to Horyzons)
2. Usefulness of platform features	1.4 General comments and questions (related to Horyzons research)
	1.5 General neutral or unclear
	2.1. Elements considered to be useful/helpful
	2.1.1. What it was helpful for
	2.1.1.1 Coping and recovery (e.g., anxiety, work, stress, and self-improvement/knowledge)
	2.1.1.2. Feeling validated and understood
	2.1.1.3. Skills acquisition
	2.1.1.4. Finding employment
	2.1.1.5. Other
	2.1.2. Individually tailored experience
	2.1.3. Community/peer network (ability to exchange re: hobbies, illness)
	2.1.4. Content
	2.1.5. Moderation
	2.1.5.1. Peer Moderation
	2.1.5.2. Clinical Moderation
	2.1.6. Other platform features
	2.2. Elements of concern and suggestions (not useful or missing)
	2.2.1. Language concerns (i.e., French / English / bilingualism)
	2.2.1.1. Suggestions (would improve)
	2.2.2. Individually tailored experience concerns
	2.2.2.1. Suggestions (would improve)
	2.2.3. Community/peer network concerns
	2.2.3.1. Suggestions (would improve)
	2.2.4. Content concerns
	2.2.4.1. Suggestions (would improve)
	2.2.5. Clinical moderation concerns
	2.2.5.1. Moderation suggestions (would improve)
	2.2.5.2.1. Peer moderator concerns
	2.2.5.2.1. Peer moderator suggestions (would improve)
	2.2.5.3. Clinical moderator concerns
	2.2.5.3.1. Clinical moderator suggestions (would improve)
	2.2.6. Other platform feature concerns
	2.2.6.1 Other platform suggestions (would improve)
	2.3 Elements related to usefulness neutral—unclear
	2.3.1. Individually tailored experience unclear
	2.3.2. Community/peer network unclear
	2.3.3. Content unclear
	2.3.4. Clinical Moderation unclear

Table S1. *Cont.*

Codes	Sub-Codes
	2.3.4.1. Peer moderation unclear 2.3.4.2. Clinical moderator unclear 2.3.5. Other platform features unclear 2.4. Elements of the platform that have improved based on previous focus group feedback
3. Safety	3.1. Elements of the platform that enhance safety/support 3.2. Elements of concern regarding safety/support (not useful/missing) 3.2.1 Suggestions (would make it safer) 3.3. Safety/support questions 3.4. Safety/support neutral-unclear
4. Technical	4.1. Navigation 4.1.1 Likes 4.1.2 Dislikes or challenges 4.1.2.1. Suggestions (would improve) 4.2. Visual design 4.2.1 Likes 4.2.2 Dislikes 4.2.2.1. Suggestions (would improve) 4.3. Accessibility 4.3.1. Technical bugs 4.3.2. Device-related access 4.3.3. Other access-related comments 4.3.4. Accessibility suggestions (would improve) 4.4. Technical neutral-unclear
5. Participation	5.1. Actual use 5.1.1 Self 5.1.2 Others 5.2. Engagement (motivation) 5.2.1 Increases (self, others) 5.2.2 Limit/missing/would increase (self, others) 5.3. Willingness/desire to use Horyzons long term 5.4. Participation neutral-unclear
6. Orientation	6.1. Elements of orientation considered helpful 6.2. Orientation concerns (not useful/missing) 6.2.1 Suggestions (would improve) 6.3. Elements of the website that participants were unaware of 6.4. Orientation neutral-unclear
7. Meet-Up	7.1. Elements of the meet-up considered helpful 7.2. Meet-up concerns (not useful/missing) 7.2.1 Suggestions (would improve) 7.3 Meet-up neutral-unclear
8. Facilitator Summaries	8.1. Facilitator summaries of participant comments