

## Supplementary File S2. Stakeholder comparisons

Median [IQR, 25-75th percentile] rating from the sensory test ( $n = 21$ )

	Soft and bite-sized		Minced and moist			Pureed		
	Freshly made	Sous Vide	Freshly made	Hydroly- sed	Commer- cial	Freshly made	Hydroly- sed	Commer- cial
Appearance								
Dietitians	6.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
	[5.0-6.0]	[4.0-5.5]	[2.0-4.5]	[3.0-5.5]	[3.5-5.0]	[2.0-4.5]	[3.0-5.5]	[2.5-5.0]
SLTs	4.0	5.0	6.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0
	[3.0-4.0]	[3.0-5.0]	[5.0-6.0]	[4.0-5.0]	[3.0-5.0]	[2.0-6.0]	[2.0-6.0]	[2.0-4.0]
Older adults	7.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	4.0
	[7.0-7.0]	[6.0-7.0]	[3.5-6.0]	[1.5-4.5]	[1.5-4.5]	[3.0-5.5]	[1.0-4.0]	[2.0-5.0]
P-value	<b>&lt;.0001</b>	<b>.003</b>	<b>.03</b>	.22	.27	.47	.12	.71
Flavour								
Dietitians	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0
	[5.5-7.0]	[4.0-5.5]	[3.0-6.0]	[3.0-5.5]	[3.5-5.0]	[2.0-5.5]	[1.5-6.0]	[1.5-4.5]
SLTs	4.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
	[3.0-5.0]	[4.0-7.0]	[5.0-6.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[3.0-5.0]	[3.0-5.0]	[3.0-5.0]	[3.0-4.0]
Older adults	6.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	4.0
	[6.0-7.0]	[5.5-7.0]	[3.5-6.5]	[2.5-4.0]	[2.0-3.5]	[3.0-5.0]	[1.0-2.5]	[1.5-4.5]
P-value	<b>.001</b>	.06	.63	.12	.10	.85	.09	.67
Smell								
Dietitians	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	[4.5-7.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[4.0-5.5]	[3.5-5.5]	[3.5-6.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[3.5-6.0]	[3.5-5.0]
SLTs	3.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0
	[2.0-5.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[3.0-5.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[3.0-5.0]	[5.0-5.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[2.0-4.0]
Older adults	6.0	5.5	3.5	2.5	2.0	4.0	2.0	3.5
	[4.3-7.0]	[3.5-6.0]	[3.0-5.5]	[2.0-5.3]	[2.0-5.0]	[2.5-5.5]	[1.0-4.5]	[1.5-4.0]
P-value	<b>.01</b>	.82	.42	.21	.26	.52	.14	.12
Texture								
Dietitians	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0

	[4.0-7.0]	[4.5-6.0]	[3.0-6.0]	[4.0-5.5]	[3.0-6.0]	[3.0-5.0]	[3.0-6.0]	[3.0-6.5]
SLTs	4.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
	[3.0-5.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[3.0-4.0]	[4.0-5.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[4.0-5.0]
Older adults	5.0	6.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	3.0
	[4.0-7.0]	[4.5-7.0]	[3.0-6.0]	[2.0-4.0]	[1.5-4.5]	[3.0-4.5]	[1.5-2.0]	[1.5-4.0]
P-value	.08	.54	.68	<b>.03</b>	.07	.44	<b>.01</b>	.20
<b>Overall rating</b>								
Dietitians	6.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0
	[5.0-6.0]	[4.0-6.0]	[3.0-6.0]	[3.5-5.5]	[4.0-6.0]	[2.5-6.0]	[2.5-6.0]	[2.5-5.5]
SLTs	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	[3.8-5.3]	[4.0-6.0]	[5.0-6.0]	[4.0-5.0]	[4.0-4.0]	[4.0-5.0]	[3.0-5.0]	[3.0-5.0]
Older adults	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	3.0
	[4.5-7.0]	[5.5-7.0]	[3.0-6.5]	[2.0-5.0]	[1.5-3.5]	[2.5-4.5]	[1.0-2.5]	[1.5-4.0]
P-value	.10	.07	.44	.24	<b>.005</b>	.39	<b>.02</b>	.23
<b>Meeting expectations</b>								
Dietitians % (n)	89 (8)	67 (6)	56 (5)	56 (5)	56 (5)	56 (5)	44 (4)	33 (3)
SLTs % (n)	29 (2)	71 (5)	86 (6)	86 (6)	57 (4)	57 (4)	57 (4)	86 (6)
Older adults % (n)	80 (4)	100 (5)	60 (3)	60 (3)	20 (1)	60 (3)	0 (0)	20 (1)
P-value	.12	.31	.12	.12	.31	.99	.21	.20
<b>Appropriate to the described level</b>								
Dietitians % (n)	11 (1)	44 (4)	78 (7)	22 (2)	78 (7)	44 (4)	56 (5)	78 (7)
SLTs % (n)	29 (2)	43 (3)	71 (5)	43 (3)	100 (7)	14 (1)	43 (3)	76 (6)
Older adults % (n)	80 (4)	100 (5)	100 (5)	100 (5)	100 (5)	100 (5)	80 (4)	80 (4)
P-value	<b>.04</b>	.10	.53	<b>.04</b>	.23	.05	.75	.93

Abbreviation: SLT = Speech Language Therapist.

Sensory aspects were rated on a 7-point scale, 1 = extremely poor, 7 = excellent. Expectation and appropriateness questions were answered by “yes, no or not sure”.

A Kruskal-Wallis test was performed to test the significance between stakeholder groups. Chi-square tests were performed to compare the categorical variables.  $p < .05$  indicates significance.