**Supplementary Materials:**

IP Utility additional information:

*Legal evaluations by individuals:* Seventy-five percent of 102 individuals reported that they use the IP for legal investigation and documentation procedures. Seventy-three individuals provided more specific details: that they conducted legal investigations on behalf of civil society/NGOs (75%), individual victims (55%), UN regional bodies (23%), official state entities (27%), and independent investigation mechanisms (18%) as well as others (7%) such as international criminal courts, the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) and academic facilities. Types of cases included human rights investigations (62%), asylum applications (59%), criminal investigations (38%), cases submitted to UN/regional bodies (29%), detention monitoring (27%), civil and administrative cases (25%), investigations conducted by UN/regional bodies (14%), and others such as humanitarian cases (1%).

*Legal evaluations by organizations:* 66% of 73 organizational representatives reported that they use the IP for legal investigation and documentation procedures. Forty-eight organizations reported on the specifics of their legal investigations: that legal investigations were conducted on behalf of civil society/NGOs (73%), individual victims (67%), UN regional bodies (23%), official state entities (23%), and independent investigation mechanisms (23%) as well as others (3%) including the IRCT and independent commissions. Types of cases included asylum applications (57%), human rights investigations (53%), criminal investigations (45%), detention monitoring (45%), civil and administrative cases (38%), cases submitted to UN/regional bodies (36%), investigations done by UN/regional bodies (13%) and others (11%) such as the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and International Criminal Court (ICC).

*Medical evaluations by individuals:* One hundred and seven individuals reported conducting medical evaluations of alleged victims. Seventy-three of these individuals reported more details of the use of their medical evaluations. They noted that evaluations were conducted on behalf of multiple types of institutions: civil society/NGOs (75%), individual victims (56%), official state entities (23%), UN regional bodies (22%), independent investigation mechanisms (19%) and others (12%) including on behalf of international criminal courts, asylum lawyers, the ICRC and human rights organizations such as PHR. Most cases were for asylum or refugee status (63%), but also included criminal cases (45%), administrative/civil cases (37%), detention monitoring (36%), cases submitted to the UN/regional bodies (26%), investigations done by the UN/regional bodies (16%), and others (6.9%) such as the international criminal courts, , the Independent Forensic Expert Group (IFEG) and humanitarian cases.

*Medical evaluations by organizations:* Forty-four organizations responded that they use the IP for medical/physical evaluations. Of these, 42 organizations provided additional details. 67% of organizations reported conducting medical evaluations for civil society/NGO investigations and for individual victims and clients. Twenty-seven percent conducted them for official state investigation and documentation, 21% conducted them for independent investigation mechanisms and 17% for UN/regional bodies. Twelve percent conducted physical evaluations for other causes including consideration for refugee or asylum status. Types of cases included asylum and refugee (61%), criminal cases (39%), civil and administrative cases (32%), detention monitoring (39%), cases submitted to the UN/regional bodies (22%), investigations done by the UN/regional bodies (17%) and others such as the ECtHR and the ICC (7%).

*Mental health evaluations by individuals:* 58% of individuals reported conducting mental health evaluations using the IP. These individuals reported that 74% of their mental health evaluations were conducted as part of a comprehensive – including both physical and psychological – forensic evaluation. Of note, there was a significant difference among the 40.1% of the 54 physicians (excluding psychiatrists), 83% of the 18 psychiatrists, and 100% of the 20 psychologists and 1 nurse who responded that they conduct mental health evaluations (p<.001). Fifty-eight individuals provided additional information noting that their evaluations were conducted on behalf of a variety of institutions including: civil society/NGO investigations (72%), individual victims/clients (59%), official state entities (19%), independent investigation mechanisms (16%), UN/regional bodies (14%) and the ICRC (2%). Most cases were for asylum or refugee status (66%), but also included criminal (41%), administrative/civil (38%), detention monitoring (28%), investigations done by UN/regional bodies (7%), cases submitted to the UN/regional bodies (21%), and other cases (7%) including rehabilitation services and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights.

*Mental health evaluations by organizations:* Fifty-eight percent of organizations reported conducting mental health evaluations using the IP. Those 37 organizations responded that mental health examinations were conducted on behalf of various groups including individual victims (65%), NGO investigations (58%), UN or regional bodies (25%), official state entities (20%), independent investigation mechanisms (23%) and others such as asylum or refugee decision-making bodies (8%). The organizations conducted the mental health evaluations for various types of proceedings including: asylum and refugee (59%), criminal or civil cases (35% each), cases submitted to the UN or regional bodies (32%), detention monitoring (27%), and investigations conducted by the UN or regional bodies (16%), as well as other cases (16%) such as ECtHR and ICC cases

*Capacity building among individuals:* Of the 83 individuals (60% of total) who reported using the IP for capacity building, the trainings were conducted for medical professionals (n=75), lawyers (n=61), mental health professionals (n=57) and others (n=24) including journalists, human rights monitors, police, social workers, officials, students, forensic professionals, resettlement workers, nurses and activists. Individuals reported conducting capacity building activities for health institutions (80%), civil society (72%), legal institutions (41%), judicial bodies (37%), asylum/refugee authorities (31%), other state agencies (32%) and others (4%) including NGOs, universities and mass media.

*Capacity building among organizations:* Of the 53 organizations (58% of total) that reported using the IP for capacity building, the trainings were conducted for lawyers (n=41), medical professionals (n=40), mental health professionals (n=40) and others (n=21) including immigration judges, paramedical staff and social workers, prosecutors, journalists, prison staff, police officers, government representatives, and trauma counselors. The capacity building activities were conducted for civil society (77%), health institutions (67%), legal institutions (43%), judicial bodies (37%), asylum authorities (33%), other state agencies (33%) and others (14%) including police and prison staff, academia, journalists, and clinicians.

*Intake tool:* Thirty-four of 99 individual respondents (34%) and 27 out of 74 organizations (37%) reported using the IP as an intake tool in providing medical and mental health or rehabilitation care to survivors.

*Advocacy and other uses:* 78 of 104 individual respondents reported using the IP for campaigning against torture and/or raising awareness about torture. Other purposes (n=49) included training, research, university and medical student training and teaching, UN norm setting, to remember rules, determining credibility of complaints during country investigation or monitoring visits, to change professional standards and as a tool to understand and document domestic violence, human trafficking and gender-based violence and assault. Fifty of 73 organizations (69%) reported using the IP for campaigning against torture and/or raising awareness about torture. Other purposes (n=18) included education and as a benchmark for policy, research, and forensic documentation.