

COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) Checklist

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research

A Note to the Editor:

Thank you for your comments, we have completed the COREQ Checklist as requested. While the study as described in our manuscript is a secondary analysis in which we did not collect primary data, we do need to refer to the primary study during parts of this checklist.

For the purposes of the COREQ Checklist, we will focus on our study (i.e., secondary analysis) and ,if relevant, describe information from the primary study. In the COREQ Checklist below, this will be indicated by the subheadings, “Our Secondary Analysis” to represent our secondary analysis, and “Primary Study” to represent the initial research that our study is derived from.

It is also important to highlight throughout the COREQ Checklist, “interviews” are referenced. For our secondary analysis, our data set included transcripts that were derived from the primary study’s audio recordings from digital storytelling sessions. These digital storytelling sessions were not conventional interviews. Therefore, the data (i.e., transcripts) in the secondary analysis were not created through a conventional “interview” as the COREQ Checklist implies. The digital storytelling sessions focused on a facilitator and a person living with dementia co-creating a digital story product. The conversations that occurred were for the purpose of co-creation of a digital story, not to generate data as typical of a conventional interview. Therefore, “interview”, in its traditional sense, does not apply to our secondary analysis and was not a part of our secondary analysis.

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/ Description	Author Responses
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: There were no interviews or focus groups as part of the secondary analysis. However, the first author was the primary data analyst referenced in the Methods section.</p> <p>Primary Study: The facilitators of digital storytelling sessions with persons living with dementia came from a variety of professional backgrounds and experiences, see Methods section for details.</p>
Credentials	2	What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	<p>Our Secondary Analysis:</p> <p><i>Authors:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) MSc Reg. OT (SK) 2) PhD Reg. OT (AB) 3) PhD Reg. OT (AB) 4) PhD Reg. OT (ON) <p><i>Data Analysts:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) BSc Kinesiology, MSc OT

			<p>Student</p> <p>2) BA Anthropology, MSc OT Student</p> <p>3) BSc Biology, MSc OT Student</p> <p>Primary Study: <i>Facilitators:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) MSc OT 2) BS Biomedical Engineering 3) BSc Psychology & Neuroscience 4) BSc Psychology 5) Caregiver of a person living with dementia
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: <i>Authors:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) MSc OT Student; Occupational Therapist 2) Research Manager 3) Assistant Professor 4) Professor <p><i>Data Analysts:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) MSc OT Student; Occupational Therapist 2) MSc OT Student 3) MSc OT Student <p>Primary Study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) PhD in Rehabilitation Science Candidate 2) Candidate 3) BSc Psychology Student 4) BSc Psychology Student 5) Care partner of person living with dementia
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: All authors identify as female.</p> <p>Primary Study: The facilitators referenced were 4 females and 1 male. See Methods section.</p>
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Author 1 had experience with qualitative data analysis as part of her MSc OT degree, and later, experience working as an Occupational Therapist in acute care and long-term care. 2) Author 2 has research training in qualitative methods and community-based research approaches.

			<p>3) Author 3 has a focus on assistive technologies.</p> <p>4) Author 4 has a well-established research program focused on technologies to support older adults and persons living with dementia living in community and care settings.</p> <p>Primary Study: Please see Methods section for facilitator backgrounds and above for credentials.</p>
<u>Relationship with participants</u>			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: There was no relationship with persons living with dementia in the secondary analysis.</p> <p>Primary Study: Facilitators met with persons living with dementia before the digital storytelling sessions in an informal “meet and greet” to discuss the study and establish a relationship.</p>
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: Persons living with dementia do not know the authors of this study.</p> <p>Primary Study: During the initial “meet and greet”, a person with dementia learned about the facilitator’s experience, credentials, occupation, interests, research involvement as well as the study details.</p>
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: The authors of this paper and the primary analyst are all health care professionals, specifically from an Occupational Therapy background. Occupational Therapists believe in collaborating with their clients to foster a therapeutic relationship. Occupational Therapists believe clients are active agents in their care, in which the client defines their goals and always has a voice no matter their illness, injury, diagnosis or disability.</p> <p>Primary Study: See Methods for details of digital storytelling facilitator characteristics. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests of the facilitators were not included as the facilitators were not involved in the writing of the</p>

			secondary analysis.
Domain 2: Study design			
<u>Theoretical framework</u>			
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: The study was conducted with a qualitative description design. Qualitative description is an appropriate method in our secondary analysis which sought to generate a description of the elements of facilitation during digital storytelling with persons living with dementia. See Methods.</p> <p>Primary Study: Not applicable to the secondary analysis.</p>
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: Purposive sampling for secondary analysis was completed based on audio recording appropriateness for transcription. 23 transcripts were excluded due to poor sound quality and inability to transcribe. See Methods section.</p> <p>Primary Study: Persons living with dementia were recruited through day programs, support groups, retirement residences, care facilities and organizations that serve populations with dementia and their care partners. See Methods section.</p>
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: Not applicable for secondary analysis.</p> <p>Primary Study: See #10 Sampling above.</p>
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: Transcripts from 16 persons living with dementia and 5 facilitators were included. From a possible 106 audio recordings, 83 had sound quality sufficient for transcription and were transcribed for analysis. See Methods section.</p> <p>Primary Study: 19 persons living with dementia and 5 facilitators were included in the primary study. See Methods section.</p>
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: Not applicable.</p> <p>Primary Study: Not applicable.</p>
<u>Setting</u>			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? e.g. home,	Our Secondary Analysis: Not applicable.

		clinic, workplace	Primary Study: Digital storytelling co-creation sessions were conducted in the place preferred by persons living with dementia and their care partners. These were mainly private homes and day programs.
Presence of non-participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	Our Secondary Analysis: Not applicable. Primary Study: At the request of persons living with dementia, at times, care partners were present during digital storytelling co-creation sessions.
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Our Secondary Analysis: The data sample was comprised of 83 transcripts generated through conversations between persons living with dementia and facilitators in digital storytelling co-creation sessions. Primary Study: The sample was comprised of persons living with dementia and digital storytelling facilitators. The persons living with dementia had mild dementia and digital storytelling facilitators came from a variety of backgrounds – see Methods section for details.
<i>Data collection</i>			
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Our Secondary Analysis: No interview guide was used. Primary Study: No interview guide was used as the product was the digital stories that were created during co-creation sessions. The data elicited were the conversations that took place during the digital storytelling co-creation process.
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	Our Secondary Analysis: Not applicable. Primary Study: The number of digital storytelling co-creation sessions varied depending on the person living with dementia and facilitator. See Table 1.
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Our Secondary Analysis: Audio recordings from the primary study were used to create 83 transcripts for secondary analysis. See Methods section. Primary Study: Digital storytelling co-creation sessions were audio recorded.

Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: While we did not have traditional field notes, we did keep a journal of reflections and activities.</p> <p>Primary Study: Facilitators of digital storytelling co-creation sessions kept field notes as part of their work with persons living with dementia.</p>
Duration	21	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: Not applicable.</p> <p>Primary Study: Digital storytelling co-creation sessions ranged from 85 seconds to 108 minutes as indicated by length of audio recordings.</p>
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: While we did observe saturation of codes and categories, we analyzed all 83 transcripts that were available. See Figure 1.</p> <p>Primary Study: Not applicable.</p>
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or corrections?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: No, transcripts were not returned to participants as part of the secondary analysis.</p> <p>Primary Study: Not applicable.</p>
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: There were 3 data analysts and 1 peer debriefer.</p> <p>Primary Study: Not applicable.</p>
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: See Figure 1 for coding hierarchy.</p> <p>Primary Study: Not applicable.</p>
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: Themes were generated inductively and continuously checked and rechecked. The coding hierarchy was revised as data analysis progressed. As a new transcript was analyzed, if a code was revised, then the previous transcripts were re-coded and the hierarchies updated. See Methods.</p> <p>Primary Study: Themes in the primary study were derived from the transcripts in the secondary analysis.</p>
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	<p>Our Secondary Analysis: Data was managed using Word Documents and by hand for secondary analysis.</p>

			Primary Study: Data was managed using Word Documents and by hand in the primary study.
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	Our Secondary Analysis: Not applicable. Primary Study: Not applicable.
<u>Reporting</u>			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Our Secondary Analysis: Transcripts were deidentified and persons living with dementias were referred to by pseudonym to maintain anonymity. Primary Study: Not applicable.
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Our Secondary Analysis: Yes, see Findings and Discussion sections to understand the relationship between skills used by facilitators and themes identified amongst facilitators of digital storytelling in this study. Primary Study: Not applicable.
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Our Secondary Analysis: Yes, the most common strategies used by facilitators in the primary study are outlined in the Findings section. Primary Study: Not applicable.
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Our Secondary Analysis: Due to word count, the less common strategies used by facilitators were not discussed in the secondary analysis. Primary Study: Not applicable.

Developed from: Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357