

Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups

Submission to CMAJ Open

Title: Implementing A Provincial Take Home Naloxone Program: Quantitative and qualitative evidence from a cross-sectional study in British Columbia, Canada

Authors: Oluwajenyo Banjo^{1,2},MPHc, Despina Tzemis¹, MPH, Diana Al-Qutub^{1,3}, MPH, Ashraf Amlani¹, MPH, Sarah Kesselring^{1,3},MPH, Jane A Buxton^{1,3} MBBS MHSc

No	Item	Guide questions/description	Response
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
Personal Characteristics			
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Despina Tzemis, MPH, Harm Reduction Epidemiologist Diana Al-Qutub, MPH candidate, MPH practicum student Sarah Kesselring, MPH candidate, MPH practicum student Oluwajenyo Banjo, MPH candidate, MPH practicum student
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? <i>E.g. PhD, MD</i>	
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	
4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	All 4 researchers are female
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Despina Tzemis is a qualitative researcher and oversaw the MPH students. Students had completed coursework in qualitative methods and guidance was also provided by the principal investigator, Dr. Jane Buxton, who is a qualitative researcher.
Relationship with participants			
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	The participants were not acquainted to the researchers prior to the study commencements
7.	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? <i>e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research</i>	The participants knew that the intent of the evaluation was to identify challenges or barriers encountered in order to make improvements to this new program. Interviewees knew that the researchers were affiliated with the BC Take Home Naloxone program. Participants were also made aware that the researchers were conducting this study as part of their MPH practicum project.
8.	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? <i>e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i>	
Domain 2: study design			
Theoretical framework			
9.	Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? <i>e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</i>	We used a qualitative descriptive approach (see reference 15 - Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? <i>Res Nurs Health</i> 2000; 23(4):334-340.)

The BC Take Home Naloxone Program

Participant selection			
10.	Sampling	How were participants selected? <i>e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</i>	Participants were recruited through convenience sampling
11.	Method of approach	How were participants approached? <i>e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i>	Clients for focus groups (FG) and interviews were recruited by program staff at BCTHN sites. Participants for other stakeholder interviews (service providers, police and parents) were recruited via email
12.	Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	52 in total (40 clients and 12 service providers)
13.	Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	We are not aware of any individuals that refused to participate in the study. No participants dropped out during the focus group on interview.
Setting			
14.	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? <i>e.g. home, clinic, workplace</i>	FG and interviews were conducted at BCTHN sites; Interviews for other stakeholders were conducted at a location that was convenient to the interviewee (coffee shop, telephone, BCCDC)
15.	Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	No
16.	Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? <i>e.g. demographic data, date</i>	Age, gender, level of education and years of substance use are reported in Table 4 of the manuscript
Data collection			
17.	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Following a literature review and input from members of the Community Advisory Board, a semi-structured interview guide was developed. The guides were modified slightly to cater to the stakeholder group being questioned. The guides were not tested in a pilot study.
18.	Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	No
19.	Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	The audio for all focus groups and interviews was recorded and transcribed prior to analysis. Researchers also took field notes during the focus groups to record any visual interactions that would not be captured through the audio recordings.
20.	Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes – during the focus groups
21.	Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	Focus groups: 1 hour approx. Client interviews: 20 min approx. Service provider Interviews: 1 hour approx.
22.	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Yes – data collection from clients & service providers ended when saturation was achieved

The BC Take Home Naloxone Program

23.	Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No. Transcripts were reviewed by researchers who listened to the audio recordings to verify their accuracy.
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
Data analysis			
24.	Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	3 researchers (DA, OB, JB)
25.	Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	No. However, initial coding was informed by the interview guides but codes were continually refined as simultaneous data collection & analysis provided new insights. Codes were grouped into similar descriptive categories. The final themes were agreed upon by the analysis team through consensus.
26.	Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	
27.	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	QSR NVivo version 8
28.	Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	The results were shared with the Community Advisory Board to validate the findings.
Reporting			
29.	Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. <i>participant number</i>	Yes – see table 5
30.	Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes
31.	Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes
32.	Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes