

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

Submission to CMAJ

Title: Childhood Obesity Prevention Interventions in Primary Care: Perspectives of Primary Care Clinicians and Parents of 2-5 year old children

Authors: Nicole Bourgeois, Paula Brauer, Janis Randall Simpson, Susie Kim, and Jess Haines

| No. | Item | Guide questions/description | Authors notes |
|--|-------------------------|--|---|
| Domain 1: Research Team and Reflexivity | | | |
| <i>Personal Characteristics</i> | | | |
| 1. | Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | Nicole Bourgeois |
| 2. | Credentials | What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD | Nicole Bourgeois, RD, MSc (candidate); Dietitian and Health Promoter in the Women's College Hospital Academic FHT |
| 3. | Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | Dr. Jess Haines, PhD, MHSc, RD; Assistant Professor at the University of Guelph in the Department of Family Relations and Applied Nutrition. Dr. Paula Brauer, PhD, RD, FDC; Associate Professor at the University of Guelph in the Department of Family Relations and Applied Nutrition. Dr. Janis Randall Simpson, PhD, RD; Associate Professor at the University of Guelph in the Department of Family Relations and Applied Nutrition Dr. Susie Kim, MD, CCFP, MScCH; Family Physician at Women's College Hospital |
| 4. | Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | All researchers are female |
| 5. | Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? | Dr. Jess Haines has received training in qualitative data collection and analyses; she has led 4 qualitative research studies, and supervised Nicole Bourgeois in this project as partial requirements for her MSc. Nicole Bourgeois has experience as a dietitian working with families of young children in a primary care setting; she had completed a graduate level course in qualitative data collection and analyses prior to study initiation. Dr. Paula Brauer has conducted 5 qualitative and consensus health services research studies and was a member of the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care working group developing recommendations on childhood obesity prevention and treatment released March 2015. |

| <i>Relationship with participants</i> | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 6. | Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | As a dietitian working at one of the study sites, Nicole had working relationships with those clinicians. Additionally, one parent participant was a former patient. Nicole had no prior relationships with participants at other sites. Dr. Jess Haines, Dr. Paula Brauer, Dr. Janis Randall Simpson, and Dr. Susie Kim had no prior relationships with any participants. |
| 7. | Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research | In all focus groups and interviews, participants were informed that the research team was considering implementing a program for parents of children 2-5 years in Family Health Teams, and that their input would help inform the tailoring and implementation of the program. |
| 8. | Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic | For clinician focus groups, the researcher (Nicole) was introduced by a contact person at each site, as a dietitian working in a Family Health Team, and as such may have been seen as an insider to clinicians. With the exception of 1 participant, parents did not know the researcher's role/background. |
| Domain 2: Study Design | | | |
| <i>Theoretical Framework</i> | | | |
| 9. | Methodological orientation and Theory | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis | We used a directed content analysis approach as described by Berg [1]; and utilized methods described by Miles and Huberman [2]. |
| <i>Participant Selection</i> | | | |
| 10. | Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | In addition to the researcher's primary care practice, two additional practices approached the researchers to participate. Through a contact person at each site, clinicians with higher proportions of children aged 2-5 were purposively approached (via departmental email) and invited to participate in focus groups. Parent participants were recruited through a variety of methods including: waiting room flyers, distribution of flyers by administrative and clinical staff, as well as a letter sent to parents through a primary school (rural site only). |
| 11. | Method of approach | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | |
| 12. | Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | A total of 40 clinicians (through 7 focus groups), and 26 parents participated. |
| 13. | Non-participation | How many people refused to | It is unknown how many clinicians refused to participate; clinicians |

| | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | participate or dropped out? Reasons? | <p>were instructed to respond to reply via email to the researcher if interested in participating. However many clinicians simply arrived to the session without notice.</p> <p>We had a total of 36 parent participants contact us regarding the study; 10 parents did not complete the interview (1 parent had a baby during the study period, 2 parents were too busy to complete the interview, and we lost touch with 7 parents after follow-up emails prior to scheduling the interview).</p> |
| <i>Setting</i> | | | |
| 14. | Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace | Clinician focus groups were all held at their primary care practices; all were held in person except one which was held over the phone. All but one parent interview was held over the phone from parents' homes. One interview was held at the primary care practice. |
| 15. | Presence of non-participants | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? | A research assistant was present at the focus groups. No one other than the researcher was present for the interviews. |
| 16. | Description of sample | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date | Demographics for clinicians are outlined in Table 1 of the manuscript (role, age, gender, number of years in practice, proportion of patients in their practice 2-5yrs old). Demographics for parents are outlined in Table 2 (age, gender, ethnicity, number of children at home). |
| <i>Data Collection</i> | | | |
| 17. | Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | Relevant interview questions are included in Box 1 of the manuscript. The guides were based heavily on the original guide developed by Dr. Haines used in the development of the proposed intervention. The guides were not pilot-tested for this 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? | Yes. All interviews and focus groups were audio-recorded, and transcribed verbatim by an undergraduate research assistant prior to analysis. |
| 20. | Field notes | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? | Yes – detailed field notes were taken by both the researcher and a research assistant for the focus groups; during a debrief the field notes were combined in the form of a contact summary sheet. For the interviews, the researcher took detailed field notes in the form of a contact summary sheet. |
| 21. | Duration | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? | Focus groups ranged from 25 minutes to 1 hour, depending on the availability of the clinicians and how much they had to say. |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | Parent interviews ranged from 20-40 minutes, depending on how much parents had to say. |
| 22. | Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | Yes – data saturation was discussed and determined by consensus between the Nicole Bourgeois, Dr. Haines and the research assistant. |
| 23. | Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? | No. Due to the extended recruitment phase, and delay in creating transcripts, it was deemed infeasible to check the transcripts with participants. |
| Domain 3: Analysis and Findings | | | |
| <i>Data Analysis</i> | | | |
| 24. | Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | Nicole Bourgeois coded all of the data, and created the coding scheme. A research assistant independently coded 25% of the data in order to determine reliability of the scheme (described in the methods section). |
| 25. | Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | The main themes described in the manuscript were identified through the finalized coding tree/scheme. Due to space limitations, a more detailed description of the scheme was not outlined in the manuscript. |
| 26. | Derivation of themes | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data | An a priori conceptual framework was used to bound the analysis, however each transcript was read in-depth and coded line-by-line by Nicole Bourgeois which formed grounded codes. The coding scheme derived from the grounded codes was harmonized with the conceptual framework to develop themes. Some new sub-themes were identified through the grounded codes. |
| 27. | Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | NVivo was used for all coding procedures, and for the reliability testing. |
| 28. | Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the findings? | Member-checking was completed after analysis with a sample of interprofessional clinicians from 1 site (physician, nurse practitioner and registered nurse). Due to the extended recruitment phase, and delay in creating transcripts, it was deemed infeasible to member-check with more participants. |
| <i>Reporting</i> | | | |
| 29. | Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number | Yes – quotations are provided throughout the manuscript in Boxes (1-6). |
| 30. | Data and findings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? | |

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|--|---|
| 31. | Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? | |
| 32. | Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Yes – cases in which there was a diversity of opinions, or deviant cases on the main themes have been identified in the manuscript. |

1. Berg BL. Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. Boston: Boston : Allyn & Bacon; 2009.
2. Miles MB, Huberman AM. Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook. Holland R, editor. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications; 1994.