Supplementary Table S1. Thematic Analysis Coding Framework

| Name of code | No. of participants | No. of references |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Access pathway | | |
| Attrition | 21 | 26 |
| Equity | 29 | 39 |
| Format | 31 | 107 |
| Funding | 24 | 51 |
| NICE guidance | 26 | 58 |
| Definitions of terms | 10 | 13 |
| Flexibility | 22 | 30 |
| Gaming | 9 | 15 |
| Precision | 14 | 25 |
| Self-funding | 21 | 25 |
| Stakeholders | 10 | 36 |
| Clinician characteristics | 10 | 30 |
| Profession | 36 | 58 |
| Levels of type 1 contact | 22 | 23 |
| Tech contact | 33 | 62 |
| | 33 | 41 |
| Tech opinions | 33 | 41 |
| Clinics | 20 | 15 |
| Clinic population | 20 | 45 |
| Information sharing | 15 | 16 |
| Information technology | 32 | 38 |
| Levels of tech usage | 34 | 62 |
| Local challenges | 5 | 7 |
| Management and vision | 22 | 26 |
| Organization | 22 | 30 |
| Organizational culture | 33 | 49 |
| Professional collaboration | 26 | 43 |
| Resources | 31 | 47 |
| Technology culture | 26 | 65 |
| Closed loop | | |
| Changes needed for future care | 28 | 38 |
| Closed-loop candidacy | 30 | 41 |
| Do-it-yourself closed loop | 2 | 4 |
| Envisaged benefit | 20 | 27 |
| Experience of trials | 10 | 11 |
| Knowledge of closed loop | 18 | 19 |
| Patient limitations | 22 | 34 |
| Views on patients | | |
| Adaptability | 26 | 40 |
| Brand differences | 17 | 19 |
| Candidacy | 32 | 165 |
| Expectations | 17 | 24 |
| Predictability | 35 | 63 |
| Proactivity | 32 | 80 |

NICE, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence.