Supplementary material BMJ Open

ADDITIONAL FILE 1

Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist

Developed from:

Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. Int J Qual Health C. 2007; 19(6): 349–357. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042

| Topic | Item No. | Guide Questions/Description | Reported on Page No. | |
|--|-------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| Domain 1: Research te | am reflexi | vity | | |
| Personal characteristics | 5 | | | |
| Interviewer/facilitator | 1 | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | 8 | |
| Credentials | 2 | What were the researcher's credentials? | 8 | |
| Occupation | 3 | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | 8 | |
| Gender | 4 | Was the researcher male or female? | 8 | |
| Experience and training | 5 | What experience or training did the researcher have? | 8 | |
| Relationship with participants | | | | |
| Relationship established | 6 | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | 23 | |
| Participant knowledge of the interviewer | 7 | What did the participants know about the researcher? E.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research | 24 | |
| Interviewer characteristics | 8 | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer? E.g. bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic | 8, 24 | |
| Domain 2: Study design | n | | • | |
| Theoretical framework | | | | |
| Methodological orientation and Theory | 9 | What methodological orientation was used to underpin the study? E.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis | 7 | |
| Participant selection | | | | |
| Sampling | 10 | How were participants selected? E.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | 8 | |
| Method of approach | 11 | How were participants approached? E.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | 8 | |
| Sample size | 12 | How many participants were in the study? | 8 | |
| Non-participation | 13 | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | 8 | |

Supplementary material BMJ Open

| Setting | | | |
|------------------------|------------|---|-----------|
| Setting of data | 14 | Where was the data collected? E.g. home, | 8,9 |
| collection | | clinic, workplace | |
| Presence of non- | 15 | Was anyone else present besides the | 9 |
| participants | | participants and researchers? | |
| Description of sample | 16 | What are the important characteristics of | 11 (table |
| | | the sample? E.g. demographic data | 3) |
| Data collection | | | |
| Interview guide | 17 | Were questions, prompts, guides provided | 9 (table |
| | | by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | 1) |
| Repeat interviews | 18 | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, | N/A |
| | | how many? | |
| Audio/visual | 19 | Did the research use audio or visual | 9 |
| recording | | recording to collect the data? | |
| Field notes | 20 | Were field notes made during and/or after | 9 |
| | | the interview or focus group? | |
| Duration | 21 | What was the duration of the interviews or | 8 |
| | | focus group? | |
| Data saturation | 22 | Was data saturation discussed? | 8 |
| Transcripts returned | 23 | Were transcripts returned to participants | N/A |
| Transcripts retained | 23 | for comment and/or correction? | '',' |
| Domain 3: analysis and | l findings | Tor comment unit, or corrections | |
| Data analysis | | | |
| Number of data | 24 | How many data coders coded the data? | 9 |
| coders | - 1 | How many data coders coded the data. | |
| Description of the | 25 | Did authors provide a description of the | N/A |
| coding tree | | coding tree? | '',' |
| Derivation of themes | 26 | Were themes identified in advance or | 7 |
| Derivation of themes | 20 | derived from the data? | ' |
| Software | 27 | What software, if applicable, was used to | 9 |
| Software | 21 | manage the data? | |
| Participant checking | 28 | Did participants provide feedback on the | N/A |
| Tarticipant checking | 20 | findings? | '',' |
| Reporting | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Quotations presented | 29 | Were participant quotations presented to | 12-22 |
| Quotations presented | 23 | illustrate the themes/findings? Was each | 12 22 |
| | | quotation identified? E.g. participant | |
| | | number | |
| Data and findings | 30 | Was there consistency between the data | 12-22 |
| consistent | | presented and the findings? | |
| Clarity of major | 31 | Were major themes clearly presented in | 12-22 |
| themes | 31 | the findings? | 12 22 |
| Clarity of minor | 32 | Is there a description of diverse cases or | 12-22 |
| themes | 32 | discussion of minor themes? | 12 22 |
| GICITICS | | discussion of millor difemes: | 1 |