**COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) Checklist**

|  |
| --- |
|  **Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity**  |
| *Personal characteristics*  |
| 1  | Interviewer/facilitator  | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?  | Page 6, Methods, Data collection |
| 2  | Credentials  | What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD  | Page 6, Methods, collection |
| 3  | Occupation  | What was their occupation at the time of the study?  | Page 6, Methods, Data collection |
| 4  | Gender  | Was the researcher male or female?  | Page 6, Methods, Data collection |
| 5  | Experience and training  | What experience or training did the researcher have?  | Page 6, Methods, Data collection |
| *Relationship with participants* |
| 6 | Relationalship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | n/a (Email correspondence but no personal relationship) |
| 7 | Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research? | n/a Information about the study’s aim was given but no personal goals |
| 8 | Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research? | n/a None |
| **Domain 2: Study design**  |
| *Theoretical framework* |
| 9 | Methodological orientation and Theory  | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis  | Page 6, Methods, data analysis |
| *Participants selection* |
| 10  | Sampling  | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball  | Page 5, Methods, Participants and procedure |
| 11  | Method of approach  | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email  | Page 5, Methods, Participants and procedure |
| 12  | Sample size  | How many participants were in the study?  | Page 5, Methods, Participants and procedure |
| 13  | Non-participation  | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?  | Reasons for drop outs are described on page 5, Methods, Participants and procedure. However, it was not feasible nor suitable to present some kind of “response rate “since we don’t the denominator, e.g. how many general practitioners there was per unit.  |
| *Setting* |
| 14  | Setting of data collection  | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace  | Page 5, Methods, Participants and procedure |
| 15  | Presence of non-participants  | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?  | Page 6, Methods, Participants and procedure |
| 16  | Description of sample  | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date  | Page 6, Methods, Participants and procedure. Data on age, gender and years of experience was not collected since the aim was not to assure some kind of representativeness and equal distribution for those parameters. |
| *Data collection* |
| 17  | Interview guide  | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  | Page 6, Methods, Data collection |
| 18  | Repeat interviews  | Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?  | Page 6, Methods, Data collection. Data on how many interviews that were repeated was not collected because these interviews were carried out by different interviewers, in order to keep the confidentiality of the respondents, no names were collected nor gender/sex, only professional and workplace. |
| 19  | Audio/visual recording  | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  | Page 6, Methods, Data collection |
| 20  | Field notes  | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  | Page 6, Methods, Data collection |
| 21  | Duration  | What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?  | Page 6, Methods, Data collection |
| 22  | Data saturation  | Was data saturation discussed?  | Page 16, Discussion, Strengths and Limitations |
| 23  | Transcripts returned  | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or corrections? | n/a (no) |
| **Domain 3: Analysis and findings**  |
| *Dataanalysis* |
| 24  | Number of data coders  | How many data coders coded the data?  | Page 7, Methods, Data analysis |
| 25  | Description of the coding tree  | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  | Page 7, Methods, Data analysis |
| 26  | Derivation of themes  | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?  | Page 7, Methods, Data analysis |
| 27  | Software  | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  | n/a Manual, no software |
| 28  | Participant checking  | Did participants provide feedback on the findings?  | A report in Swedish was published summarizing the findings. This was however not personally sent to participant, only uploaded for public use |
| *Reporting* |
| 29  | Quotations presented  | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number  | Page 8-14, Results. |
| 30  | Data and findings consistent  | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?  | Page 8-14, Results. |
| 31  | Clarity of major themes  | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?  | Page 8-14, Results. |
| 32  | Clarity of minor themes  | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Page 9, Results, Improved collaboration. Page 9, Results, Existing well-functioning processes.  |
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