

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

No	Item	Guide questions/description
<b>Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity</b>		
Personal Characteristics		
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? Annet Nanvubya (Lead author) with the help of two other Social Science research assistants
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? <i>E.g. PhD, MD MPH</i>
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study? Medical Doctor and Researcher
4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female? Female
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have? She has been involved in research data collection and management for 17 years
Relationship with participants		
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? Rapport was built between the researcher and participants prior and during the study. Detailed written consent to participate in study was obtained prior to conducting interviews and discussions.
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 were individually told what the research was about, who was conducting the research and what the reasons for conducting the research were during obtaining of informed consent. They were each given time to ask questions and those who had questions were given answers to their questions.

No	Item	Guide questions/description
8.	Interviewer characteristics	<p>What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. <i>Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i></p> <p>The reasons for conducting the study were told to the participants during obtaining of informed consent. The interviewer introduced themselves and told the participants what the study was about and what their role in the study was.</p>
<b>Domain 2: study design</b>		
Theoretical framework		
9.	Methodological orientation and Theory	<p>What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. <i>grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</i> Thematic approach</p>
Participant selection		
10.	Sampling	<p>How were participants selected? e.g. <i>purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</i> purposive</p> <p>Participants were selected to express their views and opinions based on their professions, perceived knowledge of the subject matter by community members and their roles in the study communities.</p>
11.	Method of approach	<p>How were participants approached? e.g. <i>face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i> face-to-face</p>
12.	Sample size	<p>How many participants were in the study? 47 participants were included in the qualitative study. There were a total of four FGDs which included 8-11 participants per session and a total of 10 IDIs. The IDIs included local leaders, health, religious or youth representatives who were recommended by community gate keepers who were political, social and cultural heads in these communities.</p>
13.	Non-participation	<p>How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? None refused to participate. However, 42 people did not participate because they were either busy or were contacted during the study period.</p>

No	Item	Guide questions/description
Setting		
14.	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. <i>home, clinic, workplace</i> At the clinic
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? e.g. <i>demographic data, date</i> Age, sex, responsibility in the community, date of interview/discussion. IDI participants were community residents who were considered to be more knowledgeable of the community, its services, and its people. The FGDs were conducted in different age categories and gender (there was a FGD for female minors and one of male minors aged 15-17 years; one FGD of adult males aged 25-49 years and one FGD of adult females aged 25-49 years). A focus group discussant was any willing community member who was in the age and sex category that was desired for. All participants had to be willing to participate in the study, and resident in the community for at least 6 months.
Data collection		
17.	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Yes Was it pilot tested? Yes
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? Both audio and written notes were used to collect data
20.	Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? Field notes were made during the interview or focus group discussion and supplemented later after listening to the recorded audios
21.	Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? Approximately 90 minutes The FGDs lasted between 65-103 minutes while the IDIs lasted between 37-75 minutes.

No	Item	Guide questions/description
22.	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed? Yes
23.	Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? No
<b>Domain 3: analysis and findings</b>		
Data analysis		
24.	Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data? Two
25.	Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? Yes
26.	Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? The major themes were identified in advance while minor themes were derived from the data
27.	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? NVivo-12 software
28.	Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings? Not yet, but dissemination of findings is planned in the future.
Reporting		
29.	Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Yes Was each quotation identified? e.g. <i>participant number</i> Yes
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? No