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**Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ)-Checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **COREQ LIST/ITEM DOMAINS AND RELATED SUBDOMAINS** | | **COREQ Guide Questions/Description** | | **Participant Category** | | **Description and Location in the manuscript (section, line no., and page no** |
|  | **Domain 1: Research team and reﬂexivity** | | | | | | |
|  | **Personal Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| 1 | Interviewer/facilitator | | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | | Academic staff that train HN/HND & HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | The interviews were conducted by the principal researcher (PKK). See Participant selection-Academic staff that train HN/HND, page 4, lines 36-38 and Participant selection-HN/HND work/internship supervisors, page 4, lines 47-49. |
| Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | PKK and TLB undertook data collection under the direct supervision of ANK and guidance from SO. See Authors contributions, page 27, lines 27-32. |
| 2 | Credentials | | What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD | | All researchers | | See Title Page and additional information under the section on Authors’ contributions on page 27, lines 27-32. |
| 3 | Occupation | | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | | All researchers | | Addressed under the section on Authors’ contributions on page 27, lines 27-32 and also under the acknowledgments section, page 27. Lines 35-37 |
| 4 | Gender | | Was the researcher male or female? | |  | | Principal research PKK is a male |
| 5 | Experience and training | | What experience or training did the researcher have? | |  | | At the time of the study, PKK, the lead researcher was undertaking doctorate training in Food, Nutrition, and Dietetics, of Kenyatta University, Kenya. See Acknowledgments section, lines 35-37, page 27 |
|  | **Relationship with participants** | | | | | | |
| 6 | Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | Yes, “contacts were obtained by making phone calls to the known contacts, explaining to them the purpose of the research, the methods that were to be used for data collection…” See Participant selection, Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND, page 4, lines 2-9 |
| All | | Yes, “All study respondents were provided a detailed consent form explaining the purpose of the study…” See participant selection, page 4, line 18, line 36-37, and line 47-49. Also See Declarations-Ethics approval and consent to participate section, page 27, lines 5-8. |
| 7 | Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research | | | All | | The following information about the research was contained in the consent form that was provided and explained to participants before responding to the study instruments: introduction/background to the study; research purpose and objectives; study procedures, information on voluntary participation, possible risks and time required for responding to the study instrument; information on benefits and compensation; confidentiality; and information on whom to contact any case of need of further clarification about the research. See supplementary file 1. |
| 8 | Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic | | | Principal researcher | | Addressed under section on Researcher Standpoint, on page 5, lines 31-40. |
|  | **Domain 2: study design** | | | | | | |
| 9 | Methodological orientation and  Theory | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? E.g grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis | | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | Content analysis. See Data analysis, page 5, lines 46-47. |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND & HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | Content analysis. See Data analysis lines, page 6, lines 5-9. |
|  | **Participant selection** | | | | | | |
| 10 | Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | Exhaustive sampling. See Participant selection-Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND, Page 4, lines 10-14 |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND | | Purposive sampling. See Participant selection-Academic staff that train HN/HND, page 4, line 28-33 |
| HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | Purposive sampling. See Participant selection- HN/HND work/internship supervisors, page 4, line 39-47 |
| 11 | Method of approach | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | A email-based survey was used. See Methods-study design and setting, page 3, lines 20-21; Participant selection-Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND, Page 4, lines 16-20. |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND | | Face to face interviews. See Participant selection-Academic staff that train HN/HND, page 4, lines 34-35. |
| HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | Face to face interviews. See Participant selection- HN/HND work/internship supervisors, page 4, lines 40-42. |
| 12 | Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | 450 were invited to participate in the study. See Participant selection-Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND; Page 4, lines 8-12 |
| HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | 11 supervisors participated. See Participant selection- HN/HND work/internship supervisors, page 4, line 42-47 |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND | | 14 staff participated. See Participant selection-Academic staff that train HN/HND, page 4, line 32 |
| 13 | Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | Responses were received from 132 of the 450 invited participants; giving a response rate of 29.3%. As such 318 did not participate. See Results-Demographics, training, and occupational characteristics of the HN/HND graduates, page 6, lines 10-12. |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND | | None |
| HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | None |
|  | **Setting** | | | | | | |
| 14 | Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace | | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | This depended on respondents convenience as study tools were self-administered having been emailed by the research team |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND | | At the interviewee’s workplace. See Participant selection-Academic staff that train HN/HND, page 4, line 36-38 |
| HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | At the interviewee’s workplace. See Participant selection- HN/HND work/internship supervisors, page 4, lines 47-49 |
| 15 | Presence of non-participants | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? | | | Academic staff that train HN/HND | | No |
| HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | No |
| 16 | Description of sample | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date | | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | Described under the Results-Demographics, training, and occupational characteristics of the HN/HND graduates, page 6, lines 9-15 and page 7, lines 1-21 |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND | | Described under the Results-Demographic characteristics of the academic staff and work/internship supervisors, page 8, lines 1-9 |
| HN/HND work/internship supervisors | |
|  | **Data collection** | | | | | | |
| 17 | Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | | Prompts were catered for in the study instrument. Instrument was also pre-tested. See Methods-Study Instruments, page 5, lines 1-22 and supplemental file 2 |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND & HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | | Prompts were catered for in the study instrument. Study tool was pretested. See Methods-Study Instruments, page 5, lines24-29 and supplemental files 3 and 4. |
| 18 | Repeat interviews | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | | None, except for the reminders that were sent to participants with the aim of improving response rate. See Participant selection-Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND, page 4, lines 24-27. |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND & HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | | None |
| 19 | Audio/visual recording | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? | | Academic staff that train HN/HND & HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | | Audio recording was done for some of the participants. See Methods- Academic staff that train HN/HND, page 4, lines 35-36 and Methods-HN/HND work/internship supervisors, page 4, line 49-50. |
| 20 | Field notes | Were ﬁeld notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | | No notes were taken, rather, reliance was on the written feedback received from the graduates in response to the study questions |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND & HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | | Field notes were taken during the interview. See Methods-Academic staff that train HN/HND, page 4, lines 33-34; Methods-HN/HND work/internship supervisors, page 4, lines 49. |
| 21 | Duration | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? | | Academic staff that train HN/HND & HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | | Interviews lasted for about 45 minutes to one hour on average. See Participant Selection-Academic staff that train HN/HND, page 4, lines 37-38 and Participant Selection-HN/HND work/internship supervisors, page 4, line 50-51. |
| 22 | Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | | Yes, see Data analysis, page 5, lines 46-48 |
| 23 | Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? | | All | | | No |
|  | **Domain 3: analysis and ﬁndings** | | | | | | |
|  | **Data analysis** | | | | | | |
| 24 | Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | | All | | | Three coders. See data analysis section, page 6, lines 6-7, and the Acknowledgements section, page 27, lines 42-43 |
| 25 | Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | | No | | | - |
| 26 | Derivation of themes | Were themes identiﬁed in advance or derived from the data? | | All | | | Derived from the data. See Data analysis section, page 5, lines 44-48 and page 6, lines 5-7 |
| 27 | Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | | | Microsoft Excel 2010 version and Statistical Package for Social Scientists software version 20. See Data analysis page 5, lines 43 and 49. |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND & HN/HND work/internship supervisors | | | Microsoft Excel 2010 version and NVivo 12. See Data analysis, page 6, lines 3-5. |
| 28 | Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the ﬁndings? | | All | | | Yes, feedback was received in through a validation workshop. See Methods-study design and setting section, page 3, lines 38-40 and the section on observations from the stakeholder validation workshop on page 21, lines 1-41 and page 22, lines 1-28 |
|  | **Reporting** | | | | | | |
| 29 | Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / ﬁndings? Was each quotation identiﬁed? e.g. participant number | | | | Graduates of the Bachelor’s degree in HN/HND | Most of the responses were coded and quantitized. Hence minimal use of quotations has been in Table 5 on page 11.  Quotations from the validation of findings are however presented. See section on observations from the stakeholder validation workshop on page 21, lines 1-41 and page 22, lines 1-28  Note: Quotations were used are de-identified |
| Academic staff that train HN/HND & HN/HND work/internship supervisors | Feedback mainly presented in the form of quotations across the results section, e.g. see Table 4, page 9; Table 6, page 12; Results- Nature of work and job roles performed by Nutrition and Dietetics professionals in Uganda- Perceptions of the academic staff and work/internship supervisors, page 14 lines 36-46; Table 9 on page 19-20; and section on observations from the stakeholder validation workshop on page 21, lines 1-41 and page 22, lines 1-28  Note: Quotations were used are de-identified |
| 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? | | | | All | Yes, e.g |
| 32 | Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | | | | All |  |