

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

No	Item	Guide questions/description	Author response
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
Personal Characteristics			
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Lindsay Grant-Nunn [LGN] and James Thomas Toguri [JT]; stated in text (methods section)
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? <i>E.g. PhD, MD</i>	The LGN has a MD; JT has a PhD; the lead author [RU] a PhD
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	LGN: medical student JT: medical student RU: Assistant Professor, Department of Surgery
4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	LGN: female, JT: male, RU: female
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	LGN and JT training from RU in qualitative research RU: PI, expertise in qualitative research
Relationship with participants			
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	There was no relationship between the interviewers [LGN or JT] and either participant prior to study commencement. The lead author [RU] knew some study participants (oncologists) in a professional capacity only.

7.	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. <i>personal goals, reasons for doing the research</i>	Many participants (oncologists) would have known that the lead author [RU] has research programs in cancer survivorship and palliative/end of life care.
8.	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. <i>Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i>	No characteristics are reported about the interviewer, other than they were medical students with limited experience in ACP.
Domain 2: study design			
Theoretical framework			
9.	Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. <i>grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</i>	This was a descriptive qualitative study, with the guiding orientation cited in the paper (Sandelowski).
Participant selection			
10.	Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. <i>purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</i>	Self-selected by posters (patients/families) or purposive (oncologists); stated in text (methods section)
11.	Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. <i>face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i>	Email and self-selection; stated in text (methods section)
12.	Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	4 patients, 4 family members, 10 oncologists; stated in text (results section)
13.	Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	As patients and family members were self-selected none refused or dropped out, 10/15 oncologists

			contacted participated in the study.
Setting			
14.	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? <i>e.g. home, clinic, workplace</i>	In person or telephone; stated in text (methods section).
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? <i>e.g. demographic data, date</i>	Given the nature of this study, detailed demographic data are not presented. Participants were situated in Nova Scotia and once patient who had moved to Ontario (results section).
Data collection			
17.	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	There was an interview guide developed by the researchers (provided in Supplemental File 1), based on the research objectives and relevant literature.
18.	Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	No; stated in text (methods section).
19.	Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Yes, audio recording; stated in text (methods section).
20.	Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	No.
21.	Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	~30-60 minutes; stated in text (results section).
22.	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Yes, the interviews continued until data saturation was reached. This was determined by constant comparison techniques and

			research team discussion.
23.	Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No.
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
Data analysis			
24.	Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Two researchers [JT, RU] coded the all transcripts (methods section).
25.	Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	A coding scheme, containing code definitions and decision rules related to each code, was developed by the research team. This was achieved through (1) review of all interview transcripts by RU and JT and (2) review of codes and discussion between RU and JT. (methods section).
26.	Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Derived from the data; analysis process discussed in text (methods section).
27.	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	No; stated in text (methods section).
28.	Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	No.
Reporting			
29.	Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? <i>e.g. participant number</i>	Yes (results section).
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	Yes.

32.	Clarity of minor themes	findings? Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	No.
-----	-------------------------	--	-----
