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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No. Item** | **Guide questions/description** | **Reported on Page #** |
| **Domain 1: Research team and reﬂexivity** |  |  |
| *Personal Characteristics* |  |  |
| 1. Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | Deborah T. Esan |
| 2. Credentials | What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD | Deborah T.Esan, MPH, BNSc, , RN, RM, RPHN,Senior Lecturer |
|  |  |  Kelechukwu Q. Nnamani, BNSc, RN, RM, RPHN, Nurse Intern |
|  |  |  Agatha Ogunkorode, Ph.D, MSN,M.ed. BSN, RN, Senior Lecturer |
|  |  | Fatimah Muhammad, MSN student, BNSc, RN, RM, RPHN, Staff NurseOlamide O. Oluwagbemi,MSN, BNsc, RN, RM |
| 3. Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | Lecturer, Undergraduate student, Lecturer, Staff Nurse, Nurse/Midwife |
| 4. Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | Female |
| 5. Experience and | What experience or training did the | We have conducted qualitative studies, quantitative studies previously |
| training | researcher have? |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| *Relationship with participants* |  | None |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6. Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | Yes, to create a trusting relationship |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know aboutthe researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research | The research objectives were explained to participants. Informed consent was obtained |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons andinterests in the research topic | Interest in the research topic |
| **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 | Theoretical framework Roy adaptation model was used |
| *Participant selection* |  |  |
| 10. Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g.purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | Purposive sampling was used |
| 11. Method of approach | How were participants approached?e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | Face-to-face audio-recorded guided by open ended questions |
| 12. Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | 15 |
| 13. Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | None |
| *Setting* |  |  |
| 14. Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace | Hospital |
| 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. demographic data, date | All participants were either cases of primary infertility or secondary infertility |
| *Data collection* |  |  |
| 17. Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | Yes |
| 18. Repeat interviews | Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many? | No |
| 19. Audio/visual recording | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? | We used audio recording |
| 20. Field notes | Were ﬁeld notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? | Yes |
| 21. Duration | What was the duration of the inter views or focus group? | 30-40 minutes |
| 22. Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | Yes |
| 23. Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or | None of the participants signified interest in receiving the transcript but they were given the option |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | correction? |  |
| **Domain 3: analysis and ﬁndings** |  |  |
| *Data analysis* |  |  |
| 24. Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | 5 coders |
| 25. Description of thecoding tree | Did authors provide a description ofthe coding tree? | It was described in the method section |
| 26. Derivation of themes | Were themes identiﬁed in advance or derived from the data? | Themes were derived from the data |
| 27. Software | What software, if applicable, was usedto manage the data? | Not applicable |
| 28. Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the ﬁndings? | They confirmed the findings |
| *Reporting* |  |  |
| 29. Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/ﬁndings? Was each quotation identiﬁed? e.g.participant number | 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? | Yes |