**Supplementary File 2**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic**  | **Item No.**  | **Guide Questions/Description**  | **Reported on Page No.**  |
| **Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity**  |   |   |   |
| *Personal characteristics*  |   |   |   |
| Interviewer/facilitator  | 1  | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?  | Reported on in data collection section in page 8. |
| Credentials  | 2  | What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD  |  Researchers credentials identified in title page |
| Occupation  | 3  | What was their occupation at the time of the study?  |  Reported on in title page |
| Gender  | 4  | Was the researcher male or female?  |  Reported on in title page |
| Experience and training  | 5  | What experience or training did the researcher have?  | Please see qualifications of authors on title page. All authors have undertaken both quantitative and qualitative research studies.  |
| *Relationship with participants*  |   |   |   |
| Relationship established  | 6  | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?  | Yes. Details of which are reported in in data collection section on page 9.  |
| Participant knowledge of the interviewer  | 7  | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research  | All researchers were known to participants as faculty members – see title page. |
| Interviewer characteristics  | 8  | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic  | Researchers had no supervisory relationship to the students and they were assured that their responses would not affect their progression on their programmes in any way. This is reported on in data collection, analysis and ethical consideration sections - see pages, 8. 9 and 10. |
| **Domain 2: Study design**  |   |   |   |
| *Theoretical framework*  |   |   |   |
| Methodological orientation and Theory  | 9  | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis  | Qualitative descriptive design - see methods design section on page 6 |
| *Participant selection*  |   |   |  |
| Sampling  | 10  | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball  | A purposeful sampling technique was incorporated – see sample and setting section page 7 and 8 |
| Method of approach  | 11  | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email  | See sampling and setting section, data collection and ethical considerations on page 7, 8 and 10 |
| Sample size  | 12  | How many participants were in the study?  | See sample and setting section page 7 and 8 and table 1 |
| Non-participation  | 13  | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?  | N/A |
| *Setting*  |   |   |  |
| Setting of data collection  | 14  | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace  | See data collection section on page 8 and 9. |
| Presence of nonparticipants  | 15  | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?  | No |
| Description of sample  | 16  | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date  | See sample and setting section page 7 and 8 and table 1 |
| *Data collection*  |   |   |  |
| Interview guide  | 17  | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  | Yes, see data collection section on page 8 and 9 and suplementary file 1. No pilot test took place however, after each interview the review informed subsequent interviews. |
| Repeat interviews  | 18  | Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?  | No, N/A |
| Audio/visual recording  | 19  | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  | Yes, see data collection section on page 8 and 9 |
| Field notes  | 20  | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  | Field notes were taken both during and after interviews. |
| Duration  | 21  | What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?  | See data collection section on page 8 and 9 |
| Data saturation  | 22  | Was data saturation discussed?  | Yes, data saturation was achieved at interview 15  |
| Transcripts returned  | 23  | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?  | No |
| **Topic**  | **Item No.**  | **Guide Questions/Description**  | **Extra detail provided** **&****Reported on Page No.**  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Domain 3: analysis and findings**  |   |   |   |
| *Data analysis*  |   |   |   |
| Number of data coders  | 24  | How many data coders coded the data?  | See data analysis section – see page 9 and 10 |
| Description of the coding tree  | 25  | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  | No |
| Derivation of themes  | 26  | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?  | Themes were derived from the data. See data analysis section – see page 9 and 10. |
| Software  | 27  | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  | N/A |
| Participant checking  | 28  | Did participants provide feedback on the findings?  | No |
| *Reporting*  |   |   |  |
| Quotations presented  | 29  | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number  | Yes, see findings section pages 10-19. |
| Data and findings consistent  | 30  | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?  | Yes, see findings section pages 10-19. |
| Clarity of major themes  | 31  | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?  | Yes, see findings section pages 10-19. |
| Clarity of minor themes  | 32  | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?  | N/A |

Developed from: Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357