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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No. Item** | **Guide questions/description** | **Reported on Page #** |
| **Domain 1: Research team and reﬂexivity** |  |  |
| *Personal Characteristics* |  |  |
| 1. Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the inter view or focus group? | Dr Lola Kola |
| 2. Credentials | What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD | LK has a PhD in Medical Sociology. See data Analysis section  Ist paragraph Page 5 |
| 3. Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | LK is a senior research officer at the Department of Psychiatry, University of Ibadan, and an associate professor at the Department of Sociology, Lead City University, Ibadan. See data Analysis section  Ist paragraph Page 5 |
| 4. Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | Female |
| 5. Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? | PhD  Ist paragraph Page 5 |
| *Relationship with participants* |  |  |
| 6. Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | No relationship was established with participants, prior to the study. See data Collection section: Page 3 last paragraph |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research | Participants were contacted on phone and briefed about the aims and purpose of the study after which they were invited to participate. Data collection: Page 3 last paragraph |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic | LK, facilitated the FGDs. At the beginning of all the group discussions, she declared to participants that she was not from a medical background and this proved valuable because participants were able to let down their guards and were unpretentious during the discussions.  Page 4, last paragraph in the data collection section) |
| **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 | The Behavioral Model for Vulnerable Populations provided a systematic framework for the study- Page 2 (last lines) Last paragraph in the background section  All transcripts were analyzed using content analysis of themes that emerged from the FGDs - Page 4 Data Analysis section (last paragraph). |
| *Participant selection* |  |  |
| 10. Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | Participants were purposively selected from an existing data base.- page 3, methods section, - first paragraph; Data Collection section, last paragraph - page 3 |
| 11. Method of approach | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | Participants were contacted on phone- Data collection: Page 3 - last paragraph |
| 12. Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | Participants were 42 in all - Result section page 4 , first paragraph |
| 13. Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | 8 out of those invited did not participate in the FGDs. Even though all 25 women invited accepted to participate, Only seventeen of then in all showed up on the days of the FGDs. One of the 26 care providers invited declined our invitation to participate in the FGD at the last minute because of an emergency work commitment. Data collection section. Page 3, last paragraph |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Setting* |  |  |
| 14. Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace | A seminar room at the University of Ibadan. Data Collection section Page 4, 2nd paragraph . |
| 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 | Table 3 describes our study sample |
| *Data collection* |  |  |
| 17. Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | The question quide was semi structured and allowed for exploration. Interview section - Page 3, 3rd paragraph |
| 18. Repeat interviews | Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many? | No repeat interviews were conducted |
| 19. Audio/visual recording | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? | All FGDs were audiotaped. Data collection section - page 4, last paragraph |
| 20. Field notes | Were ﬁeld notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group? | DA took field notes. Data collection section. page 4, second paragraph |
| 21. Duration | What was the duration of the inter views or focus group? | 70 -90 minutes. See data collection section page 4, second paragraph |
| 22. Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | Yes. Data collection section, page 3 - 4; last paragraph in page 3 and 1st paragraph in page 4. |
| 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? | LK and DA. Data analysis section - page 4 last paragraph |
| 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? | Subjective interpretation of the text data was achieved through the systematic classification process of coding, the identification of themes, and avoidance of preconceived categories; Data analysis section - page 4 last paragraph |
| 27. Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | No |
| 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? e.g. participant number | Yes. See Result section, pages 6 - 9 (All paragraphs on the pages) |
| 30. Data and ﬁndings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the ﬁndings? | Yes, there was.  Page 6 to 11 (All paragraphs on the pages) |
| 31. Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the ﬁndings? | Yes. See Result section, pages 5 - 9 (All paragraphs on the pages) |
| 32. Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Discussion of major and minor themes  From page 5 to 11 (All paragraphs on the pages) |