|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Item** | **Guide questions/description** | **Answers** |
| **Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity**  |   |   |   |
| Personal Characteristics  |   |   |   |
| 1.  | Interviewer/facilitator  | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?  | YM (the first author) conducted the interviews  |
| 2.  | Credentials  | What were the researcher's credentials? *E.g. PhD, MD*  |  YM has PhD, this information is also available on the title page  |
| 3.  | Occupation  | What was their occupation at the time of the study?  |  Project leader/researcher |
| 4.  | Gender  | Was the researcher male or female?  |  Female |
| 5.  | Experience and training  | What experience or training did the researcher have?  | Extensive experience in conducting interviews and focus groups (more than 10 years) |
| Relationship with participants  |   |   |   |
| 6.  | Relationship established  | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?  | All the participants were contacted prior to the study (Methods, p.6) |
| 7.  | Participant knowledge of the interviewer  | What did the participants know about the researcher? e*.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research*  | The information about the research and its aim was stated in the invitation letter and also discussed on the phone. And the information about the researcher was provided before/during the interview itself |
| 8.  | Interviewer characteristics  | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. *Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic*  | The information about the interviewer’s characteristics such as role of the researcher, interests in the topic, skills, interview questions were discussed before the interview  |
| **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*  | Our approach was phenomenological. Please see Introduction, p 4 and Methods pp. 8-9 |
| Participant selection  |   |   |   |
| 10.  | Sampling  | How were participants selected? *e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball*  | Purposive sampling was used. Methods, p. 5 |
| 11.  | Method of approach  | How were participants approached? e*.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email*  | Participants were approached by mail and phone. Methods, p. 6 |
| 12.  | Sample size  | How many participants were in the study?  | There were 20 participants, Methods, p. 5 |
| 13.  | Non-participation  | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?  | A first selection of N=40 Longitudinal Ageing Study Amsterdam (LASA) participants was made on the basis of these principles, ofwhich N=36 were invited to participate in the current study (four participants had alreadyparticipated in other ancillary LASA studies and were not contacted for this study so as not tooverburden them). Of these, N=12 agreed to participate. A second selection of participantswas made on the basis of the guiding principles (N=37), of which N=23 were invited toparticipate. A final selection was made, consisting of N=15, of which N=7 were approachedand N=4 agreed to participate. The reasons for not participating in the current study were:having no time, not willing to participate, having health problems or going on holidays. Someof the participants (four participants) could not be contacted during the period of the study.Methods, pp.5-6 |
| Setting  |   |   |   |
| 14.  | Setting of data collection  | Where was the data collected? e*.g. home, clinic, workplace*  | All the interviews took place at the home of the participants, Methods, p. 8 |
| 15.  | Presence of non-participants  | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?  | There was no one else present during the interviews besides the participants and researcher, Methods, p. 8 |
| 16.  | Description of sample  | What are the important characteristics of the sample? *e.g. demographic data, date*  |  In total N=20 participants took part in the study (11 males and nine females) ranging in age from 55 to 70 years. The study took place between November 2017 and April 2018. Five participants were from low socioeconomic neighborhoods and the other 15 from high socioeconomic neighborhoods. Methods, p. 5 and Table 1, pp. 32-33 |
| Data collection  |   |   |   |
| 17.  | Interview guide  | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  | The authors developed the topics and questions of the interview guide based on existing literature on different aspects of physical and social environments, perceptions on and experiences with living environment, and relations between mental health, well-being and the living environment of older people. The interview guide was pilot-tested with five participants. Subsequently, some of the questions were modified and adjusted.Methods, p. 8  |
| 18.  | Repeat interviews  | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?  | No |
| 19.  | Audio/visual recording  | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  | All the interviews were recorded. Methods, p. 8 |
| 20.  | Field notes  | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  | Fields notes were made directly after the inter views. Methods, p. 8 |
| 21.  | Duration  | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?  | The interviews lasted from one and a half to two and a half hours. Methods, p. 8 |
| 22.  | Data saturation  | Was data saturation discussed?  | Data saturation was not discussed, however the data was collected until the saturation point.  |
| 23.  | Transcripts returned  | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?  | Yes, transcripts were returned to the participants for comments. Methods, p. 8 |
| **Domain 3: analysis and findings**z  |   |   |   |
| Data analysis  |   |   |   |
| 24.  | Number of data coders  | How many data coders coded the data?  | There were two coders. Methods, p. 8 |
| 25.  | Description of the coding tree  | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  | The authors provide the description of the coding process. Methods, pp. 8-9 |
| 26.  | Derivation of themes  | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?  | The themes derived from the data. Methods, pp. 8-9 |
| 27.  | Software  | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  | Atlas.ti was used to manage the data. Methods, p. 8 |
| 28.  | Participant checking  | Did participants provide feedback on the findings?  | The participants did not provide the feedback on the findings. They were promised to read the article when it is published  |
| Reporting  |   |   |   |
| 29.  | Quotations presented  | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e*.g. participant number*  | Yes, the participant quotations were present to illustrate the themes. Results, pp. 12-18 |
| 30.  | Data and findings consistent  | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?  | Yes, there was the data consistency between the data presented and the findings  |
| 31.  | Clarity of major themes  | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?  |  Yes, we believe that major themes were clearly presented in the findings. Results, pp. 9-18 |
| 32.  | Clarity of minor themes  | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?  | There is also discussion of minor themes that seemed to be important. For instance Discussion, p. 21 |