**Supplementary information – Quality checklist for interviews**

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No. Item** | **Guide questions/description** | **Reported** |
| **Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity** |  |  |
| *Personal characteristics* |  |  |
| 1. Interviewer
 | Which author conducted the interview? | [BLINDED FOR SUBMISSION]  |
| 1. Credentials
 | What were the researcher’s credentials? | [BLINDED FOR SUBMISSION] |
| 1. Occupation
 | What was their occupation at the time of study? | [BLINDED FOR SUBMISSION] |
| 1. Gender
 | Was the research male/female? | [BLINDED FOR SUBMISSION] |
| 1. Experience and training
 | What experience or training did the researcher have? | [BLINDED FOR SUBMISSION] |
| *Relationship with participants* |  |  |
| 1. Relationship established
 | Was a relationship established prior to commencement | The interviews were held following completion of follow-up outcome measures. All follow-up assessments were completed by the lead author.  |
| 1. Participant knowledge of the interviewer
 | What did the participants know about the researcher? | Participants knew the university affiliation of the researcher and the purpose of the study obtained from the participant information sheets |
| 1. Interviewer characteristics
 | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer? | [BLINDED FOR SUBMISSION] |
| **Domain 2: Study design** |  |  |
| *Theoretical framework* |  |  |
| 1. Methodological orientation and theory
 | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study?  | Thematic analysis |
| *Participant selection* |  |  |
| 1. Sampling
 | How were participants selected? | Convenience sample |
| 1. Method of approach
 | How were participants approached? | Telephone and face-to-face |
| 1. Sample size
 | How many participants were in the study? | Eleven participants took part in feedback interviews |
| 1. Non-participation
 | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | 11 out of 17 participants randomised to the intervention arm completed follow-up interviews. Four participants dropped-out and could not be reached to obtain reasons for drop-out. Follow-up interviews were optional and two participants chose not to take part in interviews.  |
| *Setting* |  |  |
| 1. Setting of data collection
 | Where was the data collected? | Clinic |
| 1. Presence of non-participants
 | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? | No |
| 1. Description of sample
 | What are the important characteristics of the sample? | Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics are described in the results |
| *Data collection* |  |  |
| 1. Interview guide
 | Were questions, prompts, guides, provided by the authors? Was it pilot-tested? | An interview guide containing questions and prompts was used by the researcher. The guide was pilot-tested with non-randomised participants from the first round of recruitment.  |
| 1. Repeat interviews
 | Were report interviews carried out? | No |
| 1. Audio/visual recording
 | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? | Interviews were audio-recorded |
| 1. Field notes
 | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview? | Yes |
| 1. Duration
 | What was the duration of the interviews? | Interviews lasted for between 20-30 minutes |
| 1. Data saturation
 | Was data saturation discussed?  | Yes |
| 1. Transcripts returned
 | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment/correction> | No |
| **Domain 3: Analysis and findings** |  |  |
| *Data analysis* |  |  |
| 1. Number of data coders
 | How many data coders coded the data? | One |
| 1. Description of the coding tree
 | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | No |
| 1. Derivation of themes
 | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? | Themes were derived from the data |
| 1. Software
 | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | No software was used |
| 1. Participant checking
 | Did participants provide feedback on the findings? | No |
| *Reporting* |  |  |
| 1. Quotations presented
 | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified?  | Yes. Quotations were presented in table 2 and identified by participant number  |
| 1. Data and findings consistent
 | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? | Yes. Consistency between the data and the findings was reviewed in the discussion.  |
| 1. Clarity of major themes
 | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? | Yes. See results section.  |
| 1. Clarity of minor themes
 | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Yes. See results section.  |