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

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

**Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity.**

**Personal Characteristics**

1. Interviewer/facilitator: Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? Frank Fox

2. Credentials: What were the researcher’s credentials? B.Eng, LL.B, MApplSc, PhD

3. Occupation: What was their occupation at the time of the study? Researcher

4. Gender: Was the researcher male or female? Male

5. Experience and training: What experience or training did the researcher have? Research skills to PhD level training, 20+ years working research in industry and healthcare

**Relationship with participants**

6. Relationship established: Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? Agreed process with Medtronic gatekeeper. Provided patient information leaflet to each potential participant in advance.

7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer: What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research: Reasons for research contained in Patient Information Leaflet

 8. Interviewer characteristics: What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic: Not specifically addressed in the report. May be visible in the patient information leaflet.

**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: Thematic and Template analysis identified in report.

**Participant selection**

10. Sampling How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball: Purposive and snowball identified in report.

11. Method of approach: How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email: Potential participants were initially approached by Medtronic gatekeeper and subsequently by the interviewer to arrange interview details.

12. Sample size: How many participants were in the study? 17

13. Non-participation: How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? 3 potential participants declined as they felt they could not contribute to the aims. One set additional parameters which would have been incompatible i.e. wanted all questions in advance in writing.

**Setting**

14. Setting of data collection: Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace: Combination of in-person and remote (Teams./Zoom)

15. Presence of non-participants: Was anyone else present besides the participants & researcher? No

16. Description of sample: What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data: Broad range of roles interviewed including external to Medtronic. Details in report.

**Data collection**

17. Interview guide: Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Yes Was it pilot tested? Yes in scoping interviews

18. Repeat interviews: Were repeat interviews carried out?: No

19. Audio/visual recording: Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? Audio recorded as agreed with ethics and participants

20. Field notes: Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? Yes, to facilitate follow-up questions in the interview

21. Duration: What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? 30-60 minute range

22. Data saturation: Was data saturation discussed? Briefly, little new information was emerging in the later interviews.

23. Transcripts returned: Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? No but report drafts with quotations and findings were circulated for comment.

**Domain 3: analysis and findings**

**Data analysis**

24. Number of data coders: How many data coders coded the data? 1, the interviewer

25. Description of the coding tree: Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? Figure 2

26. Derivation of themes: Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? Template analysis using PESTLE and subthemes added on analysis

27. Software: What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? NVIVO

28. Participant checking: Did participants provide feedback on the findings? Yes, report drafts with quotations and findings were circulated for commen

**Reporting**

29. Quotations presented: Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Yes 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