**Consolidated criteria for Reporting Qualitative research (COREQ) Checklist**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No. Item** | **Guide questions/description** | **Answers** | **page** |
| **Domain 1: Research team and reﬂexivity** |  |  |  |
| *Personal Characteristics* |  |  |  |
| 1. Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | CC; VS | 7 |
| 2. Credentials | What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD | CC is a RN, GNC(c),PhD; VS is a PhD | 8 |
| 3. Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | Assistant Professor and Associate Teaching Professor at Ontario Universities | 8 |
| 4. Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | Female; female | 8 |
| 5. Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? | Both PIs are well versed in qualitative research and have published papers using qualitative methods. VS and CC have backgrounds in qualitative methods. | 8 |
| *Relationship with participants* |  |  |  |
| 6. Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | No | 8 |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research | VS is a prominent advocate for and researcher of LTC families; CC as a researcher focused on improving the care of older adults in LTC. Both with an in-depth knowledge about LTC care (e.g. CC conducted her PhD in LTC homes). | 8 |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic | The interviewers have expertise in qualitative methods by background and training, and had no prior relationship with the participants. | 8 |
| **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 analysis | 8 |
| *Participant selection* |  |  |  |
| 10. Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | Purposive sampling, and we tried to recruit more male caregivers to have equal numbers of males and females but were not able to. Also, using Twitter, the “retweets” could encourage snowball sampling. | 6 |
| 11. Method of approach | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | Social media (i.e., Twitter) was used to recruit participants. Interested participants emailed the PIs and communication occurred via email. | 6 |
| 12. Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | 30 | 7 |
| 13. Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | 0 | 8 |
| *Setting* |  |  |  |
| 14. Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace | Virtual over Zoom | 7 |
| 15. Presence of non-participants | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? | No | 7 |
| 16. Description of sample | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date | All were family caregivers of a resident living in LTC and were unable to visit for extended periods of time during the COVID-19 pandemic. These family members considered themselves “essential caregivers” and provided the primary emotional support and companionship for the resident. | 6 |
| *Data collection* |  |  |  |
| 17. Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | The question guide was developed and pilot tested. | 7 |
| 18. Repeat interviews | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? | No | 8 |
| 19. Audio/visual recording | Did the researcher use audio or visual recording to collect the data? | Video recording (which included audio) | 7 |
| 20. Field notes | Were ﬁeld notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? | Yes, and these were check with each other after each interview. These also served to inform the generation of the codes. | 8 |
| 21. Duration | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? | 90 mins | 7 |
| 22. Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | Yes | 8 |
| 23. Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? | No | N/A |
| **Domain 3: analysis and ﬁndings** |  |  |  |
| *Data analysis* |  |  |  |
| 24. Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | 3 (AY,CC,VS) | 9 |
| 25. Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | Yes, the coding tree is included as a table. | Table 1 |
| 26. Derivation of themes | Were themes identiﬁed in advance or derived from the data? | Derived from the data | 9 |
| 27. Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | NVivo 12 | 8 |
| 28. Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the ﬁndings? | No | N/A |
| *Reporting* |  |  |  |
| 29. Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/ﬁndings? Was each quotation identiﬁed? e.g. participant number | Yes | 10-24 |
| 30. Data and ﬁndings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the ﬁndings? | Yes | 10-24 |
| 31. Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the ﬁndings? | Yes | 10-24 |
| 32. Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Yes | 10-24 |
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