**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. |