

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

| No. Item                                       | Guide questions/description  | Reported on Page #  |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity</b> |  |   |
| <i>Personal Characteristics</i>                |  |   |
| 1. Inter viewer/facilitator                    | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?   | <b>p.3</b>  |
| 2. Credentials                                 | What were the researcher's credentials?<br>E.g. PhD, MD  | <b>p.3; Masters</b>   |
| 3. Occupation                                  | What was their occupation at the time of the study?  | <b>p.3; Research Assistant</b>  |
| 4. Gender                                      | Was the researcher male or female?   | <b>Female</b>   |
| 5. Experience and training                     | What experience or training did the researcher have?   | <b>p.3; Masters public health/behavioral and social health science level training</b> |
| <i>Relationship with participants</i>          |  |   |
| 6. Relationship established                    | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?  | <b>p.3; Yes, indirectly as the study RA</b>   |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer    | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research                                   | <b>Minimal; focus was on PN, not interviewer</b>                                      |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics                 | What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic | <b>p.3; independence from intervention team and thematic analysis team</b>            |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Domain 2: study design</b>            |  |   |
| <i>Theoretical framework</i>             |  |   |
| 9. Methodological orientation and Theory | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis | <b>p.3; applied thematic analysis</b>     |
| <i>Participant selection</i>             |  |   |
| 10. Sampling                             | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball   | <b>p.3; parent RCT</b>                    |
| 11. Method of approach                   | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email  | <b>Described in parent RCT</b>            |
| 12. Sample size                          | How many participants were in the study?   | <b>p.4; 23</b>                            |
| 13. Non-participation                    | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?  | <b>p.4; Four with no reasons reported</b> |
| <i>Setting</i>                           |  |   |
| 14. Setting of data collection           | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace   | <b>p.3; Zoom</b>                          |
| 15. Presence of non-participants         | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?  | <b>p.3; No</b>                            |
| 16. Description of sample                | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date  | <b>p.4; 13 (Table 1)</b>                  |
| <i>Data collection</i>                   |  |   |
| 17. Interview guide                      | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  | <b>p.3</b>                                |
| 18. Repeat interviews                    | Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?   | <b>N/A</b>                                |
| 19. Audio/visual recording               | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  | <b>p.3; audio</b>                         |
| 20. Field notes                          | Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?   | <b>Minimal</b>                            |
| 21. Duration                             | What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?   | <b>p.3; 60-min</b>                        |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| 22. Data saturation                    | Was data saturation discussed?  | <b>p.No since any participant in the parent study was eligible to complete</b> |
| 23. Transcripts returned               | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?  | <b>No</b>  |
| <b>Domain 3: analysis and findings</b> |   |  |
| <i>Data analysis</i>                   |   |  |
| 24. Number of data coders              | How many data coders coded the data?  | <b>p.3; two</b>  |
| 25. Description of the coding tree     | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?   | <b>No</b>  |
| 26. Derivation of themes               | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?   | <b>p.3; yes abductive approach</b>   |
| 27. Software                           | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  | <b>p.3; Nvivo</b>  |
| 28. Participant checking               | Did participants provide feedback on the findings?  | <b>No</b>  |
| <i>Reporting</i>                       |   |  |
| 29. Quotations presented               | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number | <b>p.4-6; yes</b>  |
| 30. Data and findings consistent       | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?  | <b>Yes</b>   |
| 31. Clarity of major themes            | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?  | <b>Yes</b>   |
| 32. Clarity of minor themes            | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?  | <b>Yes</b>   |