

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

Please indicate in which section each item has been reported in your manuscript. If you do not feel an item applies to your manuscript, please enter N/A.

For further information about the COREQ guidelines, please see Tong *et al.*, 2017:

<https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>

No.	Item	Description	Section #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
Personal characteristics			
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	"Testing Prototypes and collecting data", 1 st paragraph
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? <i>E.g. PhD, MD</i>	"Testing Prototypes and collecting data", 1 st paragraph
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	"Methods", 2 st paragraph
4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	"Methods", 2 st paragraph
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	"Testing Prototypes and collecting data", 1 st paragraph
Relationship with participants			
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	"Identifying and recruiting participating stakeholders" 2 nd paragraph
7.	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? <i>E.g. Personal goals, reasons for doing the research</i>	"Individual interviews employing user testing methods", 2 nd paragraph "Group interviews", 2 nd paragraph
8.	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? <i>E.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i>	See "Reflexivity" (Discussion, 5 th paragraph)
Domain 2: Study design			
Theoretical framework			
9.	Methodological orientation and theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? <i>E.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</i>	"Methods", 1 st paragraph
Participant selection			

10.	Sampling	How were participants selected? <i>E.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</i>	Table 1
11.	Method of approach	How were participants approached? <i>E.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i>	Table 1
12.	Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	Table 6
13.	Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? What were the reasons for this?	n/a
Setting			
14.	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? <i>E.g. home, clinic, workplace</i>	Table 3
15.	Presence of nonparticipants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	"Group interviews", 2 nd paragraph
16.	Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? <i>E.g. demographic data, date</i>	Table 2 and 3
Data collection			
17.	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	"Individual interviews employing user testing methods", 1 st paragraph and "Group interview", 1 st paragraph. See also Supplementary data for interview guide manuscripts.
18.	Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	Table 6
19.	Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	"Individual interviews employing user testing methods", 3 rd paragraph "Group interviews", 2 nd paragraph
20.	Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	"Piloting and observation"
21.	Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	"Individual interviews employing user testing methods", 1 st paragraph and "Group interview", 1 st paragraph.
22.	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	"Data analysis" 2 nd paragraph, and "Checking with stakeholders"
23.	Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	Interpretations (not transcripts): "Checking with stakeholders"
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
Data analysis			

24.	Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	"Data analysis", 1 st and 2 nd paragraph
25.	Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	"Data analysis" 1 st and 2 nd paragraph. See also Supplementary data files: "DevelopmentCycle1_legend" "DevelopmentCycle2_codes and response options" "DevelopmentCycle2_definitions"
26.	Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	"Data analysis" 2 nd paragraph
27.	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	"Data analysis" 1 st paragraph
28.	Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	"Checking with stakeholders"
Reporting			
29.	Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? <i>E.g. Participant number</i>	Tables 9-12. We entered participant numbers in earlier table drafts, but took them out to improve readability. Are available on demand.
30.	Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	
31.	Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	
32.	Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	

When submitting your manuscript via the online submission form, please upload the completed checklist as a Figure/supplementary file.

If you would like this checklist to be included alongside your article, we ask that you upload the completed checklist to an online repository and include the guideline type, name of the repository, DOI and license in the *Data availability* section of your manuscript.

Developed from: Allison Tong, Peter Sainsbury, Jonathan Craig, Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups, International Journal for Quality in Health Care, Volume 19, Issue 6, December 2007, Pages 349–357, <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>