**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?  | Local researchers who spoke the language. |
| *2.*  | Credentials  | What were the researcher's credentials? *E.g. PhD, MD*  | Title page  |
| *3.*  | Occupation  | What was their occupation at the time of the study?  | Title page  |
| *4.*  | Gender  | Was the researcher male or female?  | Both |
| *5.*  | Experience and training  | What experience or training did the researcher have?  | In Main text at the interview section, page 6 |
| Relationship with participants  |  |
| *6.*  | Relationship established  | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?  |  Yes |
| *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 doing as stated in the consent form and stated in Main text at Ethical consideration section.  |
| *8.*  | Interviewer characteristics  | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? *E.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic*  |  In Main text at the interview section, page 6 |
| **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*  | A qualitative study was adopted based on hermeneutic phenomenology and Heidegger’s philosophy. |
| Participant selection  |  |
| *10.*  | Sampling  | How were participants selected? *E.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball*  |  Snow ball |
| *11.*  | Method of approach  | How were participants approached? *E.g. face -to-face, telephone, mail, email*  |  Face-to-face online interviews |
| *12.*  | Sample size  | How many participants were in the study?  |  14 |
| *13.*  | Non-participation  | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? What were the reasons for this?  |  16 |
| Setting  |  |
| *14.*  | Setting of data collection  | Where was the data collected? *E.g. home, clinic, workplace*  |  Workplace  |
| *15.*  | Presence of nonparticipants  | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?  |  No |
| *16.*  | Description of sample  | What are the important characteristics of the sample? *E.g. demographic data, date*  | Demographic data |
| Data collection  |
| *17.*  | Interview guide  | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was its pilot tested?  | Questions, prompt and guide were provided by the authors. It was piloted among 5 participants.  |
| *18.*  | Repeat interviews  | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?  | Yes, Three consequence interviews with no more information. |
| *19.*  | Audio/visual recording  | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  |  Audio recording |
| *20.*  | Field notes  | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  |  During |
| *21.*  | Duration  | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?  |  Roughly an hour. |
| *22.*  | Data saturation  | Was data saturation discussed?  |  Yes |
| *23.*  | Transcripts returned  | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?  |  Yes |
| **Domain 3: analysis and findings**  |
| Data analysis  |
| *24.*  | Number of data coders  | How many data coders coded the data?  |  2 |
| *25.*  | Description of the coding tree  | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  |  No |
| *26.*  | Derivation of themes  | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?  |  Derived from the data. |
| *27.*  | Software  | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  | None |
| *28.*  | Participant checking  | Did participants provide feedback on the findings?  |  Yes, they did agree on finding.  |
| Reporting  |
| *29.*  | Quotations presented  | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? 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 |

**Developed from:** 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.