**Appendix 2**

**Table of consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ) checklist.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item No** | **Guide questions/description** | **Response** |
| **Domain 1 : Research team and reflexivity** |  |  |
| **Personal characteristics** |  |  |
| 1. Interviewer | Which author/s conducted the interview? | The primary author DOR conducted the interviews. |
| 1. Credentials | What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD | DOR is a research pharmacist/PhD student. |
| 1. Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | Full time research pharmacist in Clinical Pharmacy in an academic institution. |
| 1. Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | Male |
| 1. Experience & training | What experience or training did the researcher have? | DOR received training at the Health Experience Research Group, Oxford University and completed training in NVivo computer assisted qualitative data management. |
| **Relationship with participants** |  |  |
| 1. Relationship established prior to   study commencement | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | No |
| 1. Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? | Yes in a minority of cases (2 GPs). |
| 1. Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer? e.g.  Bias, assumptions, reasons and  interests in the research topic | Not addressed. |
| **Domain 2: Study design** |  |  |
| **Theoretical framework** |  |  |
| 1. Methodological orientation & theory | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? | Open coding mapped to the TDF\*. |
| **Participant selection** |  |  |
| 1. Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | Purposive sampling was complemented by snowball sampling where necessary. |
| 1. Method of approach | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | DOR contacted potential participants by telephone and a brief summary of the study was given. |
| 1. Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | 16 |
| 1. Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | Not applicable: participation was voluntary. |
| 1. Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace | In the GP participants surgeries. |
| 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? e.g. demographic data,  date | See Table 1. |
| **Data collection** |  |  |
| 1. Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | The first two interviews were reviewed for interview technique. The topic guide was reviewed after each interview. |
| 1. Repeat interviews | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? | No |
| 1. Audio/visual recording | Did the researcher use audio or visual recording to collect the data? | Data were audio recorded using a digital voice recorder. |
| 1. Field notes | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview? | Yes. Field notes were taken immediately after each interview. |
| 1. Duration | What was the duration of the interviews? | The mean interview length was 19 min (Range 9-31 min). |
| 1. Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | Data saturation was reached at interview number 16. |
| 1. Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment? | No, but they were available to participants on request. |
| **Domain 3: analysis and findings** |  |  |
| **Data analysis** |  |  |
| 1. Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | Three coders coded the data. |
| 1. Description of coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | No coding tree was developed but all the researchers discussed and agreed on the framework analysis approach *a priori.* |
| 1. Derivation of themes | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? | Themes were derived from the data by open coding and then mapped to the TDF. |
| 1. Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | NVivo Qualitative Data Analysis Software V.10.22 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? | Yes. Supporting quotations from GPs are presented. |
| 1. Data and findings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? | Quotes are embedded in text and are used to illustrate our findings in participants own language as much as possible. |
| 1. Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? | Major themes are presented in the results section. |
| 1. Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Variations in views and themes and minor themes are  presented. |

\*TDF= Theoretical Domains Framework