**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 andinterests 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 arepresented. |

\*TDF= Theoretical Domains Framework