

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

Developed from:

Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

In using COREQ checklist, the main author has considered its limitations as discussed in:

Buus, N., & Perron, A. (2020). The quality of quality criteria: Replicating the development of the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ). *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 102, 103452–103452.

MANUSCRIPT TITLE: Care workers and managers' experiences of implementing infection control guidance in an epidemic context. A qualitative study in the South East of England, during the Covid-19 pre-vaccination era.

| No. Item | Guide questions/description | Reported on Section - Page no, line no | Comments |
|--|--|--|---|
| Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity | | | |
| <i>Personal Characteristics</i> | | | |
| 1. Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | Methodology-5,140 | |
| 2. Credentials | What were the researcher's credentials? (E.g. PhD, MD) | Listed on page 1, 17-25 | |
| 3. Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | Methodology – 5,140 | |
| 4. Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | | Both interviewers are women |
| 5. Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? | Methodology – 5,141 | |
| <i>Relationship with participants</i> | | | |
| 6. Relationship established | <i>Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?</i> | Methodology – 5, 160-161 | No, interviewees and interviewers met for the first time as part of the study recruitment. |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer | <i>What did the participants know about the researcher? (e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research).</i> | Methodology – 5, 163-164 | Information about the researchers' role and involvement were shared in the Participant Information Sheet and at times |

| | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|---|
| | | | discussed during the interview, often in the initial or final part of the conversation where interviewee and interviewer introduced themselves or shared final comments on the interviews and overall study |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics | <i>What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? (e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic)</i> | Methodology - 5 | |
| Domain 2: Study design | | | |
| <i>Theoretical framework</i> | | | |
| 9. Methodological orientation and Theory | <i>What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? (e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis).</i> | Methodology – 5, 136-137 & 172 | Qualitative, semi-structured interviews and framework analysis |
| <i>Participant selection</i> | | | |
| 10. Sampling | <i>How were participants selected? (e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball)</i> | Methodology – 5, 156-158 | Mix of snowball and convenience sampling |
| 11. Method of approach | <i>How were participants approached? (e.g. face- to-face, telephone, mail, email)</i> | Methodology – 5, 160-162 | Via email or phone call |
| 12. Sample size | <i>How many participants were in the study?</i> | Methodology – 5, 166 | 12. Sample size |
| 13. Non-participation | <i>How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?</i> | N/A | First contact to identify participants were made through phone call or email to care home and homecare agencies. Many did not reply or couldn't pass on the details to the manager to eventually identify potential interviewees. All ten people who expressed interest in taking part in the study, proceeded to take part in the interview. |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|
| <i>Setting</i> | | | |
| 14. Setting of data collection | <i>Where was the data collected? (e.g. home, clinic, workplace)</i> | Methodology – 5, 145-146 | Online platform (Zoom) |
| 15. Presence of non-participants | <i>Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?</i> | N/A | No |
| 16. Description of sample | <i>What are the important characteristics of the sample? (e.g. demographic data, date)</i> | Methodology – 5-6, 166-167 | Given the focus of the study, this overlaps with the inclusion/exclusion criteria. Interviewees were managers and care workers working in residential and domiciliary care in Kent, Surrey and Sussex during wave 1 of COVID-19 |
| <i>Data collection</i> | | | |
| 17. Interview guide | <i>Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?</i> | Methodology – 5, 142-144 | Topic guide was revised by 2 Public Advisors |
| 18. Repeat interviews | <i>Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?</i> | N/A | No, this was not necessary for this study. Interviews were invited to share any follow-up comments via email but no one did. |
| 19. Audio/visual recording | <i>Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?</i> | Methodology- 5, 146 | Interviews were audio-recorded using Dictaphones. |
| 20. Field notes | <i>Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?</i> | N/A | No |
| 21. Duration | <i>What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?</i> | Methodology – 5, 146 | |
| 22. Data saturation | <i>Was data saturation discussed?</i> | N/A | Due to methodological considerations, data saturation was not considered the standard to establish sample size as data saturation relies on the idea that meaning and themes are evident in data, rather than produced and interpreted. However, this was discussed and researchers agreed that |

| | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| | | | interviews indicated the recurrence of the same themes. This was further confirmed when interim findings were shared and discussed with adult social care stakeholders in Kent, Surrey and Sussex. |
| 23. Transcripts returned | <i>Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?</i> | N/A | This was given as an option. None of the interviewees enquired about the possibility of looking at the transcripts for comments. |
| Domain 3: analysis and findings | | | |
| <i>Data analysis</i> | | | |
| 24. Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | Data analysis-6, 174 | |
| 25. Description of the coding tree | <i>Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?</i> | Data analysis - 6,173 | |
| 26. Derivation of themes | <i>Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?</i> | Data analysis – 6, 176-177 | Both. A thematic framework was organised according to the interview topic guide and themes were first identified using this framework. As the analysis progressed, themes were also derived from the interviews, allowing for further insights and nuances. |
| 27. Software | <i>What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?</i> | Data analysis – 6, 175 | NVivo 12 |
| 28. Participant checking | <i>Did participants provide feedback on the findings?</i> | N/A | Participants did not provide feedback on the findings directly. Researchers had concerns on research fatigue, especially as at the time of data collection and analysis, participant were under unprecedented stress and time pressure due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, interim and final findings were discussed with |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | | public advisors and sector representatives, including providers and carers, throughout the implementation process. |
| <i>Reporting</i> | | | |
| 29. Quotations presented | <i>Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? (e.g. participant number)</i> | Findings – 6-10 Table 1. | |
| 30. Data and findings consistent | <i>Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?</i> | Discussion – 12-13 | |
| 31. Clarity of major themes | <i>Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?</i> | Findings –6-10 Table 1 | |
| 32. Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Findings –6-10 Discussion – 12-13 | |