

Manuscript: Gaps in public preparedness to be a substitute decision maker and the acceptability of high school education on resuscitation and end-of-life care: a mixed-methods study

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

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

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	MKYW, MCM and KYL (see “ Contributors ” at the end of the manuscript)
2. Credentials	What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	See author credentials on cover page (page 1)
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Present in the manuscript under “ Study Design and Development , paragraph 1” and “ Contributors ” Group of staff and resident physicians in emergency or family medicine, with representation of medical education and palliative care subspecialization, and two medical students.
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	See “ Contributors ,” for the gender of the interviewers
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Standardized script and approach (see “ Participants and sampling ” Appendix A)
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	No – this was a street intercept (reported in Abstract & “Participants and Sampling”)
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Data Collection and Procedures Participants were aware that we were a resident physician and medical

		students conducting research to explore enablers and barriers to being a SDM.
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	Data Collection and Procedures Participants were aware that we were a resident physician and medical students conducting research to explore enablers and barriers to being a SDM.

Domain 2: study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	Survey designed based on Health Belief Model (see “ Study design and development, ” paragraph 1) Inductive thematic analysis (see “ Qualitative Analysis, ” paragraph 3)
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Every 3 rd person present in the area and time of data collection (See “ Participants and Sampling, ” paragraph 1, and “ Data Collection and Procedures ”)
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Face-to-face as described in “ Data Collection and Procedures, ” paragraph 2
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	430 (see Figure 1 , and Abstract)
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	See Figure 1
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	12 public locations, see Box 1
15. Presence of non-participants	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	See Table 1 & “ Data collection and procedures ” & Box 1
<i>Data collection</i>		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Yes, pilot tested (see “ Study Design, ” paragraph 2) and a standardized questionnaire with script for approach and prompts for questions
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	No repeat interviews were done (implied)
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	No
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes, field notes were recorded during the interview (see “ Data Collection and Procedures ”)
21. Duration	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	10 minutes, see “ Study Design and Development ”
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Sample size was driven by the quantitative methodology. All 430 interviews were coded and analyzed and as described in the Results , paragraph 5, data saturation was achieved.
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	Participants were given an opportunity to correct their answers & the field notes (see “ Data Collection and Procedures ”)
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	MKYW and WJC (see Analysis)
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	See Table 3 and 4 for themes and sub-themes, representative of coding tree
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Inductively derived from data (see Analysis)
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Manually done in Excel (no specific qualitative software was used)
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	No
<i>Reporting</i>		

29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Yes, Table 3 and 4
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, Table 3 and 4
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes, Table 3 and 4, Results