

Table 1

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

No	Item	Guide questions/description
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
Personal Characteristics		
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? Student researcher, Kyle Irvine (Page 2)
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? <i>E.g. PhD, MD</i> MD
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study? Surgical resident
4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female? Male
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have? Previous experience with qualitative research, focus groups and patient interviews. No formal training.
Relationship with participants		
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? No

No	Item	Guide questions/description
7.	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? <i>e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research</i> Participants were told the researcher's profession and the aim of the research project.
8.	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? <i>e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i> There were no biases or conflicts of interest to disclose. Participants were told the reason for conducting the research was to understand patient perspectives on remote consultations and see how the process could be improved.
Domain 2: study design		
Theoretical framework		
9.	Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? <i>e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</i> Thematic analysis approach as well as a deductive approach. (Page 2)
Participant selection		

No	Item	Guide questions/description
10.	Sampling	How were participants selected? <i>e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</i> Surgeons asked patients permission to share information with the student researcher. Recruitment by student researcher. (Page 2)
11.	Method of approach	How were participants approached? <i>e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i> Telephone (Page 2)
12.	Sample size	How many participants were in the study? 45 (Page 3)
13.	Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? 15 patients elected not to participate in an interview. Reasons were not given. (Page 3)
Setting		
14.	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? <i>e.g. home, clinic, workplace</i> Via telephone in a private office (Page 2)
15.	Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? In some cases family members of participants were present

No	Item	Guide questions/description
16.	Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? <i>e.g. demographic data, date</i> We collected age, gender, and distance from Saskatoon. (Page 3)
Data collection		
17.	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? Questions were provided by the researchers in the form of a brief, semi-structured interview guide. (Page 2)
18.	Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? No repeat interviews were done
19.	Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? The interviews were audio-recorded (Page 2)
20.	Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? No field notes were made.
21.	Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? 2-8 minutes (Page 2)
22.	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed? Yes. We reviewed transcriptions as we went. Interviews were stopped

No	Item	Guide questions/description
		<p>when no new themes were being identified. We did a retrospective analysis to ensure we had reached data saturation. (Page 2)</p>
23.	Transcripts returned	<p>Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? Participants did not have the opportunity to review transcripts</p>
<p>Domain 3: analysis and findings</p>		
<p>Data analysis</p>		
24.	Number of data coders	<p>How many data coders coded the data? 2 researchers coded the data independently. 2 patient partners also contributed to determining themes and subthemes. (Page 3)</p>
25.	Description of the coding tree	<p>Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? Yes (Page 5)</p>
26.	Derivation of themes	<p>Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? Derived from the data. However, the two main categories, advantages and disadvantages, were derived deductively. (Page 2)</p>

No	Item	Guide questions/description
27.	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? Nvivo (Page 3)
28.	Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings? Patient partners helped with analysis, interpretation and writing the manuscript. (Page 3)
Reporting		
29.	Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? <i>e.g. participant number</i> Quotations were presented and identified. (Pages 5-8)
30.	Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? There was consistency between the data reported and the findings. (Pages 5-8)
31.	Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? Major themes were all presented in the findings (Pages 5-8)
32.	Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? Subthemes were discussed in the interpretation (Pages 8-11)

