

Appendix 3. Nickel et al. qualitative study appraisal*

Were the researcher characteristics described?	Partly/moderate quality – interviews were conducted by two public health researchers with experience in qualitative research methods, however credentials, gender and characteristics of the interviewer were not reported
Was the methodological orientation to the study described?	Yes/ high quality – rationale informed by previous published DCIS terminology research (Esserman 2013, Omer 2013)
Was the target population clearly defined?	Yes/high quality – community sample of 26 Australian women aged 25 years and above who were recruited from a national community survey. Table 1 includes participant’s characteristics (age, education, experience with cancer screening, previous breast cancer diagnosis, immediate family history of cancer, employment status, worked as a health professional, survey management preference)
Was the sampling strategy clearly defined?	Yes/high quality – consenting women were recruited from a national community survey and purposively selected according to their education background (lower vs higher education), previous screening experience (previously screened vs not) and management preferences (immediate treatment vs watchful waiting as indicated by their survey responses)
Were the data collection methods clearly described?	Yes/high quality – semi-structured single telephone interview which lasted 13-40 minutes, and were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim
Was data analysis clearly described?	Yes/high quality – Framework Analysis was used to organise the data and identify main themes that capture the diverse views expressed with two researches independently coding data using a rigorous analysis process

*criteria adapted from Tong et al.¹²