

Manuscript: Exploring The Enablers and Barriers to Implementing the Medication Appropriateness Tool for Comorbid Health conditions during Dementia (MATCH-D) Criteria in Australia

Amy Page, Rhonda Clifford, Kathleen Potter, Liza Seubert, Andrew McLachlan, Xaysja Hill, Stephanie King, Vaughan Clark Nikesh Parekh, Cristin Ryan, Christopher Ethernon-Beer

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

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Detail reported	Section reported in, Page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>			
1. Inter viewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the inter view or focus group?	LS	Methods, p 3
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	Bachelor of Pharmacy and is currently a PhD candidate	Author affiliation , p1
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Pharmacy academic at the Centre for Optimisation of Medicines at the University of Western Australia	Author affiliation, p1
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Female	Author affiliation, p1
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Independent experienced focus group facilitator ... not involved in the original research	Methods , p 3
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Independent	Methods , p3
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	The participants knew that the facilitator was a pharmacy academic at the University of Western Australia who was invited as an independent facilitator invited to run the focus groups.	Appendix 2 (focus group running sheets) Participant Information Form
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	The facilitator was a pharmacy academic, and that was established prior to the focus group commencing.	Appendix 2 (focus group running sheets)

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	Content analysis	Methods, p4
<i>Participant selection</i>			
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	A combination of convenience and snowball sampling techniques were applied.	Methods , p3
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Initial recruitment was via professional organisations and both professional and patient networks. These consumer support and professional representative organisations included Alzheimer's Australia WA, Pharmaceutical Society of Australia (WA), Carers WA, Consumer Health Forum of Australia and Council on the Ageing (COTA). Awareness of the research and recruitment was raised using posters, advertisements, telephone, email and social media. The authors contacted individual pharmacies, medical practices, hospitals, community nursing services, retirement villages, residential aged care facilities and professional contacts by telephone and email.	Methods , p 3
12. Sample size	How many participants were in	55	Results , p4

	the study?		
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Three consumers and eleven GPs were unable to participate as the scheduled time or location was not suitable. One consumer declined to participate, and one consumer was not eligible (as she was a registered nurse).	Not included in manuscript as other potential non-participants approached using snowballing methodology were not quantifiable.
<i>Setting</i>			
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Focus groups were held in a variety of settings to suit participants' preferences, including the University of Western Australia, the workplace (GP practices), and the home environment, in September 2016. Participants came from rural, inner city and outer metropolitan locations in two Australian states (Western Australia and Victoria).	Methods, p4 ,
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	No non-participants. Two or three observing researchers (AP, SK, VC, XH) attended the focus groups ...	Methods, p4
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Each focus group consisted of participants from one of four stakeholder groups: consumers (people with dementia and carers for people with dementia), general practitioners (GPs), registered nurses and pharmacists. The focus groups were conducted in September 2016.	Methods Table 1

<i>Data collection</i>			
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	The focus group format was piloted at The University of Western Australia to test for internal consistency. This piloting project was intended to indicate if the discussion prompts flowed logically, were clear, and prompted relevant and detailed discussion. Pilot participants were recruited from staff and students in the Master of Pharmacy programme at the University of Western Australia. The topic guide is reported in Appendix 2.	Methods Appendix 2
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	No repeat interviews	
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Audio recordings	Methods, p4
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?	Yes	Methods, p4
21. Duration	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	The focus groups were scheduled to run approximately one hour.	Appendix 2 (focus group running sheets) Participant Information Form
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Focus groups were conducted until theme saturation occurred across the groups.	Methods, p4
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No	
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Two researchers independently themed all the transcripts.	Methods , p4
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Yes	Results , p4
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the		Methods , p4

	data?	Two researchers (AP with one of SK, XH, VC) independently hand-coded line by line all the focus group transcripts using the content analysis method to identify key themes. ^{21 22} The researchers compared their individual findings from the GP stakeholder focus group transcripts to reach consensus on the themes. They developed a framework of themes that was then applied to the remainder of the transcripts. This framework was modified and adapted as necessary to encompass the emergent themes from all focus groups. The major and minor themes were then discussed to consolidate and simplify the themes. Similarities and differences across the four stakeholder groups were examined and compared.	
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	No 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	Results , p4-7
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes	Results, p 4-7
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes	Results, p4-7

		Validation Potential applications Possible resources	
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes	Results , p4-7