

**Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ):
32-item checklist**
**Barriers to medicine use in secondary schools: a qualitative
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

YOU MUST PROVIDE A RESPONSE FOR ALL ITEMS. ENTER N/A IF NOT APPLICABLE

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on 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?	Joseph Cowley was the facilitator – he is not an author as he did not contribute to the paper.
2. Credentials	What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	BSc, MSc
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Research associate/PhD student
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Male
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	The researcher gathered data in a focus group study at Strathclyde University prior to this study in 2009. He had an MSc. He had also collected data on community based health research projects from 2001 to 2006 including the NHS Lanarkshire “Braveheart” Project”
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	No
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Participants knew that the researcher worked at the University of Strathclyde in the

		Pharmacy Department.
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	Participants know the researcher worked in a Pharmacy Department.
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	Inductive thematic analysis.
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Purposive/convenience – typical users and non users of pharmacy services were selected on the basis of demographic characteristics i.e. mothers with young children (from the UK and immigrants) men and older people.
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Participants were recruited through non-pharmacy or national health related voluntary and charity organisations.
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	26
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Not applicable – participation was voluntary.
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Localities that were convenient to participants in their community for example in a community hall
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	Gender, age and parental status.
<i>Data collection</i>		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	A topic guide was devised by the research team and

		initial interviews acted as a pilot.
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	No.
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Data were audio recorded using a digital recorder.
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?	Yes.
21. Duration	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	On average 53 minutes.
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Yes
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?	3 Lesley MacGregor, Wendy Gidman.
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Not explicitly.
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	This was an exploratory study. Analysis was inductive themes were derived from the data.
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Data were transcribed verbatim into word documents by professional transcribers. Themes were groups by cutting and pasting between documents.
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, identified by participant number
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
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes – word count restrictions did not permit more extensive theme discussion.

Once you have completed this checklist, please save a copy and upload it as part of your submission. When requested to do so as part of the upload process, please select the file type: *Checklist*. You will NOT be able to proceed with submission unless the checklist has been uploaded. Please DO NOT include this checklist as part of the main manuscript document. It must be uploaded as a separate file.