

## Supplementary File 1

### COREQ Checklist

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research. You must report the page number in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
<b>Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity</b>			
<i>Personal characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? SJB, YP, and JR.	3
Credentials	2	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD. SJB – BA (Hons), PGCert Stats YP – BPsych (Hons), MPsych (Clin), PhD JR – BSc (Hons), MSc Applied Psy, PhD	10
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study? SJB – Research Assistant YP – Research Fellow, Clinical Psychologist JR – Associate Professor	10
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female? All interviewers were female.	N/A
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have? All interviewers had previous experience in qualitative interviewing and extensive experience in working with young people.	10
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? Interviewers were unknown to participants prior to the commencement of the study and recruitment.	N/A
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? E.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research. Interviewers introduced themselves at beginning of the focus groups, explained their roles, occupations, and purpose of the research.	N/A
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? E.g. bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic As above. The authors prescribe to youth-empowerment perspectives and are committed to providing young people	10

		with a voice that captures the diversity of their experiences, to ensure their service-use needs are identified and supported.	
<b>Domain 2: Study design</b>			
<i>Theoretical framework</i>			
Methodological orientation and theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? E.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis.  The theoretical framework informing data collection and analysis was a mixed inductive-deductive, realist, experiential approach. Thematic analysis was used to analyse the data.	2
<i>Participant selection</i>			
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? E.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball sampling.  Convenience sampling.	3
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? E.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email.  Participants were approached through targeted advertisements posted on the Facebook, Twitter, and webpages of youth mental health organisations across Perth, including headspace centres, the Telethon Kids Institute, The Commissioner for Children and Young People, and the Youth Affairs Council of Western Australia.	3
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?  Ten.	3
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?  There were no withdrawals from the study; those who expressed interest took part in the focus groups.	N/A
<i>Setting</i>			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? E.g. home, clinic, workplace.  Focus groups were undertaken at two youth service sites in the Perth South Primary Health Network region of Western Australia.	3
Presence of nonparticipants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?  No, only the researchers conducting the focus groups were present with participants during the focus groups.	N/A
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? E.g. demographic data, date.  Seven participants identified as female, and three as male. Further demographic data were collected from nine participants as one participant failed to complete the demographic questionnaire. The mean age was 20.67 years ( $SD = 2.82$ ); ranging from 16-24 years. Other demographic variables are reported in the article.	3
<i>Data collection</i>			

Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  The interview schedule is outlined in Supplementary File 3. It was developed by the research team in consultation with the literature and with the study's youth advisor (TYL). It was subsequently piloted with young people at Orygen, where feedback was sought on the questions to ensure they were capturing rich information on the areas of interest.	2, 3
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?  No repeat interviews were conducted.	N/A
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  Yes, the focus groups were audio-recorded with consent from participants.	3
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  Yes, notes were taken during and after both the focus groups to identify key topics and ideas. Memos in the form of digital and paper notes were also undertaken during the data analysis process to help with theme generation and refinement.	3
Duration	21	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?  Each focus group ran for 75 minutes.	3
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?  Yes, the authors decided the concept of saturation was not best suited for this study. Instead, we followed guidelines recommended by Malterud et al. (2016).	3
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?  No.	N/A
<b>Domain 3: Analysis and findings</b>			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?  Two – IBW and AB.	3, 4
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  No.	N/A
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?  Mostly derived from the data (i.e., inductive approach), however, existing concepts in the literature (e.g., youth-friendly services, patient-centered care) helped to make sense of the findings.	2
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  NVivo 11 (QSR International Pty Ltd., 2015) was used to store and manage the qualitative data.	3

Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings? No.	N/A
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? E.g. participant number.  Yes, all quotations were identified by gender and focus group number. In the context of there being multiple participants in each focus group, we are unable to provide participant numbers specifically as these cannot be determined from the transcripts and audio-data. All findings were illustrated with relevant quotations.	4-7
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?  Yes, all data was interpreted in the Discussion section in relation to existing literature and novel findings.	7-10
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?  Yes.	4-7
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?  We did discuss minor themes as part of each major theme, however, these were not exemplified as 'subthemes' – rather they were discussed as being part of the properties of each major theme. Additionally, disconfirming case analysis identified only minor instances of differing perspectives amongst participants, which are reported as part of the relevant themes.	3-7

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