S6 Table: Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No  | Item  | Guide questions/description  | Response  |
| Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity  |
| Personal Characteristics  |
| 1.  | Interviewer/facilitator  | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?  | We were not involved in any data collection – no interviews or focus groups were conducted.  |
| 2.  | Credentials  | What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD  |
| 3.  | Occupation  | What was their occupation at the time of the study?  |
| 4.  | Gender  | Was the researcher male or female?  |
| 5.  | Experience and training  | What experience or training did the researcher have?  |
| Relationship with participants  |
| 6.  | Relationship established  | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?  | We were not involved in any data collection – no interviews or focus groups were conducted.  |
| 7.  | Participant knowledge of the interviewer  | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research  |
| 8.  | Interviewer characteristics  | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic  |
| Domain 2: study design  |
| Theoretical framework  |
| 9.  | Methodological orientation and Theory  | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis  | We used thematic analysis. (Methods Para 8) |

|  |
| --- |
| Participant selection  |
| 10.  | Sampling  | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball  | A purposive sample of reports was selected, (Methods Para 8) |
| 11.  | Method of approach  | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email  | We did not approach participants.  |
| 12.  | Sample size  | How many participants were in the study?  | We did not have study participants. We selected all cases fulfilling our inclusion criteria from the dataset. |
| 13.  | Non-participation  | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?  | We did not have study participants. Not applicable. |
| Setting  |
| 14.  | Setting of data collection  | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace  | Methods Para 2-3  |
| 15.  | Presence of non- participants  | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?  | N/A |
| 16.  | Description of sample  | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date  | We have not included these details for our qualitative sample as this was a mixed methods study and the purpose of the qualitative analyses was to supplement the quantitative findings. The characteristics of our included data however are described in the Results (Para 2).  |
| Data collection  |
| 17.  | Interview guide  | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  | We were not involved in data collection. |
| 18.  | Repeat interviews  | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?  |
| 19.  | Audio/visual recording  | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  |
| 20.  | Field notes  | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  |
| 21.  | Duration  | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?  |
| 22.  | Data saturation  | Was data saturation discussed?  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 23.  | Transcripts returned  | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?  | We did not have study participants. |
| Domain 3: analysis and findings  |
| Data analysis  |
| 24.  | Number of data coders  | How many data coders coded the data?  | 2 researchers (PR, ACS)  |
| 25.  | Description of the coding tree  | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  | Yes – the multi-axial framework used to classify incidents using the recursive model of incident analysis is described in detail and now included as supplemental information (S2-4 Text). We also describe how themes and sub-themes (i.e. our coding tree) were developed. |
| 26.  | Derivation of themes  | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?  | They were derived from the data. *“New codes were created to capture additional semantic (descriptive and superficial) insights and latent (underlying or inferred) insights present in reports and the contexts in which incidents occurred [25, 35, 36]. These codes were grouped into themes and sub-themes (by PR and ACS) that support our understanding of the data and the underlying reasons for certain incidents [25, 35, 36].”* The final themes were agreed upon by the analysis team through consensus. |
| 27.  | Software  | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  | QSR NVivo version 9  |
| 28.  | Participant checking  | Did participants provide feedback on the findings?  | This was not possible as all reports are submitted as anonymised reports from source organisations.  |
| Reporting  |  |
| 29.  | Quotations presented  | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number  | Examples were presented to illustrate key findings and themes – see table 4  |
| 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  |