Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity | Response (and manuscript line and page number) |
| Personal Characteristics |  |
| 1. Interviewer/facilitator. Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?  | Page 1The authors of this paper are the researchers involved in the Nurse Navigator evaluation. Interviews were conducted by member of the evaluation research team, in particular authors a, 2, 3, 7 and 12. Two researcher completed the initial coding, authors 1 and 3, with authors 1,2,3,4,5,6 and 7 partaking in coding and refining of themes.  |
| 2. Credentials. What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD  | Page 1The credentials of the authors are as follows **Amy-Louise Byrne** RN, BN, GCEmerg, GCCFH, Associate lecturer, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Science Central Queensland University **Professor Desley Hegney** RN, BA (Hons) PhDResearch Division Central Queensland University Brisbane Campus School of Nursing, The University of Adelaide, South Australia**Associate Professor Clare Harvey** RN, BA(Cur), MA, PhDAssociate Professor, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social SciencesCentral Queensland University**Dr Adele Baldwin** PhD, MNSt, GCETT, RN, RMSenior Lecturer, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social SciencesCentral Queensland University**Professor Eileen Willis** PhDEmeritus Professor, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social SciencesCentral Queensland University**David Heard**Research Officer, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Science Central Queensland University **Professor Jenni Judd** DHSc, MPH, MEd, DipHPESchool of Health Medical and Applied Sciences Central Queensland University **Janine Palmer** RN, NP Hawke’s Bay District Health Board New Zealand **Dr Janie Brown** BN, MEd, PhDAssociate Professor, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Paramedicine Curtin University **Dr Brody Heritage** BPsych (Hons), PhDCollege of Science, Health, Engineering and EducationMurdoch University **Dr. Shona Thompson** PhD Eastern Institute of Technology New Zealand **Bridget Ferguson** RN, RM,  BNurs, GradCertMid, MMID, MPH.Lecturer, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Central Queensland University  |
| 3. Occupation. What was their occupation at the time of the study?  | See above  |
| 4. Gender. Was the researcher male or female?  | Page 1The research team is made up of a gender diverse team.  |
| 5. Experience and training. What experience or training did the researcher have?  | Page 1Provided within the affiliations and qualifications above  |
| Relationship with participants |  |
| 6. Relationship established. Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?  | Page 7The research is part of a wider study evaluating the Nurse Navigator Service. The relationship between researchers and subjects is a professional collaborative one, and one which is ongoing in nature.  |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research  | Page 7 Participants are known to researcher and visa versa, as this research is part of a wider evaluation. Additionally, the evaluation applies a theory of change methodology to allow for emergent themes to be explored and adopted by participants.  |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics. What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic  | Page 7 The phenomenon of FTA was an emergent theme of the Nurse Navigator evaluation, thus became the subject of analysis organically. Data was collated and independently analysed by two members of the research team and then discussed with seven other researchers to ensure bias and assumptions were adequately addressed.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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  | Page 9 and 10 The Nurse Navigator evaluation uses a mixed method, theory of change framework to explore the services and to analyse emergent themes. This paper a thematic analysis of qualitative data  |
| Participant selection  |  |
| 10. Sampling. How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball  | Page 7 and 9 All Nurse Navigators across Queensland Health are invited to participate in this wider study. As part of the evaluation study, navigators provide vignettes, case studies and partake in semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The data collected from navigators was analysed with the lens of FTA for this research paper.  |
| 11. Method of approach. How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email  | Page 7 Interviews were conducted fact to face, via teleconferencing.  |
| 12. Sample size. How many participants were in the study?  | Page 8We have reported on the quantitative data showing no change in FTA count. The sample size is 52.  |
| 13. Non-participation. How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?  | N/A |
| Setting  |  |
| 14. Setting of data collection. Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace  | Page 7 and 8 Interviews were collected in a work and home settings, via the mediums described above. For patient interviews, these were conducted in a place decided by the patient, home, community.  |
| 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  | Page 4The demographic of nurse navigators and their patients is described throughout the paper. Patients are complex, with multiple chronic conditions. NN are senior registered nurses working for Queensland Health  |
| Data collection  |  |
| 17. Interview guide. Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  | N/A |
| 18. Repeat interviews. Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?  | N/A |
| 19. Audio/visual recording. Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  | Page 8 Teleconferencing meetings were conducted via Zoom or Teams.  |
| 20. Field notes. Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  | N/A |
| 21. Duration. What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?  | Interviews were conducted for approximately 1 hour  |
| 22. Data saturation. Was data saturation discussed?  | N/AThe NN evaluation is ongoing. This research report on an emergent theme of the evaluation.  |
| 23. Transcripts returned. Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?  | No, however the research evaluation is ongoing.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Domain 3: analysis and findings |  |
| Data analysis  |  |
| 24. Number of data coders. How many data coders coded the data?  | Page 10Coding was completed by 7 members of the research team.  |
| 25. Description of the coding tree. Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  | N/A |
| 26. Derivation of themes. Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?  | Page 10 and 11 Themes were dev\rived from the data  |
| 27. Software. What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  | N/A |
| 28. Participant checking. Did participants provide feedback on the findings?  | N/A |
| Reporting |  |
| 29. Quotations presented. Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number  | Page 8, 11- 20The research predominantly uses quotes from Nurse Navigators, however where possible, patient quotes were included to triangulate data  |
| 30. Data and findings consistent. Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?  | Page 20 |
| 31. Clarity of major themes. Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?  | Page 11-20Major themes were present in the findings and explored in the discussion.  |
| 32. Clarity of minor themes. Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | N/A |