

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

Manuscript title: Closing the equity gap in colorectal cancer screening for migrant communities: a qualitative study of first-generation Middle Eastern migrants in Australia and the case for an adaptive screening architecture

No.	Item	Reported in manuscript	Page no(s)
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
1	Interviewer/facilitator	Interviews were conducted by the first author as the sole interviewer.	7
2	Credentials	The interviewer was a male MD/PhD candidate with formal qualitative research training in interview-based methods and thematic analysis.	7
3	Occupation	The interviewer was an MD/PhD candidate at the time of the study.	7
4	Gender	Male.	7
5	Experience and training	The interviewer had formal qualitative research training in interview-based methods and thematic analysis.	7
6	Relationship established	No prior relationship with participants.	7
7	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	Participants received study information and provided written consent.	6, 10
8	Interviewer characteristics	The interviewer's shared Middle Eastern background was used deliberately to facilitate trust and disclosure. Furthermore, study was grounded in reflexive awareness of risks such as assumed shared understanding, mitigation through reflective prompts, independent analytic input, and team discussion.	7, 9-10
Domain 2: Study design			
9	Methodological orientation and theory	Qualitative study using semi-structured interviews and inductive thematic analysis following Braun & Clarke, informed by a pragmatic, applied qualitative orientation.	5, 7
10	Sampling	Community-based volunteer sampling: eligible participants self-selected after seeing recruitment posters, and all eligible volunteers who responded were included.	6
11	Method of approach	Recruitment posters were displayed at participating Sydney-based cultural and religious community organisations; interested individuals contacted the research team directly using the details on the study materials.	6
12	Sample size	Nineteen participants.	6
13	Non-participation	No participants declined or withdrew from the study.	6
14	Setting of data collection	One-to-one online interviews conducted via video call in New South Wales, Australia.	7
15	Presence of non-participants	No non-participants were present during interviews.	7
16	Description of sample	Detailed demographic characteristics provided (Table 1).	11
17	Interview guide	Semi-structured interview guide (Additional file 1).	7
18	Repeat interviews	No repeat interviews were conducted.	7

19	Audio/visual recording	Audio recordings were made, transcribed verbatim using OpenAI Whisper (V2), and manually checked against the recordings for accuracy.	7
20	Field notes	No formal observational field notes were made.	7
21	Duration	Interviews ranged from 20 to 70 minutes (mean 40 minutes).	7
22	Data saturation	Yes. Sample adequacy was assessed using information power. Later interviews refined existing subthemes without yielding new barrier concepts or thematic domains.	6, 8
23	Transcripts returned	Yes. Participants received a copy of their transcript within five days for factual review; no substantive amendments were requested.	7
Domain 3: Analysis and findings			
24	Number of data coders	Two researchers coded all transcripts in parallel.	8
25	Description of the coding tree	An initial working coding framework was developed after the first eight to ten interviews and iteratively refined. Final themes, sub-themes, and concepts are displayed in Table 3.	8, 13-14
26	Derivation of themes	Themes and sub-themes were derived inductively from participant accounts.	8
27	Software	Microsoft Word and Excel.	8
28	Participant checking	Participants reviewed transcripts for factual accuracy only; they were not asked to comment on the analytic interpretation.	10
29	Quotations presented	Yes. Quotations are presented throughout the Results and identified by participant number (e.g. P2, P13).	14-21
30	Data and findings consistent	Yes. The thematic findings are supported by direct quotations and linked cross-case analysis across the Results section.	13-22
31	Clarity of major themes	Yes. Four major themes are clearly presented and summarised in Table 3.	12-22
32	Clarity of minor themes	Yes. Sub-themes are clearly described, and the paper also reports cross-cutting participant-level heterogeneity and barrier co-occurrence using Table 3 and Figure 1.	12-23