Supplementary material 1

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR) checklist

Manuscript: Planned and emergent implementation strategies during national scale-up of hepatitis C point-of-care testing in Australia: a retrospective case study

Authors: Fontaine G, Nicholls W, Rudge T, Day E, Taylor N, Torres Robles A, Marshall AD, Lafferty L, Silk D, Comben S, Hosseini-Hooshyar S, Abbott J, Smart K, Martinez M, Markus C, Matthews S, Pedrana A, Kingsland M, Martinello M, Wolfenden L, Grebely J

Corresponding author: Guillaume Fontaine, PhD, RN, McGill University (guil.fontaine@mcgill.ca)

This checklist follows the 21 items of the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR) [1]. For each item, the table indicates the manuscript section(s) in which the item is addressed and summarises how it is addressed.

Table S1. SRQR checklist completed for the manuscript.

No.	Topic	SRQR item	Where reported in the manuscript (section) and how the item is addressed	Status
Title and abstract				
S1	Title	Concise description of the nature and topic of the study. Identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended.	Title page. The title identifies the topic (planned and emergent implementation strategies during national scale-up of hepatitis C point-of-care testing in Australia) and the approach (retrospective case study).	Reported
S2	Abstract	Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results, and conclusions.	Abstract (structured: Background, Methods, Results, Conclusion).	Reported
Introduction				
S3	Problem formulation	Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement.	Background, paragraphs 1–4 (HCV elimination and underserved populations; evidence for decentralised point-of-care testing; limits of describing implementation strategies as discrete, static actions; tension between national standardisation and local adaptation in large-scale programs).	Reported
S4	Purpose or research question	Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions.	Background, final paragraph (two objectives: identify and characterise the implementation strategies used across the national program; examine how strategies changed over time, including whether they were prospectively planned, adapted, or introduced in response to implementation experience; derivation of practical considerations for scale-up planning).	Reported

No.	Topic	SRQR item	Where reported in the manuscript (section) and how the item is addressed	Status
Methods				
S5	Qualitative approach and research paradigm	Qualitative approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g., postpositivist, constructivist/interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale.	Methods – Study design (retrospective single-case study integrating documentary analysis and secondary qualitative analysis of stakeholder interviews; bounded case; embedded program- and service-level analytic levels; descriptive and interpretive orientation). Guiding frameworks: ERIC taxonomy and Proctor et al. specification elements (Methods – Identification, specification and consolidation of implementation strategies). Rationale for the single-case design with embedded levels is given (comparable jurisdictional histories unavailable).	Reported
S6	Researcher characteristics and reflexivity	Researchers' characteristics that may influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience, relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability.	Methods – Data Sources: The lead analyst (GF), a nurse and implementation scientist, is in the program's study team; JG leads the national program, and DS, SC, SHH, JA, KS and MM are program coordination staff. This insider knowledge was used to verify the accuracy, actors and timing of the consolidated strategies. To limit its influence on classification, initial coding (TR, WN) and origin classification (WN) were undertaken by analysts not involved in program delivery, with independent review by GF.	Reported
S7	Context	Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale.	Methods – Setting and case (program description, testing model, centralised implementation infrastructure, service settings, national reach, four program phases and their dates, analytic period through 13 April 2026).	Reported
S8	Sampling strategy	How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g., sampling saturation); rationale.	Methods – Data sources (purposive selection of 28 core program documents by type; records from 124 meetings of nine governance and implementation bodies; stratified purposive sampling of 30 stakeholders by role group and jurisdiction).	Reported
S9	Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects	Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues.	Declarations – Ethics approval and consent to participate (UNSW Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee, HC230406; written informed consent). Methods – Identification, specification and consolidation (transcripts deidentified). Declarations – Availability of data and materials (restrictions to protect potentially identifiable participant, service and program information).	Reported
S10	Data collection methods	Types of data collected; details of data collection procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale.	Methods – Data sources (three complementary sources with dates: documents May 2022–September 2023; meeting records February 2021–December 2023; interviews January–February 2024; 2-hour validation meeting 13 April 2026). Methods – Setting and case (validation extended ascertainment of strategy introduction, modification, discontinuation and continued activity to 13 April 2026).	Reported
S11	Data collection instruments and technologies	Description of instruments (e.g., interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study.	Methods – Identification, specification and consolidation (ERIC-aligned extraction matrix and NVivo coding structure; audit trail of inclusion decisions and codebook refinements; Community of Practice recordings and interviews transcribed).	Reported

No.	Topic	SRQR item	Where reported in the manuscript (section) and how the item is addressed	Status
S12	Units of study	Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results).	Results – Data corpus and strategy inventory (28 documents; 124 meetings of nine bodies; 30 stakeholders across six states and territories). Methods – Data sources (role groups: policy and funding, program partner, service, community; jurisdictions listed). Participant role and jurisdiction are given with each quotation. *Note:* A tabulation of interview participants by role group and jurisdiction is not provided; if added, cell sizes should be checked for re-identification risk.	Reported
S13	Data processing	Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts.	Methods – Identification, specification and consolidation (transcription, deidentification and accuracy checks; NVivo coding structure; audit trail; reformulation of actions into verb-led strategy statements; consolidation with retained links to source instances for traceability).	Reported
S14	Data analysis	Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale.	Methods – Identification, specification and consolidation (ERIC coding by two analysts, TR and WN; consolidation rules); Methods – Classification of origin, trajectory, level, and evidence provenance (classification by WN with independent review by GF; temporal and level coding by GF; definitions of categories); Methods – Interpretive synthesis and derivation of planning implications (functional mapping and iterative comparison leading to the three-layer model, reviewed by all authors).	Reported
S15	Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation); rationale.	Methods – Identification, specification and consolidation (independent double coding of interviews with reconciliation; division of documents and meeting records between two researchers with cross-checking by a third reviewer; audit trail); Methods – Classification (independent review of classifications; validation by the lead investigator and program staff); triangulation of documentary, meeting and interview sources (Methods – Data sources; Discussion, provenance paragraph); Discussion – Strengths and limitations.	Reported
Results/findings				
S16	Synthesis and interpretation	Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with prior research or theory.	Results – Data corpus and strategy inventory; Planned, adapted and emergent strategy trajectories; Strategy introduction and continued activity across program phases; Delivery level of implementation strategies; How strategies were modified, locally configured, and transferred across the program; A three-layer implementation model (Figures 1–4; Table 1).	Reported
S17	Links to empirical data	Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs) to substantiate analytic findings.	Results – How strategies were modified, locally configured, and transferred across the program (participant quotations labelled with participant number, role group and jurisdiction); strategy counts by domain, trajectory, level, phase and provenance; strategy-level matrix in Supplementary material 2.	Reported
Discussion				
S18	Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contribution(s) to the field	Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings and conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclusions of earlier scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; identification of unique contribution(s) to the field.	Discussion, paragraphs 1–8 (summary of findings; relation to adaptation frameworks, the Dynamic Sustainability Framework, EPIS and complexity perspectives; implications for provenance of evidence, temporal accumulation of strategies and resourcing; planning implications in Table 2; explicit statements on transferability and on what the analysis does not establish). Contributions to the literature (front matter).	Reported

No.	Topic	SRQR item	Where reported in the manuscript (section) and how the item is addressed	Status
S19	Limitations	Trustworthiness and limitations of findings.	Discussion – Strengths and limitations (retrospective single-case design in a high-income setting; variable detail of records and interviews; sensitivity of origin and continuation classification to documentation completeness and recall; interpretive judgement in consolidation; no assessment of strategy effects or resource requirements; no causal inference).	Reported
Other				
S20	Conflicts of interest	Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed.	Declarations – Competing interests (editorial role of GF and its management; industry fees, grants and advisory roles of GF and JG).	Reported
S21	Funding	Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection, interpretation, and reporting.	Declarations – Funding (investigator awards; institutional funding; program funders including government and industry; project grants). A disclaimer is provided regarding the Australian Government.	Reported

SRQR, Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research; ERIC, Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change; HCV, hepatitis C virus; EPIS, Exploration, Preparation, Implementation, Sustainment. Section names in the “Where reported” column refer to the headings of the submitted manuscript.

Reference

1. O’Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Acad Med. 2014;89(9):1245–51. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388