# Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist - Assessing strategies to improve adherence to vivax malaria treatment in the Amazon region using educational materials and a mobile health strategy (AdheVivax Project)

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

| No. Item | Guide questions/description | Reported on Page # |
|---|---|---|
| **Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity** | | |
| *Personal Characteristics* | | |
| 1. Interviewer/facilitator | *Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?*<br><br>HSSG and APSO. | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, page 9.<br><br>Phase 2 - Evaluation of the mHealth-enhanced adherence intervention, page 15. |
| 2. Credentials | *What were the researchers' credentials?*<br><br>PhD and MSc. | Team reflexivity, page16. |
| 3. Occupation | *What was their occupation at the time of the study?*<br><br>University professors and qualitative researchers. | Title page. |
| 4. Gender | *Was the researcher male or female?*<br><br>Some researchers were male, others were female. | Team reflexivity, page 16. |
| 5. Experience and training | *What experience or training did the researcher have?*<br><br>All with qualitative research training and with published articles in the area. | Team reflexivity, page 16. |
| *Relationship with participants* | | |
| 6. Relationship established | *Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?* | Team reflexivity, page 16. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | None of the participants had an established relationship with an author prior to study commencement. | |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer | *What did the participants know about the researcher? (e.g., personal goals, reasons for doing the research).*<br><br>We provided clear explanations of the study, objectives, procedures, and potential risks. | Ethical considerations, page 39. |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics | *What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g., bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic.*<br><br>No interviewer-related biases were identified. | Team reflexivity, page 16. |
| **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.*<br><br>In the Phase 1 was conducted Thematic analysis. And in the phase 2<br>deductive coding guided by theoretical domains defined by Proctor *et al.* | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, page 9.<br><br>Phase 2 - Evaluation of the mHealth-enhanced adherence intervention (Acceptability and perceived appropriateness of the intervention) page 16. |
| *Participant selection* | | |
| 10. Sampling | *How were participants selected? e.g., purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball.*<br><br>Purposive sample in phase 1.<br>**Random purposive sampling** in the phase 2. | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, page 9.<br><br>Phase 2 - Evaluation of the mHealth-enhanced adherence intervention (Acceptability and perceived |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | appropriateness of the intervention) page 15. |
| 11. Method of approach | *How were participants approached? e.g., face-to-face, telephone, mail, email.*<br><br>We did a face-to-face interview. | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, 9.<br><br>Phase 2 - Evaluation of the mHealth-enhanced adherence intervention (Acceptability and perceived appropriateness of the intervention) page 15. |
| 12. Sample size | *How many participants were in the study?*<br><br>40 individuals in the phase 1.<br>35 individuals in the phase 2. | Results, page 17 and 28. |
| 13. Non-participation | *How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?*<br><br>No one has given up on participating in the project. | N/A |
| *Setting* | | |
| 14. Setting of data collection | *Where was the data collected? e.g., home, clinic, workplace.*<br><br>The IDIs were carried out at their house. | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, 9.<br><br>Phase 2 - Evaluation of the mHealth-enhanced adherence intervention (Acceptability and perceived appropriateness of the intervention) page 15. |
| 15. Presence of non-participants | *Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?* | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | No, only the interviewer, the observer and the participant were in the room during the interview. | adherence support intervention, page 9. |
| 16. Description of sample | *What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date*<br><br>We putted this information in the results section. | Results, page 17 and 28. |
| *Data collection* | | |
| 17. Interview guide | *Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?*<br><br>The design of the interview guide was informed by previous research exploring malaria-related knowledge, illness perceptions, and therapeutic itineraries in the Amazon region, particularly among vulnerable and mobile populations | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, page 9 |
| 18. Repeat interviews | *Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?*<br><br>N/A | N/A |
| 19. Audio/visual recording | *Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?*<br><br>The interviews were recorded in audio and transcribed without personal identifiers, so that the database could be anonymized | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, 9.<br><br>Phase 2 - Evaluation of the mHealth-enhanced adherence intervention (Acceptability and perceived appropriateness of the intervention) page 16. |
| 20. Field notes | *Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?*<br><br>Fieldnotes observation were made in notebook. | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, page 10. |
| 21. Duration | *What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?* | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | The interviews lasted an average of 40 minutes. | study and co-design of adherence support intervention, page 9. |
| 22. Data saturation | *Was data saturation discussed?*<br><br>The number of interviews was determined by the principle of theoretical saturation where IDIs are carried out until a clear pattern appears and subsequent groups do not produce new information. | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention,page 9. |
| 23. Transcripts returned | *Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?*<br><br>No. | N/A |
| **Domain 3: analysis and findings** | | |
| *Data analysis* | | |
| 24. Number of data coders | *How many data coders coded the data?*<br><br>Two researchers developed a codebook and performed line-by-line coding. | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, page 10. |
| 25. Description of the coding tree | *Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?*<br><br>No. | N/A |
| 26. Derivation of themes | *Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?*<br><br>The analysis of the interviews and the field notes allowed us to identify the two themes. | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, page 10. |
| 27. Software | *What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?*<br><br>The recordings of the IDIs and FDGs were transcribed and inserted in the MAXQDA 20 program. | Study design - Phase 1 – Exploratory qualitative study and co-design of adherence support intervention, page 9. |
| 28. Participant checking | *Did participants provide feedback on the findings?*<br><br>No. | N/A |
| *Reporting* | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 29. Quotations presented | *Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number*<br><br>Yes, quotations were presented to illustrate the themes/findings, and each quotation was identified with a participant number. | Results, pages 17-21 and 28-31. |
| 30. Data and findings consistent | *Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?*<br><br>Yes, there was consistency between the data presented and the findings. | Discussion, pages 31-37. |
| 31. Clarity of major themes | *Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?*<br><br>Yes, the themes were clearly presented in the Results section using specific sections regarding each theme. | Results, pages 17-21 and 28-31. |
| 32. Clarity of minor themes | *Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?*<br><br>No, minor themes were not discussed. | N/A |