**Implementation of the Xpert MTB/RIF assay for tuberculosis in Mongolia: a qualitative exploration of barriers and enablers –**

**Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 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?  | Gantungalag Ganbaatar and Munkhjargal Dorjravdan |
| 2.  | Credentials  | What were the researcher's credentials? *E.g. PhD, MD*  | Nicole Rendell – MPHSolongo Bekhbat - MDGantungalag Ganbaatar - EpidemiologistMunkhjargal Dorjravdan – MDMadhukar Pai - MD, PhDClaudia C Dobler – MD, MBBS, MD, PhD, FRACP |
| 3.  | Occupation  | What was their occupation at the time of the study?  | Nicole Rendell – Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor, National Tuberculosis Program MongoliaSolongo Bekhbat – Executive Director, Mongolian Anti-Tuberculosis AssociationGantungalag Ganbaatar – Epidemiologist, National Tuberculosis Program MongoliaMunkhjargal Dorjravdan – TB doctor specialising in MDR-TB, National Tuberculosis Program MongoliaMadhukar Pai - Canada Research Chair in Epidemiology & Global HealthDirector, McGill Global Health ProgramsAssociate Director, McGill International TB Centre, McGill University, Montreal, Canada Claudia C Dobler - Consultant Respiratory Physician, Conjoint Senior Lecturer UNSW and UWS, Dept of Respiratory Medicine, NHMRC TRIP (translating research into practice) fellow, Woolcock Institute of Medical Research, Sydney, Australia |
| 4.  | Gender  | Was the researcher male or female?  | Nicole Rendell – femaleSolongo Bekhbat – female Gantungalag Ganbaatar – female Munkhjargal Dorjravdan – femaleMadhukar Pai – male Claudia C Dobler – female |
| 5.  | Experience and training  | What experience or training did the researcher have?  | Nicole Rendell – post-graduate levelSolongo Bekhbat – post-graduate level Gantungalag Ganbaatar – post-graduate levelMunkhjargal Dorjravdan – post-graduate level Madhukar Pai – extensive experienceClaudia C Dobler – extensive experience |
| Relationship with participants  |   |   |  |
| 6.  | Relationship established  | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?  | Nicole Rendell – NoSolongo Bekhbat – NoGantungalag Ganbaatar – colleagueMunkhjargal Dorjravdan – colleague Madhukar Pai – NoClaudia C Dobler – No |
| 7.  | Participant knowledge of the interviewer  | What did the participants know about the researcher? e*.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research*  | Gantungalag Ganbaatar – knowledge of general personal information consistent with collegiate relationships, role within the organisation and context of the research.Munkhjargal Dorjravdan – knowledge of general personal information consistent with collegiate relationships, role within the organisation and context of the research. |
| 8.  | Interviewer characteristics  | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. *Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic*  | Gantungalag Ganbaatar – no bias was reported and interests in the research topic were well known.Munkhjargal Dorjravdan – no bias was reported and interests in the research topic were well known. |
| 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*  | Inductive-deductive approach. |
| Participant selection  |   |   |  |
| 10.  | Sampling  | How were participants selected? *e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball*  | Purposive. |
| 11.  | Method of approach  | How were participants approached? e*.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email*  | Face-to-face and over the phone. |
| 12.  | Sample size  | How many participants were in the study?  | 24 |
| 13.  | Non-participation  | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?  | None. |
| Setting  |   |   |  |
| 14.  | Setting of data collection  | Where was the data collected? e*.g. home, clinic, workplace*  | In one of the meeting rooms of the National Tuberculosis Program office or over the phone while the interview was based in the office.  |
| 15.  | Presence of non-participants  | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?  | No.  |
| 16.  | Description of sample  | What are the important characteristics of the sample? *e.g. demographic data, date*  | Use of Xpert MTB/RIF as part of their work as a TB doctor or laboratory staff.  |
| Data collection  |   |   |  |
| 17.  | Interview guide  | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  | Yes prompts were provided but the interviewers but the participants did not have visibility of the guides. Pretesting of the interview guides was undertaken. |
| 18.  | Repeat interviews  | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?  | No.  |
| 19.  | Audio/visual recording  | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?  | Audio recorder.  |
| 20.  | Field notes  | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  | No.  |
| 21.  | Duration  | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?  | It varied between participants but generally between 20-30 minutes.  |
| 22.  | Data saturation  | Was data saturation discussed?  | Yes, among researchers.  |
| 23.  | Transcripts returned  | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?  | No.  |
| Domain 3: analysis and findingsz  |   |   |  |
| Data analysis  |   |   |  |
| 24.  | Number of data coders  | How many data coders coded the data?  | Two. |
| 25.  | Description of the coding tree  | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  | No not a coding tree but a framework with definitions and examples was used to facilitate consistent coding between the authors.  |
| 26.  | Derivation of themes  | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?  | High level themes were identified in advance and subthemes were derived from the data.  |
| 27.  | Software  | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?  | QSR NVivo version 10 (QSR International Pty Ltd, Doncaster, Victoria, Australia) |
| 28.  | Participant checking  | Did participants provide feedback on the findings?  | No but the translation of the transcripts were verified by a second researcher to ensure accuracy.  |
| Reporting  |   |   |  |
| 29.  | Quotations presented  | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e*.g. participant number*  | Earlier drafts had taken this approach and then were removed as part of the editing process due to concerns about length of the paper.  |
| 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. |