

| Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Personal Characteristics | | Pariya Kashfi | Agneta Nilsson | Robert Feldt |
| 1. Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | X | | |
| 2. Credentials | What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD | Ph.Lic; PhD Candidate | PhD | PhD |
| 3. Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | PhD candidate , software engineering, Chalmers University | Senior lecturer, software engineering, Chalmers University | Professor, software engineering, Chalmers University |
| 4. Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | female | female | male |
| 5. Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? | Four years experience in doing qualitative research in both empirical software engineering and human-computer interaction. Formal training in research methods as a graduate student | Extensive experience in doing qualitative research in both empirical software engineering and information systems research. Formal training in research methods as a graduate student. | Extensive experience in doing both qualitative and quantitative research in empirical software engineering. Formal training in research methods both as a graduate student and in faculty "courses" in preparation for associate professorship" |
| Relationship with participants | | | | |
| 6. Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | The first author communicated with the participants a couple of times prior to the interviews, via email or telephone. The aim was mainly to introduce herself and the other two authors, her research, the aim of the study and the study setting | | |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research | Information about the research, her background (both academic, industrial), research interests, study goals, research goals etc. were presented to the interviewees prior to starting the interviews | | |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic | Our assumption was that UX is not understood well in software industry and that there is a need to bridge between the knowledge and understating from human-computer interaction to software engineering to support improvement of UX practice in software industry. Introduction section includes more information about the gap was saw in current literature and our view of how our study can help filling the gap | | |
| 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 | The study was inspired by grounded theory, however, not all the steps were formally followed. Rather, we used the concepts of coding, and thematic analysis to code and analyze the data |
| Participant selection | | |
| 10. Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | Purposive (based on their role and background, industry and projects involved in) but also convenience since we were looking more for interviewees at Sweden to be able to perform face-to-face interviews. The diversity of the interviewees roles and background was also important for the explorative nature of our study as explained in method section . We specifically looked for practitioners with both software engineering and UX-related roles and background. This is summarized in Table 1 in method section . Table 1 in method section presents a summary of the participants' roles and different companies |
| 11. Method of approach | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | 4 skype/telephone, 13 face to face |
| 12. Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | 17 |
| 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 | Workplace of the participants |
| 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 | The diversity of the background, roles and projects involved in was important for the explorative nature of our study as explained in method section . We specifically looked for practitioners with both software engineering and UX-related roles and background. This is summarized in Table 1 in method section |
| Data collection | | |
| 17. Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | Yes, yes, the interview guide can be found in Appendix |
| 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? | All interviews were audio recorded |
| 20. Field notes | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? | Some notes were also taken during the interviews to record important topics discussed |
| 21. Duration | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? | ~1 hour |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 22. Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | Yes, in parallel with data gathering the authors constantly discussed the initial findings and after 17 interviews the three authors agreed that data saturation is achieved, this is also explained in method section briefly |
| 23. Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? | No, since the transcript were generated from the audio recording and were precise and reliable |
| Domain 3: analysis and findings | | |
| Data analysis | | |
| 24. Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | The first author did the coding, however a pilot coding was performed to assure consistency and reduce researcher bias, this is explained in method section |
| 25. Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | Yes, a list of the codes is provided as appendix and explained in the method section |
| 26. Derivation of themes | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? | Derived from data, presented as 11 challenge categories in result section |
| 27. Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | TAMS analyzer for coding, excel for communicating the coded segments, and memoing |
| 28. Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the findings? | all of the participants received a copy of the paper to provide feedback but no one provided any detail feedback. |
| Reporting | | |
| 29. Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number | Yes, yes (id of the company, and id of the interviewee). For each quotation used in the result section this information is given. e.g. "... Usability is easy to talk about and everybody understands it." (A-1) . |
| 30. Data and findings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? | Yes, our interview findings are consistent with the findings of previous studies in this topic. This is discussed in detail in the discussion section of the paper |
| 31. Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? | Yes, The result section extensively presents these themes and connects them to the interview quotations. These themes are basically the 11 challenge categories presented in this section |
| 32. Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Yes, The result section extensively presents these themes and connects them to the interview quotations, also the major themes |