|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item no.** | **Topic** | **Topic guide questions/description** | **Response/reported on page no.** |
| **Domains 1: Research team and reflexivity** | | | |
| Personal characteristics | | | |
| 1 | Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | FR / Page 1 |
| 2 | Credentials | What were the researcher’s credentials? e.g., PhD, MD | FR’s credentials were PharmD and PhD / Not reported in manuscript |
| 3 | Occupation | What was his/her occupation at the time of the study? | FR was a registered Portuguese pharmacist and Senior Lecturer at the Guarda Polytechnique institute / Not reported in manuscript |
| 4 | Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | (Female) / Not reported in manuscript |
| 5 | Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? | FR has performed several qualitative studies during her research career / Page 2 |
| Relationship with participants | | | |
| 6 | Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | There was no established relationship between researchers and focus group participants. A relationship was established between the researchers and health professionals at each healthcare centre for the purposes of recruiting each group of participants / Page 2 |
| 7 | Participants’ knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g., personal goals, reasons for doing the research | They were informed of the research aims / Page 2 |
| 8 | Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g., bias, assumptions, reasons, and interests in the research topic | Participants were informed that the researcher held a PharmD, PhD and was a Senior Lecturer at the Guarda Polytechnique institute. They were also informed about the research aims, and that the research was being undertaken as part of MedElderly project / Not reported in manuscript |
| **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 | Thematic analysis as described by Braun and Clark, underpinned by the Theoretical Domains Framework / Page 3 |
| Participant selection | | | |
| 10 | Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g., purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | Participants were purposively sampled at thirteen primary health care centres across the central region of Portugal / Page 2 |
| 11 | Method of approach | How were participants approached? e.g., face-to-face, telephone, mail, e- mail | All potentially eligible participants were approached face-to-face, and then personally invited by their physician / Page 2 |
| 12 | Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | 61 participants / Page 4 |
| 13 | Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | All the participants who were purposively sampled agreed to participate in the focus groups / Not reported in manuscript |
| Setting | | | |
| 14 | Data collection setting | Where was the data collected? e.g., home, clinic, workplace | All focus groups were convened in meeting rooms at their respective primary healthcare centres |
| 15 | Presence of non- participants | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? | No / Not expressly reported in manuscript |
| 16 | Description of sample | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g., demographic data, date | Refer to Table 1 for demographic data and Table 2 for medication profiles; data were collected from May to October 2018 / Page 2 |
| Data-collection | | | |
| 17 | Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | A semi-structured topic guide was designed to elicit participants’ views regarding their beliefs, attitudes and perceptions about medicines / Page 1 |
| 18 | Repeat interviews | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? | Focus group sessions were carried out until saturation of information had been achieved on the research questions/ Page 2 |
| 19 | Audio/visual recording | Did the research use audio or visual recordings to collect the data? | Audio recordings were made of the focus group discussions / Page 2 |
| 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? | Focus group session duration was 60-80 minutes / Page 2 |
| 22 | Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | To determine whether data saturation had been achieved, the principles outlined by Francis et al[[1]](#footnote-1) for determining saturation in theory-based qualitative studies were followed / Not reported in manuscript |
| 23 | Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction | No / Not expressly reported in manuscript |
| **Domain 3: Analysis and findings** | | | |
| Data analysis | | | |
| 24 | Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | AIP carried out inductive coding for the thematic analysis, which was checked by FR (qualitative research expert). Maped coding was discussed by the research team (AIP, FR, TH, MM and AF) / Page 3 |
| 25 | Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | Table 3 |
| 26 | Derivation of themes | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? | Inductive and deductive approaches were used to identify the key themes The phase-1 thematic analysis involved inductive coding of data and thus no pre-determined themes were applied. For phase 2, the themes were mapped, and the pre-defined domains were deductively applied to phase-1 data / Pages 2 and 3 |
| 27 | Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | Data were managed using NVivo 12 (QSR International, Melbourne, Australia) / Page 3 |
| 28 | Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the findings? | No / Not expressly reported in manuscript |
| Reporting | | | |
| 29 | Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g., participant number | Quotations are provided to contextualise novel concepts, as are participant/primary healthcare centre numbers / Pages 2 and 4-8 |
| 30 | Data and findings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? | Data including quotations are provided in a manner consistent with the findings / see the Results and Discussion sections |
| 31 | Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? | The four major themes are presented and explained in the Results section / Pages 4-8 |
| 32 | Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Divergences between focus group patients are reported and explained in the Results section and discussed in the Discussion section. The four major themes and the constituent inductive codes (and the relationships between the three) are shown in Table 3 / see the Results and Discussion sections |
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