

Deze aanvullende informatie is zoals aangeleverd door de auteurs; ze is niet inhoudelijk of taalkundig bewerkt door de redactie van het *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde*

Supplement 1 Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Inter viewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the inter view or focus group?	MZ, WG (page 3)
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	PhD (MZ), MSc/PhD-student (WG) (page 1)
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Research fellows (page 1)
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Females (page 1)
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Both researchers had broad experience in interviewing, MZ followed courses on qualitative research. GH educates in qualitative research and supported MZ and WG during the research project (page 3).
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	No
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Broad outlines given
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	Both interviewers and members of the wider research team had pre-existing interest and experience in quality and safety of healthcare research.
Domain 2: study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	Content analysis (page 3)

<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Purposive sampling (page 3)
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Face-to-face, by telephone and email. Initial contact was by email with information about the study.
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	19 (page 3)
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	1 person refused due to lack of time
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Clinic, workplace and by phone
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	Experts, developers, directors, scientists, risk and quality managers working in health care and industry (page 3)
<i>Data collection</i>		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Interview guides were sent to interviewees prior to the interview.
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?	Interviews were audio recorded (page 3)
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	yes
21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	Between 30 and 60 minutes
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Yes (page 3)
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	Yes
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	One
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	No
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	In advance using the implementation checklist

		developed by the Dutch Quality Institute and NFU (page 3)
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Word and Excel
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	There was no formal process of participant checking of research findings. The results were presented to boards of 35 Dutch hospitals, including nine interview partners, on an invitational (19-3-2015).
<i>Reporting</i>		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Yes, with a participant number (Table 2)
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	We have attempted to present our findings in a clear manner, consistent with the data collected. (page 3-6, Table 1 and 2, Figure 1)
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	We have attempted to present our findings in a clear manner, consistent with the data collected. (page 3-6, Table 1 and 2, Figure 1)
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	We have attempted to present our findings in a clear manner, consistent with the data collected. (page 3-6, Table 1 and 2, Figure 1)