

APPENDIX 1 - COREQ checklist

The Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist

No.	Item	Guide questions/description	Notes
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
The research team			
The multidisciplinary research team had expertise in musculoskeletal conditions (JB, AT, CM), qualitative methodology (RD, TC, AT, CK), public health (RD, TC), sociology (SS) and low value care (AT, RD, TC, SS, CM).			
Personal Characteristics			
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	CK conducted all semi structured interviews. AT was the moderator during the focus groups.
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	AT: PhD CK: GCert (qualitative health research)
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	AT: physiotherapist and research fellow CK: qualitative research assistant
4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	The focus group facilitator (AT) was male. The interviewer (CK) was female.
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher(s) have?	AT and CK had experience with qualitative methods including facilitating focus groups and conducting interviews.
Relationship with participants			
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	The research team did not have any contact with participants prior to obtaining informed consent. Researchers had no professional or ongoing relationship with the participants.
7.	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Participants were aware that this was a research project to explore the use of diagnostic imaging in the emergency department. The research team explained that the goal of the research was to improve evidence-based care for patients with low back pain in the emergency department.
8.	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	The research team had an interest in overuse of imaging in the emergency department and the reduction of low value care.
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 research team conducted framework analysis. We analysed the data in an inductive manner (i.e. without preconceived ideas).

10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	We used a combination of purposive and convenience sampling. We attempted to reach maximum variation regarding age, gender and cultural background for the patient participants. With clinician participants we attempted to reach maximum variation regarding age, type of clinician (i.e. Physician, physiotherapist or nurse) and years of experience for the clinician participants.
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	We recruited all patients using routinely collected ED presentations lists from Liverpool hospital. Clinicians were recruited through head of ED from Liverpool hospital via e-mail notification of the study by one of the researchers (AT).
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	14 patient participants and 12 clinician participants.
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Of the 40 patients who were invited and eligible, 10 agreed to participate in a focus group, and 4 in an individual phone interview. Resulting in a total of 14 patient participants. We invited 115 ED physicians to participate in this study, in total 8 agreed to participate. Additionally we also invited 4 physiotherapists who all agreed to participate, resulting in a total of 12 clinician participants.
Setting		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Focus group sessions were conducted in Liverpool Hospital library meeting rooms. Interviews with both patients and clinicians were conducted via telephone.
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	There were no people present during the data collection besides participants and researchers.
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	The average age of patient participants was 43. Of the participants in the focus groups all participants were born outside Australia. For the patients participating in the interviews all but one was born in Australia.
Data collection		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	See section 'Data Collection', Page 5
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	There were no repeat interviews with the same participants.
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	All interviews were audio recorded with permission of participants.
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Researchers made field notes during the interviews and focus groups.

21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	The focus groups had an average duration of 1 hour and 25 minutes and the individual interviews with patients had an average duration of 41 minutes. The individual interviews with clinicians had an average duration of 36 minutes.
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Data saturation was reached on almost all major topics. We didn't reach saturation on the cultural aspects from a patient's perspective.
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	Transcripts were not returned to participants for comment and/or correction.
Domain 3: Analysis and findings		
Data analysis		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Four researchers coded two interviews individually and came together to compose a preliminary coding tree. One main researcher used this coding tree to code the remaining interviews with regular feedback of the rest of the analysis team.
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	There is no description of the coding tree.
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Themes were derived from the data in an inductive manner.
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Researchers used NVivo during the coding of all interviews.
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	There was no member check performed by the research team.
Reporting		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? E.g. participant number	Key findings of this study were supported with selected quotes in text. Additional supporting quotes are provided in Appendix 3.
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	All findings were derived from the data and all themes are supported by illustrative quotes.
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Major themes were derived from the data and are clearly defined by a paragraph title.
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Themes on which there was a deviant opinion within the group or between the groups are discussed. Themes that are only described by one participant are also discussed in the results section of this study.