

Supplementary table 1: Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ)

Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page description
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
Personal Characteristics		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	BN, EE/ Title Page
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials?	BN, EE, EM and VCA were MMS (master of midwifery science) CJ, CN, RN, AGA, FA, MKA, SMO, SU, EMB and NO were lecturers of Lira University
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	BN, EE, EM and VCA MMS students. CJ, CN, RN, AGA, FA, MKA, SMA, SU, EMB and NO were lecturers / Title page
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	6 of them were female, and 8 were male (Title page)
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	BN and EE conducted the interview. They trained in the qualitative research as part of their project during MMS study. Other authors were expert in qualitative studies. (Page 6)
Relationship with participants		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	No relationship with the participants was made before the commencement of the study. (Page 6)
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Participants knew the interviewer's role and reasons for performing the research as these were disclosed during the

		informed consent process. (Page 6)
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	We disclosed researchers' occupation, affiliation, reasons and interests to participants during the parent study.
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	Phenomenology was used. (Page 4)
Participant selection		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Purposeful sampling (Page 5).
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Face-to -face semi-structured in-depth interview was applied. (Page 4-5).
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	10 participants were in the study (Page 5).
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	No participant invited to participate declined. (Page 5).
Setting		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Data was collected from NICU boardroom of LRRH (Page 6).
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	All the participants were women, Christians, with age ranging from 18 to 37 Most had completed

		primary education, most of them were married. Demographic data were provided on page 9
Data collection		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Questions were guides and were pilot tested on two mothers from another facility in Northern Uganda
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?	Yes. All interviews were audiotaped. (Page 6)
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes field notes were made during the interview
21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	The duration of interviews was ranged from 30 to 40 Min. (Page 6).
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	The interviews process continued until it was clear that no additional concepts or themes were emerging, which signified theoretical saturation ((Page 6).
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
Data analysis		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	three coders
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Themes were provided on page 11-14.
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	We used data-driven codes and themes were derived from the data
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Data were managed using Microsoft Word and secure, password-

		protected electronic folders to organize interview transcripts, audio recordings, and field notes. No specialized qualitative data management software was utilized.
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	No
Reporting		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Yes. Quotations were available to illustrate the results. Each quotation was identified with each participant identifier throughout the result section. (page 11-14)
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes. There is a consistency between data and the results.
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes. Major themes were presented in the Result section using subthemes (pages 11-14)
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes. Diverse cases and minor themes were illustrated under the major themes in the Result section and argued in the Discussion section.