

Additional file 1. The Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist

No	Item	Guide question/description	
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
Personal Characteristics			
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	EMM conducted the FGI with TL as an assistant moderator
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? <i>E.g. PhD, MD</i>	EMM: PhD student SP: PhD TS: PhD KSF: PhD TL: PhD
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	EMM: University lecturer SP: Associate Senior Lecturer TS: Senior Lecturer KSF: Associate professor/ Senior Lecturer TL: Senior Lecturer
4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Female
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	EMM: Nursing SP: Health Science TS: Health Science/ Nursing KSF: Public health and health science TL: Health Science/ Nursing
			All researchers had experience in qualitative methodology and interview methods.
Relationship with participants			
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	The researchers had varying degrees of relationship with the participants, most had no prior relationship, and a few were former work colleagues.
7.	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? <i>e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research</i>	They knew the reasons for doing the research and the affiliations of the researchers.
8.	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? <i>e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i>	Reasons and interests in the research topic.
Domain 2: study design			
Theoretical framework			
9.	Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? <i>e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</i>	Content analysis.
Participant selection			
10.	Sampling	How were participants selected? <i>e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</i>	Purposive and snowball. More information is given in the method section.
11.	Method of approach	How were participants approached? <i>e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i>	To recruit participants, emails containing study information were sent to the RNs. More information is given in the method section.
12.	Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	18 RNs participated.

13.	Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Four participants dropped out, due to difficulties in finding time to participate.
Setting			
14.	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? <i>e.g. home, clinic, workplace</i>	Two FGIs were conducted face-to-face in neutral rooms at the RNs' workplaces, and two FGIs were conducted digitally using the Microsoft Teams digital platform.
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? <i>e.g. demographic data, date</i>	The sample consisted of both women and men, aged 31–63 years, who had worked in home care between 1.5–16 years. See Table 1 for the characteristics of the sample.
Data collection			
17.	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	A semi-structured interview guide was used. A pilot interview was held to evaluate the questions. See Table 2 for a description of the questions in the interview guide.
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?	The FGIs were audio recorded.
20.	Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes, during and directly after the FGIs.
21.	Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	The FGIs lasted between 55 and 65 minutes, with an average time of 60 minutes
22.	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Yes. After the fourth FGI, no new information emerged. Data analysis continued until consensus was reached, and sufficient theoretical saturation was considered to have been reached when no new insights or information emerged to further develop the results.
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?	EMM was the main coder of the data and made a preliminary analysis, which was continuously discussed with TL. Then, the codes were shared with SP, TS and KSF and further discussed in the whole team.
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?	The themes were derived from the data.
27.	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	No
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? <i>e.g. participant number</i>	Quotations were presented to illustrate the findings. Each quotation is identified by participant number.
30.	Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes
31.	Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes
32.	Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes