

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

Please indicate in which section each item has been reported in your manuscript. If you do not feel an item applies to your manuscript, please enter N/A.

For further information about the COREQ guidelines, please see Tong *et al.*, 2017:

<https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>

No.	Item	Description	Section #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
Personal characteristics			
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Razia Naveed, Tazleem Ayaz
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? <i>E.g. PhD, MD</i>	RN: MS. (Anthropology) TA: MSc (Sociology)
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Qualitative Researcher (both)
4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Female (both)
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	RN: 4+ years of experience of qualitative assessments TA: 7+ years of experience of qualitative assessments
Relationship with participants			
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Yes
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>	Exploration of efficacy and business models of midwifery centers
8.	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? <i>E.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i>	That they were conducting an open ended inquiry. Both were qualitative researchers but neither were specifically subject specialists in midwifery
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>	An inductive approach was undertaken, which is a systematic procedure to develop categories from raw data that captures key themes identified from a group of categories with common meanings
Participant selection			
10.	Sampling	How were participants selected? <i>E.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive,</i>	The participants were purposively recruited through health facilities and healthcare professionals using the

		<i>snowball</i>	snowball sampling technique. Women attending the MLBC over the days the local research teams were present and invited to participate in an interview. Data were collected from three types of informants at each site.
11.	Method of approach	How were participants approached? <i>E.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i>	Participants were selected from senior or leadership roles within the national health system as midwives, doctors, policymakers, or program planners, healthcare workers that were working in the centers studied, or women aged 18+ who had planned births at these MLBC sites and received antenatal and /or postnatal care in the 6 months before interviews
12.	Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	30
13.	Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? What were the reasons for this?	None
Setting			
14.	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? <i>E.g. home, clinic, workplace</i>	Clinic
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>	Participants were selected from senior or leadership roles within the national health system as midwives, doctors, policymakers, or program planners, healthcare workers that were working in the centers studied, or women aged 18+ who had planned births at these MLBC sites and received antenatal and /or postnatal care in the 6 months before interviews
Data collection			
17.	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Yes
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

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?	Approximately one hour
22.	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Yes
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
25.	Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Yes
26.	Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Themes were identified from the data
27.	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Yes, Nvivo
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>	Yes
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

When submitting your manuscript via the online submission form, please upload the completed checklist as a Figure/supplementary file.

If you would like this checklist to be included alongside your article, we ask that you upload the completed checklist to an online repository and include the guideline type, name of the repository, DOI and license in the *Data availability* section of your manuscript.

Developed from: Allison Tong, Peter Sainsbury, Jonathan Craig, Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups, *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, Volume 19, Issue 6, December 2007, Pages 349–357, <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>