

APPENDIX 1 - COREQ checklist

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

Environmental and structural risk factors for mycetoma in the White Nile state, Sudan: An ethnographic study

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Notes
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity- Qualitative research study		
The research team		
The multidisciplinary research team had expertise in medical and social anthropology (Papreen Nahar (PN) second author of the article, Osama Abu Zeid, (OA) Third author Badraldeen Alnoor (BA) the first author of the article, and James Fairhead (J F) the last author of the article and environmental anthropology James and Badraldeen qualitative methodology Osama, Papreen Nahar.		
Personal Characteristics		
1. Inter viewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	BA conducted all interviews and observations. OA was the translator validator data.
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's Credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	BA: PhD global health and infections JF professor of social anthropology PN PhD medical anthropology OA PhD social and developmental anthropology
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	PN: main monitor, training lead of the 5S project and research fellow at Brighton and Sussex medical school. JF: full professor at Sussex university and second supervisor to my research at Brighton and Sussex medical school. OA: co-supervisor and qualitative research post doctorate fellow at Brighton and Sussex Medical School BA: PhD Student at Brighton and Sussex Medical School
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	The focus group facilitator BA was male. The interviewer BA was male. PN main supervisor was female, the two other researchers were males
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher(s) have?	BA, PN, JF and OA had experience with designing the qualitative research studies, methods, data analysis and interpretations.
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 Interrelationship between culture, environment, and mycetoma in their community. The research team explained that the goal of the research was to explore these interrelationships to uncover the environmental and structural risk factors associated with mycetoma in the study area. There was a participant's information sheet that was

		developed by the research team and translated to Arabic for participants.
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	The research team had an interest in exploring the interrelationship between culture, environment and mycetoma in the White Nile State Al Andalous village. To understand how livelihoods intersect with mycetoma risk factors and to examine the lived experience of mycetoma patients in the study area.
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 ethnography. We analyzed the data in an thematic manner (i.e. without preconceived ideas).

10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	We used purposive 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, and nurse) traditional healers, local authorities, and local community leaders.
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	We recruited mycetoma patients from the village hospital records, focus group discussion participants based on their occupations and had mycetoma experience, and the key informant interviews based on their institutional positions to reflect the institutional setting in the research. All participants were recruited in person (face-to-face).
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	20 mycetoma patient participants and 32 FGDs participants, 8 KIs participants. The total was 60 participants.
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	All of the targeted participants interviewed. None of them refused to take part in the study.
Setting		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Focus group sessions were conducted in the first author host house were all agreed to be there. Interviews with both patients and key informants were conducted in their houses.
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	There were some people present during the data collection besides participants and researchers, especially women husbands when interviewed women in their houses.
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	The average age of patient participants was 44. Of all the participants 42. All of them were borne in the village.
Data collection		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	The interview guides were developed by the first author and revised by the research team and were pilot tested with training sessions.
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews 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?	The first author made field notes during the interviews and focus groups all observations were taken with notes and memes.

21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	The focus groups had an average duration of 1 hour and 30 minutes and the individual interviews with patients had an average duration of 45 minutes. The individual interviews with key informants had an average duration of 30 minutes.
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Data saturation was reached on almost all major topics, themes until there was redundancy in answers.
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?	The first author coded all 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 brief description of the coding tree see data analysis section in the article.
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Themes were derived from the data in an inductive manner using Invivo 11 software with intensive training from University of Sussex.
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Researchers used NVivo 11 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 the article with identifiers male/female and date.
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.