

Normalisation and equity of referral to the NHS Low Calorie Diet programme pilot; a qualitative evaluation of the experiences of health care staff

DREW, Kevin J., HOMER, Catherine <<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2571-6008>>, RADLEY, Duncan, JONES, Susan, FREEMAN, Charlotte, BAKHAI, Chirag and ELLS, Louisa

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/32984/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

DREW, Kevin J., HOMER, Catherine, RADLEY, Duncan, JONES, Susan, FREEMAN, Charlotte, BAKHAI, Chirag and ELLS, Louisa (2024). Normalisation and equity of referral to the NHS Low Calorie Diet programme pilot; a qualitative evaluation of the experiences of health care staff. BMC Public Health, 24 (1): 152.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Additional File 2

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

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Inter viewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the inter view or focus group?	pp.6
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	Additional File 2
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Additional File 2
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Additional File 2
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Additional File 2
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	pp.27 (acknowledgements)
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	pp.6
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	pp.6
Domain 2: study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	pp.6
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	pp.5/6
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	pp.5
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	pp.5
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	N/A
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home,	pp.6

Additional File 2

	clinic, workplace	
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	N/A
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	pp.23
<i>Data collection</i>		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	pp.6
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	N/A
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	pp.6
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?	pp.6
21. Duration	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	pp.6
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	N/A
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	N/A
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	pp.6
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	pp.7-17
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	pp.6
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	pp.6
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	N/A
<i>Reporting</i>		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	pp.7-17
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	pp.7-17 Additional File 3
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	pp.7-17
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	pp.7-17

Developed from:

Additional File 2

Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Personal Characteristics:

Dr Kevin J Drew PhD (Male). Post-doctoral Research Fellow with 7 years' experience of conducting qualitative evaluations of health-based interventions.

Dr Catherine Homer PhD (Female). Senior Research Fellow with experience working in academia and extensive experience working in public health.

Dr Duncan Radley PhD (Male). Reader with 25 years' experience conducting obesity research, and previously research manager in weight management service providers.

Dr Susan Jones PhD (Female). Research Fellow with 11 years' experience conducting qualitative evaluations using NPT theory.

Charlotte Freeman (Female). Project research officer with experience of evaluating interventions in academia and primary care services as well as experience of working in public health.

Dr Chirag Bakhai (Male). General Practitioner in primary care with a special interest in diabetes management. Chirag is a clinical lead on the Oversight group for the Re:Mission Study and a primary care advisor to the national diabetes programme for NHS England and NHS Improvement.

Dr Louisa Ells (Female). Professor of Obesity with a specialist interest in multi-disciplinary, cross-sector applied obesity research, with extensive experience of leading programme evaluations.