

Supplementary Document 2

Manuscript: Perceptions of Participants and Organizers of a Social Prescribing Program for Hospital Staff through Horticulture (SP4S-H) in the Community Hospitals in Singapore – A Qualitative Study

Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist¹

¹ Tong et al. 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

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Comments(Section, Page number)
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
Personal Characteristics		
1. Interviewer/ facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	AWPA; TMH (Data analysis, Page 9)
2. Credentials	What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	AWPY: MBBS TMH: Bsc (Sociology) SSSY: PhD (Public Health) (Data analysis, Page 9)
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	AWPA: Family Physician TMH: Research Officer SSSY: Research Fellow (Data analysis, Page 9)
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	AWPA: Male TMH; SSSY: Female (Data analysis, Page 9)
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	AWPA: Trains the lay in social prescribing TMH; SSSY: key investigators in many national and cluster-wide health and social research,

		including on SP (Data analysis, Page 9)
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Researchers and participants are colleagues in the same company (Data analysis, Page 9)
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	The participants understand the reasons for performing the research, based on the consent form (Research participants, Page 7)
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/ facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	The interviewers are interested to know about participant's perceptions about SP4S-H as part of program evaluation. (Introduction, page 6-7)
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	Methodology: Thematic analysis by Braun and Clarke (2006) Theoretical framework: REAIM (Data analysis, Page 8)
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g., purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Convenience sampling (Research participants, Page 8)
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g., face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Email (Research participants, Page 8)

12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	26 (Participant characteristics, Page 10)
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	7 (of which 4 were uncomfortable with interviews; 3 had conflicts with their existing schedules) (Participant characteristics, Page 10)
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Virtual meeting (Zoom) (Participant characteristics, Page 10)
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	No (Participant characteristics, Page 10)
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Age, gender, ethnicity, occupation, years of service in current setting, role in SP4S-H; status of completion in SP4S-H competition (for participants only) (Table 1 Baseline characteristics of interviewees)
<i>Data collection</i>		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Yes, there are questions provided in the interview guide. Yes, the interview guide was pilot tested in 2 participants (Data collection, page 8)
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	No repeat interviews (Participant characteristics, Page 10)
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Audio recording (Data collection, page 8)
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?	Yes; field notes were made during the interview. (Data collection, page 8)
21. Duration	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	The interviews ranged between 20 to 90 minutes (Data collection, page 8)
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Yes (Data collection, page 8)

23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No. (Not reported in the paper)
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
Data analysis		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	2 coders (Data analysis, Page 9)
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Yes (Table 2 themes and subthemes)
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Themes were identified in advance, using the REAIM framework for program evaluation. (Data analysis, Page 8)
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	NVivo Version 14 (Data analysis, Page 8)
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	Participant checking was performed but there was no significant feedback (Data analysis, Page 9)
Reporting		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Yes. Participant quotations were presented to illustrate the theme and findings and each quotation was identified (Table 2 themes and subthemes)
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes. There was consistency between data presented and the findings (See Results [Page 10-12] and Table 2 themes and subthemes)
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Major themes were clearly presented in the findings. (Table 2 themes and subthemes)
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	There is a discussion of a minor themes (contextual considerations, page 11-12)

