

## Appendix 1: The consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ)

Topic	Guide questions/description	Remarks
<b>Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity</b>		
a) Personal Characteristics		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	FT and AVD conducted the interviews.
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	The researchers' credentials are as follows: FT: PhD candidate AVD: PhD candidate HB: PhD JB: PhD MR: PhD KB: PhD
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	The researchers' occupations are as follows: FT: PhD candidate AVD: PhD candidate HB: academic/ general practitioner JB: academic/Professor MR: academic/consultant KB: academic/Professor
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	The researchers' gender are as follows: FT: female AVD: female HB: female JB: male MR: female KB: female
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	FT and AVD attended courses and workshop on qualitative research (how to conduct, analyse, report, ...) and NVivo software. Both are junior researchers and had prior interviewing experience.  HB, JB, MR and KB are experienced researchers in both quantitative and qualitative studies and have published numerous research articles.
b) Relationship with participants		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Most of the participants knew the researchers who conducted the interviews (FT and AVD) professionally.

7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Prior to the interviews, the researchers provided a brief introduction of their own backgrounds (both midwife and PhD candidate), the study, and the goal of the study.
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	No specific bias or assumptions to declare for any of the interviewers.
<b>Domain 2: study design</b>		
a) Theoretical framework		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis etc	Thematic analysis was applied.
b) Participant selection		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	The participants were purposively selected.
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Potential participants were approached by email.
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	10 GANC facilitators were recruited.
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	None of the participants refused to participate or dropped out.
c) Setting		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	The interviews took place in person at the participants' workplace or online.
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	No-one else was present besides the participants and researchers.
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	The important characteristics of the samples were their experience as a GANC facilitator, occupation and the type of organization in which they are employed.
d) Data collection		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Examples of interview questions are shown in table 1. The guide was not pilot tested.
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	No repeat interviews were carried out.
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	We used audio recording to collect the data.
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Field notes were made during and after every interview. These field notes were used to guide the following interviews and to assist in the analysis of the data.
21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	The duration of the in-depth interviews ranged from 31 to 70 min.

22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Data saturation is discussed in the methodology section.
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	The transcripts were not returned to participants for comment or correction.
<b>Domain 3: analysis and findings</b>		
a) Data analysis		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Two team members (FT and AVD) coded the data and reviewed on a regular basis with KB.
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	The coding tree can be seen in Figure 1.
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data	The themes were mainly derived from the data while analysing. However, constructs of the CFIR and TDF helped draw the interviewer's attention to the domains that could have an impact.
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	NVivo was used to support the analysis process.
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	We had the opportunity to present the findings at a meeting (with 5 of the respondents) and a workshop at a conference (with GANC facilitators from the Netherlands and Belgium). The findings were confirmed during the meetings and the conference.
b) Reporting		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Quotations of participants are presented and identified by the participant number.
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes, there was consistency between the data presented and the findings  We can conclude this by the separate coding of 2 researchers and by feedback received from respondents.
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes, major themes are clearly presented in the findings and accompanied by a figure (figure 1).
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes, there is a descriptions of the diverse cases or discussion of minor themes.