**Supplementary File 1: COREQ checklist (32 items)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity** | **Answer** | **Location in manuscript (Section, page no.)** |
| **Personal Characteristics** |  |  |
| 1. Interviewer/facilitator Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | ME | Methods, Pages 4,5 |
| 2. Credentials What were the researcher’s credentials?  | All authors title page. Interviewer’s elaborated page 5.  | Title page, specifics on page 5 Reflexivity |
| 3. Occupation What was their occupation at the time of the study?  | Yes | Methods, Page 5 Reflexivity |
| 4. Gender Was the researcher male or female | Yes | Methods, Page 5 Reflexivity |
| 5. Experience and training What experience or training did the researcher have? | Yes | Methods, Page 5 Reflexivity |
| **Relationship with participants** |  |  |
| 6. Relationship established Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | Only for the purposes of this research | n/a |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research  | All contacts were sent a Participant Information Sheet (Supplementary File 2) explaining the study and its purpose. After the introductory call, if the potential participants met the inclusion criteria and were willing to proceed, then they signed an electronic consent form prior to the recorded interview. | Methods Page 4 & Participant Information Sheet (Suppl. File 2) |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic | Yes | Methods, Page 5 Reflexivity |
| **Domain 2: study design** |  |  |
| **Theoretical framework** |  |  |
| 9. Methodological orientation and TheoryWhat methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis | Framework Method | Methods, Page 4 |
| **Participant selection** |  |  |
| 10. Sampling How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | Purposive | Methods, Page 3 |
| 11. Method of approach How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | Yes | Methods, Pages 3,4 |
| 12. Sample size How many participants were in the study | 20 | Results, Page 5 |
| 13. Non-participation How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | Included | Methods, Pages 3-4 |
| **Setting** |  |  |
| 14. Setting of data collection Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace | Video conference | Methods, Page 4 |
| 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? e.g. demographic data, date  | Included | Table 1, Results,Page 6 |
| **Data collection**  |  |  |
| 17. Interview guide Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  | Given the aim to evaluate and inform policy, the Framework method was used for data analysis with specific questions regarding barriers and facilitators to implementation and enforcement. | Methods, Page 4 |
| 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? | Interviews were audio-recorded with participants’ consent. | Methods, Page 4 |
| 20. Field notes Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?  | Yes | Methods, Page 3 |
| 21. Duration What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?  | Interviews lasted for a maximum of 60 minutes.  | Methods, Page 4 |
| 22. Data saturation Was data saturation discussed? | Yes | Methods, Pages 3,4 |
| 23. Transcripts returned Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? | Interviews were digitally audio recorded and transcribed verbatim by a professional transcription company. Transcripts were checked for accuracy. Transcripts were not returned to participants for comment or correction. | Methods, Page 4 |
| **Domain 3: analysis and findings** |  |  |
| **Data analysis** |  |  |
| 24. Number of data coders How many data coders coded the data?  | Three researchers (ME, JA, MW) independently coded three transcripts to ensure important aspects of the data were not missed, and ME coded all remaining transcripts. | Methods, Page 4 |
| 25. Description of the coding tree Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | Five key themes, including their more detailed descriptions are presented in Table 2 | Results, Page 7, Table 2 |
| 26. Derivation of themes Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data | Included | Methods, Page 4 |
| 27. Software What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | NVivo, version 12 | Methods, Page 5 |
| 28. Participant checking Did participants provide feedback on the findings?  | No | n/a |
| **Reporting** |  |  |
| 29. Quotations presented Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number | Yes, quotations were presented and attributed to anonymised participants. | Results, Pages 8-14 |
| 30. Data and findings consistent Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? | Yes | Results, Pages 8-14 |
| 31. Clarity of major themes Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? | Yes | Results, Pages 8-14 |
| 32. Clarity of minor themesIs there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Yes | Results, Pages 8-14 |