

Article title: Barriers and Facilitators to Implementing Interventions for Reducing Avoidable Hospital Readmission: Systematic Review of Qualitative Studies

Journal name: International Journal of Health Policy and Management (IJHPM)

Authors' information: Becky Q Fu¹, Claire CW Zhong¹, Charlene HL Wong¹, Fai Fai Ho², Per Nilsen³, Chi Tim Hung¹, Eng Kiong Yeoh¹, Vincent CH Chung^{1,2*}

¹Centre for Health Systems and Policy Research, Jockey Club School of Public Health and Primary Care, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong.

²School of Chinese Medicine, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong.

³Department of Medicine, Health and Caring Sciences, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden.

(*Corresponding author: vchung@cuhk.edu.hk)

Supplementary file 1. Enhancing Transparency in Reporting the Synthesis of Qualitative Research: The ENTREQ Statement Checklist*

No	Item	Guide and description	Page
1	Aim	State the research question the synthesis addresses.	3-4
2	Synthesis methodology	Identify the synthesis methodology or theoretical framework which underpins the synthesis, and describe the rationale for choice of methodology (<i>e.g. meta-ethnography, thematic synthesis, critical interpretive synthesis, grounded theory synthesis, realist synthesis, meta-aggregation, meta-study, framework synthesis</i>).	6
3	Approach to searching	Indicate whether the search was pre-planned (<i>comprehensive search strategies to seek all available studies</i>) or iterative (<i>to seek all available concepts until they theoretical saturation is achieved</i>).	5
4	Inclusion criteria	Specify the inclusion/exclusion criteria (<i>e.g. in terms of population, language, year limits, type of publication, study type</i>).	5
5	Data sources	Describe the information sources used (<i>e.g. electronic databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, psycINFO, Econlit), grey literature databases (digital thesis, policy reports), relevant organisational websites, experts, information specialists, generic web searches (Google Scholar) hand searching, reference lists</i>) and when the searches conducted; provide the rationale for using the data sources.	5

No	Item	Guide and description	Page
6	Electronic Search strategy	Describe the literature search (<i>e.g. provide electronic search strategies with population terms, clinical or health topic terms, experiential or social phenomena related terms, filters for qualitative research, and search limits</i>).	5
7	Study screening methods	Describe the process of study screening and sifting (<i>e.g. title, abstract and full text review, number of independent reviewers who screened studies</i>).	6
8	Study characteristics	Present the characteristics of the included studies (<i>e.g. year of publication, country, population, number of participants, data collection, methodology, analysis, research questions</i>).	8
9	Study selection results	Identify the number of studies screened and provide reasons for study exclusion (<i>e.g. for comprehensive searching, provide numbers of studies screened and reasons for exclusion indicated in a figure/flowchart; for iterative searching describe reasons for study exclusion and inclusion based on modifications to the research question and/or contribution to theory development</i>).	8
10	Rationale for appraisal	Describe the rationale and approach used to appraise the included studies or selected findings (<i>e.g. assessment of conduct (validity and robustness), assessment of reporting (transparency), assessment of content and utility of the findings</i>).	6
11	Appraisal items	State the tools, frameworks and criteria used to appraise the studies or selected findings (<i>e.g. Existing tools: CASP, QARI, COREQ, Mays and Pope [25]; reviewer developed tools; describe the domains assessed: research team, study design, data analysis and interpretations, reporting</i>).	6
12	Appraisal process	Indicate whether the appraisal was conducted independently by more than one reviewer and if consensus was required.	6
13	Appraisal results	Present results of the quality assessment and indicate which articles, if any, were weighted/excluded based on the assessment and give the rationale.	8-9
14	Data extraction	Indicate which sections of the primary studies were analysed and how were the data extracted from the primary studies? (<i>e.g. all text under the headings "results /conclusions" were extracted electronically and entered into a computer software</i>).	6
15	Software	State the computer software used, if any.	7
16	Number of reviewers	Identify who was involved in coding and analysis.	7

No	Item	Guide and description	Page
17	Coding	Describe the process for coding of data (<i>e.g. line by line coding to search for concepts</i>).	7
18	Study comparison	Describe how were comparisons made within and across studies (<i>e.g. subsequent studies were coded into pre-existing concepts, and new concepts were created when deemed necessary</i>).	7
19	Derivation of themes	Explain whether the process of deriving the themes or constructs was inductive or deductive.	7
20	Quotations	Provide quotations from the primary studies to illustrate themes/constructs, and identify whether the quotations were participant quotations of the author's interpretation.	-
21	Synthesis output	Present rich, compelling and useful results that go beyond a summary of the primary studies (<i>e.g. new interpretation, models of evidence, conceptual models, analytical framework, development of a new theory or construct</i>).	9-17

*: Tong, A., Flemming, K., McInnes, E. et al. Enhancing transparency in reporting the synthesis of qualitative research: ENTREQ. BMC Med Res Methodol 12, 181 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-12-181>