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

No	Item	Guide questions/description
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
Personal Characteristics		
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? ***Pantea Amin Javaheri***
2.	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? *E.g. PhD, MD* ***Juli Finlay, PhD*** ***Todd Wilson, MSc*** ***Pantea Amin Javaheri, MSc*** ***Winnie Pearson*** ***Carol Connolly, RN*** ***Meghan J. Elliot, MD MSc*** ***Michelle M. Graham, MD*** ***Colleen M. Norris, RN PhD*** ***Stephen B. Wilton, MD MSc*** ***Matthew T. James, MD PhD***
3.	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study? ***JF - Qualitative Research Associate*** ***TW - Graduate Student*** ***PAJ - Research Associate*** ***WP - Patient Partner*** ***CC - Registered Nurse and Patient Partner*** ***MJE - Nephrologist and Health Researcher*** ***MMG - Interventional Cardiologist and Health Researcher*** ***CMN - Health Researcher and Cardiac Care Policy Maker*** ***SBW - Cardiologist and Health Researcher*** ***MTJ - Nephrologist and Health Researcher***

No	Item	Guide questions/description
4.	Gender	Was the researcher male or female? *Juli Finlay, Female* *Todd Wilson, Male* *Pantea Amin Javaheri, Female* *Winnie Pearson, Female* *Carol Connolly, Female* *Meghan J. Elliot, Female* *Michelle M. Graham, Female* *Colleen M. Norris, Female* *Stephen B. Wilton, Male* *Matthew T. James, Male*
5.	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have? *JF – PhD in Anthropology, involving use of qualitative research methods* *TW - MSc in Epidemiology, coursework in Health Research Methods and workshop in qualitative methods* *PAJ – MSc in Health Research Methods, involving use of qualitative methods* *WP – Completion of Patient and Community Engagement Research (PACER) training program at University of Calgary - https://pacerinnovates.ca/* *CC – completion of CIHR SPOR Foundations of Patient Oriented Research Modules 1, 2, and 3* *MJE – MSc Health Researcher Methods, focus on qualitative methods* *MMG – MD with applied qualitative research experience* *CMN – PhD Health Services Research, involving use of qualitative research methods* *SBW – MSc in Epidemiology, applied qualitative research experience* *MTJ – PhD in Epidemiology and Health Services Research, completion of workshop in qualitative research methods and applied qualitative research experience*
Relationship with participants		
6.	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?

No	Item	Guide questions/description
		No relationship with the participant was established prior to study commencement.
7.	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.*g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research* ***Personal interest in research and reasons for doing it were described prior to the interviews***.
8.	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. *Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic* ***Acknowledgement of her role as a researcher affiliated with University of Calgary***
Domain 2: study design		
Theoretical framework		
9.	Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? *e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis* ***Conventional content analysis***
Participant selection		
10.	Sampling	How were participants selected? *e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball* ***Convenience to purposive and then theoretically sampling to sufficiency***
11.	Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.*g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email* ***Telephone or in-person at a location of convenient for the participant***

No	Item	Guide questions/description
12.	Sample size	How many participants were in the study? *30*
13.	Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? *Nine refused the invitation to participate. Reasons were not sought. None dropped out.*
Setting		
14.	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.*g. home, clinic, workplace* *The data was collected over the telephone in the workplace or at location of convenience for the patient.*
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* *Demographic data as well as other relevant aspects of the participants such as frequency of visits to their cardiologist and nephrologist if any, years with kidney disease and dialysis treatment*
Data collection		
17.	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? *The interview guide was developed iteratively by the authors with input from patient partners. The final interview guide is provided in supplementary material. Our interview guide evolved alongside our iterative analysis. This meant that as certain themes reached sufficiency, we modified our prompts to try and explore discrepancies to further enrich the analysis.*
18.	Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? *We did not carry out any repeat interviews.*

No	Item	Guide questions/description
19.	Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? *All interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and de-identified (except for patient/caregiver or cardiologist designation) prior to analysis*.
20.	Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? *N/A*
21.	Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? *Interviews with patients/caregivers and cardiologists were 30 to 40 minutes in duration.*
22.	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed? *In the methods section, we describe how our sampling continued until saturation was achieved*
23.	Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? *We did not return transcripts to participants for comment or correction. However, we had patient partners from the patient advisory group review and comment on the themes and codes developed from the transcripts.*
Domain 3: analysis and findingsz		
Data analysis		
24.	Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data? *Three*
25.	Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? *No, but we have provided a breakdown of our thematic analysis in the methods section*
26.	Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? *Themes were identified from the data.*

No	Item	Guide questions/description
27.	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? *NVivo*
28.	Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings? *Themes, their descriptors, and representative quotes were presented to patient partners for review and to ensure that their own experiences were reflected in the data.*
Reporting		
29.	Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.*g. participant number* **Participant quotations are provided in the results and table 3 to illustrate themes/findings with each quotation identified by anonymized participant number.**
30.	Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? *Yes. To ensure that the examples are illustrative of the findings, we have provided alternative, more salient quotations from the interview transcripts in table 3.*
31.	Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? *Yes. Our results present the major themes, which are collated in Table 3 with representative quotations.*
32.	Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? *No minor themes were found in the analysis*.