

Table S1 Evaluating the current study against the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) checklist

Item	Question/topic	Comment
Domain 1: research team and reflexivity		
Personal characteristics		
1	Interviewer/facilitator Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	All interviews conducted by RL-P
2	Credentials What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	RL-P is a Research Fellow in Psychology, has a PhD, and has expertise in cancer survivorship and qualitative methods
3	Occupation What was their occupation at the time of the study?	
4	Gender Was the researcher male or female?	RL-P is a female
5	Experience and training What experience or training did the researcher have?	RL-P has a PhD, in which qualitative methods were a major component. She has completed qualitative research workshops, been mentored by qualitative experts, and has been a qualitative researcher for over 11 years. She has published numerous peer reviewed qualitative studies and has supervised qualitative Honours and PhD thesis projects.
Relationship with participants		
6	Relationship established Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Relationships were already established via the EnRICH Cohort Study (BB, KM), which participants were already involved in. After participants expressed interest in participating in this study to BB/KM, RL-P contacted participants to provide further information about the study and to obtain contact details to send the questionnaire to participants. After participants completed the questionnaire, the researcher contacted participants to schedule in a telephone interview. Rapport was built during these two points of contact.
7	Participant knowledge of the interviewer What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Participants were informed that the study was an interview study to share experiences of living with lung cancer. They were told of the importance of this research in understanding the experiences and needs of lung cancer survivors.
8	Interviewer characteristics What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	RL-P completed a pre-interview reflective journal noting any potential assumptions/biases. She is a psycho-oncology researcher with an interest in understanding the needs of people living with and beyond cancer.
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	Thematic framework analysis
Participant selection		
10	Sampling How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Purposive sampling
11	Method of approach How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	A project officer with the EnRICH cohort study contacted eligible participants by telephone and invited participation. Those interested were contacted by the Research Fellow (RL-P) by telephone to provide more detailed information. Information sheet and consent forms were provided by email or post, depending on the participants preference
12	Sample size How many participants were in the study?	N = 20
13	Non-participation How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Three participants dropped out due to worsening LC and felt unable to complete the interview due to illness
Setting		
14	Setting of data collection Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Telephone interviews were conducted from a private room, either in an office or home setting
15	Presence of non-participants Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	To our knowledge, no other participants were present during the interview. Participants were asked to complete the telephone interview in a private space
16	Description of sample What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	See Participant demographics
Data collection		
17	Interview guide Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Interview questions were reviewed and refined by the authorship group. Further, the first three interview transcripts were read by NR and PB to ensure question phrasing and interviewer style were appropriate
18	Repeat interviews Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	All interviews were completed in a single session with no repeat interviews
19	Audio/visual recording Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data	All interviews were audio recorded
20	Field notes Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Post-interview reflection notes were documented immediately after each interview
21	Duration What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	Interviews lasted on average 54 minutes, ranging from 27 to 97 minutes.
22	Data saturation Was data saturation discussed?	Recruitment continued until thematic saturation was reached
23	Transcripts returned Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	Transcripts were not returned to participants for comment or correction
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
Data analysis		
24	Number of data coders How many data coders coded the data?	All interviews were coded by RL-P.
25	Description of the coding tree Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Yes, see Results.
26	Derivation of themes Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Themes were derived from the data as per framework analysis
27	Software What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Microsoft Word and Excel
28	Participant checking Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	Participants were not asked to provide feedback on the findings.
Reporting		
29	Quotations presented Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Yes, see Results
30	Data and findings consistent Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes, see Results
31	Clarity of major themes Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes, see Results
32	Clarity of minor themes Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes, see Results