

Table S1. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist.

| No | Item | Guide Questions/Description | Response |
|--|--|--|--|
| Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity | | | |
| Personal Characteristics | | | |
| 1. | Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | All the interviews were conducted by the author AMBR. |
| 2. | Credentials | What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD | AMBR, MAGC and JRGL were PhD. |
| 3. | Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | All authors were professor. |
| 4. | Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | AMBR and JRGL are men, and MAGC is a woman. |
| 5. | Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? | All researchers had experience in carrying out qualitative research and the have been trained to conduct interviews. |
| Relationship with participants | | | |
| 6. | Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | No, there wasn't. |
| 7. | Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research | Name, occupation, reasons for doing the research. |
| 8. | Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic | Name, occupation, contact method, reasons for doing the research. |
| 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 | Phenomenological and ethnographic approach with a discourse and content analysis. |
| Participant selection | | | |
| 10. | Sampling | How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball | Convenience sampling. |
| 11. | Method of approach | How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email | Face to face. |
| 12. | Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | Total 427; 320 young high school students and 107 belonging to associations. |
| 13. | Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | 11 for personal reasons. |
| Setting | | | |
| 14. | Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace | The interviews were carried out in different places. |

| | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---|--|
| 15. | Presence of non-participants | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? | No, it was not. |
| 16. | Description of sample | What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date | Young high school students and / or, belonging to associations |

Data collection

| | | | |
|-----|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 17. | Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | Yes, they were. / Yes, it was. |
| 18. | Repeat interviews | Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many? | No, they weren't. |
| 19. | Audio/visual recording | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? | Audio recording. |
| 20. | Field notes | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? | Yes, they were (field notes). |
| 21. | Duration | What was the duration of the inter views or focus group? | 60 minutes. |
| 22. | Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | Yes, it was. |
| 23. | Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? | Yes. Reviewed by 476 participants. |

Doman 3: Analysis and findings

Data analysis

| | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 24. | Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | Two (AMBR and MAGC). |
| 25. | Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | Yes, we did. |
| 26. | Derivation of themes | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? | Themes were derived using both methods. |
| 27. | Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | NUDIST Nvivo 11. |
| 28. | Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the findings? | Yes. Reviewed by 49 informants. |

Reporting

| | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 29. | Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number | Yes, there were. / Yes, there was. |
| 30. | Data and findings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? | Yes, there was. |
| 31. | Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? | Yes, they were. |
| 32. | Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Yes, there is. |

Developed from: Tong, A. Sainsbury, P., and Craig, J. 2007. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32- item checklist for interviews and focus group. Int. J. Qual. Health Care 19: 349-357.