

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplementary Material 1: Search Strategy for Medline

1: exp Intestinal Neoplasms/ OR ((colorect* or colon* or rect* or anal or anus or intestin* or bowel* or sigmoid*) adj3 (carcinom* or neoplas* or adenocarcinom* or cancer* or tumor* or tumour* or sarcom* or adenom* or malignan*)).mp.

2: exp Endoscopy, Gastrointestinal/ OR (endoscop* or proctoscop* or colonoscop* or sigmoidoscop* or rectosigmoidoscop* or proctosigmoidoscop* or COL or SIG or FSIG).mp.

3: interviews as topic/ or focus groups/ or narration/ or qualitative research/

4: (((("semi-structured" or semistructured or unstructured or informal or "in-depth" or indepth or "face-to-face" or structured or guide) adj3 (interview* or discussion* or questionnaire*)) or (focus group* or qualitative or ethnograph* or fieldwork or "field work" or "key informant"))).tw.

5: mix-method*.tw. or mix method*.tw.

6: 3 OR 4 OR 5

7: 1 AND 2 AND 6

Supplementary Material 2: CASP

Title	Author	Section A: Are the results valid? Is it worth continuing?								Section B: What are the results?				
		1. Was the research questions clearly defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	3. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	11. Is there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	12. Was any conflict of interest reported?
Gender differences in colorectal cancer screening barriers and information needs	Sanchez et al	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear
What affects the uptake of screening for bowel cancer using a faecal occult blood test (FOBT): a qualitative study	Levy et al	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear
Public perceptions of communicating information about bowel cancer screening	Wackerbarth et al	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear
Patient experiences of colonoscopy, barium enema and CT colonography: a qualitative study	von Wagner et al	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear
"It's a tube up your bottom; it makes people nervous": the experience of anxiety in initial colonoscopy patients	Mikocka-Walus et al	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear
Patient attitudes towards faecal immunochemical testing for haemoglobin as an alternative to colonoscopic surveillance of groups at increased risk of colorectal cancer	Bowyer et al	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear
Views, barriers, and suggestions for colorectal cancer screening among American Indian women older than 50 years in the Midwest	Filippi et al	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Patients' perceptions of colorectal cancer screening tests and preparatory education in federally qualified health centers	Dr Clement K. Gwede et al	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Beyond Adherence: Healthcare Disparities and the Struggle to Get Screened for Colon Cancer	Jean M Hunleth et al	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Patient-Reported Needs Following a Referral for Colorectal Cancer Screening	Karen E.Dyer et al	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear
A stitch in time saves nine: Perceptions about colorectal cancer screening after a non-cancer colonoscopy result. Qualitative study	Pia Kirkegaard et al	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Supplementary Material 3: Summary of Quality Assessment of Included Studies

	Yes		No		Unclear	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Was the research questions clearly defined?	3	27%	8	73%	0	0%
2. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%
3. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%
4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%
5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%
6. Was the method of data collection well described?	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%
7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	1	9%	0	0%	10	91%
8. Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?	1	9%	0	0%	10	91%
9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%
10. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%
11. Is there a clear statement of findings?	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%
12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%
13. Was any conflict of interest reported?	0	0%	4	36%	7	64%