WebAnnexes

Webannex 1a) Peer group checklist (Uganda)

Country			<u> </u>
Group ID			
Date of meeting			
Meeting number / All meetings	/		
Attendance:			
Number of participants allocated to group			
Number of participants present			
Number of Care companions present			
Duration:			
Starting time			
Ending time			
Content:			
Meeting topic:			
Content covered:	☐ Fully	☐ Partly	☐ Not at all
Process:			
Utilization of participatory activities*	\square All the time	☐ Sometimes	☐ Not at all
Identification of strengths**	☐ For every pt	\square For some pts	☐ Not at all
Goal setting for individuals	☐ For every pt	\square For some pts	☐ Not at all
Goal setting for group	☐ Yes	□ No	

Webannex 1b) Quality Assurance/Supervision Checklist for Peer Meeting (South Africa)

[To be administered by a member of the SMART2D team] Team member _	

A. Identification					
Group ID:					
Date of meeting:					
Meeting Number	/				
B. Attendance					
Number of participants expe	cted to attend		_		
Number of participants prese	ent		_		
Number of CHWs present					
Starting time		=			
Ending time					
C. Content		_			
Meeting topic:					
3 1					
Content covered:	☐ Fully	□ Partly	□ Not at all		
D. Process					
i. Some group activities are	☐ Strongly	☐ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
participatory*	disagree				agree
ii. The strengths of each	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
individual are identified**	disagree				agree
iii. Individuals' goals are set	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	disagree				agree
iv. Group goals are set	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	disagree				agree
E. Peer Group Leadership	•				
i. PGL uses positive body	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	□ Strongly
language	disagree				agree
ii. PGL is audible	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	disagree				agree
iii. PGL is knowledgeable	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
about the content	disagree				agree
iv. PGL moderates all	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
discussions	disagree	_ =.			agree
v. PGL empowers the	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
members	disagree				agree

Pt / pts = participant, participants

Peer group observation: Rate on a scale of 0 [Not at all] – 10 [Yes] and comment

Question	Rate	Comments
Is the topic guide used to guide the peer group session?		
Is there active participation in the peer group session?		
Did the facilitator give participants the opportunity to		
share experiences?		
Did the facilitator give participants the opportunity to ask questions?		
If so, did the facilitator handle the questions adequately?		
Is the venue large enough to accommodate all		
participants?		

Overall comments

^{*} Such as small group / paired discussions / PGL ensures that everyone gets to say something

^{**} Past healthy behavior, knowledge, other resources

Webannex 1c) Quality Assurance & interaction checklist for facilitator led phone sessions (Sweden)

Adm	Administered by: Recordings to be attached					
Sect	ion 1. Identification					
	ID#:					
	Date of recording:					
	Date of session:					
Sect	ion 2. Facilitator name					
	Facilitator name:					
	Starting time:					
	Ending time:					
	Total time of call:	Minutes				
Sect	ion 3. Content					
	Session nr:					
	Content covered:	☐ Fully	□ Pa	artly 🗆 No	t at all	
Sect	ion 4. PARAS – Strength Based Be	havioural Coach	ing			
1.	The ft works with the pt to	☐ Strongly	☐ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	identify his/her strengths	Disagree				agree
2.	The ft uses minimal response	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	tokens (mm, etc)	Disagree				agree
3.	The ft verbally reflects on pt	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	talk	Disagree	_		_	agree
4.	The ft gives sufficient time for	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	pt reflection and responses	disagree				Agree
5	The ft summarises participant	_	☐ Disagree	☐ Neutral	□ Agroo	☐ Strongly
٦.	talk	☐ Strongly	Disagree	□ iveutiai	☐ Agree	٠,
Cont	ion 5. Ft/Pt interaction	disagree				agree
		□ Ctl.	□ D '	- No. tool		Character .
1.	·	☐ Strongly	☐ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
,	session	disagree	□ D '	C No. dead		agree
۷.	The pt engages with the ft	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
2	during the discussion	disagree	□ D '	C No. dood		agree
Э.	The ft moderates the session	☐ Strongly	☐ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
4	The session holds a positive	disagree	_ 5:			agree
4.	The session holds a positive atmosphere	☐ Strongly	☐ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
_	·	disagree	_ 5:			agree
5.	The pt voice opinions about the	☐ Strongly	☐ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
_	content of the session	Disagree	_ 5:			Agree
0.	The pt shares experiences with	☐ Strongly	☐ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
C	the ft	Disagree				Agree
	ion 6. Delivery of intervention	г				
1.	The ft informed the pt about	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
_	the content of the session	disagree				agree
2.	The ft discussed the goals/	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	tasks from last session with the	disagree				Agree
	pt	□ Not				
,	The ft areas area the at the	applicable				
3.	The ft encouraged the pt to	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	work on the session specific	disagree				Agree
,	suggested tasks					
4.	The ft encouraged the pt to set	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	goals (with or without their "Hälsokompis"	disagree				Agree
-						
Э.	The ft adapts his/her speech/language so the pt can	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	□ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	understand	disagree				Agree
_						
6.	The ft demonstrates knowledge	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	pertaining to the content of the	Disagree				Agree
_	session					
/.	The ft used the session guide to	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	conduct the session	Disagree				Agree
8.	The ft shows acceptance to pt	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
_	ideas and behaviour	Disagree				Agree
9.	The ft gave the pt the	☐ Strongly	□ Disagree	☐ Neutral	☐ Agree	☐ Strongly
	opportunity to ask questions	Disagree				Agree Pt =

participant, Ft = facilitator

References: Absetz P. Elämäntapaohjauksen toteutustavan vaikutukset ja valintaa selittävät mekanismit. 2019;23–8.

Webannex 2. Care companion checklist (South Africa)

	SMART2D Home visits			
name:				
date	notes:			
	general wellbeing:			
	goal seeting and reviews			
	nutrition:			
	exercise :			
	medications (received, adherence)			
	Facility appointments (met, barriers etc)			
	other (complications/other ailments)			
	peer support group reminder:			
	next CHW visit:			
date	notes:			
	general wellbeing:			
	goal seeting and reviews			
	nutrition:			
	exercise :			
	medications (received, adherence)			
	Facility appointments (met, barriers etc)			
	other (complications/other ailments)			
	peer support group reminder:			
	next CHW visit:			
date	notes:			
	general wellbeing:			
	goal seeting and reviews			
	nutrition:			
	exercise :			
	medications (received, adherence)			
	Facility appointments (met, barriers etc)			
	other (complications/other ailments)			
	peer support group reminder:			
	next CHW visit:			

Webannex 3) Facility checklist to document (changes in) context

PROCESS TOOL 1: CARE CHECKLIST					
Site ID:					
Cluste	r ID: (To be filled in by research	personnel)			
Evalua	tor (person to fill in list):				
Date:					
S.NO:	Question	Check: present, functioning	Comments		
1.1: Ba	sic Equipment				
Α	Glucometers & strips				
В	HbA1C analyser & test				
С	Weighing scales				
D	Stadiometers				
E	Measuring tapes				
F	Blood pressure meter				
1.2: Gu	idelines				
Α	Treatment guidelines				
В	Taskshifting guidelines				
С	patient flowchart				
1.3: Register					
Α	Patient register				
В	Appointment diary				
С	Patient contact form				