The Open Public Health Journal
DOI: 10.2174/0118749445554426111006235 6, 2026, 19, e187494455544

ISSN: 1874-9445
1

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL **OPEN ACCESS**

Beyond Acceptability: Behavioral and Implementation Determinants of Utilization of Local Food-based Supplementary Feeding among Children in Indonesia

Tri Siswati[1,*], Bunga Astria Paramashanti[2], Utami Utami[3], Sri Indra Trigunarso[4], Vitria Dwi Wulansari[1], Muhammad Primiaji Rialihanto[1] and Intan Yusuf Habibie[5]

[1]*Department of Nutrition, Poltekkes Kemenkes Yogyakarta, Sleman, Yogyakarta Special Region, 55293, Indonesia*
[2]*Research Center for Public Health and Nutrition, National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Jakarta, 10340, Indonesia*
[3]*Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Islam Indonesia, Sleman, 55584, Yogyakarta Special Region, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*
[4]*Department of Environmental Health, Poltekkes Kemenkes Tanjungkarang, Bandar Lampung, 35156, Indonesia*
[5]*Department of Nutrition, Faculty of Health Science, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, East Java, 65145, Indonesia*

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Bentham Open.
This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License (CC-BY 4.0), a copy of which is available at: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Nutrition, Poltekkes Kemenkes Yogyakarta, Sleman, Yogyakarta Special Region, 55293, Indonesia; E-mail: tri.siswati@poltekkesjogja.ac.id

Cite as: Siswati T, Paramashanti B, Utami U, Trigunarso S, Wulansari V, Rialihanto M, Habibie I. Beyond Acceptability: Behavioral and Implementation Determinants of Utilization of Local Food-based Supplementary Feeding among Children in Indonesia. Open Public Health J, 2026; 19: e187494455544. http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/0118749445554426111006235

Received: May 10, 2026
Revised: September 26, 2026
Accepted: October 07, 2026
Published: Noember 24, 2026

Send Orders for Reprints to
reprints@benthamscience.net

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research. You must report the chapter in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Supplementary File 1. COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) Checklist

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
Personal characteristics			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Interviews were conducted by T.S. and V.D.W.
Credentials	2	What were the researcher's credentials? *E.g.* PhD, MD	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** T.S.: doctoral degree in nutrition; V.D.W.: master's degree in nutrition.
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Lecturers/researchers, Department of Nutrition, Poltekkes Kemenkes Yogyakarta [confirm].
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Both interviewers were female [confirm].
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Trained interviewers with backgrounds in nutrition and experience in qualitative interviewing; interview guide pilot-tested with two caregivers [confirm training details].

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
Relationship with participants			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** No prior relationship between interviewers and participants; interviewers were not involved in programme delivery.
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? *e.g.* personal goals, reasons for doing the research	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Participants were informed of the interviewers' affiliation and the study purpose before consent [confirm].
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? *e.g.* Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Interviewers' nutrition background noted as a potential influence on questioning; neutral, open-ended prompts used and assumptions discussed during analysis [confirm].
Domain 2: Study design			
Theoretical framework			
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? *e.g.* grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	**p. 4 (Section 2.1) and p. 6 (Section 2.6.2)** Implementation research approach with a convergent mixed-methods design; deductive-inductive thematic analysis.
Participant selection			
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? *e.g.* purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	**p. 4 (Section 2.2)** Purposive sampling based on programme involvement and variation in socio-demographic characteristics.
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? *e.g.* face-to- face, telephone, mail, email	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Participants were approached face-to-face *via* community health volunteers (kader).
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?	**p. 4 (Section 2.2)** 25 caregivers.
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** No caregiver declined to participate; no drop-outs.
Setting			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? *e.g.* home, clinic, workplace	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Participants' homes or a room at the posyandu.
Presence of non- participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** [Confirm: *e.g.*, only the participant and interviewer were present; in some interviews the child was present.]
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample?	**p. 8 (Section 3.2) and p. 21 (Table 3)** Caregiver age, relationship to child, education, occupation, number of children, and child age.
Data collection			
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Semi-structured interview guide developed by the research team and pilot-tested with two caregivers; the guide is not provided as a supplementary file.
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** No repeat interviews were conducted.
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Interviews were audio-recorded with consent.
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Field notes were made to supplement recordings.
Duration	21	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Approximately 45–60 minutes per interview.
.Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	**p. 4 (Section 2.2)** Saturation reached by the 22nd interview; three further interviews confirmed thematic stability.
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	**p. 6 (Section 2.5)** Transcripts were not returned to participants.
Domain 3: Analysis and Findings			
Data analysis			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	**p. 6 (Section 2.6.2)** Two coders (T.S. and B.A.P.).
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	**p. 8 (Section 3.2) and p. 24 (Figure 1)** Thematic framework of three themes and their sub-factors.

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	**p. 6–7 (Section 2.6.2)** Initial codes developed deductively from interview questions; additional themes derived inductively from the data.
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	**p. 7 (Section 2.6.2)** Manual coding; themes organised in Microsoft Excel matrices.
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	**p. 6 (Section 2.6.2)** Participants did not provide feedback on the findings.
Reporting			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? *e.g.* participant number	**pp. 8–10 (Section 3.2)** Quotations presented, each identified by participant code (Caregiver_1 to Caregiver_25).
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	**pp. 8–11 (Sections 3.2–3.3) and p. 22 (Table 4)** Findings illustrated with quotations and integrated with quantitative data.
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	**p. 8 (Section 3.2, Figure 1)** Three major themes: child-, caregiver-, and programme-related factors (Sections 3.2.1–3.2.3).
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	**pp. 8–10 (Sections 3.2.1–3.2.3)** Sub-themes described as both barriers and facilitators, including positive caregiver experiences (p. 9) and programme-level challenges (p. 10).

Developed from: Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32- item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Once you have completed this checklist, please save a copy and upload it as part of your submission.

DO NOT include this checklist as part of the main manuscript document. It must be uploaded as a separate file.

DISCLAIMER: Please note that this article is currently in the 'Early view' stage and is not the final 'Version of Record'. While it has been accepted, copy-edited, and formatted, however, it is still undergoing proofreading and corrections by the authors. Therefore, the text may still change before the final publication. Although 'Early view' may not have all bibliographic details available, the DOI and the year of online publication can still be used to cite them. The article title, DOI, publication year, and author(s) should all be included in the citation format. Once the 'Final Version of Record' becomes available the 'Early view' will be replaced by that.