Table 1

Enhanced Critical Incident Technique (ECIT) Credibility Checks

Credibility Check	Description
Audiotaping and Transcribing	The interviews were *audiotaped* and transcribed in order to ensure that researchers work directly and comprehensively from the words of participants rather than from inferences or incomplete notes.
Interviewer Fidelity	*Interviewer fidelity* was ensured by using a structured interview protocol, and researchers reviewing each other's interviews periodically.
Independent Extraction	Butterfield et al. (12) have recommended selecting 25% of the transcripts to give to an independent individual, following which the researcher would normally discuss possible discrepancies and calculate a concordance rate.
	For this study, the authors enhanced the third credibility check of *independent extraction* by collaboratively extracting CI and WL, and placing them in categories by consensus with 100% of the transcripts.
Exhaustiveness	*Exhaustiveness,* the fourth credibility check, indicates the point at which no new categories are being identified. This criterion was reached after 13 interviews, after which no other interviews were necessary.
Participation Rates	*Participation Rate* (discussed in the text) is not only provides a minimum requirement for retaining a category but also serves to establish relative strengths of each category.
Placing Into Categories by a Judge	In this credibility check, 25% of the Cis are assigned to an independent judge for category placement with a recommended match rate of 80% with the PI.
	This credibility check was modified similarly to the check of independent extraction in that the researchers placed the incidents into categories collaboratively. The researchers achieved 100% agreement through discussion at the time of category formation and coding. An independent judge further confirmed category placement with a match rate of 88%.
Cross-Checking by Participants	After the participant's results were analyzed and incidents were elicited and placed into their respective emerging categories, participants were contacted to do a second interview (by phone, e-mail, or videoconference) and were provided with a copy of their incidents along with the categories that these incidents were placed to confirm whether they had been placed appropriately. This honours participants' voices as the final authorities in representing their lived experience.
Expert Opinion Review	The categories were submitted to two outside experts for an *expert opinion* review. The experts are asked, (1) do you find the categories to be useful?; (2) are you surprised by any of the categories?; and (3) do you think there is anything missing based on your experience?

	The categories in this study were submitted to a registered midwife, and a nurse practitioner, who is also qualified as a licensed lactation consultant and is currently working in perinatal care. Both experts confirmed that the categories were congruent with their expertise, and current research in the field.
Theoretical Agreement	*Theoretical agreement* involves reporting assumptions underlying the study, and comparing emergent categories with relevant literature.

Note: These nine credibility checks were performed to enhance the rigour of the analysis, according to the guidelines of the Enhanced Critical Incident Technique (Butterfield, Borgen, Amundson, & Maglio, 2005; Butterfield, Borgen, Maglio, & Amundson, 2009), with specific project applications and/or modifications clearly noted under each description.