Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity

Personal Characteristics

1. Interviewer/facilitator

Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?

Yu Wu

2. Credentials

What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD

Ph.D. Candidate

3. Occupation

What was their occupation at the time of the study?

Research Assistant

4. Gender

Was the researcher male or female?

Male

5. Experience and training

What experience or training did the researcher have?

The researcher has passed the qualified exam, did thesis proposal, and conducted many prior interview studies before.

Relationship with participants

6. Relationship established

Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?

No

7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer

What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research

We described in detail in the email invitations about our identity, qualification, reasons for conducting the research.

8. Interviewer characteristics

What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic

We reported

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

We used grounded approach

(Lacey, A. and Luff, D. (2001). *Qualitative data analysis*. Trent focus Sheffield.)

Participant selection

10. Sampling

How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball

Purposive. We queried the GitHub search API with keywords “curated list”, which return us GitHub repositories of which descriptions contain “curated list”. We then identified the owners of those repositories as our potential participants.

11. Method of approach

How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email

We sent out email invitations.

12. Sample size

How many participants were in the study?

16

13. Non-participation

How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?

We sent email invitations to 172 unique GitHub users and 16 agreed to participate. We did pilot interviews on two volunteers we know. No participants dropped out during the interview.

Setting

14. Setting of data collection

Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace

Through chatting on the Internet

15. Presence of non-participants

Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?

No

16. Description of sample

What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date

All participants are GitHub users. Most of them are directly related to the software industry.

Data collection

17. Interview guide

Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?

Yes. We pilot tested on two volunteers.

18. Repeat interviews

Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?

No

19. Audio/visual recording

Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?

No

20. Field notes

Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?

No

21. Duration

What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?

Between 30 to 60 minutes

22. Data saturation

Was data saturation discussed?

Yes

23. Transcripts returned

Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?

No. But the chatting text history is available to both our participants and us.

Domain 3: analysis and findings

Data analysis

24. Number of data coders

How many data coders coded the data?

2

25. Description of the coding tree

Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?

Our sections and subsections in results part show the coding tree.

26. Derivation of themes

Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?

27. Software

What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?

We used both Evernote

28. Participant checking

Did participants provide feedback on the findings?

We asked our all participants for comments and feedback at the end of each interview. They usually asked us how did we find them, but did not provide feedback on the findings

Reporting

29. Quotations presented

Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number

Yes

30. Data and findings consistent

Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?

Yes

31. Clarity of major themes

Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?

Yes

32. Clarity of minor themes

Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?

Yes