

Manuscript: “Learning a way of thinking” – World Café on clinical reasoning in nursing and midwifery education and practice across five European union countries.

Ljubiša Pađen¹; Manca Pajnič ¹; Renata Vettorazzi ¹; Ana Pérez Perdomo²; Małgorzata Stefaniak³; Nele Claes⁴; Hugo Miguel Martins Franco⁵; An Vandervoort⁶ and Mirjam Ravljen ^{1,*}

Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist

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

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Page 3, 12
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	Page 3, 12
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Page 3, 12
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Page 12
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Page 3, 12
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
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	Page 3
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	Page 3, 12

Domain 2: study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	Page 3-4
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Page 3
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Page 3
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	Page 3
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	None
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Page 3
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	Page 4
<i>Data collection</i>		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Page 12
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	No
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Page 3
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?	Page 3
21. Duration	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	Page 3
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	N/A – Methodological approach was

		<p>exploratory and we have not aimed to achieve data saturation as is described by Braun and Clarke (2021).</p> <p>Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). To saturate or not to saturate? Questioning data saturation as a useful concept for thematic analysis and sample-size rationales. <i>Qualitative research in sport, exercise and health</i>, 13(2), 201-216.</p>
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Page 4
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	We have coded data inductively, Braun and Clarke (2006).
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Page 4
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Page 4
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	No
<i>Reporting</i>		
29. Quotations presented	<p>Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings?</p> <p>Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number</p>	<p>Page 4-8</p> <p>Page 3, 10</p>
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Page 4-8
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Page 4-8
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Page 4-8