

Article title: “There Is No One Truth”: A Qualitative Analysis of Advisory Committees in COVID-19 Policy-Making in Germany

Journal name: International Journal of Health Policy and Management (IJHPM)

Authors’ information: Elisa Braun^{1,2,3¶}, Kerstin Sell^{1,2¶}, Evelien de Hoop³, Karin Geffert^{1,2*}

¹Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry and Epidemiology, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany.

²Pettenkofer School of Public Health, Munich, Germany.

³Athena Institute, Science Faculty, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

***Correspondence to:** Karin Geffert; Email: kgeffert@ibe.uni-muenchen.de

Citation: Braun E, Sell K, de Hoop E, Geffert K. “There is no one truth”: a qualitative analysis of advisory committees in COVID-19 policy-making in Germany. Int J Health Policy Manag. 2026;15:9424. doi:[10.34172/ijhpm.9424](https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.9424)

Supplementary file 1. Reporting Checklist

Table 1: COREQ Criteria. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist from Tong (2007) DOI: 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042

Item	Question	Description
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
Personal Characteristics		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Lead author
2. Credentials	What were the researcher’s credentials?	B.Sc.
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	M.Sc. Student
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Female
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	B.Sc. in Molecular Medicine. Training in qualitative research though M.Sc. in Biomedical Sciences with specialization in Science in Society.
Relationship with participants		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	There was no prior relationship between the main author and the participants of this study

7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. <i>personal goals, reasons for doing the research</i>	Participants were informed about the aim of the study and the research question prior to the interviews, as well as the background of the first author
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. <i>Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i>	Special interest in science in society, use of science to solve complex societal issue such as public health crisis, therefore focus on use of science in public health policy during COVID-19
Domain 2: study design		
Theoretical framework		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. <i>grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</i>	Thematic analysis from a realist perspective using a codebook thematic analysis approach
Participant selection		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. <i>purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</i>	Purposive
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. <i>face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i>	e-Mail
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	12
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	none
Setting		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. <i>home, clinic, workplace</i>	Interviews were carried out via telephone and virtually, so it was the choice of the participants

15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	No, not known to the authors
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? <i>e.g. demographic data, date</i>	All participants were members of ad hoc expert committees installed to advice on matters concerning the COVID-19 pandemic in Germany
Data collection		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Interview guide was not pilot tested, and participants did not get the questions prior to the interview. However the interview guide included open questions and prompts, that were adapted iteratively
18. Repeated 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?	Audio recording
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes, both during and after the interviews
21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	Lasted between 28 and 57 minutes with an average of 48 minutes
22. Data Saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	No
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
Data analysis		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Two
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Yes in dedicated Appendix 3

26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	derived from the data
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	MAXQDA
28 Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	No
Reporting		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. <i>participant number</i>	Yes, quotations were presented. However, they were only attributed to the pseudonyms of the participants to safeguard the participants' anonymity
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?	1) Structure of advisory process 2) expert deliberation within the advisory process 3) Reflections on the advisory process
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes, within the examples presented of the individual major themes' sections