

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 3. Code Book

Mode of operation of the committee
Procedure of a discussion round
Intended end products
Process to get to the end product
General rational for the committee
Rational for the committee composition
Rational for the invitation to the committee
Consulting
Fashion of consultation
Attendees of meetings
Influence of attendees on the deliberation
Objective of the committee
Consultation scheme and counselling occasions
Self-establishment of the committee, finding work processes, and to each other
Session topics, how they were structured and who proposed them
Comments on the committee
Secrets/ Transparency
negative

positive
Culture of deliberation
Foundations of the advice production
Analogies
Observations
Use of evidence
Data
Literature
Studies
Use of expertise
Experience
Expert opinion
Use of logic
Input from external experts
Rationality
Personal bias
Joint Sense making of evidence
Scientific uncertainty
Data availability
Interaction with politicians
Relationship with politicians and the form of exchange with politicians
Committee as a political instrument
Political agenda
Input of the politicians during a session
Communication of the committee
Recipients of advice, counseling end products
Justification of the chosen form of communication
Form of communication
Context
Best practice
Learnings

Limitations
Pandemic development
Political circumstances
Accessibility of data
Permanent committees
Mode of operation
End product
Foundations of the advice production
Tailoring Evidence
Feasibility of implementing scientific advice
Perception of interdisciplinarity
Relationship between the experts on a panel
Discipline of the interview participants
Hurdles of interdisciplinary/large committees
Multi-disciplinary work
Prioritisation of disciplines
Communication between the disciplines
Appreciation of the disciplines
Area of responsibility (self-perception)
Advisory process during the pandemic
Influence on political decisions
Perception of the advisory process