

Supplementary table 2. Codes and examples for assessing learners' reactions in debriefings.

<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Example</i>	<i>Kappa Live coding N=6 (M=58.5, SD=9.8)</i>	<i>Video-based coding N=5 (M=35.6, SD=59.6)</i>	<i>Sample references</i>
Advocating					1
<i>Feelings</i>	Learner expresses his/her feelings.	"I'm feeling overwhelmed."	1	.80	2 3
<i>Descriptions</i>	Learner describes what happened.	"We waited almost 10 minutes before I called the surgeon."	.72	.63	3
<i>Evaluation of learners' actions</i>	Learner evaluates what was good or bad about his/her actions.	"I think it was great to perform ABC together."	.49	.38	3
<i>Evaluation of team members' action</i>	Learner evaluates what was good or bad about his/her team colleagues' actions	"For me it was exceptional because I was not included in this conversation."	.50	.66	3
<i>Explanations</i>	Learner analyses why something happened.	"I thought the cable is connected."	.68	.71	3
<i>Mental models</i>	Learner verbalizes his/her internal thought processes, schemes or assumptions.	"I learned that...."	.84	.68	4
<i>Conclusions</i>	From the discussion the learner concludes other actions that s/he could have done.	"I could have asked for help."	.87	.71	3
<i>Action plan</i>	Learner describes what s/he will do differently in the future.	"I will speak up more next time."	Not observed	1	3

<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Example</i>	<i>Kappa Live coding N=6 (M=58.5, SD=9.8)</i>	<i>Video-based coding N=5 (M=35.6, SD=59.6)</i>	<i>Sample references</i>
<i>Positive relevance</i>	Learner verbalizes his/her perception that the simulation is connected to their daily working setting or their behaviour in the clinical context.	"I know this from my daily routine."	1	.62	Inductive
<i>Negative relevance</i>	Learner verbalizes his/her perception that the simulation is not connected to their daily working setting or their behaviour in the clinical context.	"I would not have done the same in the operating room."	1	.57	Inductive
<i>Positive evaluation of the simulation</i>	Learner evaluates what s/he liked about the simulation.	"I perceived it as realistic."	.73	.79	Inductive
<i>Negative evaluation of the simulation</i>	Learner evaluates what s/he did not like about the simulation.	"I was not able to get into it."	1	.71	Inductive
<i>Illustrating</i>					1
<i>Learners' anecdote</i>	Learner talks about experience or personal moments.	"During my medical education, I was used to...."	.84	.69	Inductive
<i>Inquiring</i>					1
<i>Learners' inquiry</i>	Learner inquires about missing facts or unclear points.	"What was the problem?"	.82	.66	Inductive
<i>Other</i>					
<i>Expressions of humour</i>	Learner laughs or tells a joke.	Learners are laughing.	.75	.59	2

M=Mean duration of debriefings in minutes; SD=standard deviation in minutes.

References

1. Torbert WR, Taylor SS. Action inquiry: Interweaving multiple qualities of attention for timely action. In: Reason P, Bradbury H, eds. *The Sage handbook of action research*. London: Sage 2008:239-51.
2. Kauffeld S, Meyers RA. Complaint and solution-oriented circles in work groups. *Eur J Work Organ Psychol* 2009;18:267-94.
3. Husebø SE, Dieckmann P, Rystedt H, et al. The relationship between facilitators' questions and the level of reflection in postsimulation debriefing. *Simul Healthc* 2013;8:135-42. doi: 10.1097/SIH.0b013e31827cbb5c
4. Rudolph JW, Simon FB, Raemer DB, et al. Debriefing as formative assessment: Closing performance gaps in medical education. *Acad Emerg Med* 2008;15:1010-16.