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**Abstract**

Purpose: The aim of the study should be precisely described. It is recommended to add the hypothesis and/or research questions.

Methods: The type of research design, subjects, study period, measurement instruments, and the statistical analysis should be described.

Results: The main results should be described according to the STROBE guidelines for observational studies, or other appropriate reporting guidelines.

Conclusion: The conclusion should present an answer to the purpose, hypothesis, or research questions.

Keywords: Cohort studies; Educational measurement; Program evaluation; Republic of Korea; Research design

(It is mandatory to use **MeSH** terms through MeSH on Demand, available at: [https://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MeSHonDemand.html](https://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MeSHonDemand.html))). The use of other terms is negotiable with the editorial board.

**Introduction**

Background/rationale: Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported: what is known, what is unknown and important to know; what is the specific topic addressed in the manuscript; and why addressing that particular topic is important

Objectives: Specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses or research questions, should be described in one paragraph.

**Methods**

Ethics statement: If this study was on human subjects or human-originated materials, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, including the approval number, and informed consent from subjects are required. For a clinical trial, IRB approval is mandatory. For a secondary analysis using de-identified data, IRB approval may be waived. Please contact the editorial office to discuss the ethics statement. The most critical points of research and publication ethics are the safety of the study participants and the protection of personal information.

**Personal Characteristics of Research team**

Interviewer/facilitator: Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?

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

Occupation: What was their occupation at the time of the study?

Gender: Was the researcher male or female?

Experience and training: What experience or training did the researcher have?

**Relationship with participants**

Relationship established: Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?

Participant knowledge of the interviewer: What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research

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

**Theoretical framework**

Methodological orientation and Theory: What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis

Participant selection

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

Method of approach: How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email

Sample size: How many participants were in the study?

Non-participation: How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?

**Setting**

Setting of data collection: Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace

Presence of non-participants: Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?

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

**Data collection**

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

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

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

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

Duration: What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?

Data saturation: Was data saturation discussed?

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

**Data analysis**

Number of data coders: How many data coders coded the data?

Description of the coding tree: Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?

Derivation of themes: Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?

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

Participant checking: Did participants provide feedback on the findings?

**Results**

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

Data and findings consistent: Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?

Clarity of major themes: Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?

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

**Discussion**

Key results

Start with the main objectives of the study. Briefly summarize the main findings.

Interpretation

Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, a multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence. Do not present findings that were not described in the results section.

Comparison with previous studies

Please do not repeatedly present the results of previous relevant studies; instead, concisely state any points of discordance or concordance.

Limitations

Discuss the limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both the direction and magnitude of any potential bias.

Generalizability

Discuss the generalizability (external validity) of the study results. Consider the extent to which the results can be beneficial to other health educators around the world.

**Suggestions**

Suggest areas for further study and/or implications for education and practice.

**Conclusion**

Deduce the conclusion from the results, avoiding statements not described in the methods or results. If there were research hypotheses or questions in the introduction section, they should be answered. It is meaningful to mention the usefulness of the content in educational evaluations to promote medical or health education.
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**Legends for figures**

Fig. 1. The legends should contain a precise description so that the figure can be understood by readers without reading the main text.