

## Appendix 3

### Source findings and data extraction instrument

Scoping Review detail	
Title	Metacognitive Regulation in Physical Therapists' Clinical Reasoning: a Scoping Review
Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Explore the nature and purposes of metacognitive regulation in clinical reasoning activities in Physical Therapy</li> <li>2) Explore the breadth and diversity of methods and tools used to assess metacognitive regulation in clinical reasoning activities in Physical Therapy</li> </ol>
Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria	
Population	Physical Therapists (PTs) or PTs students
Concept	Focused on metacognitive regulation
Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns clinical reasoning</li> <li>- Describes a model or characteristics of metacognitive regulation (MR) OR/AND describes a method/tools for assessing MR</li> </ul>
Exclusion Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In a language other than English or French</li> <li>- Focused on clinical reasoning rather than metacognitive regulation</li> <li>- Focused on meta-memory / metacognitive regulation on learning without clinical reasoning</li> <li>- Not focused on Physical Therapist or PT student</li> </ul>
Evidence Sources Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year</li> <li>- Country</li> <li>- Study population</li> <li>- Type of article : (Conceptual article, Qualitative experimental article, Quantitative experimental article, Mixed experimental article, Viewpoint article, Book, Other)</li> </ul>
Part 1 - Nature of Metacognitive Regulation	
Nature of Task	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cognitive</li> <li>- Communicative</li> <li>- Psychomotor</li> <li>- Emotional</li> <li>- General PEC</li> <li>- Task-dependent or task-independent (if independent exclusion)</li> <li>- Other</li> </ul>
Task Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concurrent</li> <li>- Retrospective</li> <li>- Pre</li> <li>- During</li> <li>- Post</li> </ul>
Type of Metacognitive Regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Self-observation</li> <li>- Self-judgment</li> <li>- Self-reaction</li> </ul>
Other	Other items that do not fit into one of the pre-established categories

<b>Purpose of Metacognitive Regulation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Learning</li> <li>- Quality of care</li> <li>- Other</li> </ul>
<b>Part 2 - Assessment of Metacognitive Regulation</b>	
<b>Nature of task assessed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cognitive</li> <li>- Communicative</li> <li>- Psychomotor</li> <li>- Emotional</li> <li>- General PEC</li> <li>- Task-dependent or task-independent (if independent exclusion)</li> <li>- Other</li> </ul>
<b>Timing of task assessed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concurrent</li> <li>- Retrospective</li> <li>- Pre</li> <li>- During</li> <li>- Post</li> </ul> <p>See note* for precision</p>
<b>Type of metacognitive regulation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Self-observation</li> <li>- Self-judgment</li> <li>- Self-reaction</li> </ul>
<b>Nature of assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quantitative or Qualitative data</li> <li>- Quantitative or qualitative Assessment</li> <li>- Summative or Formative purpose</li> <li>- Assessment setting/Place of performance</li> <li>- Nature of the Situation (used for assessment)</li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>	Other items that do not fit into one of the pre-established categories

*\*Note: Johnson's study highlights the difficulty of differentiating these two levels of timing. The principle was to: 1) Define whether regulation is performed by the person more than 4 hours after the task (the duration proposed by Johnson) to determine if it is concurrent or retrospective. 2) Analyze whether regulation occurs Pre, During, or Post the task.*