Supplementary File S7. STROBE checklist for cross-sectional studies

Clinical Nutrition Learning Needs among Postgraduate Nursing Students: A Survey of Knowledge, Role Beliefs, and Self-Reported Practice

Items follow the STROBE checklist for cross-sectional studies (von Elm et al., 2007; reference [27] of the manuscript); the wording of each item is abbreviated. Locations are sections, tables and figures of the manuscript and of the Supplementary Materials.

Item	Topic	Recommendation (abbreviated)	Where reported	Status	Note
Title and abstract					
1a	Title and abstract	Design indicated with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Title; Abstract	Reported	"Survey" in the title; "cross-sectional survey" in the Abstract.
1b		Informative and balanced summary of what was done and found	Abstract	Reported	Primary, secondary and sensitivity results are given.
Introduction					
2	Background and rationale	Scientific background and rationale	Section 1	Reported	
3	Objectives	Specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Section 1; Section 2.6	Reported	Stated as a primary and a secondary question; Section 2.6 says when each was set.
Methods					
4	Study design	Key elements of the design presented early	Section 2.1	Reported	
5	Setting	Setting, locations and relevant dates, including data collection	Section 2.1; Section 2.5	*Partly reported*	The dates on which the paper questionnaires were completed were not recorded (Section 2.5).
6a	Participants	Eligibility criteria, sources and methods of selection	Section 2.1	Reported	Eligibility, invitation and the reminder are stated.
7	Variables	Outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders and effect modifiers defined	Section 2.2; Section 2.3; Section 2.4; Section 2.6	Reported	
8	Data sources and measurement	Sources and methods of assessment for each variable; comparability	Section 2.2; Section 2.4; Section 2.5; Section 5; Table S1	Reported	Section 2.2 gives the source and who adapted it; Section 5 states what is not reported for this version.
9	Bias	Efforts to address potential sources of bias	Section 2.5; Section 2.6; Section 5; Table 2; Table S3	Reported	Identifier and answer checks, four sensitivity analyses, Harman's test.
10	Study size	How the study size was arrived at	Section 2.1; Section 3.2	Reported	All enrolled students were invited (census approach); minimum detectable differences are given in Section 3.2.
11	Quantitative variables	How quantitative variables were handled; groupings chosen and why	Section 2.2; Section 2.6; Table 1	Reported	Scores analysed as continuous; the reason for collapsing experience is in Section 2.6.
12a	Statistical methods	All statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Section 2.6	Reported	
12b		Methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	Section 2.6; Section 3.6	Reported	No interaction terms; the barrier-domain test was run among respondents scoring at least 12 of 16.
12c		How missing data were addressed	Section 2.2; Section 2.4; Section 2.6	Reported	Complete cases for each score; no imputation.
12d		Analytical methods taking account of the sampling strategy	—	*Not applicable*	The analysis was not weighted.
12e		Sensitivity analyses	Section 2.5; Section 2.6; Table 2; Table S3	Reported	

Item	Topic	Recommendation (abbreviated)	Where reported	Status	Note
Results					
13a	Participants	Numbers at each stage of the study	Section 2.1; Section 2.5; Section 3.1; Table 2	Reported	Among the 630 students enrolled and invited, 408 took part; the n for each model is given with that model.
13b		Reasons for non-participation at each stage	Section 5	*Partly reported*	Nothing is known about those who did not respond, so no reasons can be given.
13c		Use of a flow diagram considered	—	*Not reported*	Considered; only the submitted records are known, so none is given.
14a	Descriptive data	Characteristics of participants; information on exposures and potential confounders	Section 3.1; Table 1	Reported	
14b		Number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Section 2.2; Section 2.4; Section 3.1; Table 1	Reported	
15	Outcome data	Numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Section 3.2; Section 3.3; Table 3	Reported	
16a	Main results	Unadjusted and adjusted estimates with their precision; confounders adjusted for and why	Section 2.6; Section 3.2; Table 2; Table S2; Table S3	Reported	Unadjusted estimates: Table S3, panel D.
16b		Category boundaries when continuous variables were categorised	Table 1; Section 2.6	Reported	
16c		Relative estimates translated into absolute terms where relevant	—	*Not applicable*	Differences are reported on the original scales.
17	Other analyses	Other analyses: subgroups, interactions, sensitivity analyses	Section 3.2; Section 3.3; Section 3.5; Section 3.6; Table S3; Table S4; Table S5	Reported	
Discussion					
18	Key results	Key results summarised with reference to the objectives	Section 4	Reported	
19	Limitations	Limitations, with sources of potential bias or imprecision, their direction and magnitude	Section 5	Reported	
20	Interpretation	Cautious overall interpretation, considering multiplicity and similar studies	Section 4; Section 6	Reported	
21	Generalisability	Generalisability (external validity) of the results	Section 5; Section 6	Reported	
Other information					
22	Funding	Source of funding and role of the funders	Funding	Reported	Source and role are stated; all authors are staff of the funder.

Reference: von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. Lancet 2007;370:1453-1457. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61602-X.