Appendix 4 Definitions of concepts

Table 2. Definitions of concepts

	DEFINITION	FORM
Feedback	Direct or indirect (qualitative, quantitative) interaction between giver and receiver or self.	Electronic, web-based, online, (e-) feedback, assessment, evaluation.
E-portfolio	E-portfolio as a tool for managing and documenting one's own learning over a lifespan in ways that encourages deep and continuous learning.[1]	Electronic, digital, web-based, online, e-portfolios
Feedback via e-portfolio	E-portfolio that fosters a provision of more or less effective feedback	Perceptions of feedback via e-portfolio; Effectiveness of feedback via e-portfolio; Usage of feedback via e-portfolio

Appendix 5 Inclusion and exclusion criteria for formal search

Table 3. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for formal search

	INCLUSION	EXCLUSION
Topic	All documents including feedback via e-portfolio as core element.	Papers focused only on: a. feedback or e-portfolio; b. feedback on implementation or e-portfolio design c. e-portfolio as a tool of research.
Study Design	All study designs.	-
Type of Paper	Research (peer-reviewed) and non-research pieces (reviews, editorials, communications, conference proceedings, reports).	Documents not applying rigor and relevance criteria [30]
Types of Setting	Evidence from higher (healthcare) educational setting.	Studies done in primary education setting.
Types of participants	Receivers AND givers of feedback (i.e., mentor- learner/ learner-leaner, learner-self).	-
Language, geographical spread, timeframe	Published worldwide in English. Timespan: 2008-2017	-

---

[1] Jenson *et al*. What It Is and Why It Matters. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning 2014;46 (2): 50-57. 2014.

Appendix 6 Test for assessing relevance and rigour

Table 4. Test for relevance (Pearson *et al.* 2012; 2015; Brennan *et al.* 2017)

Conceptually Rich	Thicker description' but not 'conceptually rich'	Conceptually Thin
Unambiguous theoretical concepts are described in sufficient depth.	Description of programme theory or sufficient information to enable it to 'surface'.	Insufficient information to enable the programme theory to surface.
Relationships between, amongst concepts are clearly articulated.	Consideration of the context in which the programme takes place.	Limited or no consideration of the context in which the programme took place.
Concepts are sufficiently developed, defined to enable understanding without the reader needing to have first-hand experience of an area of practice.	Discussion of the differences between the design and orientation of programme theory (what was intended) and implementation (what really happened).	Limited or no discussion of the differences between the design and orientation of programme theory (what was intended) and implementation (what really happened).
Concepts are grounded strongly in a cited body of literature.	Recognition and discussion of the strengths/weaknesses of the implemented programme.	Limited or no discussion of the strengths/ weaknesses of the implemented programme.
Concepts are parsimonious (i.e., provide the simplest, but not over-simplified, explanation)	Some attempt to explain anomalous results and findings with reference to context and data.	No attempts to explain anomalous results and findings with reference to context and data.
	Description of the factor affecting implementation.	Limited or no description of the factors affecting implementation.
	Typified by **terms** ('model', 'process', or 'function'), **verbs** ('investigate', 'describes', 'explains'), **topics** ('experiences').	Typified by only by mentioning an 'association' between variables.

Table 5. Test for rigour (Ohly *et al.* 2017)

	Yes	Fairly	No
The study methods are clearly reported.			
The study methods are appropriate to answer RQ.			
The sample characteristics enable generalizability.			
Raw data supports the study findings (conclusions).			
Limitations of the study are acknowledged and clearly reported.			

Appendix 7 Data Extraction Table

Table 6. Data Extraction Table

Study ID	Country	Population	Setting	Methodology	Focus of paper	Characteristics of intervention	Relevance to programme theory