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| **ENTREQ Guidelines** |
| No | Item | Rationale |
| 1 | Aim | To perform a metasynthesis of the qualitative studies exploring the experience of oncology nurses in their work setting |
| 2 | Synthesis methodology | Meta-ethnography and Thematic Synthesis |
| 3 | Approach to screening | Comprehensive search strategies |
| 4 | Inclusion criteria | See Table 2 |
| 5 | Data sources | Electronic database ( Medline, PsycINFO, CINAHL, SSCI) |
| 6 | Electronic Search Strategy | See Table 1 |
| 7 | Study Screening Methods | After collecting the references and eliminating duplicates, three authors subsequently read the titles and abstracts to assess their relevance to our subject and their methodology according to our inclusion and exclusion criteria. If the abstract was not sufficient, we read the entire article. Disagreements were resolved during meetings of the research group. The potentially relevant articles were then read in full, and a second selection made to keep only the articles that met our inclusion criteria. |
| 8 | Study Characteristics | See Table 4 |
| 9 | Study selection results | See Figure 1 ( Flow of information through the different phases of the studies selection) |
| 10 | Rationale for appraisal | Critical Appraisal Skills Program (CASP) |
| 11 | Appraisal items | It comprises 10 questions, two screening questions about the aims of the research and the appropriate use of qualitative methodology, and eight questions considering the sampling strategy, the data collection, the researcher’s reflexivity, the ethical issues, the data analysis, the findings, and the value of the research |
| 12 | Appraisal process | Two authors performed this assessment independently and then discussed the results within the research group until agreement was reached. |
| 13 | Appraisal results | See Table 5 and Supplemental material S1 |
| 14 | Data extraction | Two authors attentive read and re-read the titles, abstracts, and texts of each article. One researcher extracted the formal characteristics of the studies, and two created a summary of results and discussion section of each study selected using a standard template.  |
| 15 | Software | Nvivo Software |
| 16 | Number of reviewers | 3 |
| 17 | Coding | Thematic analysis, see Table 3 |
| 18 | Study comparaison | Thematic analysis, see Table 3 |
| 19 | Derivation of themes | Inductive |
| 20 | Quotations | See Table 6 (Quotations from participants and from authors of primary studies to illustrate each theme) |
| 21 | Synthesis output | See Discussion section |
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