





MV-SAMPLE · 2026-06-15 · (illustrative sample report)

1 · Study profile

SRQR 1–6 · COREQ 1–9

Research question	How do patients with advanced NSCLC reason about treatment trade-offs?
Methodological orientation	Interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA)
Approach / paradigm	Interpretivist / constructivist
Data collection	Semi-structured interviews
Analysis strategy	IPA double-coding with reflexive memoing
Researcher	A. Researcher — PhD candidate, RN
Reflexivity	Clinician-researcher; prior oncology nursing experience may sensitise interpretation toward clinician framings.
Research group	(illustrative sample report)

 Consensus broad agreement	 Contested expert disagreement	 Author hypothesis not externally validated	 Opinion range team decision
---	---	--	---

2 · Sample-size optimisation

SRQR 13 · COREQ 17 — detectable difference

17

Optimal N (synthesis)

Stability: stable · range 17–18 · information-power index 0.637

Three models proposed N = 25 (linear saturation), 14 (network complexity), 16 (fuzzy-set QCA). Synthesised and adjusted for information power (index 0.637), the optimal N is 17 (stable to ±0.05 input perturbation; range 17–18). The researcher decides N; this is decision support.

Author hypothesis (Vahtian, 2026) — three-model synthesis with information-power adjustment; not externally validated (see VALIDATION.md).

3 · Three-model comparison

The number is a synthesis, never one truth

Model	Estimated N	Basis
Linear saturation	25	Saturation rises with heterogeneity & theme rarity
Network complexity	14	Information power: aim, theory, dialogue lower N
Fuzzy-set QCA	16	Cases needed to cover plausible configurations
Synthesis (chosen frame)	17	Info-power-adjusted synthesis of the three

Chosen N (researcher)	18
Rationale (researcher's words)	Synthesis suggested ~16; added 2 for population breadth across two centres.
Stopping criterion	No new meaning-level themes across three consecutive interviews per centre.
Adaptive plan	Review at N=12; extend to 22 if meaning saturation is unclear.

4 · Fuzzy-set calibration sensitivity

SRQR 5

Concept calibrated	High decisional conflict
Calibration rationale	Anchors set on validated DCS thresholds.
Impact on conclusions	Sufficiency claim robust to anchor choice.

Calibration	Result / effect
0.5 anchor at moderate conflict	2 cases move in/out of the set
Stricter 0.7 anchor	No change to the sufficiency claim

5 · Epistemic limitations

SRQR 20 · COREQ 31–32

What this design can conclude:

- The range of trade-off reasoning patterns present
- How clinician framing enters patient reasoning

What it cannot conclude:

- Population prevalence of any single pattern
- Causal effect of framing on the eventual choice

Transferability: Two Nordic tertiary centres; transfer to community oncology is untested.

MethodVahti does not infer causality, validate study quality, or replace researcher judgment. The optimisation synthesis is an author hypothesis (Vahtian 2026), not externally validated.

6 · COREQ 32-item checklist

Tong, Sainsbury & Craig (2007)

#	Item	Status	Note
1	Interviewer / facilitator identified	—	
2	Credentials (e.g. PhD, MD)	—	
3	Occupation at time of study	—	
4	Gender	—	
5	Experience and training	—	
6	Relationship established prior to study	—	
7	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	—	
8	Interviewer characteristics reported	—	
9	Methodological orientation and theory	—	

#	Item	Status	Note
10	Sampling (purposive, convenience, snowball)	—	
11	Method of approach	—	
12	Sample size	—	
13	Non-participation and reasons	—	
14	Setting of data collection	—	
15	Presence of non-participants	—	
16	Description of sample	—	
17	Interview guide described	—	
18	Repeat interviews	—	
19	Audio/visual recording	—	
20	Field notes	—	
21	Duration	—	
22	Data saturation discussed	—	
23	Transcripts returned to participants	—	
24	Number of data coders	—	
25	Description of the coding tree	—	
26	Derivation of themes	—	
27	Software used	—	
28	Participant checking	—	
29	Quotations presented	—	
30	Data and findings consistent	—	
31	Clarity of major themes	—	
32	Clarity of minor themes	—	

7 · Citation & audit record

Reproducibility

Report ID	MV-SAMPLE
Generated (UTC)	2026-06-15
Citation	Vahtian. (2026). MethodVahti methods report MV-SAMPLE. EpiNet toolkit. https://vahtian.com/methodvahti
Method core	qualitative_heterogeneity_score() · Apache-2.0

Severity-weight audit log

2026-06-15T10:00:00Z · 0.9 → 0.75 · research_team: Pilot audit (n=12): observed disagreement approx 18%.