Attachment 2: Supplementary tables

Table S1: Assessment of usability among students and supervising physicians

Items for students	Response options		
	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree
1. The e-logbook was well structured. (n=56)	59%	32%	9%
2. All important information was well integrated into the e-logbook. (n=56)	70%	20%	10%
3. The information in the e-logbook was clearly and comprehensibly worded. (n=56)	80%	7%	13%
4. I found the e-logbook easy to use. (n=56)	59%	20%	21%
5. The e-logbook contained too many inconsistencies. (n=56)	18%	20%	52%
6. Completing the tasks using the provided forms and guiding questions worked perfectly from a technical point of view. (n=56)	54%	18%	28%
7. The time required to complete the e-logbook was reasonable. (n=56)	24%	18%	48%
Items for supervising physicians			
1. The e-logbook was well structured. (n=23)	78%	18%	4%
2. All important information was well integrated into the e-logbook. (n=23)	74%	22%	4%
3. I found the e-logbook easy to use. (n=23)	48%	39%	13%
4. In my view, the e-logbook was helpful in structuring the two-week clinical placement. (n=23)	61%	17%	22%
5. I was able to find the forms relevant to me (e.g. evaluation forms) quickly. (n=23)	65%	27%	18%
6. I found the e-logbook highly relevant for my role in supervising students. (n=23)	54%	21%	25%
7. I consider the time spent reviewing and discussing the e-logbook with the student to be reasonable. (n=23)	61%	30%	9%
8. I consider the use of the e-logbook as part of the two-week clinical placement to be useful. (n=23)	71%	17%	12%

For the sake of clarity, the response options “strongly agree” and “agree”, as well as “disagree” and “strongly disagree”, have been combined into single categories

Attachment 2 to Gornostayeva M, Schüttpelz-Brauns K, Ruseva NN, Hoffmann K. *Design of a digital logbook – user-friendliness, practical relevance and usefulness as a training tool, using the example of the block clinical placement in general practice at the Mannheim Faculty of Medicine.* GMS J Med Educ. 2026;43(7):Doc91. DOI: 10.3205/zma001885

Table S2: Assessment of the usefulness of the e-logbook as a training tool among students and supervising physicians

Items for students	Response options		
	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree
1. The e-logbook helped me to organise and plan my two-week clinical placement. (n=55)	37%	25%	38%
2. The e-logbook was helpful in defining my expectations and goals for the two-week clinical placement. (n=55)	42%	22%	36%
3. The e-logbook helped me to communicate with my supervising physician. (n=54)	31%	15%	54%
4. The forms and guiding questions stored in the e-logbook helped me to reflect on the cases I treated. (n=55)	51%	24%	25%
5. With the help of the e-logbook, I was able to specifically develop and improve my practical skills. (n=55)	24%	27%	49%
6. The e-logbook helped me to assess whether I had met the objectives of the two-week clinical placement. (n=55)	42%	20%	38%
7. I found keeping the e-logbook useful for my learning process. (n=55)	38%	22%	40%
Items for supervising physicians			
1. The e-logbook encouraged the students' own initiative during the two-week clinical placement. (n=23)	57%	30%	13%
2. The e-logbook forms were helpful in structuring communication with the student. (n=23)	48%	39%	13%
3. In my view, the e-logbook was helpful for the student in specifically developing and improving their practical skills. (n=23)	51%	33%	16%
4. Completing the e-logbook tasks prevented the student from engaging with the actual tasks in the GP practice. (n=23)	32%	24%	44%
5. Completing the e-logbook tasks supported the student's reflective process. (n=23)	59%	29%	12%

For the sake of clarity, the response options "strongly agree" and "agree", as well as "disagree" and "strongly disagree", have been combined into single categories

Attachment 2 to Gornostayeva M, Schüttpelz-Brauns K, Ruseva NN, Hoffmann K. *Design of a digital logbook – user-friendliness, practical relevance and usefulness as a training tool, using the example of the block clinical placement in general practice at the Mannheim Faculty of Medicine.* GMS J Med Educ. 2026;43(7):Doc91. DOI: 10.3205/zma001885