## **Supplementary Materials**

Table 1. Distribution of study characteristics.

Autho	Research	Research	Sampl	Avar	Measureme	Conclusion	Preva
rs and	Objective	Design,	e Size	age	nt Tool		lence
Count		Sampling		Age			Rate
ry		Technique,					
		Data Analysis					
1. N	To evaluate	Cross-	300	22.16	Self-	Although the	61,7
weke,	nursing students'	sectional		±	composed	students	%
et al	readiness to return	descriptive		3.11	tool by the	demonstrated a	ready
2021	to clinical practice	study		year	authors,	high level of	
Nigeri	during the				developed	readiness, only a	
a	coronavirus	Multistage			based on a	small percentage	
	pandemic in	sampling			literature	were fully	
	Southwest Nigeria	technique			review.	prepared to work	
						in a coronavirus	
		Chi-square				ward, with 61.7%	
						indicating	
						preparedness.	
2. B	To explore	Cross-	126	23,7	Self-	66.79% said that	66,79
asso,	whether and to	sectional study.			developed	the COVID-19	% not
et al,	what extent third-				questionnair	safety measures	ready
2022	year nursing	Bivariate			e by the	adopted by the	
Italia	students perceive	analysis was			researcher.	nursing program	
	that their readiness	conducted				impacted	
	for practice is	using either the				readiness for	
	affected by	chi-square test				practice	
	changes to clinical	or Fisher's					
	placements and	exact test.				The perceived	
	classroom learning					impact on	
	implemented in					readiness for	
	response to the					practice was	
	COVID-19					related to	
	pandemic.					academic	

						achievement,	
						number of	
						previous practice	
						hours, previous	
						clinical	
						experience	
3. A	To assess nursing	Cross sectional	125		• IPCP	Nursing students	RIPL
rulapp	students'	study			was	have a good	S
an, et	knowledge and		• I	-	measured	average of	score
al,	readiness to	Convenient	emale		with the	readiness for	79.09
2021	support the	sampling	110		Readiness	IPCP	
Oman	development and	technique	(88%)		for	(Interprofessional	
	implementation of		• 1		Interprofessi	Collaborative	
	IPCP.	Chi-square	ale 15		onal	Practice) and	
	(Interprofessional	tests	(12%)		Learning	have a sufficient	
	Collaborative				Scale	level of	
	Practice).				(RIPLS)	knowledge about	
					questionnair	IPCP.	
					e		
					• Kno		
					wledge was		
					measured		
					with the		
					researcher-		
					developed		
					knowledge		
					questionnair		
					e, the		
					cumulative		
4. T	To assess nursing	Descriptive	738	21.56	• Read	Nursing students	Skor
osun ö	students' readiness	cross-sectional		±	iness was	were prepared	RIPL
z, et	for	study	• I	1.48,	measured	and eager to	S
al,	interprofessional		eremp		using the	engage in	69,78
	education (IPE)		uan		Readiness		

2021	and their		538		for	interprofessional	±
Turki	perceptions of	Independent	(72.9		Interprofessi	education (IPE).	11,32
	interdisciplinary	samples t-test	%)		onal	RIPLS score	
	learning		• ]		Learning	$69.78 \pm 11.32$ .	
		Analysis of	aki-		Scale		
		variance	laki		(RIPLS).		
		(ANOVA) and	200		• Perc		
		Kruskal-Wallis	(27.1		eptions were		
		tests	%)		evaluated		
					with the		
					Interdiscipli		
					nary		
					Education		
					Perception		
					Scale		
					(IEPS).		
5. N	To examine the	Mixed Method	97	21.7	Readiness	The RIPLS scores	RIPL
umasa	differences in			±1.4	for Inter-	of nursing	S
wa, et	readiness for	Total sampling	• ]		professional	students before	score
al,	interprofessional		emale		Learning	the workshop	82.2
2021	education (IPE)	Two-tailed	538		Scale	were higher	±
Jepan	among dental,	paired t-tests	(72.9		(RIPLS)	among the 3	0.69
g	medical, and		%)			groups of	(befor
	nursing students		• 1			students, and the	e the
	before and after		ales			RIPLS scores of	works
	IPE workshops,		200			nursing students	hop)
	and to explore the		(27.1			increased	
	reasons behind		%)			significantly	
	these differences.		21.56			compared to the	
			± 1.48			scores of medical	
						and dental	
						students.	

6. M	To describe the	Descriptive/an	• 1	21.1	• Read	• Nursing	RIPL
ilutino	psychometric	alytical and	21	±	iness for	students achieved	S
vić,	properties,	comparative		(1.7)	Inter-	significantly	score
Lovrić	validity, and	cross-sectional			professional	higher total	79.6
&	reliability of the	study			Learning	RIPLS scores	± 7.9
Simin,	Serbian-adapted				Scale	compared to	
2018	RIPLS scale in	Descriptive			(RIPLS)	medical students.	
Serbia	assessing health	statistic, Tukey				• The	
	science	post-hoc test,				PIQNS total score	
	undergraduates'	Multiple linear				serves as a	
	attitudes towards	re-				predictor variable	
	collaborative	gression				for the RIPLS	
	practice and shared	analysis				total score among	
	learning, and to					nursing students.	
	evaluate the						
	influence of						
	professional group						
	and student						
	characteristics on						
	these attitudes.						
7. <b>N</b>	• To assess	Cohort study	126	73%	Casey-Fink	• Students	85-
ew	the practice			are ≤	Readiness	are confident in	99%
Zaela	readiness of	Total sampling	• I	30	for Practice	their welding	Readi
nd	Jamieson, et al,		emale	years	Survey	duties and believe	ness
	2019 senior		222(90	old		they have	total
	nursing students.		%)			adequately	score
	To validate		• 1			prepared for the	
	the Casey-Fink		ales			profession.	
	Radiness for		23(9%			• They also	
	Practice Survey in		)			feel assured in	
	the New Zealand					their	
	context.					communication	
						skills.	