

“Chemobrain” in childhood cancer survivors – the impact on social, academic, and daily living skills: a qualitative systematic review

Ines Semendric^{1*}, Danielle Pollock², Olivia J Haller¹, Rebecca P George¹, Lyndsey E. Collins-Praino¹,
Alexandra Whittaker³

1. School of Biomedicine, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia

2. JBI, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, Adelaide, South Australia

3. School of Animal and Veterinary Sciences, The University of Adelaide, Roseworthy, South Australia

*Corresponding author: Ines Semendric

Email: ines.semendric@adelaide.edu.au

Online Resource 5: JBI Checklist for Qualitative Research Template and Outcomes for Included Study

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Reviewer _____ Date _____

Author _____ Year _____ Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice- versa, addressed?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?	☐	☐	☐	☐

10. Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Citation	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Choquette, Rennick and Lee ¹²	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Walker et al. ⁴⁴	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Chen et al. ¹⁰	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Suntup ⁴⁰	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Vancer, Eiser and Horne ⁴²	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Vanclooster et al. ⁴³	N	N	N	N	N	U	Y	Y	Y	Y
%	33.33	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	33.33	33.33	83.33	100.0	100.0

Table. Critical quality appraisal