

**Cancer-related cognitive impairment: A mixed-methods evaluation of a standard
factsheet**

Supportive Care in Cancer

Chloe Yi Shing Lim^{1,2}

Sharon He^{1,3}

Joanne Shaw^{1,3}

Haryana M Dhillon^{1,2,3};

1. School of Psychology, Faculty of Science, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 2006
2. Centre for Medical Psychology and Evidence-Based Decision-Making (CeMPED), School of Psychology, Faculty of Science, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 2006
3. Psycho-Oncology Co-Operative Research Group (PoCoG), School of Psychology, Faculty of Science, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 2006

Corresponding author: Chloe Lim, chloe.lim@sydney.edu.au

Supplementary File C. Evaluating the current study against the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) checklist for qualitative research.

Item	Question/topic	Page number
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
Personal Characteristics		
1	Interviewer/facilitator Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Supp. file B
2	Credentials What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	Supp. file B
3	Occupation What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Supp. file B
4	Gender Was the researcher male or female?	Supp. file B
5	Experience and training What experience or training did the researcher have?	Supp. file B
Relationship with participants		
6	Relationship established Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Supp. file B
7	Participant knowledge of the interviewer What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Supp. file B
8	Interviewer characteristics What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	Supp. file B
Domain 2: study design		
Theoretical framework		
9	Methodological orientation and theory What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	4,6,7
Participant selection		
10	Sampling How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	6
11	Method of approach How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	6
12	Sample size How many participants were in the study?	7
13	Non-participation How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Figure 1
Setting		
14	Setting of data collection Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Supp. file B
15	Presence of non-participants Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	Supp. file B
16	Description of sample What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Table 1

Item	Question/topic	Page number
Data collection		
17	Interview guide Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Supp. file A
18	Repeat interviews Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	Supp. file B
19	Audio/visual recording Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data	6
20	Field notes Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Supp. file B
21	Duration What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	7
22	Data saturation Was data saturation discussed?	7
23	Transcripts returned Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	Supp. file B
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
Data analysis		
24	Number of data coders How many data coders coded the data?	Supp. file B
25	Description of the coding tree Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Results, Supp. file D
26	Derivation of themes Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	7
27	Software What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	6
28	Participant checking Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	Supp. file B
Reporting		
29	Quotations presented Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Results
30	Data and findings consistent Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes, see Results
31	Clarity of major themes Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes, see Results
32	Clarity of minor themes Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes, see Results