

Supplementary Table S1. Search strategy for systematic review applied in Medline.

1.	exp Child/
2.	Pediatrics/
3.	(child* or pediatric* or paediatric*).mp.
4.	1 or 2 or 3
5.	exp Neoplasms/
6.	(cancer* or tumor* or tumour* or oncolog* or neoplas* or carcinoma* or malignan*).mp.
7.	5 or 6
8.	(quality of life or QoL or survivorship or wellness).mp.
9.	"Quality of Life"/
10.	8 or 9
11.	patient reported outcome measures/ (patient reported outcome* or patient reported outcome measure* or self report* or self-report* or self-rate or self
12.	rate* or proxy-rate* or proxy or child report* or child-report* or parent-proxy or questionnaire* or survey* or validated instrument*).mp.
13.	11 or 12
14.	exp Radiotherapy/
15.	(proton* or proton therapy or proton beam therapy or radiation or radiation therapy or radiotherapy or X-ray therapy or xray therapy or particle therapy or chemoradiotherapy or external beam).mp.
16.	14 or 15
17.	4 and 7 and 10 and 13 and 16
18.	limit 17 to (english language and yr="2000 -Current")

Supplementary Table S2. Quality assessment criteria table results

Criteria	Yes (%)	Partial (%)	No (%)
1. Question/objective sufficiently described?	100.0	0.0	0.0
2. Study design evident and appropriate?	90.0	10.0	0.0
3. Method of subject/comparison group selection or source of information/input variables described and appropriate?	93.3	6.7	0.0
4. Subject (and comparison group, if applicable) characteristics sufficiently described?	73.4	23.3	3.3
5. If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?	n/a	n/a	n/a
6. If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	n/a	n/a	n/a
7. If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	n/a	n/a	n/a
8. Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement/misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	55.0	41.7	3.3
9. Sample size appropriate?	21.7	43.3	35.0
10. Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	68.3	15.0	16.7
11. Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?	80.0	16.7	3.3
12. Controlled for confounding?	28.3	41.7	30.0
13. Results reported in sufficient detail?	50.0	35.0	15.0
14. Conclusions supported by the results?	96.7	3.3	0.0

Assessment of criterion were informed by agreement with SISAQOL recommendations. Sufficient sample size was defined as 50 or more participants. Partial sufficiency of sample size was 30-50 participants. Insufficient sample size was defined as below 30 participants.