

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

What are the impacts of oral complications from cancer therapy on the quality of life of children? A protocol to update a scoping review.

The impacts of oral complications from cancer therapy on the quality of life of children.

Nona Attaran^{1¶}, Apoorva Sharma^{1&}, Martin Morris^{2&}, Olawale Dudubo^{1&}, Mary Ellen Macdonald^{3*}

¹ Faculty of Dental Medicine and Oral Health Sciences, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada

² Schulich Library of Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, and Engineering, McGill University
Montreal, QC, Canada

³ Faculty of Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada

* Corresponding author

E-mail: maryellenmacdonald@dal.ca

¶ First author on this work

& These authors also contributed equally to this work

24 **Funding**

25 The authors received no specific funding for this protocol.

26 **Data availability**

27 This article does not report data and the data availability policy is not applicable to this
28 article.

29 **Abstract**

30 **Introduction** Cancer treatments can damage healthy tissues and organs, and leave
31 harmful impacts on cancer survivors, especially on children and adolescents. The oral
32 effects of cancer treatment can occur during or soon after treatment, or months – even
33 years – later. Cancer treatments can also affect the child, psychologically and socially by
34 hindering their speech, eating, sleeping, and social interactions. These effects can have
35 profound impacts on children’s quality of life. Building on a previous review published in
36 2012, this scoping review aims to identify and map the current evidence base
37 underpinning the oral health-related impacts of cancer treatment on the quality of life of
38 children with cancer.

39 **Methodology and methods** Our methodology is guided by Arksey and O’Malley’s
40 methodological framework for scoping reviews, Levac’s additions to the framework, and
41 follows the Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer’s Manual. Five electronic databases and
42 grey literature will be systematically searched using a predefined search strategy. Two
43 reviewers will independently screen the retrieved articles using Rayyan software and
44 chart data from included articles. One of the team’s senior research members will act as
45 a third reviewer and make the final decision on disputed documents. We will include
46 literature with a focus on oral health-related quality of life of children undergoing cancer

47 treatments. Following the selection of studies, data will be extracted, synthesized, and
48 reported thematically and the relevant stakeholder's insight will be added to our results.

49 **Ethics and dissemination** No ethical approval is required as exclusively secondary data
50 will be used. Results will be disseminated in cancer and oral health conferences,
51 symposia, and a peer-reviewed journal. The information extracted from this review will
52 also be the base for a qualitative study on the quality-of-life impacts of oral health effects
53 of childhood cancer including children's perspectives.

54 **Introduction**

55 According to the World Health Organization (WHO), each year approximately 400,000
56 children and young adults are diagnosed with cancer globally. [1] The most common
57 types of childhood cancer are leukemia, lymphomas, brain cancer, and solid tumors,
58 including neuroblastoma and Wilms tumor. [2]. Whereas childhood cancer mortality used
59 to be dire, today upwards of 80% can be cured with treatments such as pharmaceuticals,
60 surgery, and radiotherapy. [1] Notwithstanding the vast improvement in mortality rates,
61 cancer treatments can leave devastating impacts on cancer survivors, damaging healthy
62 tissues and causing systemic side effects. These effects can be especially devastating for
63 young people who experience high rates of radiotherapy and chemotherapy-induced
64 complications. [3] A common location for side effects is the oral cavity, including the soft
65 and hard tissues in the mouth, from the lips anteriorly to faucial pillars posteriorly. [4, 5]
66 Treatment-related oral side effects can occur during or soon after treatment, or months –
67 even years – later. They are classified as early (acute) effects and late (chronic) effects.
68 [6] Early oral effects include oral mucositis, xerostomia (dry mouth), oral infections (e.g.,
69 candidiasis and herpes virus infections), and taste disturbances. Late effects include

70 dental decay, and abnormalities in dental and jaw development. Combined treatments
71 such as combination of chemotherapy with radiation increase the risk of dental problems
72 such as dental caries, taste disturbances, and missing teeth or roots. [5] These conditions
73 influence the physical, functional, and psychosocial health of children who have
74 undergone cancer therapy, and can continue to affect them months or years after the
75 treatment is completed. [3]

76 Evidence has highlighted the profound impact that oral health can have on a child's
77 quality of life. [7-10] Specific to childhood cancer, a scoping review by Noronha and
78 Macdonald on the oral effects of cancer treatment demonstrated the devastating impact
79 of such effects on the quality of life of children. [9] Children in the reviewed studies
80 experienced both early and late oral effects as follows:

- 81 • Mucositis was the most common early effect in this review, affecting almost 100%
82 of children undergoing chemotherapy. (8) In addition to pain, mucositis has
83 psychological and social impacts; for example, speech issues associated with oral
84 mucositis can reduce a child's engagement in social interaction. [11]
- 85 • Xerostomia is a result of damage to the salivary gland which changes the
86 consistency and amount of saliva in the mouth. It can be an early side-effect when
87 caused by chemotherapy and can have a long-term effect when caused by
88 radiotherapy to the head and neck. Decreased salivary flow and increased
89 viscosity can cause difficulty with chewing, swallowing, speech, and also affect the
90 function of taste buds resulting in taste alteration, causing a dislike for some foods
91 and appetite loss. This taste alteration can result in nausea, vomiting, pain, and
92 discomfort. [5]

- 93 • After mucositis and xerostomia, taste disturbance after chemotherapy were found
94 to be the next most common effect. [12] These children were more sensitive to
95 bitterness, and had taste recognition errors, which affected their appetite. This
96 appetite change can lead to malnutrition and impair quality of life by affecting
97 appetite, body weight, and psychological well-being. [13]
- 98 • According to this review, more than 80% of children treated for cancer had at least
99 one longer-term dental anomaly (e.g., root shortening, smaller teeth, enlarged pulp
100 chambers). These malformations arise during remission and can hinder eating,
101 speech, and social interactions, and can require additional complex clinical
102 interventions. [9]

103 Since this scoping review, the oral health-specific measure, oral health-related quality of
104 life (OHRQoL), has become more commonly used in studies on the effects of oral
105 diseases and oral complications on patients' oral symptoms. This multidimensional
106 construct focuses on how an individual's oral health affects their comfort, abilities and
107 well-being (e.g., eating, sleeping, social interactions, self-esteem). [14] The increased use
108 of OHRQoL follows the growing recognition of oral health as an essential component of
109 systemic health and general wellbeing. [15, 16] As oral health is strongly age-dependent,
110 and therefore OHRQoL in children is different from adults, this measure has been
111 adapted for child populations.[17]

112 Further, according to this prior review, there was a dearth of qualitative research into the
113 experiences of children about how oral side effects of cancer therapy impacts their quality
114 of life. [12] This result is not surprising; in a 2007 review of pediatric oncology studies,
115 85% of studies on childhood cancer did not solicit patient-reported outcomes, instead

116 relying on parent reports and health care professionals reports. [18] While having the
117 parent's and HCPs' perspective is clearly important, it has become evident that children's
118 perspectives are not always consistent with adults. As a result, a new approach to child-
119 focused research has started to engage children directly in research to better understand
120 their experiences first-hand. [19] This movement is consistent with article 12 of The
121 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child which stipulates that children's
122 experiences must be rendered through their own voices and that they have a right to
123 express their own views in matters that affect them. [20] While dental research has
124 started to follow this trend [21], it is not known if or how research on the impact of cancer
125 treatment on children's quality of life has followed suit since Noronha and Macdonald's
126 review up to 2011.

127 Therefore, the aim of this scoping review is to scope the literature since 2011 for the
128 impacts on quality of life due to therapy-related oral complications on childhood cancer
129 survivors and the children's contribution in producing this knowledge. Following is the
130 procedure we will follow to conduct this scoping review.

131 **Materials and Methods**

132 A scoping review is an exploratory research method that scopes the literature on a given
133 topic and identifies gaps in the current research and highlight areas that require further
134 inquiry. [22] The purpose of conducting a scoping review is to identify the types of
135 available evidence in a given field, clarify key concepts in the literature, examine how
136 research is conducted on a certain topic or field, and identify and analyze knowledge
137 gaps. [22]

138 This protocol will follow the Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer’s Manual to assure
139 transparency, accuracy, and completeness. [23] We will also follow Arksey and
140 O’Malley’s methodological framework, which consists of six stages for conducting a
141 scoping review: 1. Identifying the research question; 2. Identifying relevant studies; 3.
142 Selecting studies; 4. Charting the data; 5. Collating, summarizing, and reporting of
143 results; and 6. Consulting with relevant stakeholders. [24] (Fig 1)

144 **Fig 1. Arksey and O’Malley’s methodological framework**

145 All members of the research team developed, reviewed, and agreed with this protocol; we
146 intend to complete the review by Fall 2023.

147 **1. Identifying the research question**

148 Building on the work of Noronha and Macdonald mentioned above, the main objective of
149 this review is to map and synthesize the knowledge on the impact of oral complications
150 from cancer therapy on the quality of life of children surviving cancer starting in 2011. Our
151 primary research questions is:

152 What are the impacts of oral complications from cancer therapy on the quality of life of
153 childhood cancer survivors?

154 And our secondary research questions will be: How are children involved in producing
155 knowledge related to the effects of cancer treatment on their oral health related quality of
156 life?

157 **2. Identifying relevant studies**

158 The identification of relevant literature will consist of several combined approaches,
159 including searching electronic database, and reference list screening. Articles will be

160 accessed through five electronic databases: MEDLINE/PubMed, Scopus, Embase, Web
161 of Science, and PsychInfo. A librarian (MM) has created the search strategy; (Table 1) he
162 will lead citation management and assist with search documentation. The initial search
163 strategy has been piloted to verify breadth, comprehensiveness, and feasibility. This
164 search strategy will be adapted and applied to each database. We will review the
165 reference lists of included studies to identify relevant studies that were not identified in
166 the initial search.

167 **Table 1. Search Strategy**

Search Strategy
1. exp Antineoplastic Agents/ 2. exp Radiotherapy/ 3. exp Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation/ 4. exp Bone Marrow Transplantation/ 5. (antineoplastic or chemotherap* or radiotherap* or ((h?ematopoietic or bone marrow) adj3 (SCT or transplant*))).tw ,kw. 6. or/1-5 7. Oral Health/ or exp Dentistry/ or Halitosis/ or exp Stomatognathic Diseases/ or DMF Index/ or Periodontal Index/ 8. (dentist* or endodont* or orthodonti* or periodont* or prosthodont* or apicoectom* or gingivectom* or gingivoplast* or glossectom* or "mandibular advancement" or alveolectom* or alveoloplast* or vestibuloplast* or "root canal" or (oral adj1 (care or health or hygiene or surgical or surgery or mucositis)) or oropharyng* or temporomandibular or TMJ or jaw or jaws or mandibular or maxillofacial or mandible* or maxilla* or "alveolar ridge" or dental or

orthognathic or tooth or teeth or occlusion or malocclusion or mal-occlusion or odontolog* or tongue* or glossal or buccal or palatal or palate or palates or labial or lip or lips or gingiva* or gingiviti* or saliva* or DMF).tw,kw.

9. 7 or 8

10. "Quality of Life"/ or exp rehabilitation/ or exp eating/ or exp human activities/ or (rh or px).fs.

11. (quality of life or well-being or long-term or (daily adj1 (life or living)) or rehabilitat* or depress* or pain or immunosuppress* or "disease management" or "Child Oral Health Impact Profile" or C-DAS or CFSS-DS or COHRQoL or COHIP or CPQ or ECOHIS or FIS or OASIS or OHQoL or OHRQoL or QOL or P-CPQ or POQL or ("Early Childhood Oral Health Impact" or "Oral Aesthetic Subjective Impact" or "Corah Dental Anxiety" or "Family Impact") adj1 Scale) or "Children's Fear Survey Schedule" or (("Child" or "Parental-Caregiver") adj1 "Perceptions Questionnaire")).tw,kw.

12. 10 or 11

13. 6 and 9 and 12

14. limit 13 to "all child (0 to 18 years)"

15. exp Child/ or exp Pediatrics/

16. (infan* or toddler* or minors or boy? or boyhood or girl? or child* or schoolchild* or school child* or adolescen* or juvenil* or youth* or teen* or under*age* or p?ediatric*).tw,kf.

17. 15 or 16

18. 13 and 17

19. 14 or 18

20. limit 19 to (english or french)

168

169 **3. Selecting studies**

170 In this stage, all retained studies will be merged into a single Endnote library with
171 duplicated articles removed. The merged Endnote library will be imported into Rayyan
172 software (Qatar Computing Research Institute, QCRI) for screening. The study screening
173 and selection process will be conducted by two members of the research team (AS and
174 NA). The two reviewers will be calibrated: they will independently assess titles and
175 abstracts of the first 50 studies according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, after
176 which inter-rater reliability will be measured using Cohen's k coefficient. The calculated
177 coefficient will act as an indicator of whether reviewers understand and apply the
178 inclusion criteria consistently. If there is low agreement (<0.40), the reviewers will consult,
179 and, if needed, adjust or reword the eligibility criteria. This process will be repeated until
180 inter-rater agreement reaches substantial levels (>0.40).

181 Screening and selecting studies will then consist of 2 phases during which the reviewers
182 will assess study inclusion against a set of predefined eligibility criteria outlined in Table
183 2.

184 **Table 2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

Inclusion criteria	
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Data specific to children, 0-18yrs✓ Studies with adults who had cancer during childhood (0-18yrs)
Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ All types of cancer treatment interventions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Any type of childhood cancer ✓ Data specific to oral health complications from cancer treatment
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The outcome consists of any information related to quality of life and oral health related quality of life.
Study type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Any primary study type ✓ Publications between 2011 and 2021. ✓ English or French publications.
Exclusion criteria	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Studies involving a mixed sample of adults and children ✓ Studies in which the disease category was not well defined or defined as mixed diseases (e.g., studies that the child has both a cancer and a non-cancer disorder)

185

186 The first study selection phase includes the title and abstract screening of all identified
 187 documents. A third reviewer (OD) will assist in the selection process if the two primary
 188 reviewers cannot reach a consensus. Titles and abstracts that appear to meet the
 189 eligibility criteria will be retained. The second study selection phase consists of full-text
 190 review of studies that have been classified as potentially eligible during phase one. Each
 191 reviewer will review the full text of the selected articles and put their comments about the
 192 reason of including or excluding the study in Rayyan to be seen by other reviewers. Any
 193 disagreements concerning the eligibility of the articles will be solved through discussion
 194 between the reviewers with the appointment of a third reviewer if required. This stage will

195 include an iterative process, incorporating searching of the literature, refinement of
196 search strategies, and selection of articles.

197 **4. Charting the data**

198 Arksey and O'Malley's methodological framework suggests charting the data according to
199 central research themes. Thus, we will develop a data extraction tool in line with the
200 review's' objectives and corresponding research questions. We anticipate the data
201 extracted will include author, publication year, location of study, study design, age of
202 children, type of cancer, type of treatment, type of oral complications, OHRQoL
203 measurement tools and assessment strategies, the type of children's involvement in the
204 study, and findings related to the effect of cancer treatment on the oral health-related
205 quality of life of the children.

206 To ensure that all relevant data are extracted, the tool used for data extraction will be
207 reviewed by the two reviewers prior to implementation. Differences in the suggested
208 information included will be discussed between reviewers (if necessary, with a third
209 reviewer) in a meeting to reach agreement. Furthermore, to ensure the tool's utility,
210 consistency with the research questions and purpose and, the agreement level between
211 reviewers, it will be piloted on 10 articles by both reviewers and any needed modifications
212 will be implemented.

213 In the charting phase, reviewers will compare their extracted data. Inconsistencies and
214 disagreements will be discussed, reconsulting the respective documents and if
215 necessary, requesting support by a senior researcher of the team. Further, the tool will be
216 iteratively updated if necessary, during the study's full extraction process, with any
217 modifications detailed in the full scoping review report. Finally, throughout the process,

218 there will be weekly team meetings during which ambiguities, concerns or other issues
219 will be discussed.

220 **5. Collating, summarizing, and reporting findings**

221 The primary goal of a scoping review is to present a comprehensive summary of current
222 evidence and significant findings across various domains. [25] Therefore, the chosen
223 analytical approach will be descriptive and narrative, aligning with the study objectives.
224 We will follow the three steps outlined by Levac et al. [25] for this stage:

225 First, we will report the data using a descriptive numerical summary and thematic
226 analysis to describe the characteristics of the included studies. We will use a PRISMA-
227 ScR flow diagram, a version of PRISMA updated to include the literature found in
228 databases and grey literature found from other data sources to represent the process of
229 identification, inclusion, and retention of articles fulfilling all eligibility criteria (Fig 2). [26]
230 This diagram will aid replicability and transparency. The extent, scope and nature of
231 retained literature will be summarized descriptively using ranges and counts, presented in
232 graphs, charts, or tables according to our charting categories. This step will provide an
233 overview of existing evidence and research activity trends, as well as highlight potential
234 research gaps.[24]

235 **Figure 2: PRISMA-ScR flowchart**

236 Second, we will report the results specifically regarding the impact of cancer therapy on
237 the OHRQoL of children and their involvement in producing this knowledge in studies. We
238 will use graphs, charts, or tables where useful and provide an accompanying narrative
239 summary to highlight how the results are linked to the objectives and research questions
240 of this study.

241 Finally, we will identify the knowledge gaps and the broader implications for future
242 research, policy and practice.

243 **6. Consultation with relevant stakeholders**

244 While stakeholder consultation is considered optional in Arksey and O'Malley's
245 framework [24] we believe it will provide additional valuable insights into our findings and
246 opportunities for knowledge transfer in the field of pediatric oncology and pediatric
247 dentistry. Thus, we will proceed by convening health care professionals (e.g., oral health
248 professionals; oncological professionals) working for children surviving cancer, parents of
249 these children and preferably the children themselves. By consulting and sharing the
250 scoping study findings with these stakeholders and adding the experience of these
251 groups we can gain insights that can lead to improved study outcomes.

252 **Ethics**

253 For the initial review, ethical approval will not be required as there are no human
254 participants involved. We will seek ethical approval specifically for the Stakeholder
255 consultation; details will be determined after preliminary analysis is completed.

256 **Discussion**

257 In this scoping review, we aim to explore the impact of oral complications resulting from
258 cancer treatment on the quality of life of children who are going through or have survived
259 cancer. Our goal is to gain a better understanding of how these complications affect their
260 well-being and quality of life. Thus this review will update a previous literature review,
261 providing comprehensive information on the impacts of cancer treatment on the oral
262 health related quality of life of children undergoing cancer treatments by identifying,

263 synthesizing, and summarizing the reported literature in the past ten years. [9] Our
264 preliminary review suggests that in the past ten years, the literature has grown
265 substantially regarding children's OHRQoL. Moreover, as quality of life is a subjective
266 concept, we hypothesize we will find more children's direct involvement in reporting
267 consequences related to their OHRQoL. We also anticipate our review will show areas
268 that have been under-researched and may require further investigation and evaluation.

269 While the primary focus of treatment remains on combating cancer, mitigating the side
270 effects of treatment can contribute to enhancing the quality of life of pediatric cancer
271 survivors. Recognizing the influence of cancer treatment-related oral complications on
272 quality of life can assist healthcare professionals in providing more holistic care and
273 addressing the challenges faced by both patients and their families.

274 The results of this review will be shared through cancer and oral health conferences and
275 symposia to disseminate the knowledge. Additionally, the findings will be published and
276 shared with relevant stakeholders. The information extracted from this review will serve
277 as a foundation for a qualitative study, focusing on the impacts of oral health effects of
278 childhood cancer on quality of life, with a specific emphasis on gathering perspectives
279 from children themselves.

280 **Authors' contributions**

281 **Conceptualization:** Mary Ellen Macdonald, Apoorva Sharma, Nona Attaran

282 **Data curation:** Apoorva Sharma, Martin Morris, Nona Attaran, Olawale Dudubo, Mary
283 Ellen Macdonald

284 **Formal analysis:** Mary Ellen Macdonald, Apoorva Sharma, Nona Attaran,

285 **Investigation:** Nona Attaran, Apoorva Sharma, Martin Morris, Olawale Dudubo, Mary

286 Ellen Macdonald

287 **Methodology:** Martin Morris, Mary Ellen Macdonald, Apoorva Sharma, Nona Attaran

288 **Supervision:** Mary Ellen Macdonald, Martin Morris,

289 **Validation:** Mary Ellen Macdonald, Nona Attaran, Apoorva Sharma, Martin Morris,

290 Olawale Dudubo,

291 **Visualization:** Nona Attaran, Apoorva Sharma, Martin Morris, Olawale Dudubo, Mary

292 Ellen Macdonald

293 **Writing – original draft:** Nona Attaran, Mary Ellen Macdonald, Apoorva Sharma,

294 **Writing – review & editing:** Mary Ellen Macdonald, Nona Attaran, Apoorva Sharma,

295 Martin Morris, Olawale Dudubo,

296 **Acknowledgement**

297 **Supporting Information**


298 **S1. PRISMA-P 2015 checklist**

299 **References**

- 300 1. Steliarova-Foucher E, Colombet M, Ries LA, Moreno F, Dolya A, Bray F, et al.
301 International incidence of childhood cancer: a population-based registry study. *The Lancet*
302 *Oncology*. 2017;18(6):719-31.
- 303 2. Gupta S, Howard SC, Hunger SP, Antillon FG, Metzger ML, Israels T, et al. Treating
304 childhood cancer in low-and middle-income countries. *Cancer* Washington DC: The World Bank
305 Group. 2015:121-46.
- 306 3. Akyol H, Uysal K, Ören H. The incidence of oral complications in pediatric patients
307 receiving high dose chemotherapy. *Medical Pediatric Oncology*. 1997;29:442.
- 308 4. Jose M, Rajagopal V, Thankam FG. Oral tissue regeneration: Current status and future
309 perspectives. *Regenerated Organs*. 2021:169-87.
- 310 5. Mathur VP, Dhillon JK, Kalra G. Oral health in children with leukemia. *Indian Journal of*
311 *Palliative Care*. 2012;18(1):12.
- 312 6. Rawat N CS CV. Chemotherapy associated side effects among children with cancer.
313 *International Journal of Health Sciences and Research*. 2021;2(11):236-42.
- 314 7. Mouradian WE. The face of a child: children's oral health and dental education. *Journal of*
315 *Dental Education*. 2001;65(9):821-31.
- 316 8. Wilson-Genderson M, Broder HL, Phillips C. Concordance between caregiver and child
317 reports of children's oral health-related quality of life. *Community Dentistry and oral Epidemiology*.


- 318 2007;35:32-40.
- 319 9. Noronha C, Macdonald ME. Oral health issues and quality of life among pediatric cancer
320 survivors. *Treating Vulnerable Populations of Cancer Survivors: A Biopsychosocial Approach*:
321 Springer; 2016. p. 111-25.
- 322 10. General OotS. Report of the surgeon general's conference on children's mental health: a
323 national action agenda: Public Health Service, Health and Human Services Department; 2000.
- 324 11. Cheng K-f. Oral mucositis: a phenomenological study of pediatric patients' and their
325 parents' perspectives and experiences. *Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2009;17(7):829-37.
- 326 12. Noronha C. Impact on quality of life due to therapy-related oral complications in pediatric
327 cancer patients: a scoping review. Montreal: McGill University; 2012.
- 328 13. Deems DA, Doty RL, Settle RG, Moore-Gillon V, Shaman P, Mester AF, et al. Smell and
329 taste disorders, a study of 750 patients from the University of Pennsylvania smell and taste
330 center. *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*. 1991;117(5):519-28.
- 331 14. John M. Foundations of oral health-related quality of life. *Journal of Oral Rehabilitation*.
332 2021;3(48):355-9.
- 333 15. Petersen PE. The world oral health report 2003: continuous improvement of oral health in
334 the 21st century—the approach of the WHO global oral health programme. *Community Dentistry
335 and Oral Epidemiology*. 2003;(31):3-24.
- 336 16. Sischo L BH. Oral health-related quality of life: what, why, how, and future implications.
337 *Journal of Dental Research*. 2011;11(90):1264-70.
- 338 17. John M, Hujuel P, Miglioretti D, LeResche L, Koepsell T, Micheelis W. Dimensions of oral-
339 health-related quality of life. *Journal of Dental Research*. 2004;83(12):956-60.
- 340 18. Hinds PS, Brandon J, Allen C, Hijjiya N, Newsome R, Kane JR. Patient-reported outcomes
341 in end-of-life research in pediatric oncology. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*. 2007;32(9):1079-88.
- 342 19. Carnevale FA. A “Thick” conception of children’s voices: A hermeneutical framework for
343 childhood research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 2020;19:1609406920933767.
- 344 20. Resolution GA. Convention on the Rights of the Child. United Nations. 1990.
- 345 21. Marshman Z, Gupta E, Baker SR, Robinson PG, Owens J, Rodd HD, et al. Seen and
346 heard: towards child participation in dental research. *International journal of paediatric dentistry*.
347 2015;25(5):375-82.
- 348 22. Munn Z, Peters MD, Stern C, Tufanaru C, McArthur A, Aromataris E. Systematic review or
349 scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review
350 approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2018;18(1):1-7.
- 351 23. Peters M, Godfrey C, Mclnerney P, Soares C, Khalil H, Parker D. The Joanna Briggs
352 Institute reviewers' manual 2015: methodology for JBI scoping reviews. 2015.
- 353 24. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International
354 Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32.
- 355 25. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien K. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology, .
356 *Implementation Science*. 2010;5: 69.
- 357 26. Peters M, Godfrey C, Mclnerney P, Soares CB, Khalil H, Parker D. Methodology for JBI
358 scoping reviews. The Joanna Briggs institute reviewers manual 2015: Joanna Briggs Institute;
359 2015. p. 3-24.
- 360

Fig 1: Arksey and O'Malley's methodological framework [1]



Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32.

Fig 2. PRISMA-ScR flow diagram for the scoping review process. [1]



1. Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Soares C, Khalil H, Parker D. The Joanna Briggs Institute reviewers' manual 2015: methodology for JBI scoping reviews. 2015.