

Bilag

Bilag 1 – Søgestrategi

Søgning i EMBASE 23 Marts 2026

#	Query	Results from 23 Mar 2026
1	exp neoplasm/	7,348,580
2	(cancer* or tumor* or tumour* or neoplas*).ti,ab.	5,958,648
3	male/	14,312,241
4	male.ti,ab.	2,026,145
5	men.ti,ab.	1,006,059
6	man.ti,ab.	526,018
7	1 or 2	8,454,354
8	3 or 4 or 5 or 6	14,851,150
9	7 and 8	3,027,291
10	person centered care/	8,667
11	shared decision making/	25,439
12	patient centered communication/	553
13	communication skill/	23,643
14	("patient centered" or "patient centred" or "person centered" or "person centred" or "client centered" or "client centred").ti,ab.	82,340

15	("shared decision making" or SDM).ti,ab.	32,134
16	sexual counseling/	1,742
17	(sexual adj2 (counseling or conversation or discussion or communication or rehabilitation)).ti,ab.	4,254
18	(PLISSIT or EX-PLISSIT).ti,ab.	209
19	10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18	148,496
20	7 and 8 and 19	11,180
21	sexual dysfunction/	37,378
22	male sexual dysfunction/	3,326
23	exp sexual health/	29,260
24	("sexual health" or "sexual dysfunction*" or "sexual problem*" or "sexual issue*" or "sexual concern*" or "sexual well-being" or "sexual distress" or "sexual quality of life").ti,ab.	58,241
25	"International Index of Erectile Function"/	10,424
26	"sexual distress scale".ti,ab.	840
27	("International Index of Erectile Function" or IIEF).ti,ab.	13,238
28	"sexual function measure*".ti,ab.	155
29	21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 38	98,435
30	7 and 8 and 19 and 29	515

Søgning i PubMed 23 Marts 2026

#	Query	Results from 23 Mar 2026
1	"Male"[Mesh]	10,261,845
2	Men[Title/Abstract]	677,898
3	Man[Title/Abstract]	358,089
4	Male[Title/Abstract]	1,245,620
5	"Male"[Title/Abstract] OR "Man"[Title/Abstract] OR "Men"[Title/Abstract] OR "Male"[MeSH Terms]	10,765,205
6	"Neoplasms"[Mesh]	4,224,286
7	"cancer*" [Title/Abstract] OR "tumor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "tumour*" [Title/Abstract] OR "neoplas*" [Title/Abstract]	4,201,018
8	"Neoplasms"[MeSH Terms] OR "cancer*" [Title/Abstract] OR "tumor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "tumour*" [Title/Abstract] OR "neoplas*" [Title/Abstract]	5,582,797
9	("Male"[Title/Abstract] OR "Man"[Title/Abstract] OR "Men"[Title/Abstract] OR "Male"[MeSH Terms]) AND ("Neoplasms"[MeSH Terms] OR ("cancer*" [Title/Abstract] OR "tumor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "tumour*" [Title/Abstract] OR "neoplas*" [Title/Abstract]))	1,851,168
10	"Patient-Centered Care"[MeSH Terms]	27,715
11	"decision making, shared"[MeSH Terms]	3,267
12	"Sex Counseling"[MeSH Terms]	927

13	"patient centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "patient centred"[Title/Abstract] OR "person centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "person centred"[Title/Abstract] OR "client centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "client centred"[Title/Abstract]	65,733
14	"shared decision making"[Title/Abstract] OR "SDM"[Title/Abstract]	24,309
15	"sexual"[Title/Abstract] AND ("counseling"[Title/Abstract] OR "counselling"[Title/Abstract] OR "conversation"[Title/Abstract] OR "discussion"[Title/Abstract] OR "communication"[Title/Abstract] OR "rehabilitation"[Title/Abstract])	26,549
16	"PLISSIT"[Title/Abstract] OR "EX-PLISSIT"[Title/Abstract]	112
17	"Patient-Centered Care"[MeSH Terms] OR "decision making, shared"[MeSH Terms] OR "Sex Counseling"[MeSH Terms] OR ("patient centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "patient centred"[Title/Abstract] OR "person centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "person centred"[Title/Abstract] OR "client centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "client centred"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("shared decision making"[Title/Abstract] OR "SDM"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("sexual"[Title/Abstract] AND ("counseling"[Title/Abstract] OR "counselling"[Title/Abstract] OR "conversation"[Title/Abstract] OR "discussion"[Title/Abstract] OR "communication"[Title/Abstract] OR "rehabilitation"[Title/Abstract])) OR ("PLISSIT"[Title/Abstract] OR "EX-PLISSIT"[Title/Abstract])	127,236

18	<p>("Male"[Title/Abstract] OR "Man"[Title/Abstract] OR "Men"[Title/Abstract] OR "Male"[MeSH Terms]) AND ("Neoplasms"[MeSH Terms] OR ("cancer*" [Title/Abstract] OR "tumor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "tumour*" [Title/Abstract] OR "neoplas*" [Title/Abstract])) AND ("Patient-Centered Care"[MeSH Terms] OR "decision making, shared"[MeSH Terms] OR "Sex Counseling"[MeSH Terms] OR ("patient centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "patient centred"[Title/Abstract] OR "person centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "person centred"[Title/Abstract] OR "client centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "client centred"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("shared decision making"[Title/Abstract] OR "SDM"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("sexual"[Title/Abstract] AND ("counseling"[Title/Abstract] OR "counselling"[Title/Abstract] OR "conversation"[Title/Abstract] OR "discussion"[Title/Abstract] OR "communication"[Title/Abstract] OR "rehabilitation"[Title/Abstract])) OR ("PLISSIT"[Title/Abstract] OR "EX-PLISSIT"[Title/Abstract]))</p>	5,874
19	"Sexual Health"[MeSH Terms]	3,945
20	"sexual health"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual dysfunction*" [Title/Abstract] OR "sexual problem*" [Title/Abstract] OR "sexual concern*" [Title/Abstract] OR "sexual well-being"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual distress"[Title/Abstract]	36,432
21	"sexual distress scale"[Title/Abstract]	412
22	"International Index of Erectile Function"[Title/Abstract] OR "IIEF"[Title/Abstract]	6,156

23	"sexual function measure*"[Title/Abstract]	29
24	<p>"Sexual Health"[MeSH Terms] OR "Sexual Health"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual dysfunction*"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual problem*"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual concern*"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual well-being"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual distress"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual distress scale"[Title/Abstract] OR "International Index of Erectile Function"[Title/Abstract] OR "IIEF"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual function measure*"[Title/Abstract]</p>	42,330
25	<p>("Male"[Title/Abstract] OR "Man"[Title/Abstract] OR "Men"[Title/Abstract] OR "Male"[MeSH Terms]) AND ("Neoplasms"[MeSH Terms] OR ("cancer*"[Title/Abstract] OR "tumor*"[Title/Abstract] OR "tumour*"[Title/Abstract] OR "neoplas*"[Title/Abstract])) AND ("Patient-Centered Care"[MeSH Terms] OR "decision making, shared"[MeSH Terms] OR "Sex Counseling"[MeSH Terms] OR ("patient centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "patient centred"[Title/Abstract] OR "person centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "person centred"[Title/Abstract] OR "client centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "client centred"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("shared decision making"[Title/Abstract] OR "SDM"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("sexual"[Title/Abstract] AND ("counseling"[Title/Abstract] OR "counselling"[Title/Abstract] OR "conversation"[Title/Abstract] OR "discussion"[Title/Abstract] OR "communication"[Title/Abstract] OR "rehabilitation"[Title/Abstract])) OR ("PLISSIT"[Title/Abstract] OR "EX-PLISSIT"[Title/Abstract])) AND ("Sexual Health"[MeSH</p>	592

Terms] OR ("Sexual Health"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual dysfunction*"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual problem*"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual concern*"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual well-being"[Title/Abstract] OR "sexual distress"[Title/Abstract]) OR "sexual distress scale"[Title/Abstract] OR ("International Index of Erectile Function"[Title/Abstract] OR "IIEF"[Title/Abstract]) OR "sexual function measure*"[Title/Abstract])	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Søgning i Cinahl 23 Marts 2026

#	Query	Results from 23 Mar 2026
1	MH "Men"	8,146
2	XB (male or men or man)	517,851
3	S1 OR S2	519,057
4	MH "Neoplasms+"	696,448
5	XB (cancer or neoplasm* or tumor* or tumour*)	693,330
6	S4 OR S5	945,086
7	S3 AND S6	68,793
8	MH "Patient Centered Care"	43,737
9	MH "Decision Making, Shared"	6,259
10	MH "Communication Skills"	11,979
11	MH "Sexual Counseling"	890

12	XB ("patient centered" or "patient centred" or "person centered" or "person centred" or "client centered" or "client centred")	34,818
13	XB ("shared decision making" or SDM)	10,207
14	XB (sexual N2 (counseling OR counselling OR conversation OR discussion OR communication OR rehabilitation))	2,336
15	XB (PLISSIT or EX-PLISSIT)	114
16	S8 OR S9 OR S10 OR S11 OR S12 OR S13 OR S14 OR S15	88,958
17	S3 AND S6 AND S16	548
18	MH "Sexual Dysfunction, Male"	2,260
19	MH "Sexual Health"	10,666
20	XB ("sexual health" or "sexual dysfunction*" or "sexual problem*" or "sexual concern*" or "sexual well-being" or "sexual distress")	15,631
21	XB ("sexual distress scale")	104
22	XB ("International Index of Erectile Function" or IIEF)	705
23	XB ("sexual function measure*")	15
24	S18 OR S19 OR S20 OR S21 OR S22 OR S23	23,291
25	S3 AND S6 AND S16 AND S24	77

Bilag 2 – Kvalitetsvurdering med AMSTAR 2

AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both

<p>1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?</p>		
<p>For Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intervention <input type="checkbox"/> Comparator group <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcome 	<p>Optional (recommended)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</p>		
<p>For Partial Yes: The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> review question(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> inclusion/exclusion criteria <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a risk of bias assessment 	<p>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> a plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> justification for any deviations from the protocol 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</p>		
<p>For Yes, the review should satisfy ONE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Explanation for including only RCTs</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>OR Explanation for including only NRSI</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>OR Explanation for including both RCTs and NRSI</i> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</p>		
<p>For Partial Yes (all the following):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> searched at least 2 databases (relevant to research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> provided key word and/or search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> justified publication restrictions (e.g. language) 	<p>For Yes, should also have (all the following):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> searched the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> searched trial/study registries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> included/consulted content experts in the field <input type="checkbox"/> where relevant, searched for grey literature <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?</p>		
<p>For Yes, either ONE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include <input type="checkbox"/> OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both

<p>6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?</p> <p>For Yes, either ONE of the following:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>		
<p>7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</p> <p>For Partial Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review</p> <p>For Yes, must also have: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>		
<p>8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</p> <p>For Partial Yes (ALL the following):</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> described populations</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> described interventions</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> described comparators</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> described outcomes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> described research designs</p> <p>For Yes, should also have ALL the following:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> described population in detail</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> described intervention in detail (including doses where relevant)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> described comparator in detail (including doses where relevant)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> described study's setting</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> timeframe for follow-up</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>		
<p>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</p> <p>RCTs</p> <p>For Partial Yes, must have assessed RoB from</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unconcealed allocation, <i>and</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> lack of blinding of patients and assessors when assessing outcomes (unnecessary for objective outcomes such as all-cause mortality)</p> <p>For Yes, must also have assessed RoB from:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> allocation sequence that was not truly random, <i>and</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Includes only NRSI</p>		
<p>NRSI</p> <p>For Partial Yes, must have assessed RoB:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> from confounding, <i>and</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> from selection bias</p> <p>For Yes, must also have assessed RoB:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes, <i>and</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Includes only RCTs</p>		
<p>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review. Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors also qualifies</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>		

AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both

<p>11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</p>	
<p>RCTs For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> AND they used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present. <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> AND investigated the causes of any heterogeneity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No meta-analysis conducted</p>	
<p>For NRSI For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> AND they used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results, adjusting for heterogeneity if present <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No meta-analysis conducted</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review</p>	
<p>12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p>	
<p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> included only low risk of bias RCTs <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect. <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No meta-analysis conducted</p>	
<p>13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?</p>	
<p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> included only low risk of bias RCTs <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p>	
<p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p>	
<p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No meta-analysis conducted</p>	

AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both

16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?

For Yes:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The authors reported no competing interests OR | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest | <input type="checkbox"/> No |