**Supplementary Table S3**. Summary of measurement properties for each PROM.

| PROM | Content validity | Structural validity | Internal consistency | Reliability | Criterion validity | Hypotheses testing |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | n | Result | n | Result | n | Result | n | Result | n | Result |
| Self-assessment Adherence Questionnaire Daouphars et al. (2013) |  |  |  | 46 | Cronbach’s alpha for overall tool: 0.55  |  |  | 39 | Medication possession ratio ≥ 90% was considered adherent: the specificity was 0.97 when the cut-off was 8 points  |  |  |
| Turkish-Version Oral Chemotherapy Adherence Scale (T-OCAS)Bagcivan & Akbayrak (2015) | Face validity with 30 patients; Content validity with 17 experts: 0.90 | 306 | EFA: 43% of the variance was explained by 3 factors  | 306 | Cronbach’s alpha for overall tool: 0.71  | 102 | Retested after 2-4 weeks: The Pearson correlation coefficient was 0.97 | 100 | Medication Adherence Self-Efficacy Scale r=0.32 |  |  |
| Measuring Adherence and Management of Side Effects in Patients Treated with CapecitabineBaudot et al. (2016) | Face validity with 15 patients; Content validity with 2 experts | 67 | The correlation coefficient between the items does not exceed 0.61 | 67 | The correlation coefficient between the items: 0.02-0.61 |  |  |  |  | 67 | A hypothesis was confirmed: no difference in the scores between breast and colon cancer patients  |
| Chinese-Version Oral Chemotherapy Adherence Scale (C-OCAS)Li, Sun & Dong (2018) | Face validity with 30 patients; Content validity with 5 experts: 0.93 | 201 | EFA: 65% of the variance was explained by 3 factors | 201 | Cronbach’s alpha for each subscale: 0.72-0.84  | 30 | Retested after 2 weeks: The Pearson correlation coefficient was 0.74 |  |  |  |  |
| Morisky Medication Adherence Scale-8 (MMAS-8)Qin et al. (2020) |  | 75 | EFA: 76% of the variance was explained by 3 factors | 75 | Cronbach’s alpha for overall tool: 0.79  | 22 | Retested after 1 week: The Spearman coefficient for each entry was 0.51-0.80 |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment Adherence Measure (TAM)Silveira et al. (2021) |  |  |  | 84 | Cronbach’s alpha for overall tool: 0.41  |  |  |  |  | 84 | A hypothesis was not confirmed: correlation 0.25 with a health-related quality of life scale; A hypothesis was confirmed: no correlation with a side effects scale |
| Adherence – Breast Endocrine Therapy Questionnaire (A-BET)Gambalunga et al. (2022) | Content validity index with patients: 1.00; Content validity with 12 experts: 1.00 |  |  | 82 | Cronbach’s alpha for overall tool: Not specific report, but said unacceptable | 40 | Retested after 7-10 days: The Spearman coefficient for each entry was 0.80-1.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Experience with andAdherence to Oral Antineoplastic Agents Scale (EXPAD-ANEO)Talens et al. (2023) | Face validity with 22 patients; Content validity with 8 experts | 268 | CFA: 2 factors; CFI=0.99 | 268 | Omega for each subscale: 0.60-0.70  |  | NR | 268 | A pill count of 90% or more was considered adherent: the specificity was 0.8 when the cut-off was 1 point  | 268 | A hypothesis was confirmed: a significant association with a medication adherence scale; A hypothesis was confirmed: no correlation with a health literacy scale |

 Note: Empty cell means no reported testing; n, sample size; EFA, exploratory factor analysis; CFA, confirmatory factor analysis; CFI, comparative fit index.