

Evidence-based health information about pulmonary embolism: assessing the quality, usability and readability of online and offline patient information

Anja Kalch, Aliscia Albani, Constanze Kuchler, Helena Bilandzic, Simone Fischer, Inge Kirchberger

Angaben zur Veröffentlichung / Publication details:

Kalch, Anja, Aliscia Albani, Constanze Kuchler, Helena Bilandzic, Simone Fischer, and Inge Kirchberger. 2022. "Evidence-based health information about pulmonary embolism: assessing the quality, usability and readability of online and offline patient information." *PEC Innovation* 1: 100103.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecinn.2022.100103>.



Evidence-based health information about pulmonary embolism: Assessing the quality, usability and readability of online and offline patient information



Anja Kalch^{a,*}, Aliscia Albani^a, Constanze K uchler^a, Helena Bilandzic^a, Simone Fischer^{b,c}, Inge Kirchberger^{b,c}

^a Department for Media, Knowledge and Communication, University of Augsburg, Universit atsstra e 10 86159, Augsburg, Germany

^b Epidemiology, Medical Faculty, University of Augsburg, Augsburg, Germany

^c Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry and Epidemiology (IBE), LMU M unchen, Munich, Germany

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Pulmonary embolism
Patient information brochures
Informed decision making
Health information
Patient information

ABSTRACT

Objective: Pulmonary embolism (PE) is the third most common cardiovascular disease worldwide. However, public awareness is considerably lower than for myocardial infarction or stroke. Patients suffering from PE complain about the lack of (understandable) information and express high informational needs. To uncover if reliable information is indeed scarce, this study evaluates the quantity and quality of existing patient information for tertiary prevention using an evidence-based health information paradigm.

Methods: We conducted a quantitative content analysis ($n = 21$ patient information brochures; $n = 67$ websites) evaluating content categories addressed, methodical quality, usability, and readability.

Results: Results show that there is not enough patient information material focusing on PE as a main topic. Existing patient information material is mostly incomplete, difficult to understand, and low in actionability as well as readability.

Conclusion: Our systematic analysis reveals the need for more high-quality patient information on PE as part of effective tertiary prevention.

Innovation: This is the first review analyzing content, methodical quality, readability, and usability of patient information on PE. The findings of this analysis are guiding the development of an innovative, evidence-based patient information on PE aiming to support patients' informational needs and their self-care behavior.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Quantitative content analysis of patient information on pulmonary embolism
- Pulmonary embolism is hardly addressed as a main topic in information material
- Content on patients' experiences and consequences of pulmonary embolism on social and financial aspects is missing
- A minority of patient information is understandable, none is actionable, and the reading levels are above standard
- High-quality information must be developed with patients, integrating evidence-based criteria and patients' needs

1. Introduction

Public awareness about cardiovascular diseases is focused on myocardial infarction or stroke, while pulmonary embolism (PE) as the third most frequent acute heart-related disease worldwide receives less attention [1,2]. This is surprising given increasing incidence rates in high-income countries [3,4], high early mortality rates [5], and long-term physical [6] and psychological health consequences [7,8,9,10]. In Germany, women tend to suffer more often from PE than men [11,12], and the risk for PE

increases with age [12]. While clinical practice for the treatment of PE has improved continuously [13] and fulfills patients' needs regarding medical care in hospital [14], patients still feel left alone and not prepared for the physical and psychological consequences after experiencing PE [7,9,14].

Qualitative research already shows that patients suffering from PE express high informational needs during as well as after their hospital stay [9,10]. Particularly information about self-care behavior, long-term health effects as well as psychological problems are in demand [7,8,10]. To deal

* Corresponding author at: Department for Media, Knowledge and Communication, University of Augsburg, Universit atsstra e 10 86159, Augsburg, Germany.
E-mail address: anja.kalch@phil.uni-augsburg.de (A. Kalch).

with the information deficit, patients search for health information online; however, search results are often described as unhelpful, scary, upsetting or distressing [7,8,10]. These negative search experiences may be an indicator for the scarcity of available information and a low quality or usability. While deficits in available patient information on PE are likely to reduce information usage and self-management of the disease, high quality patient information is essential for patients' self-care behavior [15,16,17,18].

Especially patients with lower health literacy [19,20] and older patients, which are the majority of PE patients [12,21], regularly struggle with searching and accessing (online) health information [22]. Therefore, providing patients with information should be a key point in the health care process, e.g., by handing out printed information before hospital discharge [14]. Accordingly, easily accessible information is required that 1) addresses relevant contents, 2) is of high methodical quality and 3) is usable and 4) readable for patients with different health literacy levels [15].

These four evaluation dimensions (see table 1) are independent but related aspects of patient information. The evaluation of content categories detects the scope of information material, potential deficits, and helps to decide whether existing patient information has the potential to fulfill informational needs of patients [15,17]. However, two aspects are not considered in existing assessment instruments that are exceptionally relevant for PE patients: causes of PE and patient narratives. Results from qualitative research with PE patients show that uncertainties about the cause are an important aspect of patients' anxieties [8,9]. Further, given the complex informational needs of PE patients, a combination of factual information and patient narratives seems promising [23,24,25]. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses indicate that patient narratives have various beneficial effects on patients, by e.g. enhancing recall and engagement with health information [26,27], providing emotional support and role models [27], or increasing intentions for different types of health behavior [28,29]. However, the use of narratives in patient information is discussed controversially due to their lack of neutrality [30]. Yet, it may be particularly relevant for PE patients to provide role models and emotional support, considering the impairments with daily life activities as well as persistent worries and distress [8,9].

The methodical quality of patient information covers the reliability of health information, assessing among others whether the information is biased, accurate and evidence-based [16,31]. The demands of patient information on health-literacy are reflected in its usability and readability [15]. The usability of patient information typically refers to two aspects: understandability and actionability. Patient education material is considered as understandable when "consumers of diverse backgrounds and varying levels of health literacy can process and explain key messages" [32, p. 1]. Actionability reflects whether the material recommends concrete actions for patients [32]. The readability of patient information is typically considered as a prerequisite for its usability [33]. If reading difficulty is too high, particularly patients with moderate or lower levels are not able to use the information to their advantages [15].

While several studies have evaluated the quality, usability, or readability of online and offline patient information on other cardiovascular diseases, e.g., stroke [34], heart failure [15,17,35,36], cardiovascular risks [37],

cardiovascular prevention [38], none has addressed PE. Therefore, this study evaluates all four evaluation dimensions of PE patient information.

2. Methods

2.1. Sample

Based on systematic research, we included a total of 21 brochures and 67 websites (fig. 1). Materials had to be written in German, be printable (online audiovisual information was excluded) and available free of charge, address patients (and not medical experts), and cover PE as a main or side topic.

For the sample of brochures, we contacted twelve German health institutions (10 health insurances, Ärztliches Zentrum für Qualität in der Medizin – ÄZQ, and Bundeszentrale für gesundheitliche Aufklärung – BZgA) by e-mail. Eleven answered but could not provide print-materials. Additionally, we searched Google using the search terms *PE brochure* and *PE flyer* and included hits on the first ten pages (eliminating duplicates). The sample of websites was based on a list of typical online patient information material providers by ÄZQ [39]. ÄZQ is a German competence center, offering information services on e.g., patient information. The list includes e.g., health websites, two search engines (www.google.de – first 10 pages – and www.medinfo.de), and a medical link dictionary (www.best-med-link.de). We searched all providers on the list with the search term *pulmonary embolism* (see appendix for the full website sample).

2.2. Procedure

We conducted a quantitative content analysis to assess all brochures and websites. We used the established and tested coding instructions for Check-In and PEMAT-P. We derived coding instructions for the content categories from the guideline for evidence-based health information (GEHI) [30]. After familiarizing with all measures, two trained coders independently coded all materials using excel-sheets. During coding, coders discussed differences and agreed upon a final coding. We calculated Cohen's kappa (κ) and Holsti's method (CR) for inter-coder reliability. Flesch-Reading-Ease-Score was calculated separately.

2.3. Measures

2.3.1. Content categories

14 items (fig. 2) assessed content categories based on GEHI [30]. These include information about diagnosis, risk of disease, prognosis, treatment options, medical, psychosocial, and financial consequences [30,40]. We coded all items dichotomously (0 = *criterion not met*, 1 = *criterion met*) and computed a sum index. We reached substantial inter-rater reliability [41] for the content assessment of the brochures ($\kappa = .78$, CR = .95) and websites ($\kappa = .70$, CR = .94).

We added two extra content categories to the existing 14: causes of PE and existence of patient narratives (16 content items in total). Causes were coded (same coding instructions as above) when the material mentioned how PE occurs, e.g., by a blood clot lodging in the lung. Patient narratives were coded when insights into patients' individual experiences were given from the perspective of a patient.

2.3.2. Assessment of methodical quality

Methodical quality was assessed with the Check-In instrument [31], a revised version of DISCERN [16]. In contrast to DISCERN, which sometimes shows low inter-rater agreements for non-medical coders [42], the Check-In instrument fits to this target group. The instrument includes 28 items (6 only for online information). Items cover six quality dimensions: (1) scope and purpose, (2) involvement of stakeholders, (3) accuracy of development, (4) editorial independence, (5) clarity and design, (6) web-specific features. Coders rated all 28 items (fig. 2) dichotomously (0 = *item not fulfilled*, 1 = *item fulfilled*). Patient material is considered suitable for usage when it fulfills *mandatory items* (fig. 3) as well as the *majority of*

Table 1
Four assessment dimensions.

Assessment dimension	Definition
Content categories	This dimension assesses different categories of contents that are addressed in patient information material. The categories determine the (content-related) scope and relevance of the patient material.
Methodical quality	This dimension determines how reliable the patient information is. It mainly focuses on the accuracy of the provided information and development process.
Usability	This dimension encompasses how understandable the patient information is and how easy it is to act on suggested actions.
Readability	This dimension assesses the readability based on the sentence structure of patient information material.




Fig. 1. Study flow diagram of brochures (left) and websites (right).
 Note. PE = pulmonary embolism

the items [see 31 for details]. In case the criteria majority of items is fulfilled, but the mandatory items are not fulfilled, the material is recommended as background information [31]. Inter-rater reliability is high for brochures ($\kappa = .83$, CR = .94), and almost substantial for websites ($\kappa = .59$, CR = .93).

2.3.3. Assessment of usability

The Patient Education Materials Assessment Tool for Print Material (PEMAT-P) [32] was used to assess understandability (17 items) and actionability (7 items, fig. 4). Again, items were coded dichotomously (0 = criterion not fulfilled, 1 = criterion fulfilled). There is some overlap with individual items of the PEMAT-P and the Check-In instrument. However, the entirety of the PEMAT-P evaluates the usability, while the Check-In instrument focuses on methodical quality. Patient material is considered 1) understandable and 2) actionable according to PEMAT-P if it meets at least 70 % of the criteria [43]. Reliability for understandability of brochures is good ($\kappa = .76$, CR = .90) and moderate for websites ($\kappa = .56$, CR = .87). Reliability for actionability is very good for brochures ($\kappa = .81$, CR = .95) and substantial for websites ($\kappa = .77$, CR = .78).

2.3.4. Assessment of readability

We calculated the Flesch-Reading-Ease-Score (FRES) using an online Flesch-index calculator for German language [44], which is based on the adaption of FRES [45] for German language by Amstad [46]. Scores range from 0 to 100, where seven different score intervals translate to readability, e.g., 0 – 29 very difficult, 30 – 49 difficult or 90 – 100 very easy [47].

3. Results

The most common editors of the brochures were associations, foundations, or patient organizations (42.86 %, $n = 9$), followed by pharmaceutical and medical technology companies (33.33 %, $n = 7$), and medical doctors or clinics (23.81 %, $n = 5$). For the websites, the three most common editors were ad-supported websites 28.36 % ($n = 19$), followed by associations, foundations, or patient organizations (26.87 %, $n = 18$), and medical doctors or clinics (25.37 %, $n = 17$, see table 2 for a full overview of the editors). Among this last editor type was one health insurance company.




Fig. 2. Quality criteria for online and offline patient information according to the guidelines for evidence-based health information (GEHI).
 Note. *brochures and websites differ at the $p < .005$ level, using chi-square tests.




Fig. 3. Percentages of Check-In items for brochures and websites. Note. IN = only applicable to web sources; ^a = obligatory items for recommending the material, ^b = option item not applicable, * = brochures and websites differ at the $p < .005$ level, using chi-square tests

3.1. Content categories

Only two brochures addressed PE as main topic, while all other brochures focus on topics like deep vein thrombosis or anticoagulants (90.48 %, see table 3). Unlike brochures, 56 (83.58 %) websites treat PE as a main topic.

Only one brochure and three websites cover more than 50 % of the content categories. On average, brochures cover more contents ($M = 35.37$ %, $SD = 17.42$ %, $n = 21$) than websites ($M = 27.61$ %, $SD = 15.38$ %, $n = 67$), $t(86) = 1.96$, $p = .054$, but there are no significant differences between editor types, $F(4,83) = 1.00$, $p = .413$.

Most brochures and websites provide medical facts about *treatment options* or *diagnosis* (fig. 2). Particularly, topics that are relevant for daily life are rarely addressed, e.g., *patient-oriented outcomes* (I7) or *financial consequences* (I12b). Differences between print materials and websites are visible in two dimensions: While only about one third of the websites

(32.84 %, $n = 22$) covers *medical consequences* (I12a), most brochures (80.95 %, $n = 17$, $\chi^2(1) = 15.00$, $p < .001$) do so. Similarly, 52.38 % ($n = 11$) of the brochures address *psycho-social consequences* (I12c), but only 10.45 % of the websites do so ($n = 7$, $\chi^2(1) = 17.28$, Fisher's exact test $p < .000$).

Regarding narratives, the analysis shows that only one brochure and none of the websites contain *patient narratives* (I16). The second extra content category, *causes of PE* (I3), was fulfilled by most brochures (85,71%, $n = 18$) and websites (97,01%, $n = 65$, $\chi^2(1) = 3.81$, Fisher's exact test $p = .086$).

3.2. Methodical quality of patient information

On average, offline information meet one third of the methodical quality dimensions ($M = 34.66$ %, $SD = 13.68$ %, $n = 21$), whereas websites only meet one fourth of them ($M = 24.17$ %, $SD = 12.62$ %, $n = 67$), $t(86) = 2.15$, $p = .034$.




Fig. 4. Percentages of PEMAT-P items for brochures and websites
 Note. ^a option item not applicable, * brochures and websites differ at the $p < .005$ level, using chi-square tests.

$n = 67$), $t(86) = 3.26, p = .002$. According to the overall assessment, none of the materials is fully suitable and only two brochures and two websites qualify as background information. There are no differences in the overall score of methodical quality between the editor types, $F(4,83) = 0.58, p = .680$.

Most of the brochures present their scope and purpose well: They describe the *aim of the information material* (CI1: 90.48 %, $n = 19$, fig. 3)

Table 2
 Editor types for brochures and websites.

Editor type	Brochures in % (n)	Websites in % (n)
Associations, foundations, or patient organizations	42.86 (9)	26.87 (18)
Pharmaceutical and medical technology companies	33.33 (7)	10.45 (7)
Medical doctors or clinics	23.81 (5)	25.37 (17)
Add-supported websites	.	28.36 (19)
Other	.	8.96 (6)
Total	100 (21)	100 (67)

and clearly *address the target group* (CI2: 80.95 %, $n = 17$), while most of the websites fail to do so (CI1: 26.87 %, $n = 18, \chi^2(1) = 26.55, p < .001$ CI2: 1.49 %, $n = 1, \chi^2(1) = 62.04$, Fisher's exact test $p < .001$). The websites performed best on some of the items that are specific for online material (IN24, IN 25 and IN28). There are some items that were neither met by any brochure nor website, e.g., a *date for the next revision* (CI10) or a *validity note* (CI9).

Table 3
 Overview PE brochures and websites.

Topic	Frequency of brochures in % (n)	Frequency of websites in % (n)
PE as main topic	9.52 (2)	83.58 (56)
Thrombosis in general and PE as sub-topic	61.90 (13)	14.93 (10)
Anticoagulants and PE as sub-topic	28.57 (6)	1.49 (1)
Total	100 (21)	100 (67)

3.3. Usability assessment

Results for the PEMAT-P show a mean score for understandability of $M = 58.98\%$ for the brochures ($SD = 18.52\%$, $n = 21$, $\max = 93.75\%$, $\min = 14.29\%$) and $M = 63.08\%$ for the websites ($SD = 13.43\%$, $n = 67$, $\max = 93.75\%$, $\min = 30.77\%$), with no differences between both types of information, $t(86) = -1.11$, $p = .270$. There was however a significant difference between the editor types, $F(4,83) = 2.71$, $p = .035$. Games-Howell post-hoc tests reveal that ad-supported websites ($M = 69.30\%$, $SD = 13.24\%$, $n = 19$) show a higher understandability than information from medical doctors or clinics ($M = 55.37\%$, $SD = 13.75\%$, $n = 21$), $p = .019$. Only four brochures and 19 websites fulfill more than 70 % of the requirements and are understandable, according to the PEMAT-P instrument [34].

Over 70 % of the brochures and websites do not expect users to perform calculations (U7) and have informative headers (U9, fig. 4). Most of the brochures also make their purpose completely evident (U1) however, this criterion is only addressed by a minority of the websites (16.42 %, $n = 11$, $\chi^2(1) = 39.03$, $p < .001$). On the contrary, more websites (92.54 %, $n = 62$) than brochures (71.43 %, $n = 15$) do not include distracting information (U2; $\chi^2(1) = 6.51$, Fisher's exact test $p = .019$). A summary of the key points is rarely provided (U11).

Actionability is rather low on all dimensions with no significant differences between websites ($M = 11.74\%$, $SD = 20.00\%$, $\max = 66.67\%$, $\min = 0\%$) and brochures ($M = 17.30\%$, $SD = 21.36\%$, $\max = 60.00\%$, $\min = 0\%$), or editor types, $F(4,83) = 0.84$, $p = .501$. None of the information materials reach the requirements for actionability by fulfilling at least 70 % of the items [34]. Only about 47.62 % of the brochures and 28.36 % of the websites at least describe one action patients may take (A20). Information on tangible tools for actions (A23), and visual aids to act on instructions (A26) are missing.

3.4. Readability assessment

The Flesch-Reading-Ease-Score (FRES) shows different results for brochures and websites. While most of the brochures are difficult to read ($M = 1.05$, $SD = 0.38$, $n = 21$), most of the websites performed even worse and are categorized very difficult or difficult to read ($M = 0.81$, $SD = 0.53$, $n = 67$, $t(45.93) = 2.28$, $p = .027$, fig. 5). Editor types differ regarding readability, $F(4,83) = 3.34$, $p = .014$: pharmaceutical and technology companies provide material that is easier to read ($M = 1.07$, $SD = 0.26$, $n = 15$) than material from medical doctors or clinics ($M = 0.57$, $SD = 0.51$, $n = 21$), $p = .005$.

4. Discussion and conclusion

4.1. Discussion

Given long-term health consequences and high informational needs of patients after acute PE, patient information is essential to support the self-care behavior of patients. Overall, the quality of all evaluated patient information




Fig. 5. Percentages of FRES levels for brochures and websites

is rather low. This is in line with empirical results on patient information regarding other cardiovascular diseases [15,34,35,38,48] or cancer [49].

In terms of content categories, findings show that hardly any brochure and only half of the websites address PE as a main topic. This is consistent with the perceived lack of information patients reported in qualitative studies [8,9,10]. Specifically, effects of PE on daily life (e.g., financial or psychosocial consequences) are rather scarce. This is also reflected by the absence of patient narratives that are only included in one case. This focus on general medical facts and negligence of daily life information echoes results by Lee et al. [17] for online heart failure information.

In line with the limited coverage of content categories, the methodical quality is also rather low, including some criteria that are not addressed once. Therefore, only two brochures and two websites qualify as background information, while none is fully suitable.

In terms of understandability, less than a third of the websites and one fifth of the brochures turned out to be understandable, while none of the cases can be considered actionable regarding the PEMAT-P recommendation [43]. These results are comparable with information about heart failure [15,17] as well as online decision aids for cardiovascular disease prevention [38]. Decision aids for primary cardiovascular disease prevention were evaluated slightly better in terms of understandability [38]. It is possible that such primary prevention measures are more easily described in a usable manner, compared to PE or heart failure information that addresses tertiary prevention needs.

Regarding readability, none of the materials provided information on a standard reading level. This is consistent with several empirical studies analyzing the reading level of online patient information on cardiovascular diseases [15,34,35,48]. Especially patients with moderate or lower levels of health literacy may have difficulties to understand the information. Given that, lower health literacy is also related to higher cardiovascular risks [50] there is a strong need to provide easily readable patient information [48].

To deal with the problem of limited access to relevant, high-quality, readable, and usable patient information, Waring et al. [51] recommend clinicians to directly refer patients hospitalized for acute coronary symptoms to evidence-based online sources. However, this presupposes that such sources exist. Given that neither of the evaluated materials performed well on all dimensions, the priority is to develop high-quality and usable patient information that is understandable for patients with different health literacy levels.

A limitation of our results is that we only included text-based online and offline information. Other formats like documentations, short videos, or podcasts were not considered. Written information material has the advantage, that it may be easily integrated in the professional care process (e.g., by handing out a brochure to patients before hospital release) and that it may be used by patients of all age-groups. Even if online health information becomes more and more popular for older patients, there is still a relevant group of older patients that do not use the internet for health information search, making video clips or podcasts not available for them [52]. In addition, older patients are often faced with barriers when using online information alone [22]. Given that the likelihood to suffer from PE increases with age, printed information material seems to be of high relevance for that age group.

However, some patients might prefer content that is not text-based for several reasons, or just read, watch, and listen to anything related to the topic they can find. Especially audiovisual online-content (e.g., short TikTok-videos) becomes more and more popular for various health topics [53,54] and may provide patients with more easily accessible material on PE. This may be relevant for patients with lower health literacy [55], or younger patients [53] and should therefore be investigated in future research [17].

Related to this, our focus was on information material edited by different health institutions but not by users themselves. We chose this type of information since this has the potential to fulfill evidence-based criteria in more detail. However, user generated online information in social media

may be a relevant source for PE-patients, in particular younger age groups, to gain peer support and should be evaluated in future research, too.

Furthermore, our analysis is restricted to German information. Thus, we cannot make any general conclusions about PE patient information in other countries and languages. While European Guidelines [13] aim to ensure comparable levels of acute hospital care in European countries, the availability of patient information may differ depending on how institutionalized and therefore quality-controlled the distribution of patient information is. However, given the comparable results to other types of cardiovascular diseases, which are from a variety of countries, it seems likely that high-quality, evidence-based health information is rare, even across different countries. Future studies should address this aspect and compare patient information on PE in different countries.

In addition, we focused on material addressing PE as main topic. However, patients often suffer from comorbidities [12] such as in-hospital surgery, arterial hypertension, deep venous thrombosis, heart failure, cancer, or diabetes mellitus [11]. Future studies should include patient information on typical comorbidities and examine whether they refer to PE as well.

Lastly, we included text-based online and offline information in our study. Although both are text-based, they differ in their design possibilities. Websites are infinitely editable, can display multimedia or audiovisual formats, and offer the possibility to in-depth information presentation through hyperlinks. Brochures are finite and limited in space. Therefore, online, and offline information material might serve different needs of patients [49], which should be addressed in further studies.

4.2. Innovation

This content analysis systematically evaluated existing patient information on PE based on dimensions relevant for patients. Patient information about PE is essential for self-management behavior after hospital release, however, to our knowledge, patient information on this topic has not yet been systematically analyzed.

We combined four unique but related assessment dimensions: content categories, methodical quality, usability, and readability of online and offline patient information. While often empirical studies focus on one or two of the categories, a combination of all four evaluation dimensions delivers an extensive and patient-oriented perspective on existing information. The combination of evaluative dimensions indicates that deficits of existing patient information are not limited to weaknesses on a single

dimension, but manifest on multiple dimensions. We therefore argue that a systematic development of patient information must more strictly follow information guidelines, needs to consider informational needs of patients as a central backbone and apply a patient-centered perspective. In our analysis, we highlighted content categories that target information on living with the disease by separately assessing if medical, psychological, or financial consequences are addressed – originally captured in a single item [30]. We also expanded the instrument to include causes and patient narratives to strengthen the patient-centered perspective.

5. Conclusion

Overall, our results emphasize the need to develop high-quality and usable patient information on PE, which is at a minimum understandable for most patients. Based on established instruments, we offer several ideas on how to improve patient information. It is evident that there is a need for patient information material that covers PE as a main topic and that provides not only basic information on treatments and symptoms, but also offers in-depth information about how PE affects everyday life. These findings guide the development of an innovative, evidence-based patient information on PE, by identifying the major shortcomings of existing patient information. In particular the combination of providing evidence-based, complex content on diverse relevant categories in a readable and usable way seems to be most challenging.

Given the shortcomings of existing patient information on PE, it remains essential that health-care providers talk with patients about their informational needs and alert patients about the deficits of existing patient information. The aim should be that patients are motivated to engage in self-care behavior and feel empowered to take an active role in medical decision making. Lastly, high-quality evidence-based information should be developed as soon as possible.

Funding

This work was supported by the Federal Joint Committee (G-BA) Germany under Grant number 01VSF19023.

Disclosure statement

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

Appendix A. Sample list for brochures and websites

Brochures				
No.	Editor	Title		Year
1	Deutsche Atemwegsliga	Lungenembolie. Informationsblatt		2019
2	Aktionsbündnis Thrombose	Thrombose? Das trifft doch nur die anderen! Tiefe Beinvenenthrombose und Lungenembolie – eine unterschätzte Lebensgefahr. Informationen für Patienten und Angehörige		.
3	Deutsche Atemwegsliga e.V.	Thrombose und Lungenembolie auf Reisen		2011
	Deutsche Lungenstiftung e.V.			
4	Bayer (Schweiz) AG	Tiefe Venen-Thrombosen und Lungenembolie. Ein kleiner Ratgeber zur Behandlung und Vorbeugung		2016
5	Bayer	Ein kleiner Ratgeber – Behandlung und Vorbeugung. Tiefe Venen-Thrombose und Lungenembolie		2018
6	Schweizerische Herzstiftung	Venenthrombose und Lungenembolie. Patienteninformation		2011
7	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Angiologie, Gesellschaft für Gefäßmedizin e.V.	Thrombose und Lungenembolie. Venen-Ratgeber		2015
8	Bayer (Schweiz) AG	Aufklärungsbroschüre. Tiefe Venenthrombose und Lungenembolie		2019
9	Bundesverband für Gesundheitsinformation und Verbraucherschutz – Info Gesundheit e.V.	Thrombose. Die unterschätzte Gefahr. Informationsbroschüre für Patienten		2018
10	Bayer Vital GmbH	Ein kleiner Ratgeber: Aktiv gegen Thrombose		
11	MediClin Klinik am Rennsteig	Venenthrombose und Embolie – Erkennen und Behandeln		2015
12	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Kardiologie – Herz- und Kreislaufforschung e.V.	Pocket-Leitlinien. Diagnose und Therapie der akuten Lungenembolie		2009
13	Thrombose-Initiative e.V.	Thromboserisiken erkennen und handeln		.
14	Bayer Vital GmbH	Ein kleiner Ratgeber – Behandlung und Vorbeugung: Tiefe Venen-Thrombose und Lungenembolie		.
15	Boehringer Ingelheim	Informationsbroschüre: Tiefe Venenthrombose und Lungenembolie. Therapieoptionen und Prävention bei Thrombosen und Embolien		.
16	Krankenhaus der Barmherzigen Brüder Trier	Leben mit Gerinnungshemmern. Informationen für Patienten, Angehörige und Interessierte.		2016
17	Universitätsmedizin Göttingen	Gerinnungshemmer. Eine Broschüre für Patienten und Angehörige		2010
18	Labors.at	Blutverdünnung – Orale Antikoagulanzen (Oak). Einflussfaktoren Wissenswertes Therapie		2015
19	Schweizerische Herzstiftung	Die Gerinnungshemmung. Die Patienteninformation		2016
20	Dr. med. Hannelore Rott	Marcumar. Gut leben mit Gerinnungshemmern – ein Patientenratgeber		2011
21	UNIVERSITÄTSKLINIKUM Schleswig-Holstein	Gerinnungshemmer – das muss ich wissen!		2010
Websites				
No.	Editor	Title	Last update	URL
1	Techniker Krankenkasse	Was ist eine Lungenembolie?	2020	https://www.tk.de/techniker/gesundheits-und-medizin/behandlungen-und-medizin/herz-kreislauf-erkrankungen/was-ist-eine-lungenembolie-2022444?tkcm=ab
2	Stiftung Warentest	Lungenembolie – oft verkannt, aber lebensgefährlich	2017	https://www.test.de/medikamente/Medikamente-im-Test-lungenembolie-oft-verkannt-aber-lebensgefaehrlich-2999885-0/
3	Gute Pillen – schlechte Pillen	Lungenembolie: Viel sitzen erhöht das Risiko	2011	https://gutepillen-schlechtepillen.de/kurz-und-knapp-lungenembolie-viel-sitzen-erhoeht-das-risiko/
4	Dr. Grumpert.de	Lungenembolie	2020	https://www.dr-grumpert.de/html/lungenembolie.html
5	Charité	Pulmonale Hypertonie	.	https://kardio-cvk.charite.de/fuer-patienten/ambulante_behandlung/pulmonale_hypertonie/
6	Netdoktor	Lungenembolie	2018	https://www.netdoktor.de/krankheiten/lungenembolie/
7	apotheken.de	Lungenembolie	2019	https://www.apotheken.de/krankheiten/4283-lungenembolie
8	Medpertise	Lungenembolie, Lungeninfarkt	2020	https://www.medpertise.de/lungeninfarkt-lungenembolie/
9	Lifeline – das Gesundheitsportal	Lungenembolie: Anzeichen, Ursachen & Behandlung	2018	https://www.lifeline.de/krankheiten/lungenembolie-id44143.html
10	Deximed – Hausarztwissen online	Lungenembolie (Blutgerinnsel in der Lunge)	2020	https://deximed.de/home/b/herz-gefuesse-kreislauf/patienteninformationen/thromboseerkrankungen/lungenembolie
11	Apotheken Umschau	Lungenembolie: Symptome, Ursachen, Behandlung	2019	https://www.apotheken-umschau.de/krankheiten-symptome/atemwegserkrankungen/lungenembolie-symptome-ursachen-behandlung-736717.html
12	G-Netz Gesundheitsnetzwerk	Lungenembolie: Ursachen, Symptome, Diagnose & Therapie	.	https://www.g-netz.com/lungenembolie/
13	Gesundheit.gv.at – Öffentliches Gesundheitsportal Österreichs	Lungenembolie	2018	https://www.gesundheit.gv.at/krankheiten/herz-kreislauf/venen/lungenembolie
14	Cochrane	Neuartige orale Gerinnungshemmer für die Behandlung von Lungenembolie	2015	https://www.cochrane.org/de/CD010957/PVD_neuartige-orale-gerinnungshemmer-fur-die-behandlung-von-lungenembolie
15	Cochrane	Ausschluss einer Lungenembolie mittels D-Dimer Test bei Patienten in Unfall- und Notfallambulanzen und in der Sprechstunde im Krankenhaus	2016	https://www.cochrane.org/de/CD010864/PVD_ausschluss-einer-lungenembolie-mittels-d-dimer-test-bei-patienten-unfall-und-notfallambulanzen-und

(continued)

Websites			
No.	Editor	Title	Last update URL
16	LOT Austria	LUNGE - Lungenembolie (Blutgerinnsel in der Lunge)	. http://www.selbsthilfe-lot.at/artikel.264.php
17	Netzwerk-Lunge.org	Lungenembolie	. http://www.netzwerk-lunge.org/lungenembolie_00075.html
18	Schweizer PH-Verein für Menschen mit pulmonaler Hypertonie	Lungenembolie (Blutgerinnsel in der Lunge)	2003 https://www.lungenhochdruck.ch/lungenembolie-blutgerinnsel-in-der-lunge/
19	Qualitaetskliniken.de – Das Reha-Portal	Lungenembolie	2020 https://www.qualitaetskliniken.de/erkrankungen/lungenembolie/
20	Wikipedia	Lungenembolie	2020 https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lungenembolie
21	Lungenärzte im Netz	Was ist zu tun bei akuter Lungenembolie?	2019 https://www.lungenaerzte-im-netz.de/news-archiv/meldung/article/was-ist-zu-tun-bei-akuter-lungenembolie/
22	Median Kliniken	Reha bei Lungenembolie	. https://www.median-kliniken.de/de/behandlungsgebiete/kardiologie/lungenembolie/
23	Servona	Lungenembolie - Beschreibung	. https://www.servona.de/unternehmen/betroffene/ratgeberfuerkrankheiten/lungenembolie/lungenembolie-beschreibung/
24	MeinMed.at	Lungenembolie	2020 https://www.minimed.at/medizinische-themen/lunge/durch-lungenembolie-gefuesse-blockiert/
25	Frankfurter Rotkreuz Kliniken	Lungenembolie	. https://www.rotkreuzkliniken.de/lungenembolie.html
26	NDR	Lungenembolie: Symptome rechtzeitig erkennen	2019 https://www.ndr.de/ratgeber/gesundheit/Lungenembolie-Symptome-rechtzeitig-erkennen,lungenembolie101.html
27	Leading Medicine Guide	Lungenembolie - Verschlepptes Blutgerinnsel	. https://www.leading-medicine-guide.com/de/erkrankungen/kreislauf/lungenembolie
28	MSD Manual – Ausgabe für Patienten	Lungenembolie (LE)	2018 https://www.msmanuals.com/de-de/heim/lungen-und-atemwegserkrankungen/lungenembolie/lungenembolie-le
29	München Klinik	Lungenembolie	2020 https://www.muenchen-klinik.de/lungenkrankheiten-atemwegserkrankungen/lungenembolie/
30	Sanofi	Lungenembolie	2018 https://patienten.thromboseportal.eu/krankheitsbild/arten-und-folgen-der-thrombose/lungenembolie/
31	Lecturio	Lungenembolie	. https://www.lecturio.de/lexikon/lungenembolie
32	BILD der Frau	Gefährlich wie ein Herzinfarkt. Lungenembolie: Kennen Sie die unscheinbaren Symptome?	2020 https://www.bilderfrau.de/gesundheit/krankheiten/article207557635/Lungenembolie-Symptome-werden-oft-nicht-erkannt.html
33	T-online	Woran Sie eine Lungenembolie erkennen	2020 https://www.t-online.de/gesundheit/krankheiten-symptome/id_62683552/woran-sie-eine-lungenembolie-erkennen.html
34	Herzzentrum Stuttgart	Lungenembolie	. https://herzzentrum-stuttgart.de/krankheitsbilder/lungenembolie/
35	Ada	Wissenswertes zum gesundheitsbewußten Leben für Patienten mit Lungenembolie	2020 https://ada.com/de/conditions/pulmonary-embolism/
36	BILD	Entstehung, Behandlung, Vorbeugung. Was genau ist eine Lungenembolie?	. https://www.bild.de/ratgeber/gesundheit/chronische-lungenembolie/lungenembolie-entstehung-vorbeugung-gefahr-41758594.bild.html
37	Venencentrum Pforzheim	Venöse Thrombose und Lungenembolie	. https://www.venencentrum-pforzheim.de/venoese-thrombose-und-lungenembolie.html
38	Knappschaftsklinikum Saar	Thrombosen und Lungenembolie	. https://www.kksaar.de/puettlingen/Kliniken-Zentren/Fachabteilungen-Krankenhaus-Puettlingen/Gefaesschirurgie/Thrombosen-und-Lungenembolie.php
39	Meine-gesundheit.de	Lungenembolie	2019 https://www.meine-gesundheit.de/krankheit/krankheiten/lungenembolie
40	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Angiologie Gesellschaft für Gefäßmedizin e.V.	Diagnose. Nehmen Sie die Anzeichen einer Thrombose ernst	. https://www.dga-gefuesmedizin.de/patienten/venenerkrankungen/thrombose/diagnose.html
41	RTL	Wenn ein Blutgerinnsel ein Blutgefäß in der Lunge verstopft. Gesundheitslexikon: Lungenembolie	2019 https://www.rtl.de/cms/gesundheitslexikon-lungenembolie-4046717.html
42	MedizInfo	Lungenembolie	. http://www.medizinfo.de/lungeundatmung/lungenembolie/start.shtml
43	Liebenswert Magazin	Lungenembolie sofort erkennen und behandeln	2019 https://www.liebenswert-magazin.de/lungenembolie-sofort-erkennen-und-behandeln-5631.html
44	Rheinische Post Online	Fünf schnelle Antworten zur Lungenembolie	. https://rp-online.de/info/consent/
45	Gesundheit.de	Lungenembolie – Lebensgefährlicher Pfropf	2017 https://www.gesundheit.de/krankheiten/lunge/lungenembolie/lungenembolie-symptome-und-diagnose
46	Burg Apotheke Beilstein	Lungenembolie	. https://burg-apotheke-beilstein.de/informationen/krankheiten-und-therapie/hno-atemwege-und-lunge/lungenembolie
47	Medizin Aspekte	Lungenembolie – Risiko in der Schwangerschaft durch Prävention verhindern	. https://medizin-aspekte.de/lungenembolie-risiko-in-der-schwangerschaft-durch-praevention-mindern_35878-27129/
48	Gorch fock Facharztzentrum	Lungenembolie	. https://www.med-kropp.de/7-36-422-Lungenembolie.html
49	Pharmazeutische Zeitung	Lungenembolie Symptome richtig deuten	2015 https://www.pharmazeutische-zeitung.de/ausgabe-432015/symptome-richtig-deuten/
50	Onmeda	Lungenembolie	2019 https://www.onmeda.de/krankheiten/lungenembolie-id201486/
51	Inselspital – Universitätsspital Bern	Lungenembolien	. http://www.kardiologie.insel.ch/de/unser-angebot/lungenembolien/

(continued on next page)

(continued)

Websites			
No.	Editor	Title	Last update URL
52	Deutsche Gefäßliga e.V	Thrombose und Lungenembolie	http://www.deutsche-gefaessliga.de/gefaesserkrankungen/thrombose-und-lungenembolie
53	Vital	Lungenembolie: Lebensgefährlicher Blutstau	https://www.vital.de/gesundheits/symptome/lungenembolie-lebensgefaehrlicher-blutstau-2116.html
54	Kardionet – Ihr Herz-Kreislauf-Portal	Lungenembolie – tückisches Nachspiel einer Thrombose	https://www.kardionet.de/lungenembolie-thrombose/
55	Herz und Gefäßzentrum Bad Bevensen	Lungenembolie und tiefe Venenthrombose	https://www.hgz-bb.de/herz-gefaesse/die-gefaesse/venen/lungenembolie-und-tiefe-venenthrombose/
56	PraxisVita	Was ist eine Lungenembolie? – Das sagen die Experten	https://www.praxisvita.de/was-ist-eine-lungenembolie-das-sagen-die-experten-14439.html
57	Barmherzige Brüder Krankenhaus St. Barbara Schwandorf	Lungenembolie und Thrombose	https://www.barmherzige-schwandorf.de/kardiologie-und-pneumologie/unsere-behandlungsangebote/pneumologie/lungenembolie.html
58	Israelitisches Krankenhaus Hamburg	Lungenembolie	https://www.ik-h.de/fuer-patienten-angehoerige/was-fuehrt-sie-zu-uns/erkrankungen-der-lunge/lungenembolie/
59	Immanuel Albertinen Diakonie	Lungenembolien- und tumore	https://herzzentrum.immanuel.de/herzzentrum-brandenburg-bei-berlin-leistungen/krankheitsbilder/lungentumore-embolien/
60	Herzgesundheits	Risiko Thrombose. Lungenembolie ambulant behandeln	https://www.gesunder-herz-kreislauf.de/risiko-thrombose-lungenembolie-ambulant-behandeln
61	Barmherzige Brüder Krankenhaus Regensburg	Lungenembolie	https://www.barmherzige-regensburg.de/pneumologie-und-konservative-intensivmedizin/unsere-behandlungsangebote/lungenembolie.html
62	Novaria. Schweizer Verein der Lungentransplantierten	Was ist eine Lungenembolie?	https://novaria.ch/lungenembolie-blutgerinnsel-in-der-lunge/
63	Barmherzige Brüder Krankenhaus München	Lungenembolie	https://www.barmherzige-muenchen.de/innere-medicin-ii-kardiologie-pneumologie-und-notfallzentrum/unsere-behandlungsangebote/pneumologie/lungenembolie.html
64	Medizindoc	Lungenembolie – alles zu Ursachen, Symptomen und Behandlung.	https://medizindoc.de/lungenembolie/?gclid=CjwKCAjw88v3BRBFiEiApwLevS4AhGcPvk8i3V5qTCJi9atjaMvZc9jyEm_7TluKmgLoSsXoNAN66xoCQJoQAvD_BwE
65	Apotheke Langenzenn	Lungenembolie	https://apotheke-langenzenn.de/gesundheits-themen-lz/gesundheits-heute.html?SDKArtikel%5bcategory%5d=89&SDKArtikel%5bid%5d=4283
66	Infozentrum für Prävention und Früherkennung	Lungenembolie: jährlich bis zu 100.000 Todesfälle	https://www.vorsorge-online.de/magazin/vorsorge-in-zahlen/details/lungenembolie-jaehrlich-bis-zu-100000-todesfaelle
67	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Nuklearmedizin e.V.	Untersuchungen – Diagnostik. Lungenembolien rechtzeitig entdecken	https://www.nuklearmedizin.de/patienten/patienteninformation/embolie.php?navid=21

References

- Barco S, Mahmoudpour SH, Valerio L, Kloke FA, Münzel T, Middeldorp S, et al. Trends in mortality related to PE in the European Region, 2000–15: analysis of vital registration data from the WHO Mortality Database. *Lancet Respir Med.* 2020;8(3):277–87. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(19\)30354-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(19)30354-6).
- Wendelboe AM, Raskob GE. Global burden of thrombosis: epidemiologic aspects. *Circ Res.* 2016;118(9):1340–7. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.115.306841>.
- Keller K, Hobohm L, Ebner M, Kresoja K-P, Münzel T, Konstantinides SV, et al. Trends in thrombolytic treatment and outcomes of acute PE in Germany. *Eur Heart J.* 2019;18:ehz236. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehz236>.
- Wiener RS, Schwartz LM, Woloshin S. Time trends in PE in the United States: evidence of overdiagnosis. *Arch Intern Med.* 2011;171(9):831–7. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2011.178>.
- Barco S, Valerio L, Gallo A, Turatti G, Mahmoudpour SH, Ageno W, et al. Global reporting of PE-related deaths in the World Health Organization mortality database: vital registration data from 123 countries. *Res Pract Thromb Haemost.* 2021;5(5). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rth2.12520>.
- Sista AK, Miller LE, Kahn SR, Kline JA. Persistent right ventricular dysfunction, functional capacity limitation, exercise intolerance, and quality of life impairment following PE: Systematic review with meta-analysis. *Vasc Med.* 2017;22(1):37–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1358863X16670250>.
- Hunter R, Lewis S, Noble S, Rance J, Bennett PD. “Post-thrombotic panic syndrome”: A thematic analysis of the experience of venous thromboembolism. *Br J Health Psychol.* 2017;22(1):8–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12213>.
- Hunter R, Noble S, Lewis S, Bennett P. Long-term psychosocial impact of venous thromboembolism: a qualitative study in the community. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9(2):e024805. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024805>.
- Kirchberger I, Ruile S, Linseisen J, Haberl S, Meisinger C, Berghaus TM. The lived experience with PE: A qualitative study using focus groups. *Respir Med.* 2020;167:105978. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2020.105978>.
- Noble S, Lewis R, Whithers J, Lewis S, Bennett P. Long-term psychological consequences of symptomatic PE: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open.* 2014;4(4):e004561. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004561>.
- Keller K, Hobohm L, Ebner M, Kresoja KP, Münzel T, Konstantinides SV, et al. Trends in thrombolytic treatment and outcomes of acute pulmonary embolism in Germany. *Eur Heart J.* 2020;41(4):522–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehz236>.
- Kröger K, Moerchel C, Moysidis T, Santosa F. Incidence rate of pulmonary embolism in Germany: data from the federal statistical office. *J Thromb Thrombolysis.* 2010;29:349–53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11239-009-0396-1>.
- Konstantinides SV, Meyer G, Becattini C, Bueno H, Geersing G-J, Harjola V-P, et al. 2019 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of acute pulmonary embolism developed in collaboration with the European Respiratory Society (ERS). *Eur Heart J.* 2020;41(4):543–603. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehz405>.
- Bennett P, Patterson K, Noble S. Predicting post-traumatic stress and health anxiety following a venous thrombotic embolism. *J Health Psychol.* 2016;21(5):863–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105314540965>.
- Cajita MI, Rodney T, Xu J, Hladek M, Han H-R. Quality and Health Literacy Demand of Online Heart Failure Information. *J Cardiovasc Nurs.* 2017;32(2):156–64. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JCN.0000000000000324>.
- Charnock D, Shepperd S, Needham G, Gann R. DISCERN: an instrument for judging the quality of written consumer health information on treatment choices. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 1999;53:105–11.
- Lee KS, Cho YM, Oh SH, Jung MS, Yoon JY. Evaluation of the Heart Failure in Internet Patient Information: Descriptive Survey Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18(3):1047. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031047>.
- Wang X, Shi J, Kong H. Online Health Information Seeking: A Review and Meta-Analysis. *Health Commun.* 2021;36(10):1163–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2020.1748829>.
- Diviani N, van den Putte B, Giani S, van Weert JC. Low Health Literacy and Evaluation of Online Health Information: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Med Internet Res.* 2015;17(5):e112. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.4018>.
- Mackey LM, Doody C, Werner EL, Fullen B. Self-Management Skills in Chronic Disease Management: What Role Does Health Literacy Have? *Med Decis Mak.* 2016;36(6):741–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X16638330>.
- Bělohávek J, Dytrych V, Linhart A. Pulmonary embolism, part I: Epidemiology, risk factors and risk stratification, pathophysiology, clinical presentation, diagnosis and nonthrombotic pulmonary embolism. *Exp Clin Cardiol.* 2013 Spring;18(2):129–38. PMID: 23940438; PMCID: PMC3718593.

- [22] Waterworth S, Honey M. On-line health seeking activity of older adults: An integrative review of the literature. *Geriatr Nurs*. 2018;39(3):310–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gerinurse.2017.10.016>.
- [23] Bennett KF, von Wagner C, Robb KA. Supplementing factual information with patient narratives in the cancer screening context: a qualitative study of acceptability and preferences. *Health Expectations*. 2015;18(6):2032–41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12357>.
- [24] McGregor LM, Wagner C, von Vart G, Yuen WC, Raine R, Wardle J, et al. The impact of supplementary narrative-based information on colorectal cancer screening beliefs and intention. *BMC Cancer*. 2015;15:162–70. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-015-1167-3>.
- [25] Peter C. Fallbeispiele in der Gesundheitskommunikation. In: Rossmann C, Hastall MR, editors. *Handbuch der Gesundheitskommunikation. Kommunikationswissenschaftliche Perspektiven*. Wiesbaden: Springer; 2019.
- [26] Bekker HL, Winterbottom AE, Butow P, Dillard AJ, Feldman-Stewart D, Fowler FJ, et al. Do personal stories make patient decision aids more effective? A critical review of theory and evidence. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2013 Nov;13(S2):S9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-13-S2-S9>.
- [27] Drewniak D, Glässel A, Hodel M, Biller-Andorno N. Risks and benefits of web-based patient narratives: systematic review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(3):e15772. <https://doi.org/10.2196/15772>.
- [28] de Graaf A, Sanders J, Hoeken H. Characteristics of narrative interventions and health effects: A review of the content, form, and context of narratives in health-related narrative persuasion research. *Rev Commum Res*. 2016;4:88–131. <https://doi.org/10.12840/issn.2255-4165.2016.04.01.011>.
- [29] Shen F, Sheer VC, Li R. Impact of narratives on persuasion in health communication: a meta-analysis. *J Advert*. 2015;44(2):105–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2015.1018467>.
- [30] Lühnen J, Albrecht M, Mühlhauser I, Steckelberg A. Leitlinie evidenzbasierte Gesundheitsinformation [Guideline evidence-based health information]. Hamburg. [cited 2021 Oct 28]. Available from: <https://www.leitlinie-gesundheitsinformation.de/>; 2017.
- [31] Sängler S. Einbeziehung von Patienten/Verbrauchern in den Prozess des Qualitätsmanagements im Gesundheitswesen am Beispiel der Qualitätsförderung medizinischer Laieninformationen im Internet [Involvement of patients/consumers in the process of quality management in health care using the example of quality promotion of lay medical information on the internet, dissertation]. Jena: Bielefeld University; 2004. [cited 2022 Mar 15]. Available from: <https://www.aezq.de/aezq/arztbibliothek/mdb/edocs/pdf/schriftenreihe/schriftenreihe17.pdf>.
- [32] Shoemaker SJ, Wolf MS, Brach C. The Patient Education Materials Assessment Tool (PEMAT) and User's Guide: An Instrument To Assess the understandability and actionability of Print and Audiovisual Patient Education Materials. Rockville, MD: AHRQ; 2013. [cited 2022 Mar 15]. Available from: https://www.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/publications2/files/pemat_guide_0.pdf.
- [33] Tait AR, Voepel-Lewis T, Malviya S, Philipson SJ. Improving the readability and processability of a pediatric informed consent document. effects on parents' understanding. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2005;159:347–52.
- [34] Sharma N, Tridimas A, Fitzsimmons PR. A readability assessment of online stroke information. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2014;23(6):1362–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2013.11.017>.
- [35] Kher A, Johnson S, Griffith R. Readability assessment of online patient education material on congestive heart failure. *Adv Prev Med*. 2017;2017:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/9780317>.
- [36] Orłowski JL, Oermann MH, Shaw-Kokot J. Evaluation of heart failure websites for patient education. *Adv Emerg Nurs J*. 2013;35(3):240–6. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TME.0b013e318296469b>.
- [37] Bonner C, Fajardo MA, Hui S, Stubbs R, Trevena L. Clinical validity, understandability, and actionability of online cardiovascular disease risk calculators: systematic review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2018;20(2):e29. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8538>.
- [38] Bonner C, Patel P, Fajardo MA, Zhuang R, Trevena L. Online decision aids for primary cardiovascular disease prevention: systematic search, evaluation of quality and suitability for low health literacy patients. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(3):e025173. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025173>.
- [39] Ärztliches Zentrum für Qualität in der Medizin (ÄZQ). Bundesärztekammer (BÄK), Kassenärztliche Bundesvereinigung (KBV), Methodenreport zur Entwicklung von Kurzinformatoren für Patienten (KiP) 3rd ed.; 2019. <https://doi.org/10.6101/AZQ/000440> Berlin.
- [40] Steckelberg A, Berger B, Köpke S, Heesen C, Mühlhauser I. Kriterien für evidenzbasierte Patientinformationen [Criteria for evidence-based patient information]. *Zeitschrift für ärztliche Fortbildung und Qualitätssicherung*. 2005;99(6):343–51.
- [41] Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data biometrics. 1977;33(1):159–74.
- [42] Beauvoyer E, Arsenaault M, Lomanowska AM, Guitton MJ. Understanding online health information: Evaluation, tools, and strategies. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2017;100(2):183–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2016.08.028>.
- [43] Shoemaker SJ, Wolf MS, Brach C. Development of the Patient Education Materials Assessment Tool (PEMAT): A new measure of understandability and actionability for print and audiovisual patient information. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2014;96(3):395–403. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2014.05.027>.
- [44] Schöll P. Testen Sie Ihren Text auf Lesbarkeit [Test your text for readability]. <https://fleschindex.de/berechnen/> [accessed 2021 March 28].
- [45] Flesch R. A new readability yardstick. *J Appl Psychol*. 1948;32(3):221–33.
- [46] Amstad T. Wie verständlich sind unsere Zeitungen? [How understandable are our newspapers?, dissertation]. University of Zurich; 1978.
- [47] Arslan D, Tutar MS, Kozanhan B. Evaluating the readability, understandability, and quality of online materials about chest pain in children. *Eur J Pediatr*. 2020;179(12):1881–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00431-020-03772-8>.
- [48] Ayyaswami V, Padmanabhan D, Patel M, Prabhu AV, Hansberry DR, Agarwal N, et al. A readability analysis of online cardiovascular disease-related health education materials. *HLRP Health Lit Res Pract*. 2019;3(2). <https://doi.org/10.3928/24748307-20190306-03>.
- [49] Dreier M, Borutta B, Seidel G, Münch I, Töppich J, Bitzer E-M, et al. Printmedien- und Internetangebote mit Informationen zur Darmkrebsfrüherkennung und ihre kriteriengestützte Bewertung aus Expertensicht. *Bundesgesundheitsbl Gesundheitsforsch Gesundheitsschutz*. 2014;57(3):356–65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00103-013-1906-z>.
- [50] Magnani JW, Mujahid MS, Aronow HD, Cené CW, Dickson VV, Havranek E, et al. Health Literacy and Cardiovascular Disease: Fundamental Relevance to Primary and Secondary Prevention: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2018;138(2). <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0000000000000579>.
- [51] Waring ME, McManus DD, Amante DJ, Darling CE, Kiefe CI. Online health information seeking by adults hospitalized for acute coronary syndromes: Who looks for information, and who discusses it with healthcare providers? *Patient Educ Couns*. 2018;101(11):1973–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2018.06.016>.
- [52] Hall AK, Bernhardt JM, Dodd V. Older Adults' Use of Online and Offline Sources of Health Information and Constructs of Reliance and Self-Efficacy for Medical Decision Making. *J Health Commun*. 2015;20(7):751–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2015.1018603>.
- [53] Ostrovsky AM, Chen JR. TikTok and Its Role in COVID-19 Information Propagation. *J Adolesc Health*. 2020;67(5):730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.07.039>.
- [54] Song S, Xue X, Zhao YC, Li J, Zhu Q, Zhao M. Short-video apps as a health information source for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: information quality assessment of tiktok videos. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23(12):e28318. <https://doi.org/10.2196/28318>.
- [55] Sibold HC, Thomson MC, Hianik R, Abernethy ER, Campbell GP, Sumrall B, et al. Videos improve patient understanding of chemotherapy terminology in a rural setting. *Cancer*. 2021;127(21):4015–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.33810>.