

## Evidence table

**Table 22:** Evidence table „Narratives versus factual information only“

Certainty assessment						Summary of findings				
						No. of participants per group		Effect estimates		
Outcomes [No. of studies]	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Intervention	Control	Effects	Quality of evidence	Importance
<b>Narratives versus factual information only</b>										
<b>Knowledge [n=4]</b> Cody (24) Dillard (7) Mazor (16) Rook (19)	RCT	very serious (-2)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 268 + N=1600 (allocation on intervention and control group unclear)	N= 362	In four studies no effects (7, 16, 19, 24).	low	critical
<b>Recall of information [n=4]</b> Bollinger (12) Kreuter (15) McDonald (17) Rook (20)	RCT	very serious (-2)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 73 + N=35 (allocation on intervention and control group unclear)	N= 70	In three studies no effects (12, 17, 20), in one study effect for narratives (15).	low	critical
<b>Risk perception [n=9]</b> Betsch (27) Betsch (28) Cody (24) de Wit (23) Dillard (7) Greene (14) Kreuter (15) Prati (26) Ricketts (18)	RCT	very serious (-2)	not serious	serious (-1)	not serious	N= 73 + N=2626 (allocation on intervention and control group unclear)	N= 70	In six studies no effects (15, 18, 23, 24, 26, 27), in two studies effects for narratives (7, 28), in one study effect for statistics (14).	very low	critical

<b>Comprehensibility [n=3]</b> Greene (14) Prati (26) Slater (21)	RCT, one study with within- subject Design	very serious (-2)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N=50	N=95	In two studies no effects (14, 21), in one study effect for narratives (26).	low	important but not critical
						+ N=342 (allocation on intervention and control group unclear)				
<b>Readability [1]</b> Ricketts (18)	RCT	very serious (-2)	not serious	serious, calcula- tion of scores, no test persons (-1)	not serious	10 safety warnings each - narrative - specific example - warning only		In one study no effect (18).	very low	important but not critical
<b>Information content [n=4]</b> Greene (14) Kreuter (15) Rook (19) Rook (20)	RCT	very serious (-2)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N=388	N=434	In three studies no effects (15, 19, 20), in one study effect for statistics (14).	low	important but not critical
<b>Credibility [n=2]</b> Prati (26) Slater (21)	RCT one study with within- subject Design	very serious (-2)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N=342 (allocation on intervention and control group unclear)		In one study no effect (21), in one study effect for narratives (26).	low	limited importance
<b>Attractiveness [n=1]</b> Kreuter (15)	RCT	serious (-1)	Keine Inkonsis- tenz	Keine Indirekt- heit	Keine Impräzi- sion	N=244	N=245	In one study effect for narratives (15).	moderate	limited importance

<p><b>Persuasiveness</b> <b>[n=7]</b> Betsch (27) Betsch (28) Fagerlin (13) Rook (19) Rook (20) Ubel (22) Winterbottom (25)</p>	<p>RCT</p>	<p>very serious (-2)</p>	<p>not serious</p>	<p>not serious</p>	<p>not serious</p>	<p>N=5343 (total)</p>	<p>In seven studies effects (narratives bias statistics only, pictograms and a proportional number of positive / negative narratives lower this influence) (13, 19, 20, 22, 25, 27, 28).</p>	<p>low</p>	<p>not defined</p>
---	------------	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------------	--	------------	--------------------

## References

1. Khangura S, Bennett C, Stacey D, O'Connor AM. Personal stories in publicly available patient decision aids. *Patient Education & Counseling*. 2008;73(3):456-64.
2. Kreuter MW, Green MC, Cappella JN, Slater MD, Wise ME, Storey D, et al. Narrative communication in cancer prevention and control: a framework to guide research and application. *Annals of behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*. 2007;33(3):221-35. Epub 2007/06/30.
3. Winterbottom A, Bekker HL, Conner M, Mooney A. Does narrative information bias individual's decision making? A systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2008;67(12):2079-88.
4. Institut für Qualität und Wirtschaftlichkeit im Gesundheitswesen (IQWiG). Allgemeine Methoden. Version 4.2. 2015; <https://www.iqwig.de/de/methoden/methodenpapier.3020.html>, Zugriff am 19.11.2015.
5. Shaffer VA, Zikmund-Fisher BJ. All stories are not alike: a purpose-, content-, and valence-based taxonomy of patient narratives in decision aids. *Medical decision making : an international journal of the Society for Medical Decision Making*. 2013;33(1):4-13. Epub 2012/10/16.
6. Bunge M, Muhlhauser I, Steckelberg A. What constitutes evidence-based patient information? Overview of discussed criteria. *Patient education and counseling*. 2010;78(3):316-28. Epub 2009/12/17.
7. Dillard AJ, Fagerlin A, Dal Cin S, Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Ubel PA. Narratives that address affective forecasting errors reduce perceived barriers to colorectal cancer screening. *Soc Sci Med*. 2010;71(1):45-52. Epub 2010/04/27.
8. Feldman-Stewart D, Brennenstuhl S, McLissac K, Austoker J, Charvet A, Hewitson P, et al. A systematic review of information in decision aids. *Health expectations : an international journal of public participation in health care and health policy*. 2007;10(1):46-61. Epub 2007/02/28.
9. Bandura A. Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health education & behavior : the official publication of the Society for Public Health Education*. 2004;31(2):143-64. Epub 2004/04/20.

10. Enkin MW, Jadad AR. Using anecdotal information in evidence-based health care: heresy or necessity? *Annals of oncology : official journal of the European Society for Medical Oncology / ESMO*. 1998;9(9):963-6. Epub 1998/11/18.
11. Elwyn G, O'Connor A, Stacey D, Volk R, Edwards A, Coulter A, et al. Developing a quality criteria framework for patient decision aids: online international Delphi consensus process. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2006;333(7565):417. Epub 2006/08/16.
12. Bollinger S, Kreuter MW. Real-time moment-to-moment emotional responses to narrative and informational breast cancer videos in African American women. *Health education research*. 2012;27(3):537-43. Epub 2012/04/14.
13. Fagerlin A, Wang C, Ubel PA. Reducing the influence of anecdotal reasoning on people's health care decisions: is a picture worth a thousand statistics? *Medical decision making : an international journal of the Society for Medical Decision Making*. 2005;25(4):398-405. Epub 2005/08/03.
14. Greene K, Brinn LS. Messages influencing college women's tanning bed use: statistical versus narrative evidence format and a self-assessment to increase perceived susceptibility. *Journal of health communication*. 2003;8(5):443-61. Epub 2003/10/08.
15. Kreuter MW, Holmes K, Alcaraz K, Kalesan B, Rath S, Richert M, et al. Comparing narrative and informational videos to increase mammography in low-income African American women. *Patient education and counseling*. 2010;81 Suppl:S6-14. Epub 2010/11/13.
16. Mazor KM, Baril J, Dugan E, Spencer F, Burgwinkle P, Gurwitz JH. Patient education about anticoagulant medication: is narrative evidence or statistical evidence more effective? *Patient education and counseling*. 2007;69(1-3):145-57. Epub 2007/10/19.
17. McDonald DD, Goncalves PH, Almario VE, Krajewski AL, Cervera PL, Kaeser DM, et al. Assisting women to learn myocardial infarction symptoms. *Public Health Nurs*. 2006;23(3):216-23. Epub 2006/05/11.
18. Ricketts M, Shanteau J, McSpadden B, Fernandez-Medina KM. Using stories to battle unintentional injuries: narratives in safety and health communication. *Soc Sci Med*. 2010;70(9):1441-9. Epub 2010/02/24.
19. Rook KS. Encouraging preventive behavior for distant and proximal health threats: effects of vivid versus abstract information. *Journal of gerontology*. 1986;41(4):526-34. Epub 1986/07/01.

20. Rook KS. Effects of Case History versus Abstract Information on Health Attitudes and Behaviors<sup>1</sup>. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 1987;17(6):533-53.
21. Slater MD, Buller DB, Waters E, Archibeque M, LeBlanc M. A test of conversational and testimonial messages versus didactic presentations of nutrition information. *Journal of Nutrition Education & Behavior*. 2003;35(5):255-9.
22. Ubel PA, Jepson C, Baron J. The inclusion of patient testimonials in decision aids: effects on treatment choices. *Medical decision making : an international journal of the Society for Medical Decision Making*. 2001;21(1):60-8. Epub 2001/02/24.
23. de Wit JBF, Das E, Vet R. What Works Best: Objective Statistics or a Personal Testimonial? An Assessment of the Persuasive Effects of Different Types of Message Evidence on Risk Perception. *Health Psychology*. 2008;27(1):110-5.
24. Cody R, Lee C. Behaviors, beliefs, and intentions in skin cancer prevention. *Journal of behavioral medicine*. 1990;13(4):373-89. Epub 1990/08/01.
25. Winterbottom AE, Bekker HL, Conner M, Mooney AF. Patient stories about their dialysis experience biases others' choices regardless of doctor's advice: an experimental study. *Nephrology, dialysis, transplantation : official publication of the European Dialysis and Transplant Association - European Renal Association*. 2012;27(1):325-31. Epub 2011/06/07.
26. Prati G, Pietrantonio L, Zani B. Influenza Vaccination: The Persuasiveness of Messages Among People Aged 65 Years and Older. *Health Communication*. 2012;27(5):413-20.
27. Betsch C, Ulshofer C, Renkewitz F, Betsch T. The influence of narrative v. statistical information on perceiving vaccination risks. *Medical decision making : an international journal of the Society for Medical Decision Making*. 2011;31(5):742-53. Epub 2011/03/31.
28. Betsch C, Renkewitz F, Haase N. Effect of narrative reports about vaccine adverse events and bias-awareness disclaimers on vaccine decisions: a simulation of an online patient social network. *Medical decision making : an international journal of the Society for Medical Decision Making*. 2013;33(1):14-25. Epub 2012/08/10.