

## Evidenztabels

**Table 24:** Evidence table „Information with interactive elements versus 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>Information with interactive elements versus information only</b>										
<b>Understanding / risk perception [n=1]</b> Kuppermann (11)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 244	N=252	In one study effect for interactive elements (11).	moderate	critical
<b>Knowledge [n=6]</b> Jones (3) Alterman (4) Ruiz (5) Rawl (6) Holbrook (10) Kuppermann (11)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 802	N= 753	In two studies effects for interactive elements (6, 11). In four studies no differences between groups (3-5, 10).	moderate	critical
<b>Acceptance / attractiveness [n=3]</b> Jones (3) Ruiz (5) Kuppermann (11)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 410	N= 317	In two studies effects for interactive information (5, 11). In one study a tendency for interactive information (no test on statistical significance) (3).	moderate	limited importance

**Table 25:** Evidence table „Information in facts boxes versus description of drugs (advertisements)“

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>Information in facts boxes versus description of drugs (advertisements)</b>										
<b>Risik perception / Knowledge [n=2]</b> Schwartz (symptom & prevention trial, two RCT in one publication) (12)	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 233	N= 217	In two studies effects for facts boxes (12).	high	critical
<b>Comprehensibility / readability [n= 2]</b> Schwartz (7) Schwartz (symptom & prevention trial) (12)	RCT, Survey	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	RCT: N=233 Survey: N= 274	RCT: N= 217 Survey: -	Three studies showed that information could be found, comprehended and used (7, 12).	moderate	important but not critical

## References

1. Gysels M, Higginson IJ. Interactive technologies and videotapes for patient education in cancer care: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. *Supportive care in cancer : official journal of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2007;15(1):7-20. Epub 2006/10/07.
2. Conquering Cancer Network. Games & Videos. 2015. Available from: <http://www.conqueringcancer.net/games.html>.
3. Jones JK, Kamani SA, Bush PJ, Hennessy KA, Marfatia A, Shad AT. Development and evaluation of an educational interactive CD-ROM for teens with cancer. *Pediatric Blood and Cancer* [Internet]. 2010; (3):[512-9 pp.]. Available from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/o/cochrane/clcentral/articles/481/CN-00803481/frame.html>.
4. Alterman AI, Baughman TG. Videotape versus computer interactive education in alcoholic and nonalcoholic controls. *Alcoholism, clinical and experimental research*. 1991;15(1):39-44. Epub 1991/02/01.
5. Ruiz JG, Andrade AD, Anam R, Lisigurski M, Karanam C, Sharit J. Computer-based programmed instruction did not improve the knowledge retention of medication instructions of individuals with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *The Diabetes educator*. 2014;40(1):77-88. Epub 2013/10/31.
6. Rawl SM, Skinner CS, Perkins SM, Springston J, Wang HL, Russell KM, et al. Computer-delivered tailored intervention improves colon cancer screening knowledge and health beliefs of African-Americans. *Health education research*. 2012;27(5):868-85. Epub 2012/08/29.
7. Schwartz LM, Woloshin S, Welch HG. The drug facts box: providing consumers with simple tabular data on drug benefit and harm. *Medical decision making : an international journal of the Society for Medical Decision Making*. 2007;27(5):655-62. Epub 2007/09/18.
8. Schwartz LM, Woloshin S. The Drug Facts Box: Improving the communication of prescription drug information. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2013;110 Suppl 3:14069-74. Epub 2013/08/15.
9. Giguere A, Legare F, Grad R, Pluye P, Haynes RB, Cauchon M, et al. Decision boxes for clinicians to support evidence-based practice and shared decision making: the user experience. *Implementation science : IS*. 2012;7:72. Epub 2012/08/07.

10. Holbrook A, Labiris R, Goldsmith CH, Ota K, Harb S, Sebaldt RJ. Influence of decision aids on patient preferences for anticoagulant therapy: a randomized trial. *CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne*. 2007;176(11):1583-7. Epub 2007/05/23.
11. Kuppermann M, Norton ME, Gates E, Gregorich SE, Learman LA, Nakagawa S, et al. Computerized prenatal genetic testing decision-assisting tool: a randomized controlled trial. *Obstetrics and gynecology*. 2009;113(1):53-63. Epub 2008/12/24.
12. Schwartz LM, Woloshin S, Welch HG. Using a drug facts box to communicate drug benefits and harms: two randomized trials. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2009;150(8):516-27. Epub 2009/02/18.