

Evidence tables

Table 17: Evidence table „Text with anatomical images versus text 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
Text with anatomical images versus text only										
Knowledge [n=1] Bol (1)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 73	N= 70	In one study no effect (1).	moderate	critical
Comprehensibility / readability [n=1] Bol (1)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 73	N= 70	In one study no effect (1).	moderate	important but not critical
Acceptance / attractiveness [n=2] Bol (1)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 73	N= 70	In one study effect for anatomical images (1).	moderate	limited importance
Trust / credibility [n=1] Hollands (7)	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 450	N= 451	In one study a small effect for anatomical images (7).	high	limited importance

Table 18: Evidence table „Text with cartoons versus text only“

Certainty assessment						Summary of findings				
						No. of participants per group		Effect estimates		
Outcomes [No. of studies]	Study design	<i>Risk of bias</i>	Inconsis- tency	Indirect- ness	Impreci- sion	Interven- tion	Control	Effects	Quality of evidence	Importance
Text with cartoons versus text only										
Understanding [n=1] Delp (8)	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 103	N= 102	In one study effect for cartoons (8).	high	critical
Comprehensibility / readability [n=1] Delp (8)	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 103	N= 102	In one study effect for cartoons (8).	high	important but not critical
Acceptance / attractiveness [n=1] Delp (8)	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 103	N= 102	In one study effect for cartoons (8).	high	limited importance

Table 19: Evidence table „Text with photos versus text 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
Text with photos versus text only										
Knowledge [n=1] Bol (1)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 73	N= 70	In one study no effect (1).	moderate	critical
Comprehensibility / readability [n=1] Bol (1)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 73	N= 70	In one study no effect (1).	moderate	important but not critical
Acceptance / attractiveness [n=1] Bol (1)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 73	N= 70	In one study no effect (1).	moderate	limited importance

Table 20: Evidence table „Text with pictograms versus text 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
Text with pictograms versus text only										
Understanding [n=1] Mansoor (5) Thompson (10) Yin (11)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 237	N= 222	In two studies effects for pictograms (5, 11), in one study no effect (10).	moderate	critical
Knowledge [n=4] King (3) Mansoor (5) Sahm (9) Thompson (10)	RCT	very serious (-2)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 136 + N=94 (total, random allocation on three groups)	N= 132	In one study effect for pictograms (5), in three studies no effects (3, 9, 10).	low	critical
Comprehensibility / readability [n=2] Mansoor (5) Thompson (10)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 82	N= 78	In one study effect for pictograms (5), in one study no effect (10).	moderate	important but not critical
Akzeptanz / Attraktivität [n=2] Mansoor (5) Thompson (10)	RCT	serious (-1)	not seriouscritical	not serious	not serious	N= 82	N= 78	In two studies effects for pictograms (5, 10).	moderate	limited importance

Table 21: Evidence table „Text with illustrative drawings versus text only“

Certainty assessment						Summary of findings				
						No. of participants per group		Effect estimates		
Outcomes [No. of studies]	Study design	<i>Risk of bias</i>	Inconsis- tency	Indirect- ness	Impreci- sion	Interven- tion	Control	Effects	Quality of evidence	Importance
Text with illustrative drawings versus text only										
UNderstanding [n=4] Austin (12) Brotherstone (13) Kools (14) Liu (4)	RCT	serious (-1)	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	N= 162	N= 159	In two studies effects for drawings (12, 13), in one study no clear effect (14), in one study no effect (4).	low	critical
Knowledge [n=1] Henry (15)	RCT	very serious (-2)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 23	N= 28	In one study no effect (15).	low	critical
Comprehensibility / readability [n=2] Kools (14) Liu (4)	RCT	serious (-1)	not serious	not serious	not serious	N= 78	N= 77	In two studies no effects (4, 14).	moderate	important but not critical

References

1. Bol N, Smets EM, Eddes EH, de Haes JC, Loos EF, van Weert JC. Illustrations enhance older colorectal cancer patients' website satisfaction and recall of online cancer information. *European journal of cancer care*. 2015;24(2):213-23. Epub 2015/01/24.
2. Bunge M, Mühlhauser 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.
3. King SR, McCaffrey DJ, 3rd, Bentley JP, Bouldin A, Hallam J, Wilkin NE. The influence of symbols on the short-term recall of pharmacy-generated prescription medication information in a low health literate sample. *Journal of health communication*. 2012;17 Suppl 3:280-93. Epub 2012/10/04.
4. Liu CJ, Kemper S, McDowd J. The use of illustration to improve older adults' comprehension of health-related information: Is it helpful? *Patient education and counseling* [Internet]. 2009; (2):[283-8 pp.]. Available from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/o/cochrane/clcentral/articles/160/CN-00754160/frame.html>.
5. Mansoor LE, Dowse R. Effect of pictograms on readability of patient information materials. *The Annals of pharmacotherapy* [Internet]. 2003; (7-8):[1003-9 pp.]. Available from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/o/cochrane/clcentral/articles/903/CN-00558903/frame.html>.
6. Roundtable on Health Literacy: Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice, Institute of Medicine. In: Hernandez LM, editor. *Standardizing medication labels: confusing patients less Workshop summary*. Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2008.
7. Hollands GJ, Marteau TM. The impact of using visual images of the body within a personalized health risk assessment: an experimental study. *British journal of health psychology*. 2013;18(2):263-78. Epub 2013/01/03.
8. Delp C, Jones J. Communicating information to patients: the use of cartoon illustrations to improve comprehension of instructions. *Academic emergency medicine : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine*. 1996;3(3):264-70. Epub 1996/03/01.
9. Sahm LJ, Wolf MS, Curtis LM, Behan R, Brennan M, Gallwey H, et al. What's in a label? An exploratory study of patient-centered drug instructions. *European journal of clinical pharmacology*. 2012;68(5):777-82. Epub 2011/12/01.

10. Thompson AE, Goldszmidt MA, Schwartz AJ, Bashook PG. A randomized trial of pictorial versus prose-based medication information pamphlets. Patient education and counseling [Internet]. 2010; (3):[389-93 pp.]. Available from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/o/cochrane/clcentral/articles/944/CN-00781944/frame.html>.

11. Yin HS, Mendelsohn AL, Fierman A, Schaick L, Bazan IS, Dreyer BP. Use of a pictographic diagram to decrease parent dosing errors with infant acetaminophen: a health literacy perspective. Academic pediatrics [Internet]. 2011; (1):[50-7 pp.]. Available from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/o/cochrane/clcentral/articles/830/CN-00801830/frame.html>.

12. Austin PE, Matlack R, 2nd, Dunn KA, Kesler C, Brown CK. Discharge instructions: do illustrations help our patients understand them? Annals of emergency medicine. 1995;25(3):317-20. Epub 1995/03/01.

13. Brotherstone H, Miles A, Robb KA, Atkin W, Wardle J. The impact of illustrations on public understanding of the aim of cancer screening. Patient education and counseling. 2006;63(3):328-35. Epub 2006/10/03.

14. Kools M, van de Wiel MW, Ruiter RA, Kok G. Pictures and text in instructions for medical devices: effects on recall and actual performance. Patient education and counseling. 2006;64(1-3):104-11. Epub 2006/02/14.

15. Henry E, Brown T, Bartlett C, Massoud E, Bance M. Informed consent in otologic surgery: prospective randomized study comparing risk recall with an illustrated handout and a nonillustrated handout. Journal of otolaryngology - head & neck surgery = Le Journal d'oto-rhino-laryngologie et de chirurgie cervico-faciale. 2008;37(2):273-8. Epub 2009/01/09.