


### 3. Natural frequencies

	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>“For probabilities &gt;1%, presentation in percentages may be applied instead of presentation in natural frequencies”</b></p> <p>Agreed: 14, Disagreed: 0, Abstentions: 0</p> <p><b>Quality of the evidence:</b> high quality</p>
<p><b>Comment on the recommendation:</b></p> <p>The recommendation refers to the comparison of the presentation in percentages to that in natural frequencies in health information.</p> <p>Regarding the outcome <i>understanding / risk perception</i> one study showed that for probabilities &gt;1% the presentation in percentages was superior to that in natural frequencies.</p> <p>No difference was shown for all other outcomes (<i>knowledge</i> – 2 studies; <i>comprehensibility / readability</i> – 2 studies; <i>acceptance / attractiveness</i> – 1 study).</p>	

### Summary of the findings

#### Characteristics of the included studies

For this comparison, three studies with a total of 3,365 participants were included. The sample sizes were between 136 and 2,944, whereby the medium age was 39 to 61 years, depending on the target group. The studies were carried out in the USA (9, 18, 27) and England (19). Included were people from the general public (9), veterans (37) and visitors of both sexes to a web site (18).

The interventions consisted of scenarios concerning cholesterol reduction drugs and indigestion in drug facts boxes (9), cardiovascular risk (37), chemotherapy (18) and pain therapy (18).

#### Results for the relevant outcomes

With regard to the outcome *understanding / risk perception*, an effect for presentation in percentages was found in a high quality study (9). No differences could be seen for the outcomes *knowledge*, *comprehensibility / readability*, and *acceptance / attractiveness* (9, 18, 37).