## 3. Sorted and unsorted pictograms

| | |
|---|---|
|  | **Recommendation**<br>**„If pictograms are used as a supplement, then sorted pictograms should be used."**<br><br>Agreed: 9, Disagreed: 2, Abstentions: 2<br>**Quality of the evidence:** moderate quality |

**Comment on the recommendation:**

The Recommendation refers to the comparison of presentations with sorted and unsorted pictograms.

In this comparison, four studies showed no consistent effect for the cognitive outcomes *understanding / risk perception*, *knowledge* and *comprehensibility / readability*. A positive effect when using sorted pictograms was shown in only one out of two studies concerning the outcome *knowledge*.

With regard to the affective outcome *acceptance / attractiveness*, three studies showed a positive effect for the use of sorted pictograms. For the outcome *trust / credibility* only one study was available, which showed a positive effect for unsorted pictograms.

## Summary of the findings

### Characteristics of the included studies

For this comparison, five studies were included with 6,923 participants, of which 6,202 took part in an online study (18). Patients of both sexes (4, 19), healthy people (17, 18) and the risk group smokers (20) were investigated. The average age was from 43 to over 50 years. The interventions consisted of information concerning possible treatment (4, 17, 18), presentation of the lifetime risk (19) and the presentation of findings from fictitious genetical tests (20). The studies were conducted in the USA (18, 19), Canada (17), Germany (4) and Great Britain (20).

**Results for the relevant outcomes**

Wirth regard to the outcomes *understanding / risk perception*, *knowledge* and *comprehensibility / readability* no consistent effect was shown (4, 17, 18, 20). A positive effect for using sorted pictograms was shown for the outcome *acceptance / attractiveness*. For the outcome *trust / credibility,* a positive effect was seen for using unsorted pictograms.