



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1016/j.bjoms.2018.12.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2018.12.007)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Parvez, H., Noorani, M. S., Pandis, N., Cobourne, M. T., & Sehra, J. (2019). Information for oral and maxillofacial patients: can it be improved? *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, 57(5), 412-418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2018.12.007>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Title

Oral and Maxillofacial Patient Information Leaflets: can they be improved?

Short title

Quality of Oral and Maxillofacial Information Leaflets

Authors

^a Dr Hamza Parvez BDS, MSc, MOrth (Edin) (Postgraduate student)

^b Dr Mariam Shahid Noorani BSc, BDS, MFDS RCS(Edin), MOrth (Registrar)

^c Dr. med. dent. Nikolaos Pandis MS, MSc, DLSHTN, PhD (Senior Lecturer)

^a Professor Martyn. Cobourne FDSRCS, FDS Orth RCS, PhD (Professor)

^{a*} Dr Jadbinder Seehra BDS(Hons) MFDSRCS (Eng) MSc MOrth RCS (Eng) FDS Orth RCS (Eng) (Senior Lecturer)

Affiliations

^a Department of Orthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Oral and Craniofacial Sciences, King's College London, Floor 22, Guy's Hospital, Guy's and St Thomas NHS Foundation Trust, London, SE1 9RT, United Kingdom

^b Department of Orthodontics, Institute of Dentistry, Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom

^c Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Dental School/Medical Faculty, University of Bern, Freiburgstrasse 7 CH-3010, Bern, Switzerland

***Author for correspondence**

Mr Jadbinder Seehra
Department of Orthodontics
Faculty of Dentistry, Oral and Craniofacial Sciences
King's College London
Floor 22
Guy's Hospital
Guy's and St Thomas NHS Foundation Trust
London
SE1 9RT
United Kingdom
Email: jadbinderpal.seehra@kcl.ac.uk

Title

Oral and Maxillofacial Patient Information Leaflets: can they be improved?

Abstract

The aim and objective of this study was to evaluate the quality and readability of leaflet and online Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery patient information leaflets (PILs). The quality,

readability and grade level of each PIL was assessed using the DISCERN, Flesch Reading Ease and Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level instruments respectively. In total, 140 patient information leaflets were assessed. For both leaflet and online PILs, many items of the DISCERN instrument were deemed of low quality and poorly reported. The **median** overall quality score was 30.2. Variation in the quality and readability scores between leaflet and online PILs and those produced by various societies was evident. Overall, PILs were deemed to be of moderate quality. Online PILs were of lower quality, more difficult to read and aimed at a higher reading age level.

Introduction

Patients should now be informed of potential risks of treatment as part of the treatment consent process.¹ Patient information Leaflets (PILs) can contribute towards the informed

consent process and have reported to assist decision-making.² Additional reported benefits of PILs include: providing awareness and information to change behaviors, educating patients³, increasing patient's overall satisfaction with clinicians⁴, reducing anxiety and offering reassurance⁵ and improving patient satisfaction.⁶ PILs are popular, with the majority of patients preferring written information and leaflets.⁷ PILs can be of variable quality due to poor content, structure and writing style.^{8,9} Ideally, the content used in the PILs should easily be understood by patients, easily read and remembered to enhance the communication between the doctor and the patient.⁴

Considering the reported benefits of PILs it is important that clinicians are confident regarding the content and quality of PILs they provide their patients.⁹ The DISCERN tool is an instrument designed to assist professionals and patients with evaluating the quality of written healthcare information and hence allowing patients to make more well-informed decisions.¹⁰ The Flesch Reading Ease and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level scales have been used to assess the readability of the patient information leaflets.^{11,12} Previous assessment of both leaflet PILs^{13,14,15} and information provided online^{16,17,19} using the DISCERN instrument has reported the quality of information to be sub-optimal. In addition, the readability of orthodontic patient information leaflets have been shown to aimed at a higher reading age than the recommended population standard hence potentially reducing their effectiveness.^{14,19} Online PILs also tend to be written for individuals with a high reading level.^{16,20} The aim and objective of this study was to evaluate the quality and readability of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery patient information leaflets (PILs) produced by national oral and maxillofacial societies

Materials and methods

An electronic search was conducted to identify PILs produced by National Oral and Maxillofacial societies. The following keywords "maxillofacial surgery" and "patient information leaflets" were entered into Google (www.google.com), google scholar search engines and PubMed. Only English language PILs were included. All potential PILs (online and pdf versions) were initially screened by one author (HP). These were then independently assessed by two investigators (HP and JS). All disagreements were resolved by discussion.

The DISCERN tool consists of 16 items that are categorised into three sections: authenticity (questions 1-8), information pertaining to treatment options available to patients (questions 9-15), and an overall rating of the quality of the source of information (question 16). Each item was scaled on a five-point system, where a score of 1 was used for sources

that were seriously flawed and a score of 5 for high quality sources that had minor flaws. Each question on the DISCERN tool was independently graded by two authors (HP and MS), together producing a score for each PIL. For domains 1-15 of the DISCERN instrument, each was scored on a scale between 1(lowest)- 5(highest). **The total sum of all domains for each PIL was obtained**, which produced overall scores ranging from 15 (minimum) to 75 (maximum).¹⁵ Two investigators (HP and MN) were calibrated by assessing the quality of 5 PILs with direct referral to the DISCERN instrument and associated explanation per item. The quality of each PIL was assessed independently.

One author (HP) was responsible for assessing the readability of the PILs. The entire text of each PIL was copied into Microsoft Word and a corresponding Word file was created. The Word files were then compared against their corresponding pdf versions in order to ensure accuracy of the text. The text was then uploaded into an online tool located at www.readability-score.com. Two assessment tools (Flesch Reading Ease (FRE)²¹ and Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level²²) were used to assess readability and grade level. The Flesh readability tools considers the length of sentences and the number of syllables in each word along with different weighting factors for each variable to calculate the reading ease and grade level respectively. **The scoring system for the assessment of readability was based on the methodology employed by previous studies.** ^{12, 13} **The Flesh Reading Ease score ranges from 0 to 100, where 0 represents a passage that is very difficult to read and 100 a very simple one.** ¹³ **The overall readability of a PIL based on the FRE score was classified into different categories depending on its score. A score below 50 was classified as difficult; a score above 60 was classified as fairly difficult and a score above 80 was classified as comfortable reading text.** ¹² All data was entered into an Microsoft excel data capture sheet.

Inter-assessor reliability was assessed using the Kappa statistic (Table 1). Descriptive statistics for individual reporting items of the DISCERN instrument were calculated and converted to a percentage scale. **A non-normal distribution of the data was assessed and confirmed from graphical methods. Bootstrapping method was used to identify characteristics associated with the median score.** A two-tailed p value of 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Statistical analyses were performed using STATA software version 14.2 (Stata Corporation, College Station, Texas, USA).

Results

A total of 140 PILs (leaflet (N=62) and online (N=78) were included in this study. The inter-assessor level of agreement (%) for each item of the DISCERN instrument ranged between 35 (lowest)-81.4% (highest). For leaflet and online PILs, the largest number were produced

by British Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons (27%) and Pennsylvania Society of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons (10.0%) respectively (Table 2). The ratings of individual DISCERN item (Leaflets) is shown in Table 3. Overall, these were deemed of moderate quality (Item 16). The ratings of individual DISCERN items (Online) (N=78) are shown in Table 4. Similar to leaflet types, online PILs were deemed of moderate quality.

The overall DISCERN quality score was 30.2 (N=140). The median Discern quality scores for Leaflet and online PILs (N=78) is shown in Table 5. There was a significant difference in the quality scores between Leaflet and Online PILs (-4.86, 95 % CI: -6.26, -3.47, p = 0.001).

Table 6 reports the median readability scores for both Leaflet and Online PILs. Differences in the median readability scores are shown in Table 7.

For Leaflet PILs the median FRE and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level were 61.5 (IQR 52.4-66.7) and 8.4 (IQR 7.8-10.3). For Online PILs the median FRE and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level were 46.6 (IQR 34.4-54.9) and 11.4 (IQR 9.8 -12). The highest FRE score for leaflets and online was for PILs produced by British Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons (64.8) and Association of Oral And Maxillofacial Surgeons in Singapore (55.8) respectively. The highest Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score for leaflets was for PILs produced by South African Society of Maxillofacial and Oral Surgeons (10.9). Online PILs produced by Canadian Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons, Australian and New Zealand Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons and Pakistan Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons achieved the highest Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score of 12 (Table 6). There was a significant difference in the readability scores of FRE between Leaflet and Online PILs, with lower scores achieved by Online PILs (-14.6, 95 % CI: -20.0, -9.16). In addition, online PILs had higher Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level scores (2.80, 95 % CI: 1.83, 3.78) (Table 7).

Discussion

It is essential that clinicians and healthcare providers are confident about the quality of patient information leaflets they utilise in their clinical practice.⁹ The DISCERN instrument has been developed as “gold standard” reference for developers of patient information

leaflets (PILs).¹⁰ It has previously been used in multiple medical and dental specialties to assess the quality of PILs. Previous investigations have reported variation in the quality of PILs when assessed in relation to the DISCERN instrument.^{13, 14, 15, 21}

Regarding leaflets deficient reporting of specific items of the DISCERN instrument were identified (Table 3 and Table 4). Similar findings have been reported. Lewis and Newton¹⁵ reported deficiencies in aims, reference to sources of information or date of production, risks of treatment, effect of choosing not to have treatment, effect of treatment on overall quality of life, and support for shared decision making. Seehra et al.¹⁴ reported deficiencies in description of aims (47.2 %), description of sources (100 %), details of additional sources (69.4 %), consequences of no treatment (50 %), possible treatment options (38.8 %) and support for a shared decision process (61.1 %).

Based on item 16 (overall quality rating) of the DISCERN instrument, both the Leaflet and Online PILs included in this study were deemed to be of moderate quality. The overall quality score for the total sample was 30.2. PILs that were available online were of lower quality compared to leaflet PILs. This appears to be consistent with previous literature. Using the DISCERN instrument the mean quality score of online health information for pediatric neuro-oncology specialties was 34.5 with the majority categorized as poor quality.¹⁸ The mean quality score for both orthodontic and medical PILs has been reported at 44 and 35.2 respectively indicating a slighter higher quality compared to online sources.^{14,15}

The readability content of patient information materials should not be beyond the reading age of a 12-year-old and for the population in the United Kingdom and United States not surpass a reading level of 10-11 years old (Grade 5-6) and 13-14 year old (8th grade) respectively.^{9,23,24} The use of online resources to search for health-related information is increasing but the quality and readability of the information is debatable.²⁵ In this study, the median FRE for Leaflet PILs and Online PILs was 61.5 and 46.6 and the Flesch - Kincaid Grade Level scores for leaflet PILs was online PILs and 8.6 and 11.4 respectively. Dental practice leaflets have found leaflets to be 'difficult to read' with a mean FRE level ranging between 55.2 (SD 12.5) and 72.19 (SD 4.75).¹³ Similarly, hospital patient information leaflets have been assessed to have a mean Flesch-Kincaid reading grade of 7.8 which exceeds the comprehension of readers.²³ There was also a difference between the readability of leaflet PILs and online PILs as well as those produced by different societies. In comparison to the leaflet PILs, online PILs achieved a lower FRE scores and higher Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level scores. Leaflets produced by Australian and New Zealand Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons had the lowest FRE score and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score. In

contrast, British Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons achieved the highest FRE score of 64.8 and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score of 8.

Readability tools are a measurement criteria based on sentence length, syllable count, or vocabulary indexes. A shortcoming of this is that a word may score well using a given measure of readability, even though it may not be a commonly used term. The replacement of healthcare terminology with layman terms would not be fully achievable without potential loss of accuracy hence a certain degree must be included at the compromise of may higher readability scores.

Variability in the level of agreement per item of the DISCERN instrument between the two assessors was evident. This ranged from 35 (item 9) to 81.4%(item 5) which could limit the generalisability of the findings (Table 1). This could be attributed to the difference in experience between the two assessors and potential rater bias. The decision to include leaflets from national societies was based on the accessibility and availability but may result in a degree of selection bias. In addition, as the investigators were not blinded when assessing the PILs, a further degree of bias may have been introduced.

PILs produced by for-profit companies such as Krames were not evaluated despite their products being widely used. An assessment of the level of expertise and financial support used in the development of PILs was beyond the scope of this study and is not variable assessed in the DISCERN instrument. This could be a shortcoming of this tool as potentially the quality of PILs could be influenced by the level of support and expertise utilized. Potentially relevant non-English PILs may have also been excluded. The decision to include English only PILs was to reduce interpretation errors when assessed using the DISCERN instrument.

The aim of this study was to provide baseline data, highlight the overall deficiencies and quality of a large number and broad spectrum of oral and maxillofacial PILs. The individual treatment intervention of each PIL was not assessed or compared but could be explored in future studies.^{15,16,25} Despite patient information being reported to improve patient satisfaction⁶, the relationship between the quality of information leaflets and patient satisfaction needs further investigating to verify if PILs can have a positive influence on treatment outcomes. Ideally, Patient information leaflets should be easily accessible, understood by a wide-ranging readership, based on current evidence and designed at the appropriate reading age.^{9,10} The quality of future PILs can be further enhanced if the domains of the DISCERN instrument are followed in the design stage.

Within the study limitations the quality of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery PILs have been deemed of moderate quality. Informed consent is required when undertaking surgical procedures and PILs have been shown to contribute to this process.^{1,2} However, they should be only used as an aid in the informed consent process and not replace a verbal discussion between clinicians and patients as there is a risk that poor quality leaflets may represent a breach in the duty of care, if clinicians are not aware of the shortcomings of leaflets in terms of both content and readability. From a medico-legal aspect, if patient information leaflets have been used during the treatment consent process, it would be prudent for the clinician to document in the clinical notes that the patient has read and understood this additional information.

The results of this study have confirmed that clinicians cannot solely rely on PILs during the consenting of oral and maxillofacial procedures. When explaining healthcare options to patients, clinicians may wish to consider providing supplemental information (leaflet and online) including information describing possible treatment options, support for a shared decision making, describing risks of each treatment and a description of how different choices affect overall quality of life.

Conflicting interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest

Ethical approval

Both ethical approval and patient consent was not required

References

1. D'Cruz L, Kaney H. Consent - a new era begins. *Br Dent J* 2015; **219**: 57-9.
2. Brown H, Ramchandani M, Gillow JT, et al. Are patient information leaflets contributing to informed consent for cataract surgery? *J Med Ethics* 2004; **30**: 218-20.
3. Bennett J, Bridger P. Communicating with patients. *British Medical Journal* 1992; **305**: 1294
4. Ley P. Satisfaction, compliance and communication. *Br J Clin Psychol* 1982; **21**:241-54.
5. Stephens R, Ryan FS, Cunningham SJ. Information-seeking behavior of adolescent orthodontic patients. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* 2013; **143**: 303-09.
6. Dickinson D, Raynor DK, Duman M. Patient information leaflets for medicines: using consumer testing to determine the most effective design. *Patient education and counselling* 2001;**43**: 147-159.
7. Weinman J. Providing written information for patients: psychological considerations. *J Roy Soc Med* 1990;**83**: 303 -5.
8. Payne S, Large S, Jarrett N, et al. Written information given to patients and families by palliative care units: a national survey. *The Lancet* 2000; **355**: 1792.
9. Kenny T, Wilson RG, Purves IN, et al: A PIL for every ill? Patient information leaflets (PILs): a review of past, present and future use. *Fam Pract* 1998; **15**:471-9.
10. Charnock D, Shepperd S, Needham G, et al. DISCERN: an instrument for judging the quality of written consumer health information on treatment choices. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1999; **53**: 105-11.
11. D'alessandro DM, Kingsley P, Johnson-West J. The readability of pediatric patient education materials on the World Wide Web. *Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine* 2001;**155**: 807-12.
12. Demir F, Ozsaker E, Ilce AO. The quality and suitability of written educational materials for patients. *J Clin Nurs* 2008;**17**: 259-265.
13. Lewis MA, Newton JT. An evaluation of the quality of commercially produced patient information leaflets. *Br Dent J* 2006; **201**: 114-17.
14. Seehra J, Cockerham L, Pandis N. A quality assessment of orthodontic patient information leaflets. *Progress in orthodontics* 2016; **17**: 1-6.
15. Rees CE, Ford JE, Sheard CE. Patient information leaflets for prostate cancer: which leaflets should healthcare professionals recommend? *Patient Educ Couns* 2003; **49**: 263-272.

16. Kaicker J, Debono VB, Dang W, et al. Assessment of the quality and variability of health information on chronic pain websites using the DISCERN instrument. *BMC medicine* 2010; **8** :59.
17. Batchelor JM, Ohya Y. Use of the DISCERN instrument by patients and health professionals to assess information resources on treatments for asthma and atopic dermatitis. *Allergology International* 2009; **58**: 141-45.
18. Hargrave DR, Hargrave UA, Bouffet E. Quality of health information on the Internet in paediatric neuro-oncology. *Neuro-oncology* 2006; **8**:175-82.
19. Harwood A, Harrison JE. How readable are orthodontic patient information leaflets? *J Orthod* 2004; **31**: 210-19.
20. Smart JM, Burling D. Radiology and the internet: a systematic review of patient information resources. *Clinical radiology* 2001; **56** :867-70.
21. Flesch R. A new readability yardstick. *J Appl Psychol* 1948; **32**: 221-33.
22. Kincaid JP, Fishburne RP Jr, Rogers RL, et al. Derivation of new readability formulas (Automated Readability Index, Fog Count and Flesch Reading Ease Formula) for Navy enlisted personnel. Research Branch Report. Millington, TN: Naval Technical Training Command 1975; 8
23. Williamson JM, Martin AG. Analysis of patient information leaflets provided by a district general hospital by the Flesch and Flesch-Kincaid method. *Int J Clin Pract* 2010; **64**: 1824-1831.
24. Coiera E. The Internet's challenge to health care provision. *British Medical Journal* 1996; **312** :3-4.
25. Grewal P, Alagaratnam S. The quality and readability of colorectal cancer information on the internet. *Int J Surg* 2013; **11**:410-13.

Table legends

Table 1 Inter-assessor reliability scores per DISCERN instrument item

Table 2 Source and numbers of PILs included (N=140)

Table 3 The ratings of individual DISCERN item (Leaflets) (N=62)

Table 4 The ratings of individual DISCERN items (Online) (N=78)

Table 5 Median DISCERN quality scores for leaflet and online PILs per source

Table 6 Median readability scores for Leaflet and Online PILs per source

Table 7 Medians, median differences (observed coefficients) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the differences in readability scores for both leaflet and online types