Evaluating The Readability of Online Educational Materials Targeted

St. Joseph's Medical Center¹, University of Arizona College of Medicine – Tucson²

Results



to Radiology Patients
Nancy Phu, DO¹, Nicholas Barney, MD², Michael Larson, MD PhD²

Dignity Health®

St. Joseph's Medical Center

Introduction

- Health literacy is particularly important in radiology, due to limited direct patient care compared to other specialties.
- The average reading level for an American is at 7-8th grade.
- RadiologyInfo was a national attempt to provide accurate and accessible information for patients, yet studies completed in 2014 and 2019 showed content was written with advanced language, measured at the 10th-14th grade level.
- The editors of RadiologyInfo released a statement in 2020 addressing the higher readability and their attempts at improving comprehension.

Objectives

- Our primary goal is to re-evaluate the readability of online radiological information accessible to patients from recognized educational resource websites, academic institutions, and large private practice groups.
- If common patient resources/reports can be matched to the comprehension level of the patient, better patient autonomy and outcomes can be achieved.

Study Methods

- Three websites from each source of information provider (institutional resource, academic health institution, and private practice group) were selected for analysis.
- RadiologyInfo, ChoosingWisely, and ImageGently are three common/popular informational websites, created and vetted by the American College of Radiology (ACR) and Radiological Society of North America (RSNA).
- The top three academic institutions, Stanford University,
 University of Pennsylvania, and Washington University at St.
 Louis were selected based on the extent of their research
 grant funding, from the published 2017 rankings released by
 the Blue Ridge Institute for Medical Research.
- Radiology Associates of North Texas (RANT), Radia, and Advanced Radiology Services, were the three largest private practice groups listed on Radiology Business.
- We sampled their patient information landing page text with the Readability Test Tool, Test by Direct Input feature from Webfx.com to measure their readability metrics and compared readability scores (Flesch-Kincaid reading ease, Flesch-Kincaid grade level, and automated readability index) and text statistics.
- Texts originating from titles, subtitles, and hyperlinks were excluded from the study.

RadiologyInfo.org For patients Test/Treatment Pediatric Care Screening/Wellness Disease/Condition Safety En Español More Info- Spotlight October is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month ▶ Recently Posted: Pediatric Castrostomy Tube ▶ USEPTE Updates Lung Cancer Screening Guidelines ▶ Medical Imaging and Coronavirus (COVID-19) Safety ▶ Radiology and You ▶ Radiology and You ▶

The radiology information resource for patients

Welcome!

RadiologyInfo.org tells you how various x-ray, CT, MRI, ultrasound, radiation therapy and other procedures are performed. It also addresses what you may experience and how to prepare for the exams. The website contains over 260 procedure, exam and disease descriptions covering diagnostic and interventional radiology, nuclear medicine, radiation therapy and radiation safety and is updated frequently with new information. All material on the RadiologyInfo.org website is reviewed and approved by experts in the field of radiology from RSNA and the ACR, as well as other professional radiology organizations.

Please note

RadiologyInfo.org is not a medical facility. Please contact your physician with specific medical questions or for a referral to a radiologist or other physician. To locate a medical imaging or radiation oncology provider in your community, you can search the

Figure 1. Example of Patient Landing Page

RSNA ACR

Readability Test Quick and easy way to test the readability of your work. Enter URL Enter Text Refer from Website RadiologyInfo.org tells you how various x-ray, CT, MRI, ultrasound, radiation therapy and other procedures are performed. It also addresses what you may experience and how to prepare for the exams. The website contains over 260 procedure, exam and disease descriptions covering diagnostic and interventional radiology, nuclear medicine, radiation therapy and radiation safety and is updated HTML is allowed - it will be stripped from the text. Calculate Readability Your directly input has an average reading ease of about 18.1 of 100. It should be easily understood by 19 to 20 year olds. Share: Tweet your results

Educational Institution Websites	Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease	Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level	Automated Readability Index				
RadiologyInfo	18.10	14.20	11.40				
ImageGently	40.10	11.20	11.30				
ChoosingWisely	9.40	19.70	21.30				
Average	22.53	15.03	14.67				
Academic Institutions							
Stanford	3.60	20.00	22.10				
U Penn	21.30	15.20	15.20				
U Washington SL	20.00	15.90	16.30				
Average	14.97	17.03	17.87				
Private Practice Groups							
RANT	40.20	12.40	12.40				
Radia	51.10	11.60	11.20				
Advanced Rad	16.30	16.20	15.80				
Average	35.87	13.40	13.13				

Figure 2. Score evaluation of landing page text

Table 1. Comparison of reading scores across websites

Text Statistics	Statistics						
10 SENTENCES	138 words	45 COMPLEX WORDS	32.61% PERCENT OF COMPLEX WORDS	13.80 AVERAGE WORDS PER SENTENCE	2.07 AVERAGE SYLLABLES PER WORD		

Figure 3. Text statistics of a landing page

Educational Institution Websites	No. sentences	No. words	No. complex words	% complex words	Avg words per sentence (WPS)	Avg syllables per word (SPW)
RadiologyInfo	10.00	138.00	45.00	32.61%	13.80	2.07
ImageGently	6.00	186.00	59.00	31.72%	31.00	1.96
ChoosingWisely	4.00	154.00	35.00	22.73%	38.50	1.73
Average	6.67	159.33	46.33	29.02%	27.77	1.92
Academic Institutions						
Stanford	11.00	323.00	94.00	29.10%	29.36	2.05
U Penn	14.00	276.00	84.00	30.43%	19.71	1.96
U Washington SL	14.00	304.00	91.00	29.93%	21.71	1.95
Average	13.00	301.00	89.67	29.82%	23.59	1.99
Private Practice Groups						
RANT	5.00	96.00	21.00	21.88%	19.20	1.74
Radia	37.00	816.00	131.00	16.05%	22.05	1.58
Advanced Rad	22.00	462.00	144.00	31.17%	21.00	2.00
Average	21.33	458.00	98.67	23.03%	20.75	1.77

Results

- The average Flesch-Kincaid grade level of each category was found to be institutional website: 15th, academic institution: 17th, and private practice group: 13th, with Stanford's content being regarded with the highest grade level (20th) and ImageGently's content the lowest grade level (11th).
- The averages of the Flesch-Kincaid reading ease were institutional website: 22.5, academic institution: 15, and private practice group: 36, with Stanford having the lowest reading ease (3.6) and Radia having the highest (51.1).
- Each webpage had a variable amount of text content, with Radia providing the most information on each imaging modality and RadiologyInfo providing the least text on their patient information landing page.
- The institutional websites had an average of 159 words, of which 29% words were considered complex. There was an average of about 28 words in each sentence.
- Academic institutions had an average of 301 words, of which 30% were considered complex words. There was an average of 24 words in a sentence.
- Private practice groups had an average of 458 words, of which 23% were considered complex words. There was an average of about 21 words in a sentence.

Conclusion

- Although Radia did have the most content on their pages, this is due to having multiple pages rather than a single landing page for patients. The number of complex words (16%) is still comparatively less than other private practice groups (23%), academic health institutions (30%), and national websites (29%).
- The data show content presented from these nine radiology information providers across all three categories is significantly above the reading ability of the average American patient.
- This puts patients at a significant disadvantage in being able to understand the specifics of their medical experience but more importantly limits their ability to make informed medical decisions and receive care specifically tailored to their needs.

References

- Agarwal N, Hansberry DR, Sabourin V, Tomei KL, Prestigiacomo CJ. A Comparative Analysis of the Quality of Patient Education Materials From Medical Specialties. JAMA Intern Med. 2013;173(13):1257–1259.

 Marchand L. What is readability and why should content editors care about it? Center for Plain Language
- website. March 22, 2017. Accessed March 26, 2021. https://centerforplainlanguage.org/what-is-readability/
- Radiological Society of North America, Inc. RadiologyInfo.org. https://www.radiologyinfo.org/. Accessed March 23, 2021.
- 4. Hansberry DR, John A, John E, Agarwal N, Gonzales SF, Baker SR. A critical review of the readability of online patient education resources from RadiologyInfo.Org. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2014 Mar;202(3):566-75.
- Bange M, Huh E, Novin SA, Hui FK, Yi PH. Readability of Patient Education Materials From RadiologyInfo.org: Has There Been Progress Over the Past 5 Years? AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2019 Oct;213(4):875-879.
- 6. Rigsby CK, Krishnaraj A. Progress in Improving Readability of RadiologyInfo.org. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2020 May;214(5):W78.