UPIM-Check (User-friendly Patient Information Material Checklist – English Version)

Instrument to assess and optimise the quality of patient information material (PIM)

| Document name (e.g. short informational flyer): | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Review | Reviewer: Person affected (e.g. self-help) Expert (e.g. academic researcher, project staff) | | | | | | | |
| Provider (e.g. case manager, psychotherapist) | | | | | | | | |
| Where | and how the patient comes into contact with | PIM: | | | | | | |
| Quality | criteria | very good | suffi- cient | unsatis- factory | Suggestions for improvement | | | |
| Q1: Co | rrectness & validity of content – Does the co | | | | bes the information appear to be valid? | | | |
| Q1.1 | Up-to-date & technically correct (references, expertise of the authors, date) | | | | | | | |
| | Does the information appear to be up-to-date? Is the information correctly cited? | | | | | | | |
| Q1.2 | Transparency (author of the PIM; contact person, contact & logo) | | | | | | | |
| | How clear is the information? | | | | | | | |
| Q1.3 | Information is relevant for the target group (social evidence) | | | | | | | |
| | Is the information relevant for the target group? | | | | | | | |
| Q1.4 | Contextual integration into patient's situation (experience, emotions, burden) | [| [| | | | | |
| | How does the information fit the patient's situation? | | | | | | | |
| Q1.5 | Focus (only 1-2 aspects, e.g. cancer and holistic support) | | | | | | | |
| | Is the focus of the content clear and easy to identify? | | | | | | | |
| Q1.6 | Adequate presentation (benefits, risks and impacts are adequately presented for decision making) | | | | | | | |
| | Is the information presented in a way that an informed decision can be made? | | | | | | | |

© 2020, Theresia Krieger, Sandra Salm, Judith Mollenhauer, Natalia Cecon, Antje Dresen, Stefanie Houwaart, Kathrin Schwickerath, Andrea Göttel, Anna Arning Developed in a participatory process by: University of Cologne, House of the Cancer Patient Support Associations of Germany, Cancer Society North Rhine-Westphalia.

| Quality criteria | | very | suffi- | unsatis- | Suggestions for improvement | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Q1: Co | rrectness & validity of content – Does the co | good ntent seei | good cient factory Itent seem to be correct? Does the information appear to be valid? | | | | |
| Q1.7 | Motivation & increase of self-efficacy (the patient is interested in the offer (e.g. information, programme) because) | | | | | | |
| | Does the information increase the readers motivation to act? | | | | | | |
| Q1.8 | Recommendation for action (turning information into activity) Does the information recommend clear steps for action? | | | | | | |
| Q1.9 | Further literature / points of contact (further information is accessible, in other words, no "dead" links; contact person if information is not available) Does the information provide further sources for reading? Is a point of contact mentioned? | | | | | | |

| Q2: Re | Q2: Readability of content – Is the content easy to read? | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Q2.1 | Aim of the PIM and target group is identifiable | | | | | | | |
| | Are the aim and the target group of the PIM clear? | | | | | | | |
| Q2.2 | Clarity of content (short and concise, inspiring content e.g. quotations) | | | | | | | |
| | Is the content clear for the target group? | | | | | | | |
| Q2.3 | Simple, clear language | | | | | | | |
| | Is the PIM written in a simple and clear way? | | | | | | | |
| Q2.4 | Neutral language (non-directive) Is the PIM presented in an open-minded, not manipulating way? | | | | | | | |

© 2020, Theresia Krieger, Sandra Salm, Judith Mollenhauer, Natalia Cecon, Antje Dresen, Stefanie Houwaart, Kathrin Schwickerath, Andrea Göttel, Anna Arning Developed in a participatory process by: University of Cologne, House of the Cancer Patient Support Associations of Germany, Cancer Society North Rhine-Westphalia.

| Quality criteria | | very good | suffi- cient | unsatis- factory | Suggestions for improvement |
|------------------|---|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Q2: Re | adability of content – Is the content easy to re | • | | | |
| Q2.5 | Target group-specific language(age, education, health literacy)Does the language fit the target group? | | | | |
| Q2.6 | Use of numbers (numbers used are clear and easy to understand; no calculations) Are the numbers used easy to understand? | | | | |
| Q2.7 | Language that can be understood without prior medical knowledge, otherwise medical terms must be defined Is the information understandable without prior medical knowledge? | | | | |
| Q2.8 | Use of empowering words Does the information use words that strengthen the target group? | | | | |

| Q3: Stru | Q3: Structural readability – Is the structure of the information appropriate for the target group? | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Q3.1 | Sentence length | | | | | | | | |
| | Is the length of the sentences appropriate for the target group? | | | | | | | | |
| Q3.2 | Sentence difficulty/complexity | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Is the sentence structure appropriate for the target group?</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Q3.3 | Word length | | | | | | | | |
| | Is the length of the words appropriate for the target group? | | | | | | | | |
| Q3.4 | Word difficulty | | | | | | | | |
| | Are the words utilised appropriate? | | | | | | | | |

© 2020, Theresia Krieger, Sandra Salm, Judith Mollenhauer, Natalia Cecon, Antje Dresen, Stefanie Houwaart, Kathrin Schwickerath, Andrea Göttel, Anna Arning Developed in a participatory process by: University of Cologne, House of the Cancer Patient Support Associations of Germany, Cancer Society North Rhine-Westphalia.

| Quality criteria | | very good | suffi- cient | unsatis- factory | Suggestions for improvement |
|------------------|---|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Q4: Gra | aphical readability – Is the layout addressing | the needs | s of the ta | rget grou | p? |
| Q4.1 | Layout / overall visual appearance | | | | |
| | Is the layout of the text and the overall look of the material satisfactory? | | | | |
| Q4.2 | Eye-catching (catchy title, picture) | | | | |
| | Does the material include eye-catching elements? | | | | |
| Q4.3 | Appropriate overall text length | | | | |
| | Is the length of the text appropriate for the target group? | | | | |
| Q4.4 | Structure and context (e.g. information is condensed into short sections; sections have informative headings; information is arranged in a meaningful and logical order; summary) | | | | |
| | Is the PIM structured in a logical and meaningful order? | | | | |
| Q4.5 | Illustrations (pictures, graphics) | | | | |
| | Are the pictures and graphics used concise and understandable? | | | | |
| Q4.6 | Coloured headings and highlighting of key points | _ | | | |
| | Are coloured headings and highlighting of key points used meaningfully? | | | | |
| Q4.7 | Font size (min. size 12) | | | | |
| | Is the font size appropriate? | | | | |
| Q4.8 | Font colour (e.g. contrast with background; web links can be distinguished from "normal" text) | | | | |
| | Are the font colours meaningful applied? | | | | |

^{© 2020,} Theresia Krieger, Sandra Salm, Judith Mollenhauer, Natalia Cecon, Antje Dresen, Stefanie Houwaart, Kathrin Schwickerath, Andrea Göttel, Anna Arning Developed in a participatory process by: University of Cologne, House of the Cancer Patient Support Associations of Germany, Cancer Society North Rhine-Westphalia.

| Quality criteria | | very good | suffi- cient | unsatis- factory | Suggestions for improvement | | |
|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Q4: Gra | Q4: Graphical readability – Is the layout addressing the needs of the target group? | | | | | | |
| Q4.9 | Font type (plain font, e.g. Arial) <i>Is the font type easy to read?</i> | | | | | | |
| Q4.10 | Corporate design (recognisable, e.g. logo) Is a corporate design identifiable? | | | | | | |

Condensed instrument based on the work of Charnock et al. (1999); Herm & Linden (2013); Sänger et al. (2006); Shoemaker et al. (2014); Zhang et al. (2015).

Please cite the UPIM-Check as follows:

Krieger, T., Salm, S., Mollenhauer, J., Cecon, N., Dresen, A., Houwaart, S., Schwickerath, K., Göttel, A., & Arning, A. (2020). *UPIM-Check (User-friendly Patient Information Material Checklist)*. Cologne, Bonn, Duesseldorf: University of Cologne, House of the Cancer Patient Support Associations of Germany, Cancer Society North Rhine-Westphalia.

^{© 2020,} Theresia Krieger, Sandra Salm, Judith Mollenhauer, Natalia Cecon, Antje Dresen, Stefanie Houwaart, Kathrin Schwickerath, Andrea Göttel, Anna Arning Developed in a participatory process by: University of Cologne, House of the Cancer Patient Support Associations of Germany, Cancer Society North Rhine-Westphalia.