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Abstract

The need to provide health information in Plain English (PE) for non-native speakers and for individuals with low literacy levels has been widely acknowledged (Gilliver 2015; Parker and Kreps 2005). Use of PE has also shown to facilitate translation. Numerous institutions (e.g. the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or Cochrane) currently provide guidelines on how to develop health content in PE. In addition, authoring support tools (such as Acrolinx) are being increasingly used to simplify health information (Azzam et al. 2016; Ojala 2013), particularly as a result of the difficulties that contributors may encounter in remembering long lists of PE guidelines while editing (Temnikova 2012; Aikawa et al. 2007). This study investigates differences in the level of satisfaction experienced by authors when editing health content using both an automated and a non-automated approach. To the best of our knowledge, no prior work has compared these scenarios in terms of author’s satisfaction. Authors will be asked to simplify selected content of Cochrane’s Systematic Reviews using two scenarios: (i) by manually [...]
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Background

Cochrane Mission
Ensure that up-to-date, accurate, accessible information about the effects of healthcare interventions is readily available worldwide

Growth of Cochrane Systematic Reviews (CSR)

Growing base of CSR Users
- Clinicians (wide range of disciplines)
- Drug regulatory authorities
- Educational institutions
- Healthcare insurers and funding agencies
- Consumers (lay public)

Plain Language Summaries (PLS)

Overview of the project

Goal: Assess and compare the usability of two editing approaches (non-automated and automated) for writing Plain Language Summaries (PLS) of Cochrane Systematic Reviews

Method

Cochrane guidance

Existing PLS

Editorial team

Participants

10 statements

SUS score

Main Findings

On average, Acrolinx SUS scores are higher than Cochrane guidance SUS

BUT

No statistically significant differences between both editing approaches in terms of user satisfaction

(t(11)=1.3549, p=0.2355)

Conclusions

About Cochrane PLS Guidance
- Authors’ opinions vary depending on their level of expertise in producing PLS and the set of guidance they are provided with
- There seems to be a need for Cochrane PLS guidance to be more specific and be validated by the lay public

About Acrolinx
- Authors seem to agree in that Acrolinx can improve the readability of PLS
- Authors seem to appreciate the specificity of Acrolinx suggestions, compared to Cochrane guidance
- If integrated in Cochrane PLS editing workflow, it would be advisable for Acrolinx to be customized according to Cochrane’s style guide
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A. Correlations
- Explore whether authors’ user satisfaction results are in line with the findings on content accuracy and readability.

B. Comprehensibility Experiment
- Recruit consumers (lay public) to assess the comprehensibility of PLS produced following both editing approaches to complete the usability study and make suggestions on how to improve the current Cochrane PLS editing process.

Future Work

Pls survey and the satisfaction questionnaire about Acrolinx