

1 **Titel Page**

2 Titel of Manuscript: Identifying gaps in health literacy research through parental participation

3 Authors: Eva-Maria Grepmeier (MA)<sup>1\*+</sup>, Laura Pöhl (MSc)<sup>2+</sup>, Julia von Sommoggy (PhD)<sup>3</sup>,

4 Maja Pawellek (MSc)<sup>3</sup>, Jonas Lander (PhD)<sup>4</sup>, Anja Alexandra Schulz (PhD)<sup>5</sup>, Claudia

5 Hasenpusch (MSc)<sup>1</sup>, Anja Schwalfenberg<sup>6</sup>, Marie-Luise Dierks (PhD)<sup>4</sup>, Eva Maria Bitzer

6 (MD)<sup>2+</sup> and Christian Apfelbacher (PhD)<sup>1,7+</sup>

7 1 Institute of Social Medicine and Health System Research, Medical Faculty, Otto von

8 Guericke University Magdeburg, 39120 Magdeburg, Germany; [eva-](mailto:eva-maria.grepmeier@med.ovgu.de)

9 [maria.grepmeier@med.ovgu.de](mailto:maria.grepmeier@med.ovgu.de), [claudia.hasenpusch@med.ovgu.de](mailto:claudia.hasenpusch@med.ovgu.de);

10 [christian.apfelbacher@med.ovgu.de](mailto:christian.apfelbacher@med.ovgu.de)

11 2 Department of Public Health and Health Education, Freiburg University of Education,

12 79117 Freiburg, Germany; [laura.poehnl@ph-freiburg.de](mailto:laura.poehnl@ph-freiburg.de); [13 \[freiburg.de\]\(mailto:freiburg.de\)](mailto:evamaria.bitzer@ph-</a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

14 3 University Children's Hospital Regensburg (KUNO), Hospital St. Hedwig of the Order

15 of St. John, University of Regensburg, 93049 Regensburg, Germany;

16 [Maja.Pawellek@klinik.uni-regensburg.de](mailto:Maja.Pawellek@klinik.uni-regensburg.de); [Julia.Sommoggy@klinik.uni-regensburg.de](mailto:Julia.Sommoggy@klinik.uni-regensburg.de)

17 4 Institute for Epidemiology, Social Medicine and Health Systems Research, Hannover

18 Medical School, 30625 Hannover, Germany; [Dierks.Marie-Luise@mh-hannover.de](mailto:Dierks.Marie-Luise@mh-hannover.de),

19 [Jonas.Lander@mh-hannover.de](mailto:Jonas.Lander@mh-hannover.de)

20 5 Department of Research Methods in Health Science, Freiburg University of Education,

21 79117 Freiburg, Germany; [anja.schulz@ph-freiburg.de](mailto:anja.schulz@ph-freiburg.de)

22 6 German Allergy and Asthma Association, Deutscher Allergie und Asthma-Bund e.V.,

23 41238 Mönchengladbach, Germany; [as@daab.de](mailto:as@daab.de)

- 24 7 Family Medicine and Primary Care, Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang  
25 Technological University Singapore, 639798 Singapore;  
26 [christian.apfelbacher@med.ovgu.de](mailto:christian.apfelbacher@med.ovgu.de)
- 27 \* Correspondence: [eva-maria.grepmeier@med.ovgu.de](mailto:eva-maria.grepmeier@med.ovgu.de), Tel.: +49 391 67 24356
- 28 + Contributed equally

## 29 **Abstract**

30 **Introduction** Involving patients and the public in design, conduct and dissemination of  
31 research has gained momentum in recent years. While methods to prioritize research on  
32 treatment uncertainties have been successfully applied for various disease entities, patient  
33 and public involvement has not been prominent to prioritize research in health literacy (HL).  
34 This study aimed to set up a participatory process on identifying HL research gaps from a  
35 parent's perspective in two use cases: early childhood allergy prevention (ECAP) and  
36 COVID-19 in children with allergies (COVICAL).

37 **Methods** To prepare and empower parents, we developed and provided preparatory  
38 webinars, introductory materials, i.e., factsheets and a brochure, and a scientific podcast  
39 with seven episodes. Recruitment was carried out by our cooperation partner German  
40 Allergy and Asthma Association e. V., via local day care centres and paediatricians as well  
41 as via snowballing. The identification of research gaps took place within five workshops with  
42 n= 55 participants, four face-to-face-workshops across Germany, one online workshop.  
43 Research ideas and needs were reviewed for overlap and redundancy and compared to the  
44 existing research state of the art.

45 **Results** More than 150 initial research ideas and needs were collected which after review  
46 were reduced to a total of 37 ECAP, 33 COVICAL and 7 generic HL research questions.  
47 These were particularly related to the ease of finding and presenting good quality health  
48 information, information environment, health communication, professional education, and HL  
49 testing.

50 **Conclusions** Involving parents in the formulation of HL research priorities proved to be  
51 challenging but feasible. Research ideas often reflect wishes directed at health professionals  
52 and the health system, i.e., organizational, and systemic HL. An e Delphi process will follow

53 to elicit the TOP 10 research priorities in each use case. This project will help to plan

54 patient/parent centred HL research in ECAP and COVICAL.

55

## 56 **Acknowledgement**

57 The HELICAP Research Group would like to thank its cooperation partner, the German  
58 Allergy and Asthma Association (DAAB e.V.), and all participants in the study for their  
59 valuable contribution.

## 60 **Plain Language Summary**

61 We carried out a participatory HL research exercise to identify HL research gaps from a  
62 parent's perspective. The aim was to learn about parents'/participants' uncertainty in two use  
63 cases ECAP and COVICAL and what issues they would like to be answered by scientists.  
64 This resulted in a total of 37 ECAP, 33 COVICAL and 7 generic HL research questions.

## 65 **Introduction**

66 Participatory approaches reflect and focus actual needs, knowledge and interests of  
67 patients, parents and citizens in general (Jilani et al., 2020). This may reduce “research  
68 waste” by focusing research on patient relevant issues through involvement (Buhr & Tannen,  
69 2020; Chalmers & Glasziou, 2009). On an international level, health-related research with  
70 and by citizens is a common method to set research priorities, design, conduct, and  
71 disseminate research (Conklin, Morris, & Nolte, 2015; Domecq et al., 2014; Li, Abelson,  
72 Giacomini, & Contandriopoulos, 2015; Tritter & McCallum, 2006). In German-speaking  
73 countries participatory approaches became more important as well (International  
74 Collaboration for Participatory Health Research, o. J.; Ollenschläger, Wirth, Schwarz,  
75 Trifyllis, & Schaefer, 2018; Peter et al., 2020; Schilling et al., 2019; Wright, 2021). Involving  
76 patients in setting priorities for research has been successfully used regarding treatment  
77 uncertainties (Crowe, Fenton, Hall, Cowan, & Chalmers, 2015), in community settings  
78 (Breault et al., 2018; Clarke et al., 2023), and health promotion (Bush et al., 2017; Krawiec,  
79 Fisher, Du Toit, Bahnson, & Lack, 2021; Wright, 2021). Involvement and engagement with  
80 target groups increases the likelihood that health literacy (HL) interventions are effective  
81 (Batterham et al., 2014) but an approach to agree on research priorities has not yet been  
82 used in the field of HL research.

## 83 **Scope of the priority setting: Health Literacy in the use cases Early Childhood** 84 **Allergy Prevention and COVID-19 in Children with Allergies**

85 The German public health research group HELICAP “Health literacy in early childhood  
86 allergy prevention: parental competencies and public health in a shifting evidence  
87 landscape” explores health literacy (HL) in two use cases: early childhood allergy prevention  
88 (ECAP) and COVID-19 in children with allergies (COVICAL). HL is understood as the ability  
89 to access, understand, appraise, and apply health information to enable good health-related

90 decisions (Sørensen et al., 2012). It is a multi-faceted concept determined by individual,  
91 situational and environmental factors (Abel & Sommerhalder, 2015; Bitzer & Sørensen,  
92 2018; Sørensen et al., 2012). The goal of HL is to enable people to make grounded  
93 judgments, e.g., about when medical expert advice should be sought, knowledge of how to  
94 find the appropriate expert, and the ability to explain the health problem and personal  
95 concerns. In practice, it is much more difficult to act in a health-justified way as long as there  
96 is a lot of uncertainty about health issues. Uncertainty might induce anxiety and stress,  
97 further impeding good health-related decisions (Khojasteh, Davani, Shamsipour, Haghani, &  
98 Glamore, 2022; Okan et al., 2020; Schaeffer, Hurrelmann, Bauer, & Kolpatzik, 2018).

99 Both our use cases are characterized by high levels of uncertainty not least because of a  
100 changing evidence landscape: The scientific evidence on ECAP as well as  
101 recommendations by guidelines to prevent allergies in early childhood shifted from allergen  
102 avoidance (“protecting” the immune system) to early exposure (hence stimulation of the  
103 immune system) (Brough et al., 2022; Krawiec et al., 2021; Royal & Gray, 2020). In the first  
104 two years of the COVID-19 pandemic uncertainty was widespread among scholars,  
105 politicians, and the public. Rapidly emerging and changing scientific evidence hampered  
106 health literate decisions, a difficulty enhanced by the large amount of misinformation and  
107 unreliable information related to the pandemic (Borges do Nascimento et al., 2022; Okan et  
108 al., 2020; Schaefer, Bitzer, Okan, & Ollenschläger, 2021; Schaeffer et al., 2018).

109 The pandemic illustrated how important it is for individuals to be able especially to access,  
110 understand, appraise and apply health information (Abel & McQueen, 2020; Paakkari &  
111 Okan, 2020). For example in the case of people with allergic asthma, the risk assessment for  
112 COVID-19 infections was constrained by inconsistent scientific evidence: Asthma was  
113 initially considered to increase the risk for severe COVID-19 illness as respiratory viruses  
114 aggravate chronic airway diseases (Jackson et al., 2020). However, other studies suggested



115 that asthma and respiratory allergies do not increase the risk for severe COVID-19 disease  
116 (Jackson et al., 2020; Wu & McGoogan, 2020).

117 Since both use cases entail uncertainty further research into HL in relation to ECAP and  
118 COVICAL is warranted. Fostering HL concerning ECAP and COVICAL is an important public  
119 health concern, as e. g. low parental HL is linked to poorer health outcomes in (young)  
120 children, and lowers effectiveness in preventing disease in children (Buhr & Tannen, 2020;  
121 DeWalt, Dilling, Rosenthal, & Pignone, 2007; DeWalt & Hink, 2009; Miller, Lee, DeWalt, &  
122 Vann, 2010; Morrison, Glick, & Yin, 2019; Sanders, Shaw, Guez, Baur, & Rudd, 2009;  
123 Stafford, Goggins, Lathrop, & Haddad, 2021).

124 This study aimed to set up a participatory process to identify HL research gaps from a  
125 parent's perspective in the fields of ECAP and COVICAL.

## 126 **Methods**

127 The development and implementation of a participatory research process to identify  
128 research gaps from the parents' perspective took place within the DFG-funded research  
129 group HELICAP - "Health literacy in early childhood allergy prevention: parental  
130 competencies and public health context in a shifting evidence landscape" (FOR 2959,  
131 project number: 409800133, spokesperson C.A. Apfelbacher).

132 Consisting of six work packages, HELICAP ([www.helicap.org](http://www.helicap.org)) addresses various research  
133 challenges:

134 (1) conflicts of interest in national and selected international ECAP-guidelines, (2) living  
135 systematic reviews on ECAP and COVID-19 related HL, (3) how health professionals  
136 translate available evidence into practice, (4) the degree to which health information on the  
137 internet meets parents' needs, (5) factors influencing new parents' HL and ECAP  
138 behaviours, (6) measurement of ECAP and COVID-19 related HL.

139 Representatives of each of the HELICAP work packages, of the HELICAP's coordinating  
140 centre, and a patient representative from the German Allergy and Asthma Association  
141 (DAAB) formed a Task Force (TF), guiding the study process. The twelve TF-members have  
142 different scientific backgrounds (i.e., medicine, sociology, (health) educational sciences,  
143 cultural sciences, psychology, public health) and career levels (for details see appendix).

144 We started with a preparatory phase that included the development of introductory  
145 information, followed by interactive workshops to identify research gaps related to HL.

## 146 **Methodological Framework**

147 Our study was guided by the James Lind Alliance's Priority Setting Partnership framework  
148 (James Lind Alliance, 2021). This framework provides the fundamental basis of the planning,  
149 implementation, and evaluation of the participatory process. However, due to the scope and

150 context of the study, we adapted the methodology to a framework for prioritization in the field  
151 of HL research. To support the integrity of our findings, we used both the REPRISE reporting  
152 framework (Tong et al., 2019) and the GRIPP2 checklist (Staniszewska et al., 2017) that  
153 have been developed to improve the reporting of patient and public involvement within a  
154 research study and associated publications.

### 155 **Target Group and Recruiting**

156 The target group of this study were (new) parents with children, at average or high risk for  
157 atopic eczema, food allergies/anaphylaxis, or asthma/respiratory allergies, as well as with  
158 children already affected by allergies.

159 Recruitment took place during January-May and October-November 2022 via  
160 announcements on the DAAB and HELICAP website, through the DAAB newsletter and  
161 mailing lists, social media, as well as personal contacts and subsequent snowballing. At the  
162 HELICAP sites we approached parents in person and through employees or health  
163 professionals in family facilities, day-care centres, kindergartens, and paediatricians' offices.

### 164 **Preparatory phase**

165 To prepare and empower parents, we developed and provided webinars, introductory  
166 materials, i.e., factsheets and a brochure, and a scientific podcast.

167 - **Webinars:** We designed webinars based on each of the six HELICAP working  
168 packages, scheduled for 1.5 hours. The webinars followed a common guidance: 1)  
169 introducing briefly the HELICAP research fields and participatory research; 2)  
170 explaining the topic with regard to its meaning for and relevance towards parents;  
171 and 3) a discussion with the participants to give room for questions, ideas and  
172 comments. Each of the webinars was conducted twice to provide alternative time  
173 slots. In total we conducted 12 webinars during February-May 2022.

- 174 - **Factsheets:** Along with each webinar we provided brief digital factsheets. These  
175 factsheets with a mix of textual and visual information summarised the content of the  
176 webinar, contained room for participants' ideas, notes, or questions, and offered  
177 references for further reading.
- 178 - **Brochure:** Based on the factsheets and the discussions at the webinars, we created  
179 a 16-page brochure as a single written plain language summary. The brochure  
180 includes questions and insights that emerged during the webinar discussion with  
181 participants and aimed at informing participants of the workshops to support their  
182 preparation.
- 183 - **Podcasts:** As both, the DAAB and parents who participated in the webinars  
184 repeatedly emphasized the importance of communicating the research project via a  
185 freely available audio format, we created a scientific podcast with seven episodes  
186 (again based on the six webinars, plus a general introductory episode). Each episode  
187 lasts about 20-35 minutes and is moderated by the DAAB representative.

188 All material is in German language and publicly available via the HELICAP website  
189 (HELICAP, 2022a, 2022b, 2022c), the podcasts also via an audio streaming service (Spotify,  
190 2022).

### 191 **Interactive workshops to elicit research gaps**

192 We conducted five interactive Workshops in October and November 2022 – four on-site in  
193 Regensburg, Hannover, Freiburg und Magdeburg and one online workshop – to identify  
194 which topics our target groups were missing that could help them make good health-related  
195 decisions for themselves and their children regarding ECAP and COVICAL.

196 To facilitate participation in the workshops, to provide a low-threshold access and create a  
197 feel-good atmosphere, we chose central locations used for family activities. The participants

198 received a financial compensation, some workshops offered childcare, breakfast, or a  
199 bilingual implementation.

200 Workshops lasted about 2.5 hours (on-site) and 1.5 hours (digital), respectively. The time in  
201 the online workshop could be reduced because there was no need to physically move from  
202 table to table and the groups could spread out more quickly. In addition, the reduced time  
203 should also increase the willingness to participate.

#### 204 *Didactic concept*

205 The workshop structure and methods encompassed participant orientation and constructivist  
206 didactics (Luchte 2012; Quilling 2015). These are particularly suitable for heterogeneous  
207 groups, allowing for aligning with participants' needs, interests, and experiences (Quilling  
208 2015). Depending on feedback from participants and any challenges in the process, minor  
209 adjustments were made from workshop to workshop, e.g. with regard to the material  
210 provided to participants. To identify the research gaps in HL in the two use cases rather than  
211 to communicate knowledge we had to stimulate participants to focus on how they deal with  
212 uncertainties and to reflect on what they do not know. Participants were given tasks and  
213 encouraged to review and critically question their own experiences and their factual  
214 knowledge about the use cases.

#### 215 *Structure*

216 We organized the workshop as a moderated focus group discussion with four parts:  
217 introduction, main activity, summary, and conclusion (cf. table 1). The group-discussions  
218 were recorded, and the moderators took minutes in a supportive manner. The main activity  
219 covered three major topics:

220 a) "Accessing Health Information": Reflecting own behaviour when searching online for  
221 a child health-related information.

222 b) “Measuring Health Literacy”: Identifying benefits and challenges when participating in  
223 a HL test from the participant perspective.

224 c) “Understanding Health Information“: Discussing the flow of information from health  
225 professionals to patients, understanding of how health information is evaluated, and  
226 how recommendations for action are applied to one's life.

227 During the main activity, we followed a procedure that allowed all participants to elaborate on  
228 each of the three topics. At the beginning, participants formed small groups with three to five  
229 persons. The small groups rotated through the three topics with 25 minutes time to  
230 deliberate on each, supported by a moderator. In the online workshop, we reduced the time  
231 to work on each topic to 15 minutes.

232 The units were designed as follows: First, participants were given a short task:

233 a) to search the internet on the topic of COVID-19 in children with allergies

234 b) to look at or try out different HL tests (e. g. HLSEU-Q16, Berlin Numeracy Test, CHC-  
235 Szenario 1, S-TOFHLA, and HELICAP questionnaire)

236 c) to read a text which addresses the evidence shift in allergy prevention.

237 Second, participants reflected on their experiences performing this task, started to discuss  
238 research needs, and made notes. Finally, the moderator summarized the collected ideas on  
239 cards and presented them on board to ensure that completeness.

240 Table 1: Didactic structure of the HELICAP workshops to elicit research gaps with parents

Session	Goals	Description of session		Social format/ Methods	Material	Examples
Introduction (25 min)	Introduction of the study, the research area and getting to know each other	General information and formalities, information about the research group HELICAP, introduction of HL and the use cases, round of introductions		Plenary	PowerPoint slides, HELICAP brochure, consent form, privacy statement	
Main activity (85 min)  (3 x 25 min + 10 min break)	Reflecting on one's own search behaviour to derive limitations and challenges to access health information, and to elicit research needs.	Accessing Health Information	Activation: short internet search of COVID-19 in children with allergies.	Focus group discussion, think-aloud	Notebooks, tablet, smartphones, flash cards	Do you feel confident to search the Internet and deal with search results? During your search, what questions did you have?
			Discussion: Reflecting on challenges, difficulties, and limitations of searching for health information on the internet.			
			Deriving ideas: Collecting ideas for future research on the topic of accessing health information on the internet.			
	Find out when and how measurement of HL is useful and identify the added value of HL measurement (for individual, treatment, etc.) to elicit research needs.	Measuring Health Literacy	Activation: Reading and completing various health literacy tests.	Focus group discussion, think-aloud	Various health literacy tests, flash cards	What do you think of the questionnaires, what did you feel when you filled them in? In what situations might it be useful to complete such a questionnaire?
			Discussion: Find out the circumstances for taking part in a HL test, what advantages/disadvantages HL tests offer from the participants point of view, and when parents need to know their HL.			
			Deriving ideas: Collecting ideas for future research on the topic of health literacy measurement			
What are the problems in understanding health information, how are they dealt with, and how can research contribute to making information (transfer) more understandable?	Understanding Health Information	Activation: Reading a text on evidence shift in ECAP.	Focus group discussion, think-aloud	Sample texts on evidence shift, flash cards	How do you make sure you have understood something, and what do you do when you have a misunderstanding? What can be done to improve understanding of health information?	
		Discussion: Flow of information from health professionals or the media to patients, understanding of health information and how to deal with it.				
		Deriving ideas: Collecting ideas for future research on the topic of understanding health information				
15 min break						
Summary (20 min)	Placement of the results in the overall context, checking the completeness of the ideas	Presentation of the items collected at each major topic, possibility for additions and requests		Plenary	Items written down on flash cards	
Conclusion (10 min)	Thanks and Goodbye, building participant loyalty for further study steps	Last formalities, presentation of the next steps of the study		Plenary	Form for reimbursement of expenses	

241 *Analysis and data synthesis*

242 In the first workshop it turned out that formulating research gaps in term of precise questions  
243 is challenging for parents. We therefore extended the identification of research gaps to the  
244 collection of uncertainties, questions, and needs (in the following, referred to as “ideas for  
245 research”). After removing duplicates, we sorted the ideas derived in the five workshops, and  
246 translated the findings into potential research questions.

247 The discussions during the different sessions were not always strictly focused, despite the  
248 efforts of the moderators. There was some overlap in the topics and new topics were raised  
249 by the parents. After a review of the material, it was therefore necessary to expand the  
250 original three topics of the units (accessing health information, measuring HL, understanding  
251 health information) to a total of five categories, into which the ideas were inductively divided:  
252 "Health Information", "Information Environment", "Health Communication", "Professional  
253 Education", and "Health Literacy Testing".

254 To achieve a uniform level of abstraction and complexity the members of the TF  
255 reformulated the individual ideas in a two-stage process into scientific research questions  
256 and reviewed each individual aspect for overlap and redundancy.

257 In addition, each research question was assigned a unique identification number (ID).

258 Wherever applicable, general phrased ideas were put into research questions with reference  
259 to ECAP and/or COVICAL. We focused on research questions for which subject-matter  
260 expertise exists in the HELICAP research group. Data processing was done using MAXQDA  
261 and Microsoft Excel.

262 Participants subsequently received an initial results overview via email, which is available at  
263 the HELICAP homepage (HELICAP, 2022d) and information about the further course of the  
264 study.



265 Table 2: Exemplary workflow of summarizing and collating research gaps

ID	Workshop theme	Parents ideas and needs	Category	Development of an initial question	Revising of question	Research question related to ECAP and COVICAL
5	Accessing Health Information	Trust marks for websites, trustmarks for good websites, Certificate, Emblem for websites - "approved" by a reputable source. "Interdisciplinary group of experts", Help in assessing the seriousness of websites (also via radio, television, etc.)	Health Information	What can parents do to assess the reliability of health information on the internet, and how do they do it?	How can parents check the reliability and trustworthiness of health information on the internet? How can they do this?	How could parents check health information on the internet on ECAP for reliability and trustworthiness, and how do they do it actually?
						How could parents check health information on the internet on COVICAL for reliability and trustworthiness, and how do they do it actually?
19	Understanding Health Information	Peer to Peer	Health Communication	What are the advantages of a target group-specific "peer to peer" mediation of health information?	What are the benefits of peer to peer exchange of health information?	What are the advantages of a targeted "peer to peer" exchange on ECAP?
						What are the advantages of a targeted "peer to peer" exchange on COVICAL?
39	Measuring Health Literacy	Colours, graphs, pictures, tables simplify a test (visualise) Time problem: tests should not take long Pro "tick test": there is no/right and wrong Questionnaire should not be too long (10-15 min.)	Health Literacy Testing	To what extent do the characteristics of a test, in particular the answer format, the preparation and the length of the test, influence willingness to participate and motivation in HL tests? How can this be put into practice?	To what extent do the characteristics of a test (e.g. answer format, preparation, test length) influence the willingness and motivation to take a particular HL test?	To what extent do the characteristics of a test (i.e. measurement approach, answering format, presentation and length of the test) influence the willingness and motivation to participate in HL tests on ECAP?
						To what extent do the characteristics of a test (i.e. measurement approach, answering format, presentation and length of the test) influence the willingness and motivation to participate in HL tests on COVICAL?

266

## 267 **Results**

### 268 **Participants characteristics**

269 A total of n=55 parents attended the workshops (on-site: n=45, online: n=10), 46 provided  
270 sociodemographic details. Participating parents were mostly female (78.3%), on average  
271 38.7 years of age (SD=6.7). Educational attainment was high: 54,3% of the participants had  
272 a high school degree. 50% of the participants were affected by allergies, mostly pollen/gras.  
273 41,3 % parents had an allergy affected child, with food allergy being most often mentioned  
274 (see Table 3).

275 *Table 3: Characterization of workshop participants (n=46)*

Gender, n (%)		Years of education, n (%)	
- female	36 (78.3)	- high school	34 (54.3)
- male	10 (21.7)	- middle school	10 (15.2)
Age in years (SD)	38.7 (SD=6.7)	- others	2 (10.9)
Suffering from allergy, n (%)	23 (50)	Have a child with allergies, n (%)	19 (41.3)
- grass and pollen	11 (23.9)	- food allergies	10 (21.7)
- animal hair	5 (10.9)	- grass and pollen	6 (13.0)
- house dust mite	4 (8.7)	- house dust mite	3 (6.5)

276

### 277 **Parents view on research gaps**

278 In total, we collected 152 ideas indicating research gaps in the workshops. These first were  
279 divided into the three broad workshop theme topic areas as follows: *Accessing Health*  
280 *Information* n= 61, *Measuring Health Literacy* n= 49, and *Understanding Health Information*  
281 n= 42.

282 After reviewing the material, the following five categories could be extracted:

283 Health Information: Participants expressed their desire that access to reliable health  
284 information (on the internet) needs to be much easier, for example by linking trustworthy  
285 websites or a barrier-free positioning of prevention topics. A comprehensible, target group-  
286 specific and multimedia presentation of health information was also described as desirable.

287 ID27/28 "Support with research on the internet", ID8 "Participatory development of  
288 brochures - citizens' council for the production of health information", ID5  
289 "Seal, certificate, emblem for good websites - "approved" by reputable source -  
290 support in assessing the seriousness of websites (also via radio, television etc.),  
291 ranking the quality of information"

292 Information Environment: The parents clearly expressed the wish for a better exchange with  
293 other parents, e.g., on prevention issues. Paediatricians offer information about institutional  
294 contact points but cannot establish contact with other parents.

295 ID10 “How can we encourage more exchange with other parents?”, ID11 “Which  
296 important information provider(s) should I know?”

297 Health Communication: Participants complained in general about the limited time of health  
298 professionals and information flow. Some participants indicated that from their experience  
299 physicians do not always try to provide medical information understandably to a layperson.  
300 Some would have liked to see health professionals use communication methods, such as  
301 “teach back”. Others saw no need or too many barriers to implementing them. How to find  
302 out what you do not know so you can then search for information in a structured way was  
303 also mentioned.

304 ID14 „Which professional group is most qualified to pass on information?“, ID23  
305 „Framework: Empathy/Sensitivity/Space and Time/ Atmosphere“ and ID21/22 “How  
306 can the teach-back method be established/improved?”

307 It became clear that there is a great need to share experiences with other parents or  
308 stakeholders. In addition, content on health topics should be communicated earlier, e.g., in  
309 daycare centers, kindergartens and schools.

310 ID13 “How can we promote the exchange of experiences between those affected?  
311 (Promoting personal responsibility)”, ID24 “How can parents be made aware of  
312 relevant topics?”

313 Professional Education: Participants wanted their children to be exposed to health literacy-  
314 related content at an early age. The question arose as to how this can be achieved in  
315 schools and kindergartens.

316 ID26 “Integrate allergy prevention in the training of teachers and educators. Health  
317 literacy as a subject in school → Curriculum for school; Health literacy curriculum for  
318 kindergartens”

319 Health Literacy Testing: Research gaps in this topic highlight potential benefit and harms of  
320 HL testing. Parents wanted research to explore if testing for individual HL improves person-  
321 oriented and needs-based counselling. They wanted to know if self-testing for HL helps to  
322 better navigate the internet for health resources. Participants expressed concern about  
323 possible stigmatisation by a health professional if patients achieve a low HL level. They also  
324 reasoned about possible / optimal conditions to conduct HL-Tests.

325 ID35: „Self-assessment: How good am I in the subject?“, ID38 „Test causes  
326 stigmatization and unequal treatment by doctors/health professionals“ and ID46  
327 „Preliminary consultations with a trained assistant better than an anonymous test  
328 situation!“

### 329 **Research Questions**

330 The parental ideas, needs and questions resulted in a total of 45 research questions. Most of  
331 those research questions address both ECAP and COVICAL (n=32). Five research  
332 questions address ECAP only, one addresses COVICAL only. Seven questions do not  
333 explicitly refer to either ECAP or COVICAL, but are directed to more general issues, such as  
334 “How can HL be integrated best into the curriculum of schools?”. This means we collected a  
335 total of 37 research questions for ECAP, 33 for COVICAL and 7 generic HL questions.

336 Table 4 shows the finally derived research questions collected in the participatory process  
337 for the two use cases.

338 *Table 4: Research questions and allocation to use cases*

ID	Research Questions	ECAP	COVICAL
<b>Health Information</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>
1	How can trustworthy health information on ECAP/COVICAL be made more accessible to the public?	X	X
2	Which actors/institutions should be in charge to provide trustworthy health information on ECAP/COVICAL to the public?	X	X
28	What kind of support do parents of children with allergies need when searching the internet on COVICAL?		X
20	Which information channels on ECAP/COVICAL do parents prefer?	X	X
27	What facilitates/hampers parental searching of the internet for trustworthy health information on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
6	How should a website on ECAP/COVICAL be designed to generate trust in its contents?	X	X
3	How can health-related information on ECAP/COVICAL be prepared, presented, and disseminated best to the public in a compact and comprehensive way?	X	X
4	How should professional evidence-based information on ECAP/COVICAL (e.g., medical guidelines) best be edited so that it can be understood by parents?	X	X
5	How could parents check health information on the internet on ECAP/COVICAL for reliability and trustworthiness, and how do they do it actually?	X	X
7	How can parents best be involved in the production of scientific papers on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
8	How can parents/citizens best be involved to develop health information on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
<b>Information Environment</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>
9	Which factors are facilitating and hindering implementation of a local point of information for parents on ECAP/COVICAL (in a given community)?	X	X
10	To what extent does personal exchange a local point of information on ECAP/COVICAL for parents contribute to the HL of the population (in a given community)?	X	X
29	How should a training course for expectant parents to provide knowledge on ECAP be designed?	X	
11	Who provides trustworthy (digital) health information on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
12	What do providers of (digital) health information recommend with regard to ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
16	What do websites of paediatricians and midwives recommend with regard to ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
17	What role does the format (flyer, audio, video...) play in communicating health information (and promoting HL) about ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
18	How does product labelling for allergens (e.g., QR codes or similar) impact parental/patients allergy management?	X	
<b>Health Communication</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>
21	What strategies could be used to implement „Teach Back“ in patient counselling on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
22	What are the pros and cons of using „Teach Back“ during educational or counselling sessions on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
23	What are the conditions for health professionals to ensure patient-centred counselling on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
24	What constitutes a counselling situation suitable to raise parental awareness on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
19	What are the advantages of a targeted "peer to peer" exchange on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X

ID	Research Questions	ECAP	COVICAL
13	How can exchange among (affected) parents be promoted best to enhance parental empowerment? *		
30	Which providers should be in charge to offer educational courses to expectant parents on ECAP?	X	
14	Which professional groups are best suited to pass on health-related information on ECAP/COVICAL to patients?	X	X
15	What is the role of non-physician professional groups in communicating health-related information on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X

Professional Education		1	0
25	How can be ensured that health professionals use the communication skills they were trained in their professional education in daily practice? *		
26	How can HL be integrated best into the curriculum of schools? *		
47	How can kindergartens best promote HL? *		
31	How can ECAP be added in scheduled visits during pregnancy and early childhood?	X	

Health Literacy Testing		10	9
33	From the perspective of health professionals, does performing a HL test improve needs-oriented communication (on COVID-19) in individuals at risk for allergy?	X	X
36	What are the benefits of measuring ECAP HL on population level?	X	
34	Under what conditions are HL instruments useful to adapt teaching lessons to students' needs (in school)? *		
37	What level of HL is required to understand health information on ECAP/COVICAL and to act accordingly?	X	X
38	To what extent does the level of patients' measured HL - particularly low HL - influence interactions and perceptions with health professionals, and can this lead to stigmatization of patients? *		
44	What is the best way to integrate (specific) HL questionnaires into counselling on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
41	Which tasks are suitable for the measurement of parental HL in ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
39	To what extent do the characteristics of a test (i.e. measurement approach, answering format, presentation and length of the test) influence the willingness and motivation to participate in HL tests on ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
35	Is completing a self-assessment questionnaire on ECAP/COVICAL-specific HL helpful in searching the internet for trustworthy health information?	X	X
43	Which stakeholders should be in charge to measure HL in ECAP/COVICAL?	X	X
42	Which multipliers are most helpful to increase the reach and acceptance of HL tests on ECAP/COVICAL in routine practice?	X	X
45	From the perspective of parents and physicians: is it more helpful to do a screening for (low) general HL or to apply a HL test specific to ECAP/COVICAL after a diagnosis has been made?	X	X
46	What advantages do individual preliminary interviews by trained assistants offer compared to anonymous HL tests? *		

339

\* General research questions, without reference to ECAP or COVICAL

## 340 **Discussion**

341 The present study used a participatory approach to identify gaps in HL research on health  
342 information, information environment, professional education and HL-testing in the fields of  
343 early childhood allergy prevention (ECAP) and COVID-19 on children with allergies  
344 (COVICAL).

345 We were able to show that the involvement of parents in the identification of HL research  
346 gaps is feasible.

347 Many of the ideas expressed by parents reveal a need for better health information and  
348 communication in routine preventive services and health care and thus address basic needs.

349 However, research on accessibility, presentation, preparation, and quality of health  
350 information has been conducted for a long time. There are well validated checklists and  
351 criteria to identify credible health information on the internet (HoNCode; Institute for Quality  
352 and Efficiency in Health Care, 2021) and effective interventions to improve health  
353 communication are readily available (Centrella-Nigro & Alexander, 2017; Institute for  
354 Healthcare Improvement; Prochnow, Meiers, & Scheckel, 2019)(Michalopoulou, Falzarano,  
355 Arfken, & Rosenberg, 2010; UnityPoint Health, o. J.). Future research might not address  
356 those issues again but rather focus on how to find the most effective ways to implement  
357 such interventions at population level or in the health care system. It appears that there are  
358 not knowledge but rather implementation deficits in many areas pertaining to parental HL.

359 There are similar cases where research priorities set by citizens in fact reveal (basic) needs  
360 of the population, that are not resolved by further research but by political, governmental or  
361 health system targeted actions (Clarke et al., 2023; Trezona, Dodson, & Osborne, 2017).

362 Recruiting parents to the participatory process to identify HL research gaps on ECAP, and  
363 COVICAL proved to be challenging in our study.



364 One reason was that HL was not readily understood by our target group. Parents were not  
365 familiar with neither the expression nor the concept of HL and HL research. This became  
366 apparent during the workshops but also in the preparatory webinars, despite our efforts with  
367 a variety of different preparatory materials and a short thematic introduction at the beginning  
368 of the workshops; and despite a relatively high average level of education (54.3% of  
369 participants with high school diploma).

370 The specific topics – determined by the focus of our research group – might have further  
371 hampered the recruitment of parents: Often participatory approaches identifying research  
372 gaps are carried out with people directly affected by a condition, disease or health problem.  
373 Our first use case ECAP addresses primary prevention of allergies in children at average or  
374 high risk that do not suffer from allergies so far. In spite of the high and rising prevalence of  
375 allergies (Augustin et al., 2013; Böcking, Renz, & Pfefferle, 2012; Brough et al., 2022;  
376 Dierick et al., 2020). The topic appears not to be that salient in the population to be of major  
377 concern. Often parents become aware of childhood allergies only when the problem occurs.  
378 That is reflected in the composition of our sample, where 41.3% of the parents had children  
379 with manifest allergies, sometimes highly allergic. Those parents expressed some kind of  
380 “remorse” (“if I would have known that earlier”) reported on their very difficult journey to find  
381 relevant and trustworthy information and health care providers and were motivated to  
382 participate in the workshops because they wanted to “help other parents in future”. Under  
383 that assumption, for COVICAL it should have been easier to recruit parents. However, this  
384 was not the case, partly due to the fact, that at the time of recruitment (year 2022) the  
385 question on how to deal with COVID-19 in children with allergies/asthma was not that  
386 important any longer. A third reason might be that our participatory approach is not linked to  
387 a specific region, institution, or community and does not have solving the problem by  
388 developing an intervention in focus. In contrast to the Australian Optimizing Health Literacy  
389 and Access (OPHELIA) process (Ophelia, 2022), our study is not designed to put HL-

390 interventions into practice. Where OPHELIA seeks answers to two key questions ‘What are  
391 the HL strengths and weaknesses of clients of participating sites?’ and ‘How do sites  
392 interpret and respond to these in order to achieve positive health and equity outcomes for  
393 their clients?’ and identifies, implements, and evaluates HL actions based on the needs of  
394 different stakeholders (Batterham et al., 2014; Ophelia, 2022), the participatory process  
395 described here aimed at eliciting research gaps in HL in two rather specific fields (ECAP,  
396 COVICAL).

397 Beyond the use cases, parents complained that information is often only provided when  
398 there is a perceived need from the perspective of health professionals - after the occurrence  
399 of symptoms. This is contrary to the idea of prevention, although research shows that  
400 counselling on preventive topics by health professionals can improve patients’, thus parents’  
401 HL and health behaviour (Dennis et al., 2012; Gagliardi, Abdallah, Faulkner, Ciliska, & Hicks,  
402 2015).

403 This study is based on an established method, which has been adapted and extended to our  
404 needs: the James Lind Alliance (JLA) approach. Contrary to the recommendation of the JLA  
405 (James Lind Alliance, 2021), we did not in advance search for evidence of uncertainty in  
406 documented sources of information and include this evidence in the process. A pre-testing  
407 for research gaps might have led to different results in our study and to participants  
408 refraining from formulating their basic needs, which is one of the key findings of the study. A  
409 systematic review of the outcomes and experiences of patient co-researchers shows that  
410 focus groups and individual group interviews are the most commonly used study designs.  
411 (Malterud & Elvbakken, 2020). We chose a focus group approach, which has been shown to  
412 have several advantages over interviews: New ideas that remain hidden or unrecognised in  
413 individual interviews can be stimulated by spontaneous utterances in the group, and, in  
414 larger groups, the gap between scientists and non-scientists might be smoothed out,  
415 fostering participation (Schulz, Mack, & Renn, 2012). Other studies used family workshops

416 (Grabowski et al., 2022), observation and discussion (Scheffelaar et al., 2020) or online  
417 meetings with small group sessions (Ziegler et al., 2022) to identify stakeholder needs.

418 The experience gained from this study can help future similar initiatives. If we do not engage  
419 in co-production of research questions, we may fail to address the issues that matter most to  
420 the groups we want to benefit. Furthermore, participatory approaches could be beneficial in  
421 implementing research findings in the everyday life of beneficiaries. Involving parents could  
422 increase their understanding of HL research in ECAP and COVICAL. The research  
423 questions collected through the participatory process up to this point provide the basis for a  
424 subsequent Delphi process to identify the TOP 10 research questions in each of the two use  
425 cases. The overall aim of this process is to enable future research efforts in the field of HL  
426 on ECAP and COVICAL research to be focused and parent / patient-centred.

427

#### 428 **Abbreviations**

429 DAAB German Allergy and Asthma Association

430 HL Health Literacy

431 TF Task Force

432 JLA James Lind Alliance

433 ECAP Early Childhood Allergy Prevention

434 COVICAL COVID-19 In Children with Allergies

435

#### 436 **Declarations**

437 Funding: This study is part of the public health research group HELICAP (Health literacy in  
438 early childhood allergy prevention) funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG FOR  
439 2959, 409800133).

440 Ethics approval and consent to participate: Participation in the entire study was voluntary  
441 and could be discontinued at any time without giving reasons. The study was reviewed and

442 positively approved by the Ethics Committee of the Otto-von Guericke-University

443 Magdeburg.

444 Availability of data and materials: All data generated or analysed during this study are

445 included in this published article and its supplementary information files

## 446 **References**

- 447 Abel, T., & McQueen, D. (2020). Critical health literacy and the COVID-19 crisis. *Health*  
448 *Promotion International*, 35(6), 1612–1613. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daaa040>.
- 449 Abel, T., & Sommerhalder, K. (2015). Gesundheitskompetenz/Health Literacy: Das Konzept  
450 und seine Operationalisierung [Health literacy: An introduction to the concept and its  
451 measurement]. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt - Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz*,  
452 58(9), 923–929. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00103-015-2198-2>
- 453 Augustin, M., Franzke, N., Beikert, F. C., Stadler, R., Reusch, M., Schmitt, J., & Schäfer, I.  
454 (2013). Allergies in Germany - prevalence and perception by the public. *Journal of the*  
455 *German Society of Dermatology : JDDG*, 11(6), 514–520. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1610-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1610-0387.2012.08049.x)  
456 0387.2012.08049.x
- 457 Batterham, R. W., Buchbinder, R., Beauchamp, A., Dodson, S., Elsworth, G. R., &  
458 Osborne, R. H. (2014). The OPTimising HEalth LiterAcy (Ophelia) process: Study protocol  
459 for using health literacy profiling and community engagement to create and implement  
460 health reform. *BMC Public Health*, 14, 694. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-694>
- 461 Bitzer, E. M., & Sørensen, K. (2018). Gesundheitskompetenz – Health Literacy [Health  
462 Literacy]. *Das Gesundheitswesen*, 80(08-09), 754–766. [https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0664-](https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0664-0395)  
463 0395
- 464 Böcking, C., Renz, H., & Pfefferle, P. I. (2012). Prävalenz und sozioökonomische Bedeutung  
465 von Allergien in Deutschland [Prevalence and socio-economic relevance of allergies in  
466 Germany]. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt - Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz*, 55(3),  
467 303–307. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00103-011-1427-6>
- 468 Borges do Nascimento, I. J., Pizarro, A. B., Almeida, J. M., Azzopardi-Muscat, N.,  
469 Gonçalves, M. A., Björklund, M., & Novillo-Ortiz, D. (2022). Infodemics and health

- 470 misinformation: A systematic review of reviews. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*,  
471 100(9), 544–561. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.21.287654>
- 472 Breault, L. J., Rittenbach, K., Hartle, K., Babins-Wagner, R., Beaudrap, C. de, Jasoui, Y., . . .  
473 Mason-Lai, P. (2018). People with lived experience (PWLE) of depression: Describing  
474 and reflecting on an explicit patient engagement process within depression research  
475 priority setting in Alberta, Canada. *Research Involvement and Engagement*, 4, 37.  
476 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-018-0115-1>
- 477 Brough, H. A., Lanser, B. J., Sindher, S. B., Teng, J. M. C., Leung, D. Y. M., Venter, C., . . .  
478 Nagler, C. R. (2022). Early intervention and prevention of allergic diseases. *Allergy*, 77(2),  
479 416–441. <https://doi.org/10.1111/all.15006>
- 480 Buhr, E. de, & Tannen, A. (2020). Parental health literacy and health knowledge, behaviours  
481 and outcomes in children: A cross-sectional survey. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), 1096.  
482 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08881-5>
- 483 Bush, P. L., Pluye, P., Loignon, C., Granikov, V., Wright, M. T., Pelletier, J. F., . . .  
484 Repchinsky, C. (2017). Organizational participatory research: A systematic mixed studies  
485 review exposing its extra benefits and the key factors associated with them.  
486 *Implementation Science: IS*, 12(1), 119. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0648-y>
- 487 Centrella-Nigro, A. M., & Alexander, C. (2017). Using the Teach-Back Method in Patient  
488 Education to Improve Patient Satisfaction. *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*,  
489 48(1), 47–52. <https://doi.org/10.3928/00220124-20170110-10>
- 490 Chalmers, I., & Glasziou, P. (2009). Avoidable waste in the production and reporting of  
491 research evidence. *Lancet*, 374(9683), 86–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60329-9)  
492 [6736\(09\)60329-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60329-9)
- 493 Clarke, E., Anderson-Saria, G., Kisoli, A., Urasa, S., Moloney, S., Safic, S., . . .  
494 Paddick, S. M. (2023). Patient priority setting in HIV ageing research: Exploring the

- 495 feasibility of community engagement and involvement in Tanzania. *Research Involvement*  
496 *and Engagement*, 9(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-022-00409-y>
- 497 Conklin, A., Morris, Z., & Nolte, E. (2015). What is the evidence base for public involvement  
498 in health-care policy? Results of a systematic scoping review. *Health Expectations: An*  
499 *International Journal of Public Participation in Health Care and Health Policy*, 18(2), 153–  
500 165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12038>
- 501 Crowe, S., Fenton, M., Hall, M., Cowan, K., & Chalmers, I. (2015). Patients', clinicians' and  
502 the research communities' priorities for treatment research: There is an important  
503 mismatch. *Research Involvement and Engagement*, 1, 2. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-015-0003-x)  
504 015-0003-x
- 505 Dennis, S., Williams, A., Taggart, J., Newall, A., Denney-Wilson, E., Zwar, N., . . .  
506 Harris, M. F. (2012). Which providers can bridge the health literacy gap in lifestyle risk  
507 factor modification education: A systematic review and narrative synthesis. *BMC Family*  
508 *Practice*, 13, 44. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2296-13-44>
- 509 DeWalt, D. A., Dilling, M. H., Rosenthal, M. S., & Pignone, M. P. (2007). Low parental  
510 literacy is associated with worse asthma care measures in children. *Ambulatory*  
511 *Pediatrics*, 7(1), 25–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ambp.2006.10.001>
- 512 DeWalt, D. A., & Hink, A. (2009). Health literacy and child health outcomes: A systematic  
513 review of the literature. *Pediatrics*, 124(3), 265-274. [https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-](https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-1162B)  
514 1162B
- 515 Dierick, B. J. H., van der Molen, T., Flokstra-de Blok, B. M. J., Muraro, A., Postma, M. J.,  
516 Kocks, J. W. H., & van Boven, J. F. M. (2020). Burden and socioeconomics of asthma,  
517 allergic rhinitis, atopic dermatitis and food allergy. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics*  
518 *& Outcomes Research*, 20(5), 437–453. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14737167.2020.1819793>.

- 519 Domecq, J. P., Prutsky, G., Elraiyah, T., Wang, Z., Nabhan, M., Shippee, N., . . .  
520 Murad, M. H. (2014). Patient engagement in research: A systematic review. *BMC Health*  
521 *Services Research*, 14, 89. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-14-89>
- 522 Gagliardi, A. R., Abdallah, F., Faulkner, G., Ciliska, D., & Hicks, A. (2015). Factors  
523 contributing to the effectiveness of physical activity counselling in primary care: A realist  
524 systematic review. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 98(4), 412–419.  
525 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2014.11.020>
- 526 Grabowski, D., Pals, R. A. S., Hoeeg, D., Ingersgaard, M. V., DeCosta, P., &  
527 Jespersen, L. N. (2022). Participatory family workshops in psychosocial health and illness  
528 research: Experiences from Danish health promotion projects. *Health Promotion*  
529 *International*, 37(S2), ii73-ii82. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daac014>
- 530 HELICAP (2022a). Broschüre. Retrieved from [https://www.helicap.org/eltern-machen-](https://www.helicap.org/eltern-machen-forschung/broschuere)  
531 [forschung/broschuere](https://www.helicap.org/eltern-machen-forschung/broschuere)
- 532 HELICAP (2022b). Download Factsheets. Retrieved from <https://www.helicap.org/webinar>
- 533 HELICAP (2022c). Gesund und Kompetent: Der Podcast von und mit der Forschungsgruppe  
534 HELICAP in Kooperation mit dem Deutschen Allergie- und Asthmabund. Retrieved from  
535 <https://www.helicap.org/eltern-machen-forschung/podcast>
- 536 HELICAP (2022d). Workshop Ergebnisse: Zusammenfassung der Workshopergebnisse für  
537 die Eltern. Retrieved from  
538 [https://www.helicap.org/fileadmin/helicap\\_content/PDF/Eltern\\_machen\\_Forschung\\_-](https://www.helicap.org/fileadmin/helicap_content/PDF/Eltern_machen_Forschung_-_Workshopergebnisse.pdf)  
539 [\\_Workshopergebnisse.pdf](https://www.helicap.org/fileadmin/helicap_content/PDF/Eltern_machen_Forschung_-_Workshopergebnisse.pdf))
- 540 HoNCode. Health On the Net: a non for profit organisation, promotes transparent and  
541 reliable health information online. Retrieved from <https://www.hon.ch/en/>
- 542 Institute for Healthcare Improvement. Ask Me 3: Good Questions for Your Good Health.  
543 Retrieved from [https://www.ihl.org/resources/Pages/Tools/Ask-Me-3-Good-Questions-for-](https://www.ihl.org/resources/Pages/Tools/Ask-Me-3-Good-Questions-for-Your-Good-Health.aspx)  
544 [Your-Good-Health.aspx](https://www.ihl.org/resources/Pages/Tools/Ask-Me-3-Good-Questions-for-Your-Good-Health.aspx)



- 545 Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care (2021). Finding high-quality health  
546 information on the internet. Retrieved from [https://www.informedhealth.org/finding-high-](https://www.informedhealth.org/finding-high-quality-health-information-on-the-internet.html)  
547 [quality-health-information-on-the-internet.html](https://www.informedhealth.org/finding-high-quality-health-information-on-the-internet.html)
- 548 International Collaboration for Participatory Health Research (o. J.). What is Participatory  
549 Health Research (PHR)? Retrieved from <http://www.icphr.org/>
- 550 Jackson, D. J., Busse, W. W., Bacharier, L. B., Kattan, M., O'Connor, G. T., Wood, R. A., . . .  
551 Altman, M. C. (2020). Association of respiratory allergy, asthma, and expression of the  
552 SARS-CoV-2 receptor ACE2. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, *146*(1),  
553 203-206.e3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2020.04.009>.
- 554 James Lind Alliance (2021). The James Lind Alliance Guidebook: Version 10. Retrieved  
555 from [https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/JLA-Guidebook-Version-10-](https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/JLA-Guidebook-Version-10-March-2021.pdf)  
556 [March-2021.pdf](https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/JLA-Guidebook-Version-10-March-2021.pdf)
- 557 Jilani, H., Rathjen, K. I., Schilling, I., Herbon, C., Scharpenberg, M., Brannath, W., &  
558 Gerhardus, A. (2020). *Handreichung zur Patient\*innenbeteiligung an klinischer*  
559 *Forschung*. Universität Bremen. <https://doi.org/10.26092/ELIB/229>
- 560 Khojasteh, D., Davani, E., Shamsipour, A., Haghani, M., & Glamore, W. (2022). Climate  
561 change and COVID-19: Interdisciplinary perspectives from two global crises. *The Science*  
562 *of the Total Environment*, *844*, 157142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.157142>
- 563 Krawiec, M., Fisher, H. R., Du Toit, G., Bahnson, H. T., & Lack, G. (2021). Overview of oral  
564 tolerance induction for prevention of food allergy-Where are we now? *Allergy*, *76*(9),  
565 2684–2698. <https://doi.org/10.1111/all.14758>
- 566 Li, K. K., Abelson, J., Giacomini, M., & Contandriopoulos, D. (2015). Conceptualizing the use  
567 of public involvement in health policy decision-making. *Social Science & Medicine*, *138*,  
568 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.05.023>

- 569 Malterud, K., & Elvbakken, K. T. (2020). Patients participating as co-researchers in health  
570 research: A systematic review of outcomes and experiences. *Scandinavian Journal of*  
571 *Public Health, 48*(6), 617–628. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494819863514>
- 572 Michalopoulou, G., Falzarano, P., Arfken, C., & Rosenberg, D. (2010). Implementing Ask Me  
573 3 to improve African American patient satisfaction and perceptions of physician cultural  
574 competency. *Journal of Cultural Diversity, 17*(2), 62–67.
- 575 Miller, E., Lee, J. Y., DeWalt, D. A., & Vann, W. F. (2010). Impact of caregiver literacy on  
576 children's oral health outcomes. *Pediatrics, 126*(1), 107–114.  
577 <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-2887>
- 578 Morrison, A. K., Glick, A., & Yin, H. S. (2019). Health Literacy: Implications for Child Health.  
579 *Pediatrics in Review, 40*(6), 263–277. <https://doi.org/10.1542/pir.2018-0027>
- 580 Okan, O., Sombre, S. de, Hurrelmann, K., Berens, E. M., Bauer, U., & Schaeffer, D. (2020).  
581 *Gesundheitskompetenz der Bevölkerung im Umgang mit der Coronavirus-Pandemie.*  
582 Bielefeld. Retrieved from Universität Bielefeld website: [https://blogs.uni-](https://blogs.uni-bielefeld.de/blog/pressemitteilungen/resource/Gesundheitskompetenz_in_der_Coronavirus-Pandemie_2020_Endbericht.pdf)  
583 [bielefeld.de/blog/pressemitteilungen/resource/Gesundheitskompetenz\\_in\\_der\\_Coronaviru](https://blogs.uni-bielefeld.de/blog/pressemitteilungen/resource/Gesundheitskompetenz_in_der_Coronavirus-Pandemie_2020_Endbericht.pdf)  
584 [s-Pandemie\\_2020\\_Endbericht.pdf](https://blogs.uni-bielefeld.de/blog/pressemitteilungen/resource/Gesundheitskompetenz_in_der_Coronavirus-Pandemie_2020_Endbericht.pdf)
- 585 Ollenschläger, G., Wirth, T., Schwarz, S., Trifyllis, J., & Schaefer, C. (2018). Unzureichende  
586 Patientenbeteiligung an der Leitlinienentwicklung in Deutschland – eine Analyse der von  
587 der AWMF verbreiteten ärztlichen Empfehlungen [Patient involvement in clinical practice  
588 guidelines is poor after 12 years of German guideline standards: A review of guideline  
589 methodologies]. *Zeitschrift für Evidenz, Fortbildung und Qualität im Gesundheitswesen,*  
590 *135-136,* 50–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.zefq.2018.06.006>
- 591 Ophelia (2022). Ophelia (Optimising Health Literacy and Access). Retrieved from  
592 <https://healthliteracydevelopment.com/>

- 593 Paakkari, L., & Okan, O. (2020). COVID-19: health literacy is an underestimated problem.  
594 *The Lancet Public Health*, 5(5), e249-e250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468->  
595 2667(20)30086-4
- 596 Peter, S. von, Bär, G., Behrisch, B., Bethmann, A., Hartung, S., Kasberg, A., . . . Wright, M.  
597 (2020). Partizipative Gesundheitsforschung in Deutschland – quo vadis? [Participatory  
598 research in Germany - quo vadis?]. *Gesundheitswesen*, 82(4), 328–332.  
599 <https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1076-8078>
- 600 Prochnow, J. A., Meiers, S. J., & Scheckel, M. M. (2019). Improving Patient and Caregiver  
601 New Medication Education Using an Innovative Teach-back Toolkit. *Journal of Nursing*  
602 *Care Quality*, 34(2), 101–106. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NCQ.0000000000000342>
- 603 Royal, C., & Gray, C. (2020). Allergy Prevention: An Overview of Current Evidence. *Yale*  
604 *Journal of Biology and Medicine*, 93(5), 689–698.
- 605 Sanders, L. M., Shaw, J. S., Guez, G., Baur, C., & Rudd, R. (2009). Health literacy and child  
606 health promotion: Implications for research, clinical care, and public policy. *Pediatrics*,  
607 124 Suppl 3, S306-14. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-1162G>
- 608 Schaefer, C., Bitzer, E. M., Okan, O., & Ollenschläger, G. (2021). Umgang mit Fehl- und  
609 Desinformationen in Medien: Eine Übersicht über aktuelle wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse  
610 und Handlungsempfehlungen zum Umgang mit Fehl- und Desinformationen bei  
611 COVID-19. Hintergrundpapier. Retrieved from [https://www.public-health-](https://www.public-health-covid19.de/images/2021/Ergebnisse/20210902_Hintergrund_Fehlinformation_update.pdf)  
612 covid19.de/images/2021/Ergebnisse/20210902\_Hintergrund\_Fehlinformation\_update.pdf
- 613 Schaeffer, D., Hurrelmann, K., Bauer, U., & Kolpatzik, K. (2018). *National Action Plan Health*  
614 *Literacy. Promoting Health Literacy in Germany*. Berlin: KomPart.
- 615 Scheffelaar, A., Bos, N., Jong, M. de, Triemstra, M., van Dulmen, S., & Luijkx, K. (2020).  
616 Lessons learned from participatory research to enhance client participation in long-term  
617 care research: A multiple case study. *Research Involvement and Engagement*, 6, 27.  
618 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-020-00187-5>

- 619 Schilling, I., Behrens, H., Hugenschmidt, C., Liedtke, J., Schmiemann, G., & Gerhardus, A.  
620 (2019). Patient involvement in clinical trials: Motivation and expectations differ between  
621 patients and researchers involved in a trial on urinary tract infections. *Research*  
622 *Involvement and Engagement*, 5, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-019-0145-3>.
- 623 Schulz, M., Mack, B., & Renn, O. (Eds.) (2012). *Fokusgruppen in der empirischen*  
624 *Sozialwissenschaft: Von der Konzeption bis zur Auswertung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.  
625 Retrieved from [http://ebooks.ciando.com/book/index.cfm/bok\\_id/328734](http://ebooks.ciando.com/book/index.cfm/bok_id/328734)
- 626 Sørensen, K., van den Broucke, S., Fullam, J., Doyle, G., Pelikan, J., Slonska, Z., &  
627 Brand, H. (2012). Health literacy and public health: A systematic review and integration of  
628 definitions and models. *BMC Public Health*, 12, 80. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-12-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-12-80)  
629 80.
- 630 Spotify (2022). *Gesund und Kompetent: HELICAP*. Retrieved from  
631 <https://open.spotify.com/show/0eA8GeGCyPFLqV94P8eNCA>
- 632 Stafford, J. D., Goggins, E. R., Lathrop, E., & Haddad, L. B. (2021). Health Literacy and  
633 Associated Outcomes in the Postpartum Period at Grady Memorial Hospital. *Maternal*  
634 *and Child Health Journal*, 25(4), 599–605. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-020-03030-1>
- 635 Staniszewska, S., Brett, J., Simera, I., Seers, K., Mockford, C., Goodlad, S., . . . Tysall, C.  
636 (2017). Gripp2 reporting checklists: Tools to improve reporting of patient and public  
637 involvement in research. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)*, 358, j3453.  
638 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j3453>
- 639 Tong, A., Synnot, A., Crowe, S., Hill, S., Matus, A., Scholes-Robertson, N., . . . Craig, J. C.  
640 (2019). Reporting guideline for priority setting of health research (REPRISÉ). *BMC*  
641 *Medical Research Methodology*, 19(1), 243. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-019-0889-3>
- 642 Trezona, A., Dodson, S., & Osborne, R. H. (2017). Development of the organisational health  
643 literacy responsiveness (Org-HLR) framework in collaboration with health and social

- 644 services professionals. *BMC Health Services Research*, 17.  
645 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-017-2465-z>
- 646 Tritter, J. Q., & McCallum, A. (2006). The snakes and ladders of user involvement: Moving  
647 beyond Arnstein. *Health Policy (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*, 76(2), 156–168.  
648 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2005.05.008>.
- 649 UnityPoint Health (o. J.). Always Use Teach Back! Retrieved from  
650 <https://www.ihl.org/resources/Pages/Tools/AlwaysUseTeachBack.aspx>
- 651 Wright, M. T. (2021). Partizipative Gesundheitsforschung: Ursprünge und heutiger Stand  
652 [Participatory health research: origins and current trends]. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt -*  
653 *Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz*, 64(2), 140–145.  
654 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00103-020-03264-y>
- 655 Wu, Z., & McGoogan, J. M. (2020). Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the  
656 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72  
657 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA*, 323(13),  
658 1239–1242. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2648>
- 659 Ziegler, S., Raineri, A., Nittas, V., Rangelov, N., Vollrath, F., Britt, C., & Puhan, M. A. (2022).  
660 Long COVID Citizen Scientists: Developing a Needs-Based Research Agenda by  
661 Persons Affected by Long COVID. *The Patient*, 15(5), 565–576.  
662 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40271-022-00579-7>
- 663

664 **Appendix**

665 *Table 5: Characteristic of the Task Force (TF)*

	<b>Research focus</b>	<b>Characteristics (discipline, expertise, and experience)</b>	<b>Members in TF</b>
1	Conflicts of interest in the development of guidelines	Medicine, Public Health, Health Literacy, Systematic Reviews, Guideline Development, Health Systems consists of 1 junior and 1 senior scientist	1
2	Evidence synthesis based on Living systematic reviews	Public Health, Epidemiology, Medical Sociology, Evidence Synthesis, Systematic Reviews, Interventional and Observational Studies consists of 1 junior and 1 senior scientist	2
3	Exploring health professionals' perceptions of HL in ECAP	Sociology, Health Care Structures, Setting-based Health Promotion, Patient Counselling consists of 1 junior and 1 senior scientist	1
4	Exploring parents perceptions of HL in ECAP and during the COVID-19 pandemic	Public Health, Education, Health Literacy, Participatory Research, Quality Indicators for Health Information consists of 2 junior and 1 senior scientist	2
5	Epidemiology: Examination of birth cohorts with respect to the development of young mothers' HL.	Psychology, Health Promotion and Empowerment, Epidemiological Studies consists of 1 junior and 1 senior scientist	1
6	Development and testing of an instrument for measuring parents' HL	Psychology, Research Methods, Method Development consists of 3 junior and 1 senior scientist	1
SCC <sup>1</sup>	Scientific coordination regarding management and scientific cooperation, initiation and implementation the participatory process.	Systematic reviews, guideline development, health systems, health literacy, medicine, evidence synthesis, qualitative research consists of 3 junior and 2 senior scientists	5
DAAB <sup>2</sup>	Allergy and Asthma Association advocating for the rights of children and adults with allergies, respiratory diseases and skin diseases, advice for patients.	Counselling of Patients on Treatment of Pollen Allergy and Allergic Asthma	1

666 <sup>1</sup> Two members of the SCC are members of work package 1 and 2 respectively

667 <sup>2</sup> Cooperation Partner (HELICAP and the DAAB together form the TF)