

1                   **Can health information and decision aids decrease inequity in**  
2                   **health care? A systematic review on the equality of their**  
3                   **effectiveness**

4  
5  
6 Ellermann C\* <sup>1</sup>, Hinneburg J <sup>2,1</sup>, Wilhelm C <sup>1</sup>, Rebitschek FG <sup>1,3</sup>

7  
8  
9 <sup>1</sup>Harding Center for Risk Literacy, Faculty of Health Sciences Brandenburg, University of  
10 Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany

11 <sup>2</sup>Institute for Health and Nursing Sciences (IGPW), Medical Faculty, Martin Luther University  
12 Halle-Wittenberg, Halle, Germany

13 <sup>3</sup>Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany  
14  
15

16 \*Corresponding author (CE)

17 E-mail: [christin.ellermann@uni-potsdam.de](mailto:christin.ellermann@uni-potsdam.de)

18  
19  
20  
21 ORCIDs:

22  
23 Christin Ellermann: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4674-8260>

24 Jana Hinneburg: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7154-9418>

25 Felix G. Rebitschek: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7653-8278>  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 **Abstract**

49

50 Objectives

51 Systematic review of studies evaluating evidence-based health information (EBHI)  
52 and decision aids (DAs) in terms of the extent to which inequity-producing factors  
53 have been considered and how these factors affect access to health-related  
54 information and informed decision-making.

55

56 Study design

57 Systematic review of randomised controlled trials.

58

59 Methods

60 Systematic searches were performed in the Cochrane Library, PubMed, Embase,  
61 PsycINFO, CINAHL, ERIC and PSYINDEX from inception to May 2023 to identify  
62 evaluation studies of EBHI and DAs that take into account factors associated with  
63 unequal opportunities as defined by PROGRESS Plus. Information on the effect of  
64 these factors was extracted and analysed in terms of outcomes relevant to the  
65 decision-making process.

66

67 Results

68 Few studies have examined the impact of EBHI/DAs on outcomes relevant to  
69 decision-making with respect to inequity-producing factors. In our final synthesis, 12  
70 studies were included. A positive association between the effectiveness of the  
71 intervention and the disadvantage status could be found twice and a negative  
72 association in three studies. Overall, most of the studies found no difference in  
73 knowledge gain, decision conflict and shared decision-making (SDM) between those  
74 advantaged and disadvantaged in terms of ethnicity, gender, education, age,  
75 income, health literacy, numeracy or socioeconomic status (SES). However, few  
76 trials examined this effect and the effect was considered solely in subgroup analyses  
77 that were probably underpowered, so asymmetries between these groups may not  
78 have been detected in the existing designs.

79

80 Conclusion

81 EBHI and DAs have been shown to be effective in promoting decision-making and  
82 thus in improving health care. To improve health care equitably, greater attention  
83 needs to be paid to methodological requirements in evaluations to fully capture  
84 potential differences in access to health-related information between individuals or in  
85 populations within the target groups of EBHI/DAs.

86

87 PROSPERO registration: CRD42018103456

88

89 Key words: Equity, decision aids, decision-making, informed choice, evidence-based

90

91 **What is already known?**

- 92 • There is evidence that EBHI and DAs do not reach certain patient groups  
93 because while being developed and evaluated they do not adequately take into  
94 account differences in access to health-related information between different  
95 social groups.  
96 • There is insufficient evidence whether EBHI and DAs are equally effective for  
97 people with factors that are more or less associated with equal access to health  
98 information.  
99

100 **What the study adds**

- 101 • A systematic review of evaluation studies of EBHI and DAs to consider factors  
102 that lead to inequity and analysis of how these factors influence the intervention  
103 effects in terms of access to health-related information and outcomes relevant for  
104 decision-making.  
105

106 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy?**

- 107 • Our research makes a valuable contribution to more equitable health care by  
108 stressing critical inequality factors that may influence informed decision-making  
109 with the help of EBHI and DAs.  
110  
111

112 **Introduction**

113  
114 Evidence-based health information (EBHI) and decision aids (DAs) have the  
115 potential to reduce inequity by providing equal access to relevant information. They  
116 aim to facilitate informed decision-making by providing all those facing a health  
117 decision with sufficient knowledge, with which people can make a decision in line  
118 with their treatment preferences<sup>[1]</sup>. Unlike EBHI, DAs directly aim to elicit  
119 preferences and support patient decision-making by providing decision-makers with  
120 detailed and personalised options and outcomes<sup>[2]</sup>. EBHI and DAs are developed in  
121 an extensive process that involves continuous adaptation<sup>[3]</sup>. Information needs and  
122 requirements of the target group are crucial throughout the development process<sup>[4]</sup>.  
123 However, the group targeted by the general decision-making situation can be very  
124 heterogeneous in terms of their individual ability to understand and process  
125 information and to draw conclusions. Accordingly, there is a risk that those  
126 individuals or groups within the target group who are already disadvantaged in terms  
127 of informed and shared decision-making (SDM) will benefit least from EBHI and DAs.  
128 It has long been recognised that patient education materials fail to adequately  
129 address differences in access to health-related information between different social  
130 groups by not taking sufficient account of factors that are associated with inequalities  
131<sup>[5-7]</sup>. These factors include race/ethnicity, language, gender, education,  
132 socioeconomic status (SES) and age, which, according to PROGRESS-Plus, lead to  
133 unequal opportunities and thus differences in health outcomes<sup>[8]</sup>. Many of the factors  
134 influence access to health care in general. For instance, written information is often  
135 at a higher reading level or developed for general audiences and therefore does not  
136 reach people with low literacy skills, education, and SES or those from diverse  
137 cultural groups<sup>[7, 9, 10]</sup>, although the checklist of quality criteria from the International  
138 Patient Decision Aid Standards (IPDAS) has always included the use of plain  
139 language<sup>[11]</sup>.

140 At present, it is unclear whether EBHI and DAs are equally effective for all patient  
141 groups or which subgroups benefit (most), as few trials and systematic reviews have  
142 investigated this effect. However, evidence exists that disadvantaged patients (e.g.  
143 with lower literacy skills, education and socioeconomic status) are less likely to make  
144 informed choices and are more likely to regret their decision than advantaged groups  
145 [7]. Furthermore, a patient-level meta-analysis based on seven unpublished RCTs  
146 from the Knowledge and Evaluation Research Unit of the Mayo Clinic, USA,  
147 suggests that DAs during the clinical encounter lead to a greater increase in risk  
148 knowledge in patients with higher education than in those with lower education [12].  
149 Subgroup effects on the basis of race were imprecise. The most current Cochrane  
150 Review published in January 2024 [2], did not investigate whether the positive effect  
151 of DAs applies equally to all patient subgroups. This gap is the subject of our review.  
152 However, the authors of the review noted that more robust evidence that decision  
153 aids can improve health equity or reduce inequalities in access to care could further  
154 support their use in clinical practice, which is currently rare [2].  
155

156 Our review aims to systematically assess to which extent studies evaluating the  
157 effectiveness of EBHI/DAs have considered factors that lead to inequalities in access  
158 to health-related information. We also analyse how their effectiveness in terms of  
159 decision outcomes varies within the target groups according to these factors.  
160

## 161 **Methods**

162 The reporting follows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and  
163 Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) 2020 [13] and PRISMA-Equity statement [14] to account for  
164 equity-related aspects. PROSPERO has been used for prospective registration  
165 (CRD42018103456).  
166  
167

### 168 ***Study inclusion and exclusion***

169 Studies were included: (1) if they compared the effectiveness of EBHI/DAs  
170 (intervention) with usual care or no information (control) between different social  
171 groups in a RCT, (2) when a specific health decision needed to be made, and (3) if  
172 the main outcome of interest was an informed decision or a related aspect.  
173 Therefore, we also included studies that analysed effects on knowledge, attitude,  
174 uptake and related outcomes such as decision concordance, risk perception, recall,  
175 understanding, intention, SDM, decision conflict and regret. Furthermore, studies (4)  
176 had to include an analysis of the effects based on at least one characteristic that  
177 stratifies health opportunities and outcomes according to the PROGRESS-Plus  
178 definition (place of residence, race/ethnicity/culture, occupation, sex, religion,  
179 education, SES, social capital, age, disability and sexual orientation) in their results  
180 section. We also included non-EBHI/DA-interventions, as we expected few studies to  
181 examine the effectiveness of EBHI/DAs in different social groups. These studies had  
182 to provide information about the benefits and harms of the treatment options (e.g.  
183 participation vs. non-participation) for those about to make a decision – one of the  
184 minimum requirements for EBHI [15].  
185

186 We excluded: (1) studies comparing different formats of EBHI/DAs with the same  
187 content (e.g. tabular vs. written information), (2) studies focusing on a concrete  
188 disadvantaged group (e.g. people with low literacy), and (3) studies including a  
189

190 multicomponent intervention, where the intervention effect is not clearly attributable  
191 to the (non-)EBHI/DA.

192

### 193 ***Search strategy, study selection and data extraction***

194

195 We searched the Cochrane Library, MEDLINE and PubMed (via PubMed), EMBASE  
196 (via Ovid), PsycINFO (via Ovid), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health  
197 Literature (CINAHL) (via Ovid), ERIC and PSYINDEX (via Ovid) from inception to  
198 May 2023 using a combination of English-language search terms including or  
199 describing determinants and factors of health inequality in combination with the  
200 intervention and outcome (**Supplement 1**). EndNote 20 was used for reference  
201 management.

202

203 After duplicates were removed, two reviewers independently reviewed all titles and  
204 abstracts via the browser application Rayyan<sup>[16]</sup>. The first reviewer was always the  
205 first review author (CE); the second reviewer varied (CH, JB, JH). Studies included  
206 were then screened in full text by two reviewers independently, with disagreements  
207 resolved by discussion. Additionally, reference lists of included studies and of  
208 relevant systematic reviews identified were checked for grey literature.

209 A standard data extraction form was used to extract data, focusing on which aspects  
210 of inequality, as defined by PROGRESS Plus, were taken into account and the  
211 impact of each aspect for the respective factor.

212

### 213 ***Risk of Bias***

214

215 Two people independently assessed the risk of bias using Cochrane's ROB 2.0<sup>[17]</sup>  
216 tool for RCTs. The first person was always the first review author (CE); the second  
217 person varied (CM, DA, JB, PB). Disagreements were resolved by discussion and, if  
218 necessary, with the involvement of a third person (FGR).

219

### 220 ***Data synthesis***

221

222 Due to the lack of relevant reported data and heterogeneous instruments to access  
223 outcomes (e.g. informed choice) and disadvantage level of study participants (e.g.  
224 health literacy (HL)) and to the effect of outcomes being available for only some  
225 subgroups in the identified studies, the Grading of Recommendations Assessment,  
226 Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system<sup>[18]</sup> could not be applied and a meta-  
227 analysis was not possible. The results were therefore summarised narratively and  
228 effects visualised using harvest plots<sup>[19]</sup>, including only studies with low and medium  
229 risk of bias.

230

### 231 ***Patient and public involvement***

232

233 We did not involve patients in the design of the trial or in the dissemination of the  
234 results.

235

### 236 ***Results***

237

238 The literature searches identified 3803 studies, of which 216 potentially relevant  
239 studies were included for full-text screening. Data extraction was performed for

240 seven studies. Five additional studies were identified from the reference lists of the  
241 studies included and of relevant systematic reviews. The study selection process is  
242 shown in **Figure 1**. Sixty studies that were initially considered eligible were excluded  
243 due to wrong intervention (e.g. multicomponent analysis without separate analysis of  
244 the EBHI/DAs), 118 studies lacked an equity analysis, eight studies used the wrong  
245 study design and ten studies reported on the wrong outcome or population. See the  
246 appendix for a list of excluded studies and specific reasons (**Supplement 1**).

247

248

### 249 **Characteristics of included studies**

250

251 Of the 12 trials finally included, nine studies <sup>[6, 7, 20-26]</sup> used an intervention developed  
252 according to the IPDAS criteria <sup>[4]</sup>, so were EBHI/DAs; the remaining three <sup>[27-29]</sup> were  
253 non-EBHI/DAs. Nine studies were carried out in the USA and one study each in the  
254 UK, Australia and Canada in heterogenous clinical settings (e.g. specialised medical  
255 centres and clinical sites, primary care settings/practices). Two studies showed a  
256 thematic overlap in the decision-making situation (prenatal testing) <sup>[20, 29]</sup>; all other  
257 topics occurred only once. Due to the heterogeneous decision-making situations, the  
258 target groups of the intervention were also very diverse and ranged from pregnant  
259 women to elderly patients with increased risk or pre-existing conditions (e.g. kidney  
260 disease, early stage breast cancer), among others. Trial sizes ranged from 60 to 900  
261 participants, meaning that individual subgroups by inequity producing factor were  
262 sometimes very small. Further key characteristics of the included publications and  
263 trials can be found in **Table 1**.

264 Table 1: Characteristics of included studies.

Author/Year	Study design	Country	Setting	Population	Inequity-factor (by PROGRESS Plus)	N	Intervention	Control	Intervention effect assessment	Outcomes of relevance	Risk of Bias
Durand et al. 2021 <sup>[7]</sup>	RCT	USA	7 clinics within 4 National Cancer Institute-designated cancer centers	Women with biopsy-confirmed diagnosis of early staged breast cancer (stages I-IIIa)	By socioeconomic status (SES), education	616	<b>Evidence-based</b> (pictorial) Option Grid on breast-conserving surgery and mastectomy	Usual care (surgeons provided their standard information about breast cancer)	Subgroup analysis	Knowledge, decision concordance, SDM, decision regret, treatment choice	<b>Some concerns</b>
Gordon et al. 2017 <sup>[27]</sup>	RCT	USA	2 medical centres	Kidney transplant candidates	By age, race/ethnicity, gender, education, income, employment status, HL	288	<b>Non-evidence based</b> iPad app, "Inform Me: about Increased Risk Donor Kidneys" (n=133)	<b>Control group:</b> routine transplant education and 31-item multiple-choice posttest on paper after (n=155)	Subgroup analysis	Knowledge	<b>Some concerns</b>
Healton et al. 1999 <sup>[28]</sup>	RCT	USA	Community family planning clinics and hospital-based HIV centres in 19 sites from nine cities	Women including Black, Puerto Rican & Non Puerto Rican Latinas	By age, education, race/ethnicity, language preference	653	<b>Non-evidence-based</b> patient brochure on zidovudine therapy during pregnancy to reduce perinatal HIV transmission	No brochure	Subgroup analysis	Knowledge, intention, attitude	<b>High</b>
Hewison et al. 2001 <sup>[29]</sup>	RCT	UK	One medical centre and outpatient	Consecutive women referred for antenatal care to the Hull Maternity Hospital	By age	2000	<b>Non-evidence based</b> video information at home for Down syndrome screening (n=993)	<b>Control:</b> women who did not receive the screening video at home (n=1007)	Subgroup analysis	Knowledge	<b>Some concerns</b>
Hunter et al. 2005 <sup>[20]</sup>	RCT	Canada	One children's hospital	Pregnant women aged 35 higher at the time of delivery and their partners; gestational age of 18 weeks or less	By gender	352	<b>Non-evidence based</b> audiotape-booklet decision aid + option of genetic counselling (n=116)	<b>Control arms:</b> 1. individual genetic counselling (n=126) 2. genetic counselling in a group (n=110)	Subgroup analysis	Knowledge, decisional conflict	<b>Some concerns</b>
Patzer et al. 2018 <sup>[21]</sup>	RCT	USA	Three transplant centres	Patients living with end-stage renal disease (ESRD); 18 to 70 years of age, no previous solid	By ethnicity, gender, HL, numeracy	443	<b>Evidence-based</b> web-based DA about kidney	Centre-specific standard of care; education about kidney	Subgroups analysis	Knowledge	<b>High</b>

				organ or multiorgan transplant			transplant compared to dialysis	transplant only			
Rising et al. 2018 <sup>[6]</sup>	Multicentre RCT	USA	6 Emergency departments	Patients included adults (17 years of age) who presented to the ED with a chief complaint of chest pain, had an initial negative cardiac workup	By age, gender, ethnicity, education, numeracy, HL, Income, health insurance	898	<b>Evidence-based</b> Chest Pain Choice (COC) decision aid	Usual care	Subgroup analysis (secondary analysis)	Knowledge, decisional conflict, SDM	<b>Low</b>
Singh et al. 2019 <sup>[22]</sup>	Multicentre RCT	USA	Clinical settings (in- and outpatients)	Women with lupus nephritis	By race/ethnicity/ language, education, income, numeracy, graphical literacy, HL	298	<b>Evidence-based</b> decision aid regarding lupus nephritis and its treatments	Paper pamphlet on lupus kidney disease from the American College of Rheumatology	Subgroup analysis	Decisional conflict, informed choice	<b>Some concerns</b>
Skains et al. 2019 <sup>[30]</sup>	RCT	USA	Seven clinical sites	Parents of children with minor head trauma	By education, HL, numeracy, household income, SES	971	<b>Evidence-based</b> decision aid for parents of children with minor head trauma (n=493)	Clinicians proceeded with their usual SDM discussion with parents (n=478)	Subgroup analysis (secondary analysis)	Knowledge, decisional conflict, SDM	<b>Some concerns</b>
Thomas et al. 2013 <sup>[24]</sup>	RCT	USA	3 medical centres	Patients eligible for a primary prevention implantable cardioverter/defibrillator (ICD)	By race/ethnicity	59	<b>Evidence-based</b> educational video on ICD	Health care provider counselling (usual care)	Subgroup analysis	Knowledge, decisional conflict, uptake/intention (decision-making)	<b>High</b>
Trevena et al. 2008 <sup>[25]</sup>	RCT	Australia	Six primary care locations	People aged 50-74 years deciding whether to undergo colorectal cancer screening	By education	314	<b>Evidence-based</b> decision aid for colorectal cancer screening	The consumer version of Australian guidelines	Subgroup analysis	Knowledge, informed choice	<b>Some concerns</b>
Williams et al. 2012 <sup>[26]</sup>	RCT	USA	Georgetown University Medical Center and Howard University Cancer Center	Men pre-registered for PSA screening with no history of prostate cancer	By race/ethnicity		<b>Evidence-based</b> decision aid on PSA screening delivered at home or at the clinic	Usual care delivered at home or at the clinic	Subgroup analysis	Knowledge, decisional conflict	<b>High</b>



## 265 **Risk of bias of included studies**

266

267 Risk of bias was assessed for the individual trials at the study level. Only two out of  
268 the 12 trials were judged to be at low risk of bias across all domains and three of the  
269 trials as having a high risk of bias in at least one area (**Figure 2**). Five studies each  
270 were classified as having some concerns with regard to the randomisation process  
271 or the selective reporting of study results. For instance, although most trials were  
272 registered, information on a priori planned analyses and other details were often  
273 missing.

274 Crucially, none of the 12 trials was initially designed to assess the effect of the  
275 intervention on different social groups; most of the trials assessed the effect through  
276 subgroup analyses by social group. This often led to very small numbers of  
277 participants for the subgroups, suggesting that the trials were insufficiently powered  
278 to detect an intervention effect. Therefore, the overall quality of the evidence is rated  
279 as moderate.

280

281

## 282 **Outcomes relevant for assessing the intervention effect**

283

284 Most frequent outcomes were knowledge in 11 out of the 12 studies and decisional  
285 conflict in six studies (**Supplement 2 - table S1**). Intention/uptake, SDM and  
286 informed decision/decision concordance were outcomes of interest in three studies  
287 each, decision regret and attitude were outcomes in one study each.

288

289

## 290 **Consideration of inequity-creating factors**

291

292 Five inequity-producing factors (as according to PROGRESS-Plus) were considered  
293 at least once (

294 **Table 2**). Six out of 12 studies considered more than one factor but only two <sup>[7, 30]</sup>  
295 considered intersectionality, which refers to the overlapping of various disadvantages  
296 (e.g. low-level education and cultural background) <sup>[31]</sup>. In one of the studies, the  
297 authors defined study participants as socioeconomically disadvantaged if they were  
298 non-white, had low HL or numeracy skills and had a low income (< USD 40,000) <sup>[30]</sup>.  
299 In the second study <sup>[7]</sup>, patients with lower SES were defined as having at least two  
300 of the following characteristics: lower income, lower education or underinsurance.  
301 Only one further study <sup>[28]</sup> mentioned that one of the subgroups (non-Puerto Rican  
302 Latinas) might benefit the least, as they had the lowest level of English skills and  
303 some did not even speak Spanish.

304

305

306 **Table 2: Sociodemographic factors used in the included studies (N = 12) to assess the**  
307 **intervention effect in subgroups.**

	Ethnicity/race/language	Education	Age	Gender	HL	Numeracy	Income	SES	Employment status	Graph literacy	Insurance status
Durand et al. 2021 <sup>[7]</sup>		X						X <sup>a</sup>			
Gordon et al. 2017 <sup>[27]</sup>	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		

Healton et al. 1999 <sup>[28]</sup>	X	X	X								
Hewison et al. 2001 <sup>[29]</sup>			X								
Hunter et al. 2005 <sup>[20]</sup>				X							
Patzer et al. 2018 <sup>[21]</sup>	X			X	X	X					
Rising et al. 2018 <sup>[6]</sup>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X
Singh et al. 2019 <sup>[22]</sup>	X	X			X	X	X			X	
Skains et al. 2019 <sup>[30]</sup>	X	X			X	X	X	X <sup>b</sup>			
Thomas et al. 2013 <sup>[24]</sup>	X										
Trevena et al. 2008 <sup>[25]</sup>		X									
Williams et al. 2013 <sup>[26]</sup>	X										
	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

308

X<sup>a</sup>: SES assessed by education, income and occupational status.

309

X<sup>b</sup>: SES assessed by race, HL/numeracy and income.

310

311

312

The intervention effect was most frequently observed according to ethnicity/language preference (

313

314

**Table 2**). The most commonly assessed outcomes by inequality factors were

315

knowledge, decisional conflict and SDM (**Supplement 2 - Table S2**). The results for

316

the inequality factors are only summarised below for these three factors, as the

317

number of studies for other factors is very small, making it almost impossible to draw

318

conclusions.

319

320

321

### **Synthesis of intervention effect by inequality factors**

322

323

Overall, among heterogeneous studies in terms of decision-relevant outcomes and

324

inequality factors only three studies mentioned group-specific intervention

325

effectiveness<sup>[6, 7, 22]</sup>. The results are summarised narratively for each inequality

326

factor. Only studies with low and medium risk of bias are presented in the forest plots

327

for the most frequent endpoints (**Figure 3 A-C**).

328

329

#### **Age**

330

331

Three trials<sup>[6, 28, 29]</sup> tested for a group-specific intervention effect that was indicated in

332

one high-risk-of-bias study alone (only one knowledge aspect)<sup>[28]</sup>. Another trial

333

reported higher knowledge scores after intervention across four different age groups

334

without indication of differential effectiveness<sup>[27]</sup>. Age groups do not seem to be

335

disadvantaged by interventions, whether EBHI/DA or not (**Figure 3 A-C**), but the lack

336 of pre-post assessments across intervention groups and heterogeneous  
337 categorisations of age groups may have concealed such differences.

338

### 339 *Education*

340

341 None of the four trials that analysed knowledge effects confirmed an association with  
342 education <sup>[6, 25, 28, 30]</sup> (**Supplement 2 – table S4**). A fifth revealed similar knowledge  
343 gains <sup>[27]</sup> (**Figure 3 A-C**). Any EBHI/DA seemed to be equally effective for people  
344 with higher and lower levels of education for SDM <sup>[6, 30]</sup>, decisional conflict <sup>[22, 30]</sup>,  
345 attitudes <sup>[28]</sup>, intention <sup>[28]</sup> and informed choice <sup>[22]</sup>, although each of these endpoints  
346 was assessed in a maximum of two studies. A single study <sup>[7]</sup> found that the  
347 intervention increased disparities in decision regret between those with and without  
348 high school diploma.

349

### 350 *Ethnicity/race and language preference*

351

352 Among trials where ethnicity was taken into account (**Supplement table S5**), one <sup>[6]</sup>  
353 indicated that the intervention was more effective for white patients than for other  
354 ethnic groups (e.g. African Americans, Latinas or other racial/ethnic groups) in terms  
355 of knowledge (**Figure 3 A**). The study, however, lacked an adjustment for multiple  
356 testing. Three high-risk-of-bias trials had contradictory results regarding differential  
357 effectiveness <sup>[21, 26, 28]</sup>. Two further trials <sup>[27, 30]</sup> found similar knowledge gains across  
358 ethnicities, even though Gordon et al. <sup>[27]</sup> suggest – without a statistical test – that  
359 knowledge improved more in non-Hispanic whites than in other non-African  
360 American racial/ethnic groups. A seventh trial did not show any knowledge effect <sup>[24]</sup>.  
361 Interventions were equally effective for white and other ethnic groups with regard to  
362 decisional conflict and SDM <sup>[6, 30]</sup> (**Figure 3 B-C**). A study with high risk of bias also  
363 suggested equal effects with regard to behavioural intention <sup>[28]</sup>. Singh et al. <sup>[22]</sup>,  
364 however, suggest advantages for whites in the effects on informed choice and  
365 decisional conflict, thereby indicating a negative association (**Figure 3 B**).  
366 Although this finding for language preference was confirmed in the same study,  
367 participants preferring Spanish, who had a presumably high overlap with the  
368 Hispanic groups, were less represented in the sample, which might indicate a power  
369 problem.

370 A high-risk-of-bias trial that looked at the effect of the intervention by language  
371 preference also indicated that those who received the intervention in their preferred  
372 language/mother tongue (English-speaking or bilingual participants) knew more than  
373 those with some language barriers (Spanish-speaking participants) <sup>[28]</sup>.

374

### 375 *Gender*

376

377 No difference between women and men regarding intervention effects on knowledge,  
378 decisional conflict and SDM was indicated by any study <sup>[6, 20, 21, 27]</sup> (**Figure 3 A-C**;  
379 **Supplement table S6**). Two studies <sup>[20, 21]</sup>, one <sup>[21]</sup> with high risk of bias, assessed  
380 baseline decisional conflict and knowledge. Only one study <sup>[6]</sup> tested the respective  
381 interactions with gender.

382

### 383 *Health literacy*

384

385 One study showed higher decision-relevant knowledge with intervention for those  
386 with adequate, moderate and inadequate literacy skills <sup>[27]</sup>, but neglected to report  
387 the interaction between these groups (**Supplement 2 – table S7**). Two studies <sup>[6, 30]</sup>  
388 that observed the interaction between having a low or typical HL with the intervention  
389 could not reveal differences in knowledge (**Figure 3 A**). However, the statistical  
390 power does not seem to be sufficient to detect such an interaction if it exists. In one  
391 trial with high risk of bias, people with high literacy skills appeared to achieve greater  
392 knowledge scores than did those with lower literacy <sup>[21]</sup>. Each intervention was  
393 equally effective for SDM <sup>[6, 23]</sup> and decisional conflict <sup>[6, 22, 30]</sup> in studies of people with  
394 low and typical HL (**Figure 3 B-C**).

395

### 396 Numeracy

397

398 Knowledge was suggested to increase more for those with medium or high  
399 numeracy scores than for those with lower scores in one trial with high risk of bias <sup>[21]</sup>  
400 (**Supplement 2 – table S7**). Two further studies <sup>[6, 30]</sup> do not support this  
401 unambiguously in their comparisons of groups with low vs. typical numeracy (**Figure**  
402 **3 A**). In one study <sup>[6]</sup>, there was no adjustment for multiple testing despite 80  
403 comparisons, while both studies may not have been adequately powered to test for  
404 the interaction of numeracy with the intervention effects.  
405 For decisional conflicts, one trial <sup>[22]</sup> showed that, compared to usual care, the  
406 intervention was effective only for people with higher numeracy skills, which  
407 indicates a disparity increase (**Figure 3 B**). No difference in terms of both decisional  
408 conflict and SDM could be observed in the two further trials considering numeracy <sup>[6,</sup>  
409 <sup>23]</sup> (**Figure 3 B-C**).

410

### 411 SES

412

413 Intervention effects by socioeconomic factors have been investigated with the help of  
414 the SES (two studies <sup>[7, 30]</sup>), income (four studies <sup>[6, 22, 27, 30]</sup>) and employment status  
415 (one study <sup>[27]</sup>) (**Supplement 2 - table S8**). Durand et al. <sup>[7]</sup> found that the difference  
416 in decision-relevant knowledge after an effective intervention between those with  
417 lower and higher SES was smaller than in the control group (**Figure 3 A**). The other  
418 study could not confirm that finding <sup>[30]</sup>. Nor did four further studies, indicating similar  
419 knowledge gains across a broad income spectrum <sup>[6, 27, 30]</sup> (below 25k, below 65k,  
420 above 65k US dollars per year) and independent of employment status <sup>[27]</sup>. None of  
421 the studies <sup>[6, 7, 22, 30]</sup> found an effect on decisional conflict and SDM. Furthermore, no  
422 difference was found between people with lower and higher SES <sup>[7, 30]</sup> in terms of  
423 intervention effects on decision concordance, decisional conflict, SDM and treatment  
424 choice. Nor could an interaction effect of income with interventions on decisional  
425 conflict and SDM be confirmed <sup>[6, 30]</sup>. Only Singh et al. <sup>[22]</sup> found largest effectiveness  
426 on decisional conflict on those who reported lowest annual income (<40k). Across all  
427 studies we found, this is the only evidence that an EBHI/DA-intervention – and, more  
428 generally, any health information intervention – can reduce disparities in improving  
429 decisional conflict (**Figure 3 B**). Overall, only economic indicators of inequality  
430 revealed positively associated intervention effects.

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

## 438 **Discussion**

439

### 440 ***Principal findings***

441

442 Our systematic review reveals that inequity-producing factors are rarely considered  
443 in effectiveness studies of EBHI/DAs. Included trials took into account at least one  
444 factor as according to PROGRESS-Plus, but looked at the effect only in subgroup  
445 analyses. The designs were heterogeneous, with few directly testing the association  
446 between intervention effects and the disadvantage status, and few assessing  
447 baseline levels of the respective outcomes. Sample sizes were often small, and for  
448 many of the subgroups, few trials could be identified that provided evidence to draw  
449 conclusions about effectiveness and/or the data were poorly reported.

450 In terms of knowledge, not everyone benefits equally, which is a key endpoint for  
451 informed decision-making and SDM. People who were considered disadvantaged  
452 because of their ethnicity (e.g. African Americans, Latinas, or other racial/ethnic  
453 groups) or language in at least one study attained less knowledge in most studies,  
454 which may have prevented the identification of asymmetries in both knowledge  
455 acquisition and other outcomes. For decisional conflict, ethnic groups seem to have  
456 benefitted equally in three out of four studies, lower and higher health numerates did  
457 so in three identified studies, men and women in two identified studies, lower and  
458 higher educated in two and younger and older age groups in one study. One of three  
459 identified studies analysing numeracy and one out four studies analysing ethnicity  
460 respectively showed a disadvantage for low numerates and non-whites in terms of  
461 decisional conflict by the intervention. One of three trials analysing SES showed that  
462 knowledge inequalities between people of different SES can be reduced by providing  
463 EBHI/DAs. No differences in the effect for SDM by ethnicity, education, gender,  
464 income, HL or numeracy could be identified across all three studies. Again, however,  
465 because only few studies were available and this effect was only considered in  
466 subgroup analyses with presumably inadequate power, asymmetries across  
467 inequality factors may have not been recognised.

468

### 469 ***Strengths and limitations***

470

471 Through our research with the best available evidence, it has become clear that  
472 inequity-producing factors were rarely considered in planning the evaluation and that  
473 methodological approaches were not sufficient to make statements about the effect  
474 between and within different groups.

475 Potential limitations: First, despite our efforts to search extensively for RCTs of  
476 EBHI/DAs that evaluated the effectiveness in different social groups, our search  
477 possibly missed relevant RCTs that met our inclusion criteria. Studies may not have  
478 been identified in the title-abstract screening, because the effect of inequity-  
479 producing factors was often only analysed in subgroups or mentioned in the  
480 discussion only.

481 Our focus on RCTs may have neglected observational evidence that is more  
482 inclusive of disadvantaged subgroups. Because most studies made no assumptions  
483 about possible differences in effectiveness due to their retrospective analysis of

484 social factors, we did not define a priori a classification of disadvantaged or not  
485 disadvantaged.  
486 Having also included trials without information prepared according to quality criteria  
487 for DAs <sup>[4]</sup> and not specifying a minimum requirement in the study protocol for those  
488 studies, we subsequently specified that trials with non-EBHI had to report at least the  
489 benefits and harms. However, we did not assess the quality of the individual DAs  
490 and instead relied on the statement that the DAs had been developed according to  
491 certain criteria. Thus, some of the DAs may not meet the highest quality standards of  
492 EBHI/DAs.

### 493 494 ***Comparison with other studies***

495  
496 Unlike previous systematic reviews, ours focused on systematically assessing and  
497 analysing the effectiveness of EBHI and DAs between and within patient subgroups.  
498 A systematic review from the Cochrane Review versions on the effectiveness of DAs  
499 that included studies until 2021 <sup>[2]</sup> found that in only 12% of the included RCTs were  
500 the needs of people with low HL or other disadvantaged groups considered in the  
501 design and testing of DAs <sup>[11]</sup>, thereby suggesting differences in the degree of  
502 effectiveness between and within patient subgroups. However, the review did not  
503 investigate this. A systematic review from 2016 <sup>[32]</sup> found that just 17 out of 39  
504 included RCTs in the US included disadvantaged people while developing DAs on  
505 cancer screening and treatment. Only 14 of the included studies investigated the  
506 effect of DAs in disadvantaged groups (mainly by education and HL), most of them  
507 for one specific group and few for and between different social groups <sup>[32]</sup>.  
508 Furthermore, two systematic reviews found that SDM interventions improve for  
509 example knowledge, informed choice and SDM for disadvantaged patients (e.g.  
510 lower literacy, education and socioeconomic status) – particularly when tailored to  
511 the needs of disadvantaged groups <sup>[5, 33]</sup>. But the authors note the lack of evidence  
512 on the effectiveness of decision-making interventions for disadvantaged people  
513 compared with non-disadvantaged people, which was our focus. Other systematic  
514 reviews examined DA evaluation studies with a particular focus on a group  
515 considered disadvantaged (e.g. people with low literacy <sup>[34]</sup>, older people <sup>[35]</sup> or  
516 people with racial or ethnic minority background <sup>[36, 37]</sup>) or focused on disadvantaged  
517 populations, but for SDM interventions in general or multicomponent interventions <sup>[6,</sup>  
518 <sup>33, 37]</sup>.

### 519 520 ***Implications and future research***

521  
522 Only two studies found positive associations and three studies found negative  
523 associations between intervention effectiveness and disadvantaged group status in  
524 terms of SES and ethnicity/numeracy. On the one hand, overproportional decision-  
525 making benefits in those with lower SES may indicate a kind of “catch-up effect” and  
526 a promise of enabling access to evidence-based health communication for those  
527 groups. Disproportionately low benefits of those with low numeracy or an  
528 underrepresented ethnic background, on the other hand, may reflect disregard of  
529 health communication development standards for addressing difficulties with  
530 numbers and language. Nevertheless, advantaged and disadvantaged patients  
531 appear to benefit equally from EBHI/DAs. Given the small number of trials and the  
532 fact that the effect was considered solely in subgroup analyses, which are likely to be  
533 underpowered, asymmetries between factors of inequality may not have been

534 detected by the existing designs. Future research should therefore take better  
535 account of critical inequality factors when evaluating EBHI and DAs to contribute to  
536 more equitable health care.

537

### 538 **Conclusion**

539

540 Due to the small number of studies and their methodological and qualitative  
541 limitations, there is limited evidence on whether EBHI and DA contribute to good  
542 healthcare for all patients or whether they benefit only certain subgroups of patients.  
543 More attention should thus be paid to the methodological requirements to fully  
544 capture potential effects of the diversity of the target groups. This is the only way to  
545 prove and reduce inequalities in informed decision-making and ultimately ensure  
546 appropriate and equitable health care.

547

548

### 549 **Contributions**

550

551 CE, JH and FGR conceptualised and designed the systematic review. CE, JH, CW  
552 and FGR screened the studies and extracted the data for different updates of the  
553 systematic review. CE and FGR analysed the results. CE drafted the manuscript and  
554 made the revisions. CW, JH and FGR critically revised the manuscript. All authors  
555 finally approved the manuscript. CE is the guarantor for this review.

556 We acknowledge Carolin Harder (CH), Chiara Müller (CM), Donja Ameri (DA),  
557 Pauline Brunner (PB) and Julia Beckhaus (JB) for their research support (study  
558 screening, data extraction and risk of bias assessment).

559

### 560 **Data availability statement**

561

562 Most of the data and analyses are available in supplementary files. Additional data  
563 are available on request from the corresponding author.

564

### 565 **Ethics statements**

566

567 No ethics approval was required for this systematic review. Patient consent for  
568 publication was not applicable.

569

### 570 **Funding**

571

572 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,  
573 commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

574

### 575 **Competing interests**

576

577 The authors declare that, in the conduct and reporting of this study, there were no  
578 financial or other conflicts of interest.

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

## References

589

590

1. Marteau TM, Dormandy E, Michie S. A measure of informed choice. *Health Expect*

591

2001;4(2):99-108. doi: 10.1046/j.1369-6513.2001.00140.x

592

2. Stacey D, Lewis KB, Smith M, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or

593

screening decisions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2024(1) doi:

594

10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub6

595

3. Witteman HO, Maki KG, Vaissou G, et al. Systematic development of patient decision aids:

596

An update from the IPDAS collaboration. *Med Decis Making* 2021;41(7):736-54. doi:

597

10.1177/0272989x211014163 [published Online First: 20210619]

598

4. Elwyn G, O'Connor A, Stacey D, et al. Developing a quality criteria framework for patient

599

decision aids: online international Delphi consensus process. *BMJ*

600

2006;333(7565):417.

601

5. Durand MA, Carpenter L, Dolan H, et al. Do interventions designed to support shared

602

decision-making reduce health inequalities? A systematic review and meta-analysis.

603

*PLoS One* 2014;9(4):e94670.

604

6. Rising KL, Holler JE, et al. Effectiveness of a decision aid in potentially vulnerable

605

patients: A secondary analysis of the chest pain choice multicenter randomized trial.

606

*Med Decis Making* 2018;38(1):69-78.

607

7. Durand MA, Yen RW, O'Malley AJ, et al. What matters most: Randomized controlled trial

608

of breast cancer surgery conversation aids across socioeconomic strata. *Cancer*

609

2021;127(3):422-36.

610

8. O'Neill J, Tabish H, Welch V, et al. Applying an equity lens to interventions: using

611

PROGRESS ensures consideration of socially stratifying factors to illuminate

612

inequities in health. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;67(1):56-64. doi:

613

10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.08.005 [published Online First: 20131101]

614

9. Thomson M, Hoffman-Goetz L. Readability and cultural sensitivity of web-based patient

615

decision aids for cancer screening and treatment: a systematic review. *Med Inform*

616

*Internet* 2007;32(4):263-86.

617

10. Schubbe D, Scalia P, Yen RW, et al. Using pictures to convey health information: A

618

systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects on patient and consumer health

619

behaviors and outcomes. *Patient Educ Couns* 2020;103(10):1935-60.

620

11. Muscat DM, Smith J, Mac O, et al. Addressing health literacy in patient decision aids: An

621

update from the international patient decision aid standards. *Med Decis Making*

622

2021;0272989X211011101.

623

12. Coylewright M, B, a M, et al. Impact of sociodemographic patient characteristics on the

624

efficacy of decision AIDs: a patient-level meta-analysis of 7 randomized trials. *Circ*

625

*Cardiovasc Interv* 2014;7(3):360-7.

626

13. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated

627

guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372

628

14. Welch V, Petticrew M, Tugwell P, et al. PRISMA-Equity 2012 Extension: Reporting

629

guidelines for systematic reviews with a focus on health equity. *PLoS Med*

630

2012;9(10):e1001333. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001333



- 631 15. O'connor A, Elwyn G, Barratt A, et al. IPDAS 2005: criteria for judging the quality of  
632 patient decision aids. -: *IPDAS OHRI* 2005:2-3.
- 633 16. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, et al. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for  
634 systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5:1-10.
- 635 17. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in  
636 randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l4898 [published Online  
637 First: 20190828]
- 638 18. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of  
639 evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;336(7650):924-26. doi:  
640 10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD
- 641 19. Ogilvie D, Fayter D, Petticrew M, et al. The harvest plot: A method for synthesising  
642 evidence about the differential effects of interventions. *BMC Medical Research  
643 Methodology* 2008;8(1):8. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-8-8
- 644 20. Hunter A, Cappelli M, Humphreys L, et al. A randomized trial comparing alternative  
645 approaches to prenatal diagnosis counseling in advanced maternal age patients. *Clin  
646 Genet* 2005;67(4):303-13.
- 647 21. Patzer RE, McPherson L, Basu M, et al. Effect of the iChoose Kidney decision aid in  
648 improving knowledge about treatment options among transplant candidates: a  
649 randomized controlled trial. *Am J Transplant* 2018;18(8):1954-65.
- 650 22. Singh JA, Fraenkel L, Green C, et al. Individualized decision aid for diverse women with  
651 lupus nephritis (IDEA-WON): a randomized controlled trial. *PLoS Med*  
652 2019;16(5):e1002800.
- 653 23. Skains RM, Homme JL, Kharb, et al. Subgroup effects of a shared decision making  
654 intervention in children with minor head trauma. *Acad Emerg Med* 2019;26:S58.
- 655 24. Thomas KL, Zimmer LO, Dai D, et al. Educational videos to reduce racial disparities in ICD  
656 therapy via innovative designs (VIVID): a randomized clinical trial. *Am Heart J*  
657 2013;166(1):157-63.
- 658 25. Trevena LJ, Irwig L, Barratt A. Randomized trial of a self-administered decision aid for  
659 colorectal cancer screening. *J Med Screen* 2008;15(2):76-82. doi:  
660 10.1258/jms.2008.007110
- 661 26. Williams RM, Davis KM, Luta G, et al. Fostering informed decisions: a randomized  
662 controlled trial assessing the impact of a decision aid among men registered to  
663 undergo mass screening for prostate cancer. *Patient Educ Couns* 2013;91(3):329-36.
- 664 27. Gordon EJ, Sohn M-W, Chang C-H, et al. Effect of a mobile web app on kidney transplant  
665 candidates' knowledge about increased risk donor kidneys: a randomized controlled  
666 trial. *Transplantation* 2017;101(6):1167.
- 667 28. Healton C, Taylor S, Messeri P, et al. Effects of ZDV-based patient education on  
668 intentions toward ZDV use, HIV testing and reproduction among a US cohort of  
669 women. *AIDS Care* 1999;11(6):675-86.
- 670 29. Hewison J, Cuckle H, Baillie C, et al. Use of videotapes for viewing at home to inform  
671 choice in Down syndrome screening: a randomised controlled trial. *Prenat Diagn*  
672 2001;21(2):146-9. doi: 10.1002/1097-0223(200102)21:2<146::aid-pd3>3.0.co;2-m  
673 [published Online First: 2001/03/10]
- 674 30. Skains RM, Kuppermann N, Homme JL, et al. What is the effect of a decision aid in  
675 potentially vulnerable parents? Insights from the head CT choice randomized trial.  
676 *Health Expect* 2019

- 677 31. Merz S, Jaehn P, Mena E, et al. Intersectionality and eco-social theory: a review of  
678 potentials for public health knowledge and social justice. *Crit Public Health*  
679 2023;33(2):125-34. doi: 10.1080/09581596.2021.1951668
- 680 32. Enard KR, Dolan Mullen P, Kamath GR, et al. Are cancer-related decision aids appropriate  
681 for socially disadvantaged patients? A systematic review of US randomized  
682 controlled trials. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2016;16:64.
- 683 33. Yen RW, Smith J, Engel J, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of patient decision  
684 aids for socially disadvantaged populations: update from the International Patient  
685 Decision Aid Standards (IDPAS). *Med Decis Making* 2021;41(7):870-96.
- 686 34. McCaffery KJ, Holmes-Rovner M, Smith SK, et al. Addressing health literacy in patient  
687 decision aids. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2013;13:S10.
- 688 35. van Weert JC, van Munster BC, S, et al. Decision aids to help older people make health  
689 decisions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*  
690 2016;16:45.
- 691 36. Nathan AG, Marshall IM, Cooper JM, et al. Use of decision aids with minority patients: A  
692 systematic review. *J Gen Intern Med* 2016;31(6):663-76.
- 693 37. Baumeister A, Aldin A, Chakraverty D, et al. Interventions for improving health literacy in  
694 migrants. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2023;11(11):Cd013303. doi:  
695 10.1002/14651858.CD013303.pub2 [published Online First: 20231114]
- 696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701

## 702 **Figure legends**


703  
704 **Figure 1:** Prisma Flow Chart on study inclusion.

705  
706 **Figure 2:** Risk of bias of included studies (N=12).

707  
708 **Figure 3 A-C:** Harvest plots showing the number of intervention studies that either  
709 negatively, positively, or neither affect knowledge change, decisional conflict or SDM by  
710 inequality factors. Overall intervention effect “No” means that an intervention was not shown  
711 to be effective for the full sample with regard to knowledge, decisional conflict or SDM.  
712 Studies with high risk of bias were excluded.

713


PRISMA 2020 flow diagram



From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71. For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>


	<u>D1</u>	<u>D2</u>	<u>D3</u>	<u>D4</u>	<u>D5</u>	<u>Overall</u>	
Durand et al. 2021	!	+	+	+	+	!	
Gordon et al. 2017	+	!	+	+	+	!	
Healton et al. 1999	!	-	-	+	!	-	
Hewison et al. 2001	!	!	+	+	!	!	+
Hunter et al. 2005	+	+	+	+	!	!	!
Patzer et al. 2018	+	-	+	-	+	-	-
Rising et al.2018	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Singh et al. 2019	+	+	+	!	+	!	D1 Randomisation process
Skains et al. 2019	+	+	+	+	+	+	D2 Deviations from the intended interventions
Thomas et al. 2013	!	!	+	!	+	!	D3 Missing outcome data
Trevena et al. 2008	+	+	!	+	!	!	D4 Measurement of the outcome
Williams et al. 2013	!	+	+	-	!	-	D5 Selection of the reported result

A




Overall intervention effect  
 ■ Yes  
 ■ No

B



Overall intervention effect  
 ■ Yes  
 ■ No

C



Overall intervention effect  
 ■ Yes  
 ■ No