

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Using machine learning to improve the readability of hospital discharge instructions for heart failure

Short title: Machine learning and hospital discharge instruction readability

Alyssa W. Tuan¹, Nathan Cannon^{1*}, David Foley², Neha Gupta¹, Christian Park¹, Kyra Chester-Paul¹, Joanna Bhasker¹, Cara Pearson¹, Avisha Amarnani¹, Zachary High¹, Jennifer Kraschnewski¹, Ravi Shah¹

¹Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine, Hershey, PA, USA

* Corresponding author

Email: ncannon@pennstatehealth.psu.edu (NC)

22 **Abstract**

23 **Background:** Low health literacy is associated with poor health outcomes. Hospital
24 discharge instructions are often written at advanced reading levels, limiting patients'
25 with low health literacy ability to follow medication instructions or complete other
26 necessary care. Previous research demonstrates that improving the readability of
27 discharge instructions reduces hospital readmissions and decreases healthcare costs.
28 We aimed to use artificial intelligence (AI) to improve the readability of discharge
29 instructions.

30
31 **Methodology/Principal Findings:** We collected a series of discharge instructions for
32 adults hospitalized for heart failure (n=423), which were then manually simplified to a
33 lower reading level to create two parallel sets of discharge instructions. Only 343 sets
34 were then processed via AI-based machine learning to create a trained algorithm. We
35 then tested the algorithm on the remaining 80 discharge instructions. Output was
36 evaluated quantitatively using Simple Measure of Gobbledygook (SMOG) and Flesch-
37 Kincaid readability scores and cross-entropy analysis and qualitatively. Using this test
38 dataset (n=80), the average reading levels were: original discharge instructions (SMOG:
39 10.5669±1.2634, Flesch-Kincaid: 8.6038±1.5509), human-simplified instructions
40 (SMOG: 9.4406±1.0791, Flesch-Kincaid: 7.2221±1.3794), and AI-simplified instructions
41 (SMOG: 9.3045±0.9531, Flesch-Kincaid: 7.0464±1.1308). AI-simplified instructions
42 were significantly different from original instructions ($p < 0.00001$). The algorithm made
43 appropriate changes in 26.1% of instances to the original discharge instructions and
44 improved average reading levels by 1.26±0.32 grade levels (SMOG) and 1.02±0.47

45 grade levels (Flesch-Kincaid). Cross-entropy analysis showed that as the data set
46 increased in size, the function of the algorithm improved.

47

48 **Conclusions/Significance:** The AI-based algorithm learned meaningful phrase-level
49 simplifications from the human-simplified discharge instructions. The AI simplifications,
50 while not in complete agreement with the human simplifications, do appear as
51 statistically significant improvements to SMOG and Flesch-Kincaid reading levels. The
52 algorithm will likely produce more meaningful and concise simplifications among
53 discharge instructions as it is trained on more data. This study demonstrates an
54 important opportunity for AI integration into healthcare delivery to address health
55 disparities related to limited health literacy and potentially improve patient health.

56 **Author summary**

57 Patient-facing materials are often written at too high of a reading level for patients, such
58 as hospital discharge instructions. These instructions provide critical information on how
59 to control health conditions, take medications, and attend follow-up visits. Difficulty
60 understanding these instructions could lead to the patient returning to the hospital if they
61 do not understand how to control their health condition.

62

63 Improving the readability of discharge instructions can reduce hospital readmissions. It
64 may improve health outcomes for patients and reduce healthcare costs. Artificial
65 intelligence (AI) may be used to improve the reading level of patient-facing materials.
66 Our work aims to create a tool that can accomplish this goal.

67

68 We obtained hospital discharge instructions for heart failure. Discharge instructions
69 were edited by medical experts to improve their readability. This created two sets of
70 discharge instructions that were processed using AI. We created and tested an AI tool
71 to automatically simplify discharge instructions. Although not perfect, we found that the
72 tool was successful. This research shows that AI can be used to address health literacy
73 needs within health care by making patient-facing health materials easier to understand.
74 This is important to empower all patients to take action to improve their health.

76 Introduction

77 Limited health literacy is an important predictor of health status and affects about 9 out
78 of 10 adults in the United States [1]. It is defined as the degree to which individuals can
79 find, understand, and use information and services to inform health-related decisions
80 and actions for themselves and others [2]. Limited health literacy is related to health
81 disparities [3-7], higher healthcare costs [8-14], and poorer health outcomes [15].

82

83 Patient-facing literature is often written at too high of a readability level for their intended
84 recipients [16], including hospital discharge instructions [13-14, 17]. This can make it
85 difficult for patients to understand their medication dosing instructions, timeline for
86 follow-up appointments, and other aspects of care. As a result, patients could be
87 readmitted to hospitals [18, 19], resulting in increased costs for the healthcare system
88 as a whole with the risk of increasing morbidity and mortality for patients. A study by
89 Choudhry et al. demonstrated improved readability of discharge summaries by breaking
90 up long sentences, changing complex terminology, and assessing content with
91 readability calculators. As a result, the study team found that 30-day patient
92 readmissions in the post-hospital setting were reduced by 50% [20].

93

94 Our study aims to leverage natural language processing and artificial intelligence (AI) to
95 improve the readability of hospital discharge instructions. AI can be used to address
96 contextual information, grammatical structure, and changes to word order. Most current
97 AI solutions related to the discharge process revolve around care coordination [21],
98 rather than focus on patient discharge instructions, or aim to predict patients likely to be

99 readmitted to the hospital [22-24]. We examined whether an AI-based system can learn
100 and incorporate meaningful simplifications of hospital discharge instructions. We believe
101 that we were able to achieve this aim.

102

103 **Materials and methods**

104 **Study overview**

105 Institutional Review Board approval was obtained for this study. We obtained a list of
106 medical record numbers for adults hospitalized from 2016 to 2021 at our academic
107 medical center with a diagnosis code of heart failure, a leading cause of readmissions,
108 addressed during their hospitalization. This list was obtained through our institution's
109 information management department. Discharge summaries for these hospitalizations
110 written between 2016 to 2021 were then collected manually from the electronic medical
111 records.

112

113 We collected 423 discharge instructions. These discharge instructions were not
114 randomly collected from the list of medical record numbers available. Collected
115 discharge instructions were re-formatted to replace bulleted lists with sentences. This
116 ensured that bulleted lists were not perceived as run-on sentences by readability
117 calculators. The readability scores of the discharge instructions were then calculated
118 using the Simple Measure of Gobbledygook (SMOG) index and Flesch-Kincaid score
119 [25], creating a compilation of reading level scores for the original set of discharge
120 instructions that correlate to years of education and grade reading level.

121

122 The original versions of discharge instructions were then manually rewritten by medical
123 experts as human simplifiers using a standardized process to improve readability. This
124 process included eliminating long sentences and exchanging complex terms with lay
125 terms. The manual simplification of text was performed on a line-by-line basis to create
126 parallel data sets for AI training, while working to preserve the original meaning of the
127 content for patients. The readability scores of the human-simplified discharge
128 instructions were then calculated using the SMOG index and Flesch-Kincaid score.

129
130 Of the 423 discharge instructions, only 343 parallel discharge instructions (“training
131 dataset”) were processed via AI-based machine learning to create an algorithm trained
132 on the data. This algorithm was then tested on the remaining 80 discharge instructions
133 that the algorithm had not seen before (“test dataset”). The output from the algorithm
134 was evaluated quantitatively using readability scores and cross-entropy analysis, which
135 measures how well the algorithm predicts human simplification on a word-by-word
136 basis. The output was also evaluated qualitatively by human readers examining
137 grammar and semantic content.

138

139 **Algorithm development**

140 The text-simplification task is formulated as a machine translation problem. Machine
141 translation algorithms take text in a source language and output text in a target
142 language, such as English or German. In our case, the source language is text from the
143 original versions of hospital discharge instructions, and the target language is an AI-
144 simplified version of the text. "Translation" in this case does not refer to translation

145 between different languages, but rather the formal operation of the algorithm. All text,
146 both input and output, is rendered in English.

147

148 Like most state-of-the-art machine translation algorithms, our model is built on
149 transformers. Transformers are neural network architectures that learn representations
150 of input sequences from attention-based transformations.

151

152 **Results**

153 The average SMOG reading level of the training dataset (n=343) with no simplifications
154 was 10.9300 ± 1.4272 . By Flesch-Kincaid, the average reading level was $9.0776 \pm$
155 1.7771 . The average reading level of the human-simplified instructions was $9.3110 \pm$
156 0.8953 by SMOG and 7.3081 ± 1.2092 by Flesch-Kincaid.

157

158 We found that the average SMOG reading level of the test dataset (n=80) was 10.5669
159 ± 1.2634 for the original discharge instructions and 9.4406 ± 1.0791 for human-
160 simplified instructions (**Fig 1**). The average Flesch-Kincaid reading level was $8.6038 \pm$
161 1.5509 for the original discharge instructions and 7.2221 ± 1.3794 for human-simplified
162 instructions,

163

164 In comparison, the average SMOG reading level for the AI-simplified instructions in the
165 test dataset (n=80) was 9.3045 ± 0.9531 (**Fig 1**). The human-simplified and the AI-
166 simplified were both significantly improved reading levels from the original discharge
167 instructions (**Table 1**). The average Flesch-Kincaid reading level was 7.0464 ± 1.1308

168 for AI-simplified instructions. We found that the algorithm made appropriate changes to
169 the original discharge instructions in 26.1% of instances (**Table 2**), as well as average
170 readability level improvements of 1.2624 ± 1.0791 grade levels by the SMOG index and
171 1.5574 ± 1.3274 grade levels by the Flesch-Kincaid score. We did find that the
172 algorithm may maintain the original text without making any simplifications, although a
173 human simplifier could identify opportunities to simplify the text. At times, the algorithm
174 would introduce text that did not make sense within the meaning of the sentence (**Table**
175 **3**). The cross-entropy analysis showed that mean cross-entropy decreased as the data
176 set increased in size, indicating that the function of the algorithm improved as the data
177 set size grew (**Fig 2**).

178

179 **Table 1: Comparing average readability scores among the three versions of**
180 **discharge instructions (n=80).**

	Average reading level of original discharge instructions	Average reading level of human-simplified instructions	Average reading level of AI-simplified instructions	P-value
SMOG index	10.5669 ± 1.2634	9.4406 ± 1.0791	9.3045 ± 0.9531	$p < 0.00001$
Flesch-Kincaid readability score	8.6038 ± 1.5509	7.2221 ± 1.3794	7.0464 ± 1.1308	$p < 0.00001$

181 Average SMOG index and Flesch-Kincaid readability scores of the original, human-
182 simplified, and AI-simplified discharge instructions (n=80), one-way analysis of variance
183 (ANOVA) test

184

185 **Table 2: Examples of text from original discharge instructions with correlating**
 186 **human-simplified and AI-simplified text.**

Original discharge instructions	Human-simplified text	AI-simplified text
Please take all of your medications exactly as prescribed. Tell your primary care provider if you cannot afford your medications.	Please take all of your medicine exactly as <u>written</u> . Tell your <u>family doctor</u> if you <u>can't pay for your medicine</u> .	Please take all of your medications exactly as <u>ordered by the doctor</u> . Tell your <u>family doctor</u> if you can not <u>pay for your medications</u> .
It was our pleasure to care for you during your hospitalization.	It was our pleasure to care for you during your <u>stay in the hospital</u> .	It was our pleasure to care for you during your <u>hospital stay</u> .
If you find a discrepancy between your home medications and the medication list found later in this packet, please address this with your family doctor.	If you find a <u>difference</u> between your <u>home drugs</u> and the <u>drug list</u> found later in this packet, please <u>ask about</u> this with your family doctor.	If you find a <u>difference</u> between your home medications and the medication list found later in this packet , please <u>talk about</u> this with your family doctor .

187
 188 **Table 3: Examples of text from original discharge instructions with correlating**
 189 **human-simplified and AI-simplified text, with AI-simplified text unchanged or**
 190 **inappropriately simplified.**

Original discharge instructions	Human-simplified text	AI-simplified text
This number will connect you to the hospital operator and ask for the Cardiac Surgery PA on duty.	This number will get you to the hospital operator and ask for the <u>heart surgeon</u> on duty.	This number will connect you to the hospital operator and ask for the <u>Cardiac Surgery PA</u> on duty.
If you do not hear from the provider on this date, please contact them on the next business day.	If you do not hear from the <u>doctor</u> on <u>that day</u> , please call them the next <u>weekday</u> .	If you do not hear from the <u>doctor</u> on this date , please contact them on the next <u>2</u> business day.

Do not discontinue medications without first discussing with your physician.	Do not <u>stop</u> medications without first discussing with your <u>doctor</u> .	Do not <u>put any first pee</u> <u>first</u> discussing with your doctor.
--	---	---

191

192 Discussion

193 We found that our AI-based algorithm learned meaningful phrase-level simplifications
194 from the human-simplified discharge instructions. The AI simplifications, while not
195 completely agreeing with the human simplifications, do appear as statistically significant
196 improvements to SMOG and Flesch-Kincaid reading levels. Future studies should
197 evaluate patient comprehension of the simplified texts. A similar study identified difficult
198 terms, replaced them with easier synonyms, and generated and inserted explanatory
199 texts for them [26]. Most text replacements were deemed correct and user evaluation
200 showed a non-statistically significant trend toward better comprehension when
201 translation was provided. Another study automated simplification of medical text based
202 on word frequencies and language modeling using medical ontologies enriched with lay
203 terms [27]. The language model was trained on medical forum data and tested using
204 crowdsourcing. The researchers found their model generated simpler sentences while
205 preserving grammar and the original meaning. One study, however, used natural
206 language processing to substitute difficult terms for simpler terms and split long
207 sentences into shorter sentences in electronic medical records and journal articles; it
208 found that the length of sentences and reading grade level increased from baseline;
209 however, the study did not evaluate comprehension [28].

210

211 Our study's cross-entropy findings show that the algorithm is more concise and does
212 not produce unnecessarily long sentences. Decreasing cross entropy with increased
213 data set size indicates that the AI-based algorithm will likely produce more meaningful
214 and concise simplifications among discharge instructions as we continue to train the
215 algorithm on more data sets. Studies investigated methods to expand resources that
216 link medical terms with lay terms, which may facilitate algorithm training. These
217 methods include creating a system that identifies terms based on their importance for
218 patients [29], ranking medical terms mined from electronic medical records by
219 importance for patient comprehension [30], and predicting which medical terms are
220 unlikely to be understood by a lay reader [31,32].

221
222 Text simplification via machine learning can be a challenging process, but it serves an
223 important role in reducing barriers to health literacy. Health literacy is associated with a
224 range of social and individual factors [3-6], and certain populations are likely more
225 adversely affected by limited health literacy compared to others without such limits,
226 such as certain racial groups [4], seniors [6], young adults [6], and Medicare and
227 Medicaid populations [7]. Limited health literacy is associated with increased risk of
228 hospitalization [33,34], mortality [35], and high healthcare costs [8,9]. High healthcare
229 costs could be driven in part by individuals' difficulty understanding how to manage their
230 chronic conditions, hospital discharge instructions [10-14], and/or other medical-related
231 literature.

232

233 There are opportunities to assess patients' health literacy levels to determine their
234 literary needs. A study found that only 20% of hospitals reported routinely screening
235 patients and 41% of hospitals reported never screening health literacy [36]. Hospitals
236 that screen for health literacy may have higher medication adherence [36] and reduced
237 hospital readmission rates [37]. Screening tools to measure health literacy include the
238 Brief Health Literacy Screen (BHLS) [38], Test of Functional Health Literacy (S-
239 TOFHLA) [38,39], Single Item Literacy Screener (SILS), and Newest Vital Sign (NVS).
240 Other opportunities to address health literacy include tailoring education [40], engaging
241 caregivers [41] and conducting activities that increase patients' self-efficacy [42].

242

243 This study is limited by its small sample size of hospital discharge instructions, as there
244 is a lack of high-quality, medically accurate, and publicly available datasets for
245 evaluating medical text simplification. These discharge instructions were not randomly
246 collected from the list of medical record numbers available. Further, our study is limited
247 to heart failure discharge instructions, which may have less variability than those for
248 other diagnoses. Expanding our data set is a priority for future studies, as well as
249 evaluating comprehension of AI-simplified discharge instructions.

250

251 AI has the potential to improve the lives of individuals. This includes within improving
252 the readability of health-related materials. There is a need to ensure an appropriate
253 match between the readability of the health content and the health literacy level of the
254 patient. The association of limited health literacy with poor outcomes such as increased

255 risk of hospitalization and death warrants the need for continued investigations into such
256 interventions.

257 **Acknowledgements**

258 We thank the Institute for Augmented Intelligence in Medicine (I.AIM) at Northwestern
259 University that hosted the First Annual Big Ten Augmented Intelligence Bowl, which
260 served as the initial stimulus for this research project.

261 **References**

- 262 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC's Health Literacy Action Plan.
263 2021 June 2 [Cited 2021 December 1]. Available from:
264 <https://www.cdc.gov/healthliteracy/planact/cdcplan.html>
- 265 2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. What Is Health Literacy?. 2021
266 June 2 [Cited 2021 December 1]. Available from:
267 <https://www.cdc.gov/healthliteracy/learn/index.html>
- 268 3. National Institutes of Health. Clear & Simple. 2021 July 7 [Cited 2021 December
269 1]. Available from: [https://www.nih.gov/institutes-nih/nih-office-director/office-](https://www.nih.gov/institutes-nih/nih-office-director/office-communications-public-liaison/clear-communication/clear-simple)
270 [communications-public-liaison/clear-communication/clear-simple](https://www.nih.gov/institutes-nih/nih-office-director/office-communications-public-liaison/clear-communication/clear-simple)
- 271 4. U.S. Department of Education; Institute of Education Sciences; National Center
272 for Education Statistics. Highlights of the 2017 U.S. PIAAC Results Web Report
273 (NCES 2020-777). Available from:
274 https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/piaac/current_results.asp.
- 275 5. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Health Literacy. Health Literacy: A
276 Prescription to End Confusion. Nielsen-Bohlman L, Panzer AM, Kindig DA,
277 editors. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2004. PMID:
278 25009856.
- 279 6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. A Health Literacy Report: Analysis
280 of 2016 BRFSS Health Literacy Data. Available from:
281 [https://www.cdc.gov/healthliteracy/pdf/Report-on-2016-BRFSS-Health-Literacy-](https://www.cdc.gov/healthliteracy/pdf/Report-on-2016-BRFSS-Health-Literacy-Data-For-Web.pdf)
282 [Data-For-Web.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/healthliteracy/pdf/Report-on-2016-BRFSS-Health-Literacy-Data-For-Web.pdf)

- 283 7. Imoisili OE, Levinsohn E, Pan C, Howell BA, Streiter S, Rosenbaum JR.
284 Discrepancy Between Patient Health Literacy Levels and Readability of Patient
285 Education Materials from an Electronic Health Record. *Health Lit Res Pract.*
286 2017 Nov 9;1(4):e203-e207. doi: 10.3928/24748307-20170918-01. PMID:
287 31294265; PMCID: PMC6607789.
- 288 8. Weiss BD, Palmer R. Relationship between health care costs and very low
289 literacy skills in a medically needy and indigent Medicaid population. *J Am Board*
290 *Fam Pract.* 2004 Jan-Feb;17(1):44-7. doi: 10.3122/jabfm.17.1.44. PMID:
291 15014052.
- 292 9. Haun JN, Patel NR, French DD, Campbell RR, Bradham DD, Lapcevic WA.
293 Association between health literacy and medical care costs in an integrated
294 healthcare system: a regional population based study. *BMC Health Serv Res.*
295 2015 Jun 27;15:249. doi: 10.1186/s12913-015-0887-z. PMID: 26113118; PMCID:
296 PMC4482196.
- 297 10. Choudhry AJ, Baghdadi YM, Wagie AE, Habermann EB, Heller SF, Jenkins DH,
298 et al. Readability of discharge summaries: with what level of information are we
299 dismissing our patients? *Am J Surg.* 2016 Mar;211(3):631-6. doi:
300 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2015.12.005. Epub 2015 Dec 28. PMID: 26794665; PMCID:
301 PMC5245984.
- 302 11. Glick A, Marquez K, Migotsky M, Dreyer B, Tomopoulos S, Fierman A, et al.
303 3464 Readability, Understandability, and Actionability of Inpatient Discharge
304 Instructions: A Health Literacy Perspective. *J Clin Transl Sci.* 2019 Mar
305 27;3(Suppl 1):94. doi: 10.1017/cts.2019.214. PMCID: PMC6799280.

- 306 12. Burns ST, Amobi N, Chen JV, O'Brien M, Haber LA. Readability of Patient
307 Discharge Instructions. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2022 May;37(7):1797-1798. doi:
308 10.1007/s11606-021-06988-y. Epub 2021 Jul 8. PMID: 34240287; PMCID:
309 PMC9130361.
- 310 13. Sarzynski E, Hashmi H, Subramanian J, Fitzpatrick L, Polverento M, Simmons
311 M, et al. Opportunities to improve clinical summaries for patients at hospital
312 discharge. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2017 May;26(5):372-380. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2015-
313 005201. Epub 2016 May 6. PMID: 27154878.
- 314 14. Spandorfer JM, Karras DJ, Hughes LA, Caputo C. Comprehension of discharge
315 instructions by patients in an urban emergency department. *Ann Emerg Med.*
316 1995 Jan;25(1):71-4. doi: 10.1016/s0196-0644(95)70358-6. PMID: 7802373.
- 317 15. Berkman ND, Sheridan SL, Donahue KE, Halpern DJ, Crotty K. Low health
318 literacy and health outcomes: an updated systematic review. *Ann Intern Med.*
319 2011 Jul 19;155(2):97-107. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-155-2-201107190-00005.
320 PMID: 21768583.
- 321 16. Okuhara T, Ishikawa H, Okada M, Kato M, Kiuchi T. Designing persuasive health
322 materials using processing fluency: a literature review. *BMC Res Notes.* 2017
323 Jun 8;10(1):198. doi: 10.1186/s13104-017-2524-x. PMID: 28595599; PMCID:
324 PMC5465451.
- 325 17. Glick AF, Farkas JS, Rosenberg RE, Mendelsohn AL, Tomopoulos S, Fierman
326 AH, et al. Accuracy of Parent Perception of Comprehension of Discharge
327 Instructions: Role of Plan Complexity and Health Literacy. *Acad Pediatr.* 2020


- 328 May-Jun;20(4):516-523. doi: 10.1016/j.acap.2020.01.002. Epub 2020 Jan 16.
329 PMID: 31954854; PMCID: PMC7200278.
- 330 18. Glick AF, Farkas JS, Mendelsohn AL, Fierman AH, Tomopoulos S, Rosenberg
331 RE, et al. Discharge Instruction Comprehension and Adherence Errors:
332 Interrelationship Between Plan Complexity and Parent Health Literacy. *J Pediatr.*
333 2019 Nov;214:193-200.e3. doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2019.04.052. Epub 2019 Jun 26.
334 PMID: 31253406.
- 335 19. Bailey SC, Fang G, Annis IE, O'Connor R, Paasche-Orlow MK, Wolf MS. Health
336 literacy and 30-day hospital readmission after acute myocardial infarction. *BMJ*
337 *Open.* 2015 Jun 11;5(6):e006975. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006975. PMID:
338 26068508; PMCID: PMC4466613.
- 339 20. Choudhry AJ, Younis M, Ray-Zack MD, Glasgow AE, Haddad NN, Habermann
340 EB, et al. Enhanced readability of discharge summaries decreases provider
341 telephone calls and patient readmissions in the posthospital setting. *Surgery.*
342 2019 Apr;165(4):789-794. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2018.10.014. Epub 2018 Nov 19.
343 PMID: 30467038.
- 344 21. Safavi KC, Khaniyev T, Copenhaver M, Seelen M, Zenteno Langle AC, Zanger J,
345 et al. Development and Validation of a Machine Learning Model to Aid Discharge
346 Processes for Inpatient Surgical Care. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2019 Dec
347 2;2(12):e1917221. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.17221. PMID:
348 31825503; PMCID: PMC6991195.
- 349 22. Sherman E, Alejo D, Wood-Doughty Z, Sussman M, Schena S, Ong CS, et al.
350 Leveraging Machine Learning to Predict 30-Day Hospital Readmission After

- 351 Cardiac Surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2021 Dec 8:S0003-4975(21)02028-2. doi:
352 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2021.11.011. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34890575.
- 353 23. Sarijaloo F, Park J, Zhong X, Wokhlu A. Predicting 90 day acute heart failure
354 readmission and death using machine learning-supported decision analysis. *Clin*
355 *Cardiol.* 2021 Feb;44(2):230-237. doi: 10.1002/clc.23532. Epub 2020 Dec 23.
356 PMID: 33355945; PMCID: PMC7852168.
- 357 24. Marafino BJ, Schuler A, Liu VX, Escobar GJ, Baiocchi M. Predicting preventable
358 hospital readmissions with causal machine learning. *Health Serv Res.* 2020
359 Dec;55(6):993-1002. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.13586. Epub 2020 Oct 30. Erratum
360 in: *Health Serv Res.* 2021 Feb;56(1):168. PMID: 33125706; PMCID:
361 PMC7704477.
- 362 25. Saggion, H. (2017). Readability and Text Simplification. In: *Automatic Text*
363 *Simplification. Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies.* Springer,
364 Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-02166-4_2
- 365 26. Zeng-Treitler Q, Goryachev S, Kim H, Keselman A, Rosendale D. Making texts in
366 electronic health records comprehensible to consumers: a prototype translator.
367 *AMIA Annu Symp Proc.* 2007 Oct 11;2007:846-50. PMID: 18693956; PMCID:
368 PMC2655860.
- 369 27. Moramarco F, Juric D, Savkov A, Flann J, Lehl M, Boda K, Grafen T, Zhelezniak
370 V, Gohil S, Korfiatis AP, Hammerla N. Towards more patient friendly clinical
371 notes through language models and ontologies. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc.* 2022
372 Feb 21;2021:881-890. PMID: 35308976; PMCID: PMC8861686.

- 373 28. Kandula S, Curtis D, Zeng-Treitler Q. A semantic and syntactic text simplification
374 tool for health content. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc.* 2010 Nov 13;2010:366-70. PMID:
375 21347002; PMCID: PMC3041424.
- 376 29. Chen J, Zheng J, Yu H. Finding Important Terms for Patients in Their Electronic
377 Health Records: A Learning-to-Rank Approach Using Expert Annotations. *JMIR*
378 *Med Inform.* 2016 Nov 30;4(4):e40. doi: 10.2196/medinform.6373. PMID:
379 27903489; PMCID: PMC5156821.
- 380 30. Chen J, Jagannatha AN, Fodeh SJ, Yu H. Ranking Medical Terms to Support
381 Expansion of Lay Language Resources for Patient Comprehension of Electronic
382 Health Record Notes: Adapted Distant Supervision Approach. *JMIR Med Inform.*
383 2017 Oct 31;5(4):e42. doi: 10.2196/medinform.8531. PMID: 29089288; PMCID:
384 PMC5686421.
- 385 31. Elhadad N. Comprehending technical texts: predicting and defining unfamiliar
386 terms. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc.* 2006;2006:239-43. PMID: 17238339; PMCID:
387 PMC1839621.
- 388 32. Zeng, Q., Kim, E., Crowell, J., Tse, T. (2005). A Text Corpora-Based Estimation
389 of the Familiarity of Health Terminology. In: Oliveira, J.L., Maojo, V., Martín-
390 Sánchez, F., Pereira, A.S. (eds) *Biological and Medical Data Analysis. ISBMDA*
391 2005. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science()*, vol 3745. Springer, Berlin,
392 Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/11573067_19
- 393 33. Fabbri M, Yost K, Finney Rutten LJ, Manemann SM, Boyd CM, Jensen D,
394 Weston SA, Jiang R, Roger VL. Health Literacy and Outcomes in Patients With
395 Heart Failure: A Prospective Community Study. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2018

- 396 Jan;93(1):9-15. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2017.09.018. Epub 2017 Dec 6. PMID:
397 29217337; PMCID: PMC5756510.
- 398 34. Oskalices MIL, Okuno MFP, Lopes MCBT, Batista REA, Campanharo CRV.
399 Health literacy and adherence to treatment of patients with heart failure. Rev Esc
400 Enferm USP. 2019 Jul 15;53:e03447. English, Portuguese. doi: 10.1590/S1980-
401 220X2017039803447. PMID: 31314864.
- 402 35. Peterson PN, Shetterly SM, Clarke CL, Bekelman DB, Chan PS, Allen LA,
403 Matlock DD, Magid DJ, Masoudi FA. Health literacy and outcomes among
404 patients with heart failure. JAMA. 2011 Apr 27;305(16):1695-701. doi:
405 10.1001/jama.2011.512. PMID: 21521851; PMCID: PMC4540335.
- 406 36. Rymer JA, Kaltenbach LA, Anstrom KJ, Fonarow GC, Erskine N, Peterson ED,
407 Wang TY. Hospital evaluation of health literacy and associated outcomes in
408 patients after acute myocardial infarction. Am Heart J. 2018 Apr;198:97-107. doi:
409 10.1016/j.ahj.2017.08.024. Epub 2017 Sep 2. PMID: 29653654.
- 410 37. Son YJ, Won MH. Gender differences in the impact of health literacy on hospital
411 readmission among older heart failure patients: A prospective cohort study. J Adv
412 Nurs. 2020 Jun;76(6):1345-1354. doi: 10.1111/jan.14328. Epub 2020 Feb 25.
413 PMID: 32048337.
- 414 38. Mayberry LS, Schildcrout JS, Wallston KA, Goggins K, Mixon AS, Rothman RL,
415 Kripalani S; Vanderbilt Inpatient Cohort Study. Health Literacy and 1-Year
416 Mortality: Mechanisms of Association in Adults Hospitalized for Cardiovascular
417 Disease. Mayo Clin Proc. 2018 Dec;93(12):1728-1738. doi:

- 418 10.1016/j.mayocp.2018.07.024. Epub 2018 Nov 7. PMID: 30414733; PMCID:
419 PM6299453.
- 420 39. Mock MS, Sethares KA. Concurrent validity and acceptability of health literacy
421 measures of adults hospitalized with heart failure. *Appl Nurs Res.* 2019
422 Apr;46:50-56. doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2019.02.007. Epub 2019 Feb 13. PMID:
423 30853076.
- 424 40. Son YJ, Shim DK, Seo EK, Seo EJ. Health Literacy but Not Frailty Predict Self-
425 Care Behaviors in Patients with Heart Failure. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*
426 2018 Nov 6;15(11):2474. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15112474. PMID: 30404140;
427 PMCID: PMC6265912.
- 428 41. Nguyen L, Keshavjee K, Archer N, Patterson C, Gwady-Sridhar F, Demers C.
429 Barriers to technology use among older heart failure individuals in managing their
430 symptoms after hospital discharge. *Int J Med Inform.* 2017 Sep;105:136-142. doi:
431 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.06.001. Epub 2017 Jun 16. PMID: 28750907.
- 432 42. Dunlay SM, Griffin JM, Redfield MM, Roger VL. Patient Activation in Acute
433 Decompensated Heart Failure. *J Cardiovasc Nurs.* 2017 Nov/Dec;32(6):560-567.
434 doi: 10.1097/JCN.0000000000000367. PMID: 27631119; PMCID: PMC5348288.
435



436

437 **Fig 1: Average readability scores for the three versions of discharge instructions.**

438 Average readability scores of the original, human-simplified, and AI-simplified discharge

439 instructions (n=80) using the SMOG index and Flesch-Kincaid readability scores.



440

441 **Fig 2: Mean cross entropy by the size of the hospital discharge instruction data**

442 **set.** Cross entropy decreased as the data set increased in size, indicating that the

443 algorithm improved as the size of the data set grew (n=343).