

(1) Is it clear that the intervention was written by an organisation generally considered a trustworthy source? For example the local hospital, a well-known charity or national body?

- 3 points- It is clear that the intervention is written by an organisation considered trustworthy.
- 2 points- The intervention appears to be written by an organisation considered trustworthy but it could be clearer who wrote the intervention.
- 1 point- It is difficult to understand who wrote the intervention or there are concerns about who wrote the information.
- 0 points- The intervention is written by an untrustworthy source. E.g. a blog post that does not include any references to evidence.
- 0 points- There is no information about who has written the intervention.

(2) Does the intervention use pictures (video clips, photos, models, or charts) to help the user understand the content? For example, if an intervention is about rashes does it include pictures of a rash? If it is about temperature, does it include a diagram of how to read a thermometer?

- 3 points- There is extensive use of pictures that help the reader.
- 2 points- There is some use of pictures that help the reader.
- 1 point- There is little use of pictures or the pictures are sometimes not easy to understand and/or are irrelevant to the text.
- 0 points- There is no use of pictures.
- 0 points- Pictures are used but they are not easy to understand and/or irrelevant to the text.

(3) Is the text organised and presented in a way to make it easier to read (formatting). For example, is the text broken up into sections and with the use of short paragraphs and/or bullet point/numbering lists (rather than long paragraphs of text).

- 3 points- The whole intervention is well formatted.
- 2 points- Generally, the intervention is formatted in a way that helps the reader but there are some issues.
- 1 point- The formatting has some positive aspects but there are also many issues which could be improved to help the reader.
- 0 points- There is little attempt to format the text to help the reader.
- 0 points- The formatting makes it difficult for the reader to understand the information.

(4) Are methods used to draw attention to the key messages? For example, text is put in bold, italics or boxes are used to signal the key messages.

- 3 points- Methods are used throughout the resource to draw attention to the key messages.
- 2 points- Methods are used to draw attention to the key messages but there are some places where it could be improved.
- 1 point- There is little use of methods to draw attention to key messages or there are many issues which could be improved.
- 0 points- There is no use of methods to draw attention to the key messages.

(5) Is the content ordered in a logical way? For example, is there initially an explanation of the issue, followed by solutions.

- 3 points- The content is well ordered in a way that helps the reader understand the information.
- 2 points- Generally, the content is well ordered but there are some issues.
- 1 point- There are many issues with the ordering of the content.
- 0 points- The resource is poorly ordered which makes it difficult for the reader to understand the information.

(6) Is the font (printed text style) appropriate? For example, a Sans serif font (e.g. Arial, Calibri, Helvetica), font size is 12 or more, only one or two fonts are used, italics or underlining are not used too much.

- 3 points- An appropriate font style and size is used throughout the document.
- 2 points- Generally an appropriate font style and size is used but there are some issues.
- 1 point- Sometimes an appropriate font style is used but there are many issues throughout the resource.
- 0 points- There are issues with the font style throughout the document.

(7) Is the intervention written to the reader, that is, using the 2nd person? For example, *'if you have a rash you can speak to your pharmacist/chemist'* rather than *'if someone has a rash they can visit a pharmacist'*.

- 3 points- Intervention is fully written in the 2nd person.
- 2 points- Intervention is mainly written in the 2nd person but occasionally uses the 3rd person.

- 1 point- The intervention is mainly written in the 3rd person with some parts written in the 2nd person.
- 0 points- The intervention is written in the 3rd person.

(8) Does the intervention use accurate language rather than vague language?. For example, 'if your rash does not go away in 7 days contact your GP' rather than 'contact your GP if your rash does not improve in a few days'.

- 3 points- The intervention uses accurate language throughout.
- 2 points- Intervention generally uses accurate language but there are some occasions when it does not.
- 1 point- Sometimes there is use of accurate language but there are many uses of inaccurate language.
- 0 points- Intervention does not use accurate language.

(9) If medical terms are used within the intervention, are Plain English terms used too? For example, 'piles (haemorrhoids)' or 'your blood sugar levels (HbA1c) will be measured regularly if you have diabetes'.

- 3 points- Throughout the intervention, medical terms are not used or medical terms are supported by Plain English language explanations.
- 2 Points- Generally medical terms are not used or medical terms are supported by Plain English language explanations but there are some instances where this is not the case.
- 1 point- Occasionally medical terms are supported by Plain English language explanations but there are many instances where medical terms are not supported by Plain English Explanations.
- 0 points- The intervention uses medical terms with no explanations.

(10) Is the tone of the intervention appropriate for the reader? For example it does not seem to be telling people off.

- 3 points- The tone throughout the resource feels appropriate for the intended audience.
- 2 points- The tone generally is appropriate but there are some issues.
- 1 point- There are many instances when the tone is inappropriate but occasions when it is appropriate.
- 0 points- The tone is inappropriate throughout the resource.

(11) If acronyms are used in the intervention, are they explained? For example if BMI is used, on its first use 'body mass index' should also appear. More commonly used items like NHS may not be

explained. Although it is important to be aware that they would not be common to all populations so would depend on who the resource was aimed at. E.g. if the resource was aimed at migrants, the term 'family doctor' rather than GP may be better.

- 3 points- Any use of acronyms is supported by explanations when first used or there is no use of acronyms.
- 2 points- Generally the use of acronyms is supported by explanations when first used but there are some occasions when no explanation is provided.
- 1 point- There are many cases of acronyms not being explained.
- 0 points- Acronyms are not supported by explanations.

(12) When numbers or statistics are used, do they help to communicate information to readers in a clear manner? For example, numerals rather than words are used, numbers rather than percentages are used e.g. 1 in 100, absolute not relative risk is given.

- 3 points- Throughout the document, numbers or statistics are used clearly to help readers understand the information.
- 2 points- Generally the use of numbers or statistics are easy to understand but there are some occasions when their use could be improved.
- 1 point- There are many cases where the use of numbers or statistics is not easy to understand or causes confusion but occasions when their use is helpful.
- 0 points- Numbers are not used when they could have helped.
- 0 points- In the majority of cases, how numbers are used causes confusion.

(13) Is any information included about how to get hold of the intervention in alternative formats such as large print or translated versions? For example a phone number to access alternative formats.

- 3 points- It is clear that the intervention is available in a range of alternative formats and contact details are provided about how to get hold of the information.
- 2 points- There is some reference to the intervention being in other formats but it is unclear how to access them.
- 1 point- There is a vague reference to alternative formats but no detail about which formats the intervention is available in and/or no information on how to access them.
- 0 points- There is no mention of the intervention being available in other formats and how to get hold of them.

(14) Do you feel the right information has been provided, in the right way to allow you to take action? For example, you feel sufficient information has been provided for you to understand alternative sources of support.

- 3 points- Sufficient information has been included in the resource.
- 2 points- Generally sufficient information has been included but there are some aspects where more detail is needed.
- 1 point- There are many aspects where more information is needed but occasionally parts of the resource do include sufficient information.
- 0 points- There is not sufficient information included to take action.

Total score= _____