

1 **Article Type:** Original Article.

2 **Title:** Assessing the quality, readability and reliability of online information on COVID-19: an
3 infoveillance observational study

4 Paulo Cardoso Lins-Filho¹, Thuanny Silva de Macêdo¹, Andressa Kelly Alves Ferreira¹, Maria Cecília
5 Freire de Melo¹, Millena Mirella Silva de Araújo¹, Jaciel Leandro de Melo Freitas¹, Thaise Urbano
6 Caldas², Arnaldo de França Caldas Jr^{1,2}.

7 ¹ Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil.

8 ² Universidade de Pernambuco, Camaragibe, Pernambuco, Brazil.

9 **Corresponding Author:**

10 Arnaldo de França Caldas Júnior

11 Estrada de Aldeia, Km 13, Prive Portal de Aldeia, Aldeia, Camaragibe, Pernambuco, Brasil.

12 Tel: +55 (81) 999713652

13 E-mail: caldasjr@aldeia.com.br

14 **Other authors e-mail:**

15 paulocardoso09@hotmail.com

16 thuannymacedo16@gmail.com

17 andressa_kelly@msn.com

18 mceciliafreire@hotmail.com

19 millenamirella@hotmail.com

20 jacielsanguiar@hotmail.com

21 **Number of words (Abstract): 153 words**

22 **Number of words (Text Body + tables): 3120 words**

23 **Compliance with Ethical Standards:**

24 Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

25 **Acknowledgments:**

26 The authors would like to thank the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior

27 (CAPES) for scholarship granting.

28

29 **Abstract**

30 **Objective:** This study aimed to assess the quality, reliability and readability of internet-based information
31 on COVID-19 available on Brazil' most used search engines. **Methods:** A total of 68 websites were selected
32 through Google, Bing, and Yahoo. The websites content quality and reliability were evaluated using the
33 DISCERN questionnaire, the Journal of American Medical Association (JAMA) benchmark criteria, and
34 the presence of the Health on Net (HON) certification. Readability was assessed by the Flesch Reading
35 Ease adapted to Brazilian Portuguese (FRE-BP). **Results:** The web contents were considered moderate to
36 low quality according to DISCERN and JAMA mean scores. Most of the sample presented very difficult
37 reading levels and only 7.4% displayed HON certification. Websites of Governmental and health-related
38 authorship nature showed lower JAMA mean scores and quality and readability measures did not correlate
39 to the webpages content type. **Conclusion:** COVID-19 related contents available online were considered
40 of low to moderate quality and not accessible.

41 **Keywords:** COVID-19; Internet; Consumer Health Information; Health Education; Information
42 Dissemination.

43

44 **Introduction**

45 Health care is rapidly transitioning from a paternalistic approach to a person-centered model. This
46 process aims to improve health outcomes by building a shared decision-making process between healthcare
47 professionals and patients, characterized by the greater involvement of people in resolutions and actions
48 concerning their own health (Lee et al. 2018; Petersen et al. 2019). However, the effectiveness of this new
49 model can be hindered by a considerable number of barriers, such as low education, inadequate access to
50 knowledge and social and economic deprivation (Lee et al. 2017).

51 The internet offers a large amount of information, although the quality of health and sanitary
52 information offered is highly variable, ranging from scientific and evidence-based data to home remedies
53 or information of very questionable origin that can be dangerous to health (Eysenbach et al. 2002). The
54 biggest barrier on the internet is not the difficulty of finding health care information, but identifying those
55 that are valid and reliable (Berland et al. 2001; Lopez-Jornet and Camacho-Alonso 2009; Lopez-Jornet and
56 Camacho-Alonso 2010; Passos et al. 2020).

57 During public health emergencies, people must be aware about the health risks they face, and what
58 measures can be taken to protect their health and lives. Reliable information provided early, often, and in
59 accessible language standards, enables individuals to make choices and act to protect themselves, their
60 families and communities from health hazards (WHO 2017). Fake news and misinformation concerning
61 health on the internet represents a threat to global health (Carrieri et al. 2019). The World Health
62 Organization (WHO) warned that the COVID-19 outbreak had been accompanied by a massive abundance
63 of information, some of which was accurate and some of which was not, which made it difficult for people
64 to find reliable sources and trustworthy information when they needed it (Kouzy et al. 2020; Pulido et al.
65 2020). The consequences of disinformation overload are the spread of uncertainty, fear, anxiety and racism.
66 Thus, monitoring the quality of information available to the population is of great importance to control the
67 spread of the disease itself and to mitigate its socioeconomic impacts (Hua and Shaw 2020). Therefore, the
68 WHO is dedicating tremendous efforts aimed at providing evidence-based information and advice to the
69 population through its social media channels and a new information platform called WHO Information
70 Network for Epidemics (Zarocostas 2020).

71 Online-available information has been increasingly employed as a surrogate tool for estimating
72 epidemiology (Cervellin et al. 2017). Web-based sources are been used in the analysis, detection, and
73 forecasting of diseases and epidemics, and in predicting human behavior toward several health topics. In
74 this context, infoveillance studies have become an integral part of health sciences that focuses on scanning
75 the Internet for user-contributed health-related content, aiming to improve public health, measuring and
76 predicting the quality of health information on the Web (Eysenbach et al. 2009).

77 Several studies have already assessed the quality of the information available on the internet related
78 to different health conditions (Cuan-Baltazar et al. 2020; Jo et al. 2018; Lee et al. 2017; Passos et al. 2020;
79 Priyanka et al. 2018), however, there is no evidence about the quality of COVID-19 contents available in

80 Brazil. This study aimed to assess the reliability, readability and quality of COVID-19 related information
81 retrieved from Brazilian websites.

82 **Materials and Methods**

83 The search strategy was designed with regard to the relevance of terms employed by the internet
84 users. A query was performed on Google Trends to confirm the link of Brazilian Portuguese words to
85 COVID-19 issues. Google Trends enables researchers to study the trends and patterns of Google search
86 queries (Effenberger et al. 2020). The search term “coronavírus” held the most popularity among internet
87 users in Brazil, in April 2020.

88 Sites on the internet were identified using the three most accessed search engines by internet users
89 in Brazil: Google (www.google.com), Bing (www.bing.com) and Yahoo (www.yahoo.com), respectively,
90 97.59%, 1.2% and 1.04% of accesses in April 2020 (Statcounter 2020). In April 2020, the searches were
91 performed using computers connected to the internet, previously set up by clearing the cookies and search
92 history of each browser. The first 100 consecutive sites in each search were visited and classified. The
93 search was not restricted in terms of file format or domain. The search was limited to the Portuguese
94 language. Duplicate sites were excluded, as were non-operative sites or sites with denied direct access
95 through password requirements, book review sites, or sites offering journal abstracts, and those sites that
96 did not offer information on COVID-19. Websites that could be modified by the general population were
97 also not considered in this investigation.

98 The quality of website information was assessed by four evaluators, who were previously trained in
99 the analysis tools used. Concerning the scientific accuracy and reliability of websites information, WHO
100 official reports and technical guidelines were used as standards. The websites that were divergently
101 qualified by the examiners were reassessed to the achievement of a consensus score. As this was a study of
102 published information and involved no participants, no ethics approval was required. In order to avoid any
103 changes that may be made to the eligible websites during the period of analysis, the sites were assessed in
104 the same day by the evaluators.

105 The sites were classified in terms of affiliation as commercial, news portal, non-profit organization,
106 university or health center and government. The type of content was classified as corresponding to medical
107 facts, human experiences of interest, questions and answers and socioeconomic related content.

108 The quality of information of the selected websites was assessed using criteria of the Journal of the
109 American Medical Association (JAMA) benchmarks (Silberg et al. 1997). These are a display of authorship
110 of medical content, display of attribution or references, display of currency (date of update), and disclosure
111 of ownership, sponsorship, advertising policies or conflicts of interest. This tool lets the reader easily decide
112 if the site has the basic components like transparency and reliability. For each fulfilled criterion, 1 point
113 was given, with a total score ranging from 0 to 4.

114 The DISCERN instrument (Discern) is a valid and reliable tool to evaluate health information. It is
115 the first standardized quality index and was created by the Division of Public Health and Primary Health
116 Care at Oxford University, London. The instrument comprises 16 questions, each representing a different
117 quality criterion. The DISCERN questions are organized into three sections as follows: Questions 1–8

118 address the reliability of the publication and help users to decide whether it can be trusted as a source of
119 information relating to treatment choice. Questions 9–15 address specific details of the information relating
120 to treatment alternatives. In this context, questions 9–11 refer to the active treatments described in the
121 publication (possibly including self-care), while the options without treatment are addressed separately in
122 question 12. In turn, question 16 corresponds to the global quality assessment at the end of the instrument.
123 Each question is scored on a scale of 1–5 (where 1, the publication is poor; and 5, the publication is of good
124 quality). In the present study, only the first section of the questionnaire was used for reliability assessment.

125 The readability (RE) of the websites was assessed by the Flesch Reading Ease adapted to Brazilian
126 Portuguese (FRE) (Lee et al. 2017). This method classifies the readability of a text on a scale from 0 (very
127 difficult) to 100 (very easy) based on a calculation that considers the number of syllables per word and
128 words per sentence. The adapted formula is given by the following equation: $RE = 248.835 - (1.015 \times$
129 $ASL) - (84.6 \times ASW)$. Where: ASL = mean number of words per sentence; ASW = mean number of
130 syllables per word.

131 Those metrics were calculated using the online tool Readable.io (Readable.io, Bolney, England)
132 (Readable.io) through the information of the respective Uniform Resource Locator (URL) of each website.
133 All analyses were performed based on the overall written content downloaded from these links. The reading
134 difficulty of a text is presented according to the following scores: very easy (75-100), easy (50-75), difficult
135 (25-50), and very difficult (0-25).

136 The existence of the Health on the Net (HON) Foundation seal was also recorded. HON is a code of
137 conduct for medical and healthcare sites, defining a series of norms allowing users to know the source and
138 the purpose of the medical information presented. The HON contemplates compliance with the following
139 eight basic criteria: 1. authorship; 2. complementarity; 3. privacy; 4. attribution, references and currency;
140 5. justifiability; 6. author transparency; 7. sponsor transparency (financial disclosure); and 8. honesty in
141 advertising policy. The website may display the HON code seal if they agree to comply with the standards
142 listed, and they are subjected to random audits for compliance(HON).

143 Data were submitted to statistical analysis, all tests were applied considering an error of 5% and the
144 confidence interval of 95%, and the analyzes were carried out using SPSS software version 23.0 (SPSS Inc.
145 Chicago, IL, USA). Descriptive analysis was performed to characterize the Web pages selected for the
146 study. Although the hypothesis of normal distribution of data was not confirmed by the Kolmogorov-
147 Smirnov test, the statistical analysis was performed by the application of nonparametric tests. The
148 correlations between distinct measures were demonstrated by the Spearman rank correlation coefficients.
149 Distinct websites according to the type of content were compared by Kruskal-Wallis test. Mann-Whitney
150 U test was employed to assess the differences between the natures of websites, for this test, the affiliation
151 criteria used in data collection were dichotomized into governmental and health-related authorship nature
152 (grouping university or health center and government affiliation) and nongovernmental nor health-related
153 authorship nature (grouping news portals, commercial sites and non-profit organization affiliation)(Lee et
154 al. 2017).

155 **Results**

156 Over 2.5 billion results were retrieved from the search engines. Of the 300 webpages assessed, 68
157 fulfilled the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The search retrieval flow diagram is presented in Figure 1.

158 According to affiliation most websites were from news portals (51.5%), followed by government
159 (29.4%), commercial sites (13.2%), university or health center (4.4%) and non-profit organization (1.5%).
160 Considering the type of content, the majority of the sites displayed medical facts (88.2%) followed by
161 socioeconomic related content (5.9%), questions and answers (4.4%) and human experiences of interest
162 (1.5%).

163 None of the evaluated websites met all four criteria of JAMA benchmarks, 35.3% had a single
164 criterion, 30.9% did not include any criteria, 23.5% had 2 criteria and 10.3% presented 3 criteria. Only
165 7.4% of the sites had HON certification. The DISCERN instrument identified that 75% of the websites had
166 moderate reliability, 17.6% showed high reliability and 7.4% low reliability. For the Flesch Index, over
167 half of the sample were classified as very difficult (57.4%), while 41.2% were considered difficult. Only 1
168 website (1.5%) was classified as easy and none as very easy. Sample means of JAMA, DISCERN and FRE-
169 BP scores are shown in table 1.

170 The correlation between distinct measures assessed through the instruments was analyzed.
171 Spearman rank correlation coefficients showed a positive significant correlation between JAMA and
172 Discern scores ($p < 0.001$), and between HON certification presence and JAMA ($p = 0.006$) and Discern
173 ($p < 0.001$) scores, as shown in table 2.

174 No significant differences were observed among the mean scores of DICERN, JAMA and FRE-BP
175 according with the type of websites content (table 3). As the human experience of interest type of content
176 represents a single occurrence in the sample it was disregarded in this step of the statistical analyzes.

177 The mean JAMA scores were different according to the dichotomized affiliation categorization.
178 Higher mean was observed in nongovernmental nor health-related authorship nature. For DISCERN and
179 FRE-BP mean scores no significant statistical difference was observed, as shown in table 4.

180 **Discussion**

181 The internet has great potential for spreading health information (Berland et al. 2001). Whatever the
182 communication channel used, it is known that its content is able to influence the decisions of an individual
183 about his health, including changes in lifestyle (Afshin et al. 2016). Web-based information influences how
184 patients comply with advices, clinical diagnoses, and treatment regimens recommended by health
185 professionals (Lu et al. 2018; Lu and Zhang 2019). Treatment adherence and compliance relies on trust and
186 good professional-patient communication (Wahl et al. 2005). In this context, internet-based new
187 technologies are gaining growing global attention and becoming increasingly available for predicting,
188 preventing and monitoring emerging infectious diseases, such as COVID-19 (Effenberger et al. 2020; Yang
189 et al. 2020). However, misinformation spread through the internet can hinder the communication of health
190 entities and professionals with the general population (Lu and Zhang 2019) and so reduce adherence to the
191 confrontations proposed to contain the pandemic, as social distancing (Farooq et al. 2020). Research on the
192 role of internet content, social media messages and dominant discourses that are communicated to the public

193 is an emerging topic of public health interest in scientific work that requires further investigation (Pulido
194 et al. 2020).

195 Despite the harm that misinformation may pose, especially during a pandemic in which the
196 population's reaction to health measures imposed by governments is of crucial importance to combat the
197 spread of the disease (US Medicine Institute 2002), scientific evidence on the topic is scarce. Besides WHO
198 efforts to monitor and improve the quality of information available online on this subject (Hua and Shaw
199 2020), the few available evidence warns of the low quality and reliability of data (Abd-Alrazaq et al. 2020;
200 Febres-Cordero et al. 2018; Kouzy et al. 2020). These works are, however, limited to social media content
201 analysis and lacking standard parameters to data evaluation. In the present study, for all parameters used in
202 the data analysis, the quality of information ranged from low to moderate.

203 The HON seal was displayed in only 7.5% of the sample. Other studies carried on Brazilian websites
204 revealed even a small number of sites with this certification (Lee et al. 2017; Passos et al. 2020). The
205 absence of this seal on sites of important institutions indicates that concern for certifying the quality of
206 information in the internet is still scarce. Another possible cause for low seal adhesion is the fact that the
207 annual review required for seal maintenance is not free (Passos et al. 2020).

208 Besides the quality of information, the amount of it provided for an individual is also a concern.
209 Previous research suggests that the vast amount of available information can be confusing, potentially
210 resulting in over-concern and information overload (Farooq et al. 2020). Information overload is being
211 associated to mental health problems during COVID-19 outbreak. These findings inspire the need for
212 greater government involvement to prevent information overload while facing a public health emergency
213 (Gao et al. 2020). However, government represents only 29.4% of the sources of information, while news
214 portals represent 54.5% of the website's affiliation. In addition, governmental and health-related sources of
215 information showed lower JAMA mean scores when compared to nongovernmental nor health-related
216 sources. This demonstrates the need for better articulation between health entities and government to stand
217 out as the main provider of reliable content, directing users to good quality sources and avoiding
218 information overload.

219 According to the readability scores, the websites were considered difficult and very difficult for
220 most of population. In addition to this finding it is relevant to consider the low level of health literacy,
221 which is the degree to which people have the capacity to understand health information, reported for
222 Brazilian Portuguese speakers (Batista et al. 2018). This may result in a communication gap for laypersons.

223 In addition to ensure the quality and reliability of information, it is important that these quality
224 contents are presented in a comprehensible and accessible manner (Miguens-Vila et al. 2018). Studies
225 reported a negative correlation of readability scores with JAMA (Sobota and Ozakinci 2015) and DISCERN
226 (Lee et al. 2017) scores. These findings can be considered as exacerbating factors of the impact of the low
227 quality of information on internet users, as it demonstrates that more accessible content is of even worse
228 quality. In the present study such correlation was not found possibly due the growing concern about the
229 quality of health-related information available online (Farooq et al. 2020), however, no positive correlation

230 was found, which demonstrates the need for further efforts on improving the accessibility of high-quality
231 health related information available online.

232 The internet and search engines are dynamic processes that constantly change. The sites evaluated
233 in this investigation may not necessarily reflect the information available to patients at another time. This
234 was a limitation for this investigation. However, the search engines used for the consultation represent
235 99.8% of the access of Brazilian internet users (Statcounter 2020). In addition, to cover a reasonable amount
236 of data, the first 100 consecutive websites of each search engine were accessed.

237 Regarding the present sample of Brazilian websites, COVID-19 contents were considered of low to
238 moderate quality and low readability based on the parameters adopted. This pattern just reasonably
239 correlated with the nature of websites' authorship. These findings indicate the need for further efforts on
240 improving the quality of health-related content on internet. Health authorities might apply this evidence to
241 measure the effect of the transmission of information on the population and define better risk
242 communication strategies.

243 **Conflict of interest**

244 The authors declare no conflict of interest related to the present study.

245 **References**

- 246 1. Abd-Alrazaq A, Alhuwail D, Househ M et al. (2020) Top Concerns of Tweeters During the COVID-
247 19 Pandemic: Inveillance Study. *J Med Internet Res.* 22:e19016. [https://doi:](https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics10040224)
248 10.3390/diagnostics10040224
- 249 2. Afshin A, Babalola D, McLean M et al. (2016) Information Technology and Lifestyle: A Systematic
250 Evaluation of Internet and Mobile Interventions for Improving Diet, Physical Activity, Obesity,
251 Tobacco, and Alcohol Use. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 5:e1-18. [http://doi: 10.1161/JAHA.115.003058](http://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.115.003058)
- 252 3. Batista MJ, Lawrence HP, Sousa MLR (2018) Oral health literacy and oral health outcomes in an adult
253 population in Brazil. *BMC Public Health.* 18:60. [https://doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4443-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4443-0)
- 254 4. Berland GK, Elliott MN, Morales LS et al (2001) Health information on the Internet: accessibility,
255 quality, and readability in English and Spanish. *Jama* 285:2612-2621
256 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.285.20.2612>
- 257 5. Carrieri V, Madio L, Principe F (2019) Vaccine hesitancy and (fake) news: Quasi experimental
258 evidence from Italy. *Health Econ* 28:1377-1382. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3937>
- 259 6. Cervellin G, Comelli I, Lippi G (2017) Is Google Trends a Reliable Tool for Digital Epidemiology?
260 Insights From Different Clinical Settings. *Journal of epidemiology and global health* 7:185-189.
261 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jegh.2017.06.001>
- 262 7. Cuan-Baltazar JY, Muñoz-Perez MJ, Robledo-Vega C et al (2020) Misinformation of COVID-19 on
263 the Internet: Infodemiology Study. *JMIR Public Health Surveill* 6:e18444.
264 <https://doi.org/10.2196/18444>
- 265 8. Discern DISCERN TOOL. Division of Public Health and Primary Health Care at Oxford University.
266 <http://www.discern.org.uk/>. Accessed 20 April 2020
- 267 9. Effenberger M, Kronbichler A, Shin JI et al (2020) Association of the COVID-19 pandemic with
268 Internet Search Volumes: A Google Trends(TM) Analysis. *Int J Infect Dis* 95:192-197.
269 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.04.033>
- 270 10. Eysenbach G, Powell J, Kuss O et al (2002) Empirical studies assessing the quality of health
271 information for consumers on the world wide web: a systematic review. *Jama* 287:2691-2700.
272 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jegh.2017.06.001>

- 273 11. Eysenbach G (2009) Infodemiology and Infoveillance: Framework for an Emerging Set of Public
274 Health Informatics Methods to Analyze Search, Communication and Publication Behavior on the
275 Internet. *Journal of medical Internet research* 11:e11. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.1157>
- 276 12. Farooq A, Laato S, Islam AKMN (2020) Impact of Online Information on Self-Isolation Intention
277 During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of medical Internet research* 22:
278 e19128. <https://doi.org/10.2196/19128>
- 279 13. Febres-Cordero B, Brouwer KC, Rocha-Jimenez T et al. (2018) Influence of peer support on HIV/STI
280 prevention and safety amongst international migrant sex workers: A qualitative study at the Mexico-
281 Guatemala border. *PLoS One*. 13: 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0190787>
- 282 14. Gao J, Zheng P, Jia Y et al. (2020) Mental health problems and social media exposure during COVID-
283 19 outbreak. *PLoS One*. 15:e0231924. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231924>
- 284 15. HON T Health on the Net (HON). HON Foundation. <https://www.hon.ch/en/>. Accessed 20 April 2020.
- 285 16. Hua J, Shaw R (2020) Corona Virus (COVID-19) "Infodemic" and Emerging Issues through a Data
286 Lens: The Case of China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 17:2309.
287 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17072309>
- 288 17. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Assuring the Health of the Public in the 21st Century. *The
289 Future of the Public's Health in the 21st Century*. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US);
290 2002. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK221239/> doi: 10.17226/10548
- 291 18. Jo JH, Kim EJ, Kim JR et al (2018) Quality and readability of internet-based information on halitosis.
292 *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol* 125:215-222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oooo.2017.12.001>
- 293 19. Kouzy R, Abi Jaoude J, Kraitem A et al (2020) Coronavirus Goes Viral: Quantifying the COVID-19
294 Misinformation Epidemic on Twitter. *Cureus* 12:e7255. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.7255>
- 295 20. Lee K, Robins S, Bragazzi N et al (2017) Evaluating the Dental Caries-Related Information on
296 Brazilian Websites: Qualitative Study. *J Med Internet Res* 19:e415. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.7681>
- 297 21. Lee H, Chalmers NI, Brow A et al (2018) Person-centered care model in dentistry. *BMC Oral Health*
298 18:198. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12903-018-0661-9>
- 299 22. López-Jornet P, Camacho-Alonso F (2009) The quality of internet sites providing information relating
300 to oral cancer. *Oral Oncol* 45:e95-98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oraloncology.2009.03.017>
- 301 23. Lopez-Jornet P, Camacho-Alonso F (2010) The quality of internet information relating to oral
302 leukoplakia. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal* 15:e727-731. <http://doi:10.4317/medoral.15.e727>
- 303 24. Lu X, Zhang R, Wu W et al. (2018) Relationship Between Internet Health Information and Patient
304 Compliance Based on Trust: Empirical Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 20:e253. [https://doi:](https://doi:10.2196/jmir.9364)
305 [10.2196/jmir.9364](https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.9364)
- 306 25. Lu X, Zhang R (2019) Impact of Physician-Patient Communication in Online Health Communities on
307 Patient Compliance: Cross-Sectional Questionnaire Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 21:e12891. [https://](https://doi:10.2196/12891)
308 [doi: 10.2196/12891](https://doi.org/10.2196/12891)
- 309 26. Miguéns-Vila R, Ledesma-Ludi Y, Rodríguez-Lozano F et al. (2018) Disparities between English and
310 Spanish in readability of online endodontic information for laypeople. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 149:960-966.
311 [https://doi: 10.1016/j.adaj.2018.07.003](https://doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2018.07.003)
- 312 27. Passos KK, Leonel AC, Bonan PR et al (2020) Quality of information about oral cancer in Brazilian
313 Portuguese available on Google, Youtube, and Instagram. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal* 25:e346-
314 e352. <http://doi:10.4317/medoral.23374>
- 315 28. Petersen CL, Weeks WB, Norin O et al. (2019) Development and Implementation of a Person-
316 Centered, Technology-Enhanced Care Model For Managing Chronic Conditions: Cohort Study. *JMIR*
317 *Mhealth Uhealth* 7:e11082. <http://doi:10.2196/11082>
- 318 29. Priyanka P, Hadi YB, Reynolds GJ (2018) Analysis of the Patient Information Quality and Readability
319 on Esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD) on the Internet. *Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2018:2849390.
320 [http:// doi:10.1155/2018/2849390](http://doi:10.1155/2018/2849390)
- 321 30. Pulido CM, Ruiz-Eugenio L, Redondo-Sama G et al (2020) A New Application of Social Impact in
322 Social Media for Overcoming Fake News in Health. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 17:2430.
323 <http://doi:10.3390/ijerph17072430>
- 324 31. Readable.io Readability Score. <https://readable.io/>. Accessed 20 April 2020

- 325 32. Silberg WM, Lundberg GD, Musacchio RA (1997) Assessing, controlling, and assuring the quality of
326 medical information on the Internet: Caveant lector et viewor--Let the reader and viewer beware. *Jama*
327 277:1244-1245
- 328 33. Sobota A, Ozakinci G (2015) The quality and readability of online consumer information about
329 gynecologic cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*. 25:537-541. [https://doi: 10.1097/IGC.0000000000000362](https://doi.org/10.1097/IGC.0000000000000362)
- 330 34. Statcounter (2020) Search Engine Market Share Brazil. GlobalStats. [https://gs.statcounter.com/search-](https://gs.statcounter.com/search-engine-market-share/all/brazil)
331 [engine-market-share/all/brazil](https://gs.statcounter.com/search-engine-market-share/all/brazil). Accessed 20 April 2020
- 332 35. Wahl C, Gregoire JP, Teo K et al. (2005) Concordance, compliance and adherence in healthcare:
333 closing gaps and improving outcomes. *Healthc Q*. 8:65-70. [https://doi: 10.12927/hcq.16941](https://doi.org/10.12927/hcq.16941)
- 334 36. World Health Organization (2017) Communicating risk in public health emergencies: a WHO
335 guideline for emergency risk communication (ERC) policy and practice Switzerland ISBN 978-92-4-
336 155020-8
- 337 37. Yang T, Gentile M, Shen CF et al. (2020) Combining Point-of-Care Diagnostics and Internet of
338 Medical Things (IoMT) to Combat the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 10:e224. [https://doi:](https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics10040224)
339 [10.3390/diagnostics10040224](https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics10040224)
- 340 38. Zarocostas J (2020) How to fight an infodemic. *Lancet* 395:676. [http://doi:10.1016/s0140-](http://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30461-x)
341 [6736\(20\)30461-x](http://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30461-x)
- 342

343 **Table 1** Descriptive statistics of the scores of DISCERN, the Journal of American Medical Association
344 benchmark, and Flesch Reading Ease

	DISCERN	JAMA ^a	FRE-BP ^b
Mean (SD)	1.90 (0.493)	1.13 (0.976)	22.32 (12.325)
Median	2.00	1.00	23.00
Minimum	1.00	0.00	1.00
Maximum	3.00	3.00	72.00

^aJAMA: Journal of American Medical Association.

^bFRE-BP: Flesch Reading Ease adapted to Brazilian Portuguese.

345

346 **Table 2** Correlations between distinct quality measures

Quality measures	Correlation coefficient (p-value)		
JAMA ^a	0.464* (<0.001) ^{ab}	-0.045 (0.716) ^{ac}	0.329* (0.006) ^{ad}
DISCERN ^b	0.464* (<0.001) ^{ab}	-0.182 (0.138) ^{bc}	0.531* (<0.001) ^{bd}
FRE-BP ^c	-0.045 (0.716) ^{ac}	-0.182 (0.138) ^{bc}	-0.018 (0.882) ^{cd}
HON ^d	0.329* (0.006) ^{ad}	0.531* (<0.001) ^{bd}	-0.018 (0.882) ^{cd}

^aJAMA: Journal of American Medical Association.

^cFRE-BP: Flesch Reading Ease adapted to Brazilian Portuguese.

^dHON: Health on Net.

Superscript letters indicate correlation groups

*Significant statistical difference between the groups (Spearman correlation coefficients, $p < 0.05$).

347

348 **Table 3** Descriptive statistics of different websites type of content for DISCERN, the Journal of American
 349 Medical Association benchmark, and Flesch Reading Ease adapted to Brazilian Portuguese

Site content	DISCERN	JAMA ^a	FRE-BP ^b
Medical facts (n=60)			
Mean ^(SD)	1.90 ^(0.511)	1.10 ^(0.986)	22.38 ^(12.806)
Median	2.00	1.00	23.00
Minimum	1.00	0.00	1
Maximum	3.00	3.00	72
Questions and answers (n=3)			
Mean ^(SD)	1.67 ^(0.577)	1.33 ^(1.115)	25.00 ^(2.646)
Median	2.00	2.00	24.00
Minimum	1.00	0.00	23.00
Maximum	2.00	2.00	28.00
Socioeconomics (n=4)			
Mean ^(SD)	2.00 ^(0.000)	1.50 ^(1.000)	23.00 ^(9.274)
Median	2.00	2.00	23.50
Minimum	2.00	0.00	14.00
Maximum	2.00	2.00	31.00
p-value*	0.818	0.780	0.555

aJAMA: Journal of American Medical Association.

bFRE-BP: Flesch Reading Ease adapted to Brazilian Portuguese.

*Kruskal-Wallis test (p<0.05).

351 **Table 4** Descriptive statistics for both affiliation website groups for DISCERN, the Journal of American
 352 Medical Association benchmark, and Flesch Reading Ease adapted to Brazilian Portuguese

Quality scores	Websites								p-value
	Governmental and health-related nature (n=23)				Nongovernmental nor health-related nature (n=45)				
	Mean (SD)	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Mean (SD)	Median	Minimum	Maximum	
DISCERN	1.87 (0.548)	2	1	3	1.91 (0.468)	2	1	3	0.691
JAMA ^a	0.70 (1.063)	0	0	3	1.36 (0.857)	1	0	3	0.002*
FRE-BP ^b	18.87 (9.725)	22	1	40	24.09 (13.213)	25	3	72	0.083


^aJAMA: Journal of American Medical Association.

^bFRE-BP: Flesch Reading Ease adapted to Brazilian Portuguese.

*Significant statistical difference between the groups (Mann-Whitney U test, P<0.05).

353

354 **Fig. 1** Search retrieval flow diagram



355