

Additional file 1: Table S1 - IPDAS criteria

<b>Content criteria: Does the decision aid...</b>	<b>Met fully</b>	<b>Met partially</b>
<i>Provide information about options in sufficient detail for decision making?</i>		
Describe the health condition	x	
List the options	x	
List the option of doing nothing	x	
Describe the natural course without options		x
Describe procedures	x	
Describe positive features [benefits]	x	
Describe negative features of options	x	
Include chances of pos/neg outcomes	x	
Describe what test is designed to measure	x	
Include changes of true pos, true neg, false pos, false neg results	x	
Describe possible next steps based on test result	x	
Include chances the disease is found out without screening	x	
Describe detection/treatment that would never have caused problems if one was not screened	x	
<i>Present probabilities of outcomes in an unbiased and understandable way?</i>		
Use event rates specifying the population and time period	x	
Compare outcome probabilities using the same denominator, time period, scale	x	
Describe uncertainty around probabilities	x	
Use visual diagrams	x	
Use multiple methods to view probabilities	x	
Allows the patient to select a way of viewing probabilities [words, numbers, diagrams]	x	
Allow patient to view probabilities based on their own situation [e.g. age]	x	
Place probabilities in context of other events		x
Use both positive and negative frames [e.g. showing both survival and death rates]	x	
<i>Include methods for clarifying and expressing patients' values?</i>		
Describe the procedures and outcomes to help patients imagine what it is like to experience their physical, emotional, social effects	x	
Ask patients to consider which positive and negative features matter most	x	
Suggest ways for patients to share what matters most with others	x	
<i>Include structures guidance in deliberation and communication?</i>		
Provide steps to make a decision	x	
Suggest ways to talk about the decision with a health professional	x	
Include tools [worksheet, question list] to discuss options with others	x	

<b>Development criteria: Does the decision aid...</b>	<b>Met fully</b>	<b>Met partially</b>
<i>Present information in a balanced manner?</i>		
Able to compare positive/negative features of options	x	
Shows negative/positive features with equal detail [fonts, order, display of statistics]	x	
<i>Have a systematic development process?</i>		
Includes developers' credentials/qualifications	x	
Finds out what users [patients, practitioners] need to discuss options	x	
Has peer review by patient/professional experts not involved in development and field testing	x	
Is field tested with users (patients facing the decision; practitioners presenting options)	x	
The field tests with users [patients, practitioners] show the decision aid is:		
Acceptable	x	
Balanced for undecided patients	x	
Understood by those with limited reading skills (not target group)		x
<i>Use up to date scientific evidence that is cited in a reference section or technical document?</i>		
Provides references to evidence used	x	
Report steps to find, appraise, summarize evidence		x
Report date of last update	x	
Report how often patient decision aid is updated	x	
Describe quality of scientific evidence [including lack of evidence]	x	
Uses evidence from studies of patients similar to those of target audience	x	
<i>Disclose conflicts of interest?</i>		
Report source of funding to develop and distribute patient decision aid	x	
Report whether authors or their affiliations stand to gain or lose by choices patients make after using the decision aid	x	
<i>Use plain language?</i>		
Is written at a level that can be understood by the majority of patients in the target group	x	
Is written at a grade 8 equivalent level or less according to readability score [SMOG or FRY]	x	
Provides ways to help patients understand information other than reading [audio, video, in-person discussion]		x