

## Appendix B Table of types of evidence supporting included SUNDAE Checklist items.[1]

Item	% Delphi respondents rating item as Important	% Delphi respondents rating item as Essential	In other guidelines, but particularly important for PDA reporting guidelines	Specific to PDA evaluation	Poorly reported in existing PDA evaluation studies	Inclusion supports interpretation of results/study quality	Item reflects factors likely to impact upon PDA effectiveness	Important for systematic review and meta-analysis
1	96%	88%		X				X
2	96%	90%	X			X		X
3	98%	96%		X		X	X	X
4	89%	82%		X		X	X	X
5	83%	65%		X			X	X
6	82%	68%	X			X		X
7	89%	84%		X	X[2-4]	X	X	X
8	90%	79%		X	X[4]	X		X
9	77%	65%		X		X	X	X
10	95%	94%		X		X	X	X
11	93%	88%		X	X[4-11]	X	X	X
12	100%	98%		X	X[5-9]	X	X	X
13	91%	85%		X		X	X	X
14	69%	55%	X			X	X	X
15	96%	89%		X		X	X	X
16	75%	57%	X		X[10]	X	X	X
17	96%	85%	X		X[11]	X		X
18	66%	52%	X		X[11]	X		X
19	68%	60%		X		X	X	X
20	72%	68%		X		X	X	X
21	87%	82%		X		X	X	X
22	97%	93%		X		X	X	X
23	92%	86%	X			X		X
24	85%	72%	X			X		X
25	87%	76%	X			X		X
26	74%	67%	X	X	X[3, 12]	X		X

## References

1. Sepucha KR, Abhyankar P, Hoffman A, Bekker H, LeBlanc A, Levin C, Ropka M, Shaffer V, Sheridan S, Stacey D, Stalmeier P, Vo H, Wills C, Thomson R. Standards for UNiversal reporting of patient Decision Aid Evaluation studies: the development of SUNDAE Checklist. (under review)
2. Coulter A, Stilwell D, Kryworuchko J, et al. A systematic development process for patient decision aids. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*2013;13 Suppl 2:S2. doi: 10.1186/1472-6947-13-S2-S2
3. Lewis KB, Wood B, Sepucha KR, et al. Quality of reporting of patient decision aids in recent randomized controlled trials: A descriptive synthesis and comparative analysis. *Patient Educ Couns*Published Online First: 24 Feb 2017. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2017.02.021>
4. Montori VM, LeBlanc A, Buchholz A, et al. Basing information on comprehensive, critically appraised, and up-to-date syntheses of the scientific evidence: a quality dimension of the

International Patient Decision Aid Standards. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*2013;13(2):S5. doi:10.1186/1472-6947-13-S2-S5

5. Witteman HO, Scherer LD, Gavaruzzi T, et al. Design features of explicit values clarification methods: a systematic review. *Med Dec Making*2016;36:453-71. doi: 10.1177/0272989X15626397
6. Feldman-Stewart D, Brennenstuhl S, McLissac K, et al. A systematic review of information in decision aids. *Health Expect*2007;10(1):46-61. doi: 10.1111/j.1369-7625.2006.00420.x
7. Stacey D, Kryworuchko J, Belkora J, et al. Coaching and guidance with patient decision aids: a review of theoretical and empirical evidence. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*2013;13 Suppl 2:S11. doi: 10.1186/1472-6947-13-S2-S11
8. McCaffery KJ, Holmes-Rovner M, Smith SK, et al. Addressing health literacy in patient decision aids. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*2013;13 Suppl 2:S10. doi: 10.1186/1472-6947-13-S2-S10
9. Fagerlin A, Pignone M, Abhyankar P, et al. Clarifying values: an updated review. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*2013;13 Suppl 2:S8. doi: 10.1186/1472-6947-13-S2-S8
10. Durand MA, Stiel M, Boivin J, et al. Where is the theory? Evaluating the theoretical frameworks described in decision support technologies. *Patient Educ Couns*2008;71(1):125-35. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2007.12.004
11. Sepucha KR, Matlock DD, Wills CE, et al. "It's valid and reliable" is not enough: critical appraisal of reporting of measures in trials evaluating patient decision aids. *Med Decis Making*2014;34(5):560-6. doi:10.1177/0272989X14528381
12. Elwyn G, Dannenberg M, Blaine A, et al. Trustworthy patient decision aids: a qualitative analysis addressing the risk of competing interests. *BMJ Open*2016;6(9):e012562. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012562