

Enhancing patient understanding of laboratory test results: a systematic review of presentation formats and their impact on perception, decision, action, and memory

Frederieke A M van der Mee, Fleur Schaper, Jesse Jansen, Judith A P Bons,
Steven J R Meex, Jochen W L Cals

Submitted to: Journal of Medical Internet Research
on: October 26, 2023

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript.....	5
Supplementary Files.....	35
Figures	36
Figure 1.....	37
Figure 2.....	38
Multimedia Appendixes	39
Multimedia Appendix 1.....	40
Multimedia Appendix 2.....	40
Multimedia Appendix 3.....	40
Multimedia Appendix 4.....	40
CONSORT (or other) checklists.....	41
CONSORT (or other) checklist 0.....	41

Enhancing patient understanding of laboratory test results: a systematic review of presentation formats and their impact on perception, decision, action, and memory

Frederieke A M van der Mee^{1*} MD; Fleur Schaper^{2, 3*} PhD; Jesse Jansen¹ PhD; Judith A P Bons² PhD; Steven J R Meex² PhD; Jochen W L Cals¹ MD, Prof Dr

¹Department of Family Medicine Care and Public Health Research Institute Maastricht University Maastricht NL

²Central Diagnostic Laboratory Maastricht University Medical Center+ Maastricht NL

³Department of Clinical Chemistry Reinier Medical Diagnostic Center Delft NL

* these authors contributed equally

Corresponding Author:

Frederieke A M van der Mee MD

Department of Family Medicine

Care and Public Health Research Institute

Maastricht University

P. Debyeplein 1

Maastricht

NL

Abstract

Background: Direct access of patients to their electronic health records, including laboratory test results, has become increasingly common. Laboratory results can be challenging to interpret by patients, which may lead to anxiety, confusion, and unnecessary doctor consultations. Laboratory results can be presented in different formats, but there is limited evidence about the effect of presentation formats on patient outcomes.

Objective: To synthesize the evidence on effective formats for presenting laboratory test results with a focus on patient outcomes, including affective perception, perceived magnitude, cognitive perception, perception of communication, decision, action, and memory.

Methods: The search was conducted in three databases (PubMed, Web of Science, and EMBASE), until May 31st, 2023. We included quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods articles describing or comparing formats for presenting diagnostic laboratory test results to patients. Two reviewers independently extracted and synthesized characteristics of the articles and presentation formats used. Quality of the included articles was assessed by two independent reviewers by using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool.

Results: Eighteen studies were included, which were heterogeneous in terms of study design and primary outcomes used. Quality of the articles ranged from poor to excellent. Most studies (n = 16/18) used mock test results. The most frequently used presentation formats were numerical values with reference ranges (n = 12/18), horizontal line bars with colored blocks (n = 12/18), or a combination of horizontal line bars with numerical values (n = 8/18). All studies examined perception as a patient outcome, while action and memory were studied in one and three articles, respectively. In general, participants' satisfaction and usability were highest when test results were presented using horizontal line bars with colored blocks. Adding reference ranges or personalized information (e.g. goal ranges) further increased participants' perception. Additionally, horizontal line bars significantly decreased participants' tendency to search for information or to contact their physician, compared to numerical values with reference ranges.

Conclusions: In this review, we synthesized available evidence on effective presentation formats for laboratory test results. The use of horizontal line bars with reference ranges or personalized goal ranges increased participants' cognitive perception and perception of communication, while decreasing participants' tendency to contact their physician. Action and memory were less frequently studied, so no conclusion could be drawn about a single preferred format regarding these outcomes. Further research should focus on real-life settings, diverse presentation formats and patient outcomes. Eventually, the overarching objective is to facilitate the development of tools to effectively communicate laboratory test results to patients in clinical practice.

(JMIR Preprints 26/10/2023:53993)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.53993>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <http://www.jmir.org/>

Original Manuscript

Enhancing patient understanding of laboratory test results: a systematic review of presentation formats and their impact on perception, decision, action, and memory

FAM van der Mee^{*1}, F Schaper^{*2,3}, J Jansen¹, JAP Bons³, SJR Meex³, JWL Cals¹

** authors contributed equally*

¹ *Department of Family Medicine, Care and Public Health Research Institute, Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands.*

² *Department of Clinical Chemistry, Reinier Medical Diagnostic Center, Delft, the Netherlands.*

³ *Central Diagnostic Laboratory, Maastricht University Medical Center+, Maastricht, the Netherlands.*

Corresponding author:

Frederieke AM van der Mee

Address: P. Debyeplein 1, 6229 HA Maastricht, the Netherlands

Telephone: +31883887059

Email: frederieke.vandermee@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Abstract

Background: Direct access of patients to their online patient portal, including laboratory test results, has become increasingly common. Numeric laboratory results can be challenging to interpret by patients, which may lead to anxiety, confusion, and unnecessary doctor consultations. Laboratory results can be presented in different formats, but there is limited evidence regarding how these presentation formats impact patients' processing of the information.

Objective: To synthesize the evidence on effective formats for presenting numeric laboratory test results with a focus on outcomes related to patients' information processing, including affective perception, perceived magnitude, cognitive perception, perception of communication, decision, action, and memory.

Methods: The search was conducted in three databases (PubMed, Web of Science, and EMBASE), until May 31st, 2023. We included quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods articles describing or comparing formats for presenting diagnostic laboratory test results to patients. Two reviewers independently extracted and synthesized characteristics of the articles and presentation formats used.

Quality of the included articles was assessed by two independent reviewers by using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool.

Results: Eighteen studies were included, which were heterogeneous in terms of study design and primary outcomes used. Quality of the articles ranged from poor to excellent. Most studies ($n = 16/18$) used mock test results. The most frequently used presentation formats were numerical values with reference ranges ($n = 12/18$), horizontal line bars with colored blocks ($n = 12/18$), or a combination of horizontal line bars with numerical values ($n = 8/18$). All studies examined perception as an outcome, while action and memory were studied in one and three articles, respectively. In general, participants' satisfaction and usability were highest when test results were presented using horizontal line bars with colored blocks. Adding reference ranges or personalized information (e.g. goal ranges) further increased participants' perception. Additionally, horizontal line bars significantly decreased participants' tendency to search for information or to contact their physician, compared to numerical values with reference ranges.

Conclusions: In this review, we synthesized available evidence on effective presentation formats for laboratory test results. The use of horizontal line bars with reference ranges or personalized goal ranges increased participants' cognitive perception and perception of communication, while decreasing participants' tendency to contact their physician. Action and memory were less frequently studied, so no conclusion could be drawn about a single preferred format regarding these outcomes. Therefore, utilization of horizontal line bars with reference ranges or personalized goal ranges is recommended to enhance patients' information processing of laboratory test results. Further research should focus on real-life settings and diverse presentation formats in combination with outcomes related to patients' information processing.

Keywords: electronic health record; patient access to records; patient portal; laboratory test results; clinical laboratory information systems; health communication; health informatics; patient engagement; patient involvement

Introduction

An increasing number of patients have direct access to their own online patient portal. This includes diagnostic test results ordered by their health care professional, such as laboratory test results [1, 2]. Providing patients online access to patient portals aims to increase patient involvement in their health management. Improving patients' knowledge and self-efficacy may enhance disease self-management, interactions with health care providers and ultimately lead to better health outcomes and increased satisfaction with care [3-6].

However, patient access to online patient portals also has potentially negative consequences. For example, misinterpretation or inaccurate knowledge could lead to underestimation of test results and promote a false sense of security [7]. Similarly, gaining insight into medical test results might trigger feelings of insecurity, anxiety, and confusion [8-12]. Previous studies have shown that poor understanding of test results can lead to an increase in telephone calls or doctor consultations, emergency department visits, and even hospitalizations [13-15]. As a result, the overall utility or benefit of providing lab results directly to patients may depend on how these data are presented to and interpreted by the patient [16, 17].

Limited health literacy and numeracy skills are significant barriers to the effective use of online patient portals and understanding of laboratory test results [18, 19]. Although patient understanding can be improved to some extent by avoiding medical jargon and using plain language, overcoming the problem of incomprehension in its entirety remains an ongoing challenge [19-21]. One of the key issues is the numerical presentation of test results. Especially patients with low numeracy skills (i.e. those with limited ability to derive meaning from numbers) have been shown to have difficulties in interpreting basic laboratory test results and identifying results that fall outside the reference range [18]. The lack of supporting information and guidance on interpretation of results contributes to the problem of misinterpretation. This challenge becomes even more pronounced when a larger number of test results are presented [18].

Basic patient portals typically present laboratory test results in a numerical format, often accompanied by a reference range (i.e. the range that represents normal values for a particular test) [10, 22, 23]. An alternative approach to communicating test results is the use of visual displays, such as colors or graphics. These formats require less health literacy and numeracy skills for interpretation and may improve patients' understanding of the results [24-28]. Previous studies have examined a

variety of presentation formats for communicating laboratory test results. However, direct comparisons between these studies can be challenging due to the variety of presentation options and clinical contexts. In addition, not all formats may be appropriate for every clinical situation [29].

There is only limited evidence on the effect of specific presentation formats on patients' information processing. As highlighted by Witteman and Zikmund-Fisher, laboratory test results often lack meaning for the patients receiving them [17]. Test results represent data, which differs from information and actual knowledge patients commonly encounter in daily life [30, 31]. Patients have to complete several steps to go from data perception to usable knowledge. Ancker et al. described these steps as well, based on the Wickens model of human information processing [32, 33]. In a sequential order, patients need perception and behavioral intention to achieve actual health behavior. Therefore, it is important that these separate steps of information processing are taken into account when presentation formats are evaluated.

Our systematic review aims to synthesize the existing evidence on effective components of presentation formats for laboratory test results focusing on patients' perception, decision, action, and memory. In this review, we will specifically focus on numeric laboratory test results, and not on results containing only textual or non-numeric findings.

Methods

This review was reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (Appendix 1) [34]. A protocol for this review was not previously registered.

Search strategy

The search was conducted in three databases (PubMed, Web of Science, and EMBASE) from inception up to May 31st, 2023. In each database a search was performed, which was developed by the first author (FM) together with an experienced librarian and contained both thesaurus and free text terms. For the search in EMBASE, a filter was applied to remove preprint records and to exclude MEDLINE citations, since the latter were already covered by the PubMed search. Additionally, two authors (FM and FS) performed backward snowballing by screening reference sections of all selected articles to identify relevant publications missed with the search strategy. A fully reproducible

search can be found in Appendix 2.

Study selection and eligibility criteria

All identified titles and abstracts were downloaded to reference management software (Endnote) and duplicates were removed. Two authors (FM and FS) independently screened for potential eligible articles using Covidence, a Cochrane's technology platform [35]. First, titles and abstracts were screened against the eligibility criteria. Second, full texts of potentially suitable articles were rescreened using the same criteria. In case of disagreement, consensus was reached by discussion or screening by a third reviewer (JC).

We considered articles fitting for inclusion if they were original research. Studies describing or comparing different ways of presenting diagnostic laboratory test results to patients were included. Only studies examining numeric laboratory test results were included. Furthermore, studies needed to evaluate the effect of communicating test results on patients' comprehensibility, attitudes and/or experiences. Studies conducted in primary care and secondary/tertiary care settings were eligible, as well as studies including healthy volunteers. Studies had to be written in English or Dutch.

Studies were excluded if they:

1. Were protocols, reviews, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, book chapters, editorials, letters, practice pointers, oral presentations, or poster presentations.
2. Were about development, implementation, or adoption of online patient portals in general, or about the type of notification of laboratory test results, if they did not consider patients' interpretation of the lab results.
3. Focused on online access to notes, and not to laboratory test results.
4. Did not mention type of presentation format of lab results.
5. Focused on the development of web-based lifestyle interventions or online applications to collect patient-reported outcomes.
6. Focused on the safety or privacy issues of online patient portals.
7. Were about the effect of communicating test results in online patient portals on patients' medication management.
8. Tested the effect of test result communication on health care providers.
9. Examined communication of other types of diagnostic test results (e.g. (pharmaco)genomics, radiology, pathology, or microbiology).
10. Examined communication of test results in the context of screening programs.

Data extraction

Two authors (FM and FS) independently extracted data of the eligible studies into a prepared spreadsheet. The spreadsheet was developed by the multidisciplinary team and piloted by both authors. For each study, year of publication, country in which the study was performed, study design, number of participants, description of the study population, and the inclusion and exclusion criteria were assessed. Furthermore, information about the presentation of test results in the portal, type of laboratory test(s) studied, and whether real or mock data was used, was extracted.

Outcome measures

Previous research regarding this subject focused on a variety of outcomes related to patients' information processing. As stated above, Ancker et al. introduced a taxonomy to categorize different outcome measures when communicating numbers in healthcare [32]. These categories include sequentially; perception, decision/behavioral intention, action/actual health behavior, and memory. Perception is further divided into four subcategories: affective perception, perceived magnitude, cognitive perception, and perception of communication [32, 36, 37]. An explanation of the categorized outcome measures can be found in Textbox 1. For this review, outcome measures of each study were extracted and classified into the categories described.

Textbox 1. Explanation of the outcome measure categories based on patients' information processing by Ancker et al.

- Affective perception: feelings about the laboratory result communicated.
- Perceived magnitude: perceived size of risk associated with a test result, captured with measures as “how large or small does this value seem to you?”
- Cognitive perception: understanding whether a laboratory result is elevated, normal, or below normal. Being able to identify direction of a trend over time.
- Perception of communication: preference for presentation format of test result.
- Decision: intention to seek more information or to change behavior after viewing results.
- Action: change in actual health behavior (e.g. search for more information).
- Memory: recall of a specific test result after viewing (i.e. verbatim recall).

Quality assessment

To assess quality and risk of bias of all included studies, the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) was used [38]. The MMAT is designed to concomitantly appraise studies with different designs, such as qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods studies [39]. Question sets are specific to the study design, notably qualitative studies, quantitative randomized controlled trials, quantitative non-randomized studies, quantitative descriptive studies, and mixed methods studies. For each suitable study, the appropriate category was chosen and criteria stated for this specific category were rated as 'yes', 'no', or 'can't tell'.

Two authors (FM and FS) discussed both data and quality extraction until consensus was reached.

Data synthesis

Due to the heterogeneity of study designs and primary outcomes, meta-analysis was considered inappropriate. Instead, narrative synthesis was used to integrate the findings into descriptive summaries regarding ways of presenting laboratory test results and outcomes of interest.

Results

The initial search identified 10,537 references. A total of 3,490 duplicate records were removed. After applying the exclusion criteria in the primary title and abstract screening, another 6,900 records were removed. During full-text screening of the remaining articles ($n = 146$), it appeared that one full-text was not available. Furthermore, 127 articles were excluded because they did not meet the eligibility criteria. Describing implementation of online patient portals, unrelated to laboratory test results, was the most common exclusion criterion ($n = 55$, 43.3%) (Figure 1). A total of eighteen studies were found eligible for this systematic review. Cohen's kappa for interrater reliability was 0.62 for title and abstract screening and 0.80 for full-text screening, indicating respectively a moderate and strong agreement between the two reviewers [40].

Study characteristics

Two qualitative studies, eleven quantitative studies, and five mixed methods studies were included ($n = 18$). The included studies were published between 2012 and 2021, and the majority were conducted in the United States of America ($n = 13$). The total sample size of the included studies was 12,252 participants, ranging from eight to 6,766 participants. Among the articles reporting the

following characteristics, gender was almost equally distributed (52.6% female), and participants were predominantly middle aged (mean 51.1 years) and white (77.6% on average). Fourteen studies reported educational level, with 48.2% of the participants reporting a higher education (defined as college-degree or higher). Overall characteristics of the included studies and populations are summarized in Table 1.

The most frequently used laboratory tests were lipid profile ($n = 10$) and HbA1c or glucose ($n = 5$). In total, three studies used real patients as study population, other studies used healthy volunteers, a convenience sample or a mixed sample ($n = 12$) or did not define their study population ($n = 3$). Studies used mock test results (i.e. hypothetical results) ($n = 16$), real results ($n = 1$, with real patients), or both ($n = 1$). The majority of studies used numerical values with reference ranges ($n = 12$) or horizontal line bars with colored blocks ($n = 12$) (Table 2). A more detailed overview of the different ways of presenting test results is provided in Appendix 3. An explanation of the different presentation formats can be found in Figure 2.




Figure 1. Flow chart of the study selection process.

Table 1. Study and population characteristics of all included studies ($n = 18$).

Table 1. (Continued).

Table 1. (Continued).												
Bar-Lev et al. (2016) [46]	United Kingdom	Non-randomized experimental study	20	Real patients	20	51.8 (10.3)		5	35	60 % other	To examine different displays, presentations, personalized, color, medical, information interpretation, laypersons, laboratory results, understanding, perceptions, through actions, portals	
Brewer, Hohenstein et al. (2018) [41]	United States of America	Mixed methods study	328	Volunteers	51	46.0 (16.3, 18-90)	66.8% white, 19.6% Hispanic/Latino/ Spanish, 12.3% black/ African American/ Negro, 4.0% Asian	0	38.2	48.2	13.6% unknown	To compare relative usability in medical test results, horizontal graphs, various designs, test to enable seen electronically and consumers management
Elder et al. (2012) [48]	United States of America	Survey	211	Convenience sample	90	52.7 (10.0)	89% white, 4% African American, 6% other, 0.5% preferred not to answer	0.5	57	41	1% unknown	To explore which lab experiences and preferences communicate results, notified patient-friendly and communication manner
Morrow et al. (2017) ^b [45]	United States of America	Mixed methods study	36		67	77 (65-89)						In primary settings, finalize development, video-enhanced messages, conducting evaluation studies

Table 1. (Continued).

Morrow et al. (2019) ^b [42]	United States of America	Randomized controlled trial	144		71.5	71.9 (60-94)		18.8 13.2 68.0	To investigate to support adult comprehension and response patient based numerical information
Nystrom et al. (2018) [53]	United States of America	Mixed methods study	14	Real patients		43 (25-73)			To study patient ability to generate meaning from test result and this meaning will inform decision making and subsequent actions
Scherer et al. (2018) [43]	United States of America	Randomized controlled trial	6766	Mixed sample	50.9	49.1 (15.8)	78.2% white, 14.8% African America, 9.7% other	2.0 52.2 45.8	To test the impact of including clinically appropriate ranges outside standard range the visual display of laboratory results
Struikman et al. (2020) [54]	The Netherlands	Randomized controlled trial	487	Volunteers	50.3	52.8 (15.4)		7.7 45.8 46.4	To discuss whether the way presenting health test outcomes on electronic patient portal is associated with patient health engagement whether this varies across different outcomes

Table 1. (Continued).

Talboom-Kamp et al. (2020) [44]	The Netherlands	Survey	354	Real patients					To investigate attitudes, experiences and self-efficacy of patients using online patient portals that communicate laboratory test results
Tao et al. (2018) [23]	China	Non-randomized experimental study	72	Convenience sample	58	Young adult group: 22.3 (2.6) Older adult group: 65.8 (3.6)		1.4 33.3 65.3	To examine effects of different graphical formats and age on consumer comprehension, perceptions, visual attention, and preference of graphs of the use of self-monitoring results
Zarcadoolas et al. (2013) [50]	United States of America	Qualitative study	28	Volunteers	64.3	40.0 (12.4, 21-63)	25.0% Hispanic, 3.6% non-Hispanic white, 67.9% non-Hispanic black, 3.6% other	46.4 53.6 0	To identify vulnerable consumers' responses to patient portals, their perceived utility and value, as well as their reactions to specific portal functions
Zhang et al. (2020) ^b [15]	United States of America	Mixed methods study	203	Volunteers	48.3	63.5% 26-49	69.5% white, 4.4% Asian/Pacific islander, 16.7% African American, 5.9% Hispanic/Latino, 2.0% American Indian, 1.5% other	0 19.7 79.9 0.4% other	To examine challenges and needs of patients with comprehending laboratory test results

Table 1. (Continued).

Zhang et al. (2021) ^b [49]	United States of America	Mixed methods study	8		50	18-64			To examine to help patients understand connections between medical conditions and test results and the need for support actions receiving test results
Zikmund-Fisher et al. (2017) ^c [22]	United States of America	Survey	1620	Volunteers	52.3	48.9 (15.7)	77.4% white, 13.0% African American, 7.0% other	1.9 49.9 48.2	To investigate extent to which displays people discriminate between results that do not require urgent action
Zikmund-Fisher et al. (2018) ^c [47]	United States of America	Randomized controlled trial	1618	Volunteers	52.1	48.8 (19-89)	77.8% white, 13.2% black, 13.2% Hispanic, 4.0% Asian, 0.8% native American, 4.3% other/multirace	0 0 50.1 49.9% unknown	To test the effect of including additional anchor reference point in displays laboratory results

^aLow education: primary school. Middle education: secondary/ high/ trade school, some college. High education: 4-year college/ associate/ university/ undergraduate/ Bachelor's/ Master's/ advanced/ professional/ doctorate degree.

^bThe following articles are pilot and main study: Morrow et al. 2017 and 2019, Zhang et al. 2020 and 2021.

^cThe following articles originate from the same parent study: Zikmund-Fisher et al. 2017 and 2018.

Table 2. Laboratory test characteristics and presentation format used in all included studies ($n = 18$).

Author (year)	Laboratory test information and presentation format					
	Laboratory test	Type of data	Presentation format			
			Numerical	Horizontal line bar	Graph	Video
Bar-Lev et al. (2020)	Hemoglobin, cholesterol, progesterone	Mock	x		x	
Brewer et al. (2012)	Total cholesterol, HDL, LDL	Mock	x	x		
Elder et al. (2012)	Total cholesterol, HDL, LDL	Mock	x	x	x	
Fraccaro et al. (2018)	Creatinine, eGFR, potassium	Mock	x	x		
Hohenstein et al. (2018)	Vitamin B12, procalcitonin, cholesterol	Mock	x	x		
Kelman et al. (2016)	Rheumatoid factor	Mock	x			
Morrow et al. (2017)	Total cholesterol, HDL, LDL, TG, HbA1c	Mock				x
Morrow et al. (2019)	Total cholesterol, HDL, LDL, TG, HbA1c	Mock	x	x		x
Nystrom et al. (2018)	Total cholesterol, HDL, LDL, TG	Mock		x		
Scherer et al. (2018)	HbA1c	Mock	x	x		
Struikman et al. (2020)	Hemoglobin, TSH, vitamin D	Mock	x	x		
Talboom-Kamp et al. (2020)	Type of test differed per patient	Real		x		
Tao et al. (2018)	Glucose (fasting and postprandial)	Mock		x		
Zarcadoolas et al. (2013)	Total cholesterol, HDL, LDL, TG, HbA1c	Mock	x			
Zhang et al. (2020)	Total cholesterol, HDL, LDL, TG	Real and mock	x			
Zhang et al. (2021)	Total cholesterol, HDL, LDL	Mock		x		
Zikmund-Fisher et al. (2017)	Platelet count, ALT, creatinine	Mock	x	x		
Zikmund-Fisher et al. (2018)	Platelet count, ALT, creatinine	Mock		x		

Abbreviations: ALT, alanine aminotransferase; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; HbA1c, hemoglobin A1c; high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; TG, triglycerides; TSH, thyroid stimulating hormone.






Numerical value with evaluative label	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol. This is too high.
Numerical value with evaluative label and reference range	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol. This is too high. The reference range is 20-42 mmol/mol.
Horizontal line bar with colored blocks	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol. 
Horizontal line bar with colored blocks and evaluative label	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol. This is too high. 
Horizontal line bar with colored blocks and harm anchors	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol. 
Horizontal line bar with colored blocks and personalized goal range	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol. 
Line graph	

Figure 2. Examples of presentation formats used for displaying laboratory test results. The examples are based on a hypothetical HbA1c (hemoglobin A1c) test result. A combination of different presentation formats is possible.

Quality assessment

The quality assessment tool (MMAT) includes five assessment criteria per study design, each of which is given a score of 20% each if present (Appendix 4). Both qualitative articles ($n = 2$) scored 100%, indicating excellent quality. Quantitative articles ($n = 11$) scored between 0% and 100%, indicating a broad range of quality. These articles lost points mainly for sampling issues (biased sampling strategies and unrepresentative samples), randomization issues (unclear randomization process and incomparable groups at baseline), unclear blinding process, and lack of clarity about completeness of outcome data and nonresponse bias. Mixed methods articles ($n = 5$) scored between 60% and 100% (low-to-high quality), for the same reasons as described above. In addition, weaknesses in these articles included having an unclear rationale for using a mixed methods design,

unclear presentation format, and failure to adequately interpret the results of the integration of qualitative and quantitative findings.

Outcome measures

In all eighteen studies, perception was an outcome measure, further categorized into affective perception ($n = 7$), perceived magnitude ($n = 6$), cognitive perception ($n = 10$), and perception of communication ($n = 14$) (Table 3, Textbox 1). Additionally, ten studies assessed behavioral intention, while memory was considered as outcome measure in three of the included studies.

Affective perception

Several studies explored participants' confidence and concerns while viewing and interpreting laboratory results [15, 41-44]. Talboom-Kamp et al. demonstrated that presenting laboratory test results in horizontal line bar format with colored blocks and evaluative labels (i.e. textual explanation) enhanced participants confidence in managing their own health, although this effect was not significant [44]. No comparison between different presentation formats and the influence on confidence was described. These comparisons were also lacking in the other studies.

When results were presented in a horizontal line bar format with colored blocks and a personalized goal range, negative affect was significantly higher than when results were presented without colored blocks [43].

Scherer et al. studied the use of personalized reference values or goal ranges [43]. A type 2 diabetes mellitus scenario was studied, in which standard reference ranges are often not applicable. Replacing standard ranges with goal ranges significantly reduced perceived discouragement compared to situations without goal display, highlighting a positive effect of goal ranges on affective perception [43]. Furthermore, two other studies recommended the use of personalized reference ranges in their discussion [41, 44].

In three studies, whether laboratory test results were within reference ranges seemed to be more important than the presentation format. As results moved further from the reference range, positive emotions decreased and negative emotions increased [15, 42, 45]. This change in affective perception was not influenced by message format.

Perceived magnitude

Perceived magnitude of risk of extremely out-of-range results remained unaffected by the

presentation formats in all studies. However, for near-normal or slightly out-of-range results participants encountered difficulties in estimating test result severity. Accurate risk perception was lacking, since the severity of these results was inconsistently overestimated or underestimated [7, 22, 42, 46, 47]. Zikmund-Fisher et al. demonstrated that the incorporation of harm anchors (i.e. a threshold line outside the reference range labeled “many doctors are not concerned until here”) significantly enhanced adequate estimations of test result severity for slightly out-of-range results [47].

Three studies investigated the effect of presentation format on perceived size of risk [22, 23, 42]. Morrow et al. compared horizontal line bars with both numerical and video-enhanced formats. For both low and borderline risk scenarios, perceived magnitude of risk was significantly higher when horizontal line bars were used, indicating that participants tend to overestimate risk for normal results [42]. Tao et al. did not specify whether result normality affected risk perception using different types of horizontal line bars. However, when personalized information was added to the line bar, risk was perceived as significantly higher. Interestingly, despite this, participants expressed a preference for personalized line bars [23]. Zikmund-Fisher et al. compared different types of horizontal line bars with a numerical format. Participants expressed the highest risk perception when near-normal results were presented in a numerical format with a reference range, whereas perceived risk was lowest when horizontal line bars with gradient colors were used [22].

Cognitive perception

In all ten studies assessing this outcome, participants consistently demonstrated the ability to understand or identify out-of-range results. There was consensus among these studies that presenting numbers with a reference range only was insufficient and that tailored information is needed [48-50]. A qualitative study revealed that participants preferred the inclusion of evaluative labels [51]. In two studies using horizontal line bars as presentation format, understanding was significantly increased when color, text, or personalized information (e.g. goal range) was added [23, 43].

Table 3. The outcomes assessed in all included studies ($n = 18$).

Author (year)	Perception				Decision	Act
	Affective perception	Perceived magnitude	Cognitive perception	Perception of communication	Behavioral intention	
Bar-Lev et al. (2020)		x			x	
Brewer et al. (2012)				x		
Elder et al. (2012)			x	x		
Fraccaro et al. (2018)		x			x	
Hohenstein et al. (2018)	x		x	x		
Kelman et al. (2016)			x	x	x	
Morrow et al. (2017)	x		x	x		
Morrow et al. (2019)	x	x		x	x	
Nystrom et al. (2018)				x	x	
Scherer et al. (2018)	x		x		x	
Struikman et al. (2020)	x		x		x	
Talboom-Kamp et al. (2020)	x			x	x	
Tao et al. (2018)		x	x	x		
Zarcadoolas et al. (2013)			x	x		
Zhang et al. (2020)	x		x	x		
Zhang et al. (2021)			x	x		
Zikmund-Fisher et al. (2017)		x		x	x	
Zikmund-Fisher et al. (2018)		x		x	x	

Perception of communication

The majority of included studies observed a significant association between presentation format, participant satisfaction and ease of use. In general, satisfaction and ease of use were rated higher when test results were presented using horizontal line bars with colored blocks, as compared to other presentation formats [22, 23, 42, 44, 49, 51, 52]. In one qualitative study, numerical presentation with reference ranges was deemed insufficient, while graphs were considered too complex for easy comprehension [51]. Both quantitative and qualitative studies demonstrated that adding evaluative labels, such as explanations about the meaning and normality of test results, and background information about testing, enhanced understanding and effective utilization of results. Particularly, the use of lay terms played an important role [15, 23, 41, 44, 48-50, 53]. Furthermore, two studies found a significant positive effect on participant satisfaction when personalized information or goal ranges were incorporated [23, 44]. This addition was also recommended by two qualitative studies [49, 51]. Zikmund-Fisher et al. specifically studied different types of horizontal line bars and showed no significant differences in participants' preferences among the studied formats.

Decision

Behavioral intention was assessed in ten studies, with varying focuses among them. Some authors examined whether participants would contact their physician [7, 22, 43, 47, 53], while others inquired about participants seeking additional information online [46, 48, 53], or making lifestyle changes after reviewing lab results [42, 44, 53].

Two studies demonstrated that presentation format did not significantly influence participants' need to contact their health care provider [7, 43]. Conversely, Zikmund-Fisher et al. demonstrated in two studies that participants who viewed near-normal results in a numerical format were significantly more likely to contact their doctor compared to those viewing the same results in one of the horizontal line formats. The use of harm-anchors in horizontal line bars substantially reduced the number of participants who would want to contact their physician [22, 47].

Participants' tendency to seek information online was significantly influenced by the presentation format, with a significant higher inclination observed for the numerical format compared to the textual format [46]. Kelman et al. and Nystrom et al. similarly found that approximately half of the participants would look for additional information after receiving test results in numerical format with reference ranges and evaluative labels, or horizontal line bars with colored blocks, respectively. However, no comparison was made between presentation formats in these studies [48, 53].

Intention to make lifestyle changes after viewing laboratory results was mentioned as an outcome in

three studies [42, 44, 53]. Only one of these studies compared several presentation formats, but found no significant differences between using a numerical format, horizontal line bars with colored blocks, or video-enhanced format in terms of health-beneficial intentions [42].

Action

There was limited data concerning the actions patients take to comprehend their test results. One mixed methods study used a numerical format with reference ranges as presentation format [15]. Participants with abnormal test results were significantly more likely to take action compared to those with normal test results. As no comparison between presentation formats was investigated, the effect of format on action remains unstudied.

Memory

Variation in presentation format of test results, using either a numerical format with reference ranges and evaluative labels, horizontal line bars with colored blocks, video presentation, or grouped presentation, did not significantly impact participant recall [7, 42, 52]. However, one study found a small but statistically significant effect of test result normality on memory [42].

Struikman et al. looked at patient health engagement (PHE), a composite measure comprising affective perception, cognitive perception and behavioral intention. When test results were presented with explanatory text and visualization, PHE was significantly higher compared to when no explanatory information was provided [54].

Discussion

Principal results

Based on reviewing eighteen articles assessing various presentation formats of laboratory test results, we can conclude there is not only one optimal presentation format in terms of patients' perception, decision, action, and memory. Nevertheless, the results do indicate that presentation format is important for patients' information processing.

Presentation formats differed between articles, but numerical values with reference ranges or horizontal line bars with colored blocks were most commonly used. All included studies investigated perception as an outcome measure, most frequently perception of communication ($n = 14/18$). Patients' cognitive perception and perception of communication improved when results were

presented using horizontal line bars accompanied with colored blocks and evaluative labels or textual information. Incorporation of reference ranges or personalized goal ranges further enhanced patients' perception levels. Using horizontal line bars with harm anchors significantly reduced the number of participants who would want to contact their physician compared to using a numerical format. Furthermore, using the numerical format significantly increased participants' tendency to search for information online, compared to a textual format. Therefore, although no specific format is dissuaded in the included studies, the results suggest that presenting only numbers with reference ranges is suboptimal. Furthermore, adding too many colors and other information to test results could lead to an overload of visual information for some patients, and therefore ultimately decrease the amount of usable knowledge [43]. Action and memory were less frequently studied, respectively in one and three studies. Action was studied in a descriptive study not comparing different presentation formats, while memory was not significantly impacted by presentation format.

Several studies highlighted that patients' affective perception, action, and memory were not only influenced by presentation format, but also by whether test results were within or outside the reference range. Presentation format appeared to be secondary to test result normality if results were extremely out-of-range. Nevertheless, when results were near-normal, presentation format was more important than result normality regarding effects on patients' information processing.

Overall, the results of this review indicate that presentation format affects patients' information processing, especially in case of normal or near-normal test results.

Strengths and limitations

A multidisciplinary team of general practitioners, behavioral scientists and clinical chemists were involved in this review, which is one of its strengths. Both presentation formats and outcomes used in the included studies were standardized by the authors using a published taxonomy to enable comparison of different studies. As the results of our review are narrative, there is a potential risk of bias when describing them, introduced by the authors. Furthermore, selection bias arising from heterogeneity of studies represents a notable limitation of this review.

A limitation of the included studies is the use of volunteers or participants recruited via convenience sampling. Only three out of eighteen studies used real patients, of which one study used real test results. Sixteen studies used mock test results. Displaying mock data is common practice in system evaluation. This method involves less burden and privacy risks for participants, as no personal medical data is collected. Nonetheless, participants lack personal relevance of test results when hypothetical scenarios are used. Therefore, it is possible that most of the included studies did not

reflect how participants would respond in real life to their own personal health information. This may limit the generalizability of the findings. However, using personal test results could have negatively affected the comparability between studies, as each participant would have encountered different data.

Among the articles reporting educational level, 48.2% of the participants reported a higher education level, which is higher than in general population. This may limit the generalizability of the findings to the overall population. Another limitation is the study heterogeneity. Included articles varied widely in methods, presentation formats, and outcome measures used. Comparison of presentation formats is challenging, especially since laboratory test result communication can have a wide range of possible purposes, from interpreting one single value, to identifying important trends on time [24]. Therefore, useful presentation formats may vary per clinical scenario, which presents new challenges for designing a preferred format.

As stated above, patients have to complete several steps to go from data perception to usable knowledge [17, 32]. The majority of the included studies studied the first two steps of this taxonomy, perception and decision. Only one study examined action as outcome measure, and three studies obtained information about memory. Therefore, little is known about the impact of presentation formats on actual health behavior and usable knowledge.

Comparison with prior work

An increasing number of patients can directly access their laboratory test results online, thus it is becoming more important to make the available data meaningful to laypeople [55]. As highlighted in this review, presentation format affects patients' information processing as described above. In cognitive science, this principle is generally known as information evaluability, in other words using relevant contextual reference information to make it easier to evaluate the meaning of in this case numerical laboratory test results (e.g. is this test result good or bad, is it normal or abnormal) [56, 57]. The presentation formats for laboratory test results as studied in this review could be considered as different forms of contextual information, or evaluative categories [58]. Prior research has shown that these evaluative categories add both affective and cognitive meaning to numeric test results. This enhances patients' information processing by adding meaning and evaluability to numeric information [58-60]. Furthermore, our findings are in line with recommendations made by Witteman and Zikmund-Fisher. The authors formulated ten recommendations to communicate laboratory test results via online portals in ways that support understanding and actionable knowledge for patients [17]. Our findings align with several of their recommendations, such as the importance of providing

a clear takeaway message for each result, establishing thresholds for concern and action whenever feasible, and personalizing the frame of reference by permitting custom reference ranges.

This review explored different strategies to improve patients' interpretation and comprehension of their laboratory test results. The included studies predominantly focused on the effect of graphical presentation only including a subset of the available visualization options. Other formats such as clock or pie charts been shown in the broader numeracy literature to improve cognitive outcomes and could be the focus of further research in the context of communicating laboratory test results [61]. Graphical presentation formats might mitigate the effects of low numeracy. However, it is important to acknowledge that graphical information may not be automatically useful for individuals with limited graph literacy [62]. Besides numeracy and graph literacy, other factors such as age, educational level, health literacy and statistical literacy (e.g. understanding of concepts of uncertainty and chance) also influence patients' information processing of such graphical results [61-63]. If one of these factors causes patients to not completely understand a specific presentation format, they may consider this format as not suitable. Therefore, some patients may require extra instructions to be able to adequately process and interpret graphical presentation formats [61]. For that reason, the interaction between patients' literacy, numeracy, age and educational level should be taken into account when performing future work around test result interpretation.

Several initiatives aim to inform and educate patients about laboratory test results while incorporating the insights described above. One example is Lab Tests Online, a website that provided patients with general information about laboratory tests and their meaning [64]. Recently, the usability of ChatGPT (i.e. an upcoming tool based on natural language processing) to interpret laboratory test results was examined [65]. ChatGPT appeared to provide somewhat superficial interpretations, which were not always correct, and is therefore not yet usable as a primary information source for patients. However, this may change in the future with the further development of these type of tools. While our review focused on different presentation formats of laboratory test results, interpretative comments provided by laboratory specialists were not studied. Laboratory specialists often add comments to test results to assist general practitioners [66, 67]. A pilot study by Verboeket et al. demonstrated a positive impact on patient empowerment when patients had access to these patient specific comments [68]. Therefore, further research should explore the impact of adding interpretative comments to laboratory test results on patients' information processing.

Patients now have online access to not only their laboratory test results, but also to medical imaging and microbiology results. Given the variations in these types of diagnostic test results, further research is warranted to explore effective components for communicating these other types of test results to patients in their online patient portal.

Conclusions

As patients increasingly receive their diagnostic laboratory test results via online patient portals, it is becoming more and more important to make test results meaningful to them. Unnecessary confusion or anxiety should be avoided, especially when test results are outside of the reference range. The data from our systematic review suggest that horizontal line bars with colored blocks and reference ranges or personalized goal ranges increase patients' cognitive perception and perception of communication. Furthermore, this format might reduce patients' concerns and their tendency to contact their physician. Therefore, to improve patients' understanding of near-normal laboratory test results and prevent anxiety and concerns after viewing these results, implementing horizontal line bars with colored blocks and reference ranges or personalized goal ranges into online patient portals would be a prudent choice. Our review highlights the importance of taking end-users (i.e. patients) into consideration when designing new presentation formats. These results can guide the development and improvement of (new) online patient portals. Nevertheless, there is a need for further research that involves more comprehensive data collection and reporting, as well as more systematic evaluation methods. By using these findings, further research could inform the development of an interpretation support tool for laboratory test results.

Acknowledgements

Authors' contributions: all authors contributed to the conception of the review. FM and FS conducted the screening and data extraction. FM and FS drafted the manuscript. JJ, JB, SM and JC gave guidance throughout the whole research process. All authors critically revised and approved the manuscript.

Funding: this study received funding by a partnership between Care Research Netherlands and the Medical Sciences domain of the Dutch Research Council (Dutch abbreviation ZonMW) (project number 08391052120002). ZonMW had no direct involvement in any facet of the design of the study, analysis or interpretation of the data or writing of the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

None declared.

Abbreviations

ALT: alanine aminotransferase

ChatGPT: Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer

eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate

HbA1c: hemoglobin A1c

HDL: high-density lipoprotein

LDL: low-density lipoprotein

MMAT: Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool

PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

TG: triglycerides

TSH: thyroid stimulating hormone

References

1. Kaelber DC, Jha AK, Johnston D, Middleton B, Bates DW. A research agenda for personal health records (PHRs). *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2008;15(6):729-36. doi:10.1197/jamia.M2547
2. Tang PC, Ash JS, Bates DW, Overhage JM, Sands DZ. Personal health records: definitions, benefits, and strategies for overcoming barriers to adoption. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2006;13(2):121-6. doi:10.1197/jamia.M2025
3. Ancker JS, Osorio SN, Cheriff A, Cole CL, Silver M, Kaushal R. Patient activation and use of an electronic patient portal. *Inform Health Soc Care*. 2015;40(3):254-66. doi:10.3109/17538157.2014.908200
4. Lee CI, Langlotz CP, Elmore JG. Implications of direct patient online access to radiology reports through patient web portals. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2016;13(12):1608-14. doi:10.1016/j.jacr.2016.09.007
5. Fisher B, Bhavnani V, Winfield M. How patients use access to their full health records: a qualitative study of patients in general practice. *J R Soc Med*. 2009;102(12):539-44. doi:10.1258/jrsm.2009.090328
6. Bhavnani V, Fisher B, Winfield M, Seed P. How patients use access to their electronic GP record - a quantitative study. *Fam Pract*. 2011;28(2):188-94. doi:10.1093/fampra/cmq092
7. Fraccaro P, Vigo M, Balatsoukas P, van der Veer SN, Hassan L, Williams R, et al. Presentation of laboratory test results in patient portals: influence of interface design on risk interpretation and visual search behaviour. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2018;18(1):11. doi:10.1186/s12911-018-0589-7
8. Parker RM, Ratzan SC, Lurie N. Health literacy: a policy challenge for advancing high-quality health care. *Health Aff*. 2003;22(4):147-53. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.22.4.147
9. Garrido T, Jamieson L, Zhou Y, Wiesenthal A, Liang L. Effect of electronic health records in ambulatory care: retrospective, serial, cross sectional study. *BMJ*. 2005;330(7491):581. doi:10.1136/bmj.330.7491.581
10. Krist AH, Woolf SH. A vision for patient-centered health information systems. *J Am Med Assoc*. 2011;305(3):300-1. doi:10.1001/jama.2010.2011
11. Pillemer F, Price RA, Paone S, Martich GD, Albert S, Haidari L, et al. Direct release of test results to patients increases patient engagement and utilization of care. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(6):e0154743. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0154743
12. Sung S, Forman-Hoffman V, Wilson MC, Cram P. Direct reporting of laboratory test results to patients by mail to enhance patient safety. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2006;21(10):1075-8. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00553.x
13. Giardina TD, Baldwin J, Nystrom DT, Sittig DF, Singh H. Patient perceptions of receiving test results via online portals: a mixed-methods study. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2018;25(4):440-6. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocx140
14. Palen TE, Ross C, Powers JD, Xu S. Association of online patient access to clinicians and medical records with use of clinical services. *J Am Med Assoc*. 2012;308(19). doi:10.1001/jama.2012.14126
15. Zhang Z, Citardi D, Xing A, Luo X, Lu Y, He Z. Patient challenges and needs in comprehending laboratory test results: mixed methods study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(12):e18725. doi:10.2196/18725
16. Irizarry T, DeVito Dabbs A, Curran CR. Patient portals and patient engagement: a state of the science review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2015;17(6):e148. doi:10.2196/jmir.4255
17. Witteman HO, Zikmund-Fisher BJ. Communicating laboratory results to patients and families. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2019;57(3):359-64. doi:10.1515/cclm-2018-0634
18. Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Exe NL, Witteman HO. Numeracy and literacy independently predict

- patients' ability to identify out-of-range test results. *J Med Internet Res.* 2014;16(8):e187. doi:10.2196/jmir.3241
19. Keselman A, Smith CA. A classification of errors in lay comprehension of medical documents. *J Biomed Inform.* 2012;45(6):1151-63. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2012.07.012
20. McDonald KM, Bryce CL, Graber ML. The patient is in: patient involvement strategies for diagnostic error mitigation. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2013;22(Suppl 2):ii33-ii9. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001623
21. Britto MT, Jimison HB, Munafo JK, Wissman J, Rogers ML, Hersh W. Usability testing finds problems for novice users of pediatric portals. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2009;16(5):660-9. doi:10.1197/jamia.M3154
22. Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Scherer AM, Witteman HO, Solomon JB, Exe NL, Tarini BA, et al. Graphics help patients distinguish between urgent and non-urgent deviations in laboratory test results. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2017;24(3):520-8. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocw169
23. Tao D, Yuan J, Qu X. Presenting self-monitoring test results for consumers: the effects of graphical formats and age. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2018;25(8):1036-46. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocy046
24. Turchioe MR, Myers A, Isaac S, Baik D, Grossman LV, Ancker JS, et al. A systematic review of patient-facing visualizations of personal health data. *Appl Clin Inform.* 2019;10(4):751-70. doi:10.1055/s-0039-1697592
25. O'Kane M, Freedman D, Zikmund-Fisher BJ. Can patients use test results effectively if they have direct access? *BMJ.* 2015;350. doi:10.1136/bmj.h673
26. Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Witteman HO, Dickson M, Fuhrel-Forbis A, Kahn VC, Exe NL, et al. Blocks, ovals, or people? Icon type affects risk perceptions and recall of pictographs. *Med Decis Making.* 2014;34(4):443-53. doi:10.1177/0272989X13511706
27. Watson ID. Making test results more easily understood by patients. *BMJ.* 2015;350. doi:10.1136/bmj.h1942
28. Garcia-Retamero R, Cokely ET. Designing visual aids that promote risk literacy: a systematic review of health research and evidence-based design heuristics. *Hum Factors.* 2017;59(4):582-627. doi:10.1177/0018720817690634
29. Torsvik T, Lillebo B, Mikkelsen G. Presentation of clinical laboratory results: an experimental comparison of four visualization techniques. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2013;20(2):325-31. doi:10.1136/amiajnl-2012-001147
30. Boisot M, Canals A. Data, information and knowledge: have we got it right? *Journal of evolutionary economics.* 2004;14:43-67. doi:10.1007/s00191-003-0181-9
31. Chen M, Ebert D, Hagen H, Laramée RS, Van Liere R, Ma K-L, et al. Data, information, and knowledge in visualization. *IEEE computer graphics and applications.* 2008;29(1):12-9. doi:10.1109/MCG.2009.6
32. Ancker JS, Benda NC, Sharma MM, Johnson SB, Weiner S, Zikmund-Fisher BJ. Taxonomies for synthesizing the evidence on communicating numbers in health: goals, format, and structure. *Risk Anal.* 2022;42(12):2656-70. doi:10.1111/risa.13875
33. Wickens CD, Helton WS, Hollands JG, Banbury S. *Engineering psychology and human performance*; Routledge; 2021. ISBN:9781003177616
34. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Int J Surg.* 2021;88:105906. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2021.105906
35. Covidence systematic review software, Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia. Available from: www.covidence.org.
36. Becker MH. The health belief model and personal health behavior. *Health Educ Monogr.* 1974;2:324-508. doi:10.1177/109019817400200407
37. Witte K. Putting the fear back into fear appeals: the extended parallel process model. *Commun Monogr.* 1992;59(4):329-49. doi:10.1080/03637759209376276

38. Hong QN, Pluye P, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, et al. Mixed methods appraisal tool (MMAT), version 2018. Registration of copyright. 2018;1148552(10).
39. Pace R, Pluye P, Bartlett G, Macaulay AC, Salsberg J, Jagosh J, et al. Testing the reliability and efficiency of the pilot Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for systematic mixed studies review. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2012;49(1):47-53. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.07.002
40. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med*. 2012;22(3):276-82. PMID:23092060
41. Hohenstein JC, Baumer EP, Reynolds L, Murnane EL, O'Dell D, Lee S, et al. Supporting accurate interpretation of self-administered medical test results for mobile health: assessment of design, demographics, and health condition. *JMIR Hum Factors*. 2018;5(1):e8620. doi:10.2196/humanfactors.8620
42. Morrow D, Azevedo RFL, Garcia-Retamero R, Hasegawa-Johnson M, Huang T, Schuh W, et al. Contextualizing numeric clinical test results for gist comprehension: Implications for EHR patient portals. *J Exp Psychol Appl*. 2019;25(1):41-61. doi:10.1037/xap0000203
43. Scherer AM, Witteman HO, Solomon J, Exe NL, Fagerlin A, Zikmund-Fisher BJ. Improving the understanding of test results by substituting (not adding) goal ranges: web-based between-subjects experiment. *J Med Internet Res*. 2018;20(10):e11027. doi:10.2196/11027
44. Talboom-Kamp E, Tossaint-Schoenmakers R, Goedhart A, Versluis A, Kasteleyn M. Patients' attitudes toward an online patient portal for communicating laboratory test results: real-world study using the eHealth Impact Questionnaire. *JMIR Form Res*. 2020;4(3):e17060. doi:10.2196/17060
45. Morrow D, Hasegawa-Johnson M, Huang T, Schuh W, Azevedo RFL, Gu K, et al. A multidisciplinary approach to designing and evaluating Electronic Medical Record portal messages that support patient self-care. *J Biomed Inform*. 2017;69:63-74. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2017.03.015
46. Bar-Lev S, Beimel D. Numbers, graphs and words - do we really understand the lab test results accessible via the patient portals? *Isr J Health Policy Res*. 2020;9(1):58. doi:10.1186/s13584-020-00415-z
47. Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Scherer AM, Witteman HO, Solomon JB, Exe NL, Fagerlin A. Effect of harm anchors in visual displays of test results on patient perceptions of urgency about near-normal values: experimental study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2018;20(3):e98. doi:10.2196/jmir.8889
48. Kelman A, Robinson CO, Cochin E, Ahluwalia NJ, Braverman J, Chiauuzzi E, et al. Communicating laboratory test results for rheumatoid factor: what do patients and physicians want? *Patient Prefer Adherence*. 2016;10:2501-17. doi:10.2147/PPA.S104396
49. Zhang Z, Kmoth L, Luo X, He Z. User-centered system design for communicating clinical laboratory test results: design and evaluation study. *JMIR Hum Factors*. 2021;8(4):e26017. doi:10.2196/26017
50. Zarcadoolas C, Vaughn WL, Czaja SJ, Levy J, Rockoff ML. Consumers' perceptions of patient-accessible electronic medical records. *J Med Internet Res*. 2013;15(8):e168. doi:10.2196/jmir.2507
51. Elder NC, Barney K. "But what does it mean for me?" Primary care patients' communication preferences for test results notification. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf*. 2012;38(4):168-AP1. doi:10.1016/S1553-7250(12)38022-7
52. Brewer NT, Gilkey MB, Lillie SE, Hesse BW, Sheridan SL. Tables or bar graphs? Presenting test results in electronic medical records. *Med Decis Making*. 2012;32(4):545-53. doi:10.1177/0272989X12441395
53. Nystrom DT, Singh H, Baldwin J, Sittig DF, Giardina TD. Methods for patient-centered interface design of test result display in online portals. *eGEMS*. 2018;6(1):15. doi:10.5334/egems.255
54. Struikman B, Bol N, Goedhart A, van Weert JCM, Talboom-Kamp E, van Delft S, et al. Features of a patient portal for blood test results and patient health engagement: web-based pre-post experiment. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(7):e15798. doi:10.2196/15798
55. Zikmund-Fisher BJ. Helping people know whether measurements have good or bad

implications: increasing the evaluability of health and science data communications. *Policy Insights Behav Brain Sci.* 2019;6(1):29-37. doi.org/10.1177/2372732218813377

56. Hsee CK. The evaluability hypothesis: an explanation for preference reversals between joint and separate evaluations of alternatives. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process.* 1996;67(3):247-57. doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0077

57. Hsee CK, Zhang J. General evaluability theory. *Perspect Psychol Sci.* 2010;5(4):343-55. doi.org/10.1177/1745691610374586

58. Peters E, Dieckmann NF, Västfjäll D, Mertz C, Slovic P, Hibbard JH. Bringing meaning to numbers: the impact of evaluative categories on decisions. *J Exp Psychol Appl.* 2009;15(3):213-27. doi.org/10.1037/a0016978

59. Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Fagerlin A, Keeton K, Ubel PA. Does labeling prenatal screening test results as negative or positive affect a woman's responses? *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2007;197(5):528.e1-6. doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2007.03.076

60. Peters E. The functions of affect in the construction of preferences. *The construction of preference.* New York: Cambridge University Press; 2006. p. 454-63. ISBN: 9780511618031

61. Ancker JS, Senathirajah Y, Kukafka R, Starren JB. Design features of graphs in health risk communication: a systematic review. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2006;13(6):608-18. doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M2115

62. van Weert JC, Alblas MC, van Dijk L, Jansen J. Preference for and understanding of graphs presenting health risk information. The role of age, health literacy, numeracy and graph literacy. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2021;104(1):109-17. doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2020.06.031

63. Ancker JS, Kaufman D. Rethinking health numeracy: a multidisciplinary literature review. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2007;14(6):713-21. doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M2464

64. Campbell B, Linzer G, Dufour DR. Lab Tests Online and consumer understanding of laboratory testing. *Clin Chim Acta.* 2014;432:162-5. doi:10.1016/j.cca.2013.09.028

65. Cadamuro J, Cabitza F, Debeljak Z, De Bruyne S, Frans G, Perez SM, et al. Potentials and pitfalls of ChatGPT and natural-language artificial intelligence models for the understanding of laboratory medicine test results. An assessment by the European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (EFLM) Working Group on Artificial Intelligence (WG-AI). *Clin Chem Lab Med.* 2023;61(7):1158-66. doi:10.1515/cclm-2023-0355

66. Barlow IM. Are biochemistry interpretative comments helpful? Results of a general practitioner and nurse practitioner survey. *Ann Clin Biochem.* 2008;45(1):88-90. doi:10.1258/acb.2007.007134


67. Verboeket-van de Venne W, Oosterhuis W, Keuren J, Kleinveld H. Reflective testing in the Netherlands: usefulness to improve the diagnostic and therapeutic process in general practice. *Ann Clin Biochem.* 2009;46(4):346-7. doi:10.1258/acb.2009.009039

68. Verboeket-van de Venne WPHG, Hendriks-Dybicz AM, Oosterhuis WP. Patiënten informeren over laboratoriumuitslagen in het kader van patient empowerment. *Ned Tijdschr Klin Chem Labgeneesk.* 2015;40:223-5.






Supplementary Files

Figures

Flow chart of the study selection process.



Examples of presentation formats used for displaying laboratory test results. The examples are based on a hypothetical HbA1c (hemoglobin A1c) test result. A combination of different presentation formats is possible.

Numerical value with evaluative label	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol. This is too high.
Numerical value with evaluative label and reference range	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol. This is too high. The reference range is 20-42 mmol/mol.
Horizontal line bar with colored blocks	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol.  <p>Reference range High Very high You</p>
Horizontal line bar with colored blocks and evaluative label	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol. This is too high.  <p>Reference range High Very high You</p>
Horizontal line bar with colored blocks and harm anchors	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol.  <p>Reference range High High Very high You Many doctors are not concerned until here</p>
Horizontal line bar with colored blocks and personalized goal range	Your HbA1c was 55 mmol/mol.  <p>Below goal range Goal range for type 2 diabetes High Very high You</p>
Line graph	 <p>Value (mmol/mol) Date</p>

Multimedia Appendixes

PRISMA 2020 checklist.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/e33587b23dc5cf9468dc5c3e3a4ca145.docx>

Search strategy for PubMed, Web of Science, and EMBASE up to May 31st, 2023.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/c1bef606b5e3c9a1a24d656dee202211.docx>

Detailed overview of laboratory test results presentation formats in all included studies (n = 18).

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/05d06d6241e51f731e859ab9288e395a.docx>

Detailed overview of quality assessment of all included studies (n = 18).

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/e28fc1ed3eca7e4632479951d11f61a1.docx>



CONSORT (or other) checklists

PRISMA 2020 checklist.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/47e35c085eb353a35f1530b0239745f7.pdf>