

Evaluating the Credibility of Health Websites: Can You Trust Dr. Google?

How to Tell if It's Legit

There are several tools available to evaluate health websites. Most of them list criteria that reliable websites should meet. Here is a summary of the main criteria to look out for:

Author – The website should clearly identify the author, institution, and editorial board (the people responsible for the professional review of the content).

Date – The website should contain current scientific information, and the content should be updated regularly.

Objectivity – The website should be evidence-based and objective (factual) in its content, listing benefits and risks (e.g., side effects). The website should mention other treatment options, if available, including no treatment, and it should encourage patients to consult with a health care professional.

Purpose – The website should state its purpose clearly. Any advertising should be clearly marked and separated from the site's main content.

Transparency – The website should identify its ownership, sources of funding, and explain how it collects and uses personal information.

Usability – The website should be easy to use, well-organized, and well-designed. It should provide a way of contacting the owner of the site.

There will be some credible websites that don't meet all the criteria. Likewise, there will be unreliable websites that look very slick and seem to meet all of them. Ultimately, the only way to know if online health information is accurate is to find the source and read the scientific study being referenced. Learning how to evaluate for the credible criteria, however, will help you start filtering.

Examples of Credible Health Websites

The Medical Library Association has put together a list of pre-screened health websites called the *MLA Top Health Websites*. These websites can be accessed on the CAPHIS – Consumer and Patient Health Information Section – site: www.mlanet.org/page/top-health-websites.

Red Flags

- ! The website relies on single cases or personal testimonials.
- ! The information is presented in a sensational, overly emotional, or alarmist way.
- ! The website implies that a treatment affects everyone in the same way (e.g., 100% success rate).
- ! The website is trying to sell you something.
- ! It is not clear who the author is or what qualifications or conflicts of interest he or she has.
- ! Studies are referenced, but they are old (from 10 years ago or more) or the year of publication is not provided.
- ! Links are broken – this could indicate that the site has not been updated recently and that the health information could be outdated.

Tools for Evaluating Health Websites

DISCERN

A validated instrument that enables patients and information providers to judge the quality of written consumer health information. It consists of 15 questions and a rating scale.

HONcode

A set of principles for evaluating websites and a certification seal that websites can obtain after being assessed by the Health On the Net (HON) expert team.

JAMA Benchmarks

Four criteria to score to a website (0 to 4 points) based on authorship, attribution, disclosure, and currency.

Credible Canadian Health Websites

Health Canada
www.hc-sc.gc.ca

Public Health Agency of Canada
www.publichealth.gc.ca

Government of Canada: Health
www.healthycanadians.gc.ca

References

- Aslani A, Pourmik O, Abu-Hanna A, Eslami S. Web-site evaluation tools: a case study in reproductive health information. *Stud Health Technol Inform*. 2014;205:895-9.
- Chumber S, Huber J, Ghezzi P. A methodology to analyze the quality of health information on the internet: the example of diabetic neuropathy. *Diabetes Educ*. 2015 Feb;41(1):95-105.
- DISCERN online: quality criteria for consumer health information [Internet]. Oxford, UK: University of Oxford, Division of Public Health and Primary Health Care [cited 2016 Jan 27]. Available from: www.discern.org.uk
- Golterman L, Banasiak NC. Evaluating web sites: reliable child health resources for parents. *Pediatr Nurs*. 2011 Mar-Apr;37(2):81-3.
- HONcode: Principles – Quality and trustworthy health information [Internet]. Chene-Bourg, Switzerland: Health On the Net Foundation; 2013 Sep 19 [cited 2016 Jan 27]. Available from: www.healthonnet.org/HONcode/Conduct.html
- Khazaal Y, Chatton A, Cochand S, Coquard O, Fernandez S, Khan R, et al. Brief DISCERN, six questions for the evaluation of evidence-based content of health-related websites. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2009 Oct;77(1):33-7.
- Monheit DF. Evaluating health information web sites for credibility. *J Hospital Librarianship*. 2011 Feb 2;11(1):39-44.
- Silberg WM, Lundberg GD, Musacchio RA. Assessing, controlling, and assuring the quality of medical information on the Internet: Caveant lector et viewer—Let the reader and viewer beware. *JAMA*. 1997 Apr 16;277(15):1244-5.
- Yaqub M, Ghezzi P. Adding dimensions to the analysis of the quality of health information of websites returned by Google: cluster analysis identifies patterns of websites according to their classification and the type of intervention described. *Front Public Health*. 2015 Aug 25;3:204.

Questions or comments about CADTH or this tool?



Learn more:
cadth.ca



Contact us:
requests@cadth.ca



Follow us on Twitter:
[@CADTH_ACMTS](https://twitter.com/CADTH_ACMTS)



Subscribe to our E-Alert and *New at CADTH* newsletter:
cadth.ca/subscribe.

DISCLAIMER

The information in this document is intended to help health care decision-makers, patients, health care professionals, health systems leaders, and policy-makers make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of health care services. This information should not be used as a substitute for the application of clinical judgment in respect of the care of a particular patient or other professional judgment in any decision-making process nor is it intended to replace professional medical advice. While the Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) has taken care in the preparation of this document to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete, and up-to-date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not responsible for any errors or omissions or injury, loss, or damage arising from or as a result of the use (or misuse) of any information contained in or implied by the information in this document.

CADTH takes sole responsibility for the final form and content of this document. The views expressed herein are those of CADTH and do not necessarily reflect the views of our funders.

ABOUT CADTH

CADTH is an independent, not-for-profit organization responsible for providing Canada's health care decision-makers with objective evidence to help make informed decisions about the optimal use of drugs and medical devices in our health care system.

CADTH receives funding from Canada's federal, provincial, and territorial governments, with the exception of Quebec.

Ce document est également disponible en français.

May 2016

CADTH Evidence Driven.

cadth.ca