Healthcare Professional Perceptions of the Accuracy and Usability of Patient Education Sheets

Kelly Brunk, PharmD, MBA, BCOP[1]; Tahsin Imam, PharmD[1]; Kristine LeFebvre, DNP, RN, NPD-BC, AOCN[2]; Madeline Johnston, MSN, RN, OCN[2]; Laura Nice, PharmD, BCOP[3,4]; Hiba Ahmad, PharmD, BCOP[3,5]; Jiajoyce Richardson, DNP, CRNP[6,7]; Una Hopkins, DNP, RN, FNP-BC, NE-BC, FACCC[6,8], Madelyn Floysand, PharmD[1]

[1]Network for Collaborative Oncology Development & Advancement (NCODA), Cazenovia, NY; [2]Oncology Nursing Society (ONS), Pittsburgh, PA; [3]Hematology/Oncology Pharmacy Association (HOPA), Milwaukee, WI; [4]Allegheny Health Network, Pittsburgh, PA; [5]University of Colorado Hospital, Aurora, CO; [6]Association of Cancer Care Centers (ACCC), Rockville, MD; [7]Penn State Health, Hershey, PA; [8]Montefiore Health System, Bronx, NY

Background

- Patient Education Sheets (PES) support healthcare-professional-led education for patients with cancer.
- PES were updated to a new format starting in October 2025.

Objective

Describe healthcare professionals' perceptions of the clinical accuracy and usability of PES.

Methods

- Survey administered in two distinct data-collection waves: March–April 2026 and July–August 2026.
- Nine 5-point Likert-scale items; responses compared with the neutral midpoint of 3 using two-sided, one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank tests.

Results

Table 1. Demographics

Characteristic	No. (%) (N=219)
Professional Role	
Pharmacist	100 (46)
Nurse	82 (37)
Advanced Practice Provider	20 (9)
Pharmacy Technician	4 (2)
Physician	0 (0)
Other	13 (6)
Practice Site	
Academic Medical Center	109 (50)
Community Cancer Center	94 (43)
Other	16 (7)
PES Usage Frequency	
Daily	100 (46)
Weekly	66 (30)
Monthly	24 (11)
Never	29 (13)

Healthcare professionals report **high agreement regarding PES clinical accuracy and practical value,**

while identifying opportunities to enhance usability through **additional language translations and EHR integration.**

CE CODE: DGKD9F

Disclosures

Results (Continued)

Of 219 respondents, 157 completed the core PES evaluation.

Table 2. Likert-Scale Results by Statement

Statement	Median Score	Agree or Strongly Agree, %
The information is accurate.	4	95
The section on handling and storage of the treatment is clear, practical, and appropriate.	4	91
The calendar format is helpful to my patients.	4	88
The reading level is appropriate for my patients.	4	88
The "How This Treatment Works" section is meaningful to my patients.	4	87
PES prints well on standard clinic printers.	4	87
The length is appropriate for my patients.	4	83
The font size used is appropriate for my patients.	4	72
The page layout (landscape) is appropriate for my patients.	4	66

All nine items differed significantly from the neutral midpoint of 3 ($P < .001$).

Discussion

Limitations

- Of 219 respondents, 157 completed the core PES evaluation items; 13% reported never using PES.
- No physician respondents.
- Patient usability was assessed indirectly through healthcare professional perceptions.

Top Requested Enhancements

1. Translate PES into more languages (68%)
2. Integrate PES into electronic health records (EHRs) (47%)

Conclusions

Healthcare professionals reported high agreement regarding PES clinical accuracy and practical value, while identifying opportunities to improve layout, translations, and EHR integration.