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Risk communication

What is RiskCom?

- An issue at the intersection of science and society
- Tool for delivering evidence based information about risk and safety issues
Purpose of RC

- RC is needed for informed decision making and informed judgements about health impacts in the society
Ingredients of good risk communication

- Reliable & valid data
- Focus on the over-all-picture
- Good reporting (transparent, balanced, reasonable)

It should make a difference
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Jim has got a problem
A first report

Parliamentary Assembly
Assemblée parlementaire

Doc. 12608
6 May 2011

The potential dangers of electromagnetic fields and their effect on the environment
A second report

Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks

SCENIHR
Which one is better? Which one tells the truth?

Parliamentary Assembly
Assemblée parlementaire
http://assembly.coe.int

Doc. 12608
6 May, 2011

The potential dangers of electromagnetic fields and their effect on the environment

Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks
SCENIHR

Health Effects of Exposure to EMF
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Two options for supporting the general reader

- How to support general readers to make an informed judgement about a potential hazards?

- How to support general readers to make an informed judgement about the trustworthiness/ credibility of a hazard assessment?
Best options for supporting the general reader

- Support general readers to make better informed judgements about the trustworthiness hazard assessment reports

Questions:
- Which characteristics of these reports are decisive for judging quality and integrity of these reports?
- Which characteristics do general readers use?
Sender & message factors affecting source credibility

- Source attractiveness
- Similarity between the source and the recipient
- Gender
- Presence of evidence
- Quality of arguments
- Extremity of the claims
- Threat of the message
- Message style, and language intensity
- Quantitativeness of the message
- Congruity with the source’s self-interest
Routes of human information processing

Source credibility: Confidence or trust based?

- Confidence is based on prior experience
- Trust is based on judgement heuristics
  - Competency
  - Benevolence
  - With respect to benevolence, trust can be based on “value similarity” (Earle, 2010)
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We do not have to reinvent the wheel

- Models offered by evidence based medicine: Reporting medical research and designing patient information
Library for health research reporting

The EQUATOR Network library currently contains:

- An introduction to reporting guidelines
- Comprehensive lists of the available reporting guidelines, listed by study type:
  - Experimental studies
  - Observational studies
  - Diagnostic accuracy studies
  - Reliability and agreement studies
  - Systematic reviews
  - Qualitative research
  - Economic evaluations
  - Quality improvement studies
  - Other reporting guidelines
  - Reporting data
  - Sections of research reports
  - Specific conditions or procedures.

Download the most frequently-used reporting guidelines:

- CONSORT checklist
- CONSORT flowchart
- CONSORT extensions
- STARD checklist & flowchart
- STROBE checklists
- PRISMA checklist
- PRISMA flow diagram

Download:
Quick reference guide to the DISCERN criteria

A good quality publication about treatment choices will:

- Have explicit aims
- Achieve its aims
- Be relevant to consumers
- Make sources of information explicit
- Make date of information explicit
- Be balanced and unbiased
- List additional sources of information
- Refer to areas of uncertainty
- Describe how treatment works
- Describe the benefits of treatment
- Describe the risks of treatment
- Describe what would happen without treatment
- Describe the effects of treatment choices on overall quality of life
- Make it clear there may be more than one possible treatment choice
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S. Kandel, D. Ladeira, E. Vogel, G. Dürrenberger, J. Estenberg, E. van Rungen, and Peter Wiedemann
Objectives of CORA

- To help the consumer of risk/hazard information to raise the right questions for evaluating its credibility
- To help the assessors to provide the right information
Guiding questions for CORA

- How to communicate quality and integrity of a hazard assessment?
- Which features of hazard assessment should be disclosed in order to strengthen its trustworthiness?
- Which background information should be added?
Procedure

CORA

Examples

Credibility Research

RiskCom Research

Evidence based medicine

Own empirical Research
Framework for communicating risk assessment reports (CORA)
General structure of the CORA sections

- Recommendation
- Criteria
- Rationale
- Points for attention
Example: Public consultation

Recommendation

Examine whether there was a public consultation process in order to get the opinions of various stakeholders on the risk assessment report.
**Example: Public consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Public consultation and stakeholder participation</th>
<th>Is there information about a procedure applied in order to receive comments and inputs from various stakeholders and the general public?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Special procedure for addressing controversies</td>
<td>Is there information about a special procedure, which is addressing scientific controversies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale

- Studies on public participation in risk related decision making suggest that stakeholder involvement will improve process quality and outcome quality (Beierle & Cayford, 2001, 2002).
- It is seen by the public as a potent conflict resolution tool (Wiedemann & Schütz 2008).
- Including important stakeholders can foster trust in the resulting risk assessment and the acceptability of the recommendations made in the assessment (Dietz and Stern 2008).
Example: Public consultation

Point for attention:

Stakeholder participation is not a substitute for expertise required for the quality of the hazard assessment. However, it indicates that a range of societal values and concerns have been included in the assessment.
Limitations

- CORA is not a tool for persuading people
- General readers with a strong belief will always prefer reports that confirm their beliefs
- Negative information will raise more attention than positive information.
Thank you very much for your attention!