Preliminary Discussion Document for Public Comment (April 5, 2021)

National Academy of Medicine Project on "Principles for Defining & Verifying the Authority of Online Providers of Health Information"

PLEASE NOTE: The purpose of this document is to solicit discussion and feedback on the project from interested parties – including researchers, providers of online health information, and members of the public. All content herein is highly preliminary and subject to change. This document has not been endorsed by the National Academy of Medicine, members of the project advisory group, or the project sponsor (YouTube).

Comments may be submitted between 12:00 pm ET on April 5, 2021, and 11:59 pm ET on April 9, 2021, at <u>https://survey.alchemer.com/s3/6276080/Public-Discussion-Document-NAM-Project-on-Principles-for-Defining-Verifying-the-Authority-of-Online-Providers-of-Health-Information.</u>

About the Project

In order to enhance the accessibility of trustworthy health information on its platform, YouTube asked the National Academy of Medicine (NAM) to identify preliminary definitions of "authoritative" sources of health information and the criteria by which these sources derive and maintain their authority. The NAM project will also outline ethical and public health considerations for large-scale content curation strategies.

An expert advisory group will gather information and deliberate in order to author a peer-reviewed discussion paper for publication in *NAM Perspectives* this summer. Papers published in *NAM Perspectives* are individually authored and do not reflect consensus positions of the NAM, the National Academies, or the authors' organizations. <u>See project webpage >></u>

YouTube has informed the NAM that outcomes from this project will help to inform YouTube's identification and raising of "authoritative" sources of health information, but will not disadvantage sources that do not meet the requirements of specific authoritative source categories. Further, the NAM understands that YouTube will identify and characterize such "authoritative" sources in order to provide context for users, but will not confer a formal designation of authority or trustworthiness at the source level. The project will also generate principles that may be of use to online platforms other than YouTube.

Advisory Group

- Raynard Kington, MD, MBA, PhD (Chair), Phillips Academy in Andover
- Stacey Arnesen, MS, National Library of Medicine
- Wen-Ying Sylvia Chou, PhD, MPH, National Cancer Institute
- Sue Curry, PhD, University of Iowa (Emeritus)
- David Lazer, PhD, Northeastern University
- Antonia Villarruel, PhD, RN, University of Pennsylvania

This document is for discussion and feedback only. All content herein is highly preliminary and subject to change. This document has not been endorsed by the NAM, the project advisory group, or the project sponsor (YouTube).

Project Scope

- The project will consider <u>the authoritativeness of sources of information</u> rather than the information itself. This approach is imperfect (in that organizational authoritativeness cannot guarantee information accuracy), but it is an entry point to addressing a complex challenge. The project's final paper may suggest the addition of methods to assess information itself, especially given the evolution of knowledge over time.
- The project will also limit its consideration to the authoritativeness of <u>government and nonprofit</u> <u>organizations</u>. It will not examine individuals or for-profit organizations (with the possible exception of some entities, like hospital systems). However, it should be noted that demarcations between individuals and organizations are not always clear. Means for evaluating the authoritativeness of individuals and for-profit organizations may be addressed at a later stage.
- The project will <u>focus on U.S.-based organizations</u>. Some of the principles it develops may be applicable to organizations outside the United States, but additional research and deliberation will be needed to provide guidance on such sources.

Definitions

Selecting and defining foundational terms is an important part of this project and will be the subject of deliberation by the advisory group. The following are preliminary working definitions of key terms for discussion and feedback.

- **Authoritative:** "Able to be trusted as reliable or true"¹ according to the best available scientific evidence.
- **Source:** An organization offering health information through one or more YouTube channels branded to that organization.
- Health information: Informational or advisory content pertaining to health conditions (physical and mental), health behaviors, public health, population health, health care, health policy, or biomedical science.
- **Authoritative source of health information:** An organization providing health information considered to be reliable or true according to the best available scientific evidence.

Categories

There are several thousand U.S.-based sources providing health information on YouTube (excluding individuals and digital-first health companies).² One approach to assessing the authoritativeness of this body at scale is categorization, working from lesser to greater degrees of granularity.

The following are possible categories, presented for discussion and feedback.

• Organizations that are accredited or otherwise vetted through established mechanisms

¹ Oxford Languages definition.

² Preliminary estimate.

This document is for discussion and feedback only. All content herein is highly preliminary and subject to change. This document has not been endorsed by the NAM, the project advisory group, or the project sponsor (YouTube).

- Examples of accredited organizations:
 - Hospitals and other health care organizations
 - Universities and health professions schools (e.g., medical schools and schools of public health, nursing, dentistry, etc.)
 - Public health departments
- Examples of otherwise vetted organizations:
 - Academic health and health professions journals indexed in <u>MEDLINE</u>
 - Organizations included in MedlinePlus
- Considerations for this potential category: Not all forms of accreditation or vetting are equally thorough or definitive. Therefore, accrediting bodies and vetting processes require further examination, and enhanced granularity may be required in categorizing organizations in this group.
- Government organizations
 - Examples of government organizations:
 - Federal agencies, such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Institutes of Health, Indian Health Service, Veterans Health Administration, and Agency for Health Care Research and Quality
 - State, local, territorial, and tribal government organizations
 - Considerations for this potential category: Federal government agencies adhere to strict public transparency and accountability rules, such as those required under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA.)³ Many state and local government organizations repurpose information from federal sources. Standards and practices related to transparency and accountability differ across federal, state, territorial, and local government organizations. Further, government sources do not always provide authoritative information. For example, the CDC recently removed three pieces of guidance from its website for failing to adhere to the agency's scientific standards.⁴ Often, government organizations use terms such as "interim" to indicate that a situation is under investigation and is fluid. The authoritative may be required in categorizing organizations in this group.
- Other organizations that provide health information
 - Examples of other organizations that provide health information:
 - Independent panels that create evidence-based guidelines (e.g., US Preventive Services Task Force)
 - Professional associations and societies (e.g., American Public Health Association)
 - Advisory organizations and think tanks (e.g., Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute)
 - Health industry groups (e.g., American Hospital Association)

³ See <u>https://www.gsa.gov/policy-regulations/policy/federal-advisory-committee-management/advice-and-guidance/the-federal-advisory-committee-act-faca-brochure</u>.

⁴ See <u>https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/downloads/communication/Guidance-Review.pdf</u>. This document is for discussion and feedback only. All content herein is highly preliminary and subject to change. This document has not been endorsed by the NAM, the project advisory group, or the project sponsor (YouTube).

- Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and global health organizations (e.g., Partners in Health)
- Foundations (e.g., Robert Wood Johnson Foundation)
- Patient or disease advocacy organizations (e.g., American Heart Association)
- Community health organizations (e.g., DC Health Matters)
- *Considerations for this potential category*: This group of organizations is highly diverse, and a standard set of criteria, applied consistently, may be required to determine their authoritativeness. The following possible criteria are offered as a starting point for discussion and feedback:
 - Provides science- or evidence-based information
 - Demonstrates transparency and accountability
 - Regularly reassesses and updates content, given that knowledge and scientific consensus evolves over time
 - Uses a consensus process
 - Uses a peer review process
 - Follows FACA regulations
 - Does not engage in lobbying
 - Discloses conflict-of-interest information
 - Does not host advertisements
 - Has earned the trust of the community it serves

Ethical, Logistical, & Public Health Considerations

The ultimate purpose of identifying and elevating authoritative sources of health information is to promote science-based understanding and health-supporting behaviors among information consumers. How can we measure the impact of such an approach, in terms of both benefits and risks/harm? The following is a non-exhaustive list of ethical, logistical, and public health considerations for discussion and feedback:

- What might be the drawbacks of assessing the authoritativeness of organizations as information sources, as opposed to assessing the content they share/promote?
- Perceptions of authoritativeness and trustworthiness vary across groups. How do we avoid cementing structural disenfranchisement and health inequities (e.g., for people of color and others with valuable lived experience to share)?
- How can we empirically assess the impact of social media information curation policies on information consumption and ultimately public health outcomes?
- How can we manage commercial interests or conflicts of interest, or other ways a potential new "credibility brand" might be monetized or used for purposes counter to the promotion of health?

END OF DOCUMENT

This document is for discussion and feedback only. All content herein is highly preliminary and subject to change. This document has not been endorsed by the NAM, the project advisory group, or the project sponsor (YouTube).