Presentation title: Making Cancer Prevention Accessible: Evaluating Easy Read Materials for People with Intellectual Disabilities

Conference: Trinity Health and Education International Research Conference 2026 (THEconf2026), 3–5 March 2026.

Authors and affiliations:

- Dr Oliwia Kowalczyk – Nicolaus Copernicus University, Department of Oncology
- Donal Barry – University College Cork
- Omer Abdelaziz Saeed – University of Khartoum

Abstract

Title and Background

Easy Read materials are increasingly adopted to make cancer prevention information accessible to people with intellectual disabilities, yet systematic evaluation of their quality remains limited. This study assessed Easy Read breast cancer prevention materials using validated frameworks to identify characteristics of effective accessible health communication.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

To systematically assess the quality of Easy Read breast cancer screening materials using validated frameworks, compare approaches across healthcare systems, and identify characteristics associated with high-quality accessible materials.

Method

A cross-national comparative study examined seven publicly available Easy Read breast cancer prevention materials from organizations across three English-speaking countries (United Kingdom, United States, Australia) in August 2025. Two validated frameworks were applied: the Patient Education Materials Assessment Tool measuring understandability and actionability, and European Easy Read Standards evaluating visual design, language simplicity, and structural elements. Two trained coders independently assessed materials using standardized protocols with supervisory oversight to ensure reliability. Inter-rater agreement was established through pilot testing and calibration meetings.

Ethical approval was not required as the study analyzed publicly available educational documents.

Findings

Assessment revealed consistently high actionability scores (100% across all materials) but variable understandability, with six materials achieving 93% and one scoring 73%. Easy Read total scores ranged from 86 to 90 points. Highest-performing materials demonstrated superior visual-text integration, consistent active voice, and systematic information chunking. Lower-scoring materials exhibited excessive sentence length, inadequate picture-text integration, and inconsistent formatting. Cross-national comparison revealed no systematic

differences between countries, suggesting quality depends more on development processes than healthcare system characteristics.

Conclusion and Impact

Despite widespread Easy Read adoption, substantial improvement opportunities exist. Healthcare organizations can enhance quality by prioritizing visual-text integration, maintaining language simplicity, and incorporating user testing. These findings provide evidence-based criteria for healthcare professionals selecting educational materials and highlight the importance of evaluating resources beyond superficial Easy Read labeling. Future development should emphasize co-production with target users and systematic quality assessment using validated frameworks.