

**Table S1: Scores, measures and certificates used for the evaluation of websites and videos.**

[illegible]

<b>Flesch Reading Ease score<sup>5</sup></b>	Measure of readability. Evaluates how difficult it is to understand a text.	/	/	Score = 206.835 - (1.015 x average sentence length) - (84.6 x average number of syllables per word)	Metric (interval)	No theoretical lower bound  121.22 as highest (easiest) possible score	0-30: very difficult 30-50: difficult 50-60: fairly difficult 60-70: standard 70-80: fairly easy 80-90: easy 90-100: very easy
<b>Flesch Kincaid Grade level<sup>6</sup></b>	Measure of readability. Uses a modified Flesch Reading Ease formula to produce a grade-level score. Evaluates which standard US school grade is needed to understand a text.	/	/	Level = (0.39 x average sentence length) + (11.8 x average number of syllables per word) - 15.59	Metric (interval)	-3.4 as the lowest grade level score in theory  no upper bound	>12: higher education level ≤12: grade level score corresponding to standard US school grades, in which 12 is the final year of high school.
4. Entity related content							
<b>Key fact score</b>	Evaluation of the video content according to key facts described in established clinical guidelines.	50 items addressing the categories: definition, symptoms, risk factors, evaluation, management, outcome, and risk of progression. For specific items, compare Supplementary Table 2.	1: fully addressed 0.5: partially addressed 0: not addressed	Per item	Absolute number (%) of evaluated videos fully/partially/not addressing the respective item.	/	/
				Sum of scores for each of the 50 items.	Categorical (ordinal)	0-50	/
5. Video related parameters							
<b>Viewing rate</b>	Evaluates how often the video has been watched since upload.	/	/	views / days since upload	Metric (ratio)	/	/
<b>Engagement rate</b>	Evaluates the rate of engagement (likes, dislikes, comments) since upload.	/	/	(likes + dislikes + comments) / views	Metric (ratio)	/	/

HON, Health on the Net; JAMA, Journal of the American Medical Association; MGUS, monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance.

1. Boyer C, Selby M, Appel RD. The Health On the Net Code of Conduct for medical and health web sites. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 1998; **52 Pt 2**: 1163-1166. e-pub ahead of print 1999/06/29;
2. Organisation H-N-G. Health On the Net. In, 2020.
3. Silberg WM, Lundberg GD, Musacchio RA. Assessing, controlling, and assuring the quality of medical information on the Internet: Caveant lector et viewor--Let the reader and viewer beware. *JAMA* 1997; **277**(15): 1244-1245. e-pub ahead of print 1997/04/16;
4. Charnock D, Shepperd S, Needham G, Gann R. DISCERN: an instrument for judging the quality of written consumer health information on treatment choices. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1999; **53**(2): 105-111. e-pub ahead of print 1999/07/09; doi: 10.1136/jech.53.2.105
5. Flesch R. A new readability yardstick. *J Appl Psychol* 1948; **32**(3): 221-233. e-pub ahead of print 1948/06/01; doi: 10.1037/h0057532
6. Kincaid JP, Fishburne RP, Rogers RL, Chissom BS. Derivation of new readability formulas (automated readability index, fog count, and flesch reading ease formula) for Navy enlisted personnel. *Chief of Naval Technical Training: Naval Air Station Memphis*. 1975; (Research Branch Report 8-75. ).