

C R A B S FRAMEWORK FOR CREDIBILITY

Author: Jessica Stokes-Parish, PhD, RN



Disclaimer: This framework is not designed to be in replacement of critical appraisal, but as a tool for first glance of content online.

@j_stokesparish

C Conflict of Interest

Conflicts occur when an individual benefits from messages or decisions, making the information less reliable. Conflicts can be overt or subtle - such as an individual who owns a nutritional supplement company. They stand to benefit financially by supporting the product.

R References

References can be useful to identify whether there is evidence to back a claim and whether plagiarism exists. References can also help the reader identify the quality of the evidence - predatory publishing is increasingly problematic.

A Author

Investigating the author can be a helpful clue to know how much weight to give evidence. Is the author suitably trained and qualified? Are they currently practicing? Do they have any publications?

B Buzz words

Language clues, like buzz words, can be a sign that information isn't credible. Buzz words are used like jargon - fancy, fad words to deceive and engage your heart, not your brain. These can be anything from trendy words like "low-tox" to emotive language that sucks you in and overrides your rational brain.

S Scope of practice

Overreaching scope of practice is easier to do online than in real life. Social media creates a halo of authority, meaning that it can be difficult to identify a junior doctor versus senior specialist or identify someone providing expertise outside of their training.

Stokes-Parish, J (2022). *Navigating credibility of online information during covid-19: using mnemonics to equip the public to spot red flags in health information online*. JMIR Preprint DOI: 10.2196/preprints.38269