

Supplementary Information

Supplementary 1: Search terms for PCOS and Diabetes for Embase, Medline and PubMed databases (searches made via all fields from 2005 to 25 October 2022)

PCOS	<p>(Polycystic ovary syndrome OR PCOS OR polycystic ovary OR síndrome de ovario poliquistico OR pco-syndrom OR hyperandrogenic anovulation OR syndrome des ovaires polykystiques OR polycystic ovarian syndrome OR pos OR stein-leventhal syndrome OR síndrome dos ovários policísticos OR pcos OR polycystic ovary disorder)</p> <p>AND (Medical Education OR Medical Information or Patient information or Patient Education)</p> <p>AND (Video OR YouTube)</p>
Diabetes	<p>(Diabetes OR diabetic OR blood sugar OR diabetics OR diabeties OR diabetes educator OR diabetes mellitus OR diabetes health OR diabetes management)</p> <p>AND (Medical Education OR Patient Education)</p> <p>AND (Video OR YouTube)</p>

Supplementary 2: DISCERN Questionnaire

Is the publication reliable?	1. Are the aims clear?
	2. Does it achieve its aims?
	3. Is it relevant?
	4. Is it clear what sources of information were used to compile the publication (other than the author or producer)?
	5. Is it clear when the information used or reported in the publication was produced?
	6. Is it balanced and unbiased?
	7. Does it provide details of additional sources of support and information?
	8. Does it refer to areas of uncertainty?
How good	9. Does it describe how each treatment works?

is the quality of information on treatment choices?	10. Does it describe the benefits of each treatment?
	11. Does it describe the risks of each treatment?
	12. Does it describe what would happen if no treatment is used?
	13. Does it describe how the treatment choices affect overall quality of life?
	14. Is it clear that there may be more than one possible treatment choice?
	15. Does it provide support for shared decision-making?
Overall Rating of the Publication	16. Based on the answers to all of the above questions, rate the overall quality of the publication as a source of information about treatment choices

Supplementary 3: JAMA Questionnaire

Authorship	Is the authorship affiliation available?
	Is the authorship contribution available?
	Are the authorship credentials available?
Attribution	Is the attribution source available?
	Is the attribution copyright available?
Disclosure	Is the website ownership available?
	Is the sponsors details available?
	Are there any advertising on the video?
Currency	When was the video posted?

Supplementary 4: GQS Questionnaire

Description	Score
Poor quality, poor flow of the sites, most information missing, not at all useful for patients	1
Generally poor quality and poor flow, some information listed but many important topics missing, of very limited use to patients	2
Moderate quality, suboptimal flow, some important information is adequately discussed but others poorly discussed, somewhat useful	3

for patients	
Good quality and generally good flow, most of the relevant information is listed, but some topics not covered, useful for patients	4
Excellent quality and excellent flow, very useful for patients	5

Supplementary 5: Results of risk of bias assessment for articles from literature review

Paper	Selection bias	Attrition bias	Reporting bias
Abedin et al. 2015	Low	Low	Low
Abrar et al. 2020	Low	Low	Low
Davis et al. 2017	Low	Low	Low
Dyson et al. 2010	Low	Low	Low
Gimenez-Perez et al. 2020	Low	Low	Low
Gour et al. 2022	Low	Low	Low
Gupta et al. 2016	Low	Low	Low
Heinrich et al. 2012	Low	Low	Low
Juo et al. 2018	Low	Low	Low
Kong et al. 2021	High	Low	Low
Leong et al. 2018	Low	Low	Low
Leong et al. 2022	Low	Low	Low
Liu et al. 2014	Low	Low	Low
Lu Hu et al. 2022	Low	Low	Low
Mahajan et al. 2022	Low	Low	Low
McElfsh et al. 2019	Low	Low	Low
Paragas Jr et al. 2019	Low	Low	Low
Zhang et al. 2019	Low	Low	Low

