

**Instructions:** Please answer honestly. Put a check to the most applicable number of your choice. Your responses will remain confidential and used solely for research purposes.

Rate each statement using the scale below:

**5 – Strongly Agree**

**4 – Agree**

**3 – Neutral**

**2 – Disagree**

**1 – Strongly Disagree**

| <b>Section 1: Accuracy and Detection Performance</b>  | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. The AI system demonstrates appropriate performance in identifying potential lung abnormalities in the test CT scans for preliminary screening purposes.        |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2. The categorization of lung cancer classes (adenocarcinoma, normal, squamous cell carcinoma) is suitable for preliminary screening to support physician review. |          |          |          |          |          |
| 3. The system produces consistent results when analyzing the same medical image multiple times.   |          |          |          |          |          |

| <b>Section 2: Clarity and Usability of Interface</b>  | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. The layout and presentation of preliminary screening results in the web application is clear and well-organized. |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2. The medical terms and explanations provided for preliminary findings are understandable and appropriate.         |          |          |          |          |          |
| 3. The visual indicators (e.g., classification labels, confidence scores) on medical images are easy to interpret.  |          |          |          |          |          |

| <b>Section 3: Ease of Use</b>  | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. The web application interface is easy to navigate.                                  |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2. Uploading and submitting medical images (CT scans) for analysis is straightforward. |          |          |          |          |          |
| 3. Accessing results and preliminary screening reports within the system is easy.      |          |          |          |          |          |

| <b>Section 4: Patient-Provider Communication</b>  | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. The platform design has potential to improve communication between patients and healthcare providers in lung cancer screening workflows.               |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2. The communication features (messaging, case status updates) are effective for facilitating patient-physician interaction during the screening process. |          |          |          |          |          |
| 3. The platform's result presentation format helps patients understand preliminary findings while awaiting physician review.                              |          |          |          |          |          |

| <b>Section 5: Impact on Healthcare Delivery</b>  | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. This proof-of-concept platform demonstrates potential to support coordination and case prioritization in lung cancer screening workflows.                                   |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2. The platform design addresses workflow inefficiencies and coordination challenges in current lung cancer screening processes.   |          |          |          |          |          |
| 3. The preliminary screening features appropriately position AI findings as supporting (not replacing) physician expertise in clinical decision-making.                        |          |          |          |          |          |
| 4. The platform addresses healthcare accessibility challenges relevant to the Philippine healthcare context (limited radiologists, extended wait times, resource constraints). |          |          |          |          |          |

| <b>Section 6: Satisfaction</b>   | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. Overall, the AI preliminary screening component performs satisfactorily on the test cases demonstrated. |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2. The speed and responsiveness of the web application during evaluation is satisfactory.                  |          |          |          |          |          |
| 3. The completeness of information provided in the preliminary screening results is satisfactory.          |          |          |          |          |          |

| <b>Section 7: Intention to Use</b>  | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. I would be interested in participating in future clinical validation studies of this platform if conducted with appropriate institutional approval and resources.      |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2. I would recommend that similar coordination platforms merit further research and development for potential use in lung cancer screening (pending clinical validation). |          |          |          |          |          |
| 3. Based on this proof-of-concept demonstration, platforms like this warrant investigation for potential integration into healthcare workflows after proper validation.   |          |          |          |          |          |

| Section 8: Recommendation  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I would recommend this proof-of-concept platform as a foundation for future clinical validation research in lung cancer screening coordination.               |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. I would support further development and clinical validation studies of coordination platforms like this one.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. I would recommend that healthcare facilities consider participating in future pilot studies of similar platforms (after appropriate validation and approval). |   |   |   |   |   |

| Section 9: Trust and Security   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The security and privacy features implemented in this proof-of-concept platform are appropriate for handling medical imaging data.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. The platform appropriately positions AI-generated findings as preliminary screening that supplements (not replaces) physician expertise.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. AI-assisted preliminary screening platforms have appropriate potential to support healthcare workflows in lung cancer detection, assuming proper clinical validation is completed. |   |   |   |   |   |

### ISO Compliance Statement

This research study adheres to the guidelines of *ISO 82304-1:2016* (Health Software — General Requirements for Product Safety) and *ISO 9241-210:2019* (Human-Centred Design for Interactive Systems) to ensure the quality, usability, and safety of the AI-based lung cancer detection system and web application.

All collected information will be treated confidentially and used solely for academic research purposes in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173).

Adviser's Name & Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Validator's Name & Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Validator's Name & Signature: \_\_\_\_\_