**Epistemic Annotation Guidelines Supplemental Notes for Tricky Scenarios 3/23/20 updated 3/01/21**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lexical Cue/Situation** | **Trick** |
| Model | Only annotate when there is some uncertainty about the model |
| Headers! | Only annotate when it is a complete sentence and/or it includes the subject/scope |
| Transition words | Annotate the full sentence with them included to be able to see the connection with the previous sentence |
| May | Do not annotate when it can be replaced with can |
| Has been/have been | Use judiciously – mark if it is the only cue in the sentence, otherwise delete |
| Compound words | Generally, do not mark |
| Model | Do not mark statistical models, only hypotheses and theories |
| Due to | Mark as problem/complication |
| Differences | Difficult task mainly but can also be alternative\_options\_controvery |
| Can | Annotate to incomplete evidence when it can be replaced with may |
| Problem/Complication | Excludes statements of medical complications, but includes complications caused by the research study that need to be resolved. Medical complications should go to important consideration |
| However | If disagreement or multiple options put it to alternative\_options\_controversy, otherwise if the statement is surprising given the previous statement use anomaly\_curious\_finding |
| Will | Research protocols – do not mark “will” if methodological statements. Generally mark will if a true future prediction about the state of research. |
| Questions\_answesred\_by\_this\_work | Use in results/discussion statements about the specific work in question, pay attention to whether it is a main objective or goal |
| Potential confounders | If included in models and adjusting for them, do not mark. Only if stating new information for future research |
| Found/showed | Mark if the authors are generalizing to say “the studies showed…” because it is about the research and you could replace it with “suggest” to fall under incomplete evidence. |
| Health vs Analyses Problems | Health problems should be annotated to important\_consideration, but analyses/methodology problems should be annotated to problem\_complication |
| Estimate/ed/es | If estimating a research value then mark this as uncertainty about the estimation, but if it is about a methodology estimate then it is not ignorance. |
| This | Question\_answered\_by\_this\_work if it refers to the overall goal or aim of the paper, not a result answering the question |
| Important\_consideration | Anything that should be considered important and needs more work or evidence |
| As |  |
| But/while/however | If you can replace it with “and” delete it |
| Leads/ lead to | If it is in the background, it is more likely probable understanding, but if it is not, it is most likely superficial relationship. Also, if it is a cause-and-effect relationship – most likely probable understanding |
| Difficult task vs. problem/complication | **Difficult task** is used if the sentence is discussing how difficult something is/ there is a hurdle you have to get over with a new innovation  **Problem/complication** is more about an issue with a study, a medical complication, etc. with no mention of the difficulty of how to overcome it/ you want to triage the situation |
| Similar/consistent | Think about what is similar: if it’s the variables then a **superficial relationship** (within a study), otherwise most likely it should be **incomplete evidence** comparing methods/results/general studies (comparing studies) |
|  |  |