DeepSeek

All items are rated on a **5-point Likert scale** unless otherwise indicated:
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.
Section A. **Content Accuracy and Reliability**

1. The hazards identified by the system are **factually grounded in the scene description**. **4**

2. The analysis includes the **most critical hazards** relevant to the task and environment. **4**

3. The **severity and likelihood ratings** are reasonable and consistent with the hazards described. **4**

4. The analysis avoids mentioning **hazards not supported by the scene context** (hallucinations). **4**

5. The hazard list is **non-redundant** (few repeated or duplicate entries). **4**

Section B. **Explanation Quality**

6. Explanations are **specific to the scene context**, referencing concrete objects and spatial relations. **3**

7. Explanations provide a **causal or temporal account** (e.g., preconditions or sequences that could lead to the hazard). **4**

8. The outputs include **clear and actionable safeguards or instructions**. **4**

9. The hazard descriptions are **concise and free of irrelevant details**. **3**

10. The explanation structure makes it **easy to follow the reasoning process** of the system. **3**

Section C. **Trust and Usability**

11. I would find this hazard analysis **useful for supporting safety assessment** in assistive robotics. **3**

12. The outputs are **easy to interpret and understand** without further clarification. **3**

13. I would feel **confident relying on these results** in a real hazard analysis task. **3**

14. The system provides a **balanced level of detail**, neither overwhelming nor superficial. **4**

Section D. **Open Feedback**

(Free-text responses; supports qualitative analysis)

15. What did you find **most useful** about this hazard analysis output?

It gave a very complete list of hazards and safety points. The explanations after the table made sense and connected clearly to the risks.

16. What did you find **least useful or problematic**?

The table itself looked heavy and text-dense, so it was tiring to read. Some sentences used very technical.

17. What **improvements** would make the outputs more reliable and usable for safety analysis?

Simplify the writing and use shorter phrases.

Grok

All items are rated on a **5-point Likert scale** unless otherwise indicated:
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.
Section A. **Content Accuracy and Reliability**

1. The hazards identified by the system are **factually grounded in the scene description**. **5**

2. The analysis includes the **most critical hazards** relevant to the task and environment. **5**

3. The **severity and likelihood ratings** are reasonable and consistent with the hazards described. **4**

4. The analysis avoids mentioning **hazards not supported by the scene context** (hallucinations). **4**

5. The hazard list is **non-redundant** (few repeated or duplicate entries). **4**

Section B. **Explanation Quality**

6. Explanations are **specific to the scene context**, referencing concrete objects and spatial relations. **4**

7. Explanations provide a **causal or temporal account** (e.g., preconditions or sequences that could lead to the hazard). **4**

8. The outputs include **clear and actionable safeguards or instructions**. **4**

9. The hazard descriptions are **concise and free of irrelevant details**. **3**

10. The explanation structure makes it **easy to follow the reasoning process** of the system. **3**

Section C. **Trust and Usability**

11. I would find this hazard analysis **useful for supporting safety assessment** in assistive robotics. **3**

12. The outputs are **easy to interpret and understand** without further clarification. **3**

13. I would feel **confident relying on these results** in a real hazard analysis task. **3**

14. The system provides a **balanced level of detail**, neither overwhelming nor superficial. **3**

Section D. **Open Feedback**

(Free-text responses; supports qualitative analysis)

15. What did you find **most useful** about this hazard analysis output?

The model listed a lot of hazards and explained each with clear risk ratings. The column structure looked neat and well aligned, which helped a bit with reading. (Grok had the clearest table structure out of the 3 models)

16. What did you find **least useful or problematic**?

Even though it was structured, it was still extremely long and packed with technical detail like coordinates and measurements.

17. What **improvements** would make the outputs more reliable and usable for safety analysis?

Keep the neat column format but shorten each description.

GPT 5

All items are rated on a **5-point Likert scale** unless otherwise indicated:
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.
Section A. **Content Accuracy and Reliability**

1. The hazards identified by the system are **factually grounded in the scene description**. **5**

2. The analysis includes the **most critical hazards** relevant to the task and environment. **5**

3. The **severity and likelihood ratings** are reasonable and consistent with the hazards described. **5**

4. The analysis avoids mentioning **hazards not supported by the scene context** (hallucinations). **4**

5. The hazard list is **non-redundant** (few repeated or duplicate entries). **5**

Section B. **Explanation Quality**

6. Explanations are **specific to the scene context**, referencing concrete objects and spatial relations. **4**

7. Explanations provide a **causal or temporal account** (e.g., preconditions or sequences that could lead to the hazard). **4**

8. The outputs include **clear and actionable safeguards or instructions**. **5**

9. The hazard descriptions are **concise and free of irrelevant details**. **4**

10. The explanation structure makes it **easy to follow the reasoning process** of the system. **4**

Section C. **Trust and Usability**

11. I would find this hazard analysis **useful for supporting safety assessment** in assistive robotics. **4**

12. The outputs are **easy to interpret and understand** without further clarification. **4**

13. I would feel **confident relying on these results** in a real hazard analysis task. **4**

14. The system provides a **balanced level of detail**, neither overwhelming nor superficial. **4**

Section D. **Open Feedback**

(Free-text responses; supports qualitative analysis)

15. What did you find **most useful** about this hazard analysis output?

The explanations were straightforward and easy to follow. It felt the most natural and human in tone, and the summary sections were clear about why each hazard mattered. (GPT 5 gave the clearest reasoning out of the 3 models)

16. What did you find **least useful or problematic**?

The layout of the table looked messy. Columns didn’t line up properly, and some sentences wrapped strangely, so even though it read well, it looked disorganized. The text also repeated itself a little.

17. What **improvements** would make the outputs more reliable and usable for safety analysis?

Fix the table spacing and alignment. Otherwise, the flow of information and clarity were very good.