Appendix 3

Appendix 3(1)

For example, in Fig 3, the S text for patient 01 and the S text for patient 02 belonged to the endocrinology department, and these two texts were shown to the workers as one task. The A/P texts of patients 01, 02, and 03 also belonged to the endocrinology department, and these three texts were shown to the workers as another task.

Appendix 3(2)

The decomposed medical notes of each type were randomly arranged into 130 tasks. The details of 130 tasks are as follows; one text was shown to each worker in each of the 43 tasks. Two texts were shown to each worker in each of the 44 tasks. Three texts were shown to each worker in each of the 43 tasks.

The details of the definitions of the number of tasks or crowd worker are as follows:

In all, the tasks add up to 130 $(43 + 44 + 43)$ tasks, and the total number of notes, equaled 260 $(43 \times 1 + 44 \times 2 + 43 \times 3)$.

$(35 \text{ workers}) \times 20 \text{ tasks}/130 \text{ tasks} = 5.38$ workers, therefore, approximately five workers, on average, completed each task.

Appendix 3(3)

For example, an imitated text containing S data based on two S texts of patients 01 and 02, an imitated text containing O data based on one O text of patient 01, and an imitated

text containing A/P data based on three A/P texts of patients 01, 02, and 03 were recomposed because these three imitated texts were based on the same patient (patient 01). If any of the S, O, or A/P texts were missing for a patient (e.g., the imitated O texts based on patient 02 were missing), only the existing imitated texts were recomposed.