

Supplementary File 1. Worked Example of the AI Severity-Classification Workflow

The example below is drawn from a study case in the analysis workbook and is presented to illustrate the operational sequence of initial classification, clarification, and final classification. Only fields preserved in the source workbook are reproduced. The original clarification-question text is not retained in the available analysis file; therefore, it is not reconstructed.

Workflow element	De-identified example (case 34)
Initial AI severity	D
Initial AI reasoning	Not retained in the available analysis workbook.
Clarification response 1	"Most probably yes"
Clarification response 2	"Yes"
Clarification-question text	Not retained in the available analysis workbook.
Final AI severity after clarification	H
Final AI reasoning	The patient experienced severe shortness of breath likely caused by a blood transfusion, required continuous medical supervision, and was in a very difficult condition. The urgent transfer and a request not to resort to CPR were interpreted by the system as indicating a life-threatening situation. Confidence: high.
Final adjudicated human severity	F

Interpretation: this case was intentionally selected as a discordant example rather than a favorable demonstration. The clarification step changed the AI classification from D to H, while the final adjudicated human reference was F. It therefore illustrates both the functioning of the clarification workflow and the fact that clarification did not necessarily produce agreement with the human reference.

The RAG reference repositories used by the workflow are described in the revised manuscript Methods. The analysis workbook does not preserve which specific retrieved passages were supplied for this individual case; case-level retrieval content is therefore not reconstructed.