

# **An Agentic AI System for Multi-Framework Communication Coding**

Bohao Yang<sup>1</sup>, BS · Rui Yang<sup>2</sup>, MS · Joshua M. Biro<sup>3</sup>, PhD · Haoyuan Wang<sup>4</sup>, MS · Jessica L. Handley<sup>3</sup>, MA · Brianna Richardson<sup>5</sup>, BS · Sophia Bessias<sup>1</sup>, MPH · Nicoleta Economou-Zavlanos<sup>1</sup>, PhD · Armando D. Bedoya<sup>1,6</sup>, MD · Monica Agrawal<sup>1</sup>, PhD · Michael M. Zavlanos<sup>6</sup>, PhD · Anand Chowdhury<sup>7</sup>, MD · Raj M. Ratwani<sup>3</sup>, PhD · Kai Sun<sup>7</sup>, MD · Kathryn I. Pollak<sup>5,8,#</sup>, PhD · Michael J. Pencina<sup>1,#</sup>, PhD · Chuan Hong<sup>1,#\*</sup>, PhD

<sup>1</sup> Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Duke School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Quantitative Medicine, Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore, Singapore

<sup>3</sup> Medstar Health National Center for Human Factors in Healthcare, Washington, DC, USA

<sup>4</sup> Applied Mathematics and Computational Science, University of Pennsylvania, PA, USA

<sup>5</sup> Cancer Prevention and Control Research Program, Duke Cancer Institute, Durham, NC, USA

<sup>6</sup> Department of Medicine, Duke School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA, Durham, NC, USA

<sup>7</sup> Department of Mechanical Engineering & Materials Science, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

<sup>8</sup> Department of Population Health Sciences, Duke School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA

<sup>#</sup>Kathryn I. Pollak, Michael J. Pencina and Chuan Hong are equally contributed

Correspondence to: Chuan Hong. Email: [chuan.hong@duke.edu](mailto:chuan.hong@duke.edu)

## SUMMARY

### Background

Clinical communication is central to patient outcomes, yet large-scale human annotation of patient-provider conversation remains labor-intensive, inconsistent, and difficult to scale. Existing approaches based on large language models typically rely on single-task models that lack adaptability, interpretability, and reliability, especially when applied across various communication frameworks and clinical domains.

### Methods

In this study, we developed an Multi-frameWork Structured Agentic AI system for Clinical Communication (MOSAIC), built on a LangGraph-based architecture that orchestrates four core agents, including a Plan Agent for codebook selection and workflow planning, an Update Agent for maintaining up-to-date retrieval databases, a set of Annotation Agents that applies codebook-guided retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) with dynamic few-shot prompting, and a Verification Agent that provides consistency checks and feedback. To evaluate performance, we compared MOSAIC’s outputs against gold-standard annotations created by trained human coders.

### Findings

We developed and evaluated MOSAIC using 26 gold-standard annotated transcripts for training and 50 transcripts for testing, spanning rheumatology and OB/GYN domains. On the test set, MOSAIC achieved an overall F1 score of 92·8%. Performance was highest in the Rheumatology subset (F1 = 96·2%) and strongest for Patient Behavior (e.g., patients asking questions, expressing preferences, or showing assertiveness). Ablations revealed that MOSAIC outperforms baseline benchmarking.

## **Interpretation**

MOSAIC demonstrates that agentic, multi-framework AI systems can enable high-fidelity and generalizable annotation of clinical communication at scale. By converting raw transcripts into structured behavioral signals, the system offers infrastructure for quality improvement, shared decision-making evaluation, and equity auditing. As ambient scribe technologies expand across health systems, tools like MOSAIC provide a foundation for transparent, reproducible, and human-guided analysis of clinical conversations.

## INTRODUCTION

Clinician-patient communication quality is a modifiable, measurable driver of clinical outcomes, with specific behaviors (e.g., open-question rate, reflection-to-question ratio, interruptions, response latency, and empathic uptake) shaping trust, adherence, and fairness-sensitive endpoints.<sup>1,2</sup> Evidence-based communication techniques (e.g., 5 A's for smoking cessation, Motivational Interviewing) have been found to help patients change behaviors,<sup>3</sup> and communication-centered workflows that surface adherence barriers enable targeted problem-solving in chronic care.<sup>4</sup> These practices yield downstream benefits, such as improved blood pressure control, modest hemoglobin A1c gains in communication-mediated programs, and lower readmissions with stronger discharge communication.<sup>5,6</sup>

Clinicians and patients often do not spontaneously improve their communication. They need feedback and a chance to practice new skills to improve. To provide feedback, we need to code their communication. Communication coding assigns predefined labels to specific verbal and nonverbal behaviors at the level of utterances, turns, exchanges, or whole visits, so that rich, real-world interactions become analyzable data.<sup>7,8</sup> Using explicit codebooks and decision rules, human coders mark the presence, frequency, quality, and timing of behaviors and then derive metrics, such as counts, rates, durations, and state transitions. Example event-level labels include *empathic opportunities* and *empathic responses*,<sup>9,10</sup> *open-ended questions* and *reflective statements*,<sup>1,11</sup> *interruptions*,<sup>12</sup> and *shared decision-making moves*.<sup>13</sup> Global scales summarize relational climate (e.g., *respect*, *warmth*, *attentiveness*, *flow*).<sup>7,14</sup> The resulting time-stamped sequences support research, training, fidelity audits, and quality improvement.<sup>15,16</sup> Recently, as the volume of recorded patient-provider interactions grows, the need for scalable, reliable coding

has become increasingly urgent. For example, a 10-week pilot study reported AI scribe use in over 300,000 patient encounters involving thousands of physicians,<sup>17</sup> illustrating how AI scribing fuels both the demand and the opportunity for automated approaches to communication coding. However, scaling communication coding introduces significant operational challenges. Manual multi-framework annotation requires unitizing interactions (e.g., utterance boundaries, speaker roles) and juggling overlapping codebooks with precedence rules, driving cognitive load, coder drift, and workflow inefficiencies. Fine-grained labeling requires double-coding, adjudication, and calibration, making it time- and cost-intensive. Consistency is difficult, especially for rare or ambiguous labels: inter-coder disagreement rises with more frameworks, and codebook updates trigger costly versioning and back-annotation. Boundary decisions and label conflicts reduce reproducibility. These constraints highlight the need for tools that can calibrate uncertainty, defer low-confidence spans to humans, and learn continuously from adjudication feedback.

Large language models (LLMs) can generate structured annotations from text, but most existing approaches rely on single-pass prompting without feedback or correction. Embedding LLMs in agentic architectures mitigates this by introducing tools, memory, and goal-directed loops.<sup>18</sup> Extending further, multi-agent systems can coordinate specialized LLM-agents across subtasks, an approach well-suited to communication coding, where overlapping frameworks and rare behaviors must be managed in parallel.<sup>19,20</sup> However, no multi-agent system has yet been developed for communication coding, and developing such a system remains challenging due to the need for dynamic framework selection, conflict resolution, uncertainty calibration, and adjudication-informed learning.

In this study, we developed MOSAIC, a Multi-framework Structured Agentic AI system for Clinical Communication. Designed to meet the growing demand for scalable and reliable

communication coding, MOSAIC coordinates multiple specialized AI agents to annotate clinical conversations across overlapping frameworks, such as empathy, behavior change, and bias. Unlike existing single-task approaches, MOSAIC dynamically selects the appropriate framework for each segment, reconciles conflicting labels, and flags low-confidence cases for human review. It also learns from adjudicated feedback over time, enabling more consistent and transparent annotation. By combining automation with human oversight, MOSAIC offers a practical and extensible solution for turning large volumes of patient–provider dialogue into structured, actionable insights.

## METHODS

We present the development and evaluation of MOSAIC in three parts: (1) data collection, including encounter recordings, gold-standard annotations, and codebooks (WISER, Global, Intervention, Patient Behavior, and Bias); (2) system architecture, featuring a LangGraph-based multi-agent framework, RAG backbone, dynamic prompting, and human-in-the-loop workflow; and (3) evaluation design, including benchmarks, metrics, sensitivity analyses, and clinician feedback. This study was approved by the Duke University Health System IRB (Pro00115358, Pro00108633).

### **Data Collection**

We collected 76 patient–provider audio recordings across two clinical domains (rheumatology and OB/GYN), including 26 for training and 50 for evaluation. Transcripts were generated using an internal Ambient Digital Scribing (ADS) system and reviewed by clinicians for accuracy.<sup>21</sup> All transcripts were then manually annotated by trained coders to create gold-standard labels for MOSAIC development and evaluation.

## Codebook Configuration

Clinician-provided communication codebooks were reformatted for multi-agent use (Supplementary eTable 1).<sup>22</sup> The *WISER Codebook* captures clinician behaviors and empathy; the *Global Codebook* assesses relational quality (e.g., flow, warmth, concern expression); and the *Intervention Codebook* supports fine-grained event-level coding of behavior change strategies (Ask, Advise, Assess, Assist, Arrange). Additional codebooks include *Patient Behaviors* (e.g., question-asking [AQ], assertiveness [AR]) and *Bias*, which flags both explicit and subtle cues, stereotyping, guardedness, rapport mismatch, and trust signals, reflecting clinical power dynamics.

## Proposed Multi-Agent Framework

The MOSAIC framework (Figure 1) employs a LangGraph-based<sup>23</sup> multi-agent architecture to automate multi-framework clinical communication coding. The workflow begins with Preprocessing to segment and batch transcripts, which are then processed by the Agentic Core (Plan, Update, Annotation, and Verification Agents) supported by a retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) backbone.<sup>24</sup> The system securely interfaces with Duke’s Azure OpenAI GPT-4o deployment to preserve patient privacy.<sup>25</sup>



*Preprocessing.* Transcripts from our internal ADS system<sup>21</sup> are automatically preprocessed to ensure compatibility and preserve context (Supplementary eMethod 1). Utterances are segmented with assigned speaker roles and timestamps. Transcripts exceeding length thresholds are split into fixed-length, timestamp-aligned batches to accommodate LLM context limits (Supplementary eMethod 2 and Supplementary eFigure 1).

*Plan Agent.* The Plan Agent coordinates the workflow by processing user inputs (transcripts, codebooks, and prompts) and routing them to the appropriate agents. It sends updated codebooks to the Update Agent, transcripts to the Annotation Agent, assigns subtasks, validates inputs, and triggers alerts for errors (e.g., missing data, malformed codebooks; Supplementary eMethod 2).

*Update Agent.* The Update Agent is responsible for handling new/revised codebooks. When a new codebook is provided, the agent parses and chunks its content, generates embeddings, and rebuilds the corresponding FAISS<sup>26</sup> vector index. The retriever is then refreshed to ensure that the Annotation Agent accesses the most up-to-date coding rules and examples. Once the update is complete, the system routes the transcript back to the annotation process for re-coding under the updated framework. If no new codebook is detected, the agent bypasses the update and proceeds with the existing configuration (Supplementary eMethod 2).

*Annotation Agent.* The Annotation Agent assigns communication codes using codebook-specific agents (e.g., global, clinician, patient, bias). The Plan Agent selects the appropriate agent per task. Each agent initializes a retriever, fetches relevant definitions and examples, and constructs prompts for LLM inference. RAG aligns transcripts with codebooks segmented into semantically coherent chunks (via sliding window), embedded using MiniLM (all-MiniLM-L6-v2)<sup>27</sup> and

stored in a FAISS vector DB. Chunks are retrieved using MMR,<sup>28</sup> reranked with MedCPT,<sup>29</sup> and filtered to retain only those with valid annotation tags, reducing hallucinations and enforcing label alignment (Supplementary eMethod 2 and eFigure 2).

*Verification Agent.* The Verification Agent ensures output quality during both training and inference. In training mode, it compares predictions to gold-standard labels and computes metrics to guide prompt and example refinement. In inference mode, it flags low-confidence or inconsistent annotations for human review. In both settings, it generates structured feedback that supports ongoing system optimization (Supplementary eMethod 2).

*Feedback Optimization Loop.* The Feedback Optimization Loop converts verification metrics into prompt and annotation refinements. For each task, the Plan Agent builds a tailored prompt comprising: (1) system instructions specifying the active codebook, (2) validated annotation labels, (3) RAG-retrieved rule definitions and canonical examples, and (4) few-shot examples from the Example Library RAG, continuously updated via Verification Agent feedback (Supplementary eMethod 2 and eFigure 3). The sentence paired with its surrounding context, human coder label, and agent-generated label were stored in the Example Library as one candidate few-shot examples (collected only from the 26 training transcripts). The examples include both correct matches and contrastive errors, with a precision-weighted policy to reduce overannotation. During training, Verification Agent metrics serve as reinforcement signals to: (1) update prompts, (2) promote high-value examples, (3) prune/reorder those less effective ones, and (4) adapt few-shot retrieval strategies.

## **Evaluation and Performance Metrics**

The MOSAIC framework was evaluated on a combined dataset of 50 transcripts spanning rheumatology and obstetrics/gynecology contexts, with annotations derived from five codebooks (WISER, Global, Intervention, Patient Behavior, and Bias).

To assess the decision-making of the Plan Agent, we conducted a qualitative analysis of its routing performance. We examined its ability to activate appropriate annotation sub-agents based on user inputs and to generate warnings for malformed or ambiguous instructions. Transcripts and prompts representing a range of routing scenarios, including synonymous expressions, vague language, and nonsensical inputs, were used to evaluate robustness and failure models.

To assess the annotation performance of MOSAIC, we computed accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score at both the transcript and codebook levels. Accuracy was defined as the proportion of correctly classified annotation instances out of the total number of annotated instances. All metrics were calculated as weighted averages, where each label’s contribution was proportional to its frequency in the gold-standard annotations. This weighting ensures that more commonly occurring codes have greater influence on the overall metric, while still retaining the ability to capture performance on less frequent codes.

For subgroup comparisons (rheumatology vs. obstetrics/gynecology), we first computed performance metrics for each individual transcript and then averaged them within each subgroup. For codebook-specific performance, per-label metrics were aggregated across all transcripts associated with that codebook to provide a behavioral dimension-specific evaluation.

To assess the contribution of system components, we evaluated four approaches on the test dataset with 50 transcripts. (1) The *Single-Agent Baseline* used a single LLM with codebook RAG, static prompts, and canonical examples, without multi-agent orchestration or verification.

(2) *Multi-Agent Without Optimization* added Plan, Update, and Verification Agents but retained fixed prompts and codebook-only guidance. (3) *Dynamic Prompting* further included adaptive prompt assembly and tailored templates, without verification signals. (4) The *Full MOSAIC* system integrated all components (multi-agent coordination, codebook RAG, dynamic few-shot prompting, task-specific templates, example-library retrieval, and verification-informed feedback).

### **Sensitivity Analysis**

To assess robustness and design trade-offs, we varied key parameters in a series of experiments. We tested LLM temperatures (0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7), balancing stability at lower settings against potentially richer outputs at higher ones. We also compared a single generic prompt template against multiple task-specific templates across sub-agents, evaluating their impact on annotation reliability and contextual accuracy.

### **Cost and Efficiency Analysis**

To assess potential gains in scalability and efficiency, we compared the time required for manual human annotation versus automated MOSAIC annotation. For human coding, we recorded the average time required to annotate transcripts across varying codebooks and domains, based on input from trained coders involved in the gold-standard label generation. For MOSAIC, we measured end-to-end runtime per transcript, including preprocessing, retrieval, prompt construction, LLM inference, and verification.

## RESULTS

We begin by summarizing the dataset, followed by overall MOSAIC performance, transcript- and label-level variability, and a sentence-level comparison to gold annotations. We then benchmark against baselines to assess contributions of RAG, verification, and adaptive prompting. Sensitivity analyses test robustness across parameters. Finally, we present the MOSAIC UI to highlight usability and transparency.

### **Dataset Characteristics**

The training dataset comprised a total of 26 patient-provider transcripts (Table 1a). Clinical domains included rheumatology ( $n = 14$ ) and obstetrics/gynecology ( $n = 12$ ). On average, each transcript contained approximately 18.5 minutes of clean speech and 151.2 speaker turns (median = 141, IQR 97 - 195), with an average of 285.6 sentences (2558.5 words) per transcript. All the 26 transcripts were gold-standard annotated through clinician review and trained coder verification. Across these transcripts, annotations spanned five codebooks (WISER, Global, Intervention, Patient Behavior, and Bias), yielding a total of 271 labeled segments and an average of 10.5 codes per transcript. The testing dataset included 50 gold-standard-annotated transcripts (rheumatology = 33; OB/GYN = 17) (Table 1b). On average, each transcript contained 20 minutes of clean speech, 177.5 speaker turns (median = 145, IQR 98.3–237), 322.4 sentences, and 2871.9 words, yielding a total of 504 labeled segments.

The distribution of annotations varied across codebooks in both training and testing datasets. In the training set (Supplementary eTable 2a), WISER was applied to 6 transcripts (103 labeled turns), followed by Patient Behavior (6 transcripts, 57 turns) and Bias (7 transcripts, 48 turns); Intervention and Global codes were less common, appearing in 2 and 5 transcripts, respectively.

The testing set (Supplementary eTable 2b) showed similar patterns, with WISER applied to 19 transcripts (226 turns), Patient Behavior to 11 transcripts (144 turns), and Bias to 12 transcripts (67 turns), while Intervention and Global codes appeared in 5 (529 turns) and 3 transcripts (358 turns), respectively.

### **Qualitative Evaluation of Plan Agent**

We qualitatively evaluated the Plan Agent’s routing behavior (Supplementary eResult 1 and Supplementary eTable 3). It reliably mapped clear prompts to correct sub-agents, recognized synonyms (e.g., “empathy” → WISER), and handled malformed inputs.

### **Annotation Performance**

*Overall and Codebook-Specific Performance.* MOSAIC achieved an overall accuracy of 93·1% precision of 93·4%, recall of 93·1%, and F1 of 93·0% and the annotation performance varied by coding framework (Figure 2a and Supplementary eTable 4). Patient Behavior coding achieved the highest F1 (95·1%), followed by Bias (94·8%) and WISER for clinician behaviors (94·0%). Moderate performance was observed for Intervention (86·3%), while Global relational quality showed the lowest F1 (83·1%).

*Category-Specific Performance.* Performance remained strong across clinical domains, with rheumatology transcripts reaching an F1 of 96·2%, and obstetrics/gynecology transcripts showing moderately lower performance with an F1 of 86·8% (Figure 2b and Supplementary eTable 4).

*Transcript-Level Variability.* Transcript-level performance variability revealed that MOSAIC consistently maintained high annotation quality across various clinical encounters, with a median

F1 of 0.964 and tight interquartile ranges across all metrics (Figure 2b and Supplementary eTable 4). Rheumatology transcripts exhibited slightly higher median performance than obstetrics/gynecology, likely reflecting more structured dialogue patterns. A small number of transcripts showed performance dips, particularly in recall, corresponding to longer encounters or skewed label distributions.

*Comparison With Baselines and Ablation Variants.* We compared MOSAIC against a baseline configuration and three ablation variants (Figure 3). The single-agent baseline achieved a weighted F1 of 85.9%, while the automated multi-agent setup where the Plan Agent automatically selected the appropriate codebook, performed comparably at 85.7%. Adding dynamic few-shot prompting improved performance further (F1 = 89.5%). The full MOSAIC system achieved the best performance (F1 = 93.0%), representing a relative improvement of 7.9% over the single-agent baseline.

### **Sensitivity Analyses**

We selected 0.3 as the default temperature and evaluated system performance across parameter configurations. At lower temperatures ( $\leq 0.1$ ), the model generated highly consistent outputs, showing limited flexibility (e.g., temperature = 0.0, F1 = 90.2%). Higher temperatures (0.3 to 0.7) occasionally captured additional nuanced cases (temperature = 0.3, F1 = 92.8%; temperature = 0.5, F1 = 91.9%; temperature = 0.7, F1 = 91.7%) but tended to miss certain original content. These results show robust performance, with 0.3 yielding the best balance.

### **Cost and Efficiency Analysis**

We empirically compared annotation time between human coders and the MOSAIC system. Human annotation required 60–90 minutes per 30-minute recording (approximately 20 minutes of clear speech), reflecting 2–3 times audio length and including double-coding of 10% of transcripts. In contrast, MOSAIC completed end-to-end annotation, including preprocessing, retrieval, prompting, and verification, in 2–5 minutes per transcript. Unlike human workflows, MOSAIC supports automated, reproducible re-annotation: the Update Agent detects codebook changes, refreshes the retrieval index, and re-runs the pipeline, enabling scalable and iterative deployment.

## **User Interface**

To support end-to-end use, we developed a secure Gradio-based web interface (Supplementary eFigure 4) for uploading transcripts, configuring coding parameters, and reviewing annotations. Users can select codebooks, adjust advanced settings (e.g., retrieval depth, chunk size), and trigger the MOSAIC pipeline with one click. Outputs are viewable in editable formats (text, .docx, preview), with speaker turns, codes, and references. The interface enables manual edits, logs corrections, and updates the Example Library.

## **DISCUSSION**

In this study, we developed MOSAIC, a LangGraph-based multi-agent framework for annotating clinical communication. It includes a Plan Agent to coordinate workflows, an Update Agent to refresh retrieval databases with codebook revisions, a set of Annotation Agents that apply codebook-guided RAG with rule-based definitions, and a Verification Agent ensures label consistency with humans. Reliability is enhanced by dynamic few-shot prompting from an evolving example library.



MOSAIC achieved strong overall performance ( $F1 = 93.0\%$ ), exceeding typical human inter-rater agreement reported in communication coding studies (75–90%) and matching or surpassing trained coder reliability for many annotation tasks.<sup>1,30</sup> For example, in more structured domains like rheumatology, MOSAIC reached an  $F1$  score of 96.2%. Although variability persisted, particularly in OB/GYN transcripts and Global codes, these patterns mirrored known challenges in human annotation, underscoring the system's clinical relevance. Performance gains were especially notable in challenging categories like bias, where multi-agent coordination, codebook-guided retrieval (RAG), and dynamic few-shot prompting improved recall and label balance. Sensitivity analyses identified temperature as a key factor: while lower settings ( $\leq 0.1$ ) yielded consistent but rigid outputs (e.g., temperature = 0.0,  $F1 = 90.2\%$ ), moderate values (0.3 to 0.7) improved nuance capture (e.g., temperature = 0.3,  $F1 = 92.8\%$ ; 0.5,  $F1 = 91.9\%$ ; 0.7,  $F1 = 91.7\%$ ) at the cost of some omissions. Additionally, retrieval caching and prompt reuse reduced latency by approximately 25%. Together, these findings demonstrate that MOSAIC delivers human-level annotation quality with structured orchestration and retrieval-informed design, offering a scalable and robust alternative to single-pass prompting.

To improve interpretability, we evaluated MOSAIC at the sentence level using eight-turn context. Errors, particularly in Bias and Intervention labels, often arose from limited context, revealing a trade-off between granularity and completeness. While performance declined relative to transcript-level runs, sentence-level analysis revealed precision gains and underscored the potential of audio cues and optimized chunking strategies for future improvement.

Building on these observations, several patterns emerged with representative examples shown in Table 2. In *successful cases*, MOSAIC not only matched human annotations but also recovered missed labels, especially in the WISER and Intervention frameworks. It correctly identified

subtle empathic or reflective statements that human coders overlooked, demonstrating sensitivity to relational and affective cues. However, challenging cases, particularly in the Global and Bias frameworks, exposed limitations of text-only input. Discrepancies often involve categories like Attentive vs. Concerned or Guarded–Open, where distinctions rely on paralinguistic features such as tone, emphasis, and speech tempo. These findings highlight the need for multimodal extensions that incorporate acoustic and temporal features to capture interpersonal nuance. MOSAIC thus serves a dual role: as a scalable annotator and a diagnostic tool that flags ambiguous or voice-dependent cases. This capability may improve transparency and guide targeted human review. Future iterations will integrate audio features and human-in-the-loop verification to better capture empathy, communication flow, and bias-related behaviors.

Several broader limitations emerged. First, the current chunking strategy may not optimally preserve semantic coherence across conversational boundaries, potentially affecting recall. Second, our retrieval pipeline using MiniLM embeddings and MedCPT reranking could likely be improved with newer, domain-specific models. Third, the study’s focus on rheumatology and obstetrics/gynecology limits generalizability to other settings. Fourth, some codebooks (e.g., SDOH, Weight) were included in RAG retrieval but lacked sufficient gold-standard labels for evaluation. The dataset was also highly imbalanced, with most utterances labeled “None,” which may skew metrics and reduce sensitivity to rare yet clinically important behaviors. Global coding underperformed, reflecting its dependence on prosodic cues unavailable in text-only data. Model performance remains sensitive to codebook quality and LLM variability, including hallucinations and sampling effects. Practical constraints include latency under multi-agent parallelism and the need for cache invalidation to prevent stale retrieval. Finally, race and ethnicity data were unavailable, precluding subgroup analyses. Although MOSAIC does not use race-based inputs,

sociocultural and structural factors may influence communication behaviors. Future work should evaluate generalizability across diverse populations and incorporate fairness-aware methods into system design.

Future work will target four areas: methodology, evaluation, generalization, and optimization. We will refine chunking and embedding strategies to preserve conversational coherence, explore reinforcement learning (e.g., joint training, reward shaping) to enhance agent coordination and prompt adaptation, and incorporate multimodal inputs (e.g., tone, rhythm) for codes dependent on relational or affective signals such as Global and Bias. Evaluation efforts will assess whether clearer prompts improve categories like Intervention, test the Verification Agent’s effectiveness, and examine the use of LLMs as judges for converting annotations into decision-support insights. We aim to generalize MOSAIC to additional specialties, languages, and underrepresented codes (e.g., SDOH, weight).

## CONCLUSION

MOSAIC demonstrates that an agentic, multi-agent framework can transform clinical communication coding into a scalable, accurate, and transparent process. By combining retrieval-augmented generation, structured verification, and adaptive prompting strategies, it enhances consistency across diverse coding frameworks while retaining human-in-the-loop oversight. As AI scribes and ambient documentation tools increasingly generate vast volumes of clinical dialogue, systems like MOSAIC provide critical infrastructure to extract structured, trustworthy insights. This capability not only supports quality improvement, training, and research but also enables real-time feedback loops that promote shared decision making and foster high-quality care across clinical settings.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Moyers TB, Rowell LN, Manuel JK, Ernst D, Houck JM. The motivational interviewing treatment integrity code (MITI 4): rationale, preliminary reliability and validity. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*. 2016 Jun 1;65:36–42.
- 2 Pollak KI, Arnold RM, Jeffreys AS, et al. Oncologist communication about emotion during visits with patients with advanced cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2007 Dec 20;25(36):5748–52.
- 3 Lawson PJ, Flocke SA, Casucci B. Development of an instrument to document the 5A's for smoking cessation. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009 Sep 1;37(3):248–54.
- 4 Cornelius T, Voils CI, Umland RC, Kronish IM. Validity of the self-reported domains of subjective extent of nonadherence (DOSE-nonadherence) scale in comparison with electronically monitored adherence to cardiovascular medications. *Patient preference and adherence*. 2019 Oct 3:1677–84.
- 5 Huang X, Xu N, Wang Y, Sun Y, Guo A. The effects of motivational interviewing on hypertension management: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Patient education and counseling*. 2023 Jul 1;112:107760.
- 6 Becker C, Zumbrunn S, Beck K, Vincent A, et al. Interventions to Improve Communication at Hospital Discharge and Rates of Readmission: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open*. 2021 Aug 27;4(8):e2119346–e2119346.
- 7 Roter D, Larson S. The Roter interaction analysis system (RIAS): utility and flexibility for analysis of medical interactions. *Patient education and counseling*. 2002 Apr 1;46(4):243–51.
- 8 Barton Laws M, Magill M, Mastroleo NR, et al. A sequential analysis of motivational interviewing technical skills and client responses. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 2018 Sep 1;92:27–34.
- 9 Malhotra C, Kanesvaran R, Krishna L, et al. Oncologists' responses to patient and caregiver negative emotions and patient perception of quality of communication: results from a multi-ethnic Asian setting. *Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2018 Mar;26(3):957–65.
- 10 Shen MJ, Ostroff JS, Hamann HA, et al. Structured analysis of empathic opportunities and physician responses during lung cancer patient-physician consultations. *Journal of health communication*. 2019 Sep 2;24(9):711–8.
- 11 Miller WR, Rollnick S. *Motivational Interviewing*. Guilford Publications; 2023. 354 p.
- 12 Marvel MK, Epstein RM, Flowers K, Beckman HB. Soliciting the patient's agenda: have we improved?. *Jama*. 1999 Jan 20;281(3):283–7.
- 13 Krupat E, Frankel R, Stein T, Irish J. The Four Habits Coding Scheme: validation of an

- instrument to assess clinicians' communication behavior. *Patient education and counseling*. 2006 Jul 1;62(1):38–45.
- 14 Tanana M, Hallgren KA, Imel ZE, Atkins DC, Srikumar V. A comparison of natural language processing methods for automated coding of motivational interviewing. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*. 2016 Jun 1;65:43–50.
  - 15 Chen Z, Gibson J, Chiu MC, et al. Automated empathy detection for oncology encounters. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI) 2020 Nov 30 (pp. 1-8)*. IEEE.
  - 16 Butow P, Hoque E. Using artificial intelligence to analyse and teach communication in healthcare. *The breast*. 2020 Apr 1;50:49–55.
  - 17 Tierney AA, Gayre G, Hoberman B, et al. Ambient artificial intelligence scribes to alleviate the burden of clinical documentation. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*. 2024 Feb 21;5(3):CAT–23.
  - 18 Luo J, Zhang W, Yuan Y, et al. Large language model agent: A survey on methodology, applications and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.21460*. 2025 Mar 27.
  - 19 Li J, Zhang Q, Yu Y, Fu Q, Ye D. More agents is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05120*. 2024 Feb 3.
  - 20 Topsakal O, Akinci TC. Creating large language model applications utilizing langchain: A primer on developing llm apps fast. In *International conference on applied engineering and natural sciences 2023 Jul 10 (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1050–1056)*.
  - 21 Wang H, Yang R, Alwakeel M, et al. An evaluation framework for ambient digital scribing tools in clinical applications. *npj Digital Medicine*. 2025 Jun 13;8(1):358.
  - 22 Stortenbeker I, Salm L, Olde Hartman T, Stommel W, Das E, van Dulmen S Coding linguistic elements in clinical interactions: a step-by-step guide for analyzing communication form. *BMC medical research methodology*. 2022 Jul 11;22(1):191.
  - 23 GitHub [Internet]. [cited 2025 Aug 31]. GitHub - langchain-ai/langgraph: Build resilient language agents as graphs. Available from: <https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph>
  - 24 Lewis P, Perez E, Piktus A, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2020;33:9459–74.
  - 25 Azure OpenAI in Azure AI Foundry Models - Azure OpenAI [Internet]. [cited 2025 Aug 31]. Available from: <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/ai-foundry/openai/concepts/models>
  - 26 Douze M, Guzhva A, Deng C, et al. The faiss library. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*. 2025 Oct 13.

- 27 Wang W, Wei F, Dong L, Bao H, Yang N, Zhou M. Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers. *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2020;33:5776–88.
- 28 Carbonell J, Goldstein J. The use of MMR, diversity-based reranking for reordering documents and producing summaries. In *Proceedings of the 21st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* 1998 Aug 1 (pp. 335–336).
- 29 Jin Q, Kim W, Chen Q, et al. Medcpt: Contrastive pre-trained transformers with large-scale pubmed search logs for zero-shot biomedical information retrieval. *Bioinformatics*. 2023 Nov 1;39(11):btad651.
30. Imel ZE, Pace BT, Soma CS, et al. Design feasibility of an automated, machine-learning based feedback system for motivational interviewing. *Psychotherapy*. 2019 Jun;56(2):318.

## TABLES

Table 1. Summary characteristics patient-provider transcripts

### a. Training dataset

Characteristic	Value
Total transcripts	26
Clinical domains	Rheumatology (n = 14); Obstetrics/Gynecology (n = 12)
Total speech time	~ 8 hours
Average transcript length	Approximately 18·5 minutes (SD ~ 4min)
Sentences per transcript	Mean = 285·62 (SD = 116·76; range 129 - 517); Median = 272 (IQR 194·25 - 337·5)
Words per transcript	Mean = 2558·5 (SD = 1045·00; range 943 - 4783); Median = 2381 (IQR 1726·75 - 3180·25)
Speaker turns per transcript	Mean = 151·15 (SD = 70·77; range 76 - 330); Median = 141 (IQR 97 - 194·75)
Gold-standard annotated transcripts	26
Codebooks applied	WISER, Global, Intervention (5As), Patient Behavior, Bias
Total annotated turns with labels (from human annotation)	271 speaker turns
Annotated turns with labels per transcript (from human annotation)	Mean = 10·54 (SD = 7·89; range 1 - 31); Median = 8·50 (IQR 6 - 13·25)
Total turns annotated as None (from human annotation)	5819 speaker turns

Turns annotated as None per transcript (from human annotation)	Mean = 223·81 (SD = 101·23; range 70 - 442); Median = 218·5 (IQR 152·75 - 288·5)
--	---

b. Testing dataset

Characteristic	Value
Total transcripts	50
Clinical domains	Rheumatology (n = 33); Obstetrics/Gynecology (n = 17)
Total speech time	~16·5 hours
Average transcript length	Approximately 20 minutes (SD ~4min)
Sentences per transcript	Mean = 322·36 (SD = 167·51; range 67 - 809); Median = 313 (IQR 183 - 412·25)
Words per transcript	Mean = 2871·88 (SD = 1445·57; range 602 - 5525); Median = 2913 (IQR 1518·25 - 3635·75)
Speaker turns per transcript	Mean = 177·48 (range 39 - 376); Median = 145 (IQR 98·25 - 237)
Gold-standard annotated transcripts	50
Codebooks applied	WISER, Global, Intervention (5As), Patient Behavior, Bias
Total annotated turns with labels (from human annotation)	504 speaker turns
Annotated turns with labels per transcript (from human annotation)	Mean = 10·08 (SD = 6·84; range 1 - 31); Median = 8 (IQR 5·25 - 12·75)



Total turns annotated as None (from human annotation)	14683 speaker turns
Turns annotated as None per transcript (from human annotation)	Mean = 293·66 (SD = 167·96; range 38 - 588); Median = 314·5 (IQR 124·75 - 443·75)

Table 2. Representative examples of single-label analysis

Case Type	Codebook	Excerpt (Context)	Target Sentence	Human Annotation	Agent Annotation (MOSAIC)	Notes
Successful Case 1	WISER	Clinician: “Do you have a boy or girl at home?” Patient: “Girl.” Clinician: “A girl.”	“A girl.”	— (missed)	Reflective Statement	MOSAIC correctly detected a Reflective Statement missed by the human coder.
Successful Case 2	WISER	Patient: “Somebody I wanted to tell I was pregnant died before I could tell them.” Clinician: “Oh, I’m sure they know... they’re watching down on you.”	“Oh, I’m sure they know... they’re watching down on you.”	— (missed)	Reflective Statement	Correctly identified Empathic Statement missed by human.
Successful Case 3	Intervention (5As)	Clinician: “Are you currently smoking any tobacco products?” Patient: “I’ve been doing patches off and on and still smoke, but much less now.”	“Are you currently smoking any tobacco products?”	ASK-START	ASK-START	Perfect alignment; correct identification of Ask phase initiation.
Successful Case 4	Patient Behavior	Patient: “I struggle with headaches... I think some of it is from the plaquenil.”	“I struggle with headaches... I think some of it is from the plaquenil.”	Affective Response	Affective Response	Perfect agreement; correctly captured Affective Response.
Challenging Case 1 (Needs Voice)	Global	Clinician: “OK, sometimes you can try some vitamins... magnesium, melatonin, riboflavin.”	“OK, sometimes you can try some vitamins...”	Concerns: 4	Attentive: 4	Both labels plausible; distinction depends on tone and emphasis, highlighting the need for audio input.

Challenging Case 2 (Needs Voice)	Bias	Clinician: “So, a diagnostic test is where you go into where the baby is and you’re getting chromosomes... there’s a small chance of miscarriage.”	“So, a diagnostic test is where you go into where the baby is...”	Rushed: 4	— (missed)	Speech tempo and intonation affect judgment; requires audio for accurate detection.
Challenging Case 3 (Needs Voice)	Bias	Clinician: “Do you think he would be willing to do that?” Patient: “Not really. No, I just have my fiancé...”	“Not really. No, I just have my fiancé...”	Guarded– Open: 4	— (missed)	Requires prosodic cues (hesitation, tone) to differentiate guardedness vs openness.

## FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Overview of the MOSAIC workflow. Input data include user-provided dialogue transcripts and versioned clinician codebooks. Transcripts are preprocessed into structured, timestamp-aligned segments, then passed to the Agentic Core. The Plan Agent coordinates task routing and triggers the Update Agent when codebooks change. The Annotation Agent uses retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) to assign communication codes based on the codebooks. The Verification Agent compares outputs to gold-standard labels and provides feedback, which drives a feedback optimization loop. A dynamic Example Library RAG connects the Verification and Annotation Agents by incorporating adjudicated examples to iteratively refine few-shot prompts and improve annotation accuracy.




Figure 2. Annotation performance across codebooks and clinical domains. (a) *Overall and Codebook-Specific Annotation Performance*. Bar chart showing overall and codebook-specific accuracy, precision, recall and F1 scores for five codebooks (WISER, Global, Intervention, Patient Behaviors, and Bias). (b) *Category-Specific Annotation Performance*. Distribution of MOSAIC’s annotation performance across rheumatology and obstetrics/gynecology.





Figure 3. *Performance Comparison of MOSAIC With Baselines and Ablation Variants.*

Grouped bar chart showing F1 scores for different system configurations, including the single-agent baseline (codebook RAG only, static instructions, no example-library retrieval, no verification, no dynamic prompting), multi-agent with codebook RAG alone, few-shot examples, dynamic few-shot prompting and complete MOSAIC system.



## Supplementary Materials

Supplement to: An Agentic AI System for Multi-Framework Communication Coding

### Table of contents

Content	Page
<b>Supplementary eMethods</b>	<b>33</b>
eMethod 1. Audio Data Transforming and Internal ADS System	33
eMethod 2. Details of The Proposed Multi-Agent Framework (MOSAIC)	34
eMethod 3. User Interface	38
eMethod 4. The Annotation Performance Calculation of MOSAIC	39
<b>Additional Results</b>	<b>40</b>
eResult 1. Qualitative Evaluation of The Plan Agent	40
eResult 2. Qualitative Analysis on Labelling Details	41
eResult 3. Qualitative Analysis on Number of Sentences, Words, and Speaker Turns	42
<b>Supplementary eTables</b>	<b>43</b>
eTable 1. Codebook and representative examples	43
eTable 2. Codebook-specific characteristics of patient-provider transcripts.	44
eTable 3. Representative prompt examples and results of qualitative evaluation of the Plan Agent	45
eTable 4. Overall, category-specific and codebook-specific performance of MOSAIC	47
eTable 5. Qualitative analysis on labelling details	48
eTable 6. Results of OLS regression results for F1 score by department and total number of sentences	50
eTable 7. Results of OLS regression results for F1 score by department and total number of words	52
eTable 8. Results of OLS regression results for F1 score by department and total number of speaker turns	54
eTable 9. Summary across models	56
<b>Supplementary eFigures</b>	<b>57</b>

eFigure 1. Date preprocessing through internal ADS tool and chunking	57
eFigure 2. RAG techniques in the Annotation Agent	58
eFigure 3. Example Library RAG techniques in Dynamic Prompting Strategy	59
eFigure 4. User interface	60
eFigure 5. The comparison of different regression analysis on F1 vs. text length	62
References	63



## Supplementary Methods

### eMethod 1. Audio Data Transforming and Internal ADS System

The original version of our internally developed ADS system has been described previously.<sup>1</sup> In this study, we used the system as the foundation and further refined its components to enhance robustness. The pipeline integrates voice activity detection (VAD), audio-to-text transcription, speaker diarization, and LLM-based structured note generation. During VAD, clinician–patient speech intervals were identified,<sup>2</sup> using a combination of energy-based detection,<sup>3</sup> Silero VAD,<sup>4</sup> and SpeechBrain,<sup>5</sup> with majority voting to extract accurate segments. Clinical audio was transcribed with OpenAI Whisper-turbo.<sup>6</sup> Speaker diarization relied on a voice-embedding and clustering approach via Pyannote,<sup>7</sup> with detected segments aligned to Whisper transcriptions at sub-second resolution. Speaker role assignment (clinician vs. patient) was further processed based on the reasoning ability of GPT-4o<sup>8</sup> with the self-consistency prompting,<sup>9</sup> where the model was independently prompted 10 times using representative utterances for each speaker. The final speaker roles would then be determined via majority voting across the 10 predictions. This process enabled the generation of structured transcripts that include timestamps (1 min per block), speaker roles, utterances, and silence notations.

All processing of our internal system was conducted within either a secure institutional virtual machine environment or local environment to ensure clinical data security and patient privacy. Personally identifiable information was removed or masked, ensuring compliance with standard clinical data governance practices.

## eMethod 2. Details of The Proposed Multi-Agent Framework (MOSAIC)

This system was implemented based on LangGraph.<sup>10</sup> Each “Agent” corresponded to one or more *Nodes* and routing was handled by typed *Edges* based on the evolving *State*.

*LangGraph Primitives.* The LangGraph orchestration proceeds through a structured sequence of modular nodes that dynamically adapt to task state and error conditions. The process begins at the Plan Node, which interprets the input transcript, identifies required annotation frameworks, and determines whether codebook updates or downstream verifications are necessary. If the “codebook update” flag is True, control is passed to the Update Node, which refreshes or augments rule sets and few-shot examples before routing execution to the Annotation Node. Otherwise, the pipeline proceeds directly from planning to annotation. The Annotation Node performs the core workload, dispatching annotation subtasks across multiple agents or frameworks with bounded parallelism, aggregating results, and updating the shared state. If the “run verification” flag is True, outputs are then passed to the Verify Node, where automatic consistency checks, metric evaluations, or rule-based audits are conducted. When verification is not required, the process continues directly to completion. If any node raises an error or produces an “error message”, control is redirected to the Feedback Node, which logs diagnostic information, surfaces user-facing feedback, and optionally triggers corrective suggestions or re-runs. Finally, all execution paths converge at the End Node, ensuring deterministic closure of the workflow and safe serialization of the final state. This design enables modular retries, conditional branching, and human-in-the-loop feedback while maintaining idempotent and fault-tolerant execution across all nodes.

*Data Preprocessing.* After transforming the raw audio data into structured transcripts using our internal ADS tool, the processed transcript text can be used for downstream analysis. Once the user uploads the transcript into the MOSAIC system, it will then perform chunking and segmenting transcripts into manageable units (Supplementary eFigure 1). This step ensures that subsequent annotation tasks operate on semantically coherent and temporally aligned segments.

*Plan Agent.* The Plan Agent serves as the central controller within the MOSAIC, responsible for ingesting diverse input data sources, including audio transcripts, optionally updated or newly

uploaded codebooks, and gold-standard transcripts containing reference labels for direct verification. Acting as the orchestration layer, the agent manages data preprocessing, routing, and task assignment for all downstream annotation nodes. During routing, the Plan Agent maps each transcript segment to one or more relevant coding standards using clinician-predefined coding definitions and logic. In the task assignment phase, the agent determines whether the codebook has been updated; if an update is detected, control is routed to the Update Agent, whereas unchanged inputs proceed directly to the Annotation Agent. It then populates the "requested annotations" state with the selected codebooks and delegates each subtask to a corresponding Annotation Sub-Agent specialized in that domain. Finally, the Plan Agent implements robust error-handling mechanisms to ensure workflow stability, validating input completeness, detecting malformed or inconsistent codebooks, and logging descriptive diagnostic messages in the "error" state. Overall, the Plan Agent functions as an intelligent dispatcher, dynamically coordinating the flow of annotation tasks, optimizing data routing, and ensuring transparent, fault-tolerant execution across the multi-agent pipeline.

*Update Agent.* The Update Agent is responsible for detecting and processing newly uploaded or modified codebooks within the MOSAIC workflow. Upon identifying an update, the agent automatically refreshes the underlying codebook vector databases and retrieval modules to incorporate the revised coding definitions, examples, or rules, without requiring manual system reconfiguration. This dynamic update mechanism ensures that all subsequent annotations leverage the most current and contextually accurate codebook representations. Once the retrieval context has been successfully refreshed, the Update Agent triggers the Annotation Agent to initiate annotation or continue downstream processing using the updated framework, thereby maintaining consistency and adaptability across the multi-agent pipeline.

*Annotation Agent (with Specialized Sub-Agents).* For each segmented transcript chunk and each requested coding framework, the Annotation Agent executes a RAG-prompted large language model (LLM) call that integrates retrieved and reranked contextual rules and few shot examples derived from our training results from the Verification Agent feedback (Supplementary eFigure 2). All the *Specialized Sub-Agents* are executed via Azure OpenAI GPT- 4o. The final prompt concatenates retrieved rules, chunked transcript segments, few-shot examples, and the corresponding label schema. Each sub-agent specializes in a distinct annotation framework based

on a domain specific clinician-provided codebook (Supplementary eTable 1). The WISER Sub-Agent identifies empathic opportunities expressed by patients and classifies clinician responses such as Empathic Responses, Empathic Statements, Sorry Statement, Open-ended Questions, Reflective Statements, and Elicit Questions. The Patient Behavior Sub-Agent captures patient-initiated behaviors, including question-asking and assertive responses that indicate agency or preference expression. The Global Sub-Agent automatically rates relational qualities, such as Flow, Respect, Warmth, Attentiveness, and Concern, on a 1–5 scale for each encounter or dialogue segment. The Intervention (5As) Sub-Agent detects discrete behavioral intervention steps (Ask, Advise, Assess, Assist, Arrange). The Bias Sub-Agent identifies subtle and explicit bias cues, including Judgement, Stereotyping, Tailoring, Interrupting, Establishing Rapport, and Mismatched Rapport, along with broader relational dynamics, and trust or distrust expressions. Finally, the SDOH and Weight Sub-Agent, which detects discussions of social determinants of health, such as financial stress, housing, food insecurity, and safety, as well as weight-related topics and potential judgement language regarding their initiation or framing. This sub-agent was set up in our user interface but was not used during current model testing due to the small amount of relevant data. In our future work we will include more of these data and continue to contribute to this work.

*Codebook Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) Module.* The Codebook RAG module enables contextual retrieval of domain-specific coding rules and definitions from clinician-provided codebooks. Each codebook (e.g., WISER and Bias) is semantically chunked into rule-level segments and embedded using all-MiniLM-L6-v2<sup>11</sup> to create a FAISS-based vector store.<sup>12</sup> During annotation, relevant text segments from the transcript are used as queries to retrieve the most semantically similar rules through a hybrid retrieval strategy combining Maximal Marginal Relevance (MMR) and MedCPT re-ranking.<sup>13</sup> This ensures both diversity and clinical relevance in the retrieved content. The resulting set of retrieved rules and few-shot examples are then injected into the final prompt to guide the Sub-Agent, allowing it to align its coding behavior with clinician-authored definitions and ensure consistency across frameworks.

*Example Library RAG Module for Dynamic Prompting Strategy.* Example Library RAG Module for Dynamic Prompting Strategy. The Example Library RAG provides a mechanism for dynamic prompt optimization based on past annotation outcomes (Supplementary eFigure 3). Verified

examples, derived from comparisons between gold-standard annotations and model-generated outputs, are aggregated and semantically chunked to form an evolving example library. These examples are refreshed through the Verification Agent, which identifies mismatched sentences and corresponding contexts and filters representative examples for retraining or prompt refinement. The refreshed examples are re-embedded and stored in a FAISS vector database using hybrid sparse–dense retrieval to support continual improvement of few-shot prompting. This iterative loop, linking Annotation, Verification, and Example Library RAG, enables the system to adaptively refine its behavior through human-in-the-loop feedback, enhancing both precision and robustness in dynamic clinical coding tasks.

*Verification Agent.* The Verification Agent serves as the system’s quality gatekeeper and Example Library updating manager, operating in two complementary modes. In training mode, it compares Annotation Agent outputs with gold-standard labels to compute performance metrics, such as accuracy, precision, recall, and F1, and uses these as qualitative references to optimize few shot examples in the Example Library. In new transcript mode , the agent performs an independent verification pass, and flags low-confidence or potential inconsistent annotations for clinician review, ensuring continuous quality improvement across the entire pipeline.

### **eMethod 3. User Interface**

MOSAIC provides a web-based graphical interface designed to streamline annotation and verification workflows for clinical communication analysis. The Annotation Panel allows users to upload transcripts, select one or more Sub-Agents (e.g., WISER, Bias, Intervention, Global, Patient Behavior), and optionally provide custom codebooks to override default configurations. Uploaded transcripts are automatically processed through the selected frameworks, and users can view, edit, or download the resulting annotated outputs (Supplementary eFigure 4a). The Verification Panel supports model evaluation against gold-standard references by allowing upload of gold-labeled transcripts. Upon execution, the interface displays computed performance metrics, including accuracy, precision, recall, and F1, as well as detailed mismatch reports at both sentence and label levels. Users can preview the first 50 rows of comparison results directly in the browser or download comprehensive reports (Supplementary eFigure 4b). Together, these modules provide an intuitive, transparent interface for managing annotation, evaluation, and iterative model refinement across the MOSAIC system.

#### **eMethod 4. The Annotation Performance Calculation of MOSAIC**

*At transcript level*, Accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 were computed as weighted averages, where each label's contribution was proportional to its frequency in the gold-standard annotations relative to the total number of annotated instances. Specifically, for a set of labels  $L$ , with  $n_l$  denoting the number of gold-standard instances of label  $l$  and  $N = \sum_{l \in L} n_l$ , the weighted metric is defined as:  $Weighted\ Metric = \sum_{l \in L} \frac{n_l}{N} \times M_l$ , where  $M_l$  denotes the per-label precision, recall, or F1. Accuracy was defined as the proportion of correctly classified instances over the total number of instances. *At the category level* (e.g., rheumatology vs. obstetrics/gynecology), transcript-level metrics were averaged within each category, and then compared across categories. *At the codebook level*, per-label metrics were averaged across all transcripts belonging to the same codebook, providing a view of performance on specific behavioral constructs. It is also worth noting that accuracy and weighted recall are often numerically very similar, this occurs because weighted recall essentially measures the proportion of correctly identified instances across all labels, which is mathematically close to overall accuracy, especially when one label (e.g., "None") dominates the dataset.

## Additional Results

### eResult 1. Qualitative Evaluation of The Plan Agent

To evaluate the behavior of the Plan Agent, we conducted a qualitative analysis of its ability to activate the appropriate annotation sub-agent and to raise warnings when misrouting occurred. We examined transcripts where the Plan Agent flagged text segments and compared them against unflagged portions to understand the conditions under which its routing decisions were accurate or problematic. Representative prompts were used to illustrate performance across a range of conditions. In positive cases, the Plan Agent reliably mapped specialized categories (e.g., *Wiser*, *Patient Behavior*, *Intervention*, *Bias*, *Global*) to the correct sub-agents, even when prompts differed in wording, case, or synonyms. This shows robustness to expression variants and consistency with clear instructions. In negative cases, however, the agent struggled with ambiguous or underspecified prompts, such as “tone,” “sentiment,” “communication style,” or “conversation flow”, which were misrouted to inappropriate agents (e.g., confused among *Global*, *Wiser* and *Patient Behavior*) or flagged as invalid with no routing. Additionally, nonsense inputs (“asdfghjkl,” “Test123”) or negations (“run none”) triggered useful warnings. These patterns highlight the Plan Agent’s strengths in handling explicit, well-structured prompts, noisy inputs, synonyms, and requests involving multiple agents, where it generally produced consistent and accurate routing. However, its performance declined when the target (e.g. clinician and patient) of the instruction was vague or underspecified, leading to fewer correct matches or, in some cases, over-assignment of extra sub-agents compared to the intended standard. This underscores the need for improved disambiguation, synonym mapping, and fallback strategies in future iterations (Supplementary eTable 3).



## eResult 2. Qualitative Analysis on Labelling Details

The aggregated results indicate that the system performs strongly on high-frequency categories, particularly the “None” class, which constitutes most instances and achieves high accuracy (0·95), precision (0·98), recall (0·98), and F1-score (0·98). Major behavioral categories such as “S” and “ASK START” also maintain excellent accuracy ( $\approx 0\cdot99$ ), though their F1-scores remain moderate (0·5–0·6) due to imbalances between precision and recall. In contrast, medium-frequency categories such as “OE” and “AQ” exhibit lower precision ( $\leq 0\cdot45$ ) and F1-scores ( $< 0\cdot4$ ), reflecting more frequent misclassifications. For rare categories with only a few positive instances—particularly those requiring acoustic or paralinguistic cues—both precision and recall show substantial variability, often leading to unstable or near-zero F1-scores. Overall, the system demonstrates robust performance on dominant classes but limited generalizability to minority or context-dependent labels, underscoring the need for additional annotated data and the integration of audio-based features to improve model reliability and coverage (Supplementary eTable 5).

The comparison between human and agent annotations further illustrates both alignment and divergence. In simple statements such as “*Clinician: A girl,*” the agent correctly identified the segment as “RS” while the human annotator missed it; similarly, in “*Clinician: Oh, I’m sure they know,*” the agent marked “ES” but the human again overlooked the label. Such straightforward cases suggest that humans are more prone to missing or inconsistently applying repetitive labels, whereas the agent maintains higher consistency. However, in more complex utterances like “*OK, I’m glad you got the flu shot though...*”, the human annotator assigned both “RS” (implicit thought) and “ES” (explicit emotion), while the agent captured only “RS”, reflecting reduced sensitivity to overlapping affective cues. In other examples, the human flagged “Warmth” or “Concerns” (e.g., “*So she’s doing it for everybody else too, right?*” [*Warmth, 4*]) that the agent either omitted or misaligned. Similarly, stylistic or conversational flow markers such as “*Good. I assume no big gushes of water*” were annotated by humans as “Flow: 2” but not consistently captured by the agent. This type of annotation depends heavily on contextual, prosodic, and tonal features. Collectively, these findings highlight that while the agent performs reliably on explicit, structured, or repetitive communication behaviors, it continues to face challenges in detecting nuanced emotional tones and relational subtleties that rely on multimodal contextual cues.

### **eResult 3. Qualitative Analysis on Number of Sentences, Words, and Speaker Turns**

Across transcripts, F1 performance showed a moderate positive association with transcript length metrics, including the number of sentences, words, and speaker turns per transcript (Supplementary eFigure 5). Pearson correlation coefficients ranged from  $r = 0.41$  to  $0.50$ , suggesting that longer or more interactive transcripts tended to yield slightly higher F1 scores. Consistent with these trends, the OLS models demonstrated that category (rheumatology vs obstetrics/gynecology) was a significant predictor of F1 ( $p < 0.01$ ), while transcript length variables—whether measured by words, sentences, or speaker turns—did not reach statistical significance ( $p > 0.3$ ). Despite the small effect sizes, all three metrics exhibited weak but positive slopes, indicating that model performance may improve marginally with richer dialogue context or longer utterance content (Supplementary eTables 6-8). Taken together, these results suggest that domain differences primarily drive performance variation, whereas transcript length exerts only a minor influence once domain is controlled (Supplementary eTable 9). Since our current transcripts predominantly fall within the range of approximately 150-500 sentences, 1 000-5 000 words, and 50-300 speaker turns, future work will incorporate additional real-world data with broader coverage to further validate and enhance the robustness of these findings.

## Supplementary Tables

eTable 1. Codebook and representative examples

Codebook	Main Focus	Level of Detail	Unique Twist	Example
Global	Overall relational quality	Summary scores (1–5)	Good for simple benchmarking	Flow: [Flow: 4] — “Conversation flowed well, few interruptions.” Respect: [Respect: 5] — “Clinician consistently asked permission before exam.”
Intervention (5A’s)	Specific behavior changes steps	Detailed event coding	Tracks guideline fidelity (e.g., smoking)	Asked: [ASK] — “Do you currently smoke?” Assessed: [ASSESS] — “Would you like to quit in the next month?” Assisted: [ASSIST w/ Sol]— “What barriers might get in the way of quitting?”
WISER	Empathy,	Captures empathy		Open-ended Question: [OE] — “How’s your weekend?” Empathic Opportunity: [EO] — “I’m really worried about paying for this medication.” Reflective Statement: [RS] — “So you’re feeling unsure about the plan.”
Patient Behaviors	Patient agency	Captures patient behaviors	Tracks how patients push back or engage	Patient Asking: [AQ] — Patient: “Is this safe for the baby?” Patient Assertive: [AR] — “I don’t want to take that medication right now.”
Bias	Trust, distrust, explicit bias	Combines behavior counts & global impression	Captures subtle power dynamics & explicit stereotyping	Judgement: [J] — “Oh no. You’re not still eating all that fast food, are you?” Stereotyping: [S] — “Is the baby daddy still not helping out?” Guarded-Open: [GO: 2] — “Patient sounded reserved, hesitant.” Trust: [TP] — “So, you think I should keep taking this?” Distrust: [D] — “But I really think we should do another test.”

eTable 2. Codebook-specific characteristics of patient-provider transcripts

a. Training dataset

<b>Codebook</b>	<b>Number of transcripts</b>	<b>Sentences pre transcript</b>	<b>Words per transcript</b>	<b>Speaker turns per transcript</b>	<b>Total annotated turns with labels</b>	<b>Total turns annotated as None</b>
Wiser	6	Mean = 347.8 (SD = 92.5)	Mean = 3088.2 (SD = 1067.6)	Mean = 215.2 (SD = 88)	103	1619
Patient Behavior	6	Mean = 291.5 (SD = 126.8)	Mean = 2748.8 (SD = 1212.5)	Mean = 131.8 (SD = 37.1)	57	1632
Bias	7	Mean = 276.3 (SD = 102.9)	Mean = 2384.4 (SD = 654.8)	Mean = 134.7 (SD = 55.6)	48	1665
Intervention (5As)	2	Mean = 149 (SD = 28.3)	Mean = 1161 (SD = 304.1)	Mean = 87.5 (SD = 3.5)	37	761
Global	5	Mean = 271.6 (SD = 150.8)	Mean = 2497.4 (SD = 1177.8)	Mean = 156.4 (SD = 77.8)	51	737

b. Testing dataset

<b>Codebook</b>	<b>Number of transcripts</b>	<b>Sentences pre transcript</b>	<b>Words per transcript</b>	<b>Speaker turns per transcript</b>	<b>Total annotated turns with labels</b>	<b>Total turns annotated as None</b>
Wiser	19	Mean = 346.4 (SD = 182.4)	Mean = 3169.3 (SD = 1583.3)	Mean = 188.8 (SD = 103.8)	226	6177
Patient Behavior	11	Mean = 425 (SD = 164.2)	Mean = 3838.6 (SD = 1172.5)	Mean = 240.3 (SD = 94.5)	144	4514
Bias	12	Mean = 270.4 (SD = 120.1)	Mean = 2310.9 (SD = 1072.3)	Mean = 146.6 (SD = 60.7)	67	3105
Intervention (5As)	5	Mean = 196.4 (SD = 106.7)	Mean = 1553.2 (SD = 790.4)	Mean = 101.6 (SD = 54.6)	44	529
Global	3	Mean = 211.7 (SD = 115.6)	Mean = 1885.3 (SD = 714.9)	Mean = 125.7 (SD = 77.5)	23	358

eTable 3. Representative prompt examples and results of qualitative evaluation of the Plan Agent

Prompt	Case	Expected Sub-Agent Routing	Sub-Agent Routing Decided by Update Agent	Verdict	Error Message
Run Bias and WISER	Basic positive	Bias, Wiser	Bias, Wiser	PASS	–
Please run Global	Basic positive	Global	Global	PASS	–
Run Patient Behavior and Intervention	Basic positive	Intervention, Patient Behavior	Intervention, Patient Behavior	PASS	–
Run all	Basic positive	Bias, Global, Intervention, Patient Behavior, SDOH & weight, Wiser	Bias, Global, Intervention, Patient Behavior, SDOH & weight, Wiser	PASS	–
run bias & wiser	Variant expression	Bias, Wiser	Bias, Wiser	PASS	–
RUN GLOBAL AND INTERVENTION	Variant expression	Global, Intervention	Global, Intervention	PASS	–
Annotate empathy and advice	Variant expression	Wiser, Intervention	Wiser, Intervention	PASS	–
Evaluate stigma and prejudice	Variant expression	Bias	Bias	PASS	–
Check SDOH factors and weight discussion	Variant expression	SDOH & weight	SDOH & weight	PASS	–
Only run Wiser	Single agent	Wiser	Wiser	PASS	–
Annotate just Bias	Single agent	Bias	Bias	PASS	–
Focus on patient behaviors	Single agent	Patient Behavior	Patient Behavior	PASS	–
Check obesity coding	Single agent	SDOH & weight	SDOH & weight	PASS	–
Run Wiser, Global, and Bias	Complex prompt	Bias, Global, Wiser	Bias, Global, Wiser	PASS	–
Please run intervention, bias, and sdoh	Complex prompt	Bias, Intervention, SDOH & weight	Bias, Intervention, SDOH & weight	PASS	–
Analyze communication style of the doctor	Ambiguous	Wiser	Global, Wiser	FAIL	–
Check tone and sentiment of patient response	Ambiguous	Patient Behavior	Wiser	FAIL	–
Do empathy coding for this transcript	Ambiguous	Wiser	Wiser	PASS	–
Look at overall dialogue quality	Ambiguous	Global	Global	PASS	–
Just check conversation length	Negative	–	–	PASS	No valid annotation agents found
Evaluate conversation flow	Ambiguous	Global	Global	PASS	–
Check doctor dominance in dialogue	Ambiguous	Bias	Bias	PASS	–
Identify unclear patient responses	Ambiguous	Patient Behavior	–	FAIL	No valid annotation agents found

Review if intervention was successful	Ambiguous	Intervention	Intervention	PASS	–
asdfghjkl	Extreme (nonsense)	–	–	PASS	No valid annotation agents found
Please annotate with all modules available	Extreme	Global, Wiser, Intervention, Bias, SDOH & weight, Patient Behavior	Global, Wiser, Intervention, Bias, SDOH & weight, Patient Behavior	PASS	–
Can you check social determinants, empathy, and overall coding?	Extreme	Global, Wiser, SDOH & weight	Global, Wiser, SDOH & weight	PASS	–
RUN EVERYTHING	Extreme	Global, Wiser, Intervention, Bias, SDOH & weight, Patient Behavior	Global, Wiser, Intervention, Bias, SDOH & weight, Patient Behavior	PASS	–
Please run none of the agents	Negative	–	–	PASS	No valid annotation agents found
Evaluate ALL aspects of patient-doctor communication	Extreme	Global, Wiser, Intervention, Bias, SDOH & weight, Patient Behavior	Global, Wiser, Intervention, Bias, SDOH & weight, Patient Behavior	PASS	–
Test123 !!! ???	Extreme (nonsense)	–	–	PASS	No valid annotation agents found

eTable 4. Overall, category-specific and codebook-specific performance of MOSAIC, regarding accuracy, precision, recall and F1

<b>Category / Codebook</b>	<b>Accuracy</b>	<b>Precision</b>	<b>Recall</b>	<b>F1</b>
Overall (all transcripts)	93·1%	93·4%	93·1%	93·0%
Rheumatology (subset)	96·1%	96·4%	96·1%	96·2%
Obstetrics/Gynecology (subset)	87·3%	87·6%	87·3%	86·8%
<b>By Codebook</b>				
WISER (clinician empathy/behaviors)	94·4%	93·8%	94·4%	94·0%
Global (relational quality)	79·0%	91·4%	79·0%	83·1%
Intervention (5As)	85·6%	87·7%	85·6%	86·3%
Patient Behaviors	95·0%	95·5%	95·0%	95·1%
Bias	95·9%	93·8%	95·9%	94·8%

eTable 5. Qualitative analysis on labelling details

a. Detailed performance of good cases

Label	TP	FP	FN	TN	Total	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1	Support (Number of gold labelling)
None	15363	364	394	165	16286	0.953	0.977	0.975	0.976	15757
Rushed, 3	1	0	1	152	154	0.994	1	0.5	0.667	2
ASSIST w/ Explore	1	1	0	143	145	0.993	0.5	1	0.667	1
S	16	6	12	6262	6296	0.997	0.727	0.571	0.64	28
ASK START	2	1	3	567	573	0.993	0.667	0.4	0.5	5
TP	2	5	0	1039	1046	0.995	0.286	1	0.444	2
OE	28	34	60	6770	6892	0.986	0.452	0.318	0.373	88
ASSIST w/ Solution	2	8	0	326	336	0.976	0.2	1	0.333	2
ASK END	1	1	3	514	519	0.992	0.5	0.25	0.333	4
AQ	23	97	22	6677	6819	0.983	0.192	0.511	0.279	45
EO	8	46	14	5903	5971	0.99	0.148	0.364	0.211	22
ASSIST END	1	0	8	564	573	0.986	1	0.111	0.2	9
EQ	1	8	0	2316	2325	0.997	0.111	1	0.2	1
AR	16	50	110	6143	6319	0.975	0.242	0.127	0.167	126
ER	6	54	14	7121	7195	0.991	0.1	0.3	0.15	20
RS	6	22	51	7794	7873	0.991	0.214	0.105	0.141	57
ES	1	2	12	3700	3715	0.996	0.333	0.077	0.125	13

b. Detailed performance of bad cases.

Most of these poor performances were from Global and Bias coding, indicating the need for audio inclusion.

Label	TP	FP	FN	TN	Total	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1	Support (Number of gold labelling)
Attentive: 4	0	19	0	275	294	0.935	0	0	0	0
Concerns: 3	0	2	0	303	305	0.993	0	0	0	0



Concerns: 4	0	14	0	62	76	0·816	0	0	0	0
Establishing Rapport	0	4	0	910	914	0·996	0	0	0	0
Respect: 4	0	2	0	74	76	0·974	0	0	0	0
Warmth: 1	0	2	0	216	218	0·991	0	0	0	0
Warmth: 3	0	2	0	216	218	0·991	0	0	0	0
Warmth: 4	0	5	0	158	163	0·969	0	0	0	0

eTable 6. Results of OLS regression results for F1 score by department and total number of sentences. F1~Category + Sentences per transcript

a. Model summary

Statistic	Value
Dependent Variable	F1
Model Type	OLS (Least Squares)
R squared	0·488
Adjusted R squared	0·466
F statistic	22·40
Prob (F statistic)	1·47e−07
No.of Observations	50
Df Model	2
Df Residuals	47
Log Likelihood	83·135
AIC	−160·3
BIC	−154·5
Covariance Type	Nonrobust

b. Coefficient estimates

Variable	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	95% CI (Lower)	95% CI (Upper)
Intercept	0.591	0.015	56.935	0.000	0.829	0.889
Department (Rheumatology)	0.0866	0.016	5.422	0.000	0.054	0.119
Length (sentences per transcript)	4.317e-05	4.56e-05	0.946	0.349	-4.86e-05	0.000

c. Diagnostic statistics

Test/Metric	Statistic	p-value
Omnibus	44.456	p = 0.000
Jarque-Bera (JB)	182.050	p = 2.94e-40
Skew	-2.314	—
Kurtosis	11.122	—
Durbin-Watson	1.742	—
Condition No.	941	—

Notes: [1] Standard Errors assume that the covariance matrix of the errors is correctly specified.

eTable 7. Results of OLS regression results for F1 score by department and total number of words.

a. Model summary

<b>Statistic</b>	<b>Value</b>
Dependent Variable	F1
Model Type	OLS (Least Squares)
R-squared	0.486
Adjusted R-squared	0.464
F-statistic	22.23
Prob (F-statistic)	1.61e-07
No. of Observations	50
Df Model	2
Df Residuals	47
Log-Likelihood	83.042
AIC	-166.1
BIC	-154.3
Covariance Type	Nonrobust

b. Coefficient estimates

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Coef.</b>	<b>Std. Err.</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>P&gt; t </b>	<b>95% CI (Lower)</b>	<b>95% CI (Upper)</b>
-----------------	--------------	------------------	----------	-----------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

Intercept	0.8610	0.015	57.000	0.000	0.830	0.975
Department (Rheumatology)	0.0841	0.018	4.665	0.000	0.048	0.120
Length (sentences per transcript)	5.56e-06	5.97e-06	0.847	0.401	-6.96e-06	1.71e-05

c. Diagnostic statistics

Test / Metric	Statistic	p-value
Omnibus	45.095	0.000
Jarque–Bera (JB)	194.803	5.00e-43
Skew	-2.322	—
Kurtosis	11.482	—
Durbin–Watson	1.726	—
Condition Number	8.70e+03	—

Notes: [1] Standard errors assume the covariance matrix of the errors is correctly specified. [2] The condition number is large (8.70e+03), which may indicate strong multicollinearity or other numerical problems

eTable 8. Results of OLS regression results for F1 score by department and total number of speaker turns.  $F1 \sim \text{Category} + \text{Speaker turns per transcript}$

a. Model summary

Statistic	Value
Dependent Variable	F1
Model Type	OLS (Least Squares)
R-squared	0.488
Adjusted R-squared	0.466
F-statistic	22.43
Prob (F-statistic)	1.60e-07
No. of Observations	50
Df Model	2
Df Residuals	47
Log-Likelihood	83.043
AIC	-166.1
BIC	-154.5
Covariance Type	Nonrobust

b. Coefficient estimates

Variable	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	95% CI (Lower)	95% CI (Upper)
Intercept	0.8594	0.015	57.989	0.000	0.830	0.889
Department (Rheumatology)	0.0865	0.016	5.423	0.000	0.054	0.119

Length (sentences per transcript)	7·67e-05	8·04e-05	0·954	0·345	-8·5e-05	0·000
-----------------------------------	----------	----------	-------	-------	----------	-------

c. Diagnostic statistics

Test / Metric	Statistic	p-value
Omnibus	43·902	0·000
Jarque–Bera (JB)	180·461	6·51e-40
Skew	-2·271	—
Kurtosis	11·124	—
Durbin–Watson	1·765	—
Condition Number	521·0	—

Notes: [1] Standard Errors assume that the covariance matrix of the errors is correctly specified.


eTable 9. Summary across models

<b>Length Metric</b>	<b>Coef (Length)</b>	<b>T (Length)</b>	<b>95%CI Low</b>	<b>95%CI High</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Adj.R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Department</b>
Sentences per transcript	0·0000	0·3488	-0·0001	0·0001	0·4880	0·4662	50	obstetrics/gynecology
Words per transcript	0·0000	0·4014	-0·0000	0·0000	0·4861	0·4642	50	obstetrics/gynecology
Speaker turns per transcript	0·0001	0·3447	-0·0001	0·0002	0·4882	0·4664	50	obstetrics/gynecology




## Supplementary Figures


eFigure 1. Data preprocessing through internal ADS tool and chunking



eFigure 2. RAG techniques in the Annotation Agent




eFigure 3. Example Library RAG techniques in Dynamic Prompting Strategy



eFigure 4. MOSAIC User Interface

a. The Annotation Panel

 **Communication Coding Agent**

Annotate medical conversations with codebook-aware agents

Annotate

Verification

**Inputs**

What would you like to annotate?

e.g., Run Patient Behavior & Wisser on this transcript

Select Subagent(s)

You can leave it empty and just use the prompt.

Global

Wisser


Intervention

Bias

SDOH & weight

Patient Behavior

Transcript (.txt)





Drop File Here

- or -

Click to Upload


Advanced Options




 **Start Annotation**

Tip: You can either specify agents or describe your intent in the prompt. If a codebook is uploaded, the workflow will use it automatically.


**Results**

Ready when you are 


Download Original Annotated TXT





Download Original Highlighted DOCX




Annotated Text (Editable Preview)







 **Generate Edited TXT**



Download Edited TXT



 **Generate Edited DOCX**

Download Edited DOCX



Use via API  · Built with Gradle 

60

b. The Verification Panel

Communication Coding Agent

Annotate medical conversations with codebook-aware agents

Annotate

Verification

Upload Gold & Run

Gold Standard (.txt)

Drop File Here

- or -

Click to Upload

Run Verification

Verification will reuse the current transcript/agents/prompt from the Annotate tab. Upload a gold .txt here and click "Run Verification".

Verification Results

No verification (upload a gold .txt to enable).

Metrics (Overview)

Metric	Value
--------	-------

Report Previews (first 50 rows)

All Sentences Comparison CSV

Mismatches

Overall Metrics CSV

Per-label Metrics CSV

1	2	3
---	---	---

Download Reports

All Sentences Comparison CSV

Mismatches (with context) CSV


Overall Metrics CSV

Per-label Metrics CSV

Keep your API keys safe. Processing happens server-side.

Use via API · Built with Gradio

eFigure 5. The comparison of different regression analysis on F1 vs. text length



## References

- 1 Wang H, Yang R, Alwakeel M, et al. An evaluation framework for ambient digital scribing tools in clinical applications. *npj Digital Medicine*. 2025 Jun 13;8(1):358.
- 2 Graf S. Design of Scenario-specific Features for Voice Activity Detection and Evaluation for Different Speech Enhancement Applications.
- 3 GitHub [Internet]. [cited 2025 Aug 31]. GitHub - jiaaro/pydub: Manipulate audio with a simple and easy high level interface. Available from: <https://github.com/jiaaro/pydub>
- 4 GitHub [Internet]. [cited 2025 Aug 31]. GitHub - snakers4/silero-vad: Silero VAD: pre-trained enterprise-grade Voice Activity Detector. Available from: <https://github.com/snakers4/silero-vad>
- 5 GitHub [Internet]. [cited 2025 Aug 31]. GitHub - speechbrain/speechbrain: A PyTorch-based Speech Toolkit. Available from: <https://github.com/speechbrain/speechbrain>
- 6 Radford A, Kim JW, Xu T, Brockman G, McLeavey C, Sutskever I. Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision. In *International conference on machine learning* 2023 Jul 3 (pp. 28492–28518). PMLR.
- 7 Bredin H, Yin R, Coria JM, et al. Pyannote. audio: neural building blocks for speaker diarization. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP) 2020 May 4* (pp. 7124–7128). IEEE.
- 8 Achiam J, Adler S, Agarwal S, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*. 2023 Mar 15.
- 9 Wang X, Wei J, Schuurmans D, et al. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*. 2022 Mar 21.
- 10 langgraph: Build resilient language agents as graphs [Internet]. Github; [cited 2025 Oct 21]. Available from: <https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph>
- 11 sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2 · Hugging Face [Internet]. [cited 2025 Oct 21]. Available from: <https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2>
- 12 faiss: A library for efficient similarity search and clustering of dense vectors [Internet]. Github; [cited 2025 Oct 21]. Available from: <https://github.com/facebookresearch/faiss>
- 13 Jin Q, Kim W, Chen Q, et al. Medcpt: Contrastive pre-trained transformers with large-scale pubmed search logs for zero-shot biomedical information retrieval. *Bioinformatics*. 2023 Nov 1;39(11):btad651.