Dataset: Characteristics of X's (Formerly Twitter) Community Notes Addressing COVID-19 Vaccine Misinformation

Summary:

- The data file comprehensively covers the specific structure of the data as analyzed in our JAMA study.
- The file is in comma-separated values (CSV) format and can be opened with any application capable of reading .csv files.

Columns:

- **noteId:** a numeric identifier of the note
- **topic:** agreed upon note topic annotation
- **sourceCredibility:** agreed upon source credibility annotation.
- **accuracy:** agreed upon accuracy annotation

Annotation Methodology:

After initially reviewing a subset of COVID-19 vaccination notes, all authors discussed open-codes to classify the primary outcomes of the study. These open-codes were refined into detailed annotation instructions with the following definitions for labeling **(Table 1)**.

Table 1: Annotation Strategy	
Topic	
Adverse Events	Notes addressing claims related to specific health events associated with Covid-19 vaccination such as blood clots, myocarditis, sudden death, infertility, syncope, etc.
Conspiracy	Notes addressing claims not related to specific health events that could cause vaccine hesitancy such as unsubstantiated vaccine ingredients, planned pandemic, secret plans, ulterior motives for policy decisions, etc.
Effectiveness	Notes addressing claims about the vaccine's ability to prevent transmission or illness.
Recommendations	Notes addressing claims about who should or should not be vaccinated or which vaccine should or should not be used.
Credibility	

High Credibility	Primary sources like peer-reviewed journals, major health organizations, major universities, and governments.
Moderate Credibility	Reputable secondary sources like major news outlets, fact checkers, and preprints.
Low Credibility	Blog, social media posts, known misinformation sites, and tabloid news.
Accuracy	
Entirely Accurate	Scientifically supported claims (annotators relied primarily on their knowledge of the scientific literature and when needed used primary resources to adjudicate this annotation).
Partially Accurate	Scientifically debated claims (annotators relied primarily on their knowledge of the scientific literature and when needed used primary resources to adjudicate this annotation).
Not Accurate	Scientifically unsupported claims (annotators relied primarily on their knowledge of the scientific literature and when needed used primary resources to adjudicate this annotation).

A full double-annotation strategy was used and took place during 12/12/2023-12/28/2023. Two medical student authors (M.R.A. and N.D.) working under the supervision of the senior author (J.W.A.) and a clinician scientist (D.M.S.) annotated the entire random sample of English language notes (non-English notes were excluded from annotation) that were initially made visible on X (N=205). Annotation label disagreements were reconciled in a meeting where pertinent notes and their annotations were discussed with a senior clinician author (D.M.S.) mirroring standard medical pedagogy. After review, the entire annotation team shared consensus with the reconciled annotations.

Downloading Community Notes data files:

The data for the community notes studied are work product of X and available from X: https://twitter.com/i/communitynotes/download-data.

Identifying helpful notes:

1. File “noteStatusHistory”
    - Column “firstNonNMRStatus” = “CURRENTLY_RATED_HELPFUL”
    - Column “createdAtMillis” x>1670832000000 and x<1702427510949.
    - Save Column “noteId”
2. File “notes”

- “noteId” = “noteId” obtained from “noteStatusHistory”

Identifying notes mentioning COVID-19 Vaccination:

3. File “notes”
    - Column “summary” contains “vaccin”
    - Column “summary” contains “covid” or “coronavirus”

Context:

1. Notes deleted by their authors will be absent from “notes” but present in “noteStatusHistory” causing a small discrepancy between counts.
    a. Values reported were based on non-deleted notes at the time of analysis.
2. Note status is dynamic and can change for 2 weeks after which status is locked. All analyzed notes were initially made visible on X, but not all achieved a permanent visible status.
    a. Note specific view-counts were not reported by X at the time of the study.
        i. Post view counts were reported and were calculated by recording the number of views on the implicated post for all 205 annotated notes when available (x=189).
3. The figure was made by plotting note counts every 7 days from study onset. Week 53 was omitted from the graph for not containing a complete week.