

Supplementary Table 1. Comparison of two versions of the benefit and risk items.

Version 1	Version 2
Benefit items	
<p style="text-align: center;">Item stem: As a result of reading my notes,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Response options: 1 = disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = somewhat agree, 4 = agree, DK = don't know</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Item stem: How important is reading your visit notes for:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Response options: 1 = not at all important, to 10 = extremely important</p>
1 I understand my health and medical conditions better	
	Imp1 [Importance of] sharing your visit notes with others
2 I take better care of myself	Imp2 Taking care of your health
3 I remember the plan for my care better	Imp3 Remembering the plan for your care
4 I feel more in control of my health care	Imp4 Helping you feel in control of your care
5 I am better prepared for visits	Imp5 Preparing for your office visits
6 I do better with taking my medications as prescribed	Imp6 Helping you with your medications
	Imp7 Feeling like you have an active role in your medical care

Risk items	
<p>Item stem: As a result of reading my notes:</p> <p>Response options: 1 = disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = somewhat agree, 4 = agree, DK = don't know</p>	<p>Item stem: None</p> <p>Response options: 1 = not at all worried/concerned/confusing, to 10 = extremely worried/concerned/confusing*</p>
1 I worry more	Risk1 How much did you worry about your health after reading your visit notes
2 I am concerned about my privacy	Risk2 Now that the office visit notes are available online, how concerned are you about privacy
3 The notes are more confusing than helpful	Risk3 How confusing were the office visit notes
4 I felt offended	

* Response scale was reverse coded for analysis

Supplementary Table 2. The results of the EFAs for Study 2 and 3, factor loadings and Cronbach's alphas.

Item #	How important is reading your visit notes for:	Study 2 (BIDMC/ GHS)		Study 3 (UW)	
		Factor Loading	Cronbach's Alpha	Factor Loading	Cronbach's alpha
			N=392		N=243
Benefit Factor					
Imp2	Taking care of your health	.78		.84	
Imp3	Remembering the plan for your care	.72		.82	
Imp4	Helping you feel in control of your care	.75		.90	
Imp5	Preparing for your office visits	.74		.71	
			.83		.88
Risk Factor					
Risk1	How much did you worry about your health after reading your visit notes	.56		.49	
Risk2	Now that the office visit notes are available online, how concerned are you about privacy	.37		.26	
Risk3	How confusing were the office visit notes	.74		.39	
			.52		.30

Supplementary Table 3. Study 4: Item means, standard deviations (SD) and correlation coefficients for Geisinger sample

Item	Mean	SD	Correlation Coefficient*		
			Imp3	Imp4	Imp5
Imp2	8.61	1.95	.70	.76	.53
Imp3	8.22	2.22		.72	.56
Imp4	8.59	1.93			.59
Imp5	7.76	2.50			n/a

Note. N=228

*Pearson Correlation Coefficients; all correlations, $p = 0.001$.

Supplementary Table 4. A summary of goodness of fit statistics for testing three levels of invariance across high and low educational groups

Model		X2	df	Delta X2	Delta df	P for X2	CFI	Delta CFI	decision
1. Configural model		4.895	4	---	---	.298	.999	---	---
2. Measurement model	1 v. 2	5.429	7	0.53	3	.911	1.000	.001	accept
3. Structural Model	1 v. 3	15.625	8	10.73	4	.03	.993	-.006	accept

Note. Samples included confirmatory sample from UW Study 3 and Geisinger sample from Study 4; X2 = chi-squared, df = degrees of freedom; delta = difference in number of df between models; CFI = confirmatory fit index.

Accept = delta CFI meets criterion of <.01 cut point¹³