

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Non-invasive electromyographic speech neuroprosthesis: a geometric perspective*

Authors: *Harshavardhana T Gowda, Lee M. Miller*

How to read the checklist symbols:

- the authors responded 'yes'
- the authors responded 'no'
- N/A the authors indicated that the question does not apply to their work
- the authors did not respond to the checkbox question

For background on the checklist and guidance provided to the authors, see the [Responsible NLP Checklist](#) page at ACL Rolling Review.

A. Questions mandatory for all submissions.

- A1. Did you describe the limitations of your work?

This paper has a Limitations section.

- A2. Did you discuss any potential risks of your work?

EMG-based neuromotor interfaces may potentially be widely adopted to help individuals with motor impairments communicate naturally. At the time of writing this manuscript, the authors do not foresee any immediate potential risks.

B. Did you use or create scientific artifacts? (e.g. code, datasets, models)

- B4. Did you discuss the steps taken to check whether the data that was collected/used contains any information that names or uniquely identifies individual people or offensive content, and the steps taken to protect/anonymize it?

All data has been de-identified. The sentences used for dataset creation are largely neutral for a general audience. See section 8 (ethical considerations).

- B6. Did you report relevant statistics like the number of examples, details of train/test/dev splits, etc. for the data that you used/created?

We have explained in detail how the data was created, the train-validation-test splits, and the number of sentences. Where necessary, we also report statistical significance. All data and codes are open-sourced. See section 5 (results).

C. Did you run computational experiments?

- C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?

See section 3 (methods).

- C3. Did you report descriptive statistics about your results (e.g., error bars around results, summary statistics from sets of experiments), and is it transparent whether you are reporting the max, mean, etc. or just a single run?

See section 5 (results).

The Responsible NLP Checklist used at ACL Rolling Review is adopted from NAACL 2022, with the addition of ACL 2023 question on AI writing assistance and further refinements based on ARR practice. ACL 2026 used a subset of ARR checklist form.

D. Did you use human annotators (e.g., crowdworkers) or research with human subjects?

D1. Did you report the full text of instructions given to participants, including e.g., screenshots, disclaimers of any risks to participants or annotators, etc.?

See section 4.

D2. Did you report information about how you recruited (e.g., crowdsourcing platform, students) and paid participants, and discuss if such payment is adequate given the participants' demographic (e.g., country of residence)?

See section 8 (ethical considerations).

D3. Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating (e.g., did your instructions explain how the data would be used)?

See section 8 (ethical considerations).

D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?

See section 8 (ethical considerations).

E. Did you use AI assistants (e.g., ChatGPT, Copilot) in your research, coding, or writing?

E1. If you used AI assistants, did you include information about their use?

AI assistants were used for spelling and grammar checks and to review code. They were not used to generate novel scientific content. All experiments were conducted by the human researchers, who also formulated the research questions and wrote the manuscript.