

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *LCMA-SRT: Language-Conditional Mixture-of-Experts Adapters for Joint Multilingual Speech Recognition and Translation*

Authors: *Nanjie Li, Xiaoyong Guo, Hao Huang, Xu Haihua, Wei Shi*

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?

We include a dedicated Limitations section, but we do not separately discuss broader societal or misuse risks of the work beyond its technical limitations.

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?

We use the public Europarl-ST benchmark and do not collect or create new data in this work. The paper does not include a dedicated discussion of PII/offensive-content screening or anonymization procedures.

- 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?

3.1 Experimental setup

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

2.4 MoE Entropy Regularization

- 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?

3.2 Main 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.?

Not applicable. This work does not recruit or instruct participants or annotators.

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)?

Not applicable. This work does not recruit or pay participants or annotators.

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)?

Not applicable. This work uses a public benchmark and does not collect new data from participants.

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

Not applicable. This work does not involve a new human-subject study or new data collection protocol requiring ethics review.

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?

Not applicable. This work did not use AI assistants.