

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *RSDA: Restoring Stale Data Affinity via Dynamic Renovation Strategy for Mitigating Data Scarcity*

Authors: *Yidan Liang, Jia Zhu, Weijie Shi, Hanghui Guo, Yue Cui, Jiawei Shen, Guoqing Ma, Jingjiang Liu, Qingyu Niu, Yilin Wang, Shimin Di, Jiajie Xu*

How to read the checklist symbols:

- the authors responded ‘yes’
- the authors responded ‘no’
- 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 utilize publicly available datasets (Alpaca, Databricks-Dolly), as detailed in Section Ethical considerations, and do not collect private or sensitive user information. We do not foresee direct negative social impacts or ethical risks associated with this optimization technique.

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?

The work does not introduce direct societal risks.

- 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?

The details are shown in Section 4.1.1 Datasets and Evaluation Metrics, Appendix A Renovation Strategy Design and Pilot Experiments.

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

The details are shown in Appendix B Hyperparameter Sensitivity Analysis Experiment.

- 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?

The details are shown in Section 4.3 and Appendix C The Reusability Value of Low-quality Data.

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.?

No human subjects were used.

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)?

No human subjects were used.

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)?

No human subjects were used.

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

No human subjects were used.

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?

We employ Large Language Models to serve as the scorer and renovator within our framework. Detailed configurations, including the specific models used for data scoring and renovation, are described in Section 4.1 Experimental Setup and Appendix A Renovation Strategy Design and Pilot Experiments.