

## Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *REZE: Representation Regularization for Domain-adaptive Text Embedding Pre-finetuning*

Authors: *Seungmin Lee, Jeonghwan Lee, Hyunkuk Lim, Sejoon Kim, Mingi Sung*

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?

*This study does not involve new data collection, user interaction, or deployment scenarios in which the method is directly applied to real-world systems. The proposed approach does not introduce new social or ethical risks such as privacy concerns, safety issues, amplification of bias, or potential misuse. Accordingly, we consider the scope of this work to fall outside cases that require discussion of specific potential risks or mitigation strategies, and therefore did not include a separate Potential Risks section in the paper.*

### 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 obtain all datasets exclusively from established and widely used benchmarks such as MTEB and FinMTEB. These datasets have been proposed, curated, and extensively used by numerous authors across a broad range of prior studies. Given their widespread adoption and prior vetting within the research community, we concluded that additional independent verification or discussion regarding personally identifying information or offensive content was not necessary for this work.*

- 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?

*Section 4.1.1 & Table 1 & Table 4*

### C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

*4.1 & Appendix B*

- 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?

*4.2 & Table 2*

---

*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.?

*(left blank)*

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)?

*(left blank)*

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)?

*(left blank)*

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

*(left blank)*

**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?

*The AI assistant was used only for minor proofreading and phrasing refinements, without generating technical content or affecting the research outcomes; therefore we did not include a separate statement in the manuscript.*