

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Thinking Beyond the Local: Multi-View Instructed Adaptive Reasoning in KG-Enhanced LLMs*
Authors: *Minghan Zhang, Shu Zhao, Zhen Yang, Hongsheng Wu, Yongxing Lin, Haodong Zou, Jie Chen, Zhen Duan*

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?

No, this work does not involve any significant ethical, safety, or societal risks. The research is theoretical/fundamental in nature and does not involve human subjects, hazardous materials, or sensitive data that could pose risks. Therefore, a discussion of potential risks was not applicable.

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

- B1. Did you cite the creators of artifacts you used?

4.1

- B2. Did you discuss the license or terms for use and/or distribution of any artifacts?

No licensed artifacts were used in this study. All data, code, and materials were independently generated or obtained from public-domain sources without restrictive licensing requirements. Therefore, a discussion of licenses was not applicable.

- B3. Did you discuss if your use of existing artifact(s) was consistent with their intended use, provided that it was specified? For the artifacts you create, do you specify intended use and whether that is compatible with the original access conditions (in particular, derivatives of data accessed for research purposes should not be used outside of research contexts)?

4

- 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?

No, this study did not involve any data containing personally identifiable information (PII) or offensive content.

- B5. Did you provide documentation of the artifacts, e.g., coverage of domains, languages, and linguistic phenomena, demographic groups represented, etc.?

No, the artifacts used in this study (e.g., [Tool/Dataset Name]) are widely adopted in the field, and their comprehensive documentation (e.g., domains, languages, demographics) is already provided by the original sources. Our methodology section references these sources for reproducibility.

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.

- 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?
4.1
- C. Did you run computational experiments?**
- C1. Did you report the number of parameters in the models used, the total computational budget (e.g., GPU hours), and computing infrastructure used?
4.1
- C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?
4.1
- 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?
4.3
- C4. If you used existing packages (e.g., for preprocessing, for normalization, or for evaluation, such as NLTK, SpaCy, ROUGE, etc.), did you report the implementation, model, and parameter settings used?
4.1
- 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. No participants were involved, and only publicly available datasets 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 participants were recruited for this work. The project did not involve human subjects directly; it relied entirely on pre-existing datasets that do not involve compensation or active recruitment.
- 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)?
Consent was not obtained because the data used in this project is publicly available and anonymized, and it was originally released under terms that permit reuse for research purposes. Therefore, additional consent was not required.
- D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?
No ethics review board approval was required because this study did not involve any direct interaction with human subjects.
- D5. Did you report the basic demographic and geographic characteristics of the annotator population that is the source of the data?
The demographic and geographic characteristics of the annotators are not available, as the dataset was obtained from a third-party public source which did not provide this information. Therefore, we were unable to report these details.
- 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?
Section 4.1 briefly describes the large language models. Specifically, large language models were employed in conjunction with a knowledge graph for reasoning tasks, which is part of the core

methodology of this paper. Additionally, an AI assistant was used to improve the grammar and clarity of the English writing during manuscript preparation.