Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *MPCG: Multi-Round Persona-Conditioned Generation for Modeling the Evolution of Misinformation with LLMs*
Authors: *Chong Jun Rong Brian, Yixuan Tang, Anthony Kum Hoe Tung*

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?
Ethical Considerations

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

☑ B1. Did you cite the creators of artifacts you used?
Section 3.4

☑ B2. Did you discuss the license or terms for use and/or distribution of any artifacts?
License and Terms of Use

☑ 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)?
Ethical Considerations

☒ 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 only use the information from publicly accessible fact-checking articles from PolitiFact. These articles includes names of public figures and we retain them as it is without applying any anonymization or filtering. We rely on the sources editorial standards to ensure content integrity.

☒ B5. Did you provide documentation of the artifacts, e.g., coverage of domains, languages, and linguistic phenomena, demographic groups represented, etc.?
Section 3.4

☑ 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 3.4 and 4.1

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.

☑ **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?
Appendix G and Section 4.2

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

N/A 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?
(left blank)

☑ 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?
Section 4.2, Appendix G

☑ **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.?
While the evaluation form included all rating questions, claim context, and scoring rubrics, instructions and disclaimers were communicated verbally to participants and were not recorded in the questionnaire interface. Therefore, we do not report the full text of instructions in the paper.

☑ 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)?
Appendix E

☑ 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)?
Appendix E

☒ D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?
This study did not undergo formal ethics board review, as all participants were recruited via academic networks and no personal information was collected. The data collection involved minimal risk, and participants were informed about how their responses would be used.

☑ D5. Did you report the basic demographic and geographic characteristics of the annotator population that is the source of the data?
Appendix E

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

N/A E1. If you used AI assistants, did you include information about their use?
(left blank)