

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *CSPO: Alleviating Reward Ambiguity for Structured Table-to-LaTeX Generation*

Authors: *Yunfan Yang, Cuiling Lan, Jitao Sang, Yan Lu*

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?

This work focuses on fundamental algorithm development for table image to LaTeX code generation. It does not involve sensitive personal data or or safety-critical decision-making scenarios. As such, we do not identify significant potential risks specific to this work.

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?

Section 8. Our table data do not contain any information that names or uniquely identifies individual people or offensive content. We have double checked and confirmed this.

- 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 6.1.

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

Section 6.1 & 6.3.

- 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?

Following the common practices in this field, we report the single run results. We found two runs of testing achieve very similar performance. To save computational cost, we report the results from a single run.

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.?

We instruct the participant with only oral explanation.

- 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 external recruitment or payment was involved. Participants were recruited internally and participated voluntarily without compensation.

- 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)?

Section 8. We collect data from arXiv, using only papers with CC BY, CC BY-SA, CC0, and CC BY-NC licenses.

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

The study does not involve sensitive personal data, vulnerable populations, or medical or psychological interventions. Participants provided voluntary feedback on system outputs, and no identifiable personal information was collected. Therefore, ethics review board approval was not required.

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?

AI assistants were used only for auxiliary purposes such as language polishing and code formatting. They did not contribute to the scientific content, experimental design, data analysis, or conclusions of the paper. Therefore, explicit disclosure in the manuscript was not included.