

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *EdgeFormer: Latency-Aware Collaborative Multi-Head Attention of Transformer Inference in Edge Networks*

Authors: *Yiming Yao, Jianwei Niu, Bin Dai, Tao Ren*

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?

See Section Limitations, our work may involve broader risks common to machine learning systems. For example, models trained on textual or user-related data may inherit and amplify biases present in the data. Furthermore, the proposed framework could be misused in downstream applications, such as generating misleading or inappropriate outputs or being deployed in sensitive decision-making scenarios without sufficient oversight.

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?

See Section 4.1 (Experimental Setup). The datasets used are publicly available benchmark datasets and do not contain personally identifying information or offensive content.

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?

See Section 4.1 (Experimental Setup).

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

See Section 4.1 (Experimental Setup), Section 4.5 (System Parameter Analysis).

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?

See Section 4.1 (Experimental Setup).

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.?

Not applicated.

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)?

Not applicated.

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)?

Not applicated.

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

Not applicated.

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 used AI assistants (e.g., ChatGPT) to assist with code implementation and debugging for experimental pipelines. All generated code was reviewed, modified, and validated by the authors.