

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Read the Room, Read the Image: Understanding Indirect Speech Acts in Multimodal Visual Contexts*

Authors: *Jaehee Kim, Ji Hoon Chung, Seoyoon Park, Unsol Kim, Kyungwon Park, JiHak Kim, Yi-Jun Chen, Hansaem Kim*

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?
(left blank)

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?
(left blank)

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 3.3 (Data Statistics).

C. Did you run computational experiments?

C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?
See Section 4 (Evaluation Setup).

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 5 (Results)

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.?
See Appendix A (Experimental Procedures and Materials). The full text of the instructions provided to participants, including the informed consent form, disclaimers, and screenshots of the experimental interface, is provided in this section.

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.

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)?

See Section 3.1.1

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)?

Yes. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection. Participants were clearly informed of the study's purpose, the nature of the data collected, and that their anonymized data would be used exclusively for academic research and publication. See Section 3.2 (Participant Recruitment and Ethics) for further details.

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

The study was conducted in accordance with our institutional ethical guidelines. Formal IRB approval was not required because the data collection involved minimal risk, did not involve any personal or sensitive information that could identify individuals, and consisted of non-interventional, voluntary participation. All participants provided informed consent, and their anonymity was strictly preserved throughout the process.

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?

(left blank)