

## Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Words that make SENSE: Sensorimotor Norms in Learned Lexical Token Representations*

Authors: *Abhinav Gupta, Toben Mintz, Jesse Thomason*

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?

*Yes - Section: Limitations (page 5, lines 287-311). We address demographic generalizability of our single-university participant pool and potential linguistic biases if applied cross-culturally. IRB-approved with minimal dual-use concerns given the descriptive nature of the 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?

*Data consists of word ratings, algorithmically-generated nonce words, and anonymized multiple-choice responses with no free text. IRB-approved with standard anonymization (Section 2.2).*

- 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 2.1, Section 2.2*

### C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

*Section 2.1*

- 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?

*Section 3.1, 3.2, 3.3*

### 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.?

*Section 2.2 describes question format and examples, and full survey is linked in the introduction of the experiments Section 2.*

---

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)?  
*Section 2.2: recruited 281 undergraduate students. Limitations (lines 305-307) notes single university sample.*
- 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)?  
*IRB approval (Section 2.2) included informed consent protocols. All participants consented to data use for research purposes.*
- D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?  
*Section 2.2: IRB-approved study.*
- 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?  
*Claude (Anthropic) was used for searching for literature, LaTeX formatting assistance, writing style improvement, and manuscript editing for grammar and clarity. All scientific content, experimental design, data analysis, and conclusions are the authors' original work.*