

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Judging with Many Minds: Do More Perspectives Mean Less Prejudice? On Bias Amplification and Resistance in Multi-Agent Based LLM-as-Judge*

Authors: *Chiyu Ma, Enpei Zhang, Yilun Zhao, Wenjun Liu, Yaning Jia, Peijun Qing, Lin Shi, Arman Cohan, Yujun Yan, Soroush Vosoughi*

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?

We discuss potential risk in ethical statement

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

- B1. Did you cite the creators of artifacts you used?

they are all cited in the paper in all the sections

- B2. Did you discuss the license or terms for use and/or distribution of any artifacts?

we have discussed it in the appendix documenting the benchmarks we used

- 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)?

we follow the intended use of the benchmarks, and have provided discussions in both appendix and ethical statement section.

- 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?

The benchmark we used may contain some offensive content. We have discussed in the ethical statement, and appendix section associated with that benchmark.

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

yes, they are documented in the data set descriptions in appendix and experiment section in main paper

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.

- 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?

It is provided in main paper experiment, and result sections, and in Appendix section A.

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?

yes, we include it in the appendix

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

The experiment setup are described in the experiment section and more supportive information are provided in the appendix

- 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?

The statistics are mostly in Appendix section A, and are included in the Result section from main paper.

- 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?

We document all the implementation details in the appendix with anonymous GitHub link

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.?

(left blank)

- 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)?

(left blank)

- 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)?

(left blank)

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

(left blank)

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

(left blank)

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 only use it for improve writing and grammar check