

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Lemmatization of Polish Multi-word Expressions*

Authors: *Magdalena Krl, Aleksander Smywiski-Pohl, Zbigniew Kaleta, Pawe Lewkowicz*

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?
7

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

B1. Did you cite the creators of artifacts you used?
2, 4, 5

B2. Did you discuss the license or terms for use and/or distribution of any artifacts?
2, 4, 5

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 did not discuss whether our use of existing datasets or models matched their intended use, nor did we specify intended use or usage restrictions for the new datasets or models we created.

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?
We did not discuss checking the datasets for personally identifiable information or offensive content, nor any steps for anonymization or protection. We used Wikipedia data and place names that are used officially.

B5. Did you provide documentation of the artifacts, e.g., coverage of domains, languages, and linguistic phenomena, demographic groups represented, etc.?
We did not provide detailed documentation of the artifacts we created such as domain coverage, represented languages or demographic groups. We investigated Polish language, so we tried to cover place names and proper names, as well as regular words.

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?
2, 3, 4

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?
5

- C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?
5

- 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?
5. *We clearly stated that we report the best values achieved on the validation set (and, for selected models, on the test set). However, we did not provide error bars, variance measures, or averages over multiple runs only the single best results from our experime*

- 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?
5

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.?
Annotation was defining proper inflection, that was the only rule we applied.

- 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)?
We did the annotation ourselves.

- 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)?
Annotation was defining proper inflection, that was the only rule we applied.

- D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?
All datasets we used were pre-existing (PolEval 2019 data and Wikipedia-derived links patrialy) and already annotated, so no new human annotation or research with human subjects was required, we were working on erasing duplicates and wrong inflection. We didn't have a Review Board during this research.

- 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 used spell checker and grammar AI tool Grammarly.