Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Learning to Think on Hypergraph: HyperCoT for Structure-Guided N-ary Knowledge Graph Completion*
Authors: *Mengxue Yang, Jinming Li, Chun Yang, Jiaqi Zhu, Jiafan Li, Guanhua Zhang, Ying Li*

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?
Section limitations , Section Ethical Considerations

☑ **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?
All datasets used are public and contain no sensitiveinformation. No human subjects are involved.

☑ 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 5.1, Appendix D.1

☑ **C. Did you run computational experiments?**

☑ C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?
Section 5.1 , Section 5.5, Appendix D.2, Appendix D.3

☒ 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?
We report single-run results on standard benchmark datasets following common evaluation protocols in knowledge graph completion. We did not include additional descriptive statistics such as error bars or variance across multiple runs.

☒ **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.?
No human subjects or annotators were involved in this work.

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)?
We relied solely on publicly available benchmark datasets and did not recruit or compensate any participants.

☒ 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)?
We relied solely on publicly available benchmark datasets and did not recruit or compensate any participants.

☑ D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?
As the study only used publicly available benchmark datasets and did not involve new data collection or human subjects, ethics approval was not required.

☑ **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) solely for language polishing. All research ideas, methods, models, experiments, and code implementations were entirely developed and conducted by the authors.