

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *MoRI: Learning Motivation-Grounded Reasoning for Scientific Ideation in Large Language Models*

Authors: *Chenyang Gu, Jiahao Cheng, Meicong Zhang, Pujun Zheng, Jinquan Zheng, Guoxiu He*

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 Ethical Statement

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?

B Data Construction and Initialization

- 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?

B Data Construction and Initialization

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

G Implementation Details

- 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?

E Evaluation Protocol Details

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.?

E Evaluation Protocol Details

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)?

The evaluation was conducted by three PhD researchers who volunteered for this task. They participated voluntarily as domain experts and did not receive monetary compensation.

- 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)?

The data annotation/evaluation was performed by volunteer researchers who were fully informed about the nature of the task. The collected data consists of linguistic annotations/judgments and contains no personal identifying information.

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

This study involves expert evaluation of linguistic model outputs. It does not fall under the category of human subject research requiring IRB approval at our institution, as it presents minimal risk and does not collect personal or sensitive information from the participants.

- 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?

A Response Use of LLMs