Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Typology-Aware Multilingual Morphosyntactic Parsing with Joint Abstract Node Modeling*
Authors: *Kutay Acar, Glen Eryiit*

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?
The paper studies multilingual morphosyntactic parsing using existing, widely used benchmark datasets (Universal Dependenciesderived MSP data). The work does not introduce new data collection, user-facing systems, or deployment scenarios, and does not pose foreseeable risks beyond standard NLP research practice.

☑ **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?
The experiments use existing Universal Dependenciesderived MSP datasets, which consist of linguistically annotated sentences and do not contain personally identifying information or offensive content. No additional data collection was performed.

☑ 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 describes the dataset composition, including the languages used, their train/dev/test splits, and the evaluation protocol followed in the UniDive 2025 MSP shared task.

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

☑ C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?
The experimental setup, training procedure, and hyperparameter choices are described in Section 5.3, including the optimizer, learning rate, loss weights, abstract-node loss scheduling, early stopping criteria, and encoder configuration. Hyperparameters were tuned on the development set.

☒ 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?
Results are reported as single-run macro-averaged scores following the official UniDive 2025 MSP

evaluation protocol. Variance across random seeds or confidence intervals is not reported, as the evaluation focuses on standardized shared-task metrics.

☒ **D. Did you use human annotators (e.g., crowdworkers) or research with human subjects?**

N/A 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)

N/A 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)

N/A 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)

N/A D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?
(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?
AI assistants were used for limited editorial support, including language polishing and compliance checks for submission requirements. All scientific content, modeling decisions, experiments, and analyses were designed, implemented, and validated by the authors.