

## Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Common to Whom? Regional Cultural Commonsense and LLM Bias in India*

Authors: *Sangmitra Madhusudan, Trush Shashank More, Steph Buongiorno, Renata Dividino, Jad Kabbara, Ali Emami*

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?

*Limitations and Ethical Considerations sections*

### 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?

*Ethical Considerations section and Appendix Section A.2 (Study Details). Data contains cultural practices only, no PII. Participants provided informed consent; responses were anonymized.*

- 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 2.4 (Dataset Characteristics), Table 2, Figures 3-4. We report 515 questions, 1,630 region-answer pairs, coverage by domain/region, and agreement statistics.*

### C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

*Section 5 (Experiments) and Appendix Section A.4. We report temperature=1.0, n=30 runs per question, and model configurations.*

- 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?

*Section 6 (Results), Table 3, Figures 5-7. We report accuracy across 30 runs per question and statistical significance via chi-square tests ( $p < 0.001$ ).*

*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.*

**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.?

*Appendix Section A.2 (Study Details). We describe the survey interface, question framing ("In your region..."), and provide URL to the form interface.*

- 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)?

*Section 2.2 and Appendix Section A.2. Recruited via Prolific, compensated at \$8.00/hour following Prolific fair payment standards.*

- 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)?

*Ethical Considerations section and Appendix Section A.2. All participants provided informed consent acknowledging data usage and right to withdraw.*

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

*Ethical Considerations section. Study approved by institutional Research Ethics Board (REB).*

**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?

*(left blank)*