

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Two Streams, One Sarcasm: Orthogonal Expert Tuning for Holistic Multimodal Sarcasm Understanding*

Authors: *Diandian Guo, Cong Cao, Fangfang Yuan, Pin Xu, Cheng Hu, Zhicheng Zhang, Yu Liu, Yanbing Liu*

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?
the footnote in Abstract; 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?
Section 3.1, Ethical Statement

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?
Appendix A

C. Did you run computational experiments?

C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?
Appendix B.1, E

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?
Appendix E

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 A.3

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 annotation and human verification were conducted exclusively by the paper authors as part of their scholarly research contributions. No external participants were recruited, and no monetary compensation was involved beyond standard academic authorship credit. As a result, reporting on recruitment procedures and payment adequacy is not applicable.

- 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 dataset is constructed from publicly available online sources and inherits the data collection protocol of the original DocMSU benchmark. As the data does not involve direct interaction with or recruitment of individuals, explicit consent from the content creators was not obtained. We comply with the terms of service and copyright policies of the source platforms and discuss these considerations in the Ethics Statement.

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

The data used in this work originates from publicly accessible sources and does not involve human subject recruitment or intervention. All annotation work was performed by the authors. Therefore, the data collection protocol did not require ethics review board approval, in line with common practices for research on public data.

- 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?

Ethical Statement