

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *SciRAG: Adaptive, Citation-Aware, and Outline-Guided Retrieval and Synthesis for Scientific Literature*

Authors: *Hang Ding, Yilun Zhao, Tiansheng Hu, Manasi Patwardhan, Arman Cohan*

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?

Our paper conducts question answering based on publicly available articles on the internet, and currently poses no potential risks.

B. Did you use or create scientific artifacts? (e.g. code, datasets, models)

- B1. Did you cite the creators of artifacts you used?

see Section 4.1

- B2. Did you discuss the license or terms for use and/or distribution of any artifacts?

All artifacts are under the most permissive license, CC BY 4.0, so we did not provide additional clarification.

- B3. Did you discuss if your use of existing artifact(s) was consistent with their intended use, provided that it was specified? For the artifacts you create, do you specify intended use and whether that is compatible with the original access conditions (in particular, derivatives of data accessed for research purposes should not be used outside of research contexts)?

see Section 4.1

- 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?

Our data does not contain any such information.

- B5. Did you provide documentation of the artifacts, e.g., coverage of domains, languages, and linguistic phenomena, demographic groups represented, etc.?

see Section 4.1

- 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?

see Section 5

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.

C. Did you run computational experiments?

C1. Did you report the number of parameters in the models used, the total computational budget (e.g., GPU hours), and computing infrastructure used?
see Section 5

C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?
see section5

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 results from a single run only, as our outcomes are consistently stable.

C4. If you used existing packages (e.g., for preprocessing, for normalization, or for evaluation, such as NLTK, SpaCy, ROUGE, etc.), did you report the implementation, model, and parameter settings used?
see section4

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.?
see Section 5 and Appendix B

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)?
Participants were student subjects who took part voluntarily.

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)?
Participants were student subjects who took part voluntarily.

D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?
Participants were student subjects who took part voluntarily.

D5. Did you report the basic demographic and geographic characteristics of the annotator population that is the source of the data?
see Section 5 and Appendix B

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?
See section4