

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Beyond Benchmarks: A Capability-Based Maturity Model for Systematic AI Integration in Hospitals*

Authors: *Rui Li, XIAOFEN WU, Mingqian Liu, Xiaoxia Song, Xu Xiangjun, Jiacheng qiao, Zhuang Boqin, Xu Chen*

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?
(left blank)

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

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?
A Dataset Statistics and Scenario Definitions

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

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?
5.1 Experimental Setup

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.?
Ethical Considerations

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.

- 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)?

This study utilizes retrospective clinical data collected from internal hospital systems and standard academic benchmarks. We did not recruit or pay any external human participants (e.g., via crowdsourcing platforms). Regarding demographic representation, the proprietary clinical data used in this study is exclusively sourced from medical institutions in China.

- 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

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

Ethical Considerations

- 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?

We utilized AI assistants for limited auxiliary tasks during the preparation of this manuscript. Specifically, AI tools were used for: 1) grammatical error correction and polishing of specific paragraphs to improve clarity; 2) assisting with LaTeX formatting for tables; and 3) generating Python scripts for data visualization (e.g., the radar chart). All scientific concepts, experimental designs, data analysis, and the final verification of the text were exclusively performed by the human authors.