

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *PeerCheck: Enhancing LLM-Generated Academic Reviews Towards Human-Level Quality*

Authors: *Zeyuan Chen, Ziqing Yang, Yihan Ma, Michael Backes, Yang Zhang*

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 paper discusses potential ethical risks in the Ethical Consideration section and also mentions related concerns in the Limitations section.

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 we strip PII/offensive content, and there is no offensive or private data remains.

- 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?

4 Experimental Setup Datasets

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

4 Experimental Setup, Appendix B, and Appendix C

- 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 Human vs. LLM Reviews, 6 Enhancing LLM-Generated Reviews, Appendix D, Appendix E, Appendix F, Appendix G, Appendix H and Appendix I.

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.?

We did not recruit any new participants or annotators for this study.

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)?

We did not recruit any new participants or annotators for this study.

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 OpenReview reviews are publicly posted; by submitting, authors and reviewers consent to public reuse. We ensure no residual PII.

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

The Ethical Consideration section states that this study was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Review Board.

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 used Grammar from GPTs to fix grammar mistakes in our paper, and used GPT to remove redundant sentences and words.