

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *VocalRep: Structure-Aware Vocal Representations for Multimodal Generation*

Authors: *Da Shen, Zhenqiang Weng, Tianyu Liu, Gongyu Chen, Runhua Shi, Jiahui Chen, CHAOFAN DING, Wei-Qiang Zhang, Zihao Chen*

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?

Ethics 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?

The datasets used in this work are either publicly available benchmarks or legally authorized in-house data. We did not perform additional data collection, and therefore no explicit procedures for detecting or anonymizing personally identifiable information or offensive content were required.

- 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 4.2 and Appendix B.3

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

Section 4.1 and Appendix B.2

- 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 based on standard evaluation protocols and widely adopted benchmarks. Due to the high computational cost of training large-scale separation models, experiments are conducted using a single run with fixed hyperparameters. We clearly state the evaluation setup and ensure fair comparisons with baselines using the same protocols.

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 C.3, Instructions Given to Participants.

- 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 MOS evaluation was conducted by voluntary members of the same research group. No financial compensation was provided.

- 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 paper states that the experiments were conducted on publicly available benchmarks and a legally authorized in-house dataset, and that the authors adhered to licensing agreements and usage policies. It also states that the work does not introduce new data collection of personally identifiable information.

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

The study did not involve private, sensitive, or personally identifiable data. The evaluation only used audio samples and rating scores, so no formal ethics review board approval was obtained.

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?

AI assistants were used only for language polishing and drafting assistance. All technical content, experimental design, results, and final manuscript revisions were verified and completed by the authors.