

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Q2EI: Query-to-Entity Inference for Semantic Condensation in Domain-Specific Retrieval*

Authors: *Yixuan Sun, Zhenqin Xu, HanFeng Zhai, Zishu Yu, Xiaohui Peng*

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?
Limitations

☒ 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 4.1 and Appendix B. The paper describes the data construction process, including synthetic query generation and manual review, and confirms that no personally identifying information is included.

☒ 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 and Section 5

☒ C. Did you run computational experiments?

☒ C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?
Section 4 and Section 5

☒ 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?
Section 4 and Section 5

☒ 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.?
The study does not involve human participants or annotators.

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)?

No external participants were recruited, and no financial compensation was involved.

☐ N/A 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)?

All datasets used in this work are publicly available benchmark datasets.

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

This study does not involve human subjects or the collection of personal data and therefore does not require ethics board approval.

☒ **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?

Assistance purely with the language of the paper. This covers models used for paraphrasing or polishing the authors original content, rather than for suggesting new contentsimilar to tools like grammar checkers, spell checkers, dictionaries, and synonym tools. The use of tools that only assist with proofreading, like grammar or spell checkers, does not need to be disclosed.