

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *EMA: An Episodic Memory Agent for Efficient and Selective Memory*

Authors: *Hongyi Lan, Jiaqi Song, Zhengjia Zhong, Hui Li, Hong Liu, Xianming Lin, Rongrong Ji*

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?

We are studying memory mechanism in the experimental environment. It is unlikely that there is any risk.

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?

We use public benchmarks for this work. Benchmarks have been used in various existing works and it is unlikely that the data contains personally identifying info or offensive content.

- 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?

Appendix.A.1

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

4.4 Ablation Studies

- 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?

4.2 Overall Performance

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.?

Our study does not involve human annotators for data creation.

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.

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)?

Our study does not involve human annotators for data creation.

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)?

Our study does not involve human annotators for data creation.

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

Our study does not involve human annotators for data creation. It is also unlikely that our work has ethics issues.

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?

Our research relates to memory enhancement for LLMs, and LLMs are heavily used in the experiments. We provide all the information of the used LLMs in the experiment section. We also use LLMs for polishing the paper. However, all research ideas, implementations and experiments are conducted by authors.