

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Evaluating Memory Capability in Continuous Lifelog Scenario*

Authors: *Jianjie Zheng, Zhichen Liu, Zhanyu Shen, Jingxiang Qu, Guanhua Chen, Yile Wang, Yang Xu, Yang Liu, Sijie Cheng*

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?

Section 7

B. Did you use or create scientific artifacts? (e.g. code, datasets, models)

- ^{N/A} 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?

In Sections 3.2 and 3.3, we describe our data construction. We used a proxy approach with textual summaries to avoid raw audio privacy issues (EgoMem) and a simulation framework for virtual data (LifeMem). All data underwent a human-in-the-loop review to ensure the removal of any identifying 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?

section 3.5

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

Appendix E

- 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 4.2

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 B

- 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)?

Appendix C

- 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)?

In Section 3.2, we specify that the EgoMem subset is built upon the EgoLife dataset. We adhered to the original dataset's license and data usage agreements. For the synthesized LifeMem subset (Section 3.3), all data was generated via LLMs within a simulated environment, involving no human subjects.

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

This study does not involve new collection of sensitive data from human subjects. EgoMem uses a publicly available dataset (EgoLife), and LifeMem is entirely synthesized through a simulation framework (Section 3.3), thus not requiring IRB 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?

AI assistants (Qwen) were used to assist in generating synthetic dialogues for the LifeMem subset and for polishing the manuscript's phrasing. All AI-generated content was strictly reviewed and verified by the authors to ensure accuracy and scientific integrity.