

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Multi-Docker-Eval: A ‘Shovel of the Gold Rush’ Benchmark on Automatic Environment Building for Software Engineering*

Authors: *Kelin Fu, Tianyu Liu, ZeyuShang, YINGWEI MA, Jiaheng Liu, Jian Yang, Kaigui Bian*

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?

Our work introduces a benchmark and evaluation framework for automated environment configuration of software repositories using LLM agents. It does not involve human subjects, personal data, or any sensitive information, and it does not propose new model architectures or deployment strategies that could pose safety risks. All data are publicly available open-source repositories. Therefore, we consider the potential risks of this work to be minimal.

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 Multi-Docker-Eval benchmark uses only publicly available open-source repositories from GitHub. The data consists of code, Dockerfiles, test scripts, and natural language problem descriptions. No personally identifying information or offensive content is present or collected. Therefore, no steps for anonymization or offensive content filtering 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 3.2 (Data Collection and Filtering) and Figure 2.

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

Section 4 (Experimental Setup) and Appendix C (Experimental Details).

- 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 5 (Results) and Appendix D (Detailed Results).

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.?

(left blank)

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)?

(left blank)

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)?

(left blank)

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

(left blank)

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?

Appendix E (Use of AI Assistants).