Claim category	Definition	Mandatory criteria	Examples
(CONTR) contributions	Claims by which the authors introduce and qualify their contributions: - **final outcome** - **list of contributions** (if not a RES claim) - **objectives** - **important characteristics** of the work: features, operating details, etc.	- in an Introduction or Conclusion part OR - repetition of a CONTR claim from an Introduction part	*- We present the first challenge set and evaluation protocol for the analysis of gender bias in machine translation.* *- Our system supports the plug-n-play of different types of dialogue agents and different models.* *- To conduct this work, we reviewed four state-of-the-art models.*
(RES) results	Claims related to experimental and non-experimental results.		
RES-experimental *The experiment says that ...*	Reports of all kinds of experimental results: - **statistical measures** - **performance evaluation** (qualitative, quantitative, comparative, rankings, etc.) - **experimental observations** - **conclusions drawn from experimental results**	- the validity of the claim depends on the validity of the experiment [optional: and on the authors' reasoning about these results]	*- Our system ranks No. 4 on the test set leader-board of this multi-format information extraction task.* *- We found that 28% of the sentences contained hedging clues.*
RES-analysis *From results X, the authors say that ...*	Statements based on an analysis of results: - **explanation of the cause** of a result - **possible implications** of a result - **opinion/impression** caused by the results	- it is not directly a result of the work but a statement <u>about</u> these results or <u>derived from them</u> - the validity of the claim is dependant on the interpretation of the authors	*- We believe that this increase in performance is due to the larger training set.* *- These results are very surprising.* *- This would imply that English researchers as a whole tend to mitigate their claims more than their Spanish peers.*
RES-knowledge *The authors say /argue that ...*	Non-experimental results or statements defended by the authors: - **knowledge** claims, introduction of **new concepts** - **working hypotheses** - **argued positions** - **recommandations** (excepted for future directions, see PROSP)	- in order for the claim to be true/valid, either non-experimental results OR the authors' reasoning must be true/valid	*- We argue that a system trained only on form has a priori no way to learn meaning.* *- We have seen that current automated fact-checking research lacks a unified task formulation.*

(LIM) limitations claims	Claims by which the authors acknowledge some **limitations** of their final work or results. A limitation is understood as: - **a default / flaw** or the work /system, compared to what it is expected to do / how it is expected to be / function OR - a **restriction** on the interpretation of results.	- should relate to the final work/results and not to minor difficulties in early steps (*ie "We had to filter out noisy data before training the model"*)	*- Unfortunately, we didn't have sufficient budget for recruiting more annotators.* *- The results do not necessarily apply to other encoder-decoder models.* *- Currently, our system lacks support for parallel conversations.*
(PROSP) prospective claims	Claims by which the authors anticipate the future of their work.		
PROSP-directions	Discussions about future directions of the work: - to **correct imperfections** - to **improve / extend** it		*- Therefore, in the future, we will encode the global information by neural networks and use the self-regulation strategy to reduce the negative influence of noises.* *- This missing annotation question is still an open issue and should be further investigated.*
PROSP-impact	Discussions about the **expected impact** (either positive or negative) of the presented work on the research community / on the society.		*- We hope that our work will foster reproducibility in dialogue system research.*
(RW) related works	Explicit or implicit reference to other works which are granted **authorship of a claim** (that would, in these works, be considered as a RES: experimental, analysis or knowledge)	- it should be clear that the cited work is presented as the author of the claim. If the citation scope is unclear, do not use this label.	*- Turing (1950) argued that a machine can be said to "think" if a human judge cannot distinguish it from a human interlocutor after having an arbitrary written conversation with each.* *- Recent research has showed that word embeddings can encode linguistic properties of words.*