

Rewrite 4 of Declaration of Helsinki

Jiaxin Dong

111658846

14, 16, 17, 24

14. The [NLP Application] protocol should always contain a statement of the ethical considerations involved and should indicate that there is compliance with the principles enunciated in this Declaration.

This principle is applicable for NLP. So far based on my understanding, every application has a user agreement. However, the problem we are facing when applying this principle is “Users Never Read”. A pop up window which force user read agreement (scroll down) will be better than just mix a statement in protocol.

16. Every [NLP Application] involving [User(s)] should be preceded by careful assessment of predictable risks and burdens in comparison with foreseeable benefits to the [User(s)] or to others. This does not preclude the participation of healthy volunteers in [NLP Application]. The design of all studies should be publicly available.

This principle is applicable for NLP but not applicable for company NLP activity. Every NLP project needs time and money to train a model so NLP developers should analyze current situation carefully. An academic NLP project can be published as paper form but company NLP projects can't be publish, it not practical to let a company to give their secret money maker for free.

17. [NLP Developer(s)] should abstain from engaging in [NLP Application(s)] involving [User(s)] unless they are confident that the risks involved have been adequately assessed and can be satisfactorily managed. [NLP Developer(s)] should cease any investigation if the risks are found to outweigh the potential benefits or if there is conclusive proof of positive and beneficial results.

This principle is applicable for NLP. NLP is multi field study of human users (natural language is mostly made by human). Whenever NLP developers making a new research on users, they should always see if this project can lead to beneficiation because NLP projects take lots of valuable resource. Also developers should not expose users' privacy.

24. For a [NLP Application] who is legally incompetent, physically or mentally incapable of giving consent or is a legally incompetent minor, the [NLP Developer(s)] must obtain informed consent from the legally authorized representative in accordance with applicable law. These groups should not be included in [NLP Application] unless the [NLP Application] is necessary to promote the health of the population represented and this [NLP Application] cannot instead be performed on legally competent persons.

This is not applicable for NLP. We want to collect data as diverse as possible. We want

bias to let our model more adapted to noises and unknown data set. So no matter who the users are and what their current situation are, we should collect their data to train our NLP model.

Overall:

I think that most of these principles can actually transfer to NLP. The principles that have something with generic reasons (maximum benefit, minimal risk) can be well transform cause these factors are overlap in all research fields. Some NLP company/factory usage will be a great harm that these principle miss (privacy, information selling). In principle 24, user are over protected. As I stated above, NLP need diversity on data collecting. If user agree to let their info being collected, we should be gathering them no matter how “abnormal” our user is.