# SemEval-2025 Task 11: Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection

Shamsuddeen Hassan Muhammad<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Nedjma Ousidhoum<sup>3\*</sup>, Idris Abdulmumin<sup>4</sup>, Seid Muhie Yimam<sup>5</sup>, Jan Philip Wahle<sup>6</sup>, Terry Ruas<sup>6</sup>, Meriem Beloucif<sup>7</sup>, Christine De Kock<sup>8</sup>, Tadesse Destaw Belay<sup>9,10</sup>, Ibrahim Said Ahmad<sup>11</sup>, Nirmal Surange<sup>12</sup>, Daniela Teodorescu<sup>13</sup>, David Ifeoluwa Adelani<sup>14,15,16</sup>, Alham Fikri Aji<sup>17</sup>, Felermino Ali<sup>18</sup>, Vladimir Araujo<sup>19</sup>, Abinew Ali Ayele<sup>5,20</sup>, Oana Ignat<sup>21</sup>, Alexander Panchenko<sup>22,23</sup>, Yi Zhou<sup>3</sup>, Saif M. Mohammad<sup>24</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Imperial College London, <sup>2</sup>Bayero University Kano, <sup>3</sup>Cardiff University, <sup>4</sup>DSFSI, University of Pretoria,

<sup>5</sup>University of Hamburg, <sup>6</sup>University of Göttingen, <sup>7</sup>Uppsala University, <sup>8</sup>University of Melbourne, <sup>9</sup>Instituto Politécnico Nacional,

<sup>10</sup>Wollo University, <sup>11</sup>Northeastern University, <sup>12</sup>IIIT Hyderabad, <sup>13</sup>University of Alberta, <sup>14</sup>MILA, <sup>15</sup>McGill University,

<sup>16</sup>Canada CIFAR AI Chair, <sup>17</sup>MBZUAI, <sup>18</sup>LIACC, FEUP, University of Porto, <sup>19</sup>Sailplane AI, <sup>20</sup>Bahir Dar University,

<sup>21</sup>Santa Clara University, <sup>22</sup>Skoltech, <sup>23</sup>AIRI, <sup>24</sup>National Research Council Canada

Contact: s.muhammad@imperial.ac.uk, OusidhoumN@cardiff.ac.uk

## **Abstract**

We present our shared task on text-based emotion detection, covering more than 30 languages from seven distinct language families. These languages are predominantly low-resource and are spoken across various continents. The data instances are multi-labeled with six emotional classes, with additional datasets in 11 languages annotated for emotion intensity. Participants were asked to predict labels in three tracks: (a) multilabel emotion detection, (b) emotion intensity score detection, and (c) cross-lingual emotion detection.

The task attracted over 700 participants. We received final submissions from more than 200 teams and 93 system description papers. We report baseline results, along with findings on the best-performing systems, the most common approaches, and the most effective methods across different tracks and languages. The datasets for this task are publicly available.<sup>1</sup>

# 1 Introduction

People use language in diverse and sophisticated ways to express emotions across languages and cultures (Wiebe et al., 2005; Mohammad and Kiritchenko, 2018; Mohammad et al., 2018a). Emotions are also perceived subjectively, even within the same culture or social group. Recognising these emotions is central to language technologies and NLP applications in healthcare, digital humanities, dialogue systems, and beyond (Mohammad et al., 2018b; Saffar et al., 2023). In this work, we use emotion recognition to refer to perceived emotions,

i.e., the emotion most people believe the speaker might have felt based on a sentence or short text snippet.

Despite the linguistic diversity of regions such as Africa and Asia, which together account for more than 4,000 languages<sup>2</sup>, few emotion recognition resources exist for these languages. Prior SemEval shared tasks on emotion recognition have primarily focused on high-resource languages such as English, Spanish, and Arabic (Strapparava and Mihalcea, 2007; Mohammad et al., 2018a; Chatterjee et al., 2019). In this task, we provide participants with new datasets covering more than 30 languages from seven distinct language families, spoken across Africa, Asia, Latin America, North America, and Europe (Muhammad et al., 2025). Our manually annotated emotion recognition datasets, curated in collaboration with local communities, consist of over 100,000 multi-labeled instances drawn from diverse sources, including speeches, social media, news, literature, and reviews. Each instance is labeled by fluent speakers and annotated with six emotion classes: joy, sadness, anger, fear, surprise, disgust, and neutral. Additionally, eleven datasets include four emotional intensity levels ranging from 0 to 3 (i.e., absence of emotion to high intensity).

The task consists of three tracks: (a) multilabel emotion detection, (b) emotion intensity detection, and (c) cross-lingual emotion detection. The languages for each track are listed in Figure 1. Each team could submit results for one, two, or all three tracks in one or more languages. Our official evalu-

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The dataset is available at SemEval2025 Task 11.

<sup>2</sup>https://www.ethnologue.com/insights/ how-many-languages




Figure 1: Languages in the three tracks (A, B, and C) of SemEval 2025 Task 11.

ation metrics were the average F-score for Tracks A and C and the Pearson correlation coefficient for Track B, which measures how well system-predicted intensity scores align with human judgments.

Our task attracted over 700 participants, with 220 final submissions and 93 teams submitting system description papers. Track A (multi-label emotion detection) received the most submissions (114), followed by Track C (cross-lingual emotion detection) with 51, and Track B (emotion intensity detection) with 32. Most teams participated in multiple languages, averaging 11 languages per team. Our task was the most popular competition on CodaBench in 2024.<sup>3</sup> All task details and resources are available on the task's GitHub page.<sup>4</sup>

## 2 Related Work

NLP work on emotion detection is predominantly Western-centric, with a few exceptions for languages other than English (e.g., Italian (Bianchi et al., 2021), Romanian (Ciobotaru et al., 2022), Indonesian (Saputri et al., 2018), and Bengali (Iqbal

et al., 2022)). While multilingual datasets (e.g., (Öhman et al., 2020) and XLM-EMO (Bianchi et al., 2022)) exist, they do not fully capture cultural nuances in emotional expressions due to their reliance on translated data (e.g., XLM-EMO), as emotions are highly contextualized and culture-specific (Havaldar et al., 2023; Mohamed et al., 2024; Hershcovich et al., 2022). Furthermore, most datasets are single-labeled, and to the best of our knowledge, there are no multilingual resources that capture simultaneous emotions and their intensity across various languages.

Additionally, most prior emotion recognition shared tasks have focused on high-resource languages such as English, Spanish, German, and Arabic (Strapparava and Mihalcea, 2007; Mohammad and Bravo-Marquez, 2017; Mohammad et al., 2018b; Chatterjee et al., 2019). In contrast, this shared task covers more than 30 languages, including several low-resource languages.

#### 3 Data

#### 3.1 Data Collection

As our task includes more than 30 different datasets, curated and annotated by fluent speakers, we selected data sources based on: 1) the availability

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Codabench Newsletter 2024

<sup>4</sup>https://github.com/emotion-analysis-project/ SemEval2025-Task11

| Language                      | Train | Dev | Test  | Total |
|-------------------------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| Afrikaans ( <b>afr</b> )      | 2,107 | 98  | 1,065 | 3,270 |
| Amharic (amh)                 | 3,549 | 592 | 1,774 | 5,915 |
| Algerian Arabic (arq)         | 901   | 100 | 902   | 1,903 |
| Moroccan Arabic (ary)         | 1,608 | 267 | 812   | 2,687 |
| Chinese (chn)                 | 2,642 | 200 | 2,642 | 5,484 |
| German (deu)                  | 2,603 | 200 | 2,604 | 5,407 |
| English (eng)                 | 2,768 | 116 | 2,767 | 5,651 |
| Latin American Spanish (esp)  | 1,996 | 184 | 1,695 | 3,875 |
| Hausa (hau)                   | 2,145 | 356 | 1,080 | 3,581 |
| Hindi (hin)                   | 2,556 | 100 | 1,010 | 3,666 |
| Igbo (ibo)                    | 2,880 | 479 | 1,444 | 4,803 |
| Indonesian (ind)              | _     | 156 | 851   | 1,007 |
| Javanese (jav)                | _     | 151 | 837   | 988   |
| Kinyarwanda (kin)             | 2,451 | 407 | 1,231 | 4,089 |
| Marathi (mar)                 | 2,415 | 100 | 1,000 | 3,515 |
| Nigerian-Pidgin (pcm)         | 3,728 | 620 | 1,870 | 6,218 |
| Oromo (orm)                   | 3,442 | 575 | 1,721 | 5,738 |
| Portuguese (Brazilian; ptbr)  | 2,226 | 200 | 2,226 | 4,652 |
| Portuguese (Mozambican; ptmz) | 1,546 | 257 | 776   | 2,579 |
| Romanian (ron)                | 1,241 | 123 | 1,119 | 2,483 |
| Russian (rus)                 | 2,679 | 199 | 1,000 | 3,878 |
| Somali (som)                  | 3,392 | 566 | 1,696 | 5,654 |
| Sundanese (sun)               | 924   | 199 | 926   | 2,049 |
| Swahili (swa)                 | 3,307 | 551 | 1,656 | 5,514 |
| Swedish (swe)                 | 1,187 | 200 | 1,188 | 2,575 |
| Tatar (tat)                   | 1,000 | 200 | 1,000 | 2,200 |
| Tigrinya (tir)                | 3,681 | 614 | 1,840 | 6,135 |
| Ukrainian ( <b>ukr</b> )      | 2,466 | 249 | 2,234 | 4,949 |
| Emakhuwa (vmw)                | 1,551 | 258 | 777   | 2,586 |
| isiXhosa (xho)                | _     | 682 | 1,594 | 2,276 |
| Yoruba (yor)                  | 2,992 | 497 | 1,500 | 4,989 |
| isiZulu ( <b>zul</b> )        | -     | 875 | 2,047 | 2,922 |

Table 1: Languages and data split sizes. Datasets with no training splits (-) were only used in Track C (crosslingual) only.

of textual data potentially rich in emotions, and 2) access to annotators. Since finding suitable data is challenging when resources are limited, we typically combine sources. The main textual sources used to build our dataset collection are:

- Social media posts: Data collected from various platforms, including Reddit (e.g., eng, deu), YouTube (e.g., esp, ind, jav, sun, tir), Twitter (e.g., amh, hau), and Weibo (e.g., chn).
- Personal narratives, talks, speeches: Anonymised sentences from personal diary posts. We use these in eng, deu, and ptbr, mainly from subreddits such as IAmI. Similarly, the afr dataset includes sentences from speeches and talks.
- Literary texts: The language lead manually translated the novel *La Grande Maison* (The Big House) by Mohammed Dib<sup>5</sup> from French into Algerian Arabic (arq), and post-processed the translation to generate sentences for annotation by native speakers. Note that the translator is bilingual and a native speaker of Algerian Arabic.
- News data: Although we prefer emotionally
- <sup>5</sup>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/La\_Grande\_ Maison

- rich social media data from different platforms, when such data is scarce, we annotated news data and headlines in some African languages (e.g., yor, hau, and vmw).
- Human-written and machine-generated data: We created a dataset from scratch for Hindi (hin) and Marathi (mar). Annotators were asked to come up with emotive sentences on a given topic (e.g., family). A small portion of the Hindi dataset was automatically translated into Marathi and manually corrected by native speakers to fix translation errors. Finally, we augmented both datasets with a few hundred quality-approved instances generated by ChatGPT. Note that these constitute less than 1% of the total number of data instances.

#### 3.2 Data Annotation

We ask the annotators to select all the emotions that apply to a given text. The set of perceived emotion labels includes: anger, sadness, fear, disgust, joy, surprise, and neutral (if no emotion is present). The annotators further rate the selected emotion(s) on a four-point intensity scale: 0 (no emotion), 1 (low intensity), 2 (moderate intensity), and 3 (high intensity). We provide the definitions of the categories, annotation guidelines, and more details in Muhammad et al. (2025). We expected some level of disagreement, as emotions are complex, subtle, and perceived differently, even by people within the same culture, especially in the absence of full context. Hence, the final emotion labels were determined based on the emotions and associated intensity values selected by the annotators. Specifically, the given emotion is considered present if:

- 1. At least two annotators select a label with an intensity value of 1, 2, or 3 (low, medium, or high, respectively).
- 2. The average score exceeds a predefined threshold T. We set T to 0.5.

Once the perceived emotion labels are assigned, the final intensity scores for Track B are determined by averaging the selected intensity values and rounding up to the nearest whole number. Intensity scores are assigned only for datasets in which most instances were annotated by at least five annotators to ensure robustness. Table 1 shows the total number of instances in each dataset, as well as the number of instances in the training, development, and test splits for all languages.

#### 3.3 Annotators' Reliability

We report the reliability of the annotation using the Split-Half Class Match Percentage (SHCMP; Mohammad, 2024) as described in Muhammad et al. (2025). SHCMP extends the concept of Split-Half Reliability (SHR), traditionally used for continuous scores (Kiritchenko and Mohammad, 2016), to discrete categories like ours (i.e., intensity scores per emotion). Overall, the scores vary from 60% to more than 90%, indicating that our datasets are of high quality.

## 4 Task Description

Participants were given text snippets and asked to determine the emotions that people may attribute to the speaker based on a sentence or short text snippet uttered by the speaker. The task consists of three tracks, and participants could participate in one or more of these tracks.

#### 4.1 Tracks

**Track A: Multi-label Emotion Detection** Participants were asked to predict the perceived emotion(s) of the speaker and label each text snippet based on the presence (1) or absence (0) of the following emotions: joy, sadness, fear, anger, surprise, and disgust.

**Track B: Emotion Intensity Detection** Given a text and six emotion classes (i.e., joy, sadness, fear, anger, surprise, and disgust), participants were required to predict whether the intensity of each emotion was 0 (no emotion), 1 (low), 2 (medium), or 3 (high). Note that Track B does not include all languages, as intensity scores were only released for datasets with at least five annotators per instance to ensure more robust and reliable labels.

# Track C: Cross-lingual Emotion Detection Similar to Track A, participants were required to predict the presence or absence of each perceived emotion, but without using any training data in the target language. Instead, they were permitted to use labeled dataset(s) from at least one other language. For instance, one could use German data for training when testing on English. This track focuses on cross-lingual transfer and explores how data from various languages can support emotion detection in low-resource settings, as well as the ability of models to generalise across domains.




Figure 2: The official affiliations of some of our participants. The list includes 33 countries: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Russia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Taiwan, the UAE, the UK, the USA, and Vietnam.

# 4.2 Task Organisation

We used Codabench as the competition platform and released pilot datasets before the start of the shared task to help participants better understand the task (i.e., the datasets, the languages involved, and the labels). We provided participants with a starter kit on GitHub, resources for beginners, and organised a Q&A session along with a writing tutorial for junior researchers. Our participants were based in different parts of the world, as shown in Figure 2, with many coming from underrepresented regions. The task consisted of two phases: (1) the development phase and (2) the evaluation phase. During the development phase, the leaderboard was open, allowing a maximum of 999 submissions per participant. In the evaluation phase, the leaderboard was closed, and each participant was allowed up to three submissions, with the last submission being considered for the official ranking.

# 4.3 Evaluation Metrics and Baselines

**Evaluation Metrics** For Tracks A and C, we use the average macro F-score calculated based on the predicted and the gold-standard labels. For Track B, we use the Pearson correlation coefficient, which captures how well the system-predicted intensity scores of test instances align with human judgments. We provided the participants with an evaluation script on our GitHub page.

**Our Baselines** We run a simple majority class baseline for each language across all three tracks. Further, for Tracks A and B (Tables 2 and 3, respectively), we fine-tuned RoBERTa using the training data for each language. Table 2 shows the aver-

| Lang | Team  | Score Lang                           | Team  | Score Lang  | Team  | Score Lang                            | Team   | Score                                 |
|------|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| afr  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$        | 0.699 amh<br>0.687<br>0.371<br>0.257 | $ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{chinchunmei} \\ \textbf{nust titans} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ \underline{M_{\text{baseline}}} \end{array} $ | <b>0.773</b> arq<br><b>0.714</b><br>0.638<br>0.295        | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{jnlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$          | 0.669 ary<br>0.641<br>0.414<br>0.445  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{jnlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$         | 0.629<br>0.609<br>0.472<br>0.247      |
| chn  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{teleai} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$        | 0.709 deu<br>0.682<br>0.531<br>0.278 | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{heimerdinger} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$                      | <b>0.740</b> eng<br><b>0.706</b><br>0.642<br><b>0.449</b> | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{nycu-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$      | 0.823 esp<br>0.823<br>0.708<br>0.367  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{heimerdinger} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | <b>0.849 0.838</b> 0.774 <b>0.312</b> |
| hau  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{empaths} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$       | 0.751 hin<br>0.695<br>0.596<br>0.312 | $egin{array}{l} \mathbf{jnlp} \\ \mathbf{pai} \\ R_{\mathrm{baseline}} \\ M_{\mathrm{baseline}} \end{array}$                            | 0.926 ibo<br>0.920<br>0.855<br>0.246                      | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{late-gil-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$  | 0.600 kin<br>0.563<br>0.479<br>0.236  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{mcgill-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$   | <b>0.657 0.590</b> 0.463 0.218        |
| mar  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{indidataminer} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | 0.884 orm<br>0.883<br>0.822<br>0.264 | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{tewodros} \\ \textbf{late-gil-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$                 | 0.616 pcm<br>0.592<br>0.126<br>0.232                      | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{jnlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$          | 0.674 ptbr<br>0.634<br>0.555<br>0.357 | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{heimerdinger} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | 0.683<br>0.625<br>0.426<br>0.243      |
| ptmz | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{heimerdinger} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$  | 0.548 ron<br>0.507<br>0.459<br>0.163 | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{jnlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$                              | 0.794 rus<br>0.779<br>0.762<br>0.461                      | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{heimerdinger} \\ \textbf{jnlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | 0.901 som<br>0.891<br>0.838<br>0.262  | $egin{array}{c} \mathbf{pai} \\ \mathbf{empaths} \\ R_{\mathrm{baseline}} \\ M_{\mathrm{baseline}} \end{array}$    | <b>0.577 0.508</b> 0.459 0.198        |
| sun  | lazarus nlp<br>pai<br>$R_{ m baseline}$<br>$M_{ m baseline}$  | 0.550 swa<br>0.541<br>0.373<br>0.334 | empaths pai $R_{ m baseline}$ $M_{ m baseline}$   | <b>0.386</b> swe <b>0.385</b> 0.227 0.179                 | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{jnlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$          | 0.626 tat<br>0.619<br>0.520<br>0.264  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{tue-jms} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$      | <b>0.846 0.797</b> 0.539 0.246        |
| tir  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{nta} \\ \textbf{late-gil-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$  | 0.591 ukr<br>0.587<br>0.463<br>0.253 | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{csiro-lt} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$                          | <b>0.726</b> vmw <b>0.664</b> 0.535 0.157                 | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{team unibuc} \\ \textbf{pai} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$   | 0.325 yor<br>0.255<br>0.121<br>0.163  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pai} \\ \textbf{heimerdinger} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | <b>0.461 0.392</b> 0.092 0.165        |

Table 2: Average macro-F1 scores for our baselines ( $M_{baseline}$  and  $R_{baseline}$ , referring to the Majority Vote and RoBERTa baselines, respectively) and the top two performing systems in Track A (shown in bold) for each language.

age macro F-scores of the top-performing systems compared to our baseline in Track A, and Table 3 shows the Pearson correlation scores for Track B. For Track C (Table 4), we fine-tuned RoBERTa by training on all languages within a language family while holding out one target language used for testing, e.g., all Indo-European languages except eng when testing on it. For language families with only one language, we trained on the Slavic languages (rus and ukr) and tested on tat; on the Niger-Congo languages (swa and yor) and tested on pcm; and trained on rus when testing on chn.

#### 5 Participating Systems and Results

#### 5.1 Overview

Our task attracted more than 700 registered participants and was featured in the Codabench newsletter as the most popular competition hosted on Codabench in 2024.

In the development phase, 153 submissions were made for Track A, 52 for Track B, and 25 for Track C. In the test phase, 220 submissions were made for Track A, 96 for Track B, and 46 for Track C. The official results include more than 220 final submis-

sions from 93 teams. While the English subtracks received the highest number of submissions, we note that other languages, including underserved ones, were comparable in terms of popularity.

We report results only for teams that submitted a system description paper. Table 5 presents the results for Track A, which had 87 participating teams. Table 6 shows the results for Track B, with 38 participating teams, while Table 7 reports the results for Track C, which had 21 participating teams.

# 5.2 Track A: Multi-label Emotion Detection

# 5.2.1 Best-Performing Systems

**Team Pai** proposes one of the most effective models in the competition. They consistently rank as the top approach in Track A for 20 out of 28 languages. For their system, they combine several base models (ChatGPT-40 (OpenAI, 2024), DeepSeek-V3 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025), Gemma-9b (Team et al., 2024), Qwen-2.5-32b (Yang et al., 2024), Mistral-Small-24B (Jiang et al., 2024)) using multiple ensemble techniques (neural networks, XGBoost, LightGBM, linear regression, weighted

voting). They fine-tune Gemma-9b and Qwen-2.5-32b using AdaLoRA. For prompting the LLMs, they used an iterative prompt-optimisation technique that generates prompt variations.

**Team Chinchunmei** ranks in the top 10 in 16 languages in Track A and 12th in English. They use sample contrastive learning, where performance is enhanced by comparing sample pairs, and generative contrastive learning, where the models learn to distinguish correct from incorrect predictions. Their samples are randomly selected from the task dataset (no external augmentation). They use LLaMa3-Instruct-8B (AI@Meta, 2024) for their fine-tuning.

#### 5.2.2 Takeaways

Most of the teams that rank well on Track A experiment with essentially two methodologies: 1) fine-tuning BERT-based models such as DeBERTa (Siino, 2024), mBERT (Doley, 2023), and XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020); and/or 2) instructionfine-tuning using LoRa methodologies in combination with prompt design and data augmentation techniques on LLMs (ChatGPT-4o, DeepSeek-V3, Gemma-9b, Qwen-2.5-32b, Mistral-Small-24B). For instance, Team Telai (3rd in Chinese), Team Empaths (2nd in Hausa and Somali, and 1st in Swahili), Team NYCU-NLP (2nd in English), Team JNLP (1st in Hindi and among the best four across 10 languages), Team Unibouc (1st in Emakhuwa), Team Heiderdinger (2nd in Mozambican Portuguese, German, Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, and Yorùbá; 1st in Russian), and Team Maomao (2nd in Afrikaans).

Few teams focus on only a subset of languages or explore language-related knowledge in their methodology. For instance, Team Lazarus NLP redefined and reformulated the multi-label classification into multiple binary tasks to expand training samples. They also explored how knowledge could potentially be transferred between Indonesian languages. All the top 10 teams performed significantly better than our baseline model, with an improvement that is more notable in a few low-resource languages, such as Oromo, where Team Tewodros obtained an average macro-F1 score of 0.616 compared to a baseline of 0.126. The same was observed for Yorùbá, where Team Pai scored 0.461 compared to a baseline score of 0.092.

| Lang | Team                  | Score  | Lang | Team                  | Score  |
|------|-----------------------|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|
| amh  | csecu-learners        | 0.856  | arq  | pai                   | 0.650  |
|      | heimerdinger          | 0.781  |      | jnlp                  | 0.587  |
|      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.508  |      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.016  |
|      | $M_{ m baseline}$     | -0.001 |      | $M_{\text{baseline}}$ | -0.009 |
| chn  | pai                   | 0.722  | deu  | pai                   | 0.766  |
|      | teleai                | 0.708  |      | teleai                | 0.743  |
|      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.405  |      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.562  |
|      | $M_{ m baseline}$     | 0.000  |      | $M_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.016  |
| eng  | pai                   | 0.840  | esp  | pai                   | 0.808  |
|      | nycu-nlp              | 0.837  |      | deepwave              | 0.792  |
|      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.641  |      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.726  |
|      | $M_{ m baseline}$     | 0.001  |      | $M_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.011  |
| hau  | pai                   | 0.770  | ptbr | pai                   | 0.710  |
|      | deepwave              | 0.747  |      | teleai                | 0.690  |
|      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.270  |      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.297  |
|      | $M_{ m baseline}$     | 0.003  |      | $M_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.016  |
| ron  | pai                   | 0.726  | rus  | pai                   | 0.925  |
|      | deepwave              | 0.716  |      | teleai                | 0.919  |
|      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.557  |      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.877  |
|      | $M_{ m baseline}$     | 0.003  |      | $M_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.016  |
| ukr  | pai                   | 0.708  |      |                       |        |
|      | jnlp                  | 0.672  |      |                       |        |
|      | $R_{\text{baseline}}$ | 0.399  |      |                       |        |
|      | $M_{\text{baseline}}$ | -0.01  |      |                       |        |

Table 3: Pearson correlation scores for our baselines (Majority:  $M_{baseline}$  and RoBERTa:  $R_{baseline}$ ) and the top two performing systems in Track B (shown in bold) for each language.

# 5.3 Track B: Emotion Intensity Detection

#### **5.3.1** Best-Performing Systems

Team Pai Similar to Track A, Team Pai ranked at the top across all languages in Track B, except for Amharic. They used an ensemble of LLMs, combining several base models (ChatGPT-4o(OpenAI, 2024), DeepSeek-V3 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025), Gemma-9b (Team et al., 2024), Qwen-2.5-32b (Yang et al., 2024), Mistral-Small-24B) with multiple ensemble techniques (neural networks, XG-Boost, LightGBM, linear regression, weighted voting). They fine-tuned the Gemma and Qwen models using AdaLoRA. For prompting the LLMs, they employed an iterative prompt-optimisation technique to generate prompt variations.

**Team CSECU-Learners** CSECU-Learners ranked at the top in Amharic by fine-tuning language-specific transformers (XLM-Roberta (Conneau et al., 2020) for Amharic) with a classification layer and multi-sample dropout.

#### 5.3.2 Takeaways

Teams Deepwave, Teleai, and JNLP also ranked highly across various languages using prompt engi-

| Lang | Team   | Score Lang                            | Team   | Score L                                  | ang Team  | Score  | Lang | Team  | Score                            |
|------|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|------|---|----------------------------------|
| afr  | $\begin{array}{c} \text{maomao} \\ \textbf{deepwave} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$            | 0.705 amh<br>0.574<br>0.350<br>0.257  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{uob-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | 0.661 at 0.627 0.487 0.295               | rq deepwave maomao $R_{ m baseline}$ $M_{ m baseline}$  | 0.588<br>0.584<br>0.338<br>0.445                             | ary  | deepwave maomao  Rbaseline  Mbaseline   | 0.632<br>0.565<br>0.355<br>0.247 |
| chn  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$          | 0.689 deu<br>0.622<br>0.246<br>0.278  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{gt-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$  | <b>0.727</b> er <b>0.687</b> 0.468 0.319 | $egin{array}{ll} { m deepwave} & { m maomao} & { m } \\ { m } { m } { m }_{ m baseline} & { m } M_{ m baseline} & { m } \end{array}$              | <b>0.797</b><br><b>0.755</b><br><b>0.375</b><br><b>0.449</b> | esp  | deepwave maomao Rbaseline Mbaseline   | <b>0.831 0.806</b> 0.574 0.367   |
| hau  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{uob-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$         | 0.709 hin<br>0.627<br>0.320<br>0.312  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$  | 0.919 il<br>0.896<br>0.138<br>0.264      | bo deepwave uob-nlp $R_{ m baseline}$ $M_{ m baseline}$   | 0.605<br>0.484<br>0.075<br>0.236                             | ind  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{maomao} \\ \textbf{lazarus nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$  | 0.672<br>0.641<br>0.376<br>0.254 |
| jav  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{heimerdinger} \\ \textbf{lazarus nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | 0.439 kin<br>0.438<br>0.464<br>0.204  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{uob-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | 0.508 ma<br>0.466<br>0.184<br>0.218      | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{ar} & \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ \textbf{\textit{M}}_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | <b>0.903 0.863</b> 0.772 0.264                               | orm  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{uob-nlp} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$    | 0.542<br>0.491<br>0.262<br>0.232 |
| pcm  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$          | 0.674 ptbr<br>0.562<br>0.010<br>0.357 | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$  | 0.629 pr<br>0.617<br>0.418<br>0.243      | tmz deepwave maomao $R_{ m baseline}$ $M_{ m baseline}$   | <b>0.555 0.495</b> 0.297 0.163                               | ron  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$     | <b>0.767 0.747</b> 0.762 0.652   |
| rus  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$          | 0.906 som<br>0.852<br>0.704<br>0.262  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{maomao} \\ \textbf{deepwave} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$  | 0.488 st<br>0.488 0.273 0.198            | un deepwave maomao $R_{ m baseline}$ $M_{ m baseline}$  | <b>0.467</b><br><b>0.464</b><br><b>0.194</b><br><b>0.334</b> | swa  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{maomao} \\ \textbf{deepwave} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$     | <b>0.381 0.355</b> 0.190 0.179   |
| swe  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$          | 0.645 tat<br>0.578<br>0.512<br>0.264  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{maomao} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$  | 0.789 t:<br>0.697<br>0.445<br>0.246      | $egin{array}{ll} {f ir} & {f deepwave} \ {f uob-nlp} \ R_{f baseline} \ M_{f baseline} \end{array}$   | 0.505<br>0.445<br>0.339<br>0.253                             | ukr  | deepwave maomao R <sub>baseline</sub> M <sub>baseline</sub>   | <b>0.702 0.623</b> 0.496 0.157   |
| vmw  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{deepwave} \\ \textbf{ozemi} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$           | 0.210 xho<br>0.193<br>0.052<br>0.162  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{maomao} \\ \textbf{ozemi} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$     | 0.443 ye<br>0.315<br>0.127<br>0.115      | or maomao deepwave $R_{ m baseline}$ $M_{ m baseline}$  | <b>0.360</b><br><b>0.342</b><br>0.053<br>0.165               | zul  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{maomao} \\ \textbf{heimerdinger} \\ R_{\text{baseline}} \\ M_{\text{baseline}} \end{array}$ | <b>0.397 0.226</b> 0.153 0.109   |

Table 4: Average macro-F1 scores for our baselines ( $M_{baseline}$  and  $R_{baseline}$ , referring to the Majority Vote and RoBERTa baselines, respectively) and the top two performing systems in Track C (shown in bold) for each language.

neering approaches similar to those in Track A. Additionally, Team NYCU-NLP ranked second in English by aggregating instruction-tuned small language models. All these teams outperformed our RoBERTa baseline, which achieved moderate Pearson correlation coefficient scores overall, but performed poorly in languages such as Algerian Arabic, Hausa, Ukrainian, and even Brazilian Portuguese -highlighting the difficulty of the task.

Overall, we observe that most teams adopted approaches similar to those used in Track A, with only minor adjustments to the prompts. Notably, even the best-performing teams achieved a Pearson correlation coefficient of no more than 0.65 on Algerian Arabic, likely due to the novelty and complexity of the dataset.

#### 5.4 Track C: Cross-lingual Emotion Detection

# **5.4.1** Best-Performing Systems

**Team deepwave** Team Deepwave fine-tuned Google Gemma-2 (Team et al., 2024) using tailored data augmentation and Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting. They decomposed the task into two sub-tasks: (1) sentiment keyword identification and (2) sentiment polarity recognition.

To address the challenge of limited data, they employed k-fold (k=5) cross-validation and used model merging—a strategy that combines the predictions of multiple models to improve generalization—by averaging the prediction probabilities of each model, assigning equal weights of 0.2. In this track, a dedicated LoRA module was trained for each target language. The training dataset for each module comprised data from all other languages in Track A, excluding the target language  $L_i$ . They




Figure 3: Top LLMs used by participants across tracks (A, B, and C).

exclusively used augmented data generated through CoT prompting for training.

**Team maomao** Team maomao experimented with different setups for fine-tuning LLMs. The base models used were Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, GPT-05440 Mini2, and LLaMA-3.2-3B-Instruct (AI@Meta, 2024). They applied Direct Preference Optimisation to refine their model -a technique that selects high-quality instances from lower-quality ones within a dataset. After this step, they retrained the model using the refined dataset. They also explored random sampling and retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) methods for training, primarily on DeepSeek-V3, Owen-Max5093, and Grok-V2.

#### 5.4.2 Takeaways

Other top-performing systems include Team Ozemi, who fine-tuned a multilingual BERT model and applied machine translation to enhance performance across all languages. They used the Synthetic Minority Oversampling Technique (SMOTE) with TF-IDF to address class imbalance in Russian. They translated all the datasets into a common language using Google Translate before processing except for Nigerian Pidgin and Emakhua, where they used a multilingual BERT model for translation. They also leveraged two Kaggle competition datasets for data augmentation.

Team heimerdinger, who ranked highest in Javanese, built their approach using various LLMs (LLaMA 3.1 8B, Qwen 2.5 7B, DeepSeek-7B, MistralV0.3-7B, and Gemma2-9B) for Track C. They employed in-context learning with multilingual examples from high-resource languages such as English and Spanish.

Overall, the participating teams outperformed our baselines. However, the average scores for this track are notably lower, particularly in lowresource languages, due to the additional challenges posed by limited data and resources. As shown in Table 4, there are significant performance gaps -even the top systems did not achieve an F-score higher than 0.50 in languages such as Javanese, Somali, Sundanese, Xhosa, Yorùbá, isiZulu, and Emakhuwa (where the top system achieved an F-score of only 0.21).

#### 6 Discussion

**Popular Methods** Unsurprisingly, most topperforming teams favored fine-tuning and prompting large language models (LLMs) such as Gemma-2, Mistral, Phi-4, Qwen-2.5, DeepSeek, LLaMA-3, GPT, and Gemini models. For fine-tuning, both full fine-tuning and parameter-efficient fine-tuning were the most commonly used strategies to enhance performance.

For prompting, few-shot, zero-shot, and chainof-thought prompting were the most frequently used techniques.

Many participants also experimented with traditional transformer-based models, particularly XLM-RoBERTa, mBERT, DeBERTa, and IndicBERT (Kakwani et al., 2020) (see Figure 3 and Figure 4 in the Appendix).

**Best Performing Systems** The results from the top-performing submissions suggest that while LLMs achieve strong overall performance, their effectiveness is heavily dependent on prompt engineering techniques and wording.

Additionally, performance varies significantly by language. Across all tracks, LLM-based approaches and the best-performing systems consistently yielded better results for high-resource languages such as English and Russian. In contrast, performance dropped notably when tested on low-resource languages such as Swahili and Emakhuwa.

Furthermore, most teams did not incorporate additional datasets to enhance performance (see Appendix), as few-shot and zero-shot approaches proved highly effective.

#### 7 Conclusion

We presented our shared task on text-based emotion recognition, which covered three tracks and a total of 32 languages. The submitted systems were ranked based on macro F1-scores for Tracks A and C, comparing predicted labels to gold labels, and based on the ranking of predicted intensity scores for Track B.

We summarised the reported results, discussing the best-performing and most innovative methods.

Overall, performance varied significantly across languages. Our results highlight that emotion recognition remains an open challenge, particularly for under-served languages and in low-resource settings.

#### 8 Limitations

Emotions are subjective and subtle, and they are expressed and perceived differently. We do not claim that our datasets capture the true emotions of the speakers, fully represent language use across the 32 languages, or cover all possible emotions. We discuss the ethical considerations extensively in Section 9.

We acknowledge the limited data sources available for some low-resource languages. Therefore, our datasets may not be suitable for tasks requiring large amounts of data in a given language. However, they serve as a valuable starting point for research in this area.

#### 9 Ethical Considerations

Emotion perception and expression are subjective and nuanced, as they are influenced by various factors (e.g., cultural background, social group, personal experiences, and social context). Thus, it is impossible to determine someone's emotions with absolute certainty based solely on short text snippets. Our datasets explicitly focus on perceived emotions—identifying the emotions that most people believe the speaker may have felt. We do not claim to annotate the speaker's true emotions, as these cannot be definitively determined from text alone. We recognise the importance of this distinction, as perceived emotions may differ from actual emotions.

We acknowledge potential biases in our data, as we rely on text-based communication, which inherently carries biases from data sources and annotators. Additionally, while many of our datasets focus on low-resource languages, we do not claim they fully represent these languages' usage. Further, although we took measures to filter inappropriate content, some instances may have been overlooked.

We explicitly urge careful consideration of ethical implications before using our datasets. We prohibit their use for commercial purposes or by state actors in high-risk applications unless explicitly approved by the dataset creators. Systems built on our datasets may not be reliable at the individual instance level and are susceptible to domain shifts. Thus, they should not be used for critical decision-making, such as in health applications, without expert supervision. For a more in-depth discussion, see Mohammad (2022, 2023).

Finally, all annotators involved in the study were compensated above the minimum hourly wage.

# Acknowledgments

Shamsuddeen Muhammad acknowledges the support of Google DeepMind and Lacuna Fund, an initiative co-founded by The Rockefeller Foundation, Google.org, and Canada's International Development Research Centre. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of Lacuna Fund, its Steering Committee, its funders, or Meridian Institute.

Nedjma Ousidhoum would like to thank Abderrahmane Samir Lazouni, Lyes Taher Khalfi, Manel Amarouche, Narimane Zahra Boumezrag, Noufel Bouslama, Abderaouf Ousidhoum, Sarah Arab, Wassil Adel Merzouk, Yanis Rabai, and another annotator who would like to stay anonymous for their work and insightful comments.

Idris Abdulmumin gratefully acknowledges the ABSA UP Chair of Data Science for funding his post-doctoral research and providing compute resources.

Jan Philip Wahle and Terry Ruas were partially supported by the Lower Saxony Ministry of Science and Culture and the VW Foundation.

Meriem Beloucif acknowledges Nationella Språkbanken (the Swedish National Language Bank) and Swe-CLARIN – jointly funded by the Swedish Research Council (2018–2024; dnr 2017-00626) and its 10 partner institutions for funding the Swedish annotations.

Alexander Panchenko would like to thank Nikolay Ivanov, Artem Vazhentsev, Mikhail Salnikov, Maria Marina, Vitaliy Protasov, Sergey Pletenev, Daniil Moskovskiy, Vasiliy Konovalov, Elisey Rykov, and Dmitry Iarosh for their help with the annotation for Russian. Preparation of Tatar data was funded by AIRI and completed by Dina Abdullina, Marat Shaehov, and Ilseyar Alimova. Yi Zhou would like to thank Gaifan Zhang, Bing Xiao, and Rui Qin for their help with the annotations and for providing feedback.

#### References

- Tolulope Olalekan Abiola, Olumide Ebenezer Ojo, Grigori Sidorov, Olga Kolesnikova, and Hiram Calvo. 2025. CIC-IPN at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Transformer-Based Approach to Multi-Class Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Moh. Aghna Maysan Abyan. 2025. AGHNA at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Predicting Emotion and Its Intensity within a Text with EmoBERTa. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Milad Afshari, Richard Frost, and Samantha Kissel. 2025. MRS at SemEval-2025 Task 11: A Hybrid Approach for Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Monir Ahmad, Muhammad Anwarul Azim, and Abu Nowshed Chy. 2025. CSECU-Learners at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multilingual Emotion Recognition and Intensity Prediction with Language-tuned Transformers and Multi-sample Dropout. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- AI@Meta. 2024. Llama 3 model card.
- Danileth Almanza, Juan Carlos Martínez Santos, and Edwin Puertas. 2025. VerbaNexAI at SemEval-2025 Task 11 Track A: A RoBERTa-Based Approach for the Classification of Emotions in Text. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aisha Aman-parveen. 2025. UIMP-Aaman at SemEval-2025 Task11: Detecting Intensity and Emotion in Social Media and News. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Sowmya Anand, Tanisha Sriram, Rajalakshmi Sivanaiah, Angel Deborah S, and Mirnalinee Thankanadar. 2025. DataBees at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Challenges and Limitations in Multi-Label Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Girma Yohannis Bade, Olga Kolesnikova, Jose Luis Oropeza, Grigori Sidorov, and Mesay Gemeda Yigezu. 2025. Amado at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multi-label Emotion Detection in Amharic and English Data. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mobin Barfi, Sajjad Mehrpeyma, and Nasser Mozayani. 2025. UncleLM at SemEval-2025 Task 11: RAG-Based Few-Shot Learning and Fine-Tuned Encoders for Multilingual Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Federico Bianchi, Debora Nozza, and Dirk Hovy. 2021. FEEL-IT: Emotion and sentiment classification for the Italian language. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis*, pages 76–83, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Federico Bianchi, Debora Nozza, and Dirk Hovy. 2022. Xlm-emo: Multilingual emotion prediction in social media text. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis*, pages 195–203.
- Tewodros Achamaleh Bizuneh, Lemlem Eyob Kawo, and Grigori Sidorov. 2025. Tewodros at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multi-Label Emotion Detection Across Languages with Small Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mariia Bogatyreva, Pascal Gaertner, Quim Ribas, and Daryna Dementieva. 2025. QiMP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Optimizing Text-based Emotion Classification in English Beyond Traditional Methods. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sara Bourbour, Maryam Gheysari, Amin Saeidi Kelishami, Tahereh Talaei, Fatemeh Rahimzadeh, and Erfan Moeini. 2025. Tarbiat Modares at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Tackling Multi-Label Emotion Detection with Transfer Learning. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Iago Alves Brito, Fernanda Bufon Farber, Julia Soares
   Dollis, Daniel Machado Pedrozo, Artur Ma Novais,
   Diogo Silva, and Arlindo R. Galvão Filho. 2025.
   AKCIT at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Investigating Data
   Quality in Portuguese Emotion Recognition. In Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria.
   Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ankush Chatterjee, Kedhar Nath Narahari, Meghana Joshi, and Puneet Agrawal. 2019. SemEval-2019 task 3: EmoContext contextual emotion detection in text. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 39–48, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cheng Chen. 2025. maomao at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiyu Chen, Necva Bölücü, Sarvnaz Karimi, Diego Molla, and Cecile L. Paris. 2025a. CSIRO-LT at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Adapting LLMs for Emotion Recognition for Multiple Languages. In *Proceedings of* the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pengfei Chen, Yuyang Lin, Xue Wan, Fengping Su, and Ling Sun. 2025b. Pateam at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Three-Hop Chain-of-Thought Guided Fine-Tuning for Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexandra Ciobotaru, Mihai Vlad Constantinescu, Liviu P. Dinu, and Stefan Dumitrescu. 2022. RED v2: Enhancing RED dataset for multi-label emotion detection. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 1392–1399, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Bill Clinton. 2025. GOLDX at SemEval-2025 Task 11: RoBERTa for Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Claudiu Creanga, Teodor-george Marchitan, and Liviu P. Dinu. 2025. Team Unibuc NLP at SemEval 2025

- Task 11: Few-shot text-based emotion detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xia Cui. 2025. xiacui at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Addressing Data Imbalance in Transformer-Based Multi-Label Emotion Detection with a Simplified Weighted Loss Function. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J. L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S. S. Li, Shuang Zhou, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, T. Wang, Wangding Zeng, Wanjia Zhao, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, W. L. Xiao, Wei An, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xianzu Wang, Xinxia Shan, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yuan Ou, Yuduan Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yunfan Xiong, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Y. X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yaohui Li, Yi Zheng, Yuchen Zhu, Yunxian Ma, Ying Tang, Yukun Zha, Yuting Yan, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhiyu Wu, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Zizheng Pan, Zhen Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, and Zhen Zhang. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incen-

- tivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.12948.
- Anastasiia Demidova, Injy Hamed, Teresa Lynn, and Thamar Solorio. 2025. Emotion Train at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Comparing Generative and Discriminative Models in Emotion Recognition. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eyal Liron Dolev. 2023. Does mBERT understand Romansh? evaluating word embeddings using word alignment. In *Proceedings of the 8th edition of the Swiss Text Analytics Conference*, pages 41–53, Neuchatel, Switzerland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tirana Noor Fatyanosa, Putra Pandu Adikara, Rochmanu Purnomohadi Erfitra, Muhammad Rajendra Alkautsar Dikna, Sari Dewi Budiwati, and Cahyana Cahyana. 2025. UB\_Tel-U at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Emotions Without Borders A Unified Framework for Multilingual Classification Using Augmentation and Ensemble. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Revanth Kumar Gundam, Abhinav Marri, and Radhika Mamidi. 2025. Zero at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multilingual Emotion Classification with BERT Variants: A Comparative Study. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guillermo Segura Gómez, Adrian Pastor Lopez Monroy, Fernando Sanchez-vega, and Alejandro Rosales Pérez. 2025. NLP-Cimat at SemEval 2025 Task 11: Prompt Optimization for LLMs via Genetic Algorithms and Systematic Mutation applied on Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jingyu Han, Megan M. Horikawa, and Suvi Lehtosalo. 2025. Tue-JMS at SemEval-2025 Task 11: KReLax: An Ensemble-Based Approach for Multilingual Emotion Detection and Addressing Data Imbalance. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ikhlasul Akmal Hanif, Eryawan Presma Yulianrifat, Jaycent Gunawan Ongris, Eduardus Tjitrahardja, Muhammad Falensi Azmi, Rahmat Bryan Naufal, and Alfan Farizki Wicaksono. 2025. University of Indonesia at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Evaluating State-of-the-Art Encoders for Multi-Label Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Shreya Havaldar, Bhumika Singhal, Sunny Rai, Langchen Liu, Sharath Chandra Guntuku, and Lyle Ungar. 2023. Multilingual language models are not multicultural: A case study in emotion. In *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 202–214, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniel Hershcovich, Stella Frank, Heather Lent, Miryam de Lhoneux, Mostafa Abdou, Stephanie Brandl, Emanuele Bugliarello, Laura Cabello Piqueras, Ilias Chalkidis, Ruixiang Cui, Constanza Fierro, Katerina Margatina, Phillip Rust, and Anders Søgaard. 2022. Challenges and strategies in crosscultural NLP. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6997–7013, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Md. Iqramul Hoque, Mahfuz Ahmed Anik, Abdur Rahman, and Azmine Toushik Wasi. 2025. CIOL at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multilingual Pre-trained Model Fusion for Text-based Emotion Recognition. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pouya Hosseinzadeh. 2025. XLM-Muriel at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Hard Parameter Sharing for Multilingual Multi-label Emotion Detection. In *Proceed*ings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziyi Huang and Xia Cui. 2025. PromotionGo at SemEval-2025 Task 11: A Feature-Centric Framework for Cross-Lingual Multi-Emotion Detection in Short Texts. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amir N. Ince and Saurav K. Aryal. 2025. Howard University-AI4PC at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Combining Expert Personas via Prompting for Enhanced Multilingual Emotion Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- MD Asif Iqbal, Avishek Das, Omar Sharif, Mohammed Moshiul Hoque, and Iqbal H Sarker. 2022. Bemoc: A corpus for identifying emotion in bengali texts. *SN Computer Science*, 3(2):135.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. 2024. Mixtral of experts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088.
- Zhou Yi Jiang and Dengtao Zhang. 2025. zhouyijiang1 at SemEval-2025 Task 11: A Multi-tag Detection

- Method based on Pre-training Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Divyanshu Kakwani, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Satish Golla, Gokul N.C., Avik Bhattacharyya, Mitesh M. Khapra, and Pratyush Kumar. 2020. IndicNLPSuite: Monolingual Corpora, Evaluation Benchmarks and Pre-trained Multilingual Language Models for Indian Languages. In *Findings of EMNLP*.
- Daniel Karaś and Martyna Śpiewak. 2025. OPI-DRO-HEL at at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Few-shot prompting for Text-based Emotion Recognition. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Samantha Kent and Theresa Nindel. 2025. ITF-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11 An Exploration of English and German Multi-label Emotion Detection using Fine-tuned Transformer Models. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ashinee Kesanam, Gummuluri Venkata Ravi Ram, Chaithanya Swaroop Banoth, and G Rama Mohana Reddy. 2025. NITK-VITAL at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Focal-RoBERTa: Addressing Class Imbalance in Multi-Label Emotion Classification. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maham Khan, Faiza Khan, Laiba Rana, Hajra Binte Naeem, Seemab Latif, Mehwish Fatima, and Khurram Raja Shahzad. 2025. NUST Titans at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Exploring Afro-XLMR for Multi-Lingual, Multi-Label Emotion Recognition in Low-Resource Languages. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sarika Khatun, Dipanjan Saha, and Dipankar Das. 2025. JUNLP\_Sarika at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Bridging Contextual Gaps in Text-Based Emotion Detection using Transformer Models. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Svetlana Kiritchenko and Saif M. Mohammad. 2016. Capturing reliable fine-grained sentiment associations by crowdsourcing and best-worst scaling. In Proceedings of The 15th Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL), San Diego, California.
- Wang Kongqiang. 2025. wangkongqiang at SemEval-2025 Task 11:Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th Interna-*

- tional Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Saurabh Kumar, Sujit Kumar, Sanasam Ranbir Singh, and Sukumar Nandi. 2025. indiDataMiner at SemEval-2025 Task 11: From Text to Emotion: Transformer-Based Models for Emotions Detection in Indian Languages. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joseph Le, Hannah Cui, and James Zhang. 2025a. Stanford MLab at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Track B—Emotion Intensity Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Khoa Nguyen Anh Le and Dang Van Thin. 2025. JellyK at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Russian Multi-label Emotion Detection with Pre-trained BERT-based Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nguyen Pham Hoang Le, An Nguyen Tran Khuong, Tram Nguyen Thi Ngoc, and Thin Dang Van. 2025b. NTA at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Enhanced Multilingual Textual Multi-label Emotion Detection via Integrated Augmentation Learning. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Frances Adriana Laureano De Leon, Yixiao Wang, Yue Feng, and Mark Lee. 2025. UoB-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Leveraging Adapters for Multilingual and Cross-Lingual Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mikhail Lepekhin and Serge Sharoff. 2025. Domain\_adaptation at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Adversarial Domain Adaptation for Text-based Emotion Recognition. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jing Li and Xutao Yang. 2025. EMO-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multi-label Emotion Detection in Multiple Languages Based on XLMCNN. In *Proceed*ings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tian Li, Yujian Sun, and Huizhi. 2025. Chinchunmei at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Boosting the Large Language Model's Capability of Emotion Perception using Contrastive Learning. In *Proceedings of the*

- 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angeliki Linardatou and Paraskevi Platanou. 2025. Angeliki Linardatou at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multilabel Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chao Liu, Junliang Liu, Tengxiao Lv, Huayang Huayang Li, Tao Zeng, Ling Luo, Yuanyuan Sun, and Hongfei Lin. 2025. DUT\_IR at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Enhancing Multi-Label Emotion Classification with an Ensemble of Pre-trained Language Models and Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kun Lu. 2025. NCL-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Using Prompting engineering framework and Low Rank Approximation of Large Language Models for Multi-label Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abdeljalil El Majjodi, Imane Momayiz, and Nouamane Tazi. 2025. AtlasIA at SemEval-2025 Task 11: FastText-Based Emotion Detection in Moroccan Arabic for Low-Resource Settings. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Youssef Mohamed, Runjia Li, Ibrahim Said Ahmad, Kilichbek Haydarov, Philip Torr, Kenneth Church, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2024. No culture left behind: ArtELingo-28, a benchmark of WikiArt with captions in 28 languages. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 20939–20962, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Saif Mohammad. 2022. Ethics sheets for AI tasks. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8368–8379, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Saif Mohammad. 2023. Best practices in the creation and use of emotion lexicons. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pages 1825–1836, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Saif Mohammad and Felipe Bravo-Marquez. 2017. WASSA-2017 shared task on emotion intensity. In *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis*, pages 34–49, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Saif Mohammad, Felipe Bravo-Marquez, Mohammad Salameh, and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2018a. Semeval-2018 task 1: Affect in tweets. In *Proceedings of the 12th international workshop on semantic evaluation*, pages 1–17.
- Saif Mohammad, Felipe Bravo-Marquez, Mohammad Salameh, and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2018b. SemEval-2018 task 1: Affect in tweets. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 1–17, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Saif Mohammad and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2018. Understanding emotions: A dataset of tweets to study interactions between affect categories. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Saif M. Mohammad. 2024. WorryWords: Norms of anxiety association for over 44k English words. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16261–16278, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Melissa Andrea Moreno, Juan Carlos Martínez Santos, and Edwin Puertas. 2025. VebanexAI at Semeval-2025 Task 11 Track B: Predicting Emotion Intensity with BERT and VAD-Informed Attention. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lev Morozov, Aleksandr Mogilevskii, and Alexander Shirnin. 2025. Empaths at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Retrieval-Augmented Approach to Perceived Emotions Prediction. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shamsuddeen Hassan Muhammad, Nedjma Ousidhoum, Idris Abdulmumin, Jan Philip Wahle, Terry Ruas, Meriem Beloucif, Christine de Kock, Nirmal Surange, Daniela Teodorescu, Ibrahim Said Ahmad, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Alham Fikri Aji, Felermino D. M. A. Ali, Ilseyar Alimova, Vladimir Araujo, Nikolay Babakov, Naomi Baes, Ana-Maria Bucur, Andiswa Bukula, Guanqun Cao, Rodrigo Tufino Cardenas, Rendi Chevi, Chiamaka Ijeoma Chukwuneke, Alexandra Ciobotaru, Daryna Dementieva, Murja Sani Gadanya, Robert Geislinger, Bela Gipp, Oumaima Hourrane, Oana Ignat, Falalu Ibrahim Lawan, Rooweither Mabuya, Rahmad Mahendra, Vukosi Marivate, Andrew Piper, Alexander Panchenko, Charles Henrique Porto Ferreira, Vitaly Protasov, Samuel Rutunda, Manish Shrivastava, Aura Cristina Udrea, Lilian Diana Awuor Wanzare, Sophie Wu, Florian Valentin Wunderlich, Hanif Muhammad Zhafran, Tianhui Zhang, Yi Zhou, and Saif M. Mohammad. 2025. Brighter: Bridging

- the gap in human-annotated textual emotion recognition datasets for 28 languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11926*.
- Noah S. Murrant, Samantha Brooks, and Milton King. 2025. STFXNLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11 Track A: Neural Network, Schema, and Next Word Prediction-based Approaches to Perceived Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tafazzul Nadeem, Riyansha Singh, Suyamoon Pathak, and Ashutosh Modi. 2025. Exploration Lab IITK at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aylin Naebzadeh and Fatemeh Fatemeh Askari. 2025. GinGer at SemEval Task 11 Leveraging Fine-Tuned Transformer Models and LoRA for Sentiment Analysis in Low-Resource Languages. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emily Öhman, Marc Pàmies, Kaisla Kajava, and Jörg Tiedemann. 2020. Xed: A multilingual dataset for sentiment analysis and emotion detection. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2011.01612.
- OpenAI. 2024. Gpt-4o system card.
- Cristian Daniel Paduraru. 2025. Team UBD at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Balancing Class and Task Importance for Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the* 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ashraful Islam Paran, Sabik Aftahee, Md. Refaj Hossan, Jawad Hossain, and Mohammed Moshiul Hoque. 2025. Zero\_Shot at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Fine-Tuning Deep Learning and Transformer-based Models for Emotion Detection in Multi-label Classification, Intensity Estimation, and Cross-lingual Adaptation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mohammad Sadegh Poulaei, Mohammad Erfan Zare, Mohammad Reza Mohammadi, and Sauleh Eetemadi. 2025. YNWA\_PZ at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multilingual Multi-Label Sentiment Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Niloofar Ranjbar and Hamed Baghbani. 2025. Lotus at SemEval-2025 Task 11: RoBERTa with Llama-3 Generated Explanations for Multi-Label Emotion

- Classification. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jorge Reyes-magaña, Luis Basto-díaz, and Luis Fernando Curi-quintal. 2025. TILeN at SemEval-2025
   Task 11: A Transformer-Based Model for Sentiment Classification Applied to the Russian Language. In Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Md. Shihab Uddin Riad and Mohammad Aman Ullah. 2025. SyntaxMind at SemEval-2025 Task 11: BERT Base Multi-label Emotion Detection Using Gated Recurrent Unit. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhihao Ruan, Runyang You, Kaifeng Yang, Junxin Lin, Wenwen Dai, Mengyuan Zhou, Meizhi Jin, and Xinyue Mei. 2025. PAI at SemEval-2025 Task 11: A Large Language Model Ensemble Strategy for Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jithu Morrison S, Janani Hariharakrishnan, and Harsh Pratap Singh. 2025a. Pixel Phantoms at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Enhancing Multilingual Emotion Detection with a T5 and mT5-Based Approach. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vishal S, Rajalakshmi Sivanaiah, and Angel Deborah S. 2025b. TechSSN3 at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multi-Label Emotion Detection Using Ensemble Transformer Models and Lexical Rules. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniel Saeedi, Alireza Kheirandish, Sirwe Saeedi, Hossein Sahour, Aliakbar Panahi, and Iman Ahmadi Naeeni. 2025. GT-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: EmoRationale, Evidence-Based Emotion Detection via Retrieval-Augmented Generation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amirhossein Safdarian, Milad Mohammadi, and Heshaam Faili. 2025. UT-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Evaluating Zero-Shot Capability of GPT-40 mini on Emotion Recognition via Role-Play and Contrastive Judging. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Alieh Hajizadeh Saffar, Tiffany Katharine Mann, and Bahadorreza Ofoghi. 2023. Textual emotion detection in health: Advances and applications. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 137:104258.
- P Sam Sahil and Anupam Jamatia. 2025. Team A at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Breaking Language Barriers in Emotion Detection with Multilingual Models. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sadman Sakib, Ahaj Mahhin Faiak, Abdullah Ibne Hanif Arean, and Fariha Anjum Shifa. 2025. NLP-DU at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Analyzing Multi-label Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abdallah Saleh and Mariam M. Biltawi. 2025. HTU at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Divide and Conquer Mutli-Label emotion classification using 6 DziriB-ERTs submodels with Label-fused Iterative Masking technique for low-resource data augmentation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sani Abdullahi Sani, Salim Abubakar, Falalu Ibrahim Lawan, Abdulhamid Abubakar, and Maryam Bala. 2025. HausaNLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Advancing Hausa Text-based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emmanuel Santos-rodriguez and Mario Graff. 2025. INFOTEC-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: A Case Study on Transformer-Based Models and Bag of Words. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mei Silviana Saputri, Rahmad Mahendra, and Mirna Adriani. 2018. Emotion classification on indonesian twitter dataset. In 2018 International Conference on Asian Language Processing (IALP), pages 90–95.
- Zafar Sarif, Dipankar Das, Dr. Abhishek Das, and Md Sharib Akhtar. 2025. Trans-Sent at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Text-based Multi-label Emotion Detection using Pre-Trained BERT Transformer Models. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Albina Sarymsakova and Patricia Martin-rodilla. 2025. IEGPS-CSIC at SemEval-2025 Task 11: BERT-based approach for Multi-label Emotion Detection in English and Russian texts. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Kimberly Sharp, Sofia Kathmann, and Amelie Rüeck. 2025. Team KiAmSo at SemEval-2025 Task 11: A comparison of classification models for Multilabel Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dong Shenpo. 2025. Deep at SemEval-2025 Task 11: A Multi-Stage Approach to Emotion Detection. In Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marco Siino. 2024. DeBERTa at SemEval-2024 task 9: Using DeBERTa for defying common sense. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2024)*, pages 291–297, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Carlo Strapparava and Rada Mihalcea. 2007. SemEval-2007 task 14: Affective text. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on Semantic Evaluations (SemEval-2007)*, pages 70–74, Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hidetsune Takahashi, Sumiko Teng, Jina Lee, Wenxiao Hu, Rio Obe, Chuen Shin Yong, and Emily Sofi Ohman. 2025. OZemi at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multilingual Emotion Detection and Intensity. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mehrzad Tareh, Erfan Mohammadzadeh, Aydin Mohandesi, and Ebrahim Ansari. 2025. IASBS at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Ensembling Transformers for Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. 2024. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118.
- Zeliang Tong, Zhuojun Ding, and Yingjia Li. 2025. Heimerdinger at SemEval-2025 Task 11: A Multi-Agent Framework for Perceived Emotion Detection in Multilingual Text. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wondimagegnhue Tsegaye Tufa, Fadi Hassan, Evgenii Migaev, and Yalei Fu. 2025. FiRC-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Comparing Prompt-based and Fine-Tuning Approaches for Multilingual Emotion Classification. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Ravindran V, Rajalakshmi Sivanaiah, and Angel Deborah S. 2025. RSSN at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Optimizing Multi-Label Emotion Detection with Transformer-Based Models and Threshold Tuning. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vijay Karthick Vaidyanathan, Srihari V K, Mugilkrishna D U, and Saritha Madhavan. 2025. NLP\_goats at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multi-Label Emotion Classification Using Fine-Tuned Roberta-Large Tranformer. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vivek Verma and David Ifeoluwa Adelani. 2025. McGill-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jesús Vázquez-osorio, Helena Gómez-adorno, Gerardo Sierra, Vladimir Sierra-casiano, Diana Cancholahernández, José Tovar-cortés, Roberto Solís-vilchis, and Gabriel Salazar. 2025. LATE-GIL-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Multi-Language Emotion Detection and Intensity Classification Using Transformer Models with Optimized Loss Functions for Imbalanced Data. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Owais Waheed, Hammad Sajid, Kushal Chandani, and Muhammad Areeb Kazmi. 2025. Habib University at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angeline Wang and Aditya Gupta. 2025. CodeBlAIzers at SemEval-2025 Task 11: A BERT-based Approach for Multi-Hot Emotion Detection with Emotion-Specific Sensitivity. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shiquan Wang, Shengxiong Peng, Fang Rui Yu, Mengxiang Li, Zhongjiang He, Yongxiang Li, and Shuangyong Song. 2025. TeleAI at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection with Prompt Engineering and Data Augmentation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhenlan Wang. 2025. KDBERT MLDistill at SemEval 2025 Task 11 Multilabel Emotion Recognition via Orthogonal Knowledge Distillation. In *Proceedings*

- of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025), Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Janyce Wiebe, Theresa Wilson, and Claire Cardie. 2005. Annotating expressions of opinions and emotions in language. *Language resources and evaluation*, 39:165–210.
- Wilson Wongso, David Samuel Setiawan, Ananto Joyoadikusumo, and Steven Limcorn. 2025. Lazarus NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Fine-Tuning Large Language Models for Multi-Label Emotion Classification via Sentence-Label Pairing. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhe-yu Xu, Yu-hsin Wu, and Lung-hao Lee. 2025. NYCU-NLP at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Assembling Small Language Models for Multilabel Emotion Detection and Intensity Prediction. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jieying Xue, Phuong Minh Nguyen, Minh Le Nguyen, and Xin Liu. 2025. JNLP at SemEval-2025 Task
  11: Cross-Lingual Multi-Label Emotion Detection Using Generative Models. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. 2024. Qwen2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*.
- Hao Yang, Jin Wang, and Xuejie Zhang. 2025. YNU-NPCC at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Using Multiple Prediction Headers. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hiu Yan Yip, Hing Man Chiu, and Hai-yin Yang. 2025. CharsiuRice at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Bridging the Gap in Text-Based Emotion Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ting Zhu, Liting Non Huang, and Huizhi. 2025. tinaal at SemEval-2025 Task 11: Enhancing Perceived Emotion Intensity Prediction with Boosting Fine-Tuned Transformers. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Task Results and Analysis

In this section, we provide the complete shared task results in Tables 5, 6 and 7, and some statistics

on the architectures, training strategies, fine-tuning and prompting techniques used by our participants (Figure 4). We also provide information on additional training data usage Appendix A.

Table 5: Track A Results

| SN | Team Name               | afr  | amh  | arq  | ary  | chn  | deu  | eng  | esp  | hau  | hin  | odi  | kin  | mar  | orm    | bc H | otbr p | tmz r  | ron    | ns su   | 1S WC   | vs nr   | va sw   | le ta   | t ti    | 구         | VIIIV  | Š      | avg .  | مد ا                |
|----|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|
| -  | PAI                     | 6.69 | 64.7 |      | 62.9 | 70.9 |      | 82.3 | 84.9 | 75.1 | 92.0 | 0.09 | 65.7 | 88.4 |        |      | 58.3   | 7 8.4  |        |         |         |         |         |         |         | .8 72     | 6 25.  |        | 1 66.  | ∞:                  |
| 2  | University of Indonesia | 54.6 | 51.2 | 55.0 | 53.5 | 67.9 |      | 74.9 | 79.5 | 4.49 | 86.1 | 49.6 | 48.4 | 84.7 |        |      | 2 6.99 | 12.7   |        |         | -       |         |         |         |         | .0 63     | 4 13.  |        | 0 56.  | 9.                  |
| 3  | LATE-GIL-NLP            | 35.0 | 58.1 | 48.6 | 51.3 |      |      | 76.3 | 75.2 |      | 87.3 | 56.3 | 51.1 | 78.8 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         | .5 58.7 | .7 47     | 5 16.  | ` '    | 5 55.  | -:                  |
| 4  | Zero_Shot               | 27.0 | 54.1 | 23.9 | 23.1 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 69.5 | 73.6 |      | 83.8 | 47.0 | 19.8 | 2.08 | -      |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         | .6 31   | 4.        | _      | 12.5   |        | 5.                  |
| S  | NTA                     | 40.7 | 67.2 | 50.6 |      |      | 57.1 | 76.1 | 75.3 |      | 83.7 | 47.0 | 38.0 | 81.4 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | ι.                  |
| 9  | XLM-Muriel              | 42.7 | 66.4 | 46.1 | 50.9 | ٠.   |      |      | 74.6 |      | 84.0 | 47.8 | 32.1 | 84.2 |        |      |        |        |        | -       | -       |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | .1                  |
| 7  | PromotionGo             | 22.1 | 42.7 | 40.7 | 37.9 |      | 43.2 | 65.5 | 60.1 |      | 66.4 | 47.6 | 31.3 | 64.5 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | S.                  |
| ∞  | OZemi                   | 46.9 | 37.0 | 48.0 |      | 49.9 | 50.8 | 63.8 | 52.5 | 37.6 | 46.8 | 28.5 | 29.9 | 8.64 | 31.1 4 | 46.4 | 34.6 2 | 24.2 6 | 64.2 7 | 70.6 30 | 30.9 39 | 39.9 23 | 23.4 38 | 38.3 40 | 40.6 33 | 33.1 27.9 | 9 19.3 | 3 21.1 | 1 40.0 | 0.                  |
| 6  | INFOTEC-NLP             | 50.9 | 69.4 | 51.7 | 55.5 | 64.8 |      | 70.9 | 79.2 |      | 89.4 | 50.0 | 35.3 | 0.88 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           | ١.     |        |        | 0.                  |
| 10 | Pixel Phantoms          | 30.6 | 43.7 | 32.1 | 34.2 | 39.6 |      | 59.7 | 64.0 |      | 73.0 | 41.0 | 31.7 | 70.2 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           | `      |        |        | 4.                  |
| Ξ  | YNWA_PZ                 | 54.0 |      |      |      |      |      |      | 76.2 |      | 80.3 | 50.9 | 51.9 | 81.1 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | 0.                  |
| 12 | Deepwave                | 52.3 |      |      |      |      |      |      | 79.4 |      | 90.1 | 48.1 | 38.0 | 87.8 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           | -      |        |        | $\dot{\varepsilon}$ |
| 13 | UB_Tel-U                | 55.1 |      | 52.9 | 43.3 | 50.6 | 58.3 | 70.3 | 70.8 |      | 2.99 | 38.6 | 32.9 | 68.4 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | 6.                  |
| 14 | Heimerdinger            | 57.4 | 55.8 |      | 58.2 | 0.89 |      | 80.4 | 83.8 |      | 9.68 | 54.1 | 44.5 | 7.78 |        |      |        |        |        | -       | -       |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | $\varepsilon$       |
| 15 | Chinchunmei             | 57.7 | 77.3 |      |      | 8.99 | 70.4 | 79.7 | 81.7 |      | 0.06 | 55.9 | 47.0 | 87.2 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | ∞.                  |
| 16 | TeleAI                  | 57.8 |      |      |      | 68.2 |      |      | 80.7 |      | 85.2 | 38.5 | 39.5 | 78.3 |        |      |        |        |        |         | -       |         |         |         |         |           | -      |        |        | 5.                  |
| 17 | FiRC-NLP                | 58.0 | 9.69 | 55.2 | 58.5 | 61.7 | 68.4 | 74.2 | 79.7 |      | 87.8 | 54.1 | 41.5 | 2.98 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | -:                  |
| 18 | maomao                  | 68.7 | 49.1 | 45.4 | 54.8 | 60.3 | 57.0 | 63.2 | 77.8 |      | 81.9 | 32.0 | 43.1 | 83.7 |        |      |        |        |        | -       |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | 2                   |
| 19 | McGill-NLP              | 60.1 |      |      |      |      | 64.4 | 77.7 | 79.0 |      | 88.0 | 53.2 | 59.0 | 87.5 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | 4.                  |
| 20 | Empaths                 | 2.99 |      |      | 37.0 |      |      |      | 81.7 |      | 9.98 | 53.8 | 56.3 | 86.4 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | 4.                  |
| 21 | Pateam                  | 26.6 | 33.3 | 56.3 | 44.5 |      | 43.8 | 80.5 | 82.8 |      | 78.2 | 26.0 | 21.9 | 67.5 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           | _      |        |        | ĸ.                  |
| 22 | UoB-NLP                 | 45.0 |      | 46.9 |      |      |      | 64.5 | 72.9 | 66.3 | 84.2 | 47.2 | 51.6 | 80.0 |        |      |        |        |        | -       |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | Т.                  |
| 23 | YNU-NPCC                | 43.5 |      | 44.4 | 48.4 |      | 60.3 | 1    | 73.1 |      | 82.2 | 36.6 | 44.3 | 82.0 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           | •      |        |        | 7.                  |
| 24 | JNLP                    | 59.2 | 67.7 |      | 6.09 |      |      |      | 83.0 | 65.0 | 95.6 | 54.0 | 42.9 | 87.8 |        |      |        |        |        | -       |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | 0.                  |
| 25 | CSIRO-LT                | 31.6 |      | 52.5 |      |      | 65.7 | 9.77 | 82.0 |      | 73.2 | 32.6 | 43.0 | 75.8 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         | .8 50.0 |           |        |        |        | 7.                  |
| 56 | Howard University-AI4PC | ı    | 15.4 |      |      |      |      |      | 57.0 |      | 67.9 | 18.5 | 16.6 | 58.4 |        | 29.5 | 38.6 2 | -      |        | 59.0 16 |         |         |         |         |         | 35.3      | 3 12.8 |        |        | .5                  |
| 27 | Tue-JMS                 | 1    | 9.69 |      |      |      | 64.5 | 68.5 | 79.4 | 69.0 | 88.5 | 53.0 | 53.2 | 87.3 |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           | 4      | 1      |        | 9:                  |
| 28 | SyntaxMind              | 36.5 |      | 45.7 | 37.3 |      |      |      | 57.4 |      | 65.1 | ı    |      | 72.5 |        |      |        |        |        | 0.99    | - 35    |         | 24.1 43 |         | 1.      | 31.       |        | 26.]   | _      | 6.                  |
| 29 | IASBS                   | 59.1 | 52.3 |      |      | 55.4 |      |      | 72.8 | 65.8 | 81.1 | 54.4 | ı    | 80.1 | ı      |      |        | •      |        | 2.2     |         |         |         |         |         | 28        | ∞      | •      | 65     | 6:                  |
| 30 | Emotion Train           | 1    | 1    | 56.5 |      |      |      |      | 76.1 |      | 1    | 1    |      |      | ٠.     | 59.3 | 53.6 4 | 47.1 7 |        | 8.2     | 1       | - 17    | 2.4 53  | ,       | - 8.6   | 45        | 3      | 1      | 58.    | 0.                  |
| 31 | Team A                  | 1    | 68.5 | ٠    | 55.5 | 61.2 | 66.5 |      | 80.5 | 67.7 | 89.0 |      | 1    | 9.98 | 56.3   |      |        | - 7    |        | 8.3     |         |         | Ċ       | Ċ       |         | 09        | 1      | '      | 71.    | 4.                  |
| 32 | Habib University        | 25.7 | 45.5 | ٠    | 14.5 |      |      |      | 71.3 | ٠    | 80.8 |      |      | 76.4 | 1      | 1    |        | •      |        | 2.1     |         |         | - 21    |         |         | 29        | 1 .    | 1      | 50.    | 33                  |
| 33 | JellyK                  | ı    | ٠    |      | '    | 63.9 |      | 76.2 | 77.2 |      | 86.1 |      |      | 86.3 | 1      | 58.2 | 7      | 12.2 7 |        | 8.9     |         |         | Ċ       | . 59    | 59.3 -  | 57        | - 6    | 1      | 69     | 9:                  |
| 34 | CSECU-Learners          | 1    | 70.2 | 55.5 |      |      |      | 73.8 | 76.9 | 67.3 |      | 1    |      |      | 1      | 1    | 52.4   | - 7    | 74.7   | 84.7    | 1       |         |         |         |         | 20        | - 9    | '      | 99     | 0:                  |
| 35 | UncleLM                 | 1    | •    | •    | 53.9 |      |      | 74.6 | 76.4 |      | 85.6 |      | 1    | 80.0 | ,      | ,    | 4      | 4.0 7  |        | 7.1     |         |         |         |         |         |           | 1      | 1      | 99     | -:                  |
| 36 | Domain_adaptation       | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      | 72.0 |      | •    |      |      |      | 1      | ,    | 49.3   | - 5    | 4.0 7  | . 0.9/  |         |         | Ì       |         |         | 50.4      | 4      | •      | 52.    |                     |
| 37 | Team KiAmSo             | 46.7 |      | 49.1 | 50.1 | 56.6 | 59.8 | 72.5 | 76.3 | 58.4 | 78.5 |      | ı    | ı    | ,      |      |        | 1      |        | ,       |         |         |         |         |         |           | •      | •      | 9      | -:                  |
| 38 | EMO-NLP                 | 1    | 60.2 |      |      | '    | 53.1 | 8.99 | 1    |      |      | 1    |      | ,    | 31.8   | -    | 45.9   | 1      | - 7    | 75.9 37 | 7.8 29  | 9.3     | Ċ       | Ċ       | . 32    | . 5.      | 1      | 1      | 48.    | Τ.                  |
| 39 | GT-NLP                  | 51.9 |      | 52.7 | 53.1 | •    | 66.3 | 1    | •    | •    |      |      |      |      |        |      | 6.65   |        | ×      | 6.4     |         |         | - 56    | 4.      |         | 9         | - 0    | '      | 9      | ∞.                  |
|    |                         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |      |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |           |        |        |        | ı                   |

Table 5. Continued from previous page

| E  | Table 3. Commune mon previous page | 717 T | 3    | r<br>o | ,     |       |       |           |      |      |      |      |       |       |              |          |               |        |      |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       |        | ١    |
|----|------------------------------------|-------|------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|--------------|----------|---------------|--------|------|-----|------|------|------|-----|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|
| SN | Team Name                          | afr   | amh  | arq    | l ary | , chn | n deu | eng       | esb  | hau  | hin  | ibo  | kin m | mar o | orm pcm      |          | ptbr ptmz ron | ız ron | rus  | SOM | sun  | swa  | swe  | tat | tir u | ukr v | VIIIW | yor a  | avg  |
| 40 | Trans-Sent                         | •     | 54.7 | - 1    | '     | '     | 48.0  | 48.0 70.4 | •    | 1    | 82.4 | ,    | -     | 80.3  |              |          | '             | 70.9   | 88.3 |     |      |      | 1    | 1   |       | ,     |       |        | 70.7 |
| 41 | NUST Titans                        | '     | 71.4 | -      | '     | 1     |       |           | ٠    | 69.2 |      | 18.1 |       |       | ľ            |          | 1             | '      |      |     | 34.5 | 29.5 |      |     |       | ,     | - 3   | 2      | 42.3 |
| 42 | Zero                               | 1     | ٠    | 1      | 1     | 1     | ٠     | 71.7      |      | 1    |      |      | 1     |       | 1            |          | 1             | 36.7   | 52.9 | ٠   | ٠    | •    |      |     |       |       |       | 4      | 49.3 |
| 43 | Tewodros                           | 1     | 70.0 | -      | •     | •     | ٠     | 71.2      | 79.4 |      |      |      |       | 9 -   | - 9.19       |          | 1             | •      | ٠    |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | 7      | 9.0  |
| 4  | UIMP-Aaman                         | 1     | 1    | ٠      | 1     | 1     | 62.4  | 12.2      | 76.7 | ı    | 1    | ,    | 1     | ı     | 1            | . 51.7   | - L           | 1      | •    | ٠   | ٠    | ٠    |      |     |       |       |       | - 9    | 65.8 |
| 45 | GinGer                             | 45.4  |      | 54.7   |       | ٠     | ٠     | ٠         |      |      | 83.9 |      |       |       |              |          | 1             | •      | ٠    |     |      |      | 52.3 |     |       |       |       | - 5    | 59.1 |
| 46 | DUT_IR                             | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 1     |           |      | 1    | 84.2 |      |       | 83.7  | T            |          | -             | 1      | 74.4 |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | ∞ -    | 6.0  |
| 47 | DataBees                           | 1     | ٠    | ٠      | •     | ٠     | 51.7  |           | 9.69 | ,    |      |      | 1     | ,     |              | <u>'</u> | 1             | •      | ٠    |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | - 5    | 52.8 |
| 48 | Team Unibuc                        | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 75.5      |      | 1    |      |      | 1     | 1     | T            |          | . 17.3        | 3      | 1    |     |      |      |      |     |       | ا ع   | 32.5  | 4      | 41.8 |
| 49 | indiDataMiner                      | ١     | '    | '      | '     | '     | 1     | 66.3      | ١    | ,    | 87.4 | ,    | -     | 88.3  | <sup>'</sup> | ľ        | '             | 1      | ٠    | ٠   | ٠    | ٠    | ,    |     | ,     | ,     |       | ×      | 80.7 |
| 20 | CIOF                               | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 62.1      |      | 1    |      |      | 1     | 1     | 1            | . 27.7   | - L.          | 1      | 84.8 | ٠   |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | - 5    | 58.2 |
| 51 | CIC-IPN                            |       |      | '      | '     | 1     | •     | 70.6      | 73.2 |      |      |      |       |       |              | '        | 1             | 1      | ,    |     |      |      |      |     |       |       | - 2   | 28.2 5 | 7.3  |
| 52 | Team UBD                           | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 54.3  | 9.89      | 76.2 | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1            |          | 1             | 1      | •    | ٠   |      |      | ı    |     | 1     |       |       | 9 -    | 66.2 |
| 53 | ITF-NLP                            | 1     |      | '      | '     | '     | 62.2  | 75.0      |      | ,    |      |      | ,     | ,     | '            |          | 1             | '      | '    |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | -      | 9.89 |
| 54 | IEGPS-CSIC                         | 1     | ٠    | 1      | '     | 1     | 1     | 71.0      | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1            |          | 1             | 1      | 84.2 | ٠   | ٠    | ٠    | ı    |     | 1     |       |       | - 7    | 77.6 |
| 55 | NLP-DU                             | 1     |      | '      | '     | '     | 1     | 70.6      |      | ,    |      |      | ,     | ,     | '            |          | 1             | '      | '    |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | - 7    | 9.0  |
| 99 | zhouyijiang1                       | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 70.5      | 1    | 1    | 1    |      | 1     | 1     | 1            |          | 1             | 1      | 1    | ٠   |      | 1    | 1    | ,   |       |       |       | - 7    | 0.5  |
| 57 | wangkongqiang                      | •     | ٠    | •      | •     | ٠     | 1     | 70.0      | ٠    |      |      |      |       |       |              |          | 1             | •      | ٠    | ٠   |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | - 7    | 70.0 |
| 28 | JUNLP                              | 1     | ٠    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 6.69      | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1     | 1     | T            |          | 1             | 1      | ٠    | •   |      | ٠    |      |     | 1     |       |       | -      | 6.69 |
| 59 | dianchi                            | •     | ٠    | •      | •     | 1     | 1     | 9.69      | 1    | ,    |      | ,    | ,     |       |              |          | 1             | 1      | ٠    | ٠   |      | ٠    | ,    |     | ,     |       |       | - 9    | 9.69 |
| 09 | RSSN                               | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 69.4      |      | 1    |      |      | 1     | 1     | T            |          | -             | 1      | 1    |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | -      | 69.4 |
| 61 | CodeBlAIzers                       | 1     | ٠    | •      | •     | ٠     | 1     | 55.2      |      | ,    |      |      | 1     | 1     |              | <u>'</u> | 1             | •      | ٠    |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | - 5    | 5.2  |
| 62 | Angeliki Linardatou                | 1     | ٠    | 1      | 1     | •     | •     | 8.79      | •    |      |      |      |       |       |              |          | '             | 1      | •    |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | 9 -    | 7.8  |
| 63 | TILeN                              | '     | 1    | ٠      | •     | 1     | 1     | 1         | 1    | ,    |      | ,    | ,     |       |              |          | 1             | 1      | 82.1 |     |      |      | ,    | ,   | ,     | ,     |       | ×      | 82.1 |
| 49 | AKCIT                              | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | •     | ٠         | •    |      |      |      |       |       |              | . 60.2   | .2            | 1      | •    | ٠   |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | 9 -    | 60.2 |
| 65 | STFXNLP                            | 1     | •    | 1      | 1     | •     | 1     | 64.7      | ٠    | 1    |      | ,    | 1     | 1     | -            |          | 1             | '      | •    | ٠   |      |      |      |     |       | ,     |       | 9 -    | 64.7 |
| 99 | VerbaNexAI                         | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 62.7      | •    | 1    | 1    |      | 1     | 1     |              |          | 1             | 1      | •    | ٠   |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | 9 -    | 62.7 |
| 29 | NLP-Cimat                          | 1     | •    | 1      | 1     | •     | 1     | 62.4      | ٠    | 1    |      | ,    | 1     | 1     | -            |          | 1             | '      | •    | ٠   |      |      |      |     |       | ,     |       | - 6    | 62.4 |
| 89 | HausaNLP                           | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | ı     | 1         | •    | 56.0 | 1    | ,    | 1     | ı     | 1            |          | 1             | 1      | •    | ٠   | ٠    | ٠    |      |     |       |       |       | - 5    | 56.0 |
| 69 | TechSSN3                           | 1     | 1    | 1      | 1     | 1     | •     | 69.0      | •    | 1    |      |      | 1     |       | 1            |          | 1             | •      | 1    | •   |      |      | ı    | ı   |       |       |       | -      | 0.6  |
| 70 | HTU                                | 1     | ١    | 48.6   | - 9   | 1     | 1     | 1         | 1    | 1    | ı    | ı    | 1     | 1     | 1            |          | 1             | 1      | 1    | ٠   | ٠    | 1    | ,    | ,   |       |       |       | 4      | 48.6 |
| 71 | xiacui                             | 1     | •    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 72.2      | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | ,     | 1     |              |          | 1             | 1      | •    | ٠   | ٠    |      | 1    |     | 1     |       |       | - 7    | 2.2  |
| 72 | GOLDX                              | 1     | ٠    | 1      | '     | 1     | 1     | 76.2      |      | ı    | 1    | ,    | 1     | ı     | 1            |          | 1             | 1      | ٠    | 1   | ٠    |      |      |     |       |       |       | - 7    | 6.2  |
| 73 | Tarbiatmodares                     | 1     | 65.5 | 1      | 1     | '     | 1     | ٠         | ٠    | ı    | ı    | ,    | ı     | ı     | 1            |          | 1             | '      | '    | ٠   | ٠    |      | ,    | ,   |       | ,     |       | - 6    | 65.5 |
| 74 | Amado                              | 1     | 63.0 | '      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 1         | 1    | ı    | 1    | ı    | 1     | ı     | 1            |          | 1             | 1      | •    | ٠   | •    |      | ,    |     |       |       |       | - 6    | 63.0 |
| 75 | AtlasIA                            | 1     | 1    | 1      | 33.5  |       | 1     | ٠         | ٠    | ı    | ı    | ,    | ı     | ı     | 1            |          | 1             | '      | '    | ٠   | ٠    |      | ,    | ,   |       | ,     |       | - 33   | 3.5  |
| 9/ | NYCU-NLP                           | 1     | •    | 1      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 82.2      |      | ı    | 1    |      | 1     | ı     | 1            |          | 1             | 1      | •    | ٠   |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | ·<br>• | 82.2 |
| 77 | NCL-NLP                            | 1     | ٠    | •      | •     | •     | ı     | 78.6      |      | ı    | ı    |      | ı     | ı     | 1            |          | 1             | •      | ٠    | •   |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | - 7    | 9.87 |
| 78 | MRS                                | 1     | •    | •      | •     | •     | •     | 76.6      | •    | •    |      |      | 1     |       | -            |          | '             | 1      | •    | ٠   |      |      |      |     |       |       |       | - 7    | 9.9/ |
| 42 | NITK-VITAL                         | •     | •    | 1      | 1     | 1     | •     | 75.6      |      |      |      |      |       |       | 1            | 1        | •             | 1      | •    |     |      |      |      |     |       | 1     |       | - 7.   | 5.6  |
| 7  |                                    |       |      |        |       |       |       |           |      |      |      |      |       |       |              |          |               |        |      |     |      |      |      |     |       |       |       |        |      |

Continued on next page

 Table 5. Continued from previous page

| 1  | Table 5. Commuse monn promotes page | bro. | 2001 | Pasi |     |     |                             |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |        |                       |       |       |       |     |     |     |             |     |       |         |      |
|----|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-------------|-----|-------|---------|------|
| S  | S/N Team Name                       | afr  | amh  | arq  | ary | chn | afr amh arq ary chn deu eng | eng  | esp | hau | hin | ibo | kin | mar | orm | pcm | ptbr p | orm pcm ptbr ptmz ron | n rus | mos s | uns ı | swa | swe | tat | tat tir ukr | ıkr | VIIIV | vmw yor | avg  |
| 80 | CharsiuRice                         | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1   | 1   | 1                           | 72.6 | 1   | 1   |     | 1   |     | 1   |     |     |        | 1                     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 1   | 1   | •   | •           | 1   | 1     | 1       | 72.6 |
| 81 | QiMP                                | 1    |      |      |     | ٠   |                             | 75.4 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |        |                       |       | •     | ٠     | ٠   | ٠   | ٠   | ٠           | ٠   | ٠     | ٠       | 75.4 |
| 82 | NLP_goats                           | 1    | •    | 1    | •   | 1   | •                           | 75.0 |     |     |     | •   |     | 1   | 1   |     | 1      | -                     | '     | •     | •     | •   | 1   | •   | •           | 1   | 1     | •       | 75.0 |
| 83 | AGHNA                               | 1    |      |      | ٠   | ٠   | 1                           | 73.7 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | ,      |                       |       | •     | ٠     | ٠   | ٠   | ٠   | ٠           | ٠   | ٠     | ٠       | 73.7 |
| 84 | OPI-DRO-HEL at                      | 1    | •    | 1    | •   | 1   | •                           | 73.6 |     |     |     | •   |     | 1   | 1   |     | 1      | -                     | '     | •     | •     | •   | 1   | •   | •           | 1   | 1     | •       | 73.6 |
| 85 | Exploration Lab IITK                | 1    |      | ٠    | ٠   | ٠   | ٠                           | 73.4 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | ,      | 1                     | '     | •     | •     | •   | ٠   | ٠   | ٠           | ٠   | ٠     | ٠       | 73.4 |
| 98 | Lotus                               | 1    |      | 1    |     | 1   |                             | 73.2 | 1   |     |     | 1   |     | ,   | 1   |     | 1      | 1                     | '     | 1     | 1     | •   | 1   | ٠   | ٠           | 1   | 1     | 1       | 73.2 |
| 87 | 87 Lazarus NLP                      | 1    | ı    | 1    | 1   | 1   | ı                           | 1    | 1   | ı   | ı   | ı   |     | ı   |     | ı   | ı      |                       | 1     | 1     | 55.0  | -   | 1   | 1   | ı           | 1   | 1     | '       | 55.0 |

| S/N | Team Name         | amh  | arq  | chn  | deu  | eng  | esp  | hau  | ptbr | ron  | rus  | ukr  | avg  |
|-----|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1   | CSECU-Learners    | 85.6 | 44.3 | 57.1 | 53.3 | 65.0 | 71.5 | 65.6 | 46.6 | 63.7 | 83.3 | 47.8 | 62.2 |
| 2   | Heimerdinger      | 78.0 | 50.7 | 67.1 | 72.3 | 79.3 | 78.8 | 61.8 | 65.1 | 65.7 | 88.3 | 60.3 | 69.8 |
| 3   | CSIRO-LT          | 15.4 | 52.1 | 54.9 | 61.0 | 72.1 | 69.7 | 37.1 | 48.9 | 59.2 | 79.3 | 49.4 | 54.5 |
| 4   | TeleAI            | 32.2 | 52.4 | 70.8 | 74.2 | 83.2 | 78.6 | 57.9 | 69.0 | 70.4 | 91.8 | 64.5 | 67.7 |
| 5   | Pixel Phantoms    | 37.7 | 11.2 | 36.6 | 34.2 | 32.9 | 52.8 | 46.7 | 25.0 | 40.6 | 74.5 | 24.8 | 37.9 |
| 6   | IASBS             | 46.1 | 49.8 | 53.6 | 59.8 | 69.3 | 69.2 | 65.8 | 52.1 | 62.0 | 86.0 | 56.5 | 60.9 |
| 7   | maomao            | 46.2 | 56.7 | 58.6 | 65.4 | 75.2 | 74.9 | 52.0 | 60.2 | 65.3 | 84.7 | 53.4 | 63.0 |
| 8   | YNWA_PZ           | 49.4 | 36.5 | 48.5 | 54.1 | 68.8 | 66.7 | 58.4 | 38.2 | 57.6 | 78.4 | 42.5 | 54.5 |
| 9   | UB_Tel-U          | 56.9 | 33.2 | 56.6 | 55.1 | 53.1 | 68.3 | 53.0 | 47.8 | 55.6 | 78.2 | 53.6 | 55.6 |
| 10  | Habib University  | 60.3 | 30.8 | 47.8 | 53.2 | 74.0 | 64.2 | 39.5 | 38.6 | 49.9 | 76.4 | 42.5 | 52.5 |
| 11  | JNLP              | 60.4 | 58.7 | 65.9 | 72.5 | 81.3 | 77.5 | 65.0 | 65.1 | 70.5 | 90.7 | 67.2 | 70.4 |
| 12  | PAI               | 64.6 | 65.0 | 72.2 | 76.6 | 84.0 | 80.8 | 77.0 | 71.0 | 72.6 | 92.5 | 70.8 | 75.2 |
| 13  | Tue-JMS           | 67.2 | 42.5 | 61.3 | 64.3 | 66.5 | 73.9 | 67.0 | 56.0 | 65.4 | 88.6 | 56.1 | 64.4 |
| 14  | Deepwave          | 68.0 | 57.4 | 69.4 | 74.2 | 80.9 | 79.2 | 74.7 | 68.4 | 71.6 | 91.6 | 66.2 | 72.9 |
| 15  | Chinchunmei       | 71.6 | 48.6 | 66.4 | 70.8 | 81.0 | 77.0 | 67.9 | 62.2 | 66.4 | 89.8 | 63.1 | 69.5 |
| 16  | Domain_adaptation | 41.3 | 20.6 | 3.4  | 30.1 | -    | 45.5 | 54.6 | 23.9 | 36.8 | 56.1 | 21.1 | 33.3 |
| 17  | GT-NLP            | -    | 52.8 | 57.7 | 49.1 | 75.1 | 75.8 | 63.3 | 61.6 | 68.5 | 88.0 | 31.9 | 62.4 |
| 18  | SyntaxMind        | -    | 15.8 | 47.9 | 38.9 | 55.4 | 39.2 | -    | 23.6 | 36.8 | 52.6 | 19.1 | 36.6 |
| 19  | Zero_Shot         | -    | 29.2 | 46.7 | 42.3 | -    | 63.6 | 57.3 | -    | 51.8 | 83.7 | -    | 53.5 |
| 20  | Stanford MLab     | -    | 21.9 | -    | -    | 69.0 | -    | 54.0 | -    | 39.4 | 75.9 | -    | 52.0 |
| 21  | UT-NLP            | -    | -    | 30.7 | -    | 56.9 | -    | 33.7 | -    | -    | -    | 35.2 | 39.1 |
| 22  | UIMP-Aaman        | -    | -    | -    | 61.6 | 73.3 | 70.5 | -    | 50.4 | -    | -    | -    | 64.0 |
| 23  | Tewodros          | 65.0 | -    | -    | -    | 59.4 | 62.3 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 62.2 |
| 24  | CIOL              | -    | -    | 48.3 | -    | -    | 68.5 | -    | -    | -    | 85.9 | -    | 67.6 |
| 25  | Team UBD          | -    | -    | -    | 48.9 | -    | 70.6 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 59.8 |
| 26  | Zero              | -    | -    | -    | -    | 61.3 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 61.3 |
| 27  | AKCIT             | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 64.8 | -    | -    | -    | 64.8 |
| 28  | DataBees          | -    | -    | -    | -    | 3.0  | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 3.0  |
| 29  | QiMP              | -    | -    | -    | -    | 49.2 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 49.2 |
| 30  | CharsiuRice       | -    | -    | -    | -    | 56.6 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 56.6 |
| 31  | OZemi             | -    | -    | -    | -    | 61.2 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 61.2 |
| 32  | tinaal            | -    | -    | -    | -    | 67.0 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 67.0 |
| 33  | CIC-IPN           | -    | -    | -    | -    | 63.9 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 63.9 |
| 34  | indiDataMiner     | -    | -    | -    | -    | 69.0 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 69.0 |
| 35  | NLP_goats         | -    | -    | -    | -    | 75.1 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 75.1 |
| 36  | AGHNA             | -    | -    | -    | -    | 76.2 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 76.2 |
| 37  | NYCU-NLP          | -    | -    | -    | -    | 83.7 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 83.7 |
| 38  | TILeN             | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 80.7 | -    | 80.7 |

Table 6: Track B Results

Table 7: Track C Results

| S/N Team Name           | afr amh arq ary chn deu eng | , diff  | ard    | ary (  | chn d  | gen (     | e gue   | esp h   | hau h   | hin ib    | ibo ind | nd jav    | v kin   | n mar   | r orm   | n pcm  | ptbr   | . ptmz | ron  | rus  | SOM  | uns  | swa  | swe  | tat  | tir  | ukr  | x www  | xho yc  | yor zul | l avg     |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|---------|---------|-----------|
|                         | 70.5                        | 58.0 \$ | 58.4   | 56.5   | 62.2 6 | 68.3 7    | 75.4 8  | 80.6 59 | 59.1 89 | 89.6 43   | 43.3 67 | 67.2 42.2 | .2 44.9 | .9 86.3 | .3 36.0 | 0 56.2 | 61.7   | 49.5   | 74.7 | 85.2 | 48.8 | 46.4 | 38.0 | 57.8 | 2.69 | 37.9 | 62.3 | 17.3 4 | 44.3 35 | 35.9 39 | 39.7 57.0 |
|                         | 54.0 6                      | 61.2 \$ | 51.1   | 51.9   | 56.6 6 | 9.09      | 74.0 7  | 76.2 6. | 63.2 80 | 80.3 50   | 50.9 35 | 35.6 25.6 | 6.15 9. | 9 81.1  | .1 54.3 | 3 53.1 | 48.0   | 50.1   | 73.8 | 82.4 | 48.3 | 42.5 | 29.5 | 56.5 | 64.3 | 52.4 | 48.6 | 16.8   | 16.6 34 | 34.1 16 | 16.4 51.9 |
|                         | 57.4 6                      | 66.1 5  | 58.8   | 63.2   | 68.9   | 72.7      | .8 7.67 | 83.1 70 | 9 6.07  | 91.9 60   | 60.5 55 | 55.4 37.2 | .2 50.8 | .8 90.3 | .3 54.2 | 2 67.4 | . 62.9 | 55.5   | 7.97 | 9.06 | 48.8 | 46.7 | 35.5 | 64.5 | 78.9 | 50.5 | 70.2 | 21.0   | 15.9 34 | 34.2 19 | 19.3 59.4 |
|                         | 47.1 3                      | 37.0 4  | 47.9   | 33.9 4 | 49.9 5 | € 8.05    | 63.8 5  | 52.7 3  | 37.8 40 | 46.7 27   | 27.6 48 | 48.8 41.3 | .3 29.9 | 9 49.7  | .7 31.2 | 2 46.4 | . 34.5 | 24.2   | 64.5 | 44.0 | 31.0 | 8.04 | 23.2 | 38.8 | 40.4 | 33.1 | 28.1 | 19.3   | 31.5 21 | 21.1 21 | 21.2 38.7 |
|                         | 37.1 6                      | 62.3 4  | 42.3 4 | 44.5   | 58.8 6 | 60.3      | 65.6 7  | 74.8 58 | 58.6 83 | 85.8 43   | 43.0 51 | 51.2 35.3 | .3 29.1 | .1 83.3 | .3 37.6 | 6 52.8 | 49.9   | 37.8   | 70.3 | 83.1 | 35.1 | 37.5 | 20.2 | 54.5 | 63.9 | 36.4 | 57.9 | 4.2 1  | 16.3 13 | 13.9 10 | 10.8 47.3 |
|                         | 36.3 6                      | 62.7 4  | 44.1   | 42.4   | 56.9 5 | 55.4 (    | 64.5 7. | 72.9 6. | 62.7 80 | 80.0 48   | 48.4 33 | 33.3 -    | 46.6    | 0.08 9. | .0 49.1 | 1 51.3 | 44.0   | 32.5   | 68.1 | 9.08 | 39.7 | 29.6 | 22.0 | 48.3 | 63.7 | 44.5 | 49.8 | 3.4    | - 15    | . 6.61  | 49.4      |
|                         | 15.7                        |         |        |        | 29.9   | , 1       | 22.3    | 26.2    | - 2.    | - 7.22    | - 26    | 26.1 24.4 | 4       | 17.9    | - 6     | ٠      |        | 8.6    | 23.1 | 31.0 |      | 22.1 | 19.0 | 21.3 | 23.0 |      | 19.7 |        | - 15    | 15.1    | 21.7      |
|                         | 32.8                        | 4       | 48.5   | ,      | 54.3 4 | 47.2 7    | 73.0 6  | 69.6    | 59.8 70 | 76.4 -    |         |           | '       | 77.4    | 4.      | •      | 41.0   | 43.5   | 64.9 | 81.7 |      |      |      | 47.3 |      |      | 50.9 |        |         | Ċ       | 57.9      |
|                         | 30.0                        | 27.0    |        | 1      | 39.1 8 | 8.0       | - 2     | 24.1    | . 9     | 67.4 9.2  | 2 -     |           | '       | 76.4    | - 4     | ٠      |        |        | 47.6 | 20.7 | 27.9 |      | 11.6 | 22.1 | ,    |      | 17.9 | ,      | ·       | Ċ       | 30.6      |
| Howard University-AI4PC | - 1                         | 14.0 4  | 41.8   | 29.5   |        |           |         |         | - 5     | 50.1 25.1 | - 1     | . 37.5    | .5 20.6 | - 9:    | 17.6    | - 9    |        | 23.3   | 51.3 |      | 16.3 |      | 21.2 |      |      | 17.9 |      |        | ·       | Ċ       | 28.2      |
|                         | - 4                         | 47.2 4  | 40.2   |        | 6.4 3  | 32.2 46.2 | 46.2 5  | 56.1 50 | 50.1    |           |         |           | '       | '       | ٠       | ٠      | 25.2   |        | 51.9 | 54.7 |      |      |      |      |      |      | 23.5 |        | i<br>i  | Ċ       | 39.4      |
|                         | 4                           | 45.9 4  | 43.6   | 30.3   |        |           |         | - 4     | 6.64    |           |         | -         |         |         | 39.1    | 1 37.5 | ,      | 20.2   |      |      | 36.5 | 29.6 | 18.4 |      |      |      |      |        | i       | Ċ       | 35.1      |
|                         | 53.8                        | ۱,      | 54.3   | 53.5   | 9 -    | 68.7      |         |         | - 7.    | 78.3 -    | . 58    | 58.3 -    |         |         | •       | ٠      |        |        |      | 9.08 |      |      |      | 57.5 |      |      | 55.6 |        |         | Ċ       | 62.3      |
|                         |                             |         |        | 1      | 33.7   | ,         | 56.0    | - 3     | 39.3    |           | . 50    | 50.5      |         |         | 1       | 1      |        |        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 23.7 |        | i       | - 18    | 18.9 37.0 |
|                         |                             |         |        |        |        |           | 9 -     | 6.09    | 7       | - 6:02    |         |           |         | 78.3    |         | ٠      |        |        |      | 0.79 |      |      |      |      | 36.8 |      | 55.9 |        |         | Ċ       | 61.6      |
|                         | -                           |         |        |        |        |           |         |         | - 6     | - 1.09    | . 41    | 41.0 -    | •       | •       | •       | ٠      | 40.5   |        | 50.9 | 53.4 |      |      |      |      |      |      | 38.6 |        | i       |         | 47.4      |
|                         | 31.3                        |         |        |        |        |           | ,       |         |         |           | . 50    | 50.8 34.7 | . T.    | '       | 1       | 1      | ,      |        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        | . 8.01  | - 13    | 13.1 28.1 |
|                         | -                           |         |        |        | - 5    | 59.4      | 66.1 6  | 69.4    |         |           |         |           | '       | '       | •       | •      | 49.4   |        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        | i       | Ċ       | 61.1      |
|                         |                             |         |        |        |        |           |         |         |         |           | . 09    | 60.9 43.9 | - 6:    |         | •       | ٠      | ٠      |        |      |      |      |      |      |      | ,    |      |      | - 2    | 26.0    | - 22    | 22.6 38.4 |
|                         | -                           |         |        |        |        |           | -       |         |         |           | 2       | 64.1 43.8 | ∞.      | •       | 1       | 1      | 1      |        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | ,      |         |         | 54.0      |
|                         |                             |         |        |        |        |           |         |         |         |           | . 42    | 42.9 -    |         |         | •       | •      |        |        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         | Ċ       | 42.9      |

Table 8: Participants Information

| A, B<br>A, B, C<br>A | Team<br>AGHNA<br>AKCIT        | Affiliation Institut Teknologi Bandung CEIA NLP                    | Paper (Abyan, 2025) (Brito et al., 2025)     |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| A, B, C              | AKCIT                         | CEIA NLP   |  |
| A                    |                               |  |  |
|                      | Amado                         | none   | (Bade et al., 2025)                          |
|                      | Angeliki Linardatou           | none   | (Linardatou and Platanou,                    |
| 11                   | Aligenki Liliardatou          | none   | 2025)  |
| A                    | AtlasIA                       | AtlasIA  | (Majjodi et al., 2025)                       |
| A, B                 | CIC-NLP                       | none   | (Abiola et al., 2025)                        |
| A, B, C              | CIOL                          | Shahjalal University of Science Technology,                        | (Hoque et al., 2025)                         |
| A, B, C              | CIOL                          | Bangladesh   | (Hoque et al., 2023)                         |
| A, B                 | CSECU-Learners                | University of Chittagong   | (Ahmad et al., 2025)                         |
| A, B                 | CSIRO-LT                      | CSIRO, Macquarie University  | (Chen et al., 2025a)                         |
| A, B                 | CharsiuRice                   | Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen                              | (Yip et al., 2025)                           |
| A, B                 | Chinchunmei                   | Newcastle University, Shumei AI Research Institute                 | (Li et al., 2025)                            |
| A                    | CodeBlAIzers                  | Queen Mary University of London                                    | (Wang and Gupta, 2025)                       |
| A                    | DUT_IR                        | Dalian University of Technology, China                             | (Liu et al., 2025)                           |
| A                    | DataBees                      | SSN College Of Engineering   | (Anand et al., 2025)                         |
| A, B, C              | Deep                          | none   | (Shenpo, 2025)                               |
| A, B, C              | Domain_adaptation             | Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Univer-                | (Lepekhin and Sharoff,                       |
| A, B                 | Domain_adaptation             | sity of Leeds  | (Lepeknin and Snaroli, 2025)                 |
| Α                    | EMO-NLP                       | Yunnan University  |  |
| A                    |                               |  | (Li and Yang, 2025)                          |
| A                    | Emotion Train                 | Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelli-                | (Demidova et al., 2025)                      |
| Α                    | Empeths                       | gence USE University Independent researcher                        | (Morozov et al. 2025)                        |
| A                    | Empaths Exploration Lab HTV   | HSE University, Independent researcher                             | (Morozov et al., 2025)                       |
| A                    | Exploration Lab IITK FiRC-NLP | IIT Kanpur<br>none   | (Nadeem et al., 2025)<br>(Tufa et al., 2025) |
|                      |                               |  |  |
| A, C                 | GOLDX                         | none   | (Clinton, 2025)                              |
| A, B, C              | GT-NLP                        | Georgia Institute of Technology, Johnson & Johnson,                | (Saeedi et al., 2025)                        |
| A D                  | CinCon                        | Novastraum LLC, C3 AI  | (NIbd-bd-A-l:                                |
| A, B                 | GinGer                        | Sharif University of Technology, Iran University of                | (Naebzadeh and Askari,                       |
| A                    | HTH                           | Science and Technology   | 2025)<br>(Saleh and Biltawi, 2025)           |
| ADC                  | HTU<br>Habib University       | AlHussein Technical University Habib University, Karachi, Pakistan | (Waheed et al., 2025)                        |
| A, B, C              | HausaNLP                      | University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg, Fed-                 | (Sani et al., 2025)                          |
| A                    | Hausainer                     | eral Polytechnic, Daura  | (Sam et al., 2023)                           |
| A, B, C              | Heimerdinger                  | Huazhong University of Science and Technology                      | (Tong et al., 2025)                          |
| A, C                 | Howard University-AI4PC       | Howard University  | (Ince and Aryal, 2025)                       |
| A, B, C              | IASBS                         | IASBS University   | (Tareh et al., 2025)                         |
| A, B, C              | IEGPS-CSIC                    | Instituto de Estudios Gallegos Padre Sarmiento                     | (Sarymsakova and                             |
| A                    | ieors-esic                    | (IEGPS-CSIC)   | Martin-rodilla, 2025)                        |
| A                    | INFOTEC-NLP                   | INFOTEC Centro de Investigación e Innovación en,                   | (Santos-rodriguez and                        |
| A                    | INTOTEC-NEI                   | Tecnologías de la Información y Comunicación, Sec-                 | Graff, 2025)                                 |
|                      |                               | retaría de Ciencia, Humanidades, Tecnología e Inno-                | Gran, 2023)                                  |
|                      |                               | vación (SECIHTI)   |  |
| A                    | ITF-NLP                       | Fraunhofer FKIE  | (Kent and Nindel, 2025)                      |
| A, B                 | JNLP                          | National Institute of Informatics, Japan Advanced In-              | (Xue et al., 2025)                           |
| 11, 1                | 01.12J                        | stitute of Science and Technology, National Institute              | (1140 00 41., 2023)                          |
|                      |                               | of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology                      |  |
| A                    | JUNLP_Sarika                  | Jadavpur University, Kolkata, India                                | (Khatun et al., 2025)                        |
| A                    | JellyK                        | University of Information Technology VNU-HCM                       | (Le and Thin, 2025)                          |
| A                    | KDBERT MLDistill              | none   | (Wang, 2025)                                 |
| A, B                 | LATE-GIL-NLP                  | Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico                            | (Vázquez-osorio et al.,                      |
| , -                  |                               | 2  | 2025)  |
| A, C                 | Lazarus NLP                   | University of New South Wales, Lazarus NLP                         | (Wongso et al., 2025)                        |
| A                    | Lotus                         | PersianGulf University   | (Ranjbar and Baghbani,                       |
|                      | - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1           | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                              | 2025)  |
| A                    | MRS                           | Michigan State University  | (Afshari et al., 2025)                       |
| A                    | McGill-NLP                    | Université de Montréal, Mila - Quebec AI Institute,                | (Verma and Adelani,                          |
|                      | ·                             | McGill University, Canada CIFAR AI Chair                           | 2025)  |
| A                    | NCL-NLP                       | Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, England                 | (Lu, 2025)                                   |
| A                    | NITK-VITAL                    | National Institute of Technology Karnataka, Surathkal,             | (Kesanam et al., 2025)                       |
|                      |                               | India  |  |
|                      | NLP-Cimat                     | Center for Research in Mathematics (CIMAT), Sec-                   | (Gómez et al., 2025)                         |
| A                    | NLP-CIIIat                    |  |  |
| A                    | NLP-Cilliat                   |  | (Gomez et an, 2023)                          |
| A                    | NLF-Cimat                     | retaría de Ciencia, Humanidades, Tecnología e Innovación (SECIHTI) | (Gomez et al., 2023)                         |

 Table 8. Continued from previous page

|         | Continued from previo   | 1 6  | D                                       |
|---------|-------------------------|--|---|
| Tasks   | Team                    | Affiliation  | Paper                                   |
| A       | NLP-DU                  | CSE, DU  | (Sakib et al., 2025)                    |
| A, B    | NLP_goats               | Sri Sivasubramaniya Nadar (SSN) College of Engi-           | (Vaidyanathan et al.,                   |
|         |                         | neering  | 2025)                                   |
| A       | NTA                     | University of Information Technology, Vietnam Na-          | (Le et al., 2025b)                      |
|         |                         | tional University, Ho Chi Minh City                        |   |
| A       | NUST Titans             | National University of Science and Technology, Is-         | (Khan et al., 2025)                     |
|         |                         | lamabad Pakistan, Mid Sweden University, Sweden            | (======                                 |
| A, B    | NYCU-NLP                | National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University                   | (Xu et al., 2025)                       |
|         | OPI-DRO-HEL             | National Information Processing Institute, Warsaw,         |   |
| A       | OPI-DRO-HEL             |  |   |
|         |                         | Poland   | 2025)                                   |
| A, B, C | OZemi                   | Waseda University  | (Takahashi et al., 2025)                |
| A, B    | PAI                     | none   | (Ruan et al., 2025)                     |
| A       | Pateam                  | PING AN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF                          | (Chen et al., 2025b)                    |
|         |                         | CHINA, LTD.  |   |
| A, B    | Pixel Phantoms          | SSN college of engineering                                 | (S et al., 2025a)                       |
| A       | PromotionGo             | Hubei University   | (Huang and Cui, 2025)                   |
| A       | QiMP                    | Technical University of Munich                             | (Bogatyreva et al., 2025)               |
| A       | RSSN                    | Sri Sivasubramaniya Nadar (SSN) College of Engi-           | (V et al., 2025)                        |
| 11      | 170014                  | neering  | ( * Ct ai., 2023)                       |
| Λ.      | STFXNLP                 |  | (Murrant at al. 2025)                   |
| A       |                         | none   | (Murrant et al., 2025)                  |
| В       | Stanford MLab           | Stanford University  | (Le et al., 2025a)                      |
| A, B    | SyntaxMind              | none   | (Riad and Ullah, 2025)                  |
| A, B    | TILeN                   | none   | (Reyes-magaña et al.,                   |
|         |                         |  | 2025)                                   |
| A       | Tarbiat Modares         | Sharif University of Technology, Tarbiat Modares Uni-      | (Bourbour et al., 2025)                 |
|         |                         | versity  |   |
| A       | Team A                  | HKBK College of Engineering, Bangalore, India, Na-         | (Sahil and Jamatia, 2025)               |
|         |                         | tional Institute of Technology Agartala, Tripura, India    | (====================================== |
| A       | Team KiAmSo             | University of Tübingen                                     | (Sharp et al., 2025)                    |
| A, B, C | Team UBD                | University of Tubligen University of Bucharest             | (Paduraru, 2025)                        |
| A, B, C | Team Unibuc - NLP       | University of Bucharest  University of Bucharest           |   |
|         |                         |  | (Creanga et al., 2025)                  |
| A       | TechSSN3                | SSN College of Engineering                                 | (S et al., 2025b)                       |
| A, B    | TeleAI                  | Institute of Artificial Intelligence (TeleAI), China Tele- | (Wang et al., 2025)                     |
|         | <u> </u>                | com Corp Ltd   |   |
| A       | Tewodros                | none   | (Bizuneh et al., 2025)                  |
| В       | Tewodros                | none   | (Bizuneh et al., 2025)                  |
| A       | Trans-Sent              | Aliah University, Kolkata, Jadavpur University,            | (Sarif et al., 2025)                    |
|         |                         | Kolkata  | ·                                       |
| A, B, C | Tue-JMS                 | Universität Tübingen                                       | (Han et al., 2025)                      |
| A, B, C | UB_Tel-U                | Brawijaya University, Telkom University                    | (Fatyanosa et al., 2025)                |
| A, B, C | UIMP-Aaman              | none   | (Aman-parveen, 2025)                    |
| В, С    | UT-NLP                  |  | (Safdarian et al., 2025)                |
|         |                         | none  Iron University of Science and Technology            |   |
| A, B, C | UncleLM                 | Iran University of Science and Technology                  | (Barfi et al., 2025)                    |
| A       | University of Indonesia | Universitas Indonesia'                                     | (Hanif et al., 2025)                    |
| A, C    | UoB-NLP                 | University of Birmingham                                   | (Leon et al., 2025)                     |
| A       | VerbaNexAI              | Universidad Tecnológica de Bolívar                         | (Almanza et al., 2025)                  |
| A       | XLM-Muriel              | Amirkabir University of Technology, Tehran, Iran           | (Hosseinzadeh, 2025)                    |
| A       | YNU-NPCC                | none   | (Yang et al., 2025)                     |
| A, B, C | YNWA_PZ                 | Iran University of Science and Technology                  | (Poulaei et al., 2025)                  |
| A, B    | Zero                    | IIIT Hyderabad   | (Gundam et al., 2025)                   |
| A       | Zero                    | IIIT-Hyderabad   | (Gundam et al., 2025)                   |
| A, B, C | Zero_Shot               | Chittagong University of Engineering and Technology        | (Paran et al., 2025)                    |
|         |                         |  |   |
| A, B    | indiDataMiner           | Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, India, NTU        | (Kumar et al., 2025)                    |
|         |                         | Singapore  |   |
| A, B, C | maomao                  | none   | (Chen, 2025)                            |
| В       | VebanexAI               | -  | (Moreno et al., 2025)                   |
| В       | tinaal                  | Newcastle University, UK                                   | (Zhu et al., 2025)                      |
| A       | wangkongqiang           | none   | (Kongqiang, 2025)                       |
| A       | xiacui                  | Manchester Metropolitan University                         | (Cui, 2025)                             |
| A       | zhouyijiang1            | University of Yunnan                                       | (Jiang and Zhang, 2025)                 |
| 4.5     | 2.1104713141151         | Carrotty of Tainian  | (viaing and Linuing, 2023)              |





Figure 4: Overview of the most common architectures, training techniques, fine-tuning strategies, and prompting strategies used by our participants.






Figure 5: Overview of additional data and compute resources used by our participants.