

AAAI ICWSM Paper Checklist

Written by the AAAI ICWSM 2025 Organizing Committee

pc.chairs@icwsml.org

Abstract

This document offers a Paper Checklist to be appended at the end of all submissions to, at a minimum, the September 2023 and January 2024 rounds of the AAAI ICWSM conference.

Overview

This document offers a checklist to append at the end of a AAAI ICWSM 2024 submission. The paper checklist has been adapted from the NeurIPS 2023 guidelines (NeurIPS 2021), the Natural Language Processing (NLP) reviewing checklist compiled by Benotti et al. (2023), and the consensus-based transparency checklist (Aczel et al. 2020). The checklist follows the references. While addressing these questions in the body of their manuscript, authors can explore the discussions provided in prior work (NeurIPS 2021; Aczel et al. 2020; Benotti et al. 2023; Ashurst et al. 2020; Gebru et al. 2021) as a starting point. The ethics reading list¹ compiled by Benotti et al. (2023) provides examples of papers discussing ethical considerations in NLP research.

Detailed Instructions

Please do not inadvertently compromise the anonymity of your submission; you are allowed to be vague, within reason, regarding institutional affiliations.

Please do not modify the questions and only use the provided macros for your answers. In your paper, please delete all text in the **Overview** and **Detailed Instructions** sections, as well as all subsection headers, keeping only the **Checklist** section heading above along with the questions/answers below.

For each question, change the default **Answer** to **Yes**, and, **No**, **because**, or **NA**, when the question seems inappropriate for your research study. You are strongly encouraged to include a **justification to your answer**, either by referencing the appropriate section of your paper or providing a brief in-line description. Within the Checklist section, you may supplement your answers with a brief discussion that expands on answers to the checklist where necessary. For example:

- Did you include the license to the code and datasets? **Yes**, see the **Methods** and the **Appendix**.

- Did you include the license to the code and datasets? **No**, because the code and the data are proprietary.
- Did you include the license to the code and datasets? **NA**

Paper Checklist to be included in your paper

1. For most authors...

- (a) Would answering this research question advance science without violating social contracts, such as violating privacy norms, perpetuating unfair profiling, exacerbating the socio-economic divide, or implying disrespect to societies or cultures? **Yes**, see **Introduction and Discussion and Conclusion**.
- (b) Do your main claims in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope? **Yes**, see the **Abstract**.
- (c) Do you clarify how the proposed methodological approach is appropriate for the claims made? **Yes**, see the **Methodology**.
- (d) Do you clarify what are possible artifacts in the data used, given population-specific distributions? **Yes**, see the **Methodology**.
- (e) Did you describe the limitations of your work? **Yes**, see the **Future Work**.
- (f) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? **Yes**, see the **Discussion and Conclusion**.
- (g) Did you discuss any potential misuse of your work? **Yes**, see the **Discuss and Conclusion**.
- (h) Did you describe steps taken to prevent or mitigate potential negative outcomes of the research, such as data and model documentation, data anonymization, responsible release, access control, and the reproducibility of findings? **Yes**, see the **Methodology and Result**.
- (i) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? **Yes**.

2. Additionally, if your study involves hypotheses testing...

- (a) Did you clearly state the assumptions underlying all theoretical results? **No**, our study doesn't involve hypotheses testing.
- (b) Have you provided justifications for all theoretical results? **No**, our study doesn't involve hypotheses testing.

- (c) Did you discuss competing hypotheses or theories that might challenge or complement your theoretical results? **No, our study doesn't involve hypotheses testing.**
 - (d) Have you considered alternative mechanisms or explanations that might account for the same outcomes observed in your study? **No, our study doesn't involve hypotheses testing.**
 - (e) Did you address potential biases or limitations in your theoretical framework? **No, our study doesn't involve hypotheses testing.**
 - (f) Have you related your theoretical results to the existing literature in social science? **No, our study doesn't involve hypotheses testing.**
 - (g) Did you discuss the implications of your theoretical results for policy, practice, or further research in the social science domain? **No, our study doesn't involve hypotheses testing.**
3. Additionally, if you are including theoretical proofs...
- (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? **No, we weren't including theoretical proofs.**
 - (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? **No, we weren't include theoretical proofs.**
4. Additionally, if you ran machine learning experiments...
- (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? **No, because we didn't use machine learning.**
 - (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? **No, because we didn't use machine learning.**
 - (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? **No, because we didn't use machine learning.**
 - (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? **No, because we didn't use machine learning.**
 - (e) Do you justify how the proposed evaluation is sufficient and appropriate to the claims made? **No, because we didn't use machine learning.**
 - (f) Do you discuss what is “the cost” of misclassification and fault (in)tolerance? **No, because we didn't use machine learning.**
5. Additionally, if you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets, **without compromising anonymity...**
- (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? **Yes, see the References.**
 - (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? **Yes, see the References.**
 - (c) Did you include any new assets in the supplemental material or as a URL? **No, because the code and data are sufficient.**
- (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating? **Yes, see the Methodology.**
 - (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? **Yes, see the Methodology.**
 - (f) If you are curating or releasing new datasets, did you discuss how you intend to make your datasets FAIR (see FORCE11 (2020))? **Yes, see the Methodology.**
 - (g) If you are curating or releasing new datasets, did you create a Datasheet for the Dataset (see Gebru et al. (2021))? **Yes, see the Methodology.**
6. Additionally, if you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects, **without compromising anonymity...**
- (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots? **No, because we didn't have participants.**
 - (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with mentions of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals? **No, because we didn't have participants.**
 - (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? **No, because we didn't have participants.**
 - (d) Did you discuss how data is stored, shared, and de-identified? **No, because we didn't have participants.**

References

- Aczel, B.; Szaszi, B.; Sarafoglou, A.; Kekecs, Z.; Kucharský, Š.; Benjamin, D.; Chambers, C. D.; Fisher, A.; Gelman, A.; Gernsbacher, M. A.; et al. 2020. A consensus-based transparency checklist. *Nature human behaviour*, 4(1): 4–6.
- Ashurst, C.; Anderljung, M.; Prunkl, C.; Leike, J.; Gal, Y.; Shevlane, T.; and Dafoe, A. 2020. A guide to writing the NeurIPS impact statement. *Centre for the Governance of AI*. URL: <https://perma.cc/B5R8-2B9V>.
- Benotti, L.; Fort, K.; Kan, M.-Y.; and Tsvetkov, Y. 2023. Understanding Ethics in NLP Authoring and Reviewing. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Tutorial Abstracts*, 19–24.
- FORCE11. 2020. The FAIR Data principles. <https://force11.org/info/the-fair-data-principles/>.
- Gebru, T.; Morgenstern, J.; Vecchione, B.; Vaughan, J. W.; Wallach, H.; Iii, H. D.; and Crawford, K. 2021. Datasheets for datasets. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(12): 86–92.
- NeurIPS. 2021. NeurIPS 2021 Paper Checklist Guidelines. <https://neurips.cc/Conferences/2021/PaperInformation/PaperChecklist>.