

Annotation Guidelines

Dear Annotator,

You are given conversational turns from 20 discussions. A conversational turn is considered to be an individual reply within a discussion. Within each conversational turn, potential question/evidence types can be identified, this can be both implicit and explicit. For each conversational turn, mark which question/evidence type you think can be identified within the conversational turn.

To accomplish this, you are provided with a spreadsheet which includes the conversational turns and the question types. Additionally, the full discussion is also provided to you in case you deem it necessary to use this for context. Please make sure to only use this full discussion for context purposes – only identify which question/evidence type is present within the individual conversational turn, not the whole conversation. A list of all question types can be found on the next page, as well as within the spreadsheet.

Mark the question type which you think can be identified within the turn by writing ‘yes’ in the corresponding cells. For all other question types write ‘no’ in the corresponding cell.

Example of how to annotate within the spreadsheet:

Dataset	Turn	Discussion text	Discussion ID	What is the source's established reputation and standing within its field of expertise	Does the author have appropriate expertise or qualifications	Has the source undergone peer review or editorial oversight	Is the source free from bias or conflicts of interest	Is the publisher of the source reputable	Can the information in the source be independently verified	Is the source based on empirical evidence or firsthand data	Is the source properly cited and accessible to readers	Is the information presented by the source up-to-date
rfc	This source is not appropriate for this topic! Though, the information seems to be up-to-date	This source is no	12345	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes

An example of a conversational turn can be seen above. It includes information about the reputability of the source and the topicality of the source. The question types “Is the source reputable and recognized in its field” and “Is the information presented by the source up-to-date?” are therefore marked as ‘yes’, the other question types are marked as ‘no’.

As seen in our example, the conversational turn claims the information is up to date. If they would claim the information was not up to date, the same question types should still be able to be identified. In other words: It does not matter if the answer to one of our question types is positive or negative; if you can identify it, mark it with ‘yes’.

Please remember that a question type can be mentioned implicitly as well. For example: Someone shares a quote and names the author an “important English writer” – this implies that they find this source to be reputable and recognized in its field and therefore this question type can be identified.

Make sure to mark all question types that can be identified within the conversational turn.

Question number	Question
1	What is the source's established reputation and standing within its field of expertise?
2	Does the author have appropriate expertise or qualifications?
3	Has the source undergone peer review or editorial oversight?
4	Is the source free from bias or conflicts of interest?
5	Is the publisher of the source reputable?
6	Can the information in the source be independently verified?
7	Is the source based on empirical evidence or firsthand data?
8	Is the source properly cited and accessible to readers?
9	Is the information presented by the source up-to-date?
10	Does the source present multiple viewpoints or a balanced perspective?
11	Is the source known for its objectivity or neutrality?
12	Does the source reflect the consensus of experts on the subject?
13	Does the source avoid advocacy or promoting a specific agenda?
14	Is this source directly relevant to the claim being made?
15	Is the source appropriate for the context of the article?
16	Does the source provide the correct level of detail or depth for this claim?
17	Is the source's level of expertise and depth appropriate for how we're using it in this specific context
18	Is this source presenting new or original research?

19	Does this source draw its own conclusions, or is it summarizing existing knowledge?
20	Does the claim in the article match what the source explicitly states, or is there interpretation involved?
21	Are multiple sources combined in a way that introduces original analysis?
22	Does the source meet Wikipedia's standards for reliable sourcing?
23	Is the citation correctly formatted and detailed?
24	Does the source comply with Wikipedia's policy on primary, secondary, and tertiary sources?
25	What do other editors say about the reliability of this source?
26	What do experts say about the reliability of this source?
27	Can we reach a consensus on whether this source meets Wikipedia's standards?
28	Are there alternative sources we could use that are more reliable?
29	Are there any previous consensus discussions about this source?
30	Are there exceptional circumstances affecting the source's reliability?
31	Does the source acknowledge and address changes in their positions over time?
32	Does the source properly distinguish between correlation and causation?
33	How does the source handle contradictory evidence?
34	Does the source acknowledge limitations in its approach?
35	Does the source base its claims on sufficient examples/cases?
36	Is the source's coverage representative of the full topic?
37	Are there any known retractions or corrections associated with this source?
38	Is there transparency about funding sources?
39	Has the source's reliability been consistent throughout its history?

40	Are all made claims supported by a source?
41	Do other reputable sources (regularly) reference this source?
42	Are there concrete instances where this source has been proven accurate?
43	How well are the source's methods and findings preserved?