

# Conflicts of Interest in Published NLP Research 2000-2024

Maarten Bosten<sup>1</sup>, Bennett Kleinberg<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tilburg University

<sup>2</sup>University College London

{m.n.m.l.bosten, bennett.kleinberg}@tilburguniversity.edu

## Abstract

Natural Language Processing research is increasingly reliant on large scale data and computational power. Many achievements in the past decade resulted from collaborations with the tech industry. But an increasing entanglement of academic research and industry interests leads to conflicts of interest. We assessed published NLP research from 2000-2024 and labeled author affiliations as academic or industry-affiliated to measure conflicts of interest. Overall 27.65% of the papers contained at least one industry-affiliated author. That figure increased substantially with more than 1 in 3 papers having a conflict of interest in 2024. We identify top-tier venues (ACL, EMNLP) as main drivers for that effect. The paper closes with a discussion and a simple, concrete suggestion for the future.

## 1 Introduction

Recent landmark advancements in Natural Language Processing (NLP) research share the need for an increasing demand for computation and data. Often these demands are hard to meet for individual researchers or university labs, which opens the door for industry collaborations. The involvement of the private sector has led to key publications in its own right (e.g., BERT, Devlin et al., 2019) and has enabled other major achievements through university-industry collaborations (e.g., RoBERTa, Liu et al., 2019).

However, lessons from other disciplines call for more attention to the role of industry involvement and potential conflicts of interest. In medical research, an entanglement of practitioners and pharmaceutical companies reportedly often materializes in biased research outcomes, impacted on the research agenda, and increased willingness to adopt drugs from these companies (DeAngelis, 2000; Chren and Landefeld, 1994; Lundh et al., 2017; McComas, 2012). Current NLP research shares

similarities with medical research that make it particularly susceptible to conflicts of interest: both areas are increasingly resource-dependent and applications of academic research in these fields yield substantial benefits to private companies. Gaining insight into the role of industry involvement in NLP research and potential conflicts of interest is as timely as it is lacking. This paper maps out authors' conflicts of interest in NLP research since 2000.

### 1.1 Defining conflicts of interest

There is a conflict of interest if a person P *"is in a relationship with another, requiring P to exercise judgment in the other's behalf [and] has a (special) interest tending to interfere with the proper exercise of judgment in that relationship [where] an interest is any influence, loyalty, concern, emotion, or other feature of a situation tending to make P's judgment (in that situation) less reliable than it would normally be (Davis and Stark, 2001, p. 9)*. Importantly, according to this definition having a conflict of interest *does not* imply that person P acts upon the conflicting interest (Brody, 2011). Whenever an academic researcher (also) holds an affiliation to a private company, there are *by definition* conflicts of interest for that academic researcher. This may be outright undesirable or merely worth mentioning but it matters.

### 1.2 Industry involvement in academic research

A recent study examined institutional affiliations in 22 million scientific articles (Hottenrott et al., 2021). For authors with multiple affiliations, the study found that authors affiliated with both a university and company were uncommon across research disciplines (between < 3% - 4.6%). Among authors with a single affiliation, 3.7% held a company affiliation (Hottenrott et al., 2021, supplement-

tary Table A6).<sup>1</sup>

There are legitimate motivations for academic researchers and industry partners to collaborate. For example, academic researchers might gain access to proprietary and large datasets, expensive material, and have an increased impact on society (Perkmann et al., 2013). For companies, university-collaborations offer an opportunity to access public funding (Perkmann et al., 2013; Bodas Freitas and Verspagen, 2017), bolster public trust, increase the perceived value of the company (Rothenstein et al., 2011; Colombo et al., 2019), and provide access to talents as potential future employees (Ankrah and AL-Tabbaa, 2015; Bodas Freitas and Verspagen, 2017).

### 1.3 Why should we care?

Conflicts of interest can skew research findings and increase publication bias more broadly. Ample evidence from medical research suggests that studies that are financially supported by pharmaceutical companies tend to result in outcomes favoring these companies (Lundh et al., 2017). Furthermore, a cross-sectional study of randomized controlled trials found the financial ties of principle investigators to a company to corresponded to a higher likelihood of reporting positive study outcomes (Ahn et al., 2017). A systematic analysis of nutritional science literature indicated that studies fully funded by industry were 7x more likely to report favorable versus unfavorable conclusions in comparison to studies who had no industry funding (Lesser et al., 2007).<sup>2</sup>

Another way in which conflicts of interest could undermine scientific output is by presenting results in a self-serving manner. For example, presenting findings with more certainty than warranted could enhance the perceived credibility of a company, while results presented with more uncertainty could protect a company’s interests or competitive advantage (Tallapragada et al., 2017).

Others have added that the risks of industry involvement depend on the reliance on resources (Ankrah and AL-Tabbaa, 2015). Access to resources was reported as a strong motivator for universities to collaborate with industry. An increasing

<sup>1</sup>These proportions should be interpreted with some caution because more than 20% of their observations were considered unknown affiliations.

<sup>2</sup>Non-financial conflicts of interest could also affect research output. Such conflicts of interest refer to personal relationships or connections with companies (Boutron et al., 2019, p. 194).

reliance on data and compute make NLP research dependent on industry collaborations and this dependency makes universities vulnerable. Shedding light on the presence of conflict of interest in NLP is critical to safeguard the quality of its scientific output.

### 1.4 Aims of this work

This paper has two central contributions: (1) By resorting to the ACL anthology, we build and provide a dataset for research into conflicts of interest that is near complete for the discipline, which is practically infeasible in other areas with more scattered publication pathways. (2) We conduct analyses about the temporal development of conflicts of interest and the role of publication venues.

## 2 Data

We sought to obtain a dataset of all papers published in the ACL Anthology since 2000<sup>3</sup>. We used the Beautiful Soup (Richardson, 2024), Requests and Asyncio libraries in Python 3.10 to download all published papers since 2000 and converted the pdf papers to XML with GROBID (GROBID, 2008–2025). From the XML tree, we extracted key variables (e.g., author affiliation, year, venue) using ElementTree XML (ElementTree, 2024) and structured it in a data frame using pandas (The Pandas Development Team, 2023). All statistical analyses were done in R (R Core Team, 2023).<sup>4</sup>

That procedure resulted in  $n = 66924$  papers, of which 502 we not properly converted to XML. An additional 1,110 papers were excluded due to error handling or missing data<sup>5</sup>. We then excluded 3,687 papers due to authors without an affiliation or incorrectly parsed affiliations (e.g., due to encoding issues). After aggregation to the paper-level, we excluded collections or entire proceedings files of all papers published at a workshop/venue ( $n = 2275$  papers). Lastly, we excluded papers with

<sup>3</sup>We targeted papers in official ACL venues: AACL (Asia-Pacific chapter of ACL), ACL, ANLP (Applied NLP), CL (Computational Linguistics journal), CoNLL (Natural Language Learning), EACL (European chapter), EMNLP, IWSLT (Int. Conference on Spoken Language Translation), NAACL (North-American chapter), SemEval, \*SEM (Lexical and Computational Semantics), TACL (Transactions of ACL journal), WMT (Conference on Machine Translation)

<sup>4</sup>The final dataset, an extended version with abstracts and full papers, the code to recreate the dataset and the analysis code are available at: [https://osf.io/gfqpr/?view\\_only=2a45d1a34e8e4a96a26c8cf5ed324ca8](https://osf.io/gfqpr/?view_only=2a45d1a34e8e4a96a26c8cf5ed324ca8)

<sup>5</sup>Observations were excluded at the author level since this is our unit of interest.

more than 100+ references or authors ( $n = 663$ ) to reduce incorrectly formatted papers and leftover conference proceedings. The final dataset consisted of  $n = 58687$  papers.

## 2.1 Affiliation labeling

We specified four affiliation patterns used for labeling and engaged in an iterative process of labeling and inspecting affiliations. Affiliations were labeled as *industry*, *non-industry*, *other*, and *unsure*. Industry affiliations were those that could reasonably be assumed to be for-profit companies. The corresponding pattern consisted of common corporate abbreviations (e.g., ltd, GmbH, Corporation, corp.) and brand names (e.g., Meta, OpenAI, Uber). Affiliations were labeled as non-industry if they referred to a university, research institute, or non-profit company. The corresponding pattern consisted of abbreviations associated with scientific or non-profit institutions (e.g., University, FBK, US Naval Academy). Affiliations that could not be assigned to either industry or non-industry were labeled as *other* and not considered for further analysis. Unsure affiliations (i.e., STAR, LIMSI) were considered non-industry. Of all affiliations, 99.62% were assigned to one of the four patterns.

## 3 Findings

Overall, 27.65% ( $n = 16226$ ) of all papers had at least one author with an industry affiliation. Conversely, 72.35% ( $n = 42461$ ) of the papers stem from authors with solely academic affiliations. Among the industry-affiliated papers, 1,574 papers were published exclusively from industry-affiliated authors (2.68% of all papers).

There was substantial variation in the proportion of industry affiliations over the publications venues considered.<sup>6</sup> Table 1 indicates that industry affiliation in the dataset is driven by a few venues who attract a disproportionately large number of industry papers. A Chi-square test suggested that there was a significant association between a paper being academic or industry-affiliated and the venue,  $\chi^2(13) = 1232.5, p < .001$ . To identify the drivers of that association, we looked at the standardized residuals (z-scores).<sup>7</sup> Positive z-scores imply that the venue has a larger proportion of industry papers than would be expected if there were

<sup>6</sup>ANLP was discontinued after 2000. The results were not affected by in- or exclusion, so ANLP was retained in the dataset.

<sup>7</sup>Absolute z-scores  $> 2.33$  correspond to  $p < .01$ , two-tailed.

	Academic	Industry	z-score
AACL	0.70	0.30	1.39
ACL	0.68	0.32	12.63
ANLP	0.73	0.27	-0.08
CL	0.77	0.23	-2.94
CoNLL	0.74	0.26	-0.75
EACL	0.76	0.24	-4.99
EMNLP	0.65	0.35	21.16
IWSLT	0.74	0.26	-0.63
NAACL	0.70	0.30	4.59
SemEval	0.79	0.21	-7.51
StarSem	0.81	0.19	-4.21
TACL	0.68	0.32	2.49
WMT	0.73	0.27	-0.17
WS	0.82	0.18	-29.14

Table 1: Proportion of affiliation type by venue with z-scores (standardized residuals). Positive z-scores imply a higher proportion of industry papers than expected if there were no association, and vice versa for negative z-scores.

no association between affiliation and venue.

By far the largest drivers of the relationship were EMNLP and ACL followed by NAACL and TACL. In contrast, workshops, SemEval, Starsem, EACL and the ACL journal Computational Linguistics (CL) contained significantly fewer industry papers than would have been expected. It is noteworthy that the over-representation of industry-affiliated papers follows regional conference patterns: the North-American chapter (NAACL) has substantially higher proportions of industry papers than the European (EALP) or Asia-Pacific one (AACL). Moreover, among journals, CL attracts fewer industry papers than TACL, arguably due to different foci, with CL being more embedded in *traditional* computational linguistics. The disparity between workshops (including SemEval and Starsem) and the ACL main conferences is considerable and might reflect competing ambitions (i.e., a narrow focus and depth for workshops versus broad technical advancements at large venues), which is exemplified by EMNLP being by far the most attractive outlet for industry papers with more than 1/3 industry papers.

When assessed over time (Fig. 1), we find evidence for an acceleration of industry collaborations. Across all venues, there was an initial decrease and between 2002 and 2018, the proportion of industry-affiliated papers remained below 0.25. From 2018 onward, the proportion increased and remained

over 0.25 with a peak in 2022 (0.36). For reference, Fig. 1 shows the two primary drivers for either direction<sup>8</sup>. From 2016 onward, both venue types diverge, mainly driven by stark increases in industry papers at EMNLP.

## 4 Discussion

Conflicts of interest are important to understand since NLP research and private sector interests are intertwined at an accelerating rate. Our findings indicate that 1 in 3 peer-reviewed papers in NLP research contain a conflict of interest. Top venues such as EMNLP and ACL attract a disproportionate amount of these works, which may reflect the quality and scope of the work presented in industry-affiliated papers or be indicative of publication preferences, or both.

Our work does not take a normative stance regarding conflicts of interest; the short- and long-term research implications are yet to be determined. As such, we do not suggest that having a conflict of interest is problematic, *per se*. For many researchers, substantial remunerations and access to resources are convincing reasons for industry collaboration.

However, both the proportion of industry papers and the findings about the consequences from other disciplines warrant caution. When scientific rigor and private interests are at odds, this it could result in selective reporting (i.e., under-reporting disappointing or null findings, Ahn et al., 2017; Lundh et al., 2017), drifting research agendas (e.g., focused on commercial potential, McComas, 2012) and abandonment of critical research lines (Metz and Wakabayashi, 2020; Bender et al., 2021).

The exact nature of conflicts of interest on scientific quality might be more nuanced than merely leading to publication bias and favorable outcomes (Bodas Freitas and Verspagen, 2017; Ankrah and AL-Tabbaa, 2015). Some work suggests an inverted U-shaped relationship between industry funding and research output metrics (Muscio et al., 2017): industry funding correlated positively to research output up until an inflection point, after which the benefits vanished. That effect was discipline-specific, with the medical and health sciences only benefiting from industry-funding when funding was substantial.

<sup>8</sup>Non-missing time series data for EMNLP are available from 2007 onward.

## 4.1 Future work and limitations

Our dataset offers the means necessary to explore the role of conflicts of interest at the textual level (e.g., whether papers with industry-affiliated authors cover different topics or present findings differently (Boutron and Ravaud, 2018)). Another line of inquiry could assess, at the author-level, whether becoming industry affiliated impacts publication practices in a quasi-experimental design (e.g., comparing research output and practices before and after becoming industry-affiliated). To better understand the impact of conflicts of interest, future work could compare disciplines and formalize variables that measure scientific impact or progress. It is important to emphasize that our work resorted to a literal and strict operationalizations of conflicts of interest and that other operationalizations are also plausible.

## 4.2 A (very) simple solution

With the already high rate of conflicts of interest in NLP research and no sign of that trend disappearing, it is surprising that the solution is rather simple. While common in most scientific disciplines, the ACL has not established a mandatory conflicts of interest statement for authors in its code of ethics<sup>9</sup>. Ironically, the same authors need to declare their conflicts of interests in academic journals but not in ACL venues. A simple statement or checkbox during submission that mentions conflicts of interest and the nature thereof, would make these transparent and go along way towards mitigating adverse effects of the intensified entanglement of scientific and private interests.

## References

- Rosa Ahn, Alexandra Woodbridge, Ann Abraham, Susan Saba, Deborah Korenstein, Erin Madden, W. John Boscardin, and Salomeh Keyhani. 2017. Financial ties of principal investigators and randomized controlled trial outcomes: Cross sectional study. *BMJ*, 356:i6770.
- Samuel Ankrah and Omar AL-Tabbaa. 2015. Universities–industry collaboration: A systematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31(3):387–408.
- Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. 2021. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM*

<sup>9</sup>[https://www.aclweb.org/adminwiki/index.php/ACL\\_Conference\\_Conflict-of-interest\\_policy](https://www.aclweb.org/adminwiki/index.php/ACL_Conference_Conflict-of-interest_policy)




Figure 1: Industry affiliations 2000-2024. Industry papers are those that contain at least one industry-affiliated authors. Dashed (dotted) lines indicate the mean across the time span for the respective group.

- Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '21, page 610–623, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Isabel Maria Bodas Freitas and Bart Verspagen. 2017. [The motivations, institutions and organization of university-industry collaborations in the Netherlands](#). *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 27(3):379–412.
- Isabelle Boutron, Matthew J Page, Julian PT Higgins, Douglas G Altman, Andreas Lundh, Asbjørn Hróbjartsson, and on behalf of the Cochrane Bias Methods Group. 2019. [Considering bias and conflicts of interest among the included studies](#). In *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*, chapter 7, pages 177–204. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Isabelle Boutron and Philippe Ravaud. 2018. [Misrepresentation and distortion of research in biomedical literature](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11):2613–2619.
- Howard Brody. 2011. [Clarifying Conflict of Interest](#). *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 11(1):23–28.
- Mary-Margaret Chren and C. Seth Landefeld. 1994. [Physicians' Behavior and Their Interactions With Drug Companies: A Controlled Study of Physicians Who Requested Additions to a Hospital Drug Formulary](#). *JAMA*, 271(9):684–689.
- Massimo G. Colombo, Michele Meoli, and Silvio Vismara. 2019. [Signaling in science-based IPOs: The combined effect of affiliation with prestigious universities, underwriters, and venture capitalists](#). *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(1):141–177.
- Michael Davis and Andrew Stark. 2001. *Conflict of Interest in the Professions*. Oxford University Press.
- C. D. DeAngelis. 2000. [Conflict of interest and the public trust](#). *JAMA*, 284(17):2237–2238.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- ElementTree. 2024. [Xml.etree.ElementTree — The ElementTree XML API](#). <https://docs.python.org/3/library/xml.etree.elementtree.html>.
- GROBID. 2008–2025. [Grobid](#). <https://github.com/kermitt2/grobid>. *Preprint*, swh:1:dir:dab86b296e3c3216e2241968f0d63b68e8209d3c.
- Hanna Hottenrott, Michael E. Rose, and Cornelia Lawson. 2021. [The rise of multiple institutional affiliations in academia](#). *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 72(8):1039–1058.
- Lenard I. Lesser, Cara B. Ebbeling, Merrill Gozner, David Wypij, and David S. Ludwig. 2007. [Relationship between funding source and conclusion among nutrition-related scientific articles](#). *PLoS medicine*, 4(1):e5.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1907.11692.

Andreas Lundh, Joel Lexchin, Barbara Mintzes, Jeppe B Schroll, and Lisa Bero. 2017. [Industry sponsorship and research outcome](#). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2017(2).

Katherine A. McComas. 2012. [Researcher views about funding sources and conflicts of interest in nanotechnology](#). *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 18(4):699–717.

Cade Metz and Daisuke Wakabayashi. 2020. [Google Researcher Says She Was Fired Over Paper Highlighting Bias in A.I.](#) (Published 2020) — nytimes.com. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/03/technology/google-researcher-timnit-gebru.html>. [Accessed 16-02-2025].

Alessandro Muscio, Laura Ramaciotti, and Ugo Rizzo. 2017. [The complex relationship between academic engagement and research output: Evidence from Italy](#). *Science and Public Policy*, 44(2):235–245.

Markus Perkmann, Valentina Tartari, Maureen McKelvey, Erkkö Autio, Anders Broström, Pablo D’Este, Riccardo Fini, Aldo Geuna, Rosa Grimaldi, Alan Hughes, Stefan Krabel, Michael Kitson, Patrick Llerena, Francesco Lissoni, Ammon Salter, and Maurizio Sobrero. 2013. [Academic engagement and commercialisation: A review of the literature on university–industry relations](#). *Research Policy*, 42(2):423–442.

R Core Team. 2023. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria.

Leonard Richardson. 2024. BeautifulSoup4: Screen-scraping library.

Jeffrey M. Rothenstein, George Tomlinson, Ian F. Tanock, and Allan S. Detsky. 2011. [Company Stock Prices Before and After Public Announcements Related to Oncology Drugs](#). *JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 103(20):1507–1512.

Meghna Tallapragada, Gina M. Eosco, and Katherine A. McComas. 2017. [Aware, Yet Ignorant: Exploring the Views of Early Career Researchers About Funding and Conflicts of Interests in Science](#). *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 23(1):147–164.

The Pandas Development Team. 2023. [Pandas-dev/pandas: Pandas](#). Zenodo.

## A Venue labeling

For each paper, we extracted the conference venue through regular expression queries on the papers’ URLs. These were papers where their *Tag*, the unique identifier retrieved from the URL, corresponded to a single venue (e.g., D18-1402, all tags starting with the letter D corresponded to the EMNLP venue). The tags varied over the years, but most of them followed a similar pattern.

For venues with the same starting letter in their identifier, we manually checked which range of papers belonged to which venue. The remaining papers had tags that specifically mentioned a venue or workshop (e.g., 2021-nlp4convai-1-9). To identify these papers, we wrote a small script that retrieved the names of all workshops for each venue from the ACL webpage. These were then stored and manually searched to connect the papers to the correct venue.

## B Supplementary Tables

Table 2: Number of papers across venues and years.

CID	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	Total
AAACL	53	164	271	-	188	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	676
ACL	2284	2494	1473	1461	1073	726	421	342	363	344	317	385	218	327	256	233	208	191	290	127	125	98	51	64	40	13911
ANLP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88
CL	18	22	28	20	13	17	29	17	27	30	33	34	36	42	38	30	33	35	38	29	22	26	25	40	38	720
CoNLL	35	67	24	52	59	110	88	79	51	51	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	616
EACL	704	679	20	685	40	-	-	275	-	-	160	-	113	-	-	124	-	-	85	-	-	106	-	-	-	2991
EMNLP	2580	2468	1813	1617	1601	1033	553	340	256	299	223	200	134	141	123	156	113	126	-	141	-	-	-	-	-	13917
IWSLT	32	41	29	29	26	31	26	18	25	-	40	41	41	36	20	24	24	22	26	24	19	-	-	-	-	574
NAACL	1171	-	1000	860	44	471	389	-	212	232	-	164	113	-	169	166	-	144	132	-	92	92	-	16	-	5467
SemEval	255	275	209	176	269	216	185	174	201	152	141	110	-	-	97	-	-	105	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	2598
StarSem	34	44	28	28	19	30	30	29	27	35	21	44	104	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	473
TACL	69	87	77	86	51	42	47	34	39	40	42	33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	647
WMT	112	83	111	102	124	102	101	73	98	60	59	60	54	63	62	39	33	33	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	1392
WS	475	354	189	17	592	1265	1027	1161	1013	945	945	845	758	749	690	692	333	346	499	255	488	318	275	146	240	14617
Total	7822	6778	5272	5133	4099	4043	2896	2542	2312	2188	1981	1916	1571	1358	1455	1464	744	1002	1093	576	746	640	351	299	406	58687

Table 3: Average number of authors across venues and years.

CID	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	Average
AAACL	3.66	4.04	3.42	-	3.39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.63
ACL	4.94	4.48	3.96	3.97	3.61	3.70	3.35	3.23	3.13	3.17	2.88	2.87	2.79	2.55	2.64	2.70	2.50	2.48	2.54	2.22	2.26	3.13	2.02	2.25	2.15	3.02
ANLP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.99
CL	2.89	3.55	3.11	2.75	2.92	3.29	3.03	4.59	3.85	4.27	4.30	4.50	4.44	3.38	3.00	3.77	3.33	2.49	2.11	2.79	2.23	2.62	2.16	3.17	3.84	3.30
CoNLL	3.60	3.87	3.25	3.67	2.92	3.65	3.02	3.49	3.41	2.96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.38
EACL	3.94	4.01	2.70	3.26	3.17	-	-	3.06	-	-	2.64	-	2.63	-	-	2.32	-	-	2.22	-	-	2.39	-	-	-	2.94
EMNLP	4.91	4.54	4.35	3.82	3.80	3.69	3.48	3.17	3.35	3.05	2.88	2.96	3.04	2.93	2.81	2.65	2.47	2.55	-	2.67	-	-	-	-	-	3.32
IWSLT	8.09	5.78	6.07	4.48	4.69	3.84	3.96	3.56	4.20	-	4.72	4.83	4.59	4.39	3.40	2.92	3.71	3.14	2.85	3.42	3.47	-	-	-	-	4.31
NAACL	4.98	-	4.02	3.82	3.86	3.41	3.23	-	3.37	2.85	-	2.66	2.47	-	2.53	2.54	-	2.53	2.50	-	3.12	2.45	-	1.50	-	3.05
SemEval	3.90	3.72	3.55	3.64	3.11	3.23	3.18	3.28	3.20	3.31	3.38	2.96	-	-	2.81	-	-	2.53	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.24	3.27
StarSem	3.00	3.23	3.07	3.64	2.84	3.37	2.60	3.17	2.59	3.26	2.48	3.09	2.88	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.02
TACL	4.64	4.08	4.64	3.88	3.51	3.43	3.06	3.26	2.85	2.80	2.71	2.33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.43
WMT	4.35	4.71	5.25	4.76	3.92	3.73	3.64	3.82	3.47	3.98	4.08	3.67	3.15	3.65	2.97	4.10	3.42	2.55	2.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.79
WS	3.26	3.36	3.33	2.76	3.10	3.09	3.05	2.93	2.94	2.85	2.77	2.87	2.67	2.66	2.77	2.56	2.51	2.55	2.53	2.29	2.56	2.55	2.37	2.27	2.13	2.75
Average	4.32	4.11	3.90	3.71	3.45	3.49	3.24	3.42	3.30	3.25	3.29	3.28	3.19	3.26	2.87	2.95	2.99	2.60	2.49	2.68	2.73	2.63	2.18	2.49	2.53	3.23



Table 4: Average number of references across venues and years.

CID	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	Average
AAACL	30.4	39.7	35.1	-	29.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33.7
ACL	43.5	41.6	39.4	37.9	34.6	34.7	31.8	30.9	30.5	28.6	27.5	25.5	22.6	22.0	23.0	17.2	17.2	15.9	17.9	16.0	14.7	14.7	15.9	17.3	15.4	25.5
ANLP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.2
CL	51.9	44.8	52.2	49.0	54.0	60.2	39.3	42.1	42.6	34.4	49.6	48.1	34.7	28.6	26.1	34.1	27.9	19.2	22.2	27.1	28.6	34.7	37.7	19.1	22.3	37.2
CoNLL	44.0	39.1	44.7	39.8	38.6	37.8	31.2	29.7	27.1	26.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35.9
EACL	36.9	39.7	33.2	33.6	29.8	-	-	28.2	-	-	24.2	-	24.3	-	-	22.1	-	-	15.5	-	-	13.3	-	-	-	27.4
EMNLP	44.2	42.4	40.8	38.6	36.1	30.7	32.7	32.1	32.8	28.4	29.7	28.6	30.6	31.3	25.6	24.5	22.8	23.4	-	16.5	-	-	-	-	-	31.1
IWSLT	29.8	32.9	33.1	31.2	25.2	27.5	25.7	25.3	23.6	-	24.4	25.7	18.9	19.4	18.9	14.2	17.1	18.0	17.5	15.3	14.2	-	-	-	-	22.9
NAACL	40.9	-	38.8	34.6	19.6	33.2	30.9	-	28.8	27.1	-	24.4	22.7	-	18.1	16.3	-	14.1	14.0	-	14.3	11.4	-	17.6	-	24.0
SemEval	21.6	20.8	22.3	22.2	21.4	18.7	18.2	17.3	18.5	16.9	16.2	16.6	-	-	10.5	-	-	9.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.6	17.0
StarSem	41.2	40.9	39.9	35.4	36.5	28.7	32.2	30.7	28.5	26.1	27.6	22.9	17.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31.4
TACL	59.4	54.2	59.4	53.9	51.4	50.0	50.1	46.5	43.4	42.5	41.4	38.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49.2
WMT	27.1	29.3	27.3	25.2	24.6	23.2	24.9	24.3	21.4	23.8	26.3	25.5	21.8	20.0	17.5	16.3	15.2	16.2	14.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	22.3
WS	29.3	25.4	27.5	30.0	25.3	27.2	25.2	23.6	23.0	22.1	20.2	20.6	19.0	18.1	16.6	16.2	14.9	15.8	16.2	16.6	14.4	14.5	15.0	14.0	13.6	20.2
Average	38.5	37.6	38.0	36.0	32.8	33.8	31.1	30.1	29.1	27.7	28.7	27.6	23.6	23.2	19.5	20.1	19.2	16.5	16.8	18.3	17.2	17.7	22.8	14.5	16.6	28.1

## C Supplementary Images

Venue	2024 – 2020	2019 – 2010	2009 – 2000	1999 – 1990	1989 and older
<b>AAACL</b>	23 22 20				
<b>ACL</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10	09 08 07 06 05 04 03 02 01 00	99 98 97 96 95 94 93 92 91 90	89 88 87 86 85 84 83 82 81 80 79
<b>ANLP</b>				00 97 94 92	88 83
<b>CL</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10	09 08 07 06 05 04 03 02 01 00	99 98 97 96 95 94 93 92 91 90	89 88 87 86 85 84 83 82 81 80 78 77 76 75 74
<b>CoNLL</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10	09 08 07 06 05 04 03 02 01 00	99 98 97	
<b>EACL</b>	24 23 21	17 14 12	09 06 03	99 97 95 93 91	89 87 85 83
<b>EMNLP</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10	09 08 07 06 05 04 03 02 01 00	99 98 97 96	
<b>Findings</b>	24 23 22 21 20				
<b>IWSLT</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10	09 08 07 06 05 04		
<b>NAACL</b>	24 22 21	19 18 16 15 13 12 10	09 07 06 04 03 01 00		
<b>SemEval</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 10	07 04 01	98	
<b>*SEM</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12			
<b>TACL</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13			
<b>WMT</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10	09 08 07 06		
<b>WS</b>	24 23 22 21 20	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10	09 08 07 06 05 04 03 02 01 00	99 98 97 96 95 94 93 91 90	89 87 85 83 81 79 77

Figure 2: Visual representation of all conferences that are included in the dataset.