

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *ARCQuant: Boosting NVFP4 Quantization with Augmented Residual Channels for LLMs*
Authors: *Haoqian Meng, Yilun Luo, Yafei Zhao, Wenyuan Liu, Peng Zhang, Xindian Ma*

How to read the checklist symbols:

- the authors responded 'yes'
- the authors responded 'no'
- the authors indicated that the question does not apply to their work
- the authors did not respond to the checkbox question

For background on the checklist and guidance provided to the authors, see the [Responsible NLP Checklist](#) page at ACL Rolling Review.

A. Questions mandatory for all submissions.

- A1. Did you describe the limitations of your work?

This paper has a Limitations section.

- A2. Did you discuss any potential risks of your work?

This work focuses on the post-training quantization and inference acceleration of existing open-source Large Language Models. It does not introduce new model architectures, training objectives, or capabilities that would generate specific ethical risks or societal harms beyond those already inherent in the base models.

B. Did you use or create scientific artifacts? (e.g. code, datasets, models)

- B4. Did you discuss the steps taken to check whether the data that was collected/used contains any information that names or uniquely identifies individual people or offensive content, and the steps taken to protect/anonymize it?

We utilize widely adopted public datasets (WikiText2, C4, HumanEval) and official model checkpoints. We did not curate new data or perform additional PII filtering beyond standard community practices associated with these established benchmarks.

- B6. Did you report relevant statistics like the number of examples, details of train/test/dev splits, etc. for the data that you used/created?

Section 4.1 and Appendix B.1.

C. Did you run computational experiments?

- C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?

Section 4.1 and Appendix B.1.

- C3. Did you report descriptive statistics about your results (e.g., error bars around results, summary statistics from sets of experiments), and is it transparent whether you are reporting the max, mean, etc. or just a single run?

We report results based on deterministic runs with a fixed random seed (set to 0), as stated in Appendix B.1. Due to the high computational cost of full LLM inference evaluations, we did not perform multiple runs to estimate error bars.

The Responsible NLP Checklist used at ACL Rolling Review is adopted from NAACL 2022, with the addition of ACL 2023 question on AI writing assistance and further refinements based on ARR practice. ACL 2026 used a subset of ARR checklist form.

D. Did you use human annotators (e.g., crowdworkers) or research with human subjects?

- D1. Did you report the full text of instructions given to participants, including e.g., screenshots, disclaimers of any risks to participants or annotators, etc.?

This research is purely computational, focusing on the quantization and acceleration of Large Language Models. We rely solely on existing, publicly available datasets (e.g., WikiText2, C4, MMLU) and automatic evaluation metrics. No human subjects or crowdworkers were involved in this study.

- D2. Did you report information about how you recruited (e.g., crowdsourcing platform, students) and paid participants, and discuss if such payment is adequate given the participants' demographic (e.g., country of residence)?

(left blank)

- D3. Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating (e.g., did your instructions explain how the data would be used)?

(left blank)

- D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?

(left blank)

E. Did you use AI assistants (e.g., ChatGPT, Copilot) in your research, coding, or writing?

- E1. If you used AI assistants, did you include information about their use?

We utilized AI assistants (e.g., large language models) solely for grammatical polishing and rephrasing for clarity. All scientific claims, experimental designs, and experimental results are the original work of the authors.