

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *KCVR: Knowledge-Centric Video Reconstruction for Structured Pedagogical Summarization via Dynamic Graph Planning*

Authors: *Jingjiang Liu, Jia Zhu, Hanghui Guo, Weijie Shi, Yue Cui, Xiaokang Jin, Yilin Wang, Qingyu Niu, Jiawei Shen, Guoqing Ma, Yidan Liang, Shimin Di, Jiajie Xu*

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?

See Ethics Statement. We discuss privacy, curriculum bias, and potential misuse, including the risk of automated surveillance or punitive evaluation of teachers.

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?

See Appendix A.8. We describe the de-identification protocol, including face blurring, removal of school and personal names, and release of only derived annotations rather than raw videos.

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?

See Section 4.1, Figure 3, and Appendix A. We report the number of videos, duration, phase segments, subject splits, and dataset statistics.

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

See Section 4.1 and Appendix E.4, especially Table 17. We report the training and inference setup, model backbones, LoRA settings, planner budget, and decoding hyperparameters.

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?

See Table 1 and Section 4.1. We report macro-averages over 3 seeds and specify that significance is tested with paired Wilcoxon signed-rank tests.

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.?

See Appendix E.2. We describe the human evaluation protocol, rating criteria, blinding setup, and Likert-scale definitions used by the evaluators.

- 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)?

See Appendix E.2. We report evaluator qualifications, recruitment context, and compensation level relative to local standards.

- 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)?

See Appendix A.8. We state that explicit informed consent for research usage was obtained from all participants.

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

See Appendix A.8. We state that the data collection and processing pipeline was reviewed and approved by the host institution's ethics committee.

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 used AI assistants only for grammatical polishing, proofreading, and formatting checks. All scientific ideas, methodological decisions, experiments, and results were produced and verified by the authors.