

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Cognitive Policy-Driven LLM for Diagnosis and Intervention of Cognitive Distortions in Emotional Support Conversation*

Authors: *Lin Zhong, Renjin Zhu, Shujuan Ma, Jinhao Cui, Lingzhi Wang, Hao Chen, Qing Liao*

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?

Section 4.3 and Section 8

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?

Section 3, Section 8, and Appendix C

- 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 3 and Appendix C

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

Section 5 and Appendix B

- 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?

Section 5 and Appendix D

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.?

Appendix C and Appendix E

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.

- 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)?

Appendix C

- 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)?

The D4 dataset used in this work was originally collected from real human participants under an approved ethical review process by the original dataset creators. In our work, we obtained access to D4 through an authorized review procedure and strictly followed the original data usage terms. Participant consent for data collection and research use was handled by the original authors. We do not recollect or re-identify any participant data, and no personally identifiable information is included.

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

As explained in Section 3 and Appendix C, we use secondary data from previously published datasets. The original data collection was approved by the respective creators' ethics review boards. Since we do not conduct new human subjects research or new data collection, a new ethics board approval was not required.

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 did not use any AI assistants in our research, coding, or writing.