

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *CPT-Agent: A Cognitive Process Theory-driven Framework for Student Simulation in Writing Development*

Authors: *Yuhan Chen, Zizhuo Shen, Miaomiao Cheng, Xu Han, Jiefu Gong, Shijin Wang, Wei Song*

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?

We discuss potential risks related to AI-based student simulation and teacher training in Section 7.

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?

The information is provided in Appendix D.4.

- 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?

We report dataset statistics in Section 5.1 and Appendix D.4.

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

We discuss experimental setup and hyperparameters in Section 5.1, Appendix D.4 and Appendix E.

- 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 descriptive statistics about our results, and report mean and standard deviation over multiple runs in Section 5 and Appendix F.

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.?

We report the instructions given to participant in Appendix F.3.

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)?

We report the information in Appendix F.

- 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)?

We discuss data consent in Appendix D.4 and Appendix F.

- N/A D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?
We did not seek ethics board/IRB review because the study involved minimal risk and collected no personally identifying information; all annotators participated voluntarily with informed consent, and data were anonymized(See in Appendix D.4).

- 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 discuss LLMs as part of the experimental framework and evaluation in Section 5.1 and Appendix D.4. Additionally, we also utilize LLMs to enhance the language quality of the manuscript. We assume full responsibility for the research contributions, experimental design, and final content presented in this work.