

## Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *CARE-CR: Context-Aware Routing and Expert Fusion for Multi-Preference Cognitive Restructuring*

Authors: *Hongzhi Qi, Liangcheng Wang, yijing YU, Jianqiang Li, Bing Xiang Yang, Qing Zhao*

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 Limitations and Ethics Statement*

### 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 Ethics Statement and Section 3.1*

- 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 3.1 and 3.2*

### C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

*Section 3.4 (Implementation Details)*

- 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 4 (Results)*

### 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.?

*Scoring rubrics and anchor descriptions for human evaluation are provided in Appendix D. The complete annotation guidelines will be released with our publicly available dataset and code.*

---

*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)?

*The three PhD student annotators and the senior psychologist adjudicator are co-authors or collaborators on this research; they were not recruited as paid participants. Patient data providers were inpatients at a provincial mental health center who voluntarily provided anonymized textual responses as part of the IRB-approved study, without financial compensation.*

- 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)?

*Section Ethics Statement and Section 3.1*

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

*Section Ethics Statement*

**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 (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude) for language polishing, grammar checking, and LaTeX formatting assistance during the writing process. All technical content, experimental design, data analysis, and scientific claims were conceived and verified by the authors. AI assistants were not used to generate research ideas, experimental results, or any core scientific content.*