

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *LLMRouterBench: A Massive Benchmark and Unified Framework for LLM Routing*

Authors: *Hao Li, Yiqun Zhang, Zhaoyan Guo, Chenxu Wang, Shengji Tang, Qiaosheng Zhang, Yang Chen, Biqing Qi, Peng Ye, LEI BAI, Zhen Wang, Shuyue Hu*

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 do not include a separate discussion of potential risks, as this work focuses on benchmarking and evaluating existing LLM routing methods and does not introduce new capabilities or mechanisms beyond those already present in prior LLM research.

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 did not explicitly discuss steps to check for personally identifying information or offensive content because our benchmark exclusively comprises publicly available, widely used datasets for evaluating LLMs, which are already anonymized by their original publishers and contain no personal or offensive information.

- 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?

Appendix Section A

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

Appendix Section A

- 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?

Appendix Section A

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.?
(left blank)

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 used AI assistants (e.g., ChatGPT) for grammar and clarity improvements during writing. We did not explicitly mention this usage in the manuscript because the role of AI was limited to language editing and did not impact the research design, methods, or outcomes.