Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *DART: Mitigating Harm Drift in Difference-Aware LLMs via Distill-Audit-Repair Training*
Authors: *Ziwen Pan, Zihan Liang, Jad Kabbara, Ali Emami*

How to read the checklist symbols:

☑ the authors responded 'yes'

☒ the authors responded 'no'

N/A 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?
Ethical Considerations; Limitations

☑ **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?
Ethical Considerations; 3.4 External Safety Evaluation

☑ 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?
3.1 Experimental Setup; Appendix A: Data Splits and Protocol

☑ **C. Did you run computational experiments?**

☑ C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?
3.1 Experimental Setup; Appendix C (Training Details); Appendix M (Hyperparameter Sensitivity Analysis).

☑ 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?
3.2 Main Results; 3.3 Ablation Studies; Table 2; Figures 34; Appendix J.

☑ **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.?
Two researchers with NLP background were trained through a calibration session. The paper did not report the full text of the instructions given to annotators.

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 paper identifies the annotators only as two researchers with NLP background and does not report recruitment procedures, compensation, or payment adequacy.

☐ N/A 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)

☐ N/A 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?**

☐ N/A E1. If you used AI assistants, did you include information about their use?
(left blank)