

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *One LLM Does Not Simulate All Students: Ability-Aware Student Simulation via Cognitive Diagnosis Guided LLM Assignment*

Authors: *Huixing Que, Qi Liu, Weibo Gao, Zhenya Huang*

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?

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 data used in this work come from an existing publicly available dataset that has been anonymized by its original creators. According to the dataset documentation, personally identifiable information has been removed prior to release. Therefore, no additional anonymization steps were required in this study

- 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 4, Appendix C

C. Did you run computational experiments?

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

Section 4, 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

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.?

We don't use human annotators

- 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 don't use human annotators

- 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 data used in this work come from an existing publicly available dataset that has been anonymized by its original creators

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

It is a public dataset and we cite it

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 generative AI tools for several purposes: 1. Coding assistance: AI helped generate deployment code for large models and evaluation scripts. All code was reviewed and verified by the authors. 2. Language assistance: AI assisted in checking grammar and spelling, compressing long sentences, and translating draft text into English. 3. LaTeX assistance: AI was used to generate LaTeX code for formatting the manuscript.