

## Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Think Better, Not Longer: Token-Level Marginal Utility for Efficient Reasoning in Large Reasoning Models*

Authors: *Jiawei Li, Yang Gao, Huashan Sun, Chong Feng*

How to read the checklist symbols:

- the authors responded 'yes'
- the authors responded 'no'
- <sup>N/A</sup> 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*

**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 datasets we used are public benchmark datasets for reasoning tasks that do not contain any personally identifiable information or offensive content.*

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?  
*Yes, we reported detailed statistics in Section 5.1.*

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

C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?  
*Yes, we reported detailed statistics in Section 5.1.*

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?  
*Yes, we reported detailed statistics in Section 5.1.*

**D. Did you use human annotators (e.g., crowdworkers) or research with human subjects?**

<sup>N/A</sup> 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.?  
*Not applicable.*

---

*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.*

N/A 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)?

*Not applicable. The details about payment and recruitment are not relevant to the research content of this work.*

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)?

*Not applicable.*

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

*The ethics considerations are discussed in detail in our Ethics Considerations section.*

**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 Gemini-3 to assist with polishing this paper. The use of AI writing assistants is not relevant to the research contributions of this paper.*