

INVITATION TO COMMENT – WORK-IN-PROGRESS

GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS AND RESOURCES IN RESEARCH COMMUNICATION

At the 25th anniversary conference of the SciELO Network in September 2023 these AI usage guidelines were put forward for discussion and endorsement.

ASSAf would like to develop these guidelines into best practice guidelines for South African journals after consultation with South African editors.

Guidelines for the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools and Resources in Research Communication

1. Introduction

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools and resources has become pervasive in the preparation, evaluation, and editing of manuscripts, as well as in the publication and dissemination of articles and books. However, any use of these tools must be documented in methodologies and aligned with standards and ethical best practices in scholarly communication.

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide guidance to SciELO journals, academic book publishers in the SciELO Books collection, SciELO Preprints, and SciELO Data on the use of content generated by AI applications in scholarly communication.

In particular, they provide ideas for updating the *Guidelines to Authors* section of journals, as well as the internal management of manuscript submissions, evaluation, and final version editing by the editors of the journal.

These guidelines provide standards and practices for authors, editors, and reviewers regarding the use of AI tools and resources in research communication within the SciELO Network collections.

2. Recommendations for Authors

Authors need to take sole responsibility for the authenticity of the content of their manuscripts. The use of tools and resources that may assist authors in the preparation of their manuscripts is recommended, as long as attribution rules are followed, and ethics and scientific integrity are maintained.

Authors may use tools and resources that aid in the preparation, methodology, review, and translation of their articles, book chapters, or books. Many of these tools and resources are provided by AI applications, for example grammatical and punctuation error detection tools.

However, it is important to note that only humans can be considered authors, following the following rules and practices:

- The sources of materials used in research and manuscript writing are referenced. Any use or content generated by an AI application must be mentioned in the abstract and in the methods section or equivalent. See (5) below.

- All cited material needs to be properly attributed, including full citations, and that the cited sources support the claims made by the AI application, as it is not uncommon for AI to generate references to non-existent works, i.e., all citations need to be checked.
- Commonly used AI tools such as spelling, and grammar checks do not need to be disclosed.
- Need to assume public responsibility for their work as authors.

Concealing the use of AI tools is unethical and violates the principles of transparency and honesty in research.

3. Recommendations for Editors

Editors use tools and resources that assist in manuscript reception / submitted manuscripts, evaluation, and editing of articles, chapters, or data files. These tools help, for example, in determining whether the manuscript fits the editorial scope, summarising content, assigning metadata, identifying reviewers, and detecting duplicate images, etc. Many of these tools and resources are provided by AI applications.

Editors need to be aware of the effects of AI generated content in publication when it is employed to conduct analysis or report results (which is expected to be indicated by the author in the abstract and methods).

Editors need to conduct proper scientific scrutiny and ensure the quality and integrity of published scientific documents to the best of their ability. They need to be aware of tools and resources that facilitate the detection of AI-generated or modified content. Copy editors are called upon to avoid including misinformation, as this could have adverse consequences.

At the same time, editors must adhere to established ethical and editorial standards and best practices, including documenting any assistance provided by AI tools or resources during the manuscript reception / submitted manuscripts, evaluation, and editing process. As with the recommendations for authors, the concealing of the use of AI tools, here in the editing phase, is unethical and violates transparency in scientific editing.

When the submitted manuscript is not a preprint, the editor should not submit it to similarity checking services that may disclose identities and content inappropriately. If any ethical lapse is detected in the manuscript, the editor must follow the ethical best practices of the respective journal.

4. Recommendations for Reviewers

Reviewers are responsible for evaluating manuscripts of articles, book chapters, or books fairly and objectively, with a focus on quality and originality. Experience and knowledge are crucial in this process, supported by the use of various tools such as plagiarism detection programs, statistical analysis software, and academic search engines, among others. Many of these tools are provided by AI applications.

Like editors, reviewers must address the effects of AI-generated content in publication when it is employed to conduct analysis or report results (which is expected to be indicated by the author in the abstract and methods). They need to be aware of the tools and resources that facilitate the detection of AI-generated or modified content. Reviewers are called upon to avoid misinformation as this can have adverse consequences.

The use by reviewers of AI applications and content must comply with ethical standards and best practices and must be documented in the review reports. To retain transparency in the peer review reports reviewers need to indicate where they used AI tools and how. The review process is confidential and by placing the article in an AI tool the article becomes public and goes against the

confidentiality principle. Concealing the use of AI tools is unethical and would go against the aim of transparency in peer review.

When the submitted manuscript is not a preprint, the reviewer should not submit it to a similarity checking service that may disclose identities and content inappropriately.

5. How to Cite AI Content

Content generated by AI tools should be cited and referenced as an unrecoverable source, similar to a personal communication, following the guidelines for citing this type of resource in the chosen reference style of the relevant journal. The journal needs to provide an example in its *Guidelines to Authors* section.

6. References

a. Scientific societies and journal publishers' websites consulted:

ACL	Association for Computational Linguistics	https://www.aclweb.org/portal
Cambridge University Press	Cambridge University Press	https://www.cambridge.org/
COPE	Committee on Publication Ethics	https://publicationethics.org
ICMJE	International Committee of Medical Journal Editors	https://www.icmje.org
JAMA Network	Journal of the American Medical Association Network	https://jamanetwork.com
UK ORI	University of Kentucky Office of Research Integrity	https://www.research.uky.edu/office-research-integrity
Taylor & Francis	Taylor & Francis Online	https://www.tandfonline.com
WAME	World Association of Medical Editors	https://www.wame.org

b. Documents consulted

- Artificial intelligence and authorship. COPE 23 February 2023. <https://publicationethics.org/news/artificial-intelligence-and-authorship>
- COPE's position statement on Authorship and AI tools COPE 13 February 2023. <https://publicationethics.org/cope-position-statements/ai-author>
- Cambridge principles for generative AI in research publishing, Cambridge University Press, 2023. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/authors/publishing-ethics/research-publishing-ethics-guidelines-for-journals/authorship-and-contributorship#ai-contributions-to-research-content>

- Chatbots, Generative AI, and Scholarly Manuscripts. WAME Recommendations on Chatbots and Generative Artificial Intelligence in Relation to Scholarly Publications. January 20, 2023.
<https://wame.org/page3.php?id=110>
- Jordan Boyd-Graber, Naoaki Okazaki, et al. 2023. ACL 2023 policy on AI Writing Assistance.
<https://2023.aclweb.org/blog/ACL-2023-policy/>
- Hosseini, M., Resnik, D. B., & Holmes, K. (2023). The ethics of disclosing the use of artificial intelligence tools in writing scholarly manuscripts. Research Ethics, 19(4).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/17470161231180449>

c. Style guide examples

APA: [How to cite ChatGPT](#)

MLA: [How to cite generative AI in MLA style](#)

RMIT University - [Library tutorials](#)

- RMIT Harvard - interim guidelines
- Chicago A e B – interim guidelines
- Vancouver - interim guidelines
- IEEE - interim Guidelines

The University of British Columbia [Generative AI and ChatGPT](#)

- APA
- MLA
- Chicago
- Vancouver

d. A South African Journal Example

Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal - <https://perjournal.co.za/policies> (see AI policy)

