# Guide to the Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools and Resources in Research Communication on the SciELO Network

Preliminary Version as of September 14, 2023
[Translation into English from the Spanish version through ChatGPT August 3 Version]

## 1. Introduction

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools and resources has become ubiquitous 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 processes and aligned with standards and ethical best practices in research communication.

The purpose of this guide 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 research communication.

In particular, the guide provides guidelines for updating the author instructions section and internal management guidelines for manuscript reception, evaluation, and final version editing.

This guide establishes standards and practices that will be applied to authors, editors, and reviewers regarding the use of AI tools and resources in research communication within the SciELO Network collections.

## 2. Recommendations for Authors

The use of tools and resources that assist authors in the preparation of their manuscripts is recommended, as long as attribution rules are followed, and ethics and scientific integrity are upheld.

Authors have the right and freedom to use tools and resources that aid in the preparation, writing, review, and translation of their articles, book chapters, or books. Many of these tools and resources are provided by AI applications.

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

- Inform/mention the sources of materials used in research and manuscript writing. Any use or content generated by an AI application must be mentioned in the abstract and in the methods section or equivalent.

- Ensure that all cited material is 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 nonexistent works.

- Assume public responsibility for their work.

- Concealing the use and content of AI is an ethical lapse that violates principles of transparency and honesty in research.

## 3. Recommendations for Editors

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

Editors must be prepared and supported to address the effects of AI use and 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).

It is the responsibility of editors to conduct proper scientific scrutiny and ensure the quality and integrity of published scientific documents. To do this, they must have training and access to up-to-date tools and resources that facilitate the detection of AI-generated or modified content. Editors are called upon to avoid misinformation, as it could have adverse consequences and potential harm to individuals.

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, evaluation, and editing process. Concealing the use of AI tools is an ethical lapse that violates transparency in scientific editing.

When the received manuscript is not a preprint, the editor should not submit it to 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 editorial.

## 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 use and 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). Therefore, they must have training and access to up-to-date tools and resources that facilitate the detection of AI-generated or modified content. Reviewers are called

upon to avoid misinformation, as it could have adverse consequences and potential harm to individuals.

The use of AI applications and content must comply with ethical standards and best practices and must be documented in the review reports. Concealing the use of AI tools is an ethical lapse that violates transparency in peer review.

When the received manuscript is not a preprint, the reviewer should not submit it to services that may disclose identities and content inappropriately.

## 6. How to Cite AI Content

Content generated by AI tools should be cited and referenced as an unrecoverable source and/or similar to a personal communication, following the guidelines for citing this type of resource in the chosen reference style.

## Notes

### 1. 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 American Medical Association | https://jamanetwork.com/ |
| ORI | 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/ |

### 2. Documents consulted

- Artificial intelligence and authorship. COPE 23, Feb. 2023
  https://publicationethics.org/news/artificial-intelligence-and-authorship

- Authorship and AI tools COPE position statement. COPE 13 feb. 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, 0(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/17470161231180449

**APA**: How to cite ChatGPT

**MLA**: Guía de MLA para citar contenido creado por AI

**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