



# USE OF AI IN PUBLISHING

Contact us:

[info@sciendo.com](mailto:info@sciendo.com)

As a service provider, we recognize the evolving role of **generative AI (genAI) tools** in academic publishing. While we do not directly enforce editorial policies, we expect our partner journals to establish **transparent guidelines** for the responsible use of AI in scholarly publishing. This guidance applies to **authors, reviewers, and editorial teams** engaging with AI tools during the publication process.

We **do not currently integrate genAI tools** into our editorial services. However, if such tools are used in the future, their role would be **strictly assistive**, ensuring that intellectual property, privacy, and ethical standards remain protected. GenAI outcomes can never be fully relied upon, and **human oversight** is always necessary.

## Key considerations for AI use in scholarly publishing

We recommend that journals align their AI policies with the following principles:

- **Accountability:** GenAI tools cannot be held accountable for their outputs.
- **Transparency:** Users must declare any use of genAI tools and understand the limitations regarding the transparency of these tools.
- **Attribution:** AI-generated text often lacks proper attribution and referencing standards.
- **Accuracy and trustworthiness:** GenAI tools may introduce inaccuracies and biases and cannot verify their sources. Their outputs can blur the line between fact and fiction.
- **Copyright, privacy, and confidentiality:** GenAI tools may not provide adequate confidentiality, data security, or copyright protection. In the case of publicly available genAI platforms, users should assume there are no controls over any future use of their inputs and responses. **Locally run AI tools** offer better privacy controls but must still be used with caution.

## Guidelines for authors

Partner journals may permit the use of genAI in manuscript preparation under the following conditions:

- Any use of genAI must be disclosed, ideally in the methods or acknowledgments sections.
- GenAI may be used for manuscript refinement (e.g., language improvement, formatting), but **not** for creating, altering, or manipulating research data, images, or measurements.
- Authors must ensure they have the necessary rights to all content uploaded to public genAI platforms, considering confidentiality and proprietary rights. It should

be recognized by the author that any content uploaded into a publicly available genAI platform could be used in future genAI outputs for other people.

- AI tools do not qualify for authorship, as they can't be held accountable for all aspects of the work. An AI tool should not be included in the author list of a manuscript [see Guidance on Authorship and Contributorship].

## Guidelines for reviewers

Reviews should only be undertaken by the appointed reviewer. The responsibilities and tasks involved in reviewing a paper can only be attributed to and performed by the human submitting the review. Journals should not allow the use of genAI tools in peer review due to concerns about accountability, accuracy, trustworthiness, confidentiality, copyright, privacy, and data security.

- Reviews should be written solely by the assigned reviewer. AI-generated reviews are not accountable or verifiable.
- **Manuscripts under review must never be uploaded to public genAI platforms**, as this may violate confidentiality agreements and intellectual property rights.
- If a reviewer suspects **undisclosed genAI use in a submission**, they should report it to the **handling editor** for investigation.

## Guidelines for editorial teams

Editors play a crucial role in **assessing and managing** AI usage in manuscripts. We encourage journals to:

- **Evaluate declared AI use on a case-by-case basis**, ensuring that it aligns with transparency and ethical standards.
- **Prohibit the use of public genAI platforms for integrity checks** (e.g., plagiarism detection), as these may compromise confidentiality.
- **Ensure AI-generated content does not replace human decision-making** in editorial workflows.

## Final considerations

As AI technologies continue to evolve, we encourage journals to regularly review and update their policies on AI and research integrity. Transparency and accountability remain fundamental to the credibility of scholarly publishing.

## Additional reading

*Nature*, “Why *Nature* will not allow the use of generative AI in images and video,” 618 (214), 2023, <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-01546-4>

COPE, “Authorship and AI tools,” 13 February 2023, <https://publicationethics.org/cope-position-statements/ai-author>

EASE, “Recommendations on the use of AI in scholarly communication,” 25 September 2024, <https://ease.org.uk/2024/09/recommendations-on-the-use-of-ai-in-scholarly-communication>

