

## ChatGPT in Academic Publishing

<https://www.science.org/content/article/scientists-explore-ai-written-text-journals-hammer-policies>

<https://www.pnas.org/post/update/pnas-policy-for-chatgpt-generative-ai>

<https://factor.niehs.nih.gov/2023/3/feature/2-artificial-intelligence-ethics>

<https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2023/03/31/guest-post-academic-publishers-are-missing-the-point-on-chatgpt/>

- Opinion piece from someone in the sciences. Raises points about authorship and accountability, English as an Additional Language (EAL) writers, etc. Includes links to science journals' policies and guidelines on AI and writing.

<https://www.npr.org/2023/01/09/1147549845/gptzero-ai-chatgpt-edward-tian-plagiarism>

- Discusses GPTZero, which detects AI-generated writing

<https://support.jmir.org/hc/en-us/articles/13387268671771-Do-you-allow-the-the-use-of-ChatGPT-or-other-generative-language-models-and-how-should-this-be-reported->

[https://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws\\_home/620207?generatepdf=true](https://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/620207?generatepdf=true)

Thoughts:

- ChatGPT only uses what is there.
- It is an issue of copyright and intellectual property. If ChatGPT is using other publications, the thoughts and writing of other authors should be respected and given acceptable attribution, which is not possible with this technology.

## **Draft of Statement (11/20/2023)**

### **Introduction:**

Earlier this year, editors of content in *American Archivist* learned that authors had used artificial intelligence (AI) platforms such as ChatGPT in submissions to the [Reviews Portal](#). This sparked a conversation within the Editorial Board about the ethical use of AI in *American Archivist* content. As ChatGPT and other AI programs are becoming ubiquitous, the *American Archivist* Editorial Board is endorsing the following Norms and Recommendations for AI use within our publications.

While we will not reject a piece solely based on the use of AI, we want to be clear about how AI is used in any context in our publications. Our goal is to define standards for the journal and the portal; and to encourage authors to be transparent about their use of AI, including ChatGPT, in content they submit to *American Archivist* and the Reviews Portal. We value an ethical approach to publishing and transparency for our professional membership and our readership.

Concerns are being voiced about AI across multiple disciplines, and as a journal representing one arm of the allied information professions we are most concerned about the use of generative AI. First, generative AI poses substantial issues for copyright and intellectual property: generative AI uses other publications and writings which appear online, and these may not be appropriately attributed for copyright purposes. In addition, our own editorial experience has shown that AI generated citations may produce articles that do not exist.<sup>1</sup>

In an effort to discourage the spread of misinformation, and in an effort to maintain integrity of the journal and to value our responsibility to authors, SAA members, and readers, the *American Archivist* Editorial Board is setting forth these Norms and Recommendations for the use of AI in our publications.

### **Norms and Recommendations**

These Norms and Recommendations represent an ethical agreement between authors and the Editorial Board that is meant to encourage transparency in the use of AI in the research and publication process. They are not enforced, nor do they purport to be a legally binding agreement between SAA, *American Archivist*, or the authors submitting content.

- AI-generated content and AI-generated citations are prohibited. Authors may not submit content that is purely AI generated, nor may they submit citations generated by AI that are not verified by the authors.
- Any other use of AI (structural assistance with grammar and syntax, data analysis, etc.) should be acknowledged by the authors.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Why does ChatGPT generate fake references? - TECHE \(mq.edu.au\)](#)

- Authors must disclose the use of AI when a manuscript (review or article) is submitted. For maximum transparency, this disclosure should appear at the beginning of the article—in an author’s note, the abstract, or a statement prior to the article’s introduction.
- All content—regardless of the use of AI—will go through normal review channels (double blind peer review and/or editorial review, as appropriate).
- Editorial decisions are made based on peer/editorial review, quality of writing, and content. No article will be summarily rejected because of the use of AI, as long as that use does not include generative content or generative citations that are not verified by authors.
- Editors reserve the right to request AI transcripts from authors as well as additional information about its specific use, including where and how it was used in the piece.
- Editors reserve the right to provide AI transcripts to peer reviewers as context for the piece.