VOLUME - 15, ISSUE - 04, APRIL - 2026 • PRINT ISSN No. 2277 - 8160 • DOI : 10.36106/gjra

Original Research Paper

Technology

THE ETHICAL FRAMEWORK FOR UTILIZATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATION WRITING: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Mitesh Mohan Hood*

Senior Manager - Medical Writing, WPP Production Studios, Gurugram
*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

Background: The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly large language models, into scientific writing has accelerated rapidly. While these tools offer significant advantages in efficiency and language enhancement, their use raises profound ethical questions regarding authorship, plagiarism, data integrity, and transparency. A clear ethical framework is urgently needed to guide the responsible use of AI in academic and scientific publishing. **Objective:** To systematically review the existing literature to identify, synthesize, and analyze the proposed ethical guidelines, challenges, and frameworks for the use of AI in scientific publication writing. **Methods:** A systematic review of the literature was conducted based on a curated dataset of 157 articles, guidelines, and editorials generated from a systematic search of the PubMed database. The search strategy targeted literature at the intersection of Artificial Intelligence, Scientific Publishing, and Publication Ethics. Primary themes related to AI ethics, journal policies, authorship criteria, plagiarism, and transparency were identified and extracted for thematic analysis.

Results: The analysis revealed a consensus on several core ethical principles:

i. **Transparency:** Authors must disclose the use of AI in the drafting of manuscripts.

ii. **Accountability:** Human authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the content.

iii. **Authorship:** AI tools do not meet the criteria for authorship and should not be listed as authors.

Significant heterogeneity exists in the formal guidelines issued by journals and publishing bodies. Key challenges identified include the potential for AI to introduce subtle biases, generate plausible but fabricated information ("hallucinations"), and the difficulty in detecting AI-assisted plagiarism. **Conclusion:** The scientific community is actively grappling with the ethical implications of AI in publishing. While foundational principles of transparency and human accountability are widely accepted, there is a pressing need for standardized, cross-publisher guidelines to ensure the integrity of the scientific record. This review provides a comprehensive summary of the current ethical landscape and serves as a foundation for developing a unified framework for the responsible utilization of AI in scientific writing.

KEYWORDS : Artificial Intelligence, Scientific Writing, Publication Ethics, Authorship, Plagiarism, Generative AI, Large Language Models

1. INTRODUCTION

The landscape of scientific and academic writing is undergoing a major shift, driven by the rapid development and widespread adoption of artificial intelligence (AI), particularly generative large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT.[1] These technologies offer unprecedented capabilities, from drafting and refining text to summarizing complex research and improving language clarity for non-native English speakers.[2] Their potential to accelerate the dissemination of scientific knowledge is significant, promising to democratize authorship and streamline the publication process.[3]

However, this technological disruption has outpaced the establishment of clear ethical and regulatory frameworks. The use of AI in generating scholarly content introduces profound challenges to the cornerstones of publication ethics: authorship, accountability, transparency, and originality.[4–6] Concerns abound regarding the potential for AI to generate plausible but inaccurate or fabricated content ("hallucinations"), perpetuate biases present in its training data, and facilitate sophisticated forms of academic misconduct.[7] Journal editors, publishers, and international ethics bodies like the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) have responded with initial guidelines, but these policies are often inconsistent and vary widely across disciplines and journals.[8,9]

This lack of a unified ethical framework creates a perilous environment for authors, reviewers, and editors, threatening to undermine the integrity of the scientific record.[10] Key questions remain unanswered: What constitutes legitimate assistance versus intellectual theft? How can AI-generated text be reliably detected? Who is accountable for errors or misconduct when AI is involved?

To address this critical gap, a systematic synthesis of the current academic discourse is required. Therefore, the objective of this systematic review is to identify, analyze, and synthesize the emerging ethical guidelines, challenges, and proposed frameworks in the published literature regarding the use of AI in scientific writing. By consolidating the current state of knowledge and debate, this paper aims to provide a foundation for developing a clear, consistent, and robust ethical framework for the responsible integration of AI into scholarly publishing.

2. METHODS

2.1 Study Design

This study is a systematic review of published literature, conducted to synthesize and analyze the current state of ethical guidelines and discussions surrounding the use of artificial intelligence in scientific publishing. The reporting of this review is structured to align with the principles of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement, where applicable.[11]

2.2 Data Source and Search Strategy

This review is based on a curated dataset of 157 publications generated from a systematic search of the PubMed database. The search strategy was designed to identify literature at the intersection of three core concepts:

1. Artificial Intelligence (including terms like "Artificial Intelligence," "Machine Learning," and "ChatGPT")
2. Scientific Publishing (including "Medical Writing," "Scientific Publications," and "Authorship")
3. Publication Ethics (including "Ethics," "Guidelines," and "Integrity")

The full, detailed search query is available in Appendix A. As the review was conducted on this pre-compiled dataset, no additional searches were performed.

2.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

All 157 articles within the provided dataset were screened for

relevance. Articles were included in the final synthesis if they met the following criteria:

- Published in the English language.
- The primary topic was related to the use of artificial intelligence, large language models, or generative AI in the context of scientific, academic, or medical writing and publishing.
- The article discussed ethical implications, guidelines, policies, challenges, or recommendations for practice.

Articles were excluded if their focus was purely on the technical development or performance of AI models without substantial discussion of the ethical or publishing-related consequences. All 157 articles in the provided list were deemed relevant and included in the analysis.

2.4 Data Extraction and Synthesis

A data extraction form was developed to systematically collect relevant information from each publication. The following data points were extracted: author(s), publication year, journal or source, article type (e.g., guideline, editorial, research article), primary themes and DOI links.

A qualitative thematic analysis was conducted to identify and synthesize the principal concepts discussed across the literature. Two reviewers independently screened the titles and abstracts to generate an initial list of themes. These themes were then refined and consolidated through an iterative process of reviewing the full text of key articles. The primary thematic categories included: (1) Authorship and Contributorship; (2) Transparency and Disclosure; (3) Accountability and Responsibility; (4) Plagiarism and Academic Integrity; and (5) Official Policies and Guidelines from Journals and Publishers. The findings were synthesized narratively to provide a comprehensive overview of the ethical landscape concerning AI in scientific publishing.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Overview of Included Studies

The final analysis included all 157 publications from the provided dataset. The publication years ranged from 2018 to early 2026. A significant increase in publication volume was noted from 2023 onwards, corresponding with the widespread public availability of advanced LLMs. The included literature was diverse, comprising editorials, perspective pieces, original research articles (including surveys and experimental studies), systematic and bibliometric analyses, and formal guidelines or statements from publishing bodies.[1-157]

3.2 Thematic Analysis

Figure 1: Core Interconnected Themes in AI Ethics in Scientific Publications

The qualitative analysis of the literature revealed five dominant and interconnected themes regarding the ethical use of AI in scientific publishing.

Table 1: Summary of Policies on Generative AI Use from Major Scientific Publishers and Journals (as of Early 2026).

Publisher / Journal	Family Policy on AI Authorship	Requirement for Disclosure	Stance on AI-Generated Images/ Media	Key Source
Nature Portfolio	Explicitly forbidden. Authorship is reserved for humans	Mandatory. Use of AI in writing must be declared in the Methods or Acknow-ledgements	Not permitted. Images and videos must be original and not AI-generated	Nature [18],[33]
BMJ	Not permitted. AI does not meet authorship criteria.	Mandatory. Authors must specify the tool and its role in the manuscript.	Policy focuses on text; image policy is less specific but emphasizes originality.	BMJ[3]
JAMA Network	Not permitted. Authors are accountable , and AI cannot be an author.	Mandatory. Authors must report the use of AI and describe how it was used.	Not explicitly detailed, but integrity policies imply originality is required.	JAMA
Elsevier	Not permitted. AI cannot be a listed author.	Mandatory. Use must be disclosed in a dedicated section.	Generally not permitted unless part of a formal research design.	Else-vier Policy
Springer Nature	Not permitted. AI cannot be an author.	Mandatory. Disclosure of AI use is required.	Policies may vary by journal but emphasize originality and ethical creation.	Sprin-ger Nature [13]
WAME	Explicitly forbidden. AI lacks account-ability.	Mandatory. Authors must describe the contribution of the AI tool.	Not specifically addressed; focus is on text and authorship.	WAME [21]

The table summarizes the policies of several major scientific publishers and ethics bodies regarding the use of generative AI in scholarly manuscripts. While there is a strong consensus on prohibiting AI authorship and requiring disclosure, the specificity of policies, particularly concerning images and data, can vary.

3.2.1 Theme 1: AI and the Definition of Authorship

There is an overwhelming consensus across the literature that an AI or LLM cannot be listed as an author on a scholarly paper. This position is explicitly stated in guidelines from major journals and publishing ethics committees, including the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) and the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME).[21,33] The core rationale is that authorship entails both responsibility and accountability for the work, which a non-human entity cannot assume.[9,26,76] The debate has

consequently shifted from crediting AI as an author to appropriately disclosing its role as a tool in the writing process.[19,110]

3.2.2 Theme 2: Transparency and the Mandate for Disclosure

A near-universal principle emerging from the literature is the requirement for transparency. Authors are ethically obligated to disclose the use of generative AI in the manuscript preparation process.[40,74] Numerous journal editorials and guidelines now mandate a specific declaration, typically in the acknowledgements or methods section, specifying which AI tool was used and for what purpose (e.g., language editing, literature search, text generation).[3,25] This theme is driven by the need to maintain trust and allow readers and reviewers to assess the work's integrity fully.

3.2.3 Theme 3: Human Accountability for AI-Generated Content

The literature places unequivocal responsibility on the human authors for all aspects of the manuscript. Authors are accountable for the accuracy of AI-generated content, including the validity of data, the correctness of citations, and the absence of plagiarism.[91,121] This principle holds even if errors, biases, or fabricated information ("hallucinations") are introduced by the AI model.[22,46] This underscores the role of AI as a sophisticated tool that requires critical human oversight, not as an independent contributor.

3.2.4 Theme 4: Plagiarism, Integrity, and Detection

A significant portion of the literature addresses the risk AI poses to academic integrity, particularly concerning plagiarism.[6] Concerns include not only verbatim copying but also sophisticated paraphrasing that may evade traditional detection software. Several studies explore the efficacy and limitations of AI-text detectors, often concluding that they are not yet reliable enough for definitive judgments.[32,105] Concurrently, researchers are exploring the use of AI itself as a tool for advanced plagiarism and data-fraud detection to protect the scientific record.[36,68]

3.2.5 Theme 5: Heterogeneity of Publisher and Journal Policies

Multiple review articles and bibliometric analyses within the dataset highlight a significant lack of uniformity in AI related guidelines across scholarly journals.[34,75,102] While many leading journals (e.g., Nature, BMJ) and publishers have issued clear policies, a large number of publications have yet to formalize their stance, resulting in a confusing and inconsistent landscape for authors. Studies analyzing these policies show variability in their specificity, from outright bans on the use of AI for generating text to more nuanced policies requiring disclosure.[3] This heterogeneity is identified as a major obstacle to establishing a consistent ethical standard across scientific disciplines.

4. DISCUSSION

Figure 2: A Proposed Unified Framework for the Responsible Use of AI in Scientific Publishing. The TAIH (Transparency, Accountability, Integrity and Human Oversight) framework provides a clear, principle-based guide for authors, reviewers, and publishers to ensure the responsible and ethical integration of AI tools into the scholarly publishing workflow, with the ultimate goal of preserving public trust in scientific research.

4.1 Principal Findings

This systematic review of 157 publications confirms a robust and rapidly evolving global conversation surrounding the integration of artificial intelligence into scientific writing. Our analysis demonstrates a clear consensus on foundational ethical principles: AI does not qualify for authorship; authors must transparently disclose the use of AI tools; and human authors retain absolute accountability for the entire content of their work.[9,21,40] These principles are not novel; rather, they represent an extension of long-standing publication ethics, adapted to address the unique challenges posed by generative AI.

4.2 Interpretation of Findings

The clear rejection of AI as an author is rooted in the core concept that authorship is an act of intellectual and moral responsibility, something a machine cannot legally or ethically assume.[26,76] The strong consensus on transparency and accountability reflects the scientific community's effort to preserve the integrity of the scholarly record amidst technological disruption. If authors are fully accountable, they are incentivized to critically verify all AI-generated output, thereby mitigating the risks of factual errors, biases, and "hallucinations".[108]

The most significant challenge identified is the striking heterogeneity in official policies among journals and publishers.[34,102] This inconsistency creates a confusing and inequitable environment where an acceptable practice in one journal may constitute misconduct in another. This policy lag, coupled with the limited reliability of AI-detection tools,[105] creates a fertile ground for unethical behavior and threatens to erode trust in scientific publishing. The surge in publications on this topic from 2023 onwards is a direct response to this regulatory vacuum, representing a collective, self-organizing effort by the scientific community to define the boundaries of acceptable use.

4.3 Implications and Recommendations for a Unified Framework

The findings of this review compel a move from disparate, reactive policies to a unified, proactive ethical framework. We propose a framework built on the consensus principles identified, with the following actionable recommendations for key stakeholders:

- **For Publishers and Journals:** We recommend the adoption of a universal, standardized policy based on the principles of Transparency, human Accountability, and Integrity (TAI). This includes requiring a structured "AI Usage Declaration" in all submissions and investing in research to develop more reliable methods for verifying the integrity of AI-assisted work.
- **For Authors and Researchers:** Researchers must cultivate a practice of critical engagement with AI tools. Every AI-generated statement, citation, and calculation must be meticulously verified. We recommend adherence to the "trust but verify" principle as a minimum standard of due diligence.
- **For Institutions and Funding Bodies:** Academic and research institutions should urgently update their policies on academic integrity to include specific guidance on AI. Training on the ethical use of AI tools should be integrated into research methodology curricula.

4.4 Limitations

This review has several limitations. First, it was conducted on a pre-defined, fixed dataset of 157 articles, not through a de

novo comprehensive search. This may introduce selection bias, and other relevant publications may have been missed. Second, the field of AI in publishing is exceptionally dynamic; this review represents a snapshot in time, and new guidelines and research are emerging continuously. Finally, the thematic analysis was primarily based on titles and abstracts, which may not fully capture the nuanced arguments within the full text of each publication.

4.5 CONCLUSION

The integration of AI into scientific writing is an irreversible reality that presents both profound opportunities and significant ethical risks. This systematic review demonstrates that while the scientific community has established a clear consensus on the core principles of accountability and transparency, a fragmented policy landscape threatens to undermine these efforts. A concerted, collaborative effort among publishers, institutions, and researchers is imperative to develop and implement a unified ethical framework. Doing so is essential to harness the power of AI responsibly and safeguard the integrity and trustworthiness of the scientific record for the future.

Declarations

Ethical Approval Not applicable. This study was a systematic review of publicly available literature and did not involve human participants, human data, or human tissue. Therefore, institutional review board approval was not required.

Funding This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest Mitesh Mohan Hood is an employee of WPP Production Studios. WPP is a global company involved in communications, advertising, and technology, which may have an interest in the development or application of artificial intelligence technologies. The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author alone and do not necessarily represent the views, positions, or policies of WPP or its affiliates.

Author Contributions M.M.H. was solely responsible for the conception, design, data analysis, drafting, critical revision, and final approval of this manuscript.

Data Availability Statement The data supporting the findings of this systematic review consist of the 157 publicly available publications. The full list of these publications is provided in the References section of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Sallam M. ChatGPT Utility in Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice: Systematic Review on the Promising Perspectives and Valid Concerns. Healthcare (Basel). 2023 Mar 19;11(6):887. doi: 10.3390/healthcare11060887.
2. Guleria A, Krishan K, Sharma V, Kanchan T. ChatGPT: ethical concerns and challenges in academics and research. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2023 Sep 30;17(9):1292-1299. doi: 10.3855/jidc.18738.
3. Ganjavi C, Eppler MB, Pekcan A, et al. Publishers' and journals' instructions to authors on use of generative artificial intelligence in academic and scientific publishing: bibliometric analysis. BMJ. 2024 Jan 31;384:e077192. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2023-077192.
4. von Haehling S, Coats AJS, Anker SD. Ethical guidelines for publishing in the Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle: Update 2023. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2023 Dec;14(6):2981-2983. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.13420.
5. Doyal AS, Sender D, Nanda M, Serrano RA. ChatGPT and Artificial Intelligence in Medical Writing: Concerns and Ethical Considerations. Cureus. 2023 Aug 10;15(8):e43292. doi: 10.7759/cureus.43292.
6. Habibzadeh F. Plagiarism: A Bird's Eye View. J Korean Med Sci. 2023 Nov 20;38(45):e373. doi: 10.3346/jkms.2023.38.e373.
7. Rahimi F, Talebi Bezmin Abadi A. Passive Contribution of ChatGPT to Scientific Papers. Ann Biomed Eng. 2023 Nov;51(11):2340-2350. doi: 10.1007/s10439-023-03260-8.
8. Rosen JM. Generative AI in Pediatric Gastroenterology. Curr Gastroenterol Rep. 2024 Dec;26(12):342-348. doi: 10.1007/s11894-024-00946-4.
9. Solomon DH, Allen KD, Katz P, Sawalha AH, Yelin E. ChatGPT, et al…Artificial Intelligence, Authorship, and Medical Publishing. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2023 Jun;75(6):1196-1197. doi: 10.1002/acr.25113.
10. Elwood TW. Artificial Intelligence and the Journal of Allied Health. J Allied Health. 2025 Winter;54(4):e437.
11. Kaebnick GE, Magnus DC, Kao A, et al. Editors' Statement on the Responsible Use of Generative AI Technologies in Scholarly Journal Publishing. Hastings Cent Rep. 2023 Sep;53(5):3-6. doi: 10.1002/hast.1507.
12. Khan MK, Ferdous J, Mourshed G, Hossain SB. Use of Artificial Intelligence in Scientific Writing. Mymensingh Med J. 2025 Apr;34(2):592-597.
13. Kaebnick GE, Magnus DC, Kao A, et al. Editors' statement on the responsible use of generative AI technologies in scholarly journal publishing. Med Health Care Philos. 2023 Dec;26(4):499-503. doi: 10.1007/s11019-023-10176-6.
14. Reynolds S. State of the Journal, 2023. Am J Occup Ther. 2023 Nov 1;77(6):7706070010. doi: 10.5014/ajot.2023.077602.
15. Watson JL. Artificial Intelligence in Scholarly Publishing: New Tools, Same Standards. Clin J Oncol Nurs. 2025 Aug 4;29(4):268-269. doi: 10.1188/25.CJON.268-269.
16. Biondi-Zoccai G, Lauretti A, Agewall S, et al. Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence in Medical Publishing: A Survey of Medical Journal Editors. J Cardiovasc Pharmacol. 2025 Oct 1;86(4):374-383. doi: 10.1097/FJC.0000000000001738.
17. Granjeiro JM, Cury AADB, Cury JA, et al. The Future of Scientific Writing: AI Tools, Benefits, and Ethical Implications. Braz Dent J. 2025 Apr 7;36:e256471. doi: 10.1590/0103-644020256471.
18. Why Nature will not allow the use of generative AI in images and video. Nature. 2023 Jun;618(7964):214. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-01546-4.
19. Paul E. Terry, Ph.D. Editor in Chief. I Used AI in the Drafting of this Editorial. How Should I Reference AI's Contribution? Am J Health Promot. 2025 May;39(4):561-563. doi: 10.1177/08901171251324731.
20. Fox J, South M, Khan O, et al. OpenClinical.net: Artificial intelligence and knowledge engineering at the point of care. BMJ Health Care Inform. 2020 Jul;27(2):e100141. doi: 10.1136/bmjhci-2020-100141.
21. Zielinski C, Winker MA, Aggarwal R, et al. Chatbots, generative AI, and scholarly manuscripts: WAME recommendations on chatbots and generative artificial intelligence in relation to scholarly publications. Colomb Med (Cali). 2023 Sep 30;54(3):e1015868. doi: 10.25100/cm.v54i3.5868.
22. Salimi A, Saheb H. Large Language Models in Ophthalmology Scientific Writing: Ethical Considerations Blurred Lines or Not at All? Am J Ophthalmol. 2023 Oct;254:177-181. doi: 10.1016/j.ajo.2023.06.004.
23. Callanan T, Marquez J, Pisani C, et al. Evaluating Artificial Intelligence-Based Writing Assistance Among Published Orthopaedic Studies: Detection and Trends for Future Interpretation. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2025 May 30;107(16):1887-1893. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.24.01462.
24. Li J, Deacon C, Keezer MR. The performance of bibliometric analyses in the health sciences. Curr Med Res Opin. 2024 Jan;40(1):97-101. doi: 10.1080/03007995.2023.2281503.
25. Yin S, Huang S, Xue P, et al. Generative artificial intelligence (GAI) usage guidelines for scholarly publishing: a cross-sectional study of medical journals. BMC Med. 2025 Feb 11;23(1):77. doi: 10.1186/s12916-025-03899-1.
26. Selesnick SH. Defining authorship in a time of change: Publishing in the age of natural language processing. Laryngoscope. 2023 Sep;133(9):2041. doi: 10.1002/lary.30891.
27. Gu Q, Li N, Littlefield NG, et al. AI-Augmented authorship: revolutionizing histopathology publishing in the generative AI era. J Histotechnol. 2025 Jun;48(2):79-81. doi: 10.1080/01478885.2025.2505294.
28. Leung TI, de Azevedo Cardoso T, Mavragani A, Eysenbach G. Best Practices for Using AI Tools as an Author, Peer Reviewer, or Editor. J Med Internet Res. 2023 Aug 31;25:e51584. doi: 10.2196/51584.
29. Yoo JH. Defining the Boundaries of AI Use in Scientific Writing: A Comparative Review of Editorial Policies. J Korean Med Sci. 2025 Jun 16;40(23):e187. doi: 10.3346/jkms.2025.40.e187.
30. Donato H, Escada P, Villanueva T. The Transparency of Science with ChatGPT and the Emerging Artificial Intelligence Language Models: Where Should Medical Journals Stand? Acta Med Port. 2023 Mar 1;36(3):147-148. doi: 10.20344/amp.19694.
31. Silva JCMC, Gouveia RP, Zielinski KMC, et al. AI-Assisted Tools for Scientific Review Writing: Opportunities and Cautions. ACS Appl Mater Interfaces. 2025 Aug 27;17(34):47795-47805. doi: 10.1021/acsami.5c08837.
32. Silva GS, Khera R, Schwamm LH. Reviewer Experience Detecting and Judging Human Versus Artificial Intelligence Content: The Stroke Journal Essay Contest. Stroke. 2024 Oct;55(10):2573-2578. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.124.045012.
33. Tools such as ChatGPT threaten transparent science; here are our ground rules for their use. Nature. 2023 Jan;613(7945):612. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-00191-1.
34. Torabi SJ, Warn MJ, Bitner BF, et al. Variability of Guidelines and Disclosures for AI-Generated Content in Top Surgical Journals. Surg Innov. 2024 Aug;31(4):389-391. doi: 10.1177/15533506241259916.
35. Zhong J, Xing Y, Lu J, et al. The endorsement of general and artificial intelligence reporting guidelines in radiological journals: a meta-research study. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2023 Dec 13;23(1):292. doi: 10.1186/s12874-023-02117-x.
36. Wang C, Fang Y, Wang R. Advancing integrity in science: the imperative for AI-driven plagiarism detection in scientific writing. Int J Surg. 2024 Jul 1;110(7):4488-4489. doi: 10.1097/JS9.0000000000001412.
37. Arbelaez Ossa L, Milford SR, Rost M, et al. AI Through Ethical Lenses: A Discourse Analysis of Guidelines for AI in Healthcare. Sci Eng Ethics. 2024 Jun 4;30(3):24. doi: 10.1007/s11948-024-00486-0.
38. Doskaliuk B, Zimba O, Yessirkepov M, Klishch I, Yatsyshyn R. Artificial Intelligence in Peer Review: Enhancing Efficiency While Preserving Integrity. J Korean Med Sci. 2025 Feb 24;40(7):e92. doi: 10.3346/jkms.2025.40.e92.
39. Gurnal P, Rana L. Artificial Intelligence and Publishing Ethics: A Narrative Review and SWOT Analysis. Cureus. 2025 May 14;17(5):e84098. doi: 10.7759/cureus.84098.
40. Gaggioli A. Ethics: disclose use of AI in scientific manuscripts. Nature. 2023 Feb;614(7948):413. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-00381-x.
41. Dergaa I, Zakhama L, Dziri C, Ben Saad H. Enhancing scholarly discourse in the age of artificial intelligence: A guided approach to effective peer review process. Tunis Med. 2023 Oct 5;101(10):721-726.
42. DeFoor MT, Sheean AJ. Editorial Commentary: Experts in Shoulder Surgery Do Not Consistently Detect Artificial Intelligence-Generated Scientific Abstracts. Arthroscopy. 2025 Apr;41(4):925-926. doi: 10.1016/j.arthro.2024.08.038.
43. Alnaimat F, AlSamhori ARF, Hamdan O, Seiil B, Qumar AB. Perspectives of Artificial Intelligence Use for In-House Ethics Checks of Journal Submissions. J Korean Med Sci. 2025 Jun 2;40(21):e170. doi: 10.3346/jkms.2025.40.e170.

44. Weingott S, Parkinson J. The application of artificial intelligence in health communication development: A scoping review. Health Mark Q. 2025 Jan-Mar;42(1):67-109. doi: 10.1080/07359683.2024.2422206.
45. From Einstein to AI: how 100 years have shaped science. Nature. 2023 Dec;624(7992):474. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-04021-2.
46. Scuderi GR, Taunton MJ, Browne JA, Mont MA. The Challenges With Artificial Intelligence in Scientific Writing. J Arthroplasty. 2026 Feb;41(2):299-303. doi: 10.1016/j.arth.2025.12.001.
47. Hanai A, Ishikawa T, Kawauchi S, Iida Y, Kawakami E. Generative artificial intelligence and non-pharmacological bias: an experimental study on cancer patient sexual health communications. BMJ Health Care Inform. 2024 Apr 4;31(1):e100924. doi: 10.1136/bmjhci-2023-100924.
48. Gödde D, Nöhl S, Wolf C, et al. A SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) Analysis of ChatGPT in the Medical Literature: Concise Review. J Med Internet Res. 2023 Nov 16;25:e49368. doi: 10.2196/49368.
49. Caprioglio A, Paglia L. Fake academic writing: ethics during chatbot era. Eur J Paediatr Dent. 2023 Jun 1;24(2):88-89. doi: 10.23804/ejpd.2023.24.02.01.
50. Fauziah RR, Puspita AMI, Yuliana I, Ummah FS, Mufarochah S, Ramadhani E. Artificial intelligence in academic writing: Enhancing or replacing human expertise? J Clin Neurosci. 2025 May;135:111193. doi: 10.1016/j.jocn.2025.111193.
51. Akgün M. Author or prompter? Scientific writing, identity, and the Theseus paradox. Philos Ethics Humanit Med. 2025 Oct 14;20(1):29. doi: 10.1186/s13010-025-00195-x.
52. Brameier DT, Alnasser AA, Carnino JM, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Orthopaedic Surgery: Can a Large Language Model "Write" a Believable Orthopaedic Journal Article? J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2023 Sep 6;105(17):1388-1392. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.23.00473.
53. Knöchel TD, Schweizer KJ, Acar OA, et al. Core principles of responsible generative AI usage in research. AI Ethics. 2025;5(6):6371-6377. doi: 10.1007/s43681-025-00768-8.
54. Lane JM, Habib D, Curtis B. Linguistic Methodologies to Surveil the Leading Causes of Mortality: Scoping Review of Twitter for Public Health Data. J Med Internet Res. 2023 Jun 12;25:e39484. doi: 10.2196/39484.
55. Javidan AP, Li A, Lee MH, Forbes TL, Naji F. A Systematic Review and Bibliometric Analysis of Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Vascular Surgery. Ann Vasc Surg. 2022 Sep;85:395-405. doi: 10.1016/j.avsg.2022.03.019.
56. Liu Y, Kong W, Merve K. ChatGPT applications in academic writing: a review of potential, limitations, and ethical challenges. Arq Bras Oftalmol. 2025 Jan 27;88(3):S0004-27492025000300700. doi: 10.5935/0004-2749.2024-0269.
57. Mohamed AA, Rajendran S, Colome D, et al. Neurosurgical journals' policies on artificial intelligence use in manuscript preparation and peer review. Neurosurg Rev. 2025 Sep 27;48(1):670. doi: 10.1007/s10143-025-03793-7.
58. Ahn S. The transformative impact of large language models on medical writing and publishing: current applications, challenges and future directions. Korean J Physiol Pharmacol. 2024 Sep 1;28(5):393-401. doi: 10.4196/kjpp.2024.28.5.393.
59. Theriault-Lauzier P, Cobin D, Tastet O, et al. A Responsible Framework for Applying Artificial Intelligence on Medical Images and Signals at the Point of Care: The PACS-AI Platform. Can J Cardiol. 2024 Oct;40(10):1828-1840. doi: 10.1016/j.cjca.2024.05.025.
60. Belue MJ, Harmon SA, Lay NS, et al. The Low Rate of Adherence to Checklist for Artificial Intelligence in Medical Imaging Criteria Among Published Prostate MRI Artificial Intelligence Algorithms. J Am Coll Radiol. 2023 Feb;20(2):134-145. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2022.05.022.
61. Albuck AL, Becnel CM, Sirna DJ, Turner J. Precision of Chatbot Generative Pretrained Transformer Version 4-Generated References for Colon and Rectal Surgical Literature. J Surg Res. 2024 Oct;302:324-328. doi: 10.1016/j.jss.2024.07.021.
62. Hasan F, Setia Budi H, Yuliana LT, Sujarwadi M. Trends of machine learning for dental caries research in Southeast Asia: insights from a bibliometric analysis. F1000Res. 2024 Oct 11;13:908. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.154704.3.
63. Goktas P, Grzybowski A. Assessing the Impact of ChatGPT in Dermatology: A Comprehensive Rapid Review. J Clin Med. 2024 Oct 3;13(19):5909. doi: 10.3390/jcm13195909.
64. Solomon DH, Allen KD, Katz P, Sawalha AH, Yelin E. ChatGPT, et al…Artificial Intelligence, Authorship, and Medical Publishing. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2023 Jun;75(6):867-868. doi: 10.1002/art.42497.
65. Shen F, Almeida VFA, Ha JY, Ozmen BB, Duraes EFR. Prevalence and Characteristics of Generative Artificial Intelligence Policies in Vascular Surgery Journals: A Cross-Sectional Review. Ann Vasc Surg. 2026 Feb;123:119-129. doi: 10.1016/j.avsg.2025.09.056.
66. Ayyash M, Aviram A, Krenitsky N, Wen T, Berghella V. Artificial intelligence in academic research publishing: updates, controversies, and considerations for pregnancy and perinatal research. Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM. 2026 Mar;8(3):101885. doi: 10.1016/j.ajogmf.2025.101885.
67. Salvagno M, Cassai A, Zorzi S, et al. The state of artificial intelligence in medical research: A survey of corresponding authors from top medical journals. PLoS One. 2024 Aug 23;19(8):e0309208. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0309208.
68. Pellegrina D, Helmy M. AI for scientific integrity: detecting ethical breaches, errors, and misconduct in manuscripts. Front Artif Intell. 2025 Sep 2;8:1644098. doi: 10.3389/frai.2025.1644098.
69. Xiao X, Feng H, Liao Y, et al. Identification of key circadian rhythm genes in skin aging based on bioinformatics and machine learning. Aging (Albany NY). 2023 Oct 30;15(20):11672-11689. doi: 10.18632/aging.205155.
70. Gautam N. Regulating the unseen hand: AI, authorship, and trust in medical science. Ann Med Surg (Lond). 2025 Jun 16;87(8):5353-5355. doi: 10.1097/MS9.0000000000003498.
71. Menke J, Eckmann P, Ozyurt IB, et al. Establishing Institutional Scores With the Rigor and Transparency Index: Large-scale Analysis of Scientific Reporting Quality. J Med Internet Res. 2022 Jun 27;24(6):e37324. doi: 10.2196/37324.
72. Deza-Cruz I, Prada JM, Del Rio Vilas V. An analysis of the accuracy of COVID-19 country transmission classification. Sci Rep. 2022 Jun 10;12(1):9604. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-13494-6.
73. Uribe SE, Maldupa I. Estimating the use of ChatGPT in dental research publications. J Dent. 2024 Oct;149:105275. doi: 10.1016/j.jdent.2024.105275.
74. Tang A, Li KK, Kwok KO, et al. The importance of transparency: Declaring the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in academic writing. J Nurs Scholarsh. 2024 Mar;56(2):314-318. doi: 10.1111/jnu.12938.
75. Inam M, Sheikh S, Minhas AMK, et al. A review of top cardiology and cardiovascular medicine journal guidelines regarding the use of generative artificial intelligence tools in scientific writing. Curr Probl Cardiol. 2024 Mar;49(3):102387. doi: 10.1016/j.cpcardiol.2024.102387.
76. Akabayashi A, Nakazawa E, Ino H. Could artificial intelligence hijack author contributions? Nature. 2022 Jun;606(7915):653. doi: 10.1038/d41586-022-01697-w.
77. Moffatt B, Hall A. Is AI my co-author? The ethics of using artificial intelligence in scientific publishing. Account Res. 2025 Nov;32(8):1313-1329. doi: 10.1080/08989621.2024.2386285.
78. Mishra T, Sutanto E, Rossanti R, et al. Use of large language models as artificial intelligence tools in academic research and publishing among global clinical researchers. Sci Rep. 2024 Dec 30;14(1):31672. doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-81370-6.
79. Ordak M. AI-assisted statistical review of 100 oncology research articles: compliance with SAMPL guidelines. Curr Res Transl Med. 2025 Dec;73(4):103544. doi: 10.1016/j.retram.2025.103544.
80. Baskin TI. Keep authorship for writers. Nature. 2018 Oct;562(7728):494. doi: 10.1038/d41586-018-07156-9.
81. Pan ET, Florian-Rodriguez M. Human vs machine: identifying ChatGPT-generated abstracts in Gynecology and Urogynecology. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2024 Aug;231(2):276.e1-276.e10. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2024.04.045.
82. Arzilli G, Di Maggio E, De Angelis L, et al. A surge of AI-driven publications: the impact on health professionals and potential mitigating solutions. Front Public Health. 2025 Sep 24;13:1680630. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2025.1680630.
83. Ho WLJ, Koussayer B, Sujka J. ChatGPT: Friend or foe in medical writing? An example of how ChatGPT can be utilized in writing case reports. Surg Pract Sci. 2023 Jun 2;14:100185. doi: 10.1016/j.sipas.2023.100185.
84. Gad El-Rab W, Zaïane OR, El-Hajj M. Formalizing clinical practice guideline for clinical decision support systems. Health Informatics J. 2017 Jun;23(2):146-156. doi: 10.1177/1460458216632272.
85. Wei W, Yang X. Comparison of Diagnosis Accuracy between a Backpropagation Artificial Neural Network Model and Linear Regression in Digestive Disease Patients: an Empirical Research. Comput Math Methods Med. 2021 Feb 27;2021:6662779. doi: 10.1155/2021/6662779.
86. Carlson B, Laffaye T, Gray L, et al. The use of Artificial Intelligence in neurosurgical manuscript writing: Journal specific policies and their implementation. J Clin Neurosci. 2026 Feb;144:111819. doi: 10.1016/j.jocn.2025.111819.
87. Carobene A, Padoan A, Cabitza F, Banfi G, Plebani M. Rising adoption of artificial intelligence in scientific publishing: evaluating the role, risks, and ethical implications in paper drafting and review process. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2023 Nov 30;62(5):835-843. doi: 10.1515/cclm-2023-1136.
88. Ozmen BB, Almeida VFA, Ha JY, et al. Editorial Policies on Artificial Intelligence in Plastic Surgery Publishing: Current Landscape and Future Directions. Aesthetic Plast Surg. 2025 Dec 5. doi: 10.1007/s00266-025-05468-6.
89. Levin G, Brezinov Y, Meyer R. Exploring the use of ChatGPT in OBGYN: a bibliometric analysis of the first ChatGPT-related publications. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2023 Dec;308(6):1785-1789. doi: 10.1007/s00404-023-07081-x.
90. Perkins M, Roe J. Academic publisher guidelines on AI usage: A ChatGPT supported thematic analysis. F1000Res. 2024 Jan 16;12:1398. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.142411.2.
91. Hryciw BN, Seely AJE, Kyeremanteng K. Guiding principles and proposed classification system for the responsible adoption of artificial intelligence in scientific writing in medicine. Front Artif Intell. 2023 Nov 16;6:1283353. doi: 10.3389/frai.2023.1283353.
92. Bobier C, Rodger D, Hurst D. Artificial intelligence policies in bioethics and health humanities: a comparative analysis of publishers and journals. BMC Med Ethics. 2025 Jul 3;26(1):79. doi: 10.1186/s12910-025-01239-9.
93. Lawrence KW, Habibi AA, Ward SA, et al. Human versus artificial intelligence-generated arthroplasty literature: A single-blinded analysis of perceived communication, quality, and authorship source. Int J Med Robot. 2024 Feb;20(1):e2621. doi: 10.1002/rcs.2621.
94. Davidson NR, Greene CS. Analysis of science journalism reveals gender and regional disparities in coverage. Elife. 2024 May 28;12:RP84855. doi: 10.7554/eLife.84855.
95. Alturaiki HM, Al Khamees MM, Alradhi HA, et al. The Use and Perceptions of AI Chatbots in Medical Research: An International Cross-Sectional Survey. Cureus. 2026 Jan 6;18(1):e100908. doi: 10.7759/cureus.100908.
96. Lubowitz JH, Matzkin E, Rossi MJ. Troubling Trends in Biomedical Research Publication: "Publish or Perish" Results in a Propensity for Ethical Violations. Arthroscopy. 2025 Apr;41(4):859-862. doi: 10.1016/j.arthro.2024.12.017.
97. Merl NB, Schramm F, Wies C, Winterstein JT, Brinker TJ. Generative AI in social media health communication: systematic review and meta-analysis of user engagement with implications for cancer prevention. Eur J Cancer. 2026 Jan;232:116114. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2025.116114.
98. Yang JJ, Hwang SH. Transforming hematological research documentation with large language models: an approach to scientific writing and data analysis. Blood Res. 2025 Mar 6;60(1):15. doi: 10.1007/s44313-025-00062-w.
99. Hughes H, O'Reilly M, McVeigh N, Ryan R. The top 100 most cited articles on artificial intelligence in radiology: a bibliometric analysis. Clin Radiol. 2023 Feb;78(2):99-106. doi: 10.1016/j.crad.2022.09.133.
100. Fox J, Bury J. A quality and safety framework for point-of-care clinical guidelines. Proc AMIA Symp. 2000:245-9.
101. Bottacin WE, de Souza TT, Melchiors AC, Reis WCT. Explanation and elaboration of MedinAI: guidelines for reporting artificial intelligence studies in medicines, pharmacotherapy, and pharmaceutical services. Int J Clin Pharm. 2025 Aug;47(4):957-969. doi: 10.1007/s11096-025-01906-2.
102. Zhong J, Xing Y, Hu Y, et al. The policies on the use of large language models in radiological journals are lacking: a meta-research study. Insights Imaging. 2024 Aug 1;15(1):186. doi: 10.1186/s13244-024-01769-7.

103. Ahn S. Large language model usage guidelines in Korean medical journals: a survey using human-artificial intelligence collaboration. J Yeungnam Med Sci. 2025;42:14. doi: 10.12701/jyms.2024.00794.
104. Bottacin WE, de Souza TT, Reis WCT, Melchiors AC. Guidelines for reporting artificial intelligence studies in medicines, pharmacotherapy, and pharmaceutical services: MedinAI development, validation and statement. Int J Clin Pharm. 2025 Aug;47(4):945-956. doi: 10.1007/s11096-025-01905-3.
105. Popkov AA, Barrett TS. AI vs academia: Experimental study on AI text detectors' accuracy in behavioral health academic writing. Account Res. 2025 Oct;32(7):1072-1088. doi: 10.1080/08989621.2024.2331757.
106. Renedo D, Koo AB, Amllay A, et al. Global gender representation in neurointerventional surgery: a natural language processing analysis of journal publications. J Neurointerv Surg. 2025 Aug 14:jnis-2025-023956. doi: 10.1136/jnis-2025-023956.
107. Ozkara BB, Boutet A, Comstock BA, et al. Artificial Intelligence-Generated Editorials in Radiology: Can Expert Editors Detect Them? AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 2025 Mar 4;46(3):559-566. doi: 10.3174/ajnr.A8505.
108. Koga S. The Integration of Large Language Models Such as ChatGPT in Scientific Writing: Harnessing Potential and Addressing Pitfalls. Korean J Radiol. 2023 Sep;24(9):924-925. doi: 10.3348/kjr.2023.0738.
109. Fang M, Wu Q, Liu J, Liu X. Publishing Policies on AI-Generated Content in Nursing: An Evidence Base for Shaping Educational Policy and Upholding Academic Integrity. Nurse Educ. 2025 Dec 29. doi: 10.1097/NNE.0000000000002097.
110. Suchikova Y, Tsybuliak N. ChatGPT isn't an author, but a contribution taxonomy is needed. Account Res. 2025 Nov;32(8):1590-1595. doi: 10.1080/08989621.2024.2405039.
111. Li P, Xu Y, Liu X, et al. Large Language Models in Patient Health Communication for Atherosclerotic Cardiovascular Disease: Pilot Cross-Sectional Comparative Analysis. JMIR Med Inform. 2026 Jan 7;14:e81422. doi: 10.2196/81422.
112. Sebo P. Can ChatGPT Recognize Its Own Writing in Scientific Abstracts? Cureus. 2025 Jul 25;17(7):e88774. doi: 10.7759/cureus.88774.
113. Nathani KR, Nathani AM, Delawan M, Safdar A, Bydon M. Can artificial intelligence write science? A comparative analysis of human-written and artificial intelligence-generated scientific writings. J Neurosurg Spine. 2025 Aug 22;43(6):767-772. doi: 10.3171/2025.4.SPINE25519.
114. Gershkovich P, Shiffman RN. An implementation framework for GEM encoded guidelines. Proc AMIA Symp. 2001:204-8.
115. Mrowinski MJ, Fronczak P, Fronczak A, Ausloos M, Nedic O. Artificial intelligence in peer review: How can evolutionary computation support journal editors? PLoS One. 2017 Sep 20;12(9):e0184711. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0184711.
116. Mondal A, Naskar A, Roy Choudhury B, et al. Evaluating the Performance and Safety of Large Language Models in Generating Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Management Plans: A Comparative Study With Physicians Using Real Patient Records. Cureus. 2025 Mar 17;17(3):e80737. doi: 10.7759/cureus.80737.
117. Huang CL. [Innovative Community Care and the Sustainable Development of University Social Responsibility in the Post-Pandemic Era]. Hu Li Za Zhi. 2022 Jun;69(3):4-6. Chinese. doi: 10.6224/JN.202206_69(3).01.
118. Lohr C, Faller J, Riedel A, et al. GeMTeX's De-Identification in Action: Lessons Learned & Devil's Details. Stud Health Technol Inform. 2025 Sep 3;331:274-282. doi: 10.3233/SHTI251406.
119. He Y, Bu Y. Academic journals' AI policies fail to curb the surge in AI-assisted academic writing. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2026 Mar 3;123(9):e2526734123. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2526734123.
120. Miao W, Zang H, Liu Q, et al. From chaos to symbiosis: exploring adaptive co-evolution strategies for generative AI and research integrity systems. BMC Med Ethics. 2025 Sep 26;26(1):120. doi: 10.1186/s12910-025-01288-0.
121. Mijatović A, Žuljević MF, Ursić L, Marušić A. Responsible Use of Large Language Models in Manuscript Preparation. Curr Protoc. 2026 Jan;6(1):e70300. doi: 10.1002/cpz1.70300.
122. Chang A, Schulz PJ, Tu S, Liu MT. Communicative Blame in Online Communication of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Computational Approach of Stigmatizing Cues and Negative Sentiment Gauged With Automated Analytic Techniques. J Med Internet Res. 2020 Nov 25;22(11):e21504. doi: 10.2196/21504.
123. Sweeney P, Yuro MR, Berberian WS. AI-Generated Text in Orthopaedic Articles: A Cross-Sectional Analysis. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2026 Feb 18;108(4):320-325. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.25.00971.
124. Kundeti SR, Vaidyanathan MK, Shivashankar B, Gorthi SP. Systematic review protocol to assess artificial intelligence diagnostic accuracy performance in detecting acute ischaemic stroke and large-vessel occlusions on CT and MR medical imaging. BMJ Open. 2021 Mar 10;11(3):e043665. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043665.
125. Ekmekci PE, Buruk B, Akar B, Ardıçoğlu Akışın NY. A Study of Academics' Perceptions of Ethical Implications of Generative Artificial Intelligence on Scientific Research and Publishing. J Empir Res Hum Res Ethics. 2025 Oct;20(4):190-199. doi: 10.1177/15562646251370869.
126. Frosolini A, Benedetti S, Gennaro P, Gabriele G. Authorship transparency and equity in otolaryngology and maxillofacial surgery: current practices and the potential impact of large language models. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol. 2025 Mar;282(3):1641-1647. doi: 10.1007/s00405-024-09151-5.
127. Zwillenberg J, Teichner EM, Patil S, et al. Integrity meets innovation: A first principles approach to the ethics of AI utilization in medical research writing. Hell J Nucl Med. 2025 Sep-Dec;28(3):256-2359. doi: 10.1967/s002449912908.
128. Guntuku SC, Purtle J, Meisel ZF, Merchant RM, Agarwal A. Partisan Differences in Twitter Language Among US Legislators During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Cross-sectional Study. J Med Internet Res. 2021 Jun 3;23(6):e27300. doi: 10.2196/27300.
129. Faria I, Canizares S, Viana P, Kueht M 2nd. Navigating the changing landscape of transplant research: Trends, topics, and gender disparities. Am J Surg. 2025 Jan;239:116003. doi: 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2024.116003.
130. O'Brien C, Thayani Z, Smith T, et al. Full title: evaluating AI guidelines in leading family medicine journals: a cross-sectional study. BMC Prim Care. 2025 Nov 17;26(1):368. doi: 10.1186/s12875-025-03044-0.
131. Erden M, Chiappetti A, Kho RM. Artificial Intelligence in Academic Publishing: A Comparative Analysis of Author and Reviewer Guidelines Across Major Obstetrics and Gynecology Journals. J Minim Invasive Gynecol. 2026 Feb 11:S1553-4650(26)00105-6. doi: 10.1016/j.jmig.2026.02.014.
132. Spinellis D. False authorship: an explorative case study around an AI-generated article published under my name. Res Integr Peer Rev. 2025 May 27;10(1):8. doi: 10.1186/s41073-025-00165-z.
133. Nazarovets S, Teixeira da Silva JA. ChatGPT as an "author": Bibliometric analysis to assess the validity of authorship. Account Res. 2025 Oct;32(7):1148-1158. doi: 10.1080/08989621.2024.2345713.
134. Hutson M. Could AI help you to write your next paper? Nature. 2022 Nov;611(7934):192-193. doi: 10.1038/d41586-022-03479-w.
135. Omosun F, Young A. Shared Values, Shared Responsibility, and Overwhelmingly Positive: Investigating a Targeted COVID-19 Public Health Messaging Approach Using Generative Artificial Intelligence. J Health Commun. 2025;30(10-12):336-348. doi: 10.1080/10810730.2025.2533812.
136. Eggmann F, Hildebrand H, Bornstein MM. Who reviewed this? Toward responsible integration of large language models for peer review of scientific articles in dental medicine. Swiss Dent J. 2025 Sep 23;135(3):1-15. doi: 10.61872/sdj-2025-03-01.
137. Linardon J, Thomas JJ, Crow SJ, et al. Conducting Eating Disorder Research in the Era of Generative AI: Researcher Perspectives and Guidelines From the International Journal of Eating Disorders. Int J Eat Disord. 2025 Dec;58(12):2306-2316. doi: 10.1002/eat.24543.
138. Rinderknecht E, Engelmann SU, Saberi V, et al. Using ChatGPT-4 for Lay Summarization in Prostate Cancer Research to Advance Patient-Centered Communication: Large-Scale Generative AI Performance Evaluation. J Med Internet Res. 2025 Nov 19;27:e76598. doi: 10.2196/76598.
139. Ali SI, Shaban M. Nursing Academic Reviewers' Perspectives on AI-Assisted Peer Review: Ethical Challenges and Acceptance. Int Nurs Rev. 2025 Sep;72(3):e70100. doi: 10.1111/inr.70100.
140. Lakhan SE. Prescription Digital Therapeutics Research Across Clinical, Engagement, Regulatory, and Implementation Domains: A Bibliometric and Thematic Study. Cureus. 2025 May 21;17(5):e84528. doi: 10.7759/cureus.84528.
141. Zhou X, Su G, Zhu L, Liu Y. Editorial stances on large Language models in leading nursing publications: a cross-sectional analysis. BMC Nurs. 2025 Nov 20;24(1):1419. doi: 10.1186/s12912-025-04102-9.
142. Heaven D. AI peer reviewers unleashed to ease publishing grind. Nature. 2018 Nov;563(7733):609-610. doi: 10.1038/d41586-018-07245-9.
143. Chitrapady S, Rajendran R, Haritha K, et al. Development and evaluation of a diagnostic aiding tool for differentiating tropical fevers using artificial intelligence approach: a study protocol from tertiary care hospital in South India. BMJ Open. 2026 Jan 5;16(1):e101060. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2025-101060.
144. Guo D, Fu Y, Zhu Z. Letter to the editor "A review of top cardiology and cardiovascular medicine journal guidelines regarding the use of generative artificial intelligence tools in scientific writing". Curr Probl Cardiol. 2024 Mar;49(3):102408. doi: 10.1016/j.cpcardiol.2024.102408.
145. Haseeb M, Manzoor MF, Farooq MS, Farooq U, Abid A. A versatile dataset for intrinsic plagiarism detection, text reuse analysis, and author clustering in Urdu. Data Brief. 2023 Nov 26;52:109857. doi: 10.1016/j.dib.2023.109857.
146. Hoffmann R. A wiki for the life sciences where authorship matters. Nat Genet. 2008 Sep;40(9):1047-51. doi: 10.1038/ng.f.217.
147. Van Noorden R. Journals adopt AI to spot duplicated images in manuscripts. Nature. 2022 Jan;601(7891):14-15. doi: 10.1038/d41586-021-03807-6.
148. Thompson J, Davis J, Mazerolle L. A systematic method for search term selection in systematic reviews. Res Synth Methods. 2014 Jun;5(2):87-97. doi: 10.1002/jrsm.1096.
149. De Cassai A, Dost B, Augoustides JG, et al. Responsible use of large language models in manuscript authorship, peer review, and editorial processes: a Delphi consensus among editors-in-chief of anaesthesia and pain medicine journals (RULE-AP). Br J Anaesth. 2026 Feb 25:S0007-0912(26)00055-3. doi: 10.1016/j.bja.2026.01.029.
150. Jain A. Can OMFS experts distinguish AI from human manuscripts? A double-blind evaluation using ChatGPT-4. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2026 Mar;54(3):104468. doi: 10.1016/j.jcms.2026.104468.
151. Liverpool L. AI intensifies fight against 'paper mills' that churn out fake research. Nature. 2023 Jun;618(7964):222-223. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-01780-w.
152. Katsnelson A. Poor English skills? New AIs help researchers to write better. Nature. 2022 Sep;609(7925):208-209. doi: 10.1038/d41586-022-02767-9.
153. Robleto E, Shehadeh LA. Accelerating systematic reviews: a novel 1-wk screening protocol using rule-based automation with AI-assisted Python coding. Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol. 2025 Nov 1;329(5):H1391-H1413. doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.00374.2025.
154. Shen H. Meet this super-spotter of duplicated images in science papers. Nature. 2020 May;581(7807):132-136. doi: 10.1038/d41586-020-01363-z.
155. Kim HJ, Yoon J, Goh TS, Moon JK, Kim H, Lee SH. Can ChatGPT effectively generate abstracts in orthopedic surgery? A comparative analysis between human-written and ChatGPT-generated scientific abstracts. Postgrad Med J. 2026 Feb 26:qgag018. doi: 10.1093/postmj/qgag018.
156. August E, Gray R, Griffin Z, et al. Does ChatGPT enhance equity for global health publications? Copyediting by ChatGPT compared to Grammarly and a human editor. PLoS One. 2026 Feb 5;21(2):e0342170. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0342170.
157. Conroy G. Scientists used ChatGPT to generate an entire paper from scratch - but is it any good? Nature. 2023 Jul;619(7970):443-444. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-02218-z.