

Suspected Undeclared Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Academic Literature

An Analysis of the Academ-AI Dataset

Alex Glynn, MA 

Kornhauser Health Sciences Library
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY
United States of America

alex.glynn@louisville.edu

November 26, 2024

Abstract

Since generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools such as OpenAI's ChatGPT became widely available, researchers have used them in the writing process. The consensus of the academic publishing community is that such usage must be declared in the published article. Academ-AI documents examples of suspected undeclared AI usage in the academic literature, discernible primarily due to the appearance in research papers of idiosyncratic verbiage characteristic of large language model (LLM)-based chatbots. This analysis of the first 500 examples collected reveals that the problem is widespread, penetrating the journals and conference proceedings of highly respected publishers. Undeclared AI seems to appear in journals with higher citation metrics and higher article processing charges (APCs), precisely those outlets that should theoretically have the resources and expertise to avoid such oversights. An extremely small minority of cases are corrected post publication, and the corrections are often insufficient to rectify the problem. The 500 examples analyzed here likely represent a small fraction of the undeclared AI present in the academic literature, much of which may be undetectable. Publishers must enforce their policies against undeclared AI usage in cases that *are* detectable; this is the best defense currently available to the academic publishing community against the proliferation of undisclosed AI.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, large language models, chatbots, ChatGPT, generative pre-trained transformer, research integrity, publishing, peer review.

1 Background

Shortly after the public release of OpenAI’s ChatGPT in November 2022, researchers began incorporating its use into their workflows. The use of ChatGPT or similar tools based on large language models (LLMs) to generate text for inclusion in research articles was immediately controversial. A consensus rapidly emerged in the academic publishing community on two points:

1. No artificial intelligence (AI) system may be listed as an author.
2. Any author who uses AI in the writing process must declare that they have done so in the published article.

These principles have been declared by a variety of academic publishing organizations, including the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), the Council of Science Editors (CSE), the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), the Institute of Physics (IOP), the Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE), Elsevier, Frontiers, the Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI), the Public Library of Science (PLoS), Sage, Science, Springer, Taylor & Francis, and Wiley.¹

The justification for point 1 is that LLMs cannot be held accountable for their statements, but human authors can. Authorship implies the assumption of responsibility for the contents of a manuscript; since an LLM cannot assume this responsibility, it cannot be an author. Responsibility instead lies with the author who chooses to use an LLM to generate text and incorporate that text into their own work. It is also the author’s responsibility to validate such text:

Researchers who use these NLP [natural language processing] systems to write text for their manuscripts must therefore check the text for factual and citation accuracy; bias; mathematical, logical, and common-sense reasoning; relevance; and originality.
(Hosseini et al., 2023)

Point 2 ensures that the implementation of point 1 does not compromise transparency. LLMs should not be listed as authors, but it is still important for readers to know that they are reading AI-generated text:

Because NLP systems may be used in ways that may not be obvious to the reader, researchers should disclose their use of such

systems and indicate which parts of the text were written or co-written by an NLP system.
(Hosseini et al., 2023)

These are more than academic principles, beyond responsibility or transparency for their own sake. LLMs have a well-documented tendency to “make up information”, write “plausible-sounding but incorrect or nonsensical answers” (OpenAI, 2022), or “confidently state information that isn’t correct” (Weston & Shuster, 2021). This phenomenon is known as “confabulation,” “hallucination,” or “fabrication” and is one of twelve risks novel to or exacerbated by the use of generative AI identified by the United States National Institute of Standards and Technology (2024, NIST). Examples of the real-world impact of confabulation include several legal cases, in which attorneys cited non-existent case law to support their arguments² or may have done so.³

As the NIST emphasizes, confabulation is a consequence of training generative AI models to optimize the next word prediction objective. LLMs such as the generated pretrained transformer (GPT) architecture of ChatGPT (OpenAI) are programmed to predict the next token (part of a word) in a text string. This is, in the words of OpenAI researchers, “only a proxy for what these models want to do” (Ouyang et al., 2022). They are not sentient; they do not “know” information or “understand” the instructions they are given; such verbiage is inappropriately anthropomorphic, although its use is difficult to avoid entirely. As long as we use LLMs trained to optimize the next word prediction objective, confabulation will occur. It is imperative, therefore, that authors scrutinize the outputs of AI systems to ensure that they are accurate before including them in research manuscripts. Readers must be informed whenever AI is used to generate text so that they may apply their own scrutiny.

These principles, while generally agreed upon by the academic publishing community, have not consistently been upheld. Many journals and other academic publications, including those with explicit policies against undeclared generative AI use, have published articles containing what appears to be AI-generated text, which can be identified by the occurrence of certain characteristic features (see § 3.4), or other AI-generated media. I maintain a repository of examples known as Academ-AI (<https://www.academ-ai.info/>). The purpose of this article is to report the development of this repository and characterize the first 500 examples collected. I will also discuss how journals represented in the repository differ from their peers in terms of publication costs and citation metrics.

¹Specifically, all of the listed organizations have declared point 2, and all but the IEEE and PLoS have declared point 1. The relevant text from these policies is compiled in Appendix A.

²*Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 22-cv-1461 (PKC) (S.D.N.Y. Jun. 22, 2023); *People v. Crabill*, 23PDJ067 (Col. O.P.D.J. Nov. 22, 2023).

³*Ex parte Lee*, 673 S.W.3d 755 (Tex. App. 2023).

Table 1. Dictionary used to construct document feature matrix.

Feature	Search patterns
Reference to data cutoff/update	update, cutoff, cut-off, training data, up until, up to my, my last
“Regenerate response”	regenerate response
“Certainly, here...”	certainly here
First-person singular	i’m, i have, i can*, i must, i do*, i am, i recommend, i advise, i apologize, i would, i encourage, i provide, my, me
Lack of access	don’t have access, don’t have real-time access, don’t have specific, don’t have direct access, real-time access, real-time information, real-time updates, real-time statistics, we would need access
Second-person address	you, your, you’re, you’ve
Self-identification as a language model	language model
Referral to other sources	recent, latest, up-to-date

2 Methods

2.1 Data collection

Phrases characteristic of AI-generated text were used to query Google Scholar. Examples include “as an AI language model,” “certainly, here are,” and “don’t have access to real-time.” The Retraction Watch list of papers with evidence of ChatGPT writing was also used to supplement these searches (Retraction Watch, 2024). Each result was manually examined and included or excluded according to the following criteria.

2.2 Inclusion criteria

1. Publication as an academic journal article or conference paper.
2. Appearance of:
 - (a) Phrasing characteristic of AI-generated text *or*
 - (b) Statement from the publication or authors that AI was used without declaration.

2.3 Exclusion criteria

1. Suspicious phrasing justified by context on manual examination.
2. Any medium other than journal articles and conference papers, such as books, preprints, and technical reports.
3. Publication too early to contain LLM-generated text, as determined by:
 - (a) Publication before 2022 *and*
 - (b) Indexing in a reputable database, such as PubMed, Web of Science, or Scopus.

Exclusion criterion 3 was a time-saving measure since AI-generated text would be unlikely to appear in the academic literature more than ten months prior to the public release of ChatGPT (November 2022). However, since unscrupulous publishers could falsify metadata, dates of publication were relied upon only when confirmed by a reputable independent indexing service (criterion 3b).

2.4 Data extraction

For each article or paper included, sections of the text containing suspect phrasing were extracted and stored in Markdown files. Citations were collected using Zotero version 6.0.37 (Takats et al., 2024). Metadata not captured automatically by Zotero were entered manually. The ISSN Portal and the websites of individual publications were used to supplement metadata collection (International Standard Serial Number International Centre, 2024). International Standard Serial Numbers (ISSNs) of journals were validated using the ISSN Portal. Those that yielded no results were tested using the ISSN checksum (Abdalla et al., 2015). Bibliographic data were exported to YAML for analysis using Better BibTeX version 6.7.210 (Heyns, 2024).

2.5 Third-party data

Information on article processing charges (APCs) was drawn from the website of each journal. APC data were also drawn from the Directory of Open Access Journals (2024) to facilitate comparison between DOAJ-indexed journals that were and were not represented in the Academ-AI dataset; where journal websites conflicted with DOAJ-reported APCs, the journal website figure was used, and the discrepancy was reported to the DOAJ. Foreign exchange rates were drawn from the




Figure 1. Number of articles/papers published by year.

Open Exchange Rates application programming interface version 0.7, queried October 30, 2024 (Open Exchange Rates, 2024). Citation metrics were drawn from the Scimago Journal Rank (SJR) database (SCImago, n.d.).

2.6 Analysis of text

A natural language processing analysis was conducted using *quanteda* version 4.0.2 (Benoit et al., 2018). Text excerpts from the Academ-AI database were tokenized. A dictionary of keywords associated with each of eight textual features of interest was compiled and used to construct a document feature matrix (Table 1). In the case of referral to other sources, the feature was expressed using so many different phrasings that a single set of keywords with sufficient sensitivity and specificity became inefficient. Instead, an excessively sensitive set was used, and results were manually screened.⁴ With the document feature matrix constructed, documents (articles and papers) were dichotomized as having or lacking each textual feature.

2.7 Statistical methods

Documents were categorized by type (journal article or conference paper), alleged year of publication, and publisher. Journal articles were also categorized according to whether they appeared in a journal with APCs (yes, no, or unknown). APCs were converted to US dollars and summarized, overall and by publisher. To give appropriate weight to containers (journals and conferences) that published multiple documents (articles and papers) in the dataset, documents, rather than containers, were treated as single observations even where reporting and comparing container-level variables, such

as publisher or APC.

The number of DOAJ-indexed journals that had APCs, stratified by whether or not a given journal was represented in the Academ-AI dataset, was calculated. The same two groups, excluding journals that did not charge APCs, were compared in terms of APC value in US dollars. Additionally, the citation metrics of SJR-indexed journals represented in the Academ-AI dataset were compared with those of all other journals in the SJR database. For the comparisons with the DOAJ and SJR databases, containers (journals) were treated as single observations.

Categorical variables were reported as frequencies and percentages and compared using χ^2 tests. Continuous variables were reported as medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) and compared using Wilcoxon rank-sum tests. P -values <0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Tokenization, currency conversion, and analysis were performed using R version 4.4.0 (Chambers et al., 2024).

3 Results

Although further examples have since been collected, the dataset used for the present investigation comprised excerpts from 500 published documents: 449 journal articles and 51 conference papers. Years of publication according to the publishers are depicted in Figure 1; 93.2% had publication dates in 2022 or later, leaving 6.8% ostensibly published long before the public release of ChatGPT (November 2022).

Articles were published in 345 different journals, the overwhelming majority of which (86%) published only one of the articles (Figure 2). The journals most highly

⁴For instance, an LLM will sometimes use the words “recent” and “latest” to refer to information dated shortly prior to its last update, purporting to paraphrase this information; on other occasions, the same words will refer to information dated *after* that update, to which the user is encouraged to direct their attention since the LLM cannot access it (see § 3.4). Differentiation between the two usages necessitated manual examination of all instances of “recent” or “latest” in context.




Figure 2. Distribution of articles/papers per journal/conference.




Figure 3. Number of articles/papers stratified by publisher.

represented in the dataset were the *International Journal of Open Publication and Exploration* (18 articles) and the *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science* (11 articles).

Papers were presented at 45 different conferences, with 91% of conferences including only one of the papers (Figure 2). The conference most highly represented in the dataset was the International Conference on Electronics, Communication and Aerospace Technology (4 papers).

Only 13.1% of journal articles were published in journals produced by a major academic publisher, such as Elsevier (5.1%), Springer (2.2%), or MDPI (1.1%); see Figure 3. By contrast, the overwhelming majority of conference papers (88.2%) were published by major academic publishers, chiefly the IEEE (80.4%). Overall, major publishers produced 20.8% of the documents in the dataset. All major publishers represented in the dataset require declaration of AI usage in their editorial policies apart from Wolters Kluwer.⁵ Only two Wolters Kluwer publications—*Medicine* and the *Annals of Medicine & Surgery*—appear in the dataset, and both

require AI declaration in their guidelines for authors, each using verbiage borrowed from the COPE policy (Annals of Medicine & Surgery, 2024; Medicine, 2024).

Journals without a confirmed ISSN or claiming to be registered to the ISSN of another journal published 62 of the articles (13.8%); see Table 2.

3.1 Article processing charges

At least 295 articles (65.7%) were published in a journal with some form of publication charge; 21 of these were in journals that mentioned having such a charge on their websites but did not state a specific figure. Among the remaining 274, the median charge was US \$150 (IQR 50–1,295). Charges stratified by publisher are depicted in Figure 4. Wiley had the highest median APC; major publishers had much higher APCs than other publishers (median [IQR] \$3,039 [2,191–3,530] vs. \$80 [34–300]; $P < 0.001$).

⁵The IOP uses the word “should” in their policy but have stated that failure to declare constitutes a “violation” (“Retraction”, 2023).

Table 2. ISSN status of journals represented in the Academ-AI dataset, weighted by number of articles.

ISSN status	<i>n</i> (%)
Confirmed*	387 (86.2)
Invalid	3 (0.7)
No ISSN	14 (3.1)
Provisional [†]	25 (5.6)
Refers to different journal	18 (4.0)
Unreported record [‡]	2 (0.4)

* Publication checked by the ISSN network.

[†] Assigned to pre-publications, likely to become Confirmed.

[‡] Not yet assigned; not (yet) reported to the ISSN International Centre.




Figure 4. Boxplots showing distribution of APCs stratified by publisher.

3.2 DOAJ

Thirty-five articles (7.8%) were published in 33 journals indexed in the DOAJ.⁶ Of these, 28 journals (84.8%) had publication charges, a significantly greater proportion than among the remainder of the journals in the database (34.3%; $P < 0.001$). The APCs of journals represented in the Academ-AI dataset (median \$1,982; IQR 194–2,994) were much higher than the rest of the DOAJ (median \$842; IQR 100–2,070; $P = 0.039$); see Figure 5.

3.3 Citation metrics

Seventy journals in the SJR database published 82 articles (18.3%) in the Academ-AI dataset. Compared to other journals in the database, journals represented on Academ-AI had significantly higher median SJR scores, h-indices, publication outputs, citations, and citation rates; see Table 3 and Figure 6.

⁶The *Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences*, *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, and *Advances in Mathematical Finance and Applications*, though since removed from the DOAJ, were indexed when these articles were published and are included in the analysis.

3.4 Textual features

3.4.1 First-person singular

Use of the first-person singular is typical of LLM chatbots but not of multi-author journal articles; it therefore functions as a tell-tale sign of AI involvement. The majority of excerpts in the Academ-AI dataset (55.2%) featured use of the first-person singular; see Figure 7. Even in the excerpts from single-author articles, the context made clear on manual examination that the first-person singular pronoun referred to the chatbot, not to the author of the article.

3.4.2 Model update

LLM chatbots are trained to warn users of their own limitations, such as the knowledge cutoff in their training data. Lack of data after this cutoff date can affect the accuracy of a chatbot’s outputs (OpenAI, 2024); hence, chatbots frequently inform users of their cutoff date or




Figure 5. Violin plot showing distribution and quartiles of APCs for DOAJ-indexed journals, stratified by whether or not they are represented in the Academ-AI dataset.

Table 3. Comparison of SJR-indexed journals that (not) represented in the Academ-AI dataset.

Metric	Academ-AI ($n=70$)*	Other ($n=29,095$)*	p^\dagger
SJR	0.57 [0.28–1.02]	0.34 [0.17–0.72]	<0.001
No data (n)	5	205	
h-index	73 [17–129]	24 [10–56]	<0.001
Documents published in 2023	363 [84–1,249]	42 [19–100]	<0.001
Documents published 2020–2022	803 [144–4,353]	124 [65–290]	<0.001
2023 citations to documents published in 2020–2022	3,376 [188–20,302]	148 [31–607]	<0.001
Citations per document published 2020–2022	2.98 [1.16–5.06]	1.19 [0.40–2.67]	<0.001

* Median [IQR] † Wilcoxon rank-sum test

“last knowledge update” as in the following example [emphasis added]:

Using PCSK9 inhibition as a therapeutic approach for COVID-19 presents several challenges and potential limitations. *As of my last knowledge update in September 2023, clinical data supporting its use were limited.*
(Arsh et al., 2024)

The purpose of this disclaimer is to account for potential developments since September 2023, specifically more clinical data supporting the use of PCSK9 inhibition as a COVID-19 therapy. Despite the issuance of an erratum (“Role of PCSK9 Inhibition during the Inflammatory Stage of SARS-COV-2”, 2024), the AI-generated text has not been removed from the published article. Almost half of the articles in the Academ-AI dataset (49.0%) made some reference to their knowledge cutoff.

3.4.3 “Certainly, here...”

As *chatbots*, many LLMs are trained to use conversational verbiage reminiscent of a helpful customer service professional. A common example of this verbiage is a response opening with “Certainly, here is...” or “Cer-

tainly, here are...”, as in the following example [emphasis added]:

Certainly, here is a possible introduction for your topic: Lithium metal [sic] batteries are promising candidates for high-energy-density rechargeable batteries due to their low electrode potentials and high theoretical capacities. (Zhang et al., 2024a)

In this instance, it appears that the chatbot was prompted to provide an introduction for the article, and the authors copied the chatbot’s helpful preamble along with the generated introduction. The article was eventually retracted (Zhang et al., 2024b). The same verbiage appeared in almost a third of the examples in the Academ-AI dataset (31.8%).

3.4.4 Referral to recent sources

In keeping with their caution concerning their own knowledge cutoffs, chatbots are wont to refer users to other sources of information when relevant data in their training sets are sparse or when the subject matter is highly technical. Three separate examples of this behavior were observed in an article in *Medicine* [emphasis added]:




Figure 6. Violin plots showing distributions and quartiles of SJR statistics stratified by whether or not the journal is included in the Academ-AI dataset.

It’s important to note that research in this field is ongoing, and *newer studies may have been published since my last update*. It’s advisable to search for more recent literature to stay current on advancements in our understanding of CD4/CD8 ratios and their implications in various health conditions.

...

It’s important to note that advancements in HIV research occur regularly, and new findings may have emerged *since my last update* in January 2022. For the most current information, it’s recommended to consult recent scientific literature or speak with healthcare professionals specializing in HIV care.

...

For the latest information, it’s advisable to refer to recent scientific literature.

(Obeagu & Obeagu, 2024)

Just over a fifth of the examples in the Academ-AI dataset (20.6%) included an encouragement to the user

to seek information from more recent or authoritative sources.

3.4.5 Second-person address

In addition to referring to themselves using the first-person singular, chatbots also frequently address the user in the second person. For example [emphasis added]:

If *you* have additional details or context about SMO or CSMO, please provide them so that *I* can offer more specific insights.

(Sumit et al., 2024)

Again, the verbiage is reminiscent of helpful customer service personnel. About one in seven examples (13.8%) in the dataset involved use of the second person to directly address the user.

3.4.6 “Regenerate response”

In early releases of ChatGPT, users could press a button labeled “Regenerate response,” instructing the chatbot




Figure 7. Number and proportion of articles/papers with textual features suggestive of AI usage.

to make another attempt to answer their prompt. In 58 cases, comprising 11.6% of the dataset, authors seem to have accidentally copied the button label along with the chatbot’s output and pasted both into their manuscripts. As one correction phrased it:

[T]he authors used ChatGPT to perform the English editing for the newly added content. However, they neglected to remove the phrase “regenerate response” in their haste. (Tsai et al., 2023)

In one notable example, the appearance of the phrase in the reference list led to a reexamination of the entire bibliography, in turn revealing that 18 of the 76 references appear not to exist; rather, they were likely fabricated by the chatbot (The PLOS ONE Editors, 2024).

3.4.7 Self-identification as a language model

When warning users of their various limitations, chatbots will sometimes identify themselves explicitly as language models, for example [emphasis added]:

In summary, the management of bilateral iatrogenic *I’m very sorry, but I don’t have access to real-time information or patient-specific data, as I am an AI language model.*⁷ (Bader et al., 2024b)

This was a comparatively uncommon marker of AI-generated text, appearing on only 8.6% of examples in the Academ-AI dataset.

3.4.8 Lack of access

Chatbots will occasionally warn users that they lack access to data relevant to the prompt, such as “real-time

information or patient-specific data” as in the example by Bader et al. (2024b); see § 3.4.7. In the Academ-AI dataset, 8.6% of the examples included such a warning.

3.5 Non-textual features

In one notable example, *Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology* published an article containing AI-generated figures, most infamously a cross-section of anatomically impossible rat genitalia. The article in question was retracted a mere three days after its publication (Frontiers Editorial Office, 2024).

3.6 Corrections

Fifteen articles with suspected AI-generated content in as many journals have been corrected post publication, including six full retractions (Bader et al., 2024a; Frontiers Editorial Office, 2024; Li & Yao, 2024; “Retraction”, 2023; The PLOS ONE Editors, 2024; Zhang et al., 2024b), five corrections (“Corrigendum”, 2023; “Editor’s Note”, 2024; “Role of PCSK9 Inhibition during the Inflammatory Stage of SARS-COV-2”, 2024; Tsai et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023), and five “stealth” corrections: that is, articles corrected without a formal statement (Aquarius et al., 2024).⁸ In total, therefore, 3.0% of examples in the dataset were corrected, with 2.2% being formally corrected and 1.0% stealth-corrected. Formal corrections occurred a median 104 days (IQR 48–151) after publication; see Figure 8. Journals were faster to issue full retractions (median 50 [IQR 38–92] days) than corrections (median 120 [IQR 104–182] days), but this difference was not statistically significant ($P = 0.17$).

Of the 11 formal corrections, four identified ChatGPT as the AI tool used (“Corrigendum”, 2023; “Retraction”, 2023; Tsai et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023); one claimed that only Grammarly was used (The PLOS ONE

⁷For screenshots of original, see Cabanac (2024).

⁸See Appendix B for details. Ezzameli and Mahersia (2023) received both a stealth revision and subsequently a formal correction (“Editor’s Note”, 2024).




Figure 8. Publication-to-correction timeline of all known formal corrections to articles in the Academ-AI dataset.

Editors, 2024), and one claimed that Grammarly and Quillbot were used (“Role of PCSK9 Inhibition during the Inflammatory Stage of SARS-COV-2”, 2024). One stated that the use of generative AI, while a breach of journal policy, was not the reason for retraction (Bader et al., 2024a), and one did not mention AI at all, referring only to “nonstandard phrases,” which may be an oblique reference to the phrase “regenerate response” (Li & Yao, 2024).

In two cases, the AI-generated text was removed (Tsai et al., 2023) or enclosed in brackets (Yang et al., 2023), but no declaration of AI usage was added to the main article as required by MDPI and Elsevier policy, respectively. In Arsh et al. (2024), the AI-generated text was persists, and the declaration of AI usage appears only in the erratum (“Role of PCSK9 Inhibition during the Inflammatory Stage of SARS-COV-2”, 2024). In Kanjarla et al. (2023), the AI-generated text was not removed, and there is no declaration of AI usage in the main article, despite the following statement appearing in the corrigendum:

Sage policy requires authors to declare the use of ChatGPT if used for writing assistance. As such, the acknowledgements section has been updated to disclose this assistance. (“Corrigendum”, 2023)

Of the five corrections, only one succeeded in bringing the original article into compliance with the relevant journal or publisher policy on AI declaration (“Editor’s Note”, 2024).

3.7 Summary of findings

Hundreds of examples of undeclared AI-generated content appear to be present in the academic literature; approximately one in five of these evaded detection by

a major publisher with an explicit policy against such content. Journals represented in the dataset more commonly have APCs, and their APCs and citation scores are higher than those of their peers in the DOAJ and SJR database, respectively; in other words, the journals committing editorial oversights concerning AI are paradoxically paid more for editorial processing and achieve greater academic impact. An extremely small proportion of cases are corrected following discovery, and still fewer are corrected formally. Four out of five formal corrigenda failed to revise the original article sufficiently to comply with editorial policy.

4 Discussion

It seems that in a remarkable number of cases, editorial and peer review have failed to uphold publishing standards with regard to artificial intelligence. Part of the problem may be a lack of awareness of the idiosyncratic phrasing used by LLMs. While some features, such as explicit self-identification “as an AI language model” are difficult to miss, it is unsurprising that others, such as inappropriate use of conversational phrasing or the first-person singular, do not immediately lead reviewers to think of AI specifically. Phrasing such as “as of my last knowledge update” should, however, alert editors and reviewers that *something* is amiss, and if errors such as these endure the scrutiny of multiple reviewers and editors, what else are they overlooking?

The Shoukat et al. (2024) case is particularly illustrative of this problem. The appearance of the phrase “regenerate response” in the reference list of an article does not in itself diminish the scientific quality of that article any more than a slight misspelling or a poorly formatted paragraph break. However, as an indicator of AI involvement, the error led to the discovery that al-

most a quarter of the reference list was likely confabulated. That 18 of the authors' sources did not exist went unnoticed throughout the peer review, copyedit, and typesetting processes, and had the authors been fractionally more careful when copying the chatbot's output—avoiding copying the button label along with the response—the confabulation may never have come to light. The tendency of LLM chatbots to confabulate references is well documented (see Moskatel and Zhang (2024) for example), and many citations to non-existent sources may already be present in the published literature.

4.1 Dark AI

In the examples described here, the AI-generated text is sufficiently incongruous with the remainder of the article as to be obvious, but LLM outputs vary widely, and identifying them amid human-authored text is not always straightforward or even possible. Neither humans, nor machines, nor a combination of the two can reliably distinguish AI-generated content from human-authored content (Campbell & Jovanović, 2023). Future AI detection systems may be more advanced, but so will future generative AI systems, meaning that detection will likely continue to present a problem.

The examples on Academ-AI were predominantly identifiable due to characteristic turns of phrase, which are only reproduced in a manuscript when authors copy text directly from an AI system with little to no scrutiny. Light proofreading would be sufficient to remove such clear AI fingerprints, though not necessarily sufficient to identify deeper AI-induced problems in the content, such as confabulated information. In other words, once characteristic AI phraseology becomes widely known or AI detectors become more reliable, unscrupulous authors may be incentivized to expend moderate additional effort disguising AI-generated text rather than significant additional effort thoroughly validating it; this would mask the symptoms while failing to treat the underlying disease.

It is entirely possible that lightly edited AI-generated text is already abundant in the literature, undetectable, but just as, if not more, flawed than its caveat-riddled, conversationally toned, and therefore identifiable original version. While this hypothesis is deeply troubling, it should not deter us from studying and contending with the examples that *are* observable, any more than the opacity of dark matter and dark energy should deter physicists from the study of observable matter and energy.

It is imperative that we identify and address the instances of undeclared AI that we *can* detect. In such cases, journals and publishers must enforce their own policies via correction or retraction, depending on the severity of the policy violation. To do otherwise sets a precedent of policy violations going unaddressed, sug-

gesting to authors that declaration of AI usage is unnecessary. By contrast, a precedent of enforcing these policies incentivizes declaration among careless and even unscrupulous authors on the off-chance that the use of AI is detectable in their case.

I have previously drawn a comparison to conflict of interest (Glynn, 2024b). Briefly, scientific research has successfully transitioned in recent decades from a prohibitive model, in which competing interests are disqualifying, to a transparent model, in which competing interests are disclosed and managed (Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Potential Conflicts of Interest in Patient Outcomes Research Teams, 1991, pp. 61–63). With disclosure becoming commonplace and failure to disclose meeting severe consequences, researchers have every incentive to disclose their conflicts rather than concealing them. We can use the same incentives to encourage transparency with regard to AI usage, but this depends on journals enforcing their own policies.

4.2 Conclusion

Given the risks posed by the inclusion of AI-generated text in research literature, publishers and journals must establish a precedent of enforcing their policies against undeclared AI usage in the writing process. When policy violations that escape the notice of editors and peer reviewers are identified post publication, formal corrections must be made.

Declarations

Funding

The author received no specific funding for this work.

Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Data availability

Glynn, A. (2024a). *Academ-AI Analysis*. OSF. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/S4YGV>

References

Abdalla, Y. M., Androvic, A., Cantié, P., Howlett, L., Katrincova, B., Laska, D., Mastilovic, A., Pellegrin, F.-X., Romano-Reynolds, R., Schütz, C., Seppälä, M.-L., & Zawado, H. (2015, January). *ISSN Manual*. ISSN InterNational Centre. Retrieved June 27, 2024, from <https://www.issn.org/understanding-the-issn/assignment-rules/issn-manual/#>

- Annals of Medicine & Surgery. (2024). *Annals of Medicine and Surgery: Instructions for Authors*. Editorial Manager. Retrieved March 19, 2024, from <https://edmgr.ovid.com/amsu/accounts/ifaith.htm>
- Aquarius, R., Schoeters, F., Wise, N., Glynn, A., & Cabanac, G. (2024, September 10). *The existence of stealth corrections in scientific literature – a threat to scientific integrity*. arXiv: 2409.06852 [cs]. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.06852>
- Arsh, H., Manoj Kumar, F., Simran, F., Tamang, S., Rehman, M. U., Ahmed, G., Khan, M., Malik, J., & Mehmoodi, A. (2024). Role of PCSK9 inhibition during the inflammatory stage of SARS-COV-2: An updated review. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery* (2012), 86(2), 899–908. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MS9.0000000000001601>
- Bader, R., Imam, A., Alnees, M., Adler, N., ilia, J., Zugar, D., Dan, A., & Khalaileh, A. (2024a). REMOVED: Successful management of an Iatrogenic portal vein and hepatic artery injury in a 4-month-old female patient: A case report and literature review. *Radiology Case Reports*, 19(6), 2106–2111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radcr.2024.02.037>
- Bader, R., Imam, A., Alnees, M., Adler, N., ilia, J., Zugar, D., Dan, A., & Khalaileh, A. (2024b). Successful management of an Iatrogenic portal vein and hepatic artery injury in a 4-month-old female patient: A case report and literature review. *Radiology Case Reports*, 19(6), 2106–2111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radcr.2024.02.037>
- Benoit, K., Watanabe, K., Wang, H., Nulty, P., Obeng, A., Müller, S., & Matsuo, A. (2018). Quanteda: An R package for the quantitative analysis of textual data. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 3(30), 774. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00774>
- Cabanac, G. (2024, March). *Comment #1*. PubPeer. Retrieved July 9, 2024, from <https://pubpeer.com/publications/F93A8D69350BC6B12AB48B132161A7#1>
- Campbell, M., & Jovanović, M. (2023). Detecting Artificial Intelligence: A New Cyberarms Race Begins. *Computer*, 56(8), 100–105. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2023.3279446>
- Chambers, J., Dalgaard, P., Gentleman, R., Hornik, K., Ihaka, R., Kalibera, T., Lawrence, M., Ligges, U., Lumley, T., Maechler, M., Meyer, S., Murrell, P., Plummer, M., Ripley, B., Sarkar, D., Lang, D. T., Tierney, L., & Urbanek, S. (2024, April 24). R (Version 4.4.0). Vienna (Austria). <https://www.r-project.org/>
- Corrigendum. (2023). *European Journal of Mass Spectrometry*, 29(4), 272–272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14690667231195424>
- Directory of Open Access Journals. (2024). *Public Data Dump*. Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). Retrieved July 28, 2024, from <https://doaj.org/docs/public-data-dump/>
- Editor’s note: “Emotion recognition from unimodal to multimodal analysis: A review” [Information Fusion, 99 (2023) 101847]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2023.101847>. (2024). *Information Fusion*, 109, 102446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2024.102446>
- Ezzameli, K., & Mahersia, H. (2023). Emotion recognition from unimodal to multimodal analysis: A review. *Information Fusion*, 99, 101847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2023.101847>
- Frontiers Editorial Office. (2024). Retraction: Cellular functions of spermatogonial stem cells in relation to JAK/STAT signaling pathway. *Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcell.2024.1386861>
- Glynn, A. (2024a). *Academ-AI Analysis*. OSF. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/S4YGV>
- Glynn, A. (2024b). The case for universal artificial intelligence declaration on the precedent of conflict of interest. *Accountability in Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2024.2345719>
- Heyns, E. (2024, June 27). *Better BibTeX* (Version 6.7.210). Netherlands. <https://retorque.re/zotero-better-bibtex/>
- Hosseini, M., Rasmussen, L. M., & Resnik, D. B. (2023). Using AI to write scholarly publications. *Accountability in Research*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2168535>
- Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Potential Conflicts of Interest in Patient Outcomes Research Teams. (1991). *Patient Outcomes Research Teams: Managing Conflict of Interest* (M. S. Donaldson & A. M. Capron, Eds.). National Academies Press (US). Retrieved July 11, 2024, from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK234452/>
- International Standard Serial Number International Centre. (2024). *The ISSN Portal*. The ISSN Portal. Retrieved July 2, 2024, from <https://portal.issn.org/>
- Kanjarla, N., Pasupuleti, B., Boggula, N., Kusuma, P. K., Kothapally, D., Gone, V., & Kiran, G. (2023). A HPLC-MS/MS method for the determination of Nadolol in rat plasma: Development, validation, and application to pharmacokinetic study. *European Journal of Mass Spectrometry*, 29(3), 170–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14690667231179569>
- Li, K., & Yao, H. (2024). Retraction Note: Revitalizing our earth: Unleashing the power of green energy in soil remediation for a sustainable future. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 31(31), 44459–44459. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-024-34165-1>
- Medicine. (2024). *Instructions for Authors*. Medicine. Retrieved March 27, 2024, from <https://journals.>

- www.md-journal/Pages/Instructions-for-Authors.aspx
- Moskatel, L. S., & Zhang, N. (2024). Comparative prevalence and characteristics of fabricated citations in large language models in headache medicine. *Headache: The Journal of Head and Face Pain*, 64(1), 93–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/head.14638>
- National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2024, July). *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile* (NIST AI NIST AI 600-1). National Institute of Standards and Technology. Gaithersburg, MD. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.600-1>
- Obeagu, E. I., & Obeagu, G. U. (2024). Utilization of immunological ratios in HIV: Implications for monitoring and therapeutic strategies. *Medicine*, 103(9), e37354. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000037354>
- Open Exchange Rates. (2024). *About the Open Exchange Rates API*. Open Exchange Rates. Retrieved July 25, 2024, from <https://openexchangerates.org/about>
Location: London, UK.
- OpenAI. (2022, November 30). *Introducing ChatGPT*. OpenAI. Retrieved March 11, 2024, from <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>
- OpenAI. (2024, March 4). *GPT-4 Technical Report*. arXiv: 2303.08774. <https://doi.org/http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C. L., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., Schulman, J., Hilton, J., Kelton, F., Miller, L., Simens, M., Askell, A., Welinder, P., Christiano, P., Leike, J., & Lowe, R. (2022, March 4). *Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback*. arXiv: 2203.02155 [cs]. Retrieved March 11, 2024, from <http://arxiv.org/abs/2203.02155>
- Retraction Watch. (2024, March 18). *Papers and peer reviews with evidence of ChatGPT writing*. Retraction Watch. Retrieved July 8, 2024, from <https://retractionwatch.com/papers-and-peer-reviews-with-evidence-of-chatgpt-writing/>
- Retraction: Exploring new optical solutions for nonlinear Hamiltonian amplitude equation via two integration schemes (2023 Phys. Scr.98 095218). (2023). *Physica Scripta*, 98(10), 109701. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1402-4896/acf6b8>
- Role of PCSK9 inhibition during the inflammatory stage of SARS-COV-2: An updated review: Erratum. (2024). *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*, 86(9), 5659. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MS9.0000000000002497>
- SCImago. (n.d.). *SJR – SCImago Journal & Country Rank*. SCImago. Retrieved July 25, 2024, from <https://www.scimagojr.com>
- Shoukat, R., Ismayil, I., Huang, Q., Oubibi, M., Younas, M., & Munir, R. (2024). A comparative analysis of blended learning and traditional instruction: Effects on academic motivation and learning outcomes. *PLoS One*, 19(3), e0298220. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0298220>
- Sumit, Chhillar, R. S., Dalal, S., Dalal, S., Lilhore, U. K., & Samiya, S. (2024). A dynamic and optimized routing approach for VANET communication in smart cities to secure intelligent transportation system via a chaotic multi-verse optimization algorithm. *Cluster Computing*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10586-024-04322-9>
- Takats, S., Stillman, D., Cheslack-Postava, F., Abaev, B., Bagdonas, M., Jelinek, A., Najdek, T., Petrov, D., Rentka, M., Vasilakis, M., Venčkauskas, A., Wang, X., & Sha, Y. (2024, March 19). *Zotero* (Version 6.0.37). Vienna (VA). <https://www.zotero.org/>
- The PLOS ONE Editors. (2024). Retraction: A comparative analysis of blended learning and traditional instruction: Effects on academic motivation and learning outcomes. *PLoS One*, 19(4), e0302484. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0302484>
- Tsai, C.-Y., Yeh, Y.-H., Tsai, L.-H., & Chou, E. C.-L. (2023). Correction: Tsai et al. The Efficacy of Transvaginal Ultrasound-Guided BoNT-A External Sphincter Injection in Female Patients with Underactive Bladder. *Toxins* 2023, 15, 199. *Toxins*, 15(6), 399. <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxins15060399>
- Weston, J., & Shuster, K. (2021, July 16). *Blender Bot 2.0: An open source chatbot that builds long-term memory and searches the internet*. The latest AI news from Meta. Retrieved April 16, 2024, from <https://ai.meta.com/blog/blender-bot-2-an-open-source-chatbot-that-builds-long-term-memory-and-searches-the-internet/>
- Yang, J., Xing, Y., & Han, Y. (2023). Corrigendum to “Utilization of E-commerce for fossil fuels allocation and green recovery” [Resour. Pol. 85B (2023) 103980]. *Resources Policy*, 87, 104336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2023.104336>
- Zhang, M., Wu, L., Yang, T., Zhu, B., & Liu, Y. (2024a). The three-dimensional porous mesh structure of Cu-based metal-organic-framework - aramid cellulose separator enhances the electrochemical performance of lithium metal anode batteries. *Surfaces and Interfaces*, 46, 104081. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surfin.2024.104081>
- Zhang, M., Wu, L., Yang, T., Zhu, B., & Liu, Y. (2024b). Retraction notice to “The three-dimensional porous mesh structure of Cu-based metal-

organic-framework - Aramid cellulose separator enhances the electrochemical performance of lithium metal anode batteries” [Surfaces and

Interfaces, Volume 46, March 2024, 104081].
Surfaces and Interfaces, 46, 104550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surfin.2024.104550>

Appendix A Excerpts from policy statements

The following are excerpts from publishing organizations' policies pertaining to AI authorship and the necessity of AI declaration. Statements affirming that AI systems must not be credited as authors are highlighted in orange. Statements affirming that the use of AI tools in the writing process must be declared are highlighted in blue.

A.1 Publication ethics organizations

A.1.1 Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

COPE joins organisations, such as WAME and the JAMA Network among others, to state that **AI tools cannot be listed as an author of a paper.**

Authors who use AI tools in the writing of a manuscript [...] **must be transparent in disclosing** in the Materials and Methods (or similar section) of the paper how the AI tool was used and which tool was used.

Committee on Publication Ethics. (2023, February 13). *Authorship and AI tools*. Committee On Publication Ethics. Retrieved March 21, 2024, from <https://publicationethics.org/cope-position-statements/ai-author>

A.1.2 Council of Science Editors (CSE)

Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools (such as ChatGPT or chatbots) **should not be listed as authors.**

Authors should disclose usage of AI tools and machine learning tools such as ChatGPT, Chatbots, and Large Language Models (LLM).

Jackson, J., Landis, G., Baskin, P. K., Hadsell, K. A., English, M., & Cse Editorial Policy Committee. (2023). CSE Guidance on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence Tools. *Science Editor*, 46(2), 72. <https://doi.org/10.36591/SE-D-4602-07>

A.1.3 International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE)

At submission, the journal should require authors to disclose whether they used Artificial Intelligence (AI)-assisted technologies (such as Large Language Models [LLMs], chatbots, or image creators) in the production of submitted work.

Chatbots (such as ChatGPT) should not be listed as authors because they cannot be responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the work, and these responsibilities are required for authorship (see Section II.A.1).

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2024, January). Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals. *International Committee of Medical Journal Editors*. Retrieved March 19, 2024, from <https://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>

A.1.4 World Association of Medical Editors (WAME)

Chatbots cannot be authors.

Authors should be transparent when chatbots are used and provide information about how they were used.

Zielinski, C., Winker, M. A., Aggarwal, R., Ferris, L. E., Heinemann, M., Florencio Lapeña, J., Jr., Pai, S. A., Ing, E., Citrome, L., Alam, M., Voight, M., Habibzadeh, F., & the WAME Board. (2023, May 31). *Chatbots, Generative AI, and Scholarly Manuscripts: WAME Recommendations on Chatbots and Generative Artificial Intelligence in Relation to Scholarly Publications*. World Association of Medical Editors. <https://wame.org/page3.php?id=106>

A.2 Scientific Associations

A.2.1 Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)

The use of content generated by artificial intelligence (AI) in an article (including but not limited to text, figures, images, and code) shall be disclosed in the acknowledgments section of any article submitted to an IEEE publication.

Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. (2024). *Submission and Peer Review Policies*. IEEE Author Center. Retrieved March 21, 2024, from <https://journals.ieeeauthorcenter.ieee.org/become-an-ieee-journal-author/publishing-ethics/guidelines-and-policies/submission-and-peer-review-policies/>

A.2.2 Institute of Physics (IOP)

IOP Publishing follows the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) position statement that **AI tools cannot meet the requirements for authorship** as they cannot take responsibility for the submitted work.

There are many responsible and appropriate uses for generative AI within scholarly research and we support authors using it in this manner. When doing so, **authors are encouraged to be transparent about their use of any generative AI tools in either the research or the drafting of the manuscript.**

Institute of Physics. (n.d.). *Ethical policy for journals*. IOPscience. Retrieved July 2, 2024, from <https://publishingsupport.iopscience.iop.org/ethical-policy-journals/>

A.2.3 Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE)

Because authorship attribution requires accountability for the submitted work, **SPIE does not allow Chat GPT and other Large Language Models (LLMs) to be listed as authors on a manuscript.** **If authors use AI tools when writing a manuscript, it should be disclosed** along with all other tools used in the study in the Materials and Methods section of the paper.

Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers. (2024). *Manuscript guidelines and policies*. SPIE.. Retrieved July 2, 2024, from <https://spie.org/conferences-and-exhibitions/event-resources/manuscript-guidelines-and-policies>

A.3 Publishers

A.3.1 Elsevier

Authors should disclose in their manuscript the use of AI and AI-assisted technologies and a statement will appear in the published work.

Authors should not list AI and AI-assisted technologies as an author or co-author, nor cite AI as an author.

Elsevier. (2024). *The use of AI and AI-assisted technologies in writing for Elsevier*. Elsevier. Retrieved March 25, 2024, from <https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/the-use-of-generative-ai-and-ai-assisted-technologies-in-writing-for-elsevier>

A.3.2 Frontiers

Authors should not list a generative AI technology as a co-author or author of any submitted manuscript.

If the author of a submitted manuscript has used written or visual content produced by or edited using a generative AI technology, such use must be acknowledged in the acknowledgements section of the manuscript and the methods section if applicable.

Frontiers. (2024). *Author Guidelines*. Frontiers. Retrieved July 2, 2024, from <https://www.frontiersin.org/guidelines/author-guidelines>

A.3.3 Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI)

Tools such as ChatGPT and other large language models (LLMs) do not meet authorship criteria and thus cannot be listed as authors on manuscripts.

In situations where AI or AI-assisted tools have been used in the preparation of a manuscript, this must be appropriately declared with sufficient details at submission via the cover letter.

Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. (2024). *Research and Publication Ethics*. MDPI.. Retrieved June 10, 2024, from <https://www.mdpi.com/ethics>

A.3.4 Public Library of Science (PLOS)

Contributions by artificial intelligence (AI) tools and technologies to a study or to an article's contents must be clearly reported in a dedicated section of the Methods, or in the Acknowledgements section for article types lacking a Methods section.

Public Library of Science. (n.d.). *Ethical Publishing Practice*. PLOS.. Retrieved July 2, 2024, from <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/ethical-publishing-practice#loc-artificial-intelligence-tools-and-technologies>

A.3.5 Sage

Authors are required to [...] clearly indicate the use of language models in the manuscript, including which model was used and for what purpose.

Please note that AI bots such as ChatGPT should not be listed as an author on your submission.

Sage. (2023, January 27). *ChatGPT and Generative AI*. SAGE Publications Inc. Retrieved June 10, 2024, from <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/chatgpt-and-generative-ai>

A.3.6 Science

AI-assisted technologies [such as large language models (LLMs), chatbots, and image creators] do not meet the Science journals' criteria for authorship and therefore may not be listed as authors or coauthors, nor may sources cited in Science journal content be authored or coauthored by AI tools. Authors who use AI-assisted technologies as components of their research study or as aids in the writing or presentation of the manuscript should note this in the cover letter and in the acknowledgments section of the manuscript.

Science. (2024). *Science Journals: Editorial Policies*. Retrieved March 21, 2024, from <https://www.science.org/content/page/science-journals-editorial-policies>

A.3.7 Springer

Large Language Models (LLMs), such as ChatGPT, do not currently satisfy our authorship criteria.

Use of an LLM should be properly documented in the Methods section (and if a Methods section is not available, in a suitable alternative part) of the manuscript.

Springer. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence (AI)*. Springer. Retrieved March 21, 2024, from <https://www.springer.com/us/editorial-policies/artificial-intelligence--ai-/25428500>

A.3.8 Taylor & Francis

Authors must be aware that using AI-based tools and technologies for article content generation, e.g. large language models (LLMs), generative AI, and chatbots (e.g. ChatGPT), is not in line with our authorship criteria.

Where AI tools are used in content generation, they must be acknowledged and documented appropriately in the authored work.

Taylor & Francis. (2024). *Defining authorship in your research paper*. Taylor & Francis. Retrieved March 21, 2024, from <https://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/editorial-policies/defining-authorship-research-paper/>

A.3.9 Wiley

If an author has used a GenAI tool to develop any portion of a manuscript, its use must be described, transparently and in detail, in the Methods section (or via a disclosure or within the Acknowledgements section, as applicable).

Therefore—in accordance with COPE’s position statement on Authorship and AI tools—these tools cannot fulfil the role of, nor be listed as, an author of an article.

Wiley. (2023, February 28). *Best Practice Guidelines on Research Integrity and Publishing Ethics*. Wiley Author Services. <https://authorservices.wiley.com/ethics-guidelines/index.html>

A.4 Journals

A.4.1 *Annals of Medicine & Surgery*

Kindly note that Artificial Intelligence (AI) authoring tools do not meet the requirements for Authorship as recommended by the ICMJE. Authors who use AI tools in the writing of a manuscript [...] must be transparent in disclosing in the Materials and Methods (or similar section) of the paper how the AI tool was used and which tool was used.

Annals of Medicine & Surgery. (2024). *Annals of Medicine and Surgery: Instructions for Authors*. Editorial Manager. Retrieved March 19, 2024, from <https://edmgr.ovid.com/amsu/accounts/ifauth.htm>

A.4.2 *Medicine*

Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools, such as ChatGPT, do not qualify for authorship.

Authors who use AI tools in the writing of a manuscript [...] must be transparent in disclosing in the manuscript which AI tool was used and how it was used.

Medicine. (2024). *Instructions for Authors*. Medicine. Retrieved March 27, 2024, from <https://journals.lww.com/md-journal/Pages/Instructions-for-Authors.aspx>

Appendix B List of stealth corrections

B.1 Ezzameli and Mahersia (2023)

The phrase “Regenerate response” was removed from the article (Cabanac, 2024). The first author confirmed that the phrase was the result of using ChatGPT (Ezzameli, 2024). An acknowledgement to this effect was added to the article, and a formal correction was eventually published (“Editor’s Note”, 2024).

B.2 Mohamed et al. (2023)

The phrase “Regenerate response” was removed from the article (Cabanac, 2023b). The first author confirmed that the phrase was the result of using AI tools (Mohamed, 2023). Since no declaration of AI usage has been added to the article, it is still in violation of Elsevier policy.

B.3 Akhter et al. (2023)

The phrase “Regenerate response” was removed from the article between July 27, 2023, and September 19, 2023 (Cabanac, 2023c). No formal correction was published.

B.4 Rini et al. (2023)

The phrase “Regenerate response” was removed from the article (Cabanac, 2023a). No formal correction was published, but as of September 27, 2024, the following statement had been added to the new version of the article:

— This article only used AI for proof-reading, while idea and content are the results of author’s research and thought.

At least one more stealth correction seems to have occurred; as of November 20, 2024, the article contains neither the AI-generated phrase nor the statement concerning AI use.

B.5 Velthuisen and Otto (2023)

The phrase “Regenerate response” was removed from the article. No formal correction was published, but the following statement was added to the new version of the article:

— This article has been republished with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

The nature of the correction is not specified, and its impact (or lack thereof) is decided for the reader. Additionally, since there is still no acknowledgement of AI usage in the article, it appears to remain non-compliant with Taylor &

Francis policy. Given the lack of transparency in this approach, I consider it closer to a stealth correction than a formal correction.

References

- Akhter, A., Acharjee, U. K., Talukder, M. A., Islam, M. M., & Uddin, M. A. (2023). A robust hybrid machine learning model for Bengali cyber bullying detection in social media. *Natural Language Processing Journal*, 4, 100027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlp.2023.100027>
- Cabanac, G. (2023a, May). *Comment #1*. PubPeer. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://pubpeer.com/publications/F54B56E4775351CC5EDA05D5ABE189#1>
- Cabanac, G. (2023b, September). *Comment #1*. PubPeer. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://pubpeer.com/publications/8C16BAC6189B02EAE9192E7D5D28C2#1>
- Cabanac, G. (2023c, December). *Comment #4*. PubPeer. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://pubpeer.com/publications/82AE520EA54FC025369F9CD6E17C68#3>
- Cabanac, G. (2024, March). *Comment #3*. PubPeer. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://pubpeer.com/publications/6A8918534C304C6BD58F51DC126838#3>
- Editor's note: "Emotion recognition from unimodal to multimodal analysis: A review" [Information Fusion, 99 (2023) 101847 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2023.101847>]. (2024). *Information Fusion*, 109, 102446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2024.102446>
- Ezzameli, K. (2024, March). *Comment #2*. PubPeer. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://pubpeer.com/publications/6A8918534C304C6BD58F51DC126838#2>
- Ezzameli, K., & Mahersia, H. (2023). Emotion recognition from unimodal to multimodal analysis: A review. *Information Fusion*, 99, 101847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2023.101847>
- Mohamed, A. A.-R. (2023, September). *Comment #2*. PubPeer. Retrieved July 8, 2024, from <https://pubpeer.com/publications/8C16BAC6189B02EAE9192E7D5D28C2#1>
- Mohamed, A. A.-R., Moustafa, G. G., El Bohy, K. M., Saber, T. M., Metwally, M. M. M., El Desoukey Mohammed, H., El-Far, A. H., Alotaibi, B. S., Alosaimi, M., Abuzahrah, S. S., & Alqahtani, L. S. (2023). Exploring cardiac impact of oral nicotine exposure in a transplantable Neoplasm Mice Model: Insights from biochemical analysis, morphometry, and molecular docking: *Chlorella vulgaris* green algae support. *Toxicology*, 497–498, 153629. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tox.2023.153629>
- Rini, F., Pratiwi, L., Mary, T., & Weay, A. L. (2023). Analysis of student responses toward activities using e-learning in higher education. *Journal*

of Engineering Researcher and Lecturer, 2(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.58712/jerel.v2i1.143>

Velthuisen, D., & Otto, L. (2023). Editorial 32 (2). *African Security Review*, 32(2), 131–132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10246029.2023.2223037>