

# AADEJ Desk-Side Tool

## Model Guidance Policies on GAI Use by Authors, Editors, Reviewers and Publishers

This companion tool to the AADEJ Paper presents the Stakeholder Panel's consensus (see Section V) on standardizing GAI guidelines in dental publishing. Results reflect the median score from our 11-member panel, ensuring the most accurate measure for ordinal data. Model statements are color-coded for clarity:



**Recommended:** reflecting the consensus of the Stakeholder Panel and the literature, informed by legal and ethical considerations



**Consider:** based on the consensus of the Stakeholder Panel and the publication's needs and mission

Although the median score for each concept indicated a consensus to **Recommend**, the AADEJ Stakeholder Panel's predetermined methodology dictated specific exceptions. Despite the favorable median, a single 'not to recommend' vote for Statements 13 and 14 necessitated a final score of **Consider**. Similarly, panelist comments on Statements 3 and 4 resulted in a **Consider** grading. Statement 11 was also scored as **Consider**, as it provides location options for disclosure based on publication need.



### **1. Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) and GAI-assisted technologies cannot be cited or credited as an author or co-author.**

Authorship implies human responsibility, accountability, and the ability to assert conflict of interest and manage copyrights, which AI tools cannot fulfill.

Only humans can be accountable for accuracy, integrity, approval of the final version, and submission agreement. This includes GAI's inability to consent to publication via a publishing agreement and giving contractual assurances, which are uniquely human responsibilities.<sup>56,60</sup>

Courts have consistently declined to extend copyright protection to nonhuman authors. The U.S. Copyright Office only recognizes copyright in works "created by a human being."<sup>26-31</sup> U.S. copyright law fundamentally requires human authorship for a work to be protected. The D.C. Circuit Court emphasized in *Thaler v. Perlmutter* that "authors are at the center of the Copyright Act" and machines lack the "life" or "mind" necessary to qualify as authors.<sup>26</sup> The USCO officially adopted this human-authorship requirement in 1973.<sup>32</sup>



### **2. The use of GAI is permissible for checking grammar or formatting human-created text, provided it does not alter core ideas, analysis, or authorship of the manuscript.**

Permitted uses of GAI tools also include:

- Idea generation and exploration
- Language refinement and improvement
- Interactive online search using LLM-enhanced search engines.
- Data extraction, provided it involves publicly available or authorized data and is used to support scholarly human analysis.
- Editorial copy-editing, including language polishing and clarity improvements, provided final content reflects human oversight and professional standards.

Generative AI tools may assist with readability and language, but must be used as a support tool, not a substitute for original human creativity. *Purely AI-generated material* cannot be copyrighted, however, output that includes meaningful human contribution or revision is eligible for copyright.<sup>33</sup>

"Human creativity supplemented with AI or expressed through AI can qualify for copyright protection."<sup>32,33,34</sup> These guidelines allow the use of GAI if the final output reflects substantive human contribution in the final work. Authors and editors play the central role in review and revision, ensuring human oversight.

### **3. Authors should not use GAI to analyze and draw insights from data as part of research.**

Generative AI tools pose fundamental challenges to research repeatability and reliability due to their inherent inconsistency.<sup>6</sup>

GAI can generate output that appears factual but is misleading or false, often in ways that are difficult to identify. Consequently, AI should not be used for critical research tasks such as interpreting data, drawing scientific conclusions, producing scientific insights, or creating or manipulating original research data and results.

Elsevier states that this policy refers only to author use in the writing process, and not to the researcher's use of AI tools to analyze and draw insights from data as part of the research process, *so long as the results are reviewed for accuracy by a human author*.<sup>55</sup> (Appendices 2 and 5)

### **4. GAI cannot be used to create, alter, or manipulate original research data and results, such as measurements, x-rays, photographs, blots, and images.**

Sage Publishing advises against using GAI "to create or modify core research data." (Appendices 2 and 5)

The inconsistency inherent in Generative AI tools poses a challenge for repeatability and reliability, which are essential in research.<sup>6</sup> GAI can generate output that appears factual but is misleading or false, and often difficult to identify. AI should not be used for research tasks such as interpreting data, drawing scientific conclusions, producing scientific insights, or creating/manipulating original research data and results.

### **5. AI-generated or altered images are not permitted.**

Publishers express high caution regarding GAI images due to unresolved legal, copyright, and integrity issues (Appendix 5).

They may introduce bias or misleading impressions, and they are not copyrightable.

An exception is made if AI-assisted imaging is part of the research design or methods to generate or interpret underlying data, provided its use is described reproducibly in the methods section, including tool name, version, and manufacturer.

Modification or enhancement of clinical images by GAI is strictly prohibited, **except** for adjustments of brightness, contrast, or color balance that do not obscure the original information.

The use of GAI for graphical abstracts is not permitted and requires a disclosure statement in the Methods section of a manuscript.

GAI cover art may be permissible depending on publication policy. Prior permission, cleared rights, correct attribution and disclosure are required. Disclosure placement may be a statement adjacent to the publication's Table of Contents.

## **6. Authors are fully responsible and accountable for the content of their work.**

Authors are "ultimately responsible and accountable for the contents, integrity, and originality of their work, even when GAI is used."<sup>56</sup> For copyright to apply, there must be "sufficient human control over the expressive elements."<sup>32-35</sup> AI-generated output that includes a meaningful human contribution or revision is eligible for publication. Authors are responsible for ensuring that all content complies with copyright laws and publication standards.

The ethical principle of truthfulness obliges members of the dental publishing community to ensure that all AI-generated content presented is correct and not misleading, which requires confirmation of the accuracy of any cited sources. Authors should carefully review and edit the result because AI can generate authoritative-sounding output that can be incorrect, incomplete, or biased.<sup>52</sup>

## **7. GAI use requires human oversight and review.**

This is a crucial principle for establishing **accountability** and ensuring **copyrightability**. Authors are "ultimately responsible and accountable for the contents, integrity, and originality of their work, even when AI is used". For copyright to apply, there must be "sufficient human control over the expressive elements."<sup>32,33</sup>

The duty to do good requires recognition of AI's ability to hallucinate. Authors should carefully review and edit the output from AI tools to identify and remove incorrect, incomplete, biased, false or misleading content.

## **8. Authors must disclose in their manuscript the use of AI and AI-assisted technologies**

Disclosure the use of GAI supports transparency and trust between authors, readers, reviewers, editors and contributors, while facilitating compliance with the terms of use or the relevant tool.

## **9. Tools that are used to improve spelling, grammar, and general editing, do not require disclosure.**

Improvements by GAI tools to human-generated texts for readability and style, and to address errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation and tone, do not require disclosure.

These improvements may include wording and formatting changes to the texts, but do not include generative editorial work and autonomous content creation.

## **10. Authors should disclose how the AI tool was used and identify the specific tool.**

***Statement: During the preparation of this work the author(s) used [NAME TOOL / SERVICE] on [DATE] for [REASON]. After using this GAI tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the accuracy and content of this work.***

***\*Providing the prompt used is recommended for research manuscripts***



## **11. Location of disclosure depends on use and may be defined by a publication's specific needs. Options include:**

- At the end of an article or editorial proceeding references if applicable
- Methods Section of a manuscript if used as part of a formal research design or analytical work and reporting results with tables and figures
- Acknowledgements Section of a manuscript for writing assistance or revising text
- A unique disclosure section of a manuscript proceeding references

Stakeholder ranking of this guidance to “consider,” reflects that the location to disclose GAI use varies with the intent of the article or manuscript. This variability can lead to confusion for authors when preparing manuscripts for submission.<sup>57</sup> To promote standardization, AADEJ offers its recommendations based on the author guidelines of JAMA Network,<sup>58</sup> WAME,<sup>58,59</sup> ICMJE<sup>50</sup> and Elsevier/JADA<sup>52</sup> guidance to disclose in either the Methods or Acknowledgements sections.



## **12. Authors should disclose the use of GAI in a submission cover letter or email.**

Disclosure of GAI use is required through a submission cover letter in accordance with ICMJE guidance. This promotes awareness for the editorial team when assessing submissions and builds transparency and trust.



## **13. Editors and peer reviewers should not upload submitted manuscripts (or any parts of manuscripts, including figures and tables) to GAI tools or services.**

Throughout the process, manuscripts should be treated as confidential. Uploading manuscripts, review reports, and letters risks violating authors' confidentiality, proprietary rights, and potentially data privacy rights.

Contractual terms governing AI platforms may grant AI vendors rights to prompts and uploaded materials for training their systems, which further endangers confidentiality.<sup>44,45</sup>

To protect author confidentiality, property and privacy rights, reviewers and editors must treat submitted manuscripts as confidential documents. They should not upload them or any part thereof (including figures and tables) into GAI tools.

An exception applies to tools used for detecting plagiarism or AI use. However, submitting authors should be informed of their use, and editors must ensure the tool protects privacy and intellectual property rights.



## **14. Generative tools should not be used in the peer review process assessing a manuscript.**

Reviewers and editors must exercise critical thinking and original assessment in their work, which are uniquely human responsibilities that cannot be delegated to generative AI tools.

The peer review process is fundamentally a human endeavor, and accountability for peer review reports rests with humans who have accepted the invitation to review a manuscript.



## **15. Editors should not upload submitted manuscripts, reports, and letters for editing without permission from the author following redaction of all protected information.**

Throughout the process, manuscripts should be treated as confidential. Uploading manuscripts, review reports, and letters risks violating authors' confidentiality, proprietary rights, and potentially data privacy rights.

An exception applies to tools used for detecting plagiarism or AI use. However, submitting authors should be informed of their use, and editors must ensure the tool protects privacy and intellectual property rights.

## 16. Reviewers must not upload manuscripts or reports to GAI for feedback in a peer review report.

GAI or AI-assisted technologies should not be used by reviewers to assist in the peer review of a manuscript. Peer review implies responsibilities that can only be attributed to humans. Reviewers and editors must exercise critical thinking and original assessment and cannot delegate their responsibilities to AI tools.

Reviewers must treat peer review reports as confidential documents and should not upload them or any part thereof into GAI tools, as these risks violating authors' confidentiality, property, and privacy rights.

Under human supervision, following redaction of protected information, the use of GAI writing tools for editing may be permissible.

## 17. Misconduct: Undisclosed use of AI constitutes a breach of professional integrity.

As noted in the publisher sections of Appendices 2 and 5, Sage notes that "appropriate corrective action will be taken" for undisclosed AI use, and Taylor and Francis mention that "prohibited uses may be subject to editorial investigation."

In the Publication-Ethics Organization sections, COPE states that "authors are liable for any breach of publication ethics," and STM instructs that "when reviewers suspect an author has violated the journal's GAI policy, they should report it to the editor."

In the Journal section, JMDA and VDJ provide more specific policy, stating that violations can lead to remedial actions, including publishing a notice, retracting the article, and referring the case to ethics committees or the author's institution.

## Sample Guideline for Authors statement on use of GAI

The following statement is used by *The AADEJ Communicator* newsletter, offered here as a sample for publication decision-makers developing their own policies.

**Guidelines for AI Use:** AI tools cannot be credited as authors. Authors must disclose any use of AI in generating content for their submissions. A disclosure statement should specify the tool used and its purpose. However, authors do not need to disclose the use of AI for grammar and language refinement. Authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of their work.