



ESJ Policy on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence

The European Scientific Journal (ESJ) recognizes that Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools, including large language models such as ChatGPT and similar systems, are increasingly used in research, academic writing, peer review, and editorial workflows.

ESJ does not consider the responsible use of GenAI inherently incompatible with scholarly publishing. However, its use must be **transparent, accountable, proportionate, and subject to human verification**. Artificial intelligence cannot assume responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, originality, interpretation, or ethical conduct of scholarly work. Human authors, reviewers, and editors remain fully accountable for all content and decisions associated with a manuscript.

1. Use of GenAI by Authors

Authors may use GenAI tools during the preparation or revision of a manuscript, provided that such use is appropriately disclosed.

Authors remain entirely responsible for the accuracy, originality, integrity, references, data, analysis, interpretations, and conclusions contained in their manuscript.

GenAI tools must not be listed as authors or co-authors because they cannot assume responsibility or accountability for scholarly work.

Authors should disclose substantive use of GenAI, including use for:

- generating or substantially rewriting text;
- developing, modifying, or interpreting analyses;
- generating or modifying code;
- assisting with data processing, analysis, or interpretation;
- generating tables, figures, images, or other research outputs;
- assisting with literature synthesis;
- preparing responses to reviewers or revising a manuscript following peer review.

Routine tools used exclusively for spelling, grammar, formatting, or minor language correction do not normally require disclosure unless they substantially alter the intellectual content of the manuscript.

Where GenAI has been used, authors should provide a brief **GenAI Use Declaration**, preferably before the References or in another clearly identifiable section of the manuscript.



A suitable statement is:

Generative AI Use Declaration: During the preparation of this manuscript, the author(s) used [name of tool and version, where known] for [brief description of purpose]. The author(s) reviewed and verified the resulting content and take full responsibility for the final manuscript.

Authors must independently verify all information produced by GenAI. In particular, GenAI-generated references, quotations, factual claims, calculations, statistical interpretations, data, and code must not be accepted without verification.

Failure to disclose substantial GenAI use may result in requests for clarification or correction and, where serious concerns regarding research integrity arise, further editorial investigation.

2. Use of GenAI by Peer Reviewers

ESJ permits reviewers to use GenAI tools as an **assistive instrument** during peer review, provided that such use does not replace the reviewer's own scholarly judgment.

The reviewer remains entirely responsible for the content, accuracy, fairness, and recommendation contained in the review report.

GenAI may, for example, assist reviewers with language improvement, organization of comments, identification of issues requiring further consideration, or structuring a review report. It should not be treated as an autonomous reviewer or as the sole basis for an editorial recommendation.

Reviewers must exercise particular caution regarding **confidentiality**. Unpublished manuscripts, confidential data, personal information, or proprietary material should not be uploaded to AI systems where confidentiality, data retention, or subsequent use cannot reasonably be assured.

ESJ asks reviewers to disclose their use of GenAI in the confidential **“Comments to the Editor”** section of the review report.

The declaration should briefly indicate whether GenAI was used and, where applicable, its extent. For example:

GenAI disclosure: I used ChatGPT to assist with the organization and language editing of my review. The scientific assessment, comments, and recommendation are my own.



or:

GenAI disclosure: GenAI was used to assist in the preliminary identification of methodological and reporting issues. I independently verified all observations and take full responsibility for this review.

or simply:

GenAI disclosure: No generative AI tool was used in preparing this review.

ESJ considers disclosure preferable to attempting to prohibit AI use altogether. The purpose of the declaration is **transparency, not automatic disqualification of the review**.

3. Use of GenAI by Editors and the ESJ Editorial Office

ESJ may use GenAI tools as part of its editorial workflow, including during the **initial screening of submitted manuscripts**.

Such tools may assist the Editorial Office in activities including:

- preliminary assessment of manuscript structure and completeness;
- identifying potential methodological, reporting, or internal consistency issues;
- identifying unusual or potentially problematic references;
- checking whether the manuscript appears appropriate for the journal's scope;
- assisting in identifying possible ethical or research-integrity concerns;
- assisting editors in organizing information relevant to an initial editorial assessment.

ESJ presently uses **ChatGPT as an assistive tool for initial manuscript screening only where the submitting author has explicitly consented to such use through the submission process**.

GenAI screening **does not constitute peer review and does not make editorial decisions**.

No manuscript is accepted, rejected, or otherwise finally evaluated solely on the basis of an AI-generated assessment. Any observations generated through GenAI-assisted screening are reviewed by a member of the Editorial Office or an editor, who remains responsible for determining whether further clarification, peer review, revision, or editorial action is required.

4. Human Responsibility and Editorial Decision-Making

At every stage of the ESJ publication process, **human judgment remains decisive**.

GenAI may support scholarly or editorial work, but it may not replace:



- author responsibility for the research;
- reviewer responsibility for the peer-review report;
- editor responsibility for editorial evaluation;
- independent verification of evidence;
- human assessment of research integrity and ethical concerns.

Editorial decisions are made by ESJ editors based on the manuscript, peer-review reports, applicable editorial policies, and professional academic judgment.

An AI-generated recommendation, score, or assessment is never treated as an independent editorial decision.

5. Confidentiality and Data Protection

Authors, reviewers, and editors should consider confidentiality before entering unpublished material into third-party AI systems.

Reviewers in particular have a duty to protect confidential manuscripts entrusted to them for peer review.

Where GenAI is used, users should consider the relevant provider's policies concerning storage, processing, reuse, and confidentiality of submitted information.

Sensitive personal information, confidential research data, unpublished proprietary information, or other restricted material should not be entered into an AI system unless appropriate safeguards are in place.

6. Transparency Rather Than Prohibition

ESJ's approach is based on **responsible and transparent use rather than a general prohibition of GenAI**.

The Journal recognizes that AI technologies are developing rapidly and that their appropriate use differs across disciplines and scholarly tasks. The central principles therefore remain:

disclosure, human oversight, verification, confidentiality, and accountability.

The use of GenAI itself is not considered research misconduct. However, AI use does not excuse plagiarism, fabricated references, falsified or fabricated data, misleading presentation of research, undisclosed manipulation of images or data, or other breaches of research integrity.



7. Undisclosed or Inappropriate Use

Where ESJ has reasonable concerns that GenAI may have been used in a manner inconsistent with this policy, the Editorial Office may request clarification from the author or reviewer.

The presence of AI-like language or the output of an AI-detection system alone will **not ordinarily be treated as conclusive evidence of misconduct**.

Editorial action will instead be based on the underlying scholarly or ethical issue, such as fabricated citations, unverifiable data, plagiarism, inaccurate reporting, undisclosed generated material, or breach of confidentiality.

Where necessary, ESJ may request source material, underlying data, analysis files, references, or other documentation in order to clarify the integrity of the submission.

8. Continuing Review of the Policy

Generative AI technologies and scholarly publishing practices continue to evolve. ESJ will periodically review this policy in light of developments in scholarly communication, research integrity, technological practice, and recommendations issued by organizations such as the **European Association of Science Editors (EASE)**.

European Scientific Journal, ESJ
Editorial Office
<https://eujournal.org/index.php/esj>
Updated: 10.09.2026