

1 **A Systematic Examination of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) Usage Guidelines for**
2 **Scholarly Publishing in Medical Journals**

3 Shuhui Yin, MA^{1*}, Peiyi Lu, PhD^{2*}, Zhuoran Xu, MSc^{3*}, Zi Lian, EdD⁴, Chenfei Ye, PhD^{5,6},
4 Chihua Li, DrPH^{7,8}

5 *Equally contributed as first authors

6 1. Applied Linguistics & Technology, Department of English, Iowa State University, IA, USA

7 2. Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong, Hong
8 Kong SAR, China

9 3. Graduate Group in Genomics and Computational Biology, Perelman School of Medicine,
10 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

11 4. Center for Health Equity & Urban Science Education, Teachers College, Columbia University,
12 New York, NY, USA

13 5. International Research Institute for Artificial Intelligence, Harbin Institute of Technology
14 (Shenzhen), Shenzhen, Guangdong, China

15 6. Pengcheng Laboratory, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China

16 7. State Key Laboratory of Quality Research in Chinese Medicine, University of Macau, Macao
17 SAR, China

18 8. Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, MI, USA

19

20 Word count: 3,359

21

22 **Corresponding authors**

23 Chihua Li

24 Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, MI, USA

25 426 Thompson St

26 Ann Arbor, MI 48104

27 Phone: +1 917-528-8696

28 chihuali@umich.edu

29

30

31 Chenfei Ye

32 International Research Institute for Artificial Intelligence, Harbin Institute of Technology

33 (Shenzhen), Shenzhen, China

34 Phone: +86 0755-27905894

35 chenfei.ye@foxmail.com

36

37 **Key points**

38 **Question** What are the provision and specificity of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) usage
39 guidelines for scholarly publishing in top and whole-spectrum medical journals and their
40 relationships with journal characteristics?

41 **Findings** Author guidelines were more abundant and specific in top journals than in whole-
42 spectrum journals. However, reviewer guidelines were extremely scarce in both groups of
43 journals. Journal ranking score was associated with both provision and specificity of GAI usage
44 guidelines in whole-spectrum journals while no significant relationship was found in top journals.

45 **Meaning** The lack of provision and specificity as well as the inconsistencies in existing
46 guidelines suggest that immediate attention is needed to guide GAI usage in scholarly publishing
47 and safeguard integrity and trust in medical research.

48

49

50

51 **Abstract**

52 **Background**

53 A thorough and in-depth examination of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) usage guidelines
54 in medical journals will inform potential gaps and promote proper GAI usage in scholarly
55 publishing. This study aims to examine the provision and specificity of GAI usage guidelines
56 and their relationships with journal characteristics.

57 **Methods**

58 From the SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) list for medicine in 2022, we selected 98 journals as top
59 journals to represent highly indexed journals and 144 as whole-spectrum sample journals to
60 represent all medical journals. We examined their GAI usage guidelines for scholarly publishing
61 between December 2023 and January 2024.

62 **Results**

63 Compared to whole-spectrum sample journals, the top journals were more likely to provide
64 author guidelines (64.3% vs. 27.8%) and reviewer guidelines (11.2% vs. 0.0%) as well as refer to
65 external guidelines (85.7% vs 74.3%). Probit models showed that SJR score or region was not
66 associated with the provision of these guidelines among top journals. However, among whole-
67 spectrum sample journals, SJR score was positively associated with the provision of author
68 guidelines (0.85, 95% CI 0.49 to 1.25) and references to external guidelines (2.01, 95% CI 1.24
69 to 3.65). Linear models showed that SJR score was positively associated with the specificity level
70 of author and reviewer guidelines among whole-spectrum sample journals (1.21, 95% CI 0.72 to
71 1.70), and no such pattern was observed among top journals.

72 **Conclusions**

73 The provision of GAI usage guidelines is limited across medical journals, especially for reviewer
74 guidelines. The lack of specificity and consistency in existing guidelines highlights areas
75 deserving improvement. These findings suggest that immediate attention is needed to guide GAI
76 usage in scholarly publishing in medical journals.

77 **Introduction**

78 ChatGPT, a chatbot powered by generative artificial intelligence (GAI) through large
79 language models, was released in November 2022. It can generate responses based on statistical
80 language patterns and is easily accessible to people without technical expertise.¹ Its multifaceted
81 capabilities and potential applications within diverse contexts have attracted billions of users and
82 visits.²⁻⁴ Consequently, many researchers have been actively exploring ChatGPT and other
83 similar tools' potential applications to scholarly publishing, including manuscript preparation
84 and peer review.⁵⁻⁸ To date, at least 1000 medical publications reported the use and impact of
85 such tools in scholarly publishing.⁹⁻¹¹ For manuscript preparation, researchers have used GAI
86 tools to conduct literature review, formulate study design, analyze data, and even interpret
87 results.¹²⁻¹⁵ For peer review, GAI has been used to summarize manuscript contents, review code,
88 check methods, and even draft comments and feedback.^{9,16} These practices highlight that such
89 tools have and will continue to transform scholarly publishing.

90 However, GAI is far from perfect and can lead to multiple concerns.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ Major concerns
91 regarding its role in scholarly publishing include the eligibility of these tools for authorship, the
92 risk of producing misleading or inaccurate information, breaches of data privacy and
93 confidentiality, as well as challenges to integrity and originality.²⁰⁻²³ In response, many journals,
94 organizations, and publishers have started to provide GAI usage guidelines for authors and
95 reviewers and made continuous updates.²⁴⁻²⁶ For example, medical publication organizations,
96 and publishers, such as the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) and
97 Elsevier, have decided that GAI should not be listed as authors because they cannot be
98 accountable for the submitted work;^{27,28} some journals require authors to document details of
99 GAI usage and fact-check GAI-generated contents; and some journals strictly prohibit the use of
100 GAI in peer review.²⁹ These developments show the new challenges posed by GAI and the
101 scientific community's corresponding adaptations.

102 Despite a fast-growing increase in discussions on GAI usage in scientific research, few
103 have examined GAI usage guidelines systematically. For example, one study examined GAI
104 usage guidelines for authors based on the 100 largest publishers and top 100 highly ranked
105 journals of different disciplines, and it found less than a quarter of these publishers and around
106 85% of the top journals provided author guidelines.³⁰ The other study examined author

107 disclosure requirements for GAI usage in 125 nursing journals and found less than 40% of them
108 had explicit instructions.³¹ They offered valuable insights into the evolving ethical standards and
109 practices of this rapidly changing field.

110 However, many other important aspects of GAI usage guidelines remain less explored or
111 unknown. First, few or no existing studies examined GAI guidelines for reviewers, ignoring the
112 equal importance of peer review in scholarly publishing. Second, previous studies either focused
113 on top-ranked journals or only on nursing journals, leading to an incomplete assessment of such
114 guidelines across medical journals. Third, little exploration has been made on the relationship
115 between journal characteristics and GAI guidelines for authors and reviewers. To address these
116 gaps, our study focuses on medical journals and includes both top and whole-spectrum journals.
117 We aim to delineate the provision and specificity of GAI guidelines for authors and reviewers as
118 well as external guidelines referred by these journals. We will also examine potential
119 relationships between journal characteristics and the provision and specificity of different GAI
120 guidelines. These together will provide a thorough overview of current practices and contribute
121 to the ongoing development of GAI usage guidelines across medical journals.

122

123 **Methods**

124 **Journal selection**

125 Based on the SCImago Journal Rank (SJR), two lists of journals were selected from the
126 journal ranking list for medicine in 2022: ‘top’ journals and whole-spectrum sample journals
127 (**Figure 1**).³² Each journal’s ranking was determined by its corresponding SJR score, a measure
128 of the number of citations received by its articles that contextualizes the journal’s prestige and
129 popularity within the academic community.

130 The list of top journals was generated due to the observation that many leading journals
131 had extensive discussions on how to use GAI or relevant tools in scholarly publishing, the
132 inclusion of which may provide rich information on such guidelines.^{7,33} To obtain a list of top
133 journals, we selected a representative journal with the highest SJR score from each journal
134 family among the first 200 ranked journals. This is because journals within the same family

135 usually adopt identical GAI usage guidelines. For example, the Lancet and other 21 Lancet-
136 affiliated journals were all among the first 200 ranked journals and adopted identical guidelines.

137 The list of whole-spectrum sample journals was generated to comprehensively examine
138 the current state of GAI usage guidelines across medical journals. For this journal list, we
139 randomly selected two journals from every 100 journals on the ranking list. Non-English journals
140 were excluded, and journals of the same family were replaced. As a result, we included 98
141 journals for top journals and 144 journals for whole-spectrum sample journals.

142

143 **Data collection and extraction**

144 For each journal selected above, two members of our research team independently carried
145 out a thorough examination of the guidelines, which were publicly available on each journal's
146 website. This was to identify any content related to the GAI usage. The following information
147 was extracted to create two datasets for top journals and whole-spectrum sample journals
148 respectively: journal characteristics and three types of GAI usage guidelines (**Table 1**). Journal
149 characteristics included three items: journal name, SJR score, and region. Three types of GAI
150 usage guidelines included author guidelines, reviewer guidelines, and references to external
151 guidelines. All the data extraction was completed between December 2023 and January 2024.
152 Any disagreements were resolved through group discussions.

153 For author guidelines, we identified eight requirements: usage permission, language
154 editing, manuscript writing, data analysis and interpretation, image generating, fact-checking
155 requirement, usage documentation, and authorship eligibility. Usage permission refers to
156 whether GAI tools are allowed to be used in manuscript preparation. Language editing,
157 manuscript writing, data analysis and interpretation, and image generating refer to whether GAI
158 tools are allowed to be used in each of these manuscript development steps. Fact-checking
159 requirement refers to whether authors are required to check and verify AI-generated content.
160 Usage documentation refers to whether authors are required to disclose and document the use of
161 GAI tools. Authorship eligibility refers to whether AI owns authorship and is allowed to be listed
162 as an author. Journals providing any of these eight requirements were marked as providing
163 author guidelines.

164 For reviewer guidelines, we identified three requirements: usage permission, language
165 editing, and usage documentation. Journals providing any of these three requirements were
166 marked as providing reviewer guidelines. We further coded each of the 11 requirements for
167 author and reviewer guidelines as ‘Yes’, ‘No’, or ‘Not Reported’.

168 For each journal, we generated a specificity score for author guidelines (range: 0 to 8),
169 reviewer guidelines (range: 0 to 3), and author and reviewer guidelines combined (range: 0 to 11),
170 respectively. Those scores were derived from the above coding: a score of ‘1’ was assigned for
171 either ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ to each requirement; and a score of ‘0’ for “Not Reported”. A higher
172 specificity score indicated a higher specificity level.

173 Many journals referred to external guidelines formulated by publishing organizations or
174 publishers for authors and reviewers. For these external guidelines on GAI usage, we focused on
175 standards formulated by four groups: the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), ICMJE, the
176 World Association of Medical Editors (WAME), and publishers. We coded the reference to each
177 of these four external guidelines as ‘Yes’ or ‘Not Reported’. We did not examine the specificity
178 score of external guidelines because they were not journal-specific.

179

180 **Statistical analysis**

181 We summarized and compared the characteristics and provision of different usage
182 guidelines between top journals and whole-spectrum sample journals. We used Probit regression
183 to examine relationships between journal characteristics and the provision of author or reviewer
184 guidelines and references to external guidelines. We used linear regression to relationships
185 between journal characteristics and the specificity score of these guidelines. We conducted all
186 analyses using R 4.2. All data used for this study was provided in **Supplementary Tables 1 and**
187 **2.**

188

189 **Results**

190 **Table 2** summarizes journal characteristics and the provision of different GAI usage
191 guidelines. The 98 top journals had a median SJR score of 4.2, and 95 of them (96.9%) were
192 based in either Northern America or Western Europe. The 144 whole-spectrum sample journals

193 had a median SJR score of 0.5, and they were more evenly distributed across the three regions.
194 The top journals were more likely to provide different types of GAI usage guidelines than whole-
195 spectrum sample journals, including author guidelines (64.3% vs. 27.8%), reviewer guidelines
196 (11.2% vs. 0.0%), and references to external guidelines (85.7% vs 74.3%). A detailed summary
197 of the provision and specificity of GAI usage guidelines is presented for top journals and whole-
198 spectrum sample journals in **Supplementary Table 3**, including eight requirements for authors,
199 three requirements for reviewers, and four frequently referred external guidelines. Compared to
200 whole-spectrum sample journals, top journals had a higher specificity level of author guidelines,
201 reviewer guidelines, and the two combined.

202 Relationships between journal characteristics and the provision of GAI usage guidelines
203 among top journals differed from those among whole-spectrum sample journals (**Table 3**).
204 Among top journals, the provision of these guidelines generally showed no significant
205 differences comparing journals with varying SJR scores or those based in different regions.
206 However, journals based in Western Europe were more likely to refer to external guidelines than
207 those based in Northern America (2.07, 95% CI: 1.07 to 4.26). Among whole-spectrum sample
208 journals, journals with a higher SJR score were more likely to provide author guidelines (0.85,
209 95% CI: 0.49 to 1.25) and refer to external guidelines (2.01, 95% CI: 1.24 to 3.65). Compared to
210 journals based in Northern America, those in Western Europe had a similar likelihood of
211 providing author guidelines (0.02, 95% CI: -0.51 to 0.55), whereas journals in other regions were
212 less likely to do so (-1.03, 95% CI: -1.67 to -0.43). Since no reviewer guidelines were provided
213 by whole-spectrum sample journals, no association estimates were obtained.

214 **Figure 2** shows the specificity level of author and reviewer guidelines and detailed
215 requirements of different guidelines among top journals. The specificity score was determined by
216 how many of the 11 requirements of author and reviewer guidelines were provided. For author
217 guidelines, a consensus emerged on five requirements whenever provided: permitting GAI usage,
218 allowing for language editing, requiring fact-checking, mandating usage documentation, and
219 prohibiting AI authorship. However, disagreements were observed about whether GAI can be
220 used for writing manuscripts, analyzing and interpreting data, and generating images. For
221 reviewer guidelines, fewer journals provided requirements, and there were disagreements on
222 permitting GAI usage and allowing for language editing. Among external guidelines, the ICMJE
223 guideline was the most frequently referred to. Details of external guidelines are summarized in

224 **Supplementary Table 4.** Among whole-spectrum sample journals, similar patterns of
225 requirements were observed except that a lower proportion of journals provided specific
226 requirements (**Supplementary Figure 1**).

227 Relationships between journal characteristics and specificity scores of author and
228 reviewer guidelines were examined (**Supplementary Table 5**). Among top journals, the
229 journal's SJR score was not associated with the specificity level of usage guidelines. In contrast,
230 whole-spectrum sample journals with a higher SJR score exhibited a higher specificity level.
231 Among both groups of journals, those based in Western Europe had a similar level of specificity
232 as those in North America, whereas journals from other regions had a lower specificity level.
233 Relationships for author guidelines showed similar patterns among top journals.

234

235 **Discussion**

236 Our study systematically examined GAI usage guidelines for scholarly publishing across
237 medical journals, including author guidelines, reviewer guidelines, and references to external
238 guidelines. Around two-thirds of top journals provided author guidelines while less than one-
239 third of whole-spectrum journals did so, highlighting differential acknowledgment and
240 integration of GAI practices and room for improvement across medical journals. The extremely
241 low proportion of both top and whole-spectrum sample journals providing reviewer guidelines
242 showed their negligence in setting guidance on the use of such tools for reviewers. The high
243 proportion of both journal groups referred to external guidelines showed the critical role of these
244 external standards in fostering ethical practices of GAI usage. We also identified journal
245 characteristics that were associated with the provision and specificity level of different guidelines.
246 Together, our results suggest the urgent need for explorations and improvements of GAI usage
247 guidelines in scholarly publishing.

248 Among medical journals across the whole spectrum, only a small proportion of journals
249 (28%) provided GAI usage guidelines for authors, highlighting a serious lack of alertness in
250 guiding the proper use of such tools. Lack of proper guidance can lead to unethical practices or
251 allow AI-generated manuscripts to infiltrate publications undetected, jeopardizing the quality,
252 integrity, and transparency of research.³⁴⁻³⁶ Interestingly, the figure we observed is considerably
253 lower than that reported by another study (86%) focusing on only top journals.³⁰ Moreover, the

254 provision of author guidelines among top medical journals (64%) is also lower in our study
255 compared to that study. The main reason for the discrepancy in the provision of author guidelines
256 between our study and the other is the different journal selection methods. Our study selected
257 one representative journal from each journal family while the other study included multiple
258 journals of the same families. For example, among their 51 top medical journals, six were Nature
259 family journals and three were JAMA family journals, which usually adopted the same
260 guidelines. This journal selection method can lead to biases in examining the provision of GAI
261 usage guidelines. Indeed, we observed a similar proportion of journals providing author
262 guidelines among the first 200 SJR-ranked medical journals when we included multiple journals
263 of the same families.

264 The better provisions of author guidelines comparing top journals to whole-spectrum
265 journals can be attributed to several factors. They include more accessible advanced AI
266 technology in Western Europe and Northern America, stringent regulatory environments, and
267 robust scholarly communication networks.³⁷⁻³⁹ Author guidelines provided by top journals are
268 also more specific than others, evidenced by two observations. First, top journals had a much
269 higher specificity level than whole-spectrum sample journals; second, among whole-spectrum
270 sample journals, journals with a higher SJR score tend to be more specific. This greater
271 specificity level can help authors adhere to ethical standards and prevent potential misconduct,
272 including plagiarism or misrepresentation of AI-generated content as human work. Our findings
273 showed that both top and whole-spectrum journals have significant room for improvement.

274 Across journals, consensus has been achieved for five of the eight requirements examined
275 in author guidelines, and disagreements were observed for three requirements related to content
276 generating applications. The remarkable capacities of GAI justify its usage in scholarly writing,
277 especially for language editing.⁴⁰⁻⁴³ However, its risks threatening research integrity require
278 authors to conduct fact-checking and usage documentation but not to grant such tools
279 authorship.⁴⁴ These agreements show how the scientific community is embracing GAI in a
280 cautious way. For example, the emphasis on fact-checking and usage documentation is necessary
281 for preventing fabrication and potential biases and promoting transparency and trust.⁴⁵

282 Notably, journals differ in instructions for usage documentation on what should be
283 disclosed. While some journals require authors to report any use of GAI, other journals allow

284 authors not to do so if such tools were solely used for language editing. This may be explained
285 by journals' different interpretations of GAI applications. Together with two other recent studies
286 showing inconsistencies in what to disclose of GAI usage, a need is highlighted surrounding
287 standardization of GAI usage disclosure and documentation.^{30,31,46} More importantly, journals
288 held different and even opposite stances for content-generating applications, including
289 manuscript writing, data analysis and interpretation, and image generating. This is due to concern
290 centered on plagiarism because it is challenging to trace and verify the originality of AI-
291 generated content.^{47,48}

292 As the first study that systematically examined GAI usage guidelines for reviewers, we
293 are surprised to find that an extremely small proportion of journals did so. For example, only 10%
294 of top journals and none of the whole-spectrum sample journals provided reviewer guidelines.
295 Given the reviewers' pivotal role in safeguarding the quality and integrity of scholarly work, this
296 negligence reflects a concerning gap in guiding the use of such tools in the peer review process.
297 The misuse of GAI in peer review can have multiple negative consequences, including the
298 breach of private data and violation of intellectual property. These are important issues
299 considering the sensitive nature of health data and medical research.²²

300 Among the merely available reviewer guidelines identified, we observed disagreements
301 on requirements regarding usage permission, language editing, and usage documentation across
302 journals. We interpreted these disagreements as journals' different stances on how to protect the
303 confidentiality of manuscripts.^{49,50} Some journals specified conditions in which GAI can be used.
304 For example, they required reviewers to obtain permission from authors and editors, to confirm
305 that manuscripts shall not be used as training data, and provide authors with the choice to opt for
306 or against a GAI-assisted review process.^{26,51}

307 Around 90% of top journals and three quarters of whole-spectrum sample journals have
308 referred to external guidelines on GAI usage formulated by ICMJE, COPE, WAVE, or
309 publishers. This underscores a collective endeavor to establish ethical benchmarks for GAI usage
310 in scholarly publishing. Notably, top journals based in Western Europe were more likely to refer
311 to external standards than their Northern American counterparts. This may stem from Western
312 Europe's pioneering regulations on GAI usage.^{52,53} Importantly, we identified conflicts between
313 journal-specific guidelines and referred external guidelines for at least five of the top journals we

314 selected. For example, *Molecular Aspects of Medicine* prohibits content-generating applications,
315 while its referred external guideline, WAME, permits such usage. These conflicts have also been
316 reported by another study.³⁰ To avoid confusion, we call for attention to resolve such conflicts.

317 We identified three main aspects of GAI usage guidelines that need urgent improvements.
318 First, it is important for journals to provide specific GAI usage guidelines for both authors and
319 reviewers rather than only refer to external guidelines. Journal-specific guidelines can better
320 ensure the relevance and effectiveness in guiding GAI usage in their unique scholar environment.
321 Second, details of the guidelines should be specified to avoid confusion, especially for content-
322 generating applications. Our systematic evaluation of available GAI usage guidelines provides a
323 roadmap to clarify expectations on proper GAI practices. Third, disagreements identified across
324 guidelines warrant special attention. Although these disagreements highlight the continuously
325 evolving use of GAI, it is possible to establish a framework of proper practices and specify
326 requirements under different scenarios. For example, journals may consider standardizing usage
327 documentation by integrating questions into the manuscript submission system; ascertaining
328 whether GAI was used, and if so, detailing specific purposes and ensuring accountability.
329 Besides, it is essential to regularly review, discuss, and update GAI usage guidelines.

330 Our study has several strengths. It pioneered a systematic and quantitative examination of
331 GAI usage guidelines across top and whole-spectrum medical journals, which provides an
332 overview of the current regulations in scholarly publishing. It also synthesized existing GAI
333 usage guidelines for both authors and reviewers and established a systematic checklist. We
334 further provided recommendations aimed at improving existing GAI usage guidelines for
335 scholarly publishing and promoting the proper use of GAI tools. While our study focused on
336 medical journals, we believe our findings and recommendations can be applied to journals in
337 other disciplines.

338 Our study also has limitations. First, for whole-spectrum sample journals, we sampled 2%
339 of the 7,174 medical journals with an SJR score and included only English journals. Despite this,
340 our use of stratified random sampling enables the representation of all medical journals listed in
341 the SJR database and allows for timely communication of our important findings. Second, the
342 scarce provision of reviewer guidelines observed in our findings might be attributed to the
343 potential non-public accessibility of reviewer guidelines, which we think is uncommon. Third,

344 our analysis did not include guidelines for editors, despite their relevance and importance, due to
345 their scarce availability across the journals we examined. In the future, we would like to
346 collaborate with different journals to conduct such examinations.

347

348 **Conclusions**

349 The provision of GAI usage guidelines is limited across medical journals, especially for
350 reviewer guidelines. The lack of specificity and inconsistencies in existing guidelines highlight
351 areas deserving improvement. Immediate attention is needed to guide GAI usage in scholarly
352 publishing and safeguard the integrity and trust of medical research.

353 **Corresponding Author:** Chenfei Ye, Chihua Li.
354 **Author Contributions:** Li had full access to all of the data in the study and took responsibility
355 for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.
356 *Concept and design:* Yin, Li.
357 *Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data:* All authors.
358 *Drafting of the manuscript:* Yin, Li.
359 *Critical review of the manuscript for important intellectual content:* All authors.
360 *Statistical analysis:* All authors.
361 *Obtained funding:* Ye, Li.
362 *Administrative, technical, or material support:* Yin, Li.
363 *Supervision:* Li.
364 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** None.
365 **Funding/Support:** Chenfei Ye is supported by grants from the National Natural Science
366 Foundation of P.R. China (62106113); Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research
367 Foundation (2023A1515010792), Basic Research Foundation of Shenzhen Science and
368 Technology Stable Support Program (GXWD 20231129121139001).
369 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:** The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study;
370 collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval
371 of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.
372 **Data Sharing Statement:** All data relevant to the study are included in the article or included as
373 supplementary materials. Full data and analytical code are available from the corresponding
374 author at chihuali@umich.edu.

375 **References**

- 376 1. OpenAI. Introducing ChatGPT. Accessed December 1, 2023. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>
- 377 2. Hern A. AI bot ChatGPT stuns academics with essay-writing skills and usability. *The*
378 *Guardian*. Accessed December 4, 2022.
379 [https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2022/dec/04/ai-bot-chatgpt-stuns-academics-with-](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2022/dec/04/ai-bot-chatgpt-stuns-academics-with-essay-writing-skills-and-usability)
380 [essay-writing-skills-and-usability](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2022/dec/04/ai-bot-chatgpt-stuns-academics-with-essay-writing-skills-and-usability)
- 381 3. Stokel-Walker C. AI bot ChatGPT writes smart essays — should professors worry? *Nature*.
382 Accessed December 9, 2022. doi:10.1038/d41586-022-04397-7
- 383 4. Editorial. ChatGPT: friend or foe? *Lancet Digit Health*. 2023;5(3):e102. doi:10.1016/S2589-
384 7500(23)00023-7
- 385 5. Flanagin A, Bibbins-Domingo K, Berkwits M, Christiansen SL. Nonhuman “authors” and
386 implications for the integrity of scientific publication and medical knowledge. *JAMA*.
387 2023;329(8):637. doi:10.1001/jama.2023.1344
- 388 6. Watkins R. Guidance for researchers and peer-reviewers on the ethical use of Large Language
389 Models (LLMs) in scientific research workflows. *AI Ethics*. Accessed May 16, 2023.
390 doi:10.1007/s43681-023-00294-5
- 391 7. Biswas S. ChatGPT and the future of medical writing. *Radiology*. 2023;307(2):e223312.
392 doi:10.1148/radiol.223312
- 393 8. Hosseini M, Horbach SPJM. Fighting reviewer fatigue or amplifying bias? considerations and
394 recommendations for use of ChatGPT and other large language models in scholarly peer
395 review. *Res Integr Peer Rev*. 2023;8(1):4. doi:10.1186/s41073-023-00133-5
- 396 9. Van Noorden R, Perkel JM. AI and science: what 1,600 researchers think. *Nature*.
397 2023;621(7980):672-675. doi:10.1038/d41586-023-02980-0
- 398 10. Thirunavukarasu AJ, Ting DSJ, Elangovan K, et al. Large language models in medicine. *Nat*
399 *Med*. 2023; 29(8): 1930-1940. doi:10.1038/s41591-023-02448-8
- 400 11. AI will transform science — now researchers must tame it. *Nature*. 2023;621(7980):658-658.
401 doi:10.1038/d41586-023-02988-6
- 402 12. Editorial. Prepare for truly useful large language models. *Nat Biomed Eng*. 2023;7(2):85-86.
403 doi:10.1038/s41551-023-01012-6
- 404 13. Editorial. Not a generative AI-generated Editorial. *Nat Cancer*. 2023;4(2):151-152.
405 doi:10.1038/s43018-023-00531-0
- 406 14. Owens B. How Nature readers are using ChatGPT. *Nature*. 2023;615(7950):20-20.
407 doi:10.1038/d41586-023-00500-8


- 408 15. Messeri L, Crockett MJ. Artificial intelligence and illusions of understanding in scientific
409 research. *Nature*. 2024;627(8002):49-58. doi:10.1038/s41586-024-07146-0
- 410 16. Donker T. The dangers of using large language models for peer review. *Lancet Infect Dis*.
411 2023;23(7):781. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00290-6
- 412 17. Zheng H, Zhan H. ChatGPT in Scientific Writing: A Cautionary Tale. *Am J Med*.
413 2023;136(8):725-726.e6. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2023.02.011
- 414 18. Hwang SI, Lim JS, Lee RW, et al. Is ChatGPT a “Fire of Prometheus” for Non-Native
415 English-Speaking Researchers in Academic Writing? *Korean J Radiol*. 2023;24(10):952.
416 doi:10.3348/kjr.2023.0773
- 417 19. Van Dis EAM, Bollen J, Zuidema W, Van Rooij R, Bockting CL. ChatGPT: five priorities
418 for research. *Nature*. 2023;614(7947):224-226. doi:10.1038/d41586-023-00288-7
- 419 20. Thorp HH. ChatGPT is fun, but not an author. *Science*. 2023;379(6630):313.
420 doi:10.1126/science.adg7879
- 421 21. Stokel-Walker C. ChatGPT listed as author on research papers: many scientists disapprove.
422 *Nature*. 2023;613(7945):620-621. doi:10.1038/d41586-023-00107-z
- 423 22. National Institutes of Health. The use of generative artificial intelligence technologies is
424 prohibited for the NIH peer review process. Accessed December 21, 2023.
425 <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-23-149.html>
- 426 23. Liverpool L. AI intensifies fight against ‘paper mills’ that churn out fake research. *Nature*.
427 2023;618(7964):222-223.
- 428 24. Flanagan A, Kendall-Taylor J, Bibbins-Domingo K. Guidance for authors, peer reviewers,
429 and editors on use of AI, language models, and chatbots. *JAMA*. 2023;330(8):702-703.
430 doi:10.1001/jama.2023.12500
- 431 25. Committee on Publication Ethics. Authorship and AI tools. Accessed December 8, 2023.
432 <https://publicationethics.org/cope-position-statements/ai-author>
- 433 26. Leung TI, De Azevedo Cardoso T, Mavragani A, Eysenbach G. Best practices for using AI
434 tools as an author, peer reviewer, or editor. *J Med Internet Res*. 2023;25:e51584.
435 doi:10.2196/51584
- 436 27. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Defining the role of authors and
437 contributors. Accessed December 8, 2023.
438 [https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-](https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html)
439 [of-authors-and-contributors.html](https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html)
- 440 28. Elsevier. Publishing ethics. Accessed December 8, 2023.
441 <https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/publishing-ethics#0-publishing-ethics>

- 442 29. The Lancet Peer Review. Accessed December 10, 2023. [https://www.thelancet.com/peer-](https://www.thelancet.com/peer-review)
443 review
- 444 30. Ganjavi C, Eppler MB, Pekcan A, Biedermann B, Abreu A, Collins GS, Gill IS, Cacciamani
445 GE. Publishers' and journals' instructions to authors on use of generative artificial intelligence
446 in academic and scientific publishing: bibliometric analysis. *BMJ*. 2024;384:e077192.
447 doi:10.1136/bmj-2023-077192
- 448 31. Tang A, Li K, Kwok KO, Cao L, Luong S, Tam W. The importance of transparency:
449 declaring the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in academic writing. *J Nurs*
450 *Scholarsh*. 2024;56(2):314-318. doi:10.1111/jnu.12938
- 451 32. SciMago. Journal and country rank. Accessed December 1, 2023.
452 <https://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php>
- 453 33. Editorial. Tools such as ChatGPT threaten transparent science; here are our ground rules for
454 their use. *Nature*. 2023;613(7945):612. doi:10.1038/d41586-023-00191-1
- 455 34. Prillaman M. "ChatGPT detector" catches AI-generated papers with unprecedented accuracy.
456 *Nature*. Accessed November 06, 2023. doi:10.1038/d41586-023-03479-4
- 457 35. Misra DP, Chandwar K. ChatGPT, artificial intelligence and scientific writing: what authors,
458 peer reviewers and editors should know. *J R Coll Physicians Edinb*. 2023;53(2):90-93.
459 doi:10.1177/14782715231181023
- 460 36. Conroy G. Scientific sleuths spot dishonest ChatGPT use in papers. *Nature*. Accessed
461 September 8, 2023. doi:10.1038/d41586-023-02477-w
- 462 37. Roche C, Wall PJ, Lewis D. Ethics and diversity in artificial intelligence policies, strategies
463 and initiatives. *AI Ethics*. 2023;3(4):1095-1115. doi:10.1007/s43681-022-00218-9
- 464 38. Fjeld J, Achten N, Hilligoss H, Nagy A, Srikumar M. Principled artificial intelligence:
465 mapping consensus in ethical and rights-based approaches to principles for AI. *Berkman Klein*
466 *Cent Res Publ*. Accessed January 15, 2020. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3518482
- 467 39. Jobin A, Ienca M, Vayena E. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nat Mach Intell*.
468 2019;1(9):389-399. doi:10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2
- 469 40. Berdejo-Espinola V, Amano T. AI tools can improve equity in science. *Science*. 2023 Mar
470 10;379(6636):991. doi: 10.1126/science.adg9714.
- 471 41. Yan M, Cerri GG, Moraes FY. ChatGPT and medicine: how AI language models are shaping
472 the future and health related careers. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2023;41(11):1657-1658.
473 doi:10.1038/s41587-023-02011-3
- 474 42. Huang J, Tan M. The role of ChatGPT in scientific communication: writing better scientific
475 review articles. *Am J Cancer Res*. 2023;13(4):1148-1154.

- 476 43. Li H, Moon JT, Purkayastha S, Celi LA, Trivedi H, Gichoya JW. Ethics of large language
477 models in medicine and medical research. *Lancet Digit Health*. 2023;5(6):e333-e335.
478 doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00083-3
- 479 44. Bell S. The write algorithm: promoting responsible artificial intelligence usage and
480 accountability in academic writing. *BMC Med*. 2023;21(1):334. doi:10.1186/s12916-023-
481 03039-7
- 482 45. Vintzileos AM, Chavez MR, Romero R. A role for artificial intelligence chatbots in the
483 writing of scientific articles. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2023;229(2):89-90.
484 doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2023.03.040
- 485 46. Beall J. Predatory publishers are corrupting open access. *Nature*. 2012;489(7415):179-179.
486 doi:10.1038/489179a
- 487 47. Lund BD, Wang T, Mannuru NR, Nie B, Shimray S, Wang Z. ChatGPT and a new academic
488 reality: artificial intelligence-written research papers and the ethics of the large language
489 models in scholarly publishing. *J Assoc Inf Sci Technol*. 2023;74(5):570-581.
490 doi:10.1002/asi.24750
- 491 48. Dehouche N. Plagiarism in the age of massive Generative Pre-trained Transformers (GPT-3).
492 *Ethics Sci Environ Polit*. 2021;21:17-23.
- 493 49. Hosseini M, Horbach SPJM. Fighting reviewer fatigue or amplifying bias? considerations
494 and recommendations for use of ChatGPT and other large language models in scholarly peer
495 review. *Res Integr Peer Rev*. 2023;8(1):4. doi:10.1186/s41073-023-00133-5
- 496 50. Al-Hawawreh M, Aljuhani A, Jararweh Y. Chatgpt for cybersecurity: practical applications,
497 challenges, and future directions. *Clust Comput*. 2023;26(6):3421-3436. doi:10.1007/s10586-
498 023-04124-5
- 499 51. Flanagan A, Kendall-Taylor J, Bibbins-Domingo K. Guidance for Authors, Peer Reviewers,
500 and Editors on Use of AI, Language Models, and Chatbots. *JAMA*. 2023;330(8):702.
501 doi:10.1001/jama.2023.12500
- 502 52. Li Z. Why the European AI Act transparency obligation is insufficient. *Nat Mach Intell*.
503 2023;5(6):559-560. doi:10.1038/s42256-023-00672-y
- 504 53. Roberts H, Cows J, Hine E, et al. Governing artificial intelligence in China and the
505 European Union: Comparing aims and promoting ethical outcomes. *Inf Soc*. 2023;39(2):79-97.
506 doi:10.1080/01972243.2022.2124565

507


Figure 1. Flowchart of journal selection



Footnote: * Journals from the same family most likely adopted identical guidelines for GAI usage.

Non-English journals were excluded; Journals from the same family were replaced.

Figure 2. Specificity level of author and reviewer guidelines and requirements of different GAI usage guidelines among top journals



Footnote: The specificity score displays how many requirements were provided for author and reviewer guidelines combined (range: 0-11).

Table 1. Journal characteristics and three types of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) usage guidelines extracted

Items	Journal characteristics	Three types of GAI usage guidelines		
		Author guidelines (Y/N/NR)	Reviewer guidelines (Y/N/NR)	References to external guidelines (Y/NR)
1	Journal name	Usage permission	Usage permission	COPE
2	SJR score	Language editing	Language editing	ICMJE
3	Region	Manuscript writing	Usage documentation	WAME
4		Data analysis and interpretation		Publishers
5		Image generating		
6		Fact-checking requirement		
7		Usage documentation		
8		Authorship eligibility		

Footnote: Abbreviations: Y, Yes; N, No; NR, Not Reported;

COPE, Committee on Publication Ethics; ICMJE, International Committee of Medical Journal Editors; WAME, World Association of Medical Editors.

Table 2. Journal characteristics and provision of different GAI usage guidelines

	Top journals (n = 98)	Whole-spectrum sample journals (n = 144)	P value[#]
Journal characteristics			
SJR score, median (IQR)	4.2 (3.6, 6.7)	0.5 (0.2, 0.9)	< 0.01
Region, n (%)			
Northern America	50 (51.0)	39 (27.1)	< 0.01
Western Europe	45 (45.9)	51 (35.4)	
Other regions*	3 (3.1)	54 (37.5)	
Provision of different usage guidelines			
Author guidelines, n (%)	63 (64.3)	40 (27.8)	< 0.01
Reviewer guidelines, n (%)	11 (11.2)	0 (0.0)	< 0.01
References to external guidelines, n (%)	84 (85.7)	107 (74.3)	< 0.05

Footnote: *Other regions included Africa, Asiatic region, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Middle East, and Pacific region.

Differences between the two groups of journals were analyzed using Wilcoxon Rank Sum test or Chi-Square tests.

Table 3. Probit regression analysis of the relationship between journal characteristics and the provision of different GAI usage guidelines

		Top journals			Whole-spectrum sample journals		
	Journal characteristics	Coefficient	95% CI	P value	Coefficient	95% CI	P value
		Provision of any author guidelines					
Model 1	SJR score	-0.01	(-0.04, 0.02)	0.58	0.85	(0.49, 1.25)	<0.01
Model 2	Northern America	Ref	-	-	Ref	-	-
	Western Europe	0.02	(-0.50, 0.54)	0.95	0.02	(-0.51, 0.55)	0.94
	Other regions	-5.62	(NA, 22.74)	0.98	-1.03	(-1.67, -0.43)	<0.01
		Provision of any reviewer guidelines					
Model 1	SJR score	0.00	(-0.06, 0.03)	1.00	-	-	-
Model 2	Northern America	Ref	-	-	-	-	-
	Western Europe	-0.05	(-0.72, 0.62)	0.89	-	-	-
	Other regions	-4.22	(NA, 41.32)	0.99	-	-	-
		Any reference to external guidelines					
Model 1	SJR score	1.00	(0.97, 1.06)	0.85	2.01	(1.24, 3.65)	< 0.05
Model 2	Northern America	Ref	-	-	Ref	-	-
	Western Europe	2.07	(1.07, 4.26)	< 0.05	1.53	(0.87, 2.70)	0.14
	Other regions	101.92	(0.00, NA)	0.99	1.24	(0.72, 2.14)	0.44

Footnote: NA (not available) indicates that the 95% CI hits infinity due to small sample size. No association estimates were obtained for the provision of reviewer guidelines in whole-spectrum sample journals because none of these journals provided reviewer guidelines.