

Policy on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) and Large Language Models (LLMs)

The Bulletin of Linguistic and Intercultural Studies (BSLI) recognizes that generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), large language models (LLMs), and other AI-assisted technologies are increasingly used in academic research, writing, translation, data analysis, and scholarly communication.

BSLI supports the responsible use of such technologies where they enhance scholarly work without replacing human intellectual contribution, critical judgment, accountability, or research integrity.

This policy applies to authors, reviewers, editors, and other participants in the editorial process and should be read together with the journal's *Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement* and other editorial policies.

1. Core Principles

The use of GenAI or AI-assisted technologies must comply with the principles of:

- human accountability;
- transparency;
- accuracy and verification;
- academic integrity and originality;
- confidentiality;
- protection of intellectual property;
- privacy and data protection;
- research ethics and, where applicable, security requirements.

Human authors, reviewers, and editors remain fully responsible for their respective contributions and decisions.

AI tools must not replace human scholarly judgment.

2. AI and Authorship

Generative AI systems, large language models, chatbots, and other AI-assisted technologies cannot be listed as authors or co-authors of manuscripts submitted to or published by BSLI.

Authorship entails responsibilities that can only be assumed by human contributors, including accountability for the accuracy and integrity of the work, approval of the final manuscript, management of conflicts of interest, and responsibility for responding to questions concerning the published work.

AI systems must therefore not appear in the author list and must not be cited as authors.

The human authors remain fully responsible for all material submitted to BSLI, including material produced or modified with the assistance of AI technologies.

3. Permitted Use of GenAI/LLMs by Authors

Authors may use GenAI/LLMs and AI-assisted technologies as supporting tools in research and manuscript preparation, provided that such use complies with this policy.

Permissible uses may include:

- improving readability, language, and style;
- assisting with translation;
- supporting the organization or restructuring of text;
- brainstorming or preliminary exploration of ideas;
- assisting with coding, computational tasks, or data processing;
- supporting literature discovery, provided that all sources are independently verified;
- other research or writing assistance conducted under meaningful human supervision.

GenAI must not replace the author's critical thinking, scholarly expertise, interpretation, or intellectual contribution.

Authors must independently review and verify all AI-assisted output before submission.

Authors are responsible for the accuracy of all factual statements, quotations, references, translations, interpretations, analyses, data, and conclusions contained in the manuscript.

4. Disclosure of GenAI/LLMs Use

Authors must disclose use of GenAI/LLMs or AI-assisted technologies in the preparation of a manuscript.

A disclosure is required when an AI tool has been used to generate, rewrite, summarize, translate, restructure, analyze, or otherwise materially influence scholarly content.

Basic tools used solely for conventional spelling, grammar, or punctuation checking also require disclosure.

Declaration of Generative AI/LLMs and AI-Assisted Technologies

The declaration should identify the tool or service used and explain its purpose.

The recommended format is:

"During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used [NAME OF TOOL/SERVICE] for [PURPOSE]. The author(s) subsequently reviewed and edited the resulting material as necessary, independently verified its accuracy, and take full responsibility for the content of the article."

The Editors may request further information about the use of AI technologies when necessary to assess the integrity, originality, methodology, or reproducibility of a submission.

Failure to disclose material use of GenAI may result in editorial action.

5. GenAI Used as Part of the Research Methodology

When GenAI constitutes an object of study, source of research data, analytical instrument, experimental intervention, or substantive component of the research methodology, its use must be described in the manuscript's methodology.

Where relevant, authors should report:

- the name of the AI system;
- model and version, where identifiable;
- provider;
- date or period of access;
- relevant prompts or prompting strategy;
- material parameters or settings;
- procedures for collecting, selecting, coding, validating, or interpreting outputs;
- human oversight and verification procedures;
- known methodological limitations.

Where prompts, AI-generated corpora, or outputs constitute significant research materials, authors are encouraged to make them available as supplementary materials where copyright, privacy, ethics, security, confidentiality, and legal requirements permit.

The purpose of such reporting is to allow readers to understand and, where reasonably possible, reproduce the research process.

6. Accuracy, Sources, and References

GenAI output must never be treated as inherently reliable.

Authors must independently verify factual statements and bibliographic information produced or suggested by AI systems against authoritative sources.

Fabricated or unverifiable citations, quotations, sources, data, evidence, findings, or other material must not be included in a manuscript.

Authors remain responsible for ensuring appropriate attribution, obtaining necessary permissions, and preventing plagiarism or copyright infringement.

GenAI systems should not ordinarily be cited as scholarly authorities for factual or academic claims.

Where interaction with an AI system constitutes primary research material — for example, a study examining the responses of an LLM — the system and interaction should be

documented as research material according to the methodological and citation requirements appropriate to the study.

7. AI-Generated or AI-Manipulated Research Material

GenAI must not be used to fabricate, falsify, or deceptively manipulate:

- research data;
- empirical evidence;
- quotations;
- documents;
- images;
- audio or video recordings;
- participant responses;
- translations presented as primary data;
- research findings.

Where AI-generated or AI-modified material is legitimately part of the research design, its origin and the method by which it was generated or modified must be clearly disclosed.

Synthetic or AI-generated material must be identified where readers might otherwise reasonably interpret it as authentic empirical or documentary material.

Authors are responsible for ensuring that AI-generated or AI-modified materials comply with applicable copyright, privacy, data-protection, research-ethics, and security requirements.

8. Confidential, Sensitive, Personal, Restricted, or Classified Information

Authors must exercise particular caution when using AI technologies in research involving confidential, sensitive, personal, proprietary, restricted, or classified information.

Such information must not be entered into publicly accessible or unauthorized third-party AI systems.

This requirement is particularly relevant to research involving national security, intelligence, defence, law enforcement, critical infrastructure, vulnerable persons or communities, sensitive cultural or linguistic data, and other contexts in which unauthorized disclosure could create legal, ethical, privacy, institutional, or security risks.

Authors are responsible for ensuring that their use of AI technologies complies with all applicable legal, institutional, contractual, ethical, data-protection, and security obligations.

9. Use of GenAI by Peer Reviewers

Manuscripts submitted to BSLI are confidential scholarly communications.

Reviewers must not upload a submitted manuscript, any part of a manuscript, unpublished data, figures, supplementary materials, or information revealing the content of a submission to publicly accessible or unauthorized third-party GenAI systems.

This prohibition applies even where an AI service describes itself as private unless its use has been specifically authorized by BSLI and appropriate confidentiality, intellectual-property, data-protection, and security safeguards have been established.

Reviewers must personally conduct the scholarly evaluation of manuscripts.

GenAI must not replace the reviewer's critical thinking, expertise, independent assessment, or judgment.

Reviewers remain fully responsible for the accuracy, appropriateness, fairness, and intellectual content of their reviews.

10. Use of GenAI by Editors

Editors must maintain the confidentiality of submitted manuscripts and associated editorial communications.

Editors must not upload unpublished manuscripts, peer-review reports, supplementary materials, author information, or other confidential submission material to publicly accessible or unauthorized third-party GenAI systems.

GenAI must not independently determine:

- whether a manuscript proceeds to peer review;
- the selection or evaluation of reviewers;
- whether a manuscript is accepted or rejected;
- the final editorial decision.

Editorial assessment and final decisions must remain under meaningful human control.

AI-assisted technologies may support administrative, technical, linguistic, similarity-screening, metadata, or production functions where appropriate confidentiality, intellectual-property, privacy, and security safeguards exist.

Where BSLI routinely employs GenAI in editorial or production processes that materially affect published content, the journal will disclose such use to authors where appropriate.

Editors remain accountable for the integrity of the editorial process and all final editorial decisions.

11. AI Detection

BSLI does not regard automated AI-content detection tools, by themselves, as sufficient evidence of inappropriate AI use or research misconduct.

Automated detection systems may produce false positives or false negatives and should therefore not constitute the sole basis for an editorial decision or allegation of misconduct.

Where concerns arise, Editors may request clarification from the authors and may ask for relevant documentation, research materials, earlier manuscript versions, methodological information, source data, or other evidence necessary to assess the integrity of the work.

Any investigation will consider the totality of available evidence and will follow the journal's publication-ethics procedures.

12. Unacceptable Uses of GenAI

The following practices are incompatible with BSLI's standards:

- listing an AI system as an author or co-author;
- fabricating or falsifying data, evidence, sources, quotations, references, or findings;
- submitting AI-generated scholarly content without appropriate human intellectual contribution and oversight;
- concealing substantive AI use where disclosure is required;
- using AI-generated material in a manner that constitutes plagiarism or infringes copyright or other intellectual-property rights;
- using AI to fabricate or manipulate research materials deceptively;
- compromising manuscript confidentiality during peer review or editorial processing;
- processing protected, restricted, sensitive, or classified information through unauthorized AI systems;
- using GenAI to impersonate authors, reviewers, research participants, sources, or other persons;
- using AI as a substitute for scholarly judgment, verification, or accountability;
- using GenAI to manufacture or manipulate citations, peer reviews, identities, or other elements of the scholarly record.

13. Breaches of the Policy

Suspected breaches of this policy will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

Depending on the nature, extent, intent, and consequences of the breach, BSLI may:

- request clarification or supporting documentation;
- require revision or correction;
- conduct additional editorial or ethical review;
- reject a manuscript;
- issue a correction, expression of concern, or retraction following publication;
- take other measures consistent with the journal's Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement and applicable publication-ethics standards.

Failure to disclose AI use does not automatically establish research misconduct. However, deliberate concealment, fabrication, falsification, breach of confidentiality, or other deceptive use of AI may constitute misconduct.

14. Human Accountability

Regardless of the technologies used, responsibility for scholarly communication remains human.

Authors are responsible for their manuscripts.

Reviewers are responsible for their reviews.

Editors are responsible for editorial decisions.

The use of GenAI does not transfer or diminish these responsibilities.

15. Policy Review

GenAI/LLMs technologies, regulatory frameworks, and scholarly publishing standards are evolving rapidly.

BSLI will review this policy periodically and may amend it to reflect developments in publication ethics, scholarly communication, research integrity, data protection, intellectual property, security, and responsible AI.

Authors, reviewers, and editors should consult the version of this policy in force at the relevant stage of the editorial process.

Last updated: September 2026