



The Use of Artificial Intelligence for Manuscript Writing Violates the Core Principle of Originality

Sergio Huerta, MD, FACS, HEC-C^a

^a VA North Texas Health Care System; University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX
Correspondence: Sergio.Huerta@UTSouthwestern.edu

About this article: Received Sept 5, 2023 / Accepted Sept 17, 2023 / Published Sept 19, 2023

Keywords: Ethics, Artificial Intelligence, Manuscript Writing, ChatGPT

Peer Reviewers: B. Yi and M. Argo

AvaGHJ 1(1); 2023: 22-23 <https://doi.org/10.59016/avaghj.74916>

I wrote my first manuscript in 2001.¹ In order to obtain the required background information, I went to the library to seek relevant articles, made copies of the relevant papers, and had to manually type the references that were pertinent to the manuscript. I drafted my first version of the manuscript on a word processor without the use of spelling or grammar check. I created the appropriate photographs and diagrams in color or black and white of the gels and required items for the paper. To formally submit my manuscript, I sent two copies of the final draft to the journal editorial office in the mail. After the reviews came back, the same process was required to submit a revised version of the manuscript.

Computers equipped with Microsoft Word® made the first drastic positive improvement in manuscript writing and revision. Next came reference managing systems such as Reference Manager® and EndNote®, which restructured the way scientific writers conduct article searches and draft initial forms of manuscripts. These advancements, in combination with the online submission process, have revolutionized the way in which we currently search, read, write, and submit manuscripts. Have all these changes taken advantage of some form of artificial intelligence (AI) in publishing? Absolutely.

During the past two decades the pace at which these items were incorporated into manuscript writing and submission was such that it was anticipated and rapidly accepted as a common practice for authors and publishers writing and accepting manuscripts, respectively. If AI plays a role here, it has been a well-accepted use of AI, as this does not violate originality for manuscript creation. If anyone were to write a poem to their spouse or write vows for their wedding no one would be offended if spell check was utilized to correct various drafts of these items. However, if a spouse used a Shakespearean poem modified by a few words but described as an original piece for their vows, it would be viewed unoriginal and wrong. Similarly, using someone else's wedding vows to express our commitment to our spouse violates the same form of originality and would be considered unacceptable by the current social norms. Is scientific writing not deserving of this same scrutiny?

Artificial intelligence in the form of ChatGPT, LaMDA, Bleder Blot 2, Alexa Teacher Model, DialogGPT, Godel, Sparrow, Galactica, Chatosinc, and others entered the writing and publishing of manuscripts arena with such electrifying speed that it has captured authors, reviewers, editors, and publishers unready to respond to the ethical aspects pertaining to originality. For an article described as original, is it acceptable to use AI platforms to draft the introduction and part of the discussion? How about the use of AI for review articles?

The issue at hand is the permissibility of these platforms for authors to draft (in part or in full) manuscripts described as original work for submission to be considered for publication. Anyone who considers these platforms acceptable to write a poem for their spouse and deem it as their own work would likely use these same platforms to write manuscripts and describe these works as 'theirs'.

The core of this argument is ORIGINALITY. As of today, the use of AI to create manuscripts violates this principle and thus, it should NOT be considered an acceptable practice for all involved in the production of original or review manuscripts to be considered for peer-reviewed publications.

I maintain that this current predicament should be viewed as a positive challenge for authors. We can and should find ways to express our words in such a manner that leaves no doubt to future readers that we are indeed writing original papers. For reviewers, use this as an opportunity to identify works that may have been clearly assisted by AI. Editors should explicitly indicate that papers written using any form of AI will not be permissible for publication. Publishers should enforce these same restrictions.

For the future, there might be a role for publishing manuscripts with AI assistance. However, authors MUST be entirely transparent about the assistance received from AI. Furthermore, authors should clearly state how much AI was utilized to produce the manuscript. For example, an author could state: "the introduction of this manuscript and part of the discussion were produced with ChatGPT" or "ninety percent of this manuscript was generated with ChatGPT assistance". Alternatively, with the current enthusiasm

towards AI and with the ever-growing number of online journals, I anticipate some journals will specifically request submissions targeting authors who generate manuscripts assisted by AI in the near future. However, today is not the day. We are not ready for the incredibly fast pace with which AI has emerged in the writing arena and we need to critically consider the ethical, emotional, legal ramifications before blindly accepting its use in manuscript writing.

References

1. Huerta S, Srivatsan ES, Venkatasan N, Livingston EH. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences*. 2001;46(9):1884-1891. doi:10.1023/a:1010626929411