

Generating Transparency: LIS Journals and Developing Policy on the Use of Generative AI

Evan M. Allgood

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, USA

allgood4@illinois.edu

ABSTRACT

Conversations around Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) have proliferated in the LIS journal community since the late 2022 release of ChatGPT (Felländer-Tsai & Overgaard, 2023; Stokel-Walker, 2023). The profession's conversations have run the gamut from wholeheartedly welcoming GenAI to categorically banning its use. While there are strong opinions at both poles, these conversations tend to conclude with the same compromise: requesting author and journal transparency (Gaggioli, 2023; Ganjavi et al., 2023; Staiman, 2023).

This call for transparency stems from the overarching ethical concerns with GenAI around accuracy, bias, and authority (Walters & Wilder, 2023). With these concerns in mind, the editorial team of an academic journal detailed issues and potential solutions regarding the use of GenAI at every step of the publishing process, from proposal to publication.

This poster presentation will outline one academic LIS journal's process for developing a GenAI policy for authors, reviewers, and editorial staff. This poster will share background research and provide a model for how journals can protect their authors, reviewers, staff, and readers. By sharing our experience of creating thorough policy around the use of GenAI, we intend to support LIS journal editors as they work to provide our community with high quality, integrous information while mitigating the cultural, linguistic, and ideological biases that can arise in the use of GenAI.

ALISE RESEARCH TAXONOMY TOPICS

Scholarly communications; Information policy; Publishing.

AUTHOR KEYWORDS

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI); Academic publishing; Journal policy generation.

Copyright 2025 by the authors. Published under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21900/j.alise.2025.1971>

REFERENCES

- Felländer-Tsai, L., & Overgaard, S. (2023). Adapting to the rapidly moving target artificial intelligence (AI) in scholarly publishing. *Acta Orthopaedica*, *94*, 625. <https://doi.org/10.2340/17453674.2023.34900>
- Gaggioli, A. (2023). Ethics: Disclose use of AI in scientific manuscripts. *Nature*, *614*(7948), 413–413. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00381-x>
- Ganjavi, C., Eppler, M. B., Pekcan, A., Biedermann, B., Abreu, A., Collins, G. S., Gill, I. S., & Cacciamani, G. E. (2023). *Bibliometric Analysis of Publisher and Journal Instructions to Authors on Generative-AI in Academic and Scientific Publishing* (No. arXiv:2307.11918). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.11918>
- Staiman, A. (2023, September 14). Publishers, Don't Use AI Detection Tools! *The Scholarly Kitchen*. <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2023/09/14/publishers-dont-use-ai-detection-tools/>
- Stokel-Walker, C. (2023). ChatGPT listed as author on research papers: Many scientists disapprove. *Nature*, *613*(7945), 620–621. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00107-z>
- Walters, W. H., & Wilder, E. I. (2023). Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by ChatGPT. *Scientific Reports*, *13*(1), 14045. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-41032-5>