

# AI use in publishing

## Best practices

**Tufts guidance:** The [Tufts Generative AI Usage Guidelines for Faculty, Staff, and Students](#), particularly guidelines #1-4, provide an overarching framework for AI use in scholarship.

**Publisher & funder policies:** More specifically, each major publisher has AI guidelines for authors that lay out which types of AI use are permitted and which are prohibited, and how AI use should be disclosed. Consult the guidelines for the publisher(s) you publish with most often to ensure your use of AI is in line with their policies.

Many funders also provide guidance. For example, [2026 guidance from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services](#).

Researchers are beginning to share **practical recommendations** to develop your own workflows and best practices for using AI regardless of where you're publishing:

- [Eight things to actually do](#), in a newsletter by Dr. Gustavo Monnerat, Deputy Editor at the Lancet Group
- [Our recommendations for the use of AI Language bots for scientific communication](#), in an editorial by a large group of researchers (see the text box at the end of the article)

Across these resources, **key themes** have emerged: verify all output from AI, keep track of your usage and disclose as appropriate, and remember that you are ultimately responsible and accountable for all ideas and content in your published work.

## Resources

- UC Davis maintains a [list of links to many publisher policies](#)
- See [Table 1](#) in [Chigwada & Ngulube \(2026\)](#) for a summary of where publisher policies typically align around types of AI use, and where you should pay particular attention to your specific publisher's policies where there is not yet consensus in the academic community
- The Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information (CASRAI) provides [template language](#) for AI disclosure statements

## Case studies

Take a look at these three case studies for real life examples of AI in the publishing process.

- 1) Issues with a published clinical image ([Retraction Watch](#))
- 2) Read the section "Journalistic Sin" on paraphrasing ([Generative AI in the Newsroom](#))
- 3) Multiple citation errors in an opinion piece ([Retraction Watch](#))

For each case, consider the following questions:

- 1) What is surprising or interesting to you about this case study?
- 2) Which of the [Tufts Generative AI Usage Guidelines for Faculty, Staff, and Students](#) could help avoid/address these issues?
- 3) Look up the generative AI guidelines of a publisher you have worked with. How would they respond to this case?