

EDITORIAL

AI in Research Publications: A Double-Edged Sword

Enoka Corea  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1450-2098>, Himani Molligoda  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9216-9035>,
Co-Editors, Chat GPT

Keywords: artificial intelligence, research publications

© Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are attributed and materials are shared under the same license.



Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping the landscape of research publications, offering both unprecedented opportunities and significant challenges. As tools for data analysis, writing assistance, and literature review become more sophisticated, the role of AI in academic research is no longer optional but inevitable.

One of the most notable advantages of AI is efficiency. AI-powered tools can analyze vast datasets in seconds, identify patterns that might escape human researchers, and accelerate the research cycle. In academic publishing, AI assists with language editing, reference management, plagiarism detection, and even peer-review support. For researchers, especially those from non-English-speaking backgrounds, AI can enhance clarity and accessibility, helping valuable research reach a wider audience. Additionally, AI-driven discovery tools can uncover relevant literature more comprehensively, reducing oversight and duplication of work.

However, the disadvantages are equally compelling. A major concern is the erosion of academic integrity. Overreliance on AI-generated text can blur authorship boundaries, raising questions about originality, accountability, and intellectual ownership. If not transparently disclosed, AI assistance may undermine trust in published research. Bias is another critical issue: AI systems are trained on existing data, which may reflect historical, cultural, or disciplinary biases, potentially reinforcing inequities in research outcomes and publication practices.

There is also the risk of superficial scholarship. While AI can generate fluent text, it does not possess genuine understanding or critical judgment. This may encourage the production of polished but shallow manuscripts, prioritizing quantity over quality. Furthermore, unequal

access to advanced AI tools could widen the gap between well-funded institutions and researchers in low-resource settings.

In conclusion, AI in research publications is a powerful tool, not a substitute for human intellect. Its benefits can be transformative if guided by clear ethical standards, transparency, and responsible use. The challenge for the academic community is not whether to use AI, but how to integrate it in ways that strengthen, rather than compromise, the credibility and rigor of scholarly research.

References

1. Elsevier. (2023). The use of artificial intelligence in scientific writing and publishing. Elsevier Publishing Ethics.
2. Nature Editorial. (2023). Tools such as ChatGPT threaten transparent science. *Nature*, 613(7945), 612. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00191-1>
3. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). (2023). Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work.
4. Lund, B. D., Wang, T., Mannuru, N. R., et al. (2023). ChatGPT and scholarly publishing: A review. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 49(1), 102594.
5. UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence.