

Consultation Round 2 — Preparatory reading

Kari D. Weaver, Kiera McNeice, Mike Perkins, Natalya Tsibulyak, Sergio Santamarina, Lorelei Lingard, Bert Seghers

Published 8 July 2026 — v4.5

0 — Context

Towards a Global Reporting Standard for AI Disclosure in Research

AI is a powerful tool. It is not as simple as a hammer, but more like a car. A car is only safe and useful because of the rules, skills, and systems built around it: traffic laws, driver training, road design, and shared responsibility between drivers. Like a car, AI's value depends on the rules, skills, and governance we build around it. It requires ongoing regulation, user education, and shared accountability, so that AI can be used responsibly in research.

The fast uptake of AI in research is a collective transformation for science. We are all learning and adapting in this phase of transition.



This consultation is part of a global, multi-stakeholder effort to develop a **global reporting standard for AI disclosure** in research articles. It has three consultation rounds. This document accompanies the [second round](#) (July-October 2026). The initiative forms the Focus Track of the World Conference on Research Integrity 2026 and is supported by ISC, STM, COPE and the GYA. [More about this initiative](#)

The goal is to support **consistent, meaningful and proportionate disclosure¹ of AI use in research**, with shared, clear expectations. By standardising how we disclose AI use, we create the "traffic rules" that allow the research community to collectively harness AI's immense potential while minimising the risks.

[More about the goals of AI disclosure and its standardisation](#)

The eventual global reporting standard for AI disclosure is intended to cover:

- all tasks in the research life cycle that might influence results, interpretation or reporting;
- all kinds of AI agents and tools that could contribute to research, not only large language models (LLMs);
- disclosure in peer-reviewed research articles only (for now²).

¹ We use "disclosure" to mean any "information about the use/contributions of AI, provided in the research article for transparency purposes". It could cover information in the main part of the manuscript, or a separate statement at the end of the article, or both.

² Other research outputs — such as grant proposals, peer review reports, datasets, and code — also need shared expectations for AI disclosure and documentation. But reaching consensus on disclosure for peer-reviewed articles alone is already a significant challenge. We focus on articles first. The standard could serve as an inspiration for AI disclosure standards covering other outputs.

What we learned in Round 1

- AI might change how research is done. But the **principles** of research integrity, transparency and accountability **do not change**. Authors transparently describe their methods and acknowledge work that's not their own. So transparency about AI contributions to research is logical.
- Researchers should reflect on responsible AI use. A disclosure standard can **foster** such **reflection**. It should not become a box-ticking exercise or a policing instrument for control or punishment. The use of AI in and of itself should not be stigmatised.
- AI disclosure requirements should be clear and easy to understand. Researchers at every career stage and in every research community should know what is expected of them, and why. A reporting standard is developed in **service of** this **cultural change**: in support of genuine reflection, mindful documentation, and meaningful transparency.
- Disclosure should include what AI was used for, and how it may have influenced research results.
- A disclosure expectation should be **proportionate**, distinguishing between minor assistive use and substantive contribution replacing researcher decision-making.
- A global reporting standard should be **structured**, to enable comparability and interoperability with existing infrastructures. This common core structure should be balanced with room for **flexible descriptions**, to account for the diverse needs of different research domains.
- A global standard must be **inclusive**. It should not be harder to follow for researchers in communities and regions with limited infrastructure or with less institutional support.
- **Human responsibility and accountability remain essential**. AI in research raises questions about oversight and verification.
- A **living standard**: As AI tools and practices develop fast, we need an **adaptable** reporting standard, and a **process for updates**.

Key open questions: the topics of round 2

1. **Which AI use should be disclosed?** (Thresholds)
2. **Where in the article should it be disclosed?** (Placement)
3. **How should it be structured?** (Taxonomy)
4. **Should non-empty AI disclosure be mandatory?**
5. **How to signal responsibility and accountability?**

1 — Which AI use should be disclosed? (Thresholds)

Not all AI use is equally significant. Some uses may improve efficiency with little impact on content, while others shape important parts of the work. Round 1 showed that reporting should be **proportional to the level of AI involvement**. Substantive use requires disclosure. Minimal or marginal use may require only minimal or no disclosure.

*A central question for a reporting standard is therefore: **which uses of AI should be disclosed?***

To ensure consistency, comparability, and fairness, we need a **shared understanding** of what is “disclosure-worthy” AI use. However, expectations may differ across disciplines. For example, AI-assisted language editing may be seen as substantive in some fields (philosophy, for instance), but routine in others.

Proposed qualitative threshold

Based on Round 1 results and discussions within the core team, we propose a qualitative³ threshold and explanation:

AI use should be disclosed if it substantively shapes or replaces human judgement, or has another substantive influence on research processes or its reporting.

To decide whether an influence is “substantive”, researchers should ask: would a disciplinary peer — whether a reviewer or a reader — reasonably need to know about the use of AI to understand how the research was conducted, or to assess the reliability or validity of the published work?

In particular, researchers should consider:

(1) any cases where **human judgement** was shaped or influenced by AI outputs, or was delegated to an AI tool, for decisions that would typically be made by (expert) human researchers — *even if a human researcher later validated or verified the result*;

(2) the extent to which AI use influenced the **research process OR reported content**, *in a way that affects meaning, interpretation, or results* — for example in study design, data generation, data processing, analysis, or interpretation of the results, OR in generating or shaping text, figures, code, or other material included in the publication;

(3) the **cumulative effect** of multiple or repeated AI uses, even when each individual use seems minor.

Disclosure is generally *not required* for purely technical or minor AI uses that do not affect meaning, interpretation or substance — such as spellchecking, grammar correction, polishing, or formatting.

This *threshold* defines a *minimum requirement* only. Researchers may disclose more than required if they wish to do so. In case of doubt, disclosure is advised.

[1A] What are your views on the proposed disclosure threshold? / Which (types/levels of) AI use in research should be disclosed? [Open text]

In other words: What AI use should always be disclosed, in your view? What determines that threshold? You may also reflect on (a) how “substantive” AI use should be defined in your field, and (b) whether the proposed criterium should be changed, refined or supplemented (for example with quantitative criteria).

³ An alternative would be to define *quantitative* thresholds for disclosure. For a quantitative threshold to be meaningful, there must be a reasonably objective way to calculate it, but there is no single or clear way to determine a quantitative value for what proportion of research outcomes were influenced by AI tools. Consequently, we propose a qualitative threshold with no quantitative criteria.

[1B] If you are able or wish so: **please include three examples of AI use** (from your field): **one that would require disclosure, one that would not, and one where you doubt.** [Open text]

[1C] **Where would you put yourself on the following spectrum?** [Tick one]

- ☐ All AI use should be disclosed, without exceptions.
- ☐ More AI use should be disclosed than the above threshold says (but not all).
- ☐ In between — about as much as the above threshold says.
- ☐ Less AI use should be disclosed than the above threshold says (but still some should).
- ☐ AI use should never be disclosed.
- ☐ Unsure / no opinion

[1D] **To what extent do you agree with the following statements?** [Tick one per row]

	Strong agree	Rather agree	No opinion	Rather disagree	Strong disagree	Unsure / no opinion
AI use should be disclosed when it substantively influences the research process, interpretation, reported content, or results.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The standard should define a minimum disclosure threshold, while allowing authors to disclose more if they wish.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Routine spelling, grammar correction, reference formatting, or cosmetic editing should require disclosure.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Repeated minor uses of AI can become disclosure-worthy when their cumulative influence shapes the work.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Reading continues on next page.

2 — Where should AI use be disclosed? (Placement)

There are two main approaches.

Integrated in relevant sections of the article

Dispersed and contextual

AI use is described in the same way as any other tool used in the research process: in existing parts of the article such as the literature review, methods, results or figure captions.

- + Follows existing research reporting practices
- + Puts the use of AI in relevant research contexts
- + Supports detailed methodological transparency
- Information about AI use may be scattered throughout the article, making it harder to find
- Harder to compare AI use across articles
- Some AI uses may not fit naturally into existing main content sections
- May increase the length of the main article text (journal space may be limited)

A separate AI disclosure statement

Centralised and comparable

AI use is disclosed in a dedicated section at the beginning or end of the article, comparable to (and published near) author contribution statements, conflict of interest statements, or acknowledgments.

- + Easy to find — all information about AI use in one place
- + Easier to standardise and compare across articles (including by automated tools)
- + Allows disclosure that does not fit into any existing article sections or reporting practices
- May lose meaning when separated from relevant research context
- May promote compliance over methodological transparency
- Singles out AI as a unique technology requiring disclosure (which may risk stigmatisation)
- This would set a new industry-wide practice, that may only be temporarily relevant — locking in a transitional structure that may feel obsolete once AI use becomes fully normalised

[2A] Where should AI use be disclosed? [Tick one]

- ☐ Only integrated into the article — no need for a separate statement.
- ☐ Both the main article content and a separate standalone statement can include information on AI use.
- ☐ Only in a separate statement — no need to include information on AI use in the article content.
- ☐ No opinion / none of the above

[2B] If you checked ‘both’: what locations would be most appropriate for which kinds of information?

[Open text]

[2C] Do you want to share other comments on placement (location) of AI disclosure? [Open text]

You can share further details or thoughts, such as e.g. other benefits or drawbacks of content-integrated or separate disclosure.

3 — How should AI disclosure be structured? (Taxonomy)

For AI use *that meets the threshold for disclosure*, the next question is: **how should this information be structured?** This question is independent of where disclosure happens.

To make disclosure **consistent and comparable**, Round 1 showed broad support for a **structured format**, where AI use is classified using a taxonomy of **research and reporting tasks**. This helps readers understand *where* and *how* AI was used, regardless of where AI use is disclosed.

Proposed taxonomy

Based on the results of Round 1, a review of existing AI disclosure standards, and discussion within the core team, we propose 18 controlled categories (a “taxonomy”) to serve as a framework for disclosing AI use in research tasks. The proposed list of research tasks is:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. <i>Idea generation</i> | 10. <i>Computer code generation/refinement/auditing</i> |
| 2. <i>Hypothesis development</i> | 11. <i>Data cleaning/preprocessing/auditing</i> |
| 3. <i>Literature search</i> | 12. <i>Quantitative data analysis</i> |
| 4. <i>Literature summarization</i> | 13. <i>Qualitative data analysis</i> |
| 5. <i>Design > Study design / experiment design</i> | 14. <i>Data visualization</i> |
| 6. <i>Design > Data collection methodology</i> | 15. <i>Figure or image generation</i> |
| 7. <i>Design > Data analysis plan</i> | 16. <i>Drafting manuscript or abstract text</i> |
| 8. <i>Data collection (operations / activities)</i> | 17. <i>Translation</i> |
| 9. <i>Data creation</i> | 18. <i>Editing or rewriting including of reference lists</i> |

In the eventual reporting standard, each category title will include a definition.

This proposal does not include tasks such as “project management” or “funding acquisition”, as AI use in these areas is not likely to affect what is reported in a research article (it doesn’t meet the disclosure threshold).

Different fields could also develop sub-categories appropriate to their specific research processes. More granularity makes disclosure clearer and more comparable, but it may also increase the reporting burden on researchers.

The proposed list provides a set of standardised categories for describing AI use: a *shared vocabulary*. It does not determine a reporting format. Regardless of the placement options discussed before, these categories can be used to structure a standalone disclosure statement, or as controlled terminology within the manuscript itself (for example, in the methods section).

[3A] How adequate is the proposed 18-category taxonomy for classifying AI use (in your field)?

[Tick one]

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Fully adequate as written | ☐ Too detailed or burdensome |
| ☐ Mostly adequate, but some category titles need minor changes | ☐ Not detailed enough |
| ☐ Mostly adequate, but a few categories are missing | ☐ Not suitable for my field |
| | ☐ Unsure / no opinion |

[3B] What are your views on the proposed taxonomy? [Open text]

We particularly invite feedback on (a) the level of granularity; (b) missing research tasks that could require disclosure; (c) ambiguity; (d) overlap; (e) discipline-specific requirements.

Please note that the taxonomy is merely a classification of research tasks. It doesn’t require *all* AI use in these categories to be disclosed — only AI use that meets agreed thresholds.

4 — Should non-empty AI disclosure be mandatory?

If authors do not disclose any use of AI in their manuscript (no information on AI use at all), what does that mean? Today, this might mean that they have ...

- ... not used any AI tools, or
- ... used AI tools, but not in a way they consider substantive, or
- ... used AI tools in substantive ways, but *decided not to disclose* this, or
- ... not considered whether AI tools had a substantive impact on their research.

The last two options are not good practice, but are common. The **use of AI tools is currently underreported** in research publications (Khan, 2026). In a future where AI use *and AI disclosure* will be normalised and destigmatised, one could assume that no information on AI use means that there was no substantive use of AI (meeting the threshold for disclosure). We are not yet in that future today.

How can the Global Reporting Standard for AI Disclosure help this culture change? An option suggested by many Consultation Round 1 respondents, was **to make non-empty disclosure mandatory**. This means including an explicit confirmation such as: *“Apart from the AI uses disclosed here, the authors did not use any AI that meets the threshold for disclosure.”*

Similar to mandatory COI statements (including “The authors declare no conflict of interest”), making a non-empty AI disclosure mandatory would also introduce *negative disclosures* or *null declarations*, such as *“The authors did not use any AI that meets the threshold for disclosure.”*

Disclosure expected only when AI is used

Journal policies have their policies and requirements for AI disclosure. All authors are assumed to comply with these, so no disclosure means no AI use.

- + Aligns with disclosure of other tools and software
- Simply agreeing to a publisher’s policy on AI disclosure (☑) may not be enough to guarantee accurate reporting
- The ambiguity of no disclosure remains

Mandatory non-empty disclosure (including “null”)

Journals require a non-empty AI disclosure, making explicit that non-disclosed AI use underlying the research is to be considered non-substantive.

- + May improve accurate and honest reporting, and could support culture change, at least temporarily
- + Avoids the ambiguity of no disclosure
- + Aligns with policies for disclosure of conflicts of interest (same goal: for readers to judge reliability)
- Singles out AI as a unique technology requiring negative disclosure which may risk stigmatisation
- A new mandatory declaration could place a disproportionate burden on authors, reviewers, and publishers.
- This would set a new industry-wide practice, that may only be temporarily relevant (transition)

[4A] To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strong agree	Rather agree	No opinion	Rather disagree	Strong disagree	Unsure / no opinion
Journals should require authors to include a non-empty disclosure (including a negative disclosure when they have not substantively used AI)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Agreement with a publisher policy on AI disclosure is convincing enough to trust that AI reporting was accurate.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[4B] What is your view on mandatory non-empty AI disclosure, including the introduction of “null” disclosures? [\[Open text\]](#)

You could (i) consider conditions under which mandatory disclosure makes sense, or (ii) suggest possible formulations, or (iii) give guidance on where journals would expect such disclosure (main content vs. separate statement).

5 — How to signal responsibility and accountability?

There is strong agreement that (i) AI **cannot be an author**; and (ii) humans remain **fully responsible** for research content. *How* this responsibility should be **shown in disclosure** is still open.

5.1 — A general responsibility statement?

The authors take full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of this work. (AITD)

Responsibility for the final manuscript lies entirely with the authors. GAI tools are not listed as authors and do not bear responsibility for the final outcomes. (GAIDeT)

The authors are fully responsible for the content of the published work and can be held accountable for its content, regardless of how much AI was used.

+ Some are in favour of including a statement of responsibility in all articles. This makes an implicit principle explicit, and may make authors reflect and improve oversight. Adding a public statement to the article is stronger than ticking a box to declare this to journal editors.

— Some see no value in this. Authors confirm their responsibility when submitting their manuscripts, making these statements redundant. Requiring a generic statement risks becoming a “box-ticking” exercise in practice, and therefore is unlikely to meet the goals of further reflection and oversight.

[5A] **Should a general responsibility statement be part of AI disclosure?** [Tick one]

- ☐ Yes, a default statement should be part of the disclosure standard.
- ☐ A responsibility statement can be meaningful, but it should be voluntary and form-free — not part of the disclosure standard.
- ☐ No, a responsibility statement is not necessary.

[5B] **What is your view on (general) responsibility statements?** [Open text]

You could give the reason for your answer above, or suggest possible formulations.

5.2 — Documenting verification and oversight?

The second focus track session at the World Conference highlighted accountability concerns about AI use in science, with “verification of AI outputs” as the highest-ranking risk. Are appropriate “oversight” strategies in place to ensure validity and reliability? Participants named the relevance of verification (human checking, cross-checking, review by specialised AI agents) and documentation (e.g. audit trails, AI output logs).

(generic) The authors reviewed and edited all AI-generated content.

(rigorous) All AI-generated content was reviewed by at least two authors, independently verified against primary sources, benchmarked where applicable, and the content approved by all co-authors.

(descriptive, ex1) Author A re-ran all analyses using established scripts and validated the results against raw data. Author B cross-checked AI-assisted interpretations with known material properties and prior studies. Only results confirmed through these steps were included in the final analysis.

(descriptive, ex2) Author X reviewed and revised all generated survey questions to remove biased wording and to ensure alignment with research objectives. The revised survey was pilot-tested, and discrepancies between AI suggestions and participant understanding were corrected before data collection. Author Y checked all studies cited in the references against the original publications to confirm that findings were represented correctly.

+ Some argue that researchers should describe how they have ensured human accountability, for example by explicitly describing measures taken to validate AI outputs, mitigate risks and biases, and ensure the reliability of conclusions based on AI outputs.

— Some would find the reporting burden of this documentation disproportionately heavy, even excessive. So it is not evident to expect or even require such documentation in any way.

[5C] **What information about verification and oversight of AI use, if any, should authors disclose to be meaningful and feasible?** (e.g. in your research context) [Open text]

What would allow a reader, reviewer, editor, or institution to understand whether appropriate oversight took place? Which risks do you want to understand the mitigations of (hallucination, inaccuracy, data security, bias, copyright, IP ...)? You may suggest guidance for the standard or describe practices from your own field.

For example,

- Should such documentation be structured or narrative?
- Should it be brief or detailed?
- Should authors disclose what AI did, what humans checked, and what could not be checked?

[5D] **Where should verification and oversight information be findable?** [Tick all that apply]

Multiple answer possibilities are possible. Check all that could include such information.

- ☐ In the article’s main content (sections)
- ☐ In a separate statement in the article
- ☐ In a repository, as complementary materials
- ☐ Available on demand for reviewers, readers, journal (request to the corresponding author)
- ☐ It’s good practice to record these, but they should not be accessible to readers (only for investigation)
- ☐ None of the above: verification and oversight information should not be recorded
- ☐ Unsure / No opinion

[5E] **To what extent is it desirable that authors include the following information (in the context of verification and oversight) when AI tools are substantively used** (in your field)? [Tick one per line]

	Essential	Very desirable	Moderately desirable	Perhaps desirable	Not desirable	Unsure
Which risks were considered and mitigated, such as hallucinations, inaccuracies, bias, privacy, data security, copyright, or IP concerns	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
What aspects of the work were reviewed, verified, or corrected by humans	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How sources, citations, factual claims, data, or outputs were checked against reliable sources or primary data	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Any limitations in verification, including aspects of AI outputs that could not be fully checked	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Whether records of AI interactions, prompts, logs, or audit trails were retained, and under what conditions they are accessible	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Who (which human) was responsible for oversight and verification of each AI use (comparable to information in an author contribution statement)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[5F] **What do you think a Reporting Standard should advise with respect to making verification and oversight transparent?** [Open text]

Or anything else you would like to share about signalling responsibility and accountability in research papers, when AI was substantively used?

6 — Summary and other feedback

Question 6: **Are there any thoughts about AI disclosure, the preparatory reading or the process of this focus track you would like to share with us?** [Open text]

This question is optional. Feel free to leave it blank.

References

Khan, Z. (2026). AI: Researchers underreport use in journal submissions, analysis suggests. *BMJ*, 392, s194. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.s194>

