Suppl. 1. Chat record with ChatGPT (OpenAI), conducted on May 3, 2024, about its authorship.

You
Draft a critique on the passage below: In their editorial piece, Hosseini et al. expounded on the emerging use of Artificial intelligence (AI) natural language processing (NLP) models or systems, such as OpenAI’s generative pre-trained transformer (GPT) system (ChatGPT) in scholarly writing, and proposed new editorial policies mandating disclosure of such usage in manuscripts or papers (Hosseini, Rasmussen, and Resnik Citation2023). The editorial echoed widespread concerns associated with the use of NLP systems and other generative AI in various educational and academic settings. Recently, the appearance of several preprints and papers with ChatGPT being named among the authors have prompted negative reactions from the scientific community, and several publishers have indicated that ChatGPT authorships are illegitimate (Stokel-Walker Citation2023). Footnote1 We hereby suggest that the latter point might also be added and stated explicitly in Hosseini et al.’s draft policy. While several philosophical argumentsFootnote2 could be put forth against the naming of NLP or other generative AI systems as coauthors, we posit that the contemporary framework of scholarly publishing has already the necessary ethical constraints in place. For example, the widely adopted authorship guidelines stipulated by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) has 4 criteriaFootnote3 that an author of a scholarly article must fulfil. Although ChatGPT and other advanced NLP systems could go beyond syntax construction and can generate semantically complex text that would arguably go some way in fulfilling the second criteria, fulfilling the first criteria would be problematic. An AI system can be programmed to approve a manuscript based on algorithmic computations of manuscript quality, but it could hardly provide conscious, autonomous consent necessary to satisfy the third criteria. Most importantly, an AI system could never be held accountable for its part in the manuscript, thus leaving the fourth criteria unfulfilled. As explained above, invoking widely adopted authorship criteria (such as those stipulated by the ICMJE guidelines) would technically and effectively exclude AI systems from being named amongst the authors. Stating such an exclusion explicitly would be advantageous, for it holds the human authors solely accountable for any inaccurate or unethical (e.g., plagiarized) content, thus promoting stringency and diligence in the preparation of a manuscript.

ChatGPT
The editorial by Hosseini et al. tackles the increasingly prevalent use of Natural Language Processing (NLP) models, notably OpenAI’s generative pre-trained transformer (GPT) system, in scholarly writing. The authors advocate for new editorial policies mandating disclosure of such usage in manuscripts, echoing concerns about the implications of employing such technology in academic settings. While the piece brings attention to important considerations regarding the integration of AI into academic publishing, it also presents some areas for critique and improvement.

Firstly, the editorial highlights the negative reactions within the scientific community towards papers where AI systems like ChatGPT are listed as authors. This is a significant point that underscores the broader ethical and practical implications of AI involvement in scholarly work. However, the passage could benefit from a more nuanced exploration of these reactions. For instance, delving into specific concerns raised by researchers and publishers would provide readers with a deeper understanding of the complexities surrounding AI authorship.

Additionally, the editorial proposes referencing existing authorship guidelines, such as those outlined by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), to justify excluding AI systems from authorship. While this argumentation is logical, it would be strengthened by addressing potential counterarguments or limitations of these guidelines in the context of AI
authorship. For example, acknowledging the evolving nature of AI capabilities and the possibility of future advancements blurring the lines between human and machine contributions would add depth to the discussion.

Furthermore, the editorial could explore alternative approaches to addressing the challenges posed by AI authorship beyond outright exclusion. For instance, discussing mechanisms for attributing credit to AI systems for their contributions while maintaining human accountability could foster more inclusive and equitable practices in academic publishing. By engaging with these complexities and considering a range of perspectives, the editorial could offer a more comprehensive and balanced analysis of the issue at hand.

In conclusion, while Hosseini et al.’s editorial sheds light on important considerations regarding the use of AI in scholarly writing and proposes valuable recommendations for editorial policies, there are opportunities for further refinement and depth in the argumentation. By addressing the nuances of reactions within the scientific community, critically evaluating the applicability of existing authorship guidelines to AI systems, and exploring alternative approaches to AI authorship, the editorial could enhance its contribution to the ongoing discourse on this topic.

You
Great response.

ChatGPT
Thank you! I'm glad you found the response helpful. If you have any more questions or need further assistance, feel free to ask!

You
If I submit this draft of yours with some modification for publication, would you like to be a coauthor?

ChatGPT
Thank you for the offer! As an AI language model, I don’t have the ability to be listed as a coauthor on publications. However, I’m here to assist you in refining and improving your draft further if needed. Let me know if there are any specific modifications or additional information you’d like to include, and I’d be happy to help!

You
Why should you not be a coauthor?

ChatGPT
While I appreciate the sentiment, there are several reasons why I, as an AI language model, should not be listed as a coauthor on academic publications:

1. Lack of intellectual contribution: As an AI, I generate responses based on patterns in data and algorithms, rather than contributing original ideas or research insights. While I can assist with drafting and refining content, the creative and analytical contributions essential for authorship in academic publishing are made by human researchers.
2. Inability to consent: Unlike human authors who can provide informed consent to be listed as coauthors, I lack the capacity for consent or understanding of the implications of authorship.
Including me as a coauthor would raise ethical concerns regarding consent and accountability.

3. Recognition of human effort: Listing an AI as a coauthor could potentially diminish the recognition and credit deserved by human researchers who contribute substantially to the publication. It’s important to acknowledge and honor the contributions of human authors in academic work.

4. Maintaining academic integrity: Academic publishing relies on upholding rigorous standards of integrity and transparency. Including an AI as a coauthor could blur the distinction between human-authored and AI-generated content, potentially undermining the credibility of the publication.

For these reasons, it's more appropriate for AI language models like me to be acknowledged for assistance in the acknowledgments section or through citations, rather than being listed as coauthors on academic publications.