GENERATIVE AI POLICIES

RUPKATHA JOURNAL ON INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES IN HUMANITIES

1. Introduction

In the wake of the recent intervention of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI), it has become imperative to formulate comprehensive AI Policies for the Rupkatha Journal for all concerned to ensure ethical use, transparency, and accountability in AI applications. Tools like ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, Claude, NovelAI, Jasper AI, DALL-E, Midjourney, Runway, DeepSeek, Grammarly, etc., are increasingly used in scholarly writings. This new development has positive and negative implications for higher education and research.

At the Rupkatha Journal, we have published on Digital Humanities and AI since 2015. We understand that AI is evolving, and we cannot precisely anticipate what forms it will take, for instance, after five years. The current policies and guidelines are developed considering the present scenarios. The AI policies will evolve in several key areas to keep pace with advancements and address emerging ethical concerns:

- Ethical Use and Fairness
- Transparency and Explainability
- Privacy and Data Protection
- Security and Safety
- Intellectual Property and Attribution
- Human-AI Collaboration
- Regulation and Governance

Therefore, all parties involved with the journal are encouraged to note these policies to understand the benefits and potential challenges of Generative AI.

2. The Possibilities

The Rupkatha Journal is enthusiastic about certain positive aspects of AI technologies:

1. **Constant Personal Guide**: AI tools can play the role of an instant guide for a flashed idea to be further generated, verified and developed to a planning level. Similarly, different ideas can be explored and sorted with proper prompts.
2. **Exploring Possibilities**: AI tools can be used effectively to explore the possibilities of a research work. The human mind can catch the right options through a cognitive process helped by empirical human experience.

3. **Versatile Machine-Linguist**: AI tools empowered with large language models can play the role of versatile linguists in translating different language contents to a practicable level. Upon verification, the contents can be used for research.
4. **Testing Models and Frameworks**: AI models will be helpful in testing models and frameworks before being included in actual research.
5. **Minimising Scholarly Communication Bias**: Unlike traditional scholarly search engines, AI models will increasingly provide better search results contextually with relevant links to hitherto ignored results from low-ranking journals. Greater emphasis on content rather than the sources of the content will thus minimise bias in scholarly communication and dissemination of research.

3. The Challenges

Despite the promises of AI, at present, there are certain pitfalls of using AI in scholarly research:

- **Inaccuracies, Falsities and Biases**: The present algorithms working with the AI models may not always give accurate outputs, which may be inaccurate, false and biased. A human not an expert in the field may not find them and can accept them as true. AI may inadvertently perpetuate stereotypes, cultural biases, or offensive material.
- **Problems of Attribution**: AI models struggle to include accurate attributions because they lack training data, contextual understanding, real-time references, and proper algorithms. In many cases, AI tools produce false citations with false page numbers. So, a researcher should never trust the AI outputs.
- **Infringement of Intellectual Property**: The lack or absence of accurate attribution leads to a violation of IPR, data security and confidentiality. This poses significant risks for users, including potential breaches of sensitive information and insufficient safeguards against the misuse or unauthorized distribution of proprietary content.
- **Data Privacy**: The data used as prompts may contain sensitive or personal information, which can be collected from the backends and used for unintended purposes. This raises concerns about the potential for data breaches.
- **Ethical Dilemmas**: Generative AI poses many ethical questions regarding its use in scholarly matters.
- **Regulatory Compliance**: The rapid development of generative AI has outpaced regulatory frameworks and led to uncertainties regarding legal compliance and accountability.
- **User Dependency**: Users might become dependent on AI-generated content rather than developing their own ideas. Over-reliance on generative AI tools can lead to a decrease in critical thinking.

4. Authors' Responsibilities and Use of Generative AI Tools

Authors' Responsibilities

Authors must understand that they are solely responsible for the content they submit to us. This responsibility cannot be shifted to anyone else. Authors must note the above caveat and submit content under the ethical standards given below.

Ethical Use of AI

1. The Rupkatha Journal allows the use of AI only to **improve the readability and language** of the content to a practicable degree.
2. It does **NOT support** the use of AI in the **Literature Review process** as it may result in inaccurate, faulty and biased presentation.
3. It does **NOT support the creation of models, graphical content, maps, figures, and images** unless they are part of an experiment involving AI models in specific AI research.
4. It does **NOT support the use of AI for statistical or any kind of quantitative analysis** unless it is part of an experiment involving AI models in specific AI research.
5. It does **NOT support** the inclusion of any form of AI coding unless it is part of an experiment involving AI models in specific AI research.
6. It does **NOT support and accept AI-dictated article structuring**. The argumentative structure should be free from AI intervention.
7. Qualitative research must be based on human perception, logic, and empirical experience. AI cannot be used as an alternative to human reasoning.
8. Using AI to **translate** any text and include it in an article is **NOT** allowed.
9. Using AI to fix the title of an article is NOT recommended, as it may lead to redundancy and affect the originality of the title.
10. Using AI to prepare the Reference Section/Works Cited part is not recommended as it may contain inaccuracies with the data.
11. Using AI in preparing the **Bio-notes** of the author/s is **NOT** recommended as AI tools prepare vague and recognisable texts with unnecessary content inflation.
12. Generative AI tools must not be cited as an authority/author.
13. The use of AI in exceptional cases, as mentioned above, must be clearly acknowledged with all the specifications of the AI tools.

The conclusion is that a work of research before submission must be conducted, completed and prepared with active human supervision. Ultimately, an author is responsible, accountable and answerable for the content.

Steps Against Unethical Use

- Any unethical use of AI will result in outright desk rejection of an article. It will not be sent for peer review.
- In the cases of blatant use of AI, the authors will be blacklisted. The act may even be communicated to the concerned institution.

5. Guidelines for Editors in Using AI

- Editors play the most important roles in ensuring the confidentiality of the peer review process and the privacy and security of submitted research. This responsibility demands the highest level of trust at various levels. All our journal editors are requested to follow our standards to avoid breach of confidentiality and data leakage of both the scholarly contents and author/s' private information while using AI tools.
- Considering the potential breach and leakage, we use standard plagiarism software carefully to detect AI-generated content in an article.
- Editors must not paste portions of a submitted article or upload the entire document in any Generative AI platforms or tools.
- Working with any kind of Generative software for the purpose of analysing any submitted content is forbidden for the editors.
- Editors must not use Generative AI for editorial communications like emails or portals as it may lead to a violation of the confidentiality and privacy of the authors.

6. Guidelines for Peer Reviewers in Using AI

- While theoretically and practically, it is possible to create and use AI tools for primary peer review, the time has not come yet to use them because of concerns with data protection and privacy. Therefore, peer reviewers are requested not to use any AI tools directly or interactively with the submitted manuscripts.
- They are further requested to avoid using Generative AI tools to summarise any portion of an article, comment on any portion, or prepare the review report.
- Peer reviewers must not paste portions of a submitted article or upload the entire document to any Generative AI platforms or tools.
- Peer reviewers must not use Generative AI for review communications with the editors like emails or portals as it may violate the confidentiality and privacy of content.

First published February 19, 2025.