

Guidelines for Transparency of GenAI Use in Research

Version: 12 March, 2026

When should we disclose AI use

Disclosure strategies should be adopted in line with disciplinary norms and the judgement of the principal investigator about the degree of automation. To help researchers systematize their thinking, we have developed: (1) a taxonomy of increasing levels of GenAI automation of scholarly tasks (pg. 1) and (2) recommended disclosure strategies (pg. 2). We provide this as an aid to researchers and their department as they attempt to **select the appropriate disclosure strategy for different uses of GenAI**. Full guidelines are available at <LINK>

Level of GenAI Automation of Scholarly Task (discipline-specific; examples for each should be identified by relevant experts)	Disclosure Strategy (discipline-specific; to be completed by relevant governing body) Recommended strategy in bold
Minimal <i>Examples for discussion with peers</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sentence-level writing assistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grammar, spelling ● Informal research aid <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alternative to web-search, encyclopedia, stackoverflow, etc. ○ Ideation partner ● Minimal assistance in generating code <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Syntax checking 	<input type="checkbox"/> No disclosure required <input type="checkbox"/> Structured disclosure statement <input type="checkbox"/> AI CRediT disclosure <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed disclosure of process
Low <i>Examples for discussion with peers</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paragraph level writing assistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outlining paragraph structure ○ Re-drafting passages longer than a sentence. ● Low-level assistance in generating code <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Code comment generation ○ Code review for possible bugs, syntax compliance, etc. 	<input type="checkbox"/> No disclosure required <input type="checkbox"/> Structured disclosure statement <input type="checkbox"/> AI CRediT disclosure <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed disclosure of process
Moderate <i>Examples for discussion with peers</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper-level writing assistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outlining paper or argument structure ○ Drafting whole paper sections ● Summarization of prior literature alongside human review ● Argument ideation and refinement ● Mid-level assistance in generating code <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Code refactoring ○ Minor feature addition 	<input type="checkbox"/> No disclosure required <input type="checkbox"/> Structured disclosure statement <input type="checkbox"/> AI CRediT disclosure <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed disclosure of process
High <i>Examples for discussion with peers</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Synthetic data generation ● Summarization of prior literature without human review ● Direct interpretation of primary texts without human review ● High-level assistance in generating code <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agent-based systems 	<input type="checkbox"/> No disclosure required <input type="checkbox"/> Structured disclosure statement <input type="checkbox"/> AI CRediT disclosure <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed disclosure of process

NOT RECOMMENDED: AI as Credited Authors While GenAI usage should be disclosed as appropriate, this does not mean that a GenAI system should be credited as a co-author. Most scholarly organizations, publishers, and citation styles advise against including GenAI systems as authors because the tool cannot take responsibility for the content of the work. See the policies of the [APA](#), [ACM](#), [IEEE](#), [Nature](#), [Springer](#), and [ICJME](#).

How should we disclose AI use

(1) Structured Disclosure Statement

Where there has been a **low to moderate** degree of assistance, we recommend disclosing use of GenAI in the Methods or Acknowledgements of scholarly output, with a simple structured statement which identifies the tool, the task it was used for, and the process of editing its output (if any). [Monash University](#) provides an example:

"I used [ADD AI tool (ADD link if needed)] to [ADD how used]. I modified the outputs in [ADD ways]."

- Explain which AI tools you have used and for what purposes.
- Explain why these tools were selected and provide a URL link to the tool.
- Summarize how you have altered, adopted, or built on the AI output.

Example 1: I acknowledge the use of Microsoft Copilot (version GPT-4, Microsoft, <https://copilot.microsoft.com/>) to summarise my initial notes and to proofread my final draft.

Example 2: I acknowledge the use of [1] ChatGPT [2] (<https://chat.openai.com/>) [3] to refine the academic language and accuracy of my own work. On 4 January 2023 I submitted my entire essay (link to google document here) with the instruction to "Improve the academic tone and accuracy of language, including grammatical structures, punctuation and vocabulary". [4] The output (here) was then modified further to better represent my own tone and style of writing.

(2) AI CRediT Disclosure:

Where there has been a **moderate** degree of assistance, we recommend generating disclosure statements for each scholarly task from the [Contributor Role Taxonomy \(CRediT\)](#). This approach is taken by the [Artificial Intelligence Disclosure Framework](#) which provides an [online statement builder](#).

CRediT Task	Disclosure
Conceptualization	Ideas; formulation or evolution of overarching research goals and aims "I used [ADD AI tool (ADD link if needed)] to [ADD how used] and [ADD number of iterations/drafts]. I modified the outputs in [ADD ways]."
Methodology	Development or design of methodology; creation of models "I used [ADD AI tool (ADD link if needed)] to [ADD how used] and [ADD number of iterations/drafts]. I modified the outputs in [ADD ways]."

Importantly, different disciplines may develop more specialized documentation and disclosure matrices that better capture their scholarly process. Researchers should use their own judgement in modifying documentation templates to fully disclose their use of AI in ways that are consistent with promoting reproducibility, reliability and appropriate attribution.

(3) Detailed Disclosure of Process

In cases where data are generated by GenAI, significant interpretive work is done without human review, or arguments are wholly constructed by GenAI - the risks to reproducibility go up substantially. In circumstances where there has been a **high** degree of assistance, we recommend a full documentation of the process in a lab notebook that lists the prompts, context documents, outputs, model versions and date and time from which information retrieval occurred.

- If relevant, the prompt(s) used to generate a response in the GenAI system.
- The date the output was generated.
- The output obtained (e.g. a 'link to chat' if ChatGPT, or a compilation of all output generated as an appendix).
- How the output was changed for use or incorporation into a piece of work (e.g. a tracked-changes document or a descriptive paragraph).