

# Here, there and Everywhere: On the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Management Research and the Peer-Review Process

Caroline Gatrell<sup>a</sup>  Daniel Muzio<sup>b</sup>  Corinne Post<sup>c</sup>  and Christopher Wickert<sup>d</sup> 

<sup>a</sup>University of Liverpool; <sup>b</sup>University of York; <sup>c</sup>Villanova University; <sup>d</sup>Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

**ABSTRACT** This editorial introduces and explains the *Journal of Management Studies*' (JMS) new policy on artificial intelligence (AI). We reflect on the use of AI in conducting research and generating journal submissions and what this means for the wider JMS community, including our authors, reviewers, editors, and readers. Specifically, we consider how AI-generated research and text could both assist and augment the publication process, as well as harm it. Consequentially, our policy acknowledges the need for careful oversight regarding the use of AI to assist in the authoring of texts and in data analyses, while also noting the importance of requiring authors to be transparent about how, when and where they have utilized AI in their submissions or underlying research. Additionally, we examine how and in what ways AI's use may be antithetical to the spirit of a quality journal like JMS that values both human voice and research transparency. Our editorial explains why we require author teams to oversee all aspects of AI use within their projects, and to take personal responsibility for accuracy in all aspects of their research. We also explain our prohibition of AI's use in peer-reviewers' evaluations of submissions, and regarding editors' handling of manuscripts.

## INTRODUCTION

Debates regarding generative artificial intelligence (AI), rather like the title of the Beatles' song, are presently 'Here, There and Everywhere': AI is featured regularly in the news and is a central focus at many levels and in many contexts. Around the world, academia's stakeholders – including governments, universities, and research institutions – are discussing AI's impact on research and education. For instance, the UK's Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC), which runs the national centre for AI across the tertiary

*Address for reprints:* Christopher Wickert, Department of Management & Organization, School of Business and Economics, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU), De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands ([christopher.wickert@vu.nl](mailto:christopher.wickert@vu.nl)).

education sector, is publishing a wealth of documentation on the use of AI in education and research (JISC, 2021, 2023). The OECD (2023) is examining policies for AI in science, and discussing implications for AI governance, while the United States Senate has just introduced legislation in high-risk AI applications (including use of biometric data) for research, innovation, and accountability (US Senate, n.d.).

Conversations about AI and research tend to focus on one of two (related) questions: ‘research on AI’ and ‘research with AI’.<sup>[1]</sup> ‘Research on AI’ conversations consider AI primarily as an object of research. In the *Journal of Management Studies* (JMS) and other generalist management journals, scholars are studying AI from a range of perspectives including: how AI quantification of remote working could change understandings about productivity (Leonardi, 2021); how AI impacts professional and knowledge-intensive work (Brown et al., 2024; Faulconbridge et al., 2023; Pakarinen and Huising, 2023); in what ways AI and data-driven analytics could alter the evolution of business environments (Haenlein et al., 2019) and how far AI research can develop meaningful insights in organization studies (Raisch and Krakowski, 2021). These are intriguing and exciting conversations that we continue to encourage, and which fit appropriately within JMS’ Aims and Scope.

‘Research with AI’ conversations consider the implications that arise from AI’s increasing embeddedness within our research tools and practices. Regarding research with AI, academics in journals across disciplines (including JMS) are vigorously debating whether, how, and when, AI may benefit research – and at what point it might damage academic integrity (see Cotton et al., 2023; Dupps Jr, 2023; Haenlein et al., 2019; Kulkarni et al., 2023; Leonardi, 2021; Raisch and Krakowski, 2021). Questions are raised regarding to what extent AI solutions may replace human reflexivity and how far AI might undermine responsible management research (Lindebaum and Fleming, 2023; Lindebaum et al. 2023; Moser et al., 2022). Researchers across most sectors are experimenting with, and curious about, the potential of rapidly evolving AI research tools (Dergaa et al., 2023). Given these ongoing and unsettled discussions and discoveries, journal editors, authors, and peer-reviewers alike have expressed uncertainty and ambivalence about how AI might be used in relation to research development and paper submissions, from the perspectives of both authors and peer-reviewers (Curtis, 2023; Garcia, 2023). As a result, journal editors and publishers are increasingly examining the use of AI solutions in the publication process (Eke, 2023).

In light of these fast moving and on-going debates, it seems therefore both timely and appropriate that we, as JMS General Editors, should clarify and state our position regarding research using AI, sharing what we believe is much needed guidance for our authors and reviewers. To that end, the current General Editor team at *Journal of Management Studies* has explored how best to frame JMS policies for the benefit of our community. Our aim is to manage, fairly, both our editorial approach towards submitted papers that may use AI in research, and the peer-review of AI-informed submissions. In this editorial, we explain the thinking process that lies behind the new JMS policy regarding AI usage in terms of the authoring of papers – of all types – that are submitted to our Journal, as well as the peer-reviewing of JMS papers.

We start by reflecting upon the threats and opportunities of conducting research and generating a narrative using AI. We recognize that utilizing AI generative platforms is easy: AI tools are simple to access, user-friendly and capable of generating text that (while

requiring individual adjustment) can appear both sophisticated and convincing (Curtis, 2023; Parilla, 2023). However, we caution that AI may produce results that might appear sufficiently sensible and convincing to enter the review process, but which in practice may be riddled with substantive inaccuracies (Hosseini et al., 2023). We consider to what extent the production of AI-generated research and text might reasonably aid and augment the publication process, and how far it might harm it. In so doing, we explore how and in what ways AI use may be antithetical to the spirit of a quality journal like JMS, that values both human voice and research transparency. Finally, we explore the need for careful oversight in the use of AI to assist in the authoring of texts and in the analysis of qualitative or quantitative data.

Leading up to our statement outlining the new JMS policy on AI (see the policy at the end of this editorial and on the [JMS website](#)), we elaborate on the importance of requiring authors to be transparent about how, when, and where they have utilized AI in their submissions (see Table I for an overview), a crucial consideration that has informed JMS' new policy. In sum, we require that authors oversee all aspects of AI use within their projects, taking personal responsibility for the accuracy of their research to avoid spreading the kind of AI-generated misinformation (what IBM (n.d.) describes as 'hallucinations') that arises if AI tools provide inaccurate or nonsensical responses (Klein, 2023; Shearing, 2023). Our editorial also explains why, at present, we offer no opportunity for AI to be part of the review process. In a nutshell, colleagues' unpublished work is submitted to JMS in confidence; feeding unpublished research into a generative database not only violates this fundamental arrangement of confidence among authors and JMS; it may also prejudice the authors and contribute unverified research to public scrutiny, because all data and information fed to generative AI potentially become part of the knowledge domain.

We conclude with our statement outlining the new JMS policy on AI, which may be amended in the future, but which will continue to reflect JMS' ethos.

## **THREATS AND OPPORTUNITIES OF AI IN THE CONDUCT, REPORTING, AND PEER-REVIEWING OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH**

Journal editors, authors, and peer-reviewers alike have expressed uncertainty and ambivalence about the use of AI in relation to paper submissions and the underlying empirical or conceptual research. These concerns extend to the use of AI in data management and analysis, the production and synthesis of narrative and text, and the development of research ideas and logical arguments. Some see AI as a serious threat to academic integrity and validity. Eke (2023, p. 3), for example (while recognizing that AI can be a 'good academic assistant') expresses concerns about the potential for academic deceit and calls for a multi-stakeholder effort to develop a harmonized approach for defining the use of generative AI systems within academia – while acknowledging that such an aim is challenging and might require a 'redefinition of what constitutes academic achievement' (Eke, 2023, p. 3).

Alternatively, others, like Morgan, writing in *Times Higher Education*, observe how AI is regarded by some scholars as beneficial, offering potential to make the publishing of scholarly research more efficient and accessible. AI might enable more time to do 'actual research', 'lead[ing] to better papers' and 'boost[ing]' opportunities for 'researchers who publish in English but for whom English is not their native language' (Morgan, 2023, p. 19). Discussions thus continue to proliferate as to what extent the use of AI can both augment and harm

Table I. JMS view on how AI can both augment and harm research

<i>Practices of AI use in research</i>	<i>Tools (current examples)</i>	<i>JMS position: How AI could augment and harm research quality</i>	<i>JMS policy</i>
<i>Editing, formatting, and typesetting tools (including references)</i>	ChatGPT	<i>Augmentation</i> These tools automate tasks, which could have previously been outsourced to external service providers (language editors/proof-readers). In some cases, they are more sophisticated evolutions of previously available technologies (endnote)	Use of these tools may be permitted if it is disclosed in the manuscript. It must be visible to all readers, including editors and reviewers. Authors must take personal responsibility for ensuring the reliability and accuracy of the output
	Gemini Quillbot Typeset.io		
<i>Literature review tools</i>	Chatpdf	<i>Augmentation</i> When used to support authors in conducting literature reviews, by helping with searching, sorting, or summarizing sources. As such it provides a starting point for the review exercise	Transparently disclosed and supervised use of these tools may be permitted rather than replaces human authorship. This use needs to be explained and justified in the paper visible to all readers. Authors must take personal responsibility for ensuring the reliability accuracy of the output
	Claude Consensus Scholarcy Scite Semantic scholars		
<i>Analytical tools (Qualitative and quantitative)</i>	Elicit	<i>Augmentation</i> When used as a tool to verify, correct, or corroborate the authors own calculations or interpretations and corroborate human judgement in the analytical process, both in qualitative and quantitative analyses. These tools may also be used to direct authors' attention to potentially interesting aspects of a dataset	Use may be allowed when deployed in a supervised and supportive role. This use must be discussed and explained in detail in the methodology section; Authors must take personal responsibility for ensuring the reliability and accuracy of the output
	Tableau		
		<i>Harm</i> While we generally consider these tools to augment research quality, we caution against taking AI-generated solutions at face value and without critical 'human' verification	
		<i>Harm</i> AI-generated output may be a starting point, but on its own it is often flawed or incomplete. As such it is unreliable if not properly supervised by human judgement	
		<i>Harm</i> When used to dispense of human judgement in drawing inferences from qualitative or quantitative data, it may lead to inaccurate or implausible conclusions	

(Continues)

Table I. (Continued)

<i>Practices of AI use in research</i>	<i>Tools (current examples)</i>	<i>JMS position: How AI could augment and harm research quality</i>	<i>JMS policy</i>
<i>Idea generation, structuring and content generation tools</i>	ChatGPT Claude Elicit Gemini	<i>Augmentation</i> When authors dialogue with AI over the development of a particular idea, which could spark new insights or creative connections  <i>Harm</i> When usage replaces the authors' own ideas and voice, by automating the idea generation, development, and execution process or when authors lose control and abdicate responsibility for the text	Use may be allowed when deployed in a supervised and supportive role. This use must be discussed and explained in detail. It must be visible to all readers, including editors and reviewers. Authors must take personal responsibility for ensuring the reliability and accuracy of the output
<i>Reviewing</i>	ChatGPT Claude Gemini	<i>Harm</i> We seek the personal views of our reviewers on manuscripts. Feeding manuscripts into AI tools would compromise confidentiality and potentially contribute erroneous data into the knowledge domain	Use of AI by reviewers is not allowed
<i>Editing</i>	ChatGPT Claude Gemini	<i>Harm</i> We seek the personal judgement and assessment of our editors on manuscripts. Feeding manuscripts, referee reports or editor letters for proofreading into AI tools would compromise confidentiality and potentially contribute erroneous data into the knowledge domain	Use of AI by editors is not allowed

scholarly research. While we concur that the opportunities of AI to enhance research should be harnessed, we caution, equally, against its potentially damaging effects on integrity.

Of particular concern for scholarly journals is the use of AI in conducting, reporting, and peer-reviewing of research. This concern is reflected across domains – we note how medical journals in particular (due to anxieties about the impact on clinical practice) are ahead of the game, burgeoning with papers that highlight the benefits and downsides of AI for theory, practice, and publication (Curtis, 2023). Specifically, the role of editors and reviewers in managing AI papers is considered by Dupps (2023, p. 665) who (writing about eye surgery) recognizes that AI can assist researchers by augmenting literature reviews and producing arguments – yet may also pose ‘ethical challenges for the academic community’.

While the use of AI is now well established to check quantitative papers for calculation mistakes (Wang, 2023), Dupps emphasizes his worry that content generated by AI may

be less reliable or trustworthy compared with human evaluation of clinical results. Many of the arguments explored within medical journals are relevant across the publication system – and are just as pertinent for management studies as they are in the science, technology, and engineering fields, given that we want to ensure that research published in JMS is rigorous and trustworthy. Such concerns have led to calls for editorial policies about AI that identify standardized peer review protocols. For example, in a letter to the editor of *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, Garcia (2023, pp. 1–2) asks: ‘Do we risk compromising the traditional human-driven peer review process in pursuit of efficiency and innovation, or do we prioritize the preservation of established standards and human expertise?’.

For the JMS editorial team, the problem lies in the fact that AI can produce outputs that appear persuasive and sensible, demonstrating ‘remarkable proficiency in generating human-like text’. Yet such outputs are ‘fallible and may occasionally produce erroneous or misleading information’ (Jarrah et al., 2023, p. 15). For example, the news media has been fascinated with the case of the New York lawyers who presented their arguments in court using precedents generated by AI – only to discover that the examples cited were fake (Milmo, 2023). Illuminating further the point about the fallibility of AI-generated information, Hosseini and Rasmussen (2023, p. 3) critique a short, AI-generated description regarding the beliefs of Immanuel Kant – a piece that seems well written but is ‘completely incorrect’, with potential to mislead readers regarding Kant’s meaning and intent. Writing about paediatric medicine, Curtis (2023) points out his concern that AI has the capacity to create eloquent narratives that could, while seeming to disseminate important medical information, serve to obfuscate inaccuracies and poor-quality research (see also Sweeney, 2023). While management scholars are not conducting clinical procedures, the impact of AI-induced ‘hallucinations’ on management theory and practice could be also very serious. Readers of scholarly papers in high-quality management journals like JMS are expecting rigorous and defensible research on which they can base decisions concerning theory, practice, and education – so it is crucial that papers published by JMS be accurate and reliable.

## **JMS’ POSITION ON THE USE OF AI IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS**

The problem of inaccuracy and misleading information is one that JMS is keen to guard against. From the perspective of JMS, this pressing issue impacts all aspects of the publishing process, and it is important we take steps now to develop and adopt ‘policies on the use of AI in research, given the rapid and unpredictable advances in this technology’ (Hosseini and Rasmussen, 2023, p. 7). Taking into account others’ views, and in light of the ethos of JMS, we seek below to clarify JMS’ stance on AI-generated materials.

For journal editors, the situation is complex. The number of players involved and the consequences of publishing papers that are either AI-generated or peer-reviewed by non-human actors (Dupps Jr, 2023; Garcia, 2023) raises questions. While authors are fully responsible for their manuscripts and the integrity of the underlying research (regardless of whether this involves the use of AI) the reputational fall-out for journals



from retractions and corrigenda is significant. And, while commentators might urge the publishing world to develop software sophisticated enough to detect and keep up with AI technologies as these develop, how realistic is such an aim? (Eke, 2023). Presently, it is possible to feed into generative AI platforms a range of material and to receive a convincing synthesis of what has been submitted, with no guarantee that either a human or computerized eye will be able to detect this (Cotton et al., 2023).

From the perspective of peer-review, how can editors of a high-quality journal like JMS maintain rigorous standards, as well as assure confidentiality, if time-pressed reviewers are feeding manuscripts – or even their notes on manuscripts – into generative AI systems? As Garcia (2023) observes, while recognizing the pressures under which peer-reviewers are working, we cannot maintain the integrity of the review process should reviewers employ a process that is described by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (in relation to peer-review) as generating ‘Authoritative sounding output that can be incorrect, incomplete or biased’ (Garcia, 2023, p. 2). Below, we consider from a JMS perspective the implications for both authorship and peer review of manuscripts.

### **Authorship and AI: Conserving our Ethos**

While the literature on AI and its use in academia is constantly growing and shifting, for us as Editors of JMS the key to answering the question of AI and authorship is perhaps clearer than it might at first seem. We suggest that the position of JMS going forward lies in the purpose and antecedents of our Journal in relation both to the publication of research papers and our expectations of peer reviewers. Since its inception in 1963, JMS has been characterized by (among others) two key values that are consistently important to our journal. The first value is our strong relationships with authors and reviewers. In keeping with Orme (1990, p. 361) good editorship is defined as the taking of responsibility, on behalf of the Journal, for serving wider society, the academic profession, JMS authors, and its readership. JMS is a journal that seeks both to develop individuals and to contribute to enriching the wider academic community. In any paper that is accepted at JMS, the path to publication will have reflected deep and developmental engagement, over several months or even years, between the Action Editors, the Managing Editors, the peer-reviewers, and the authors themselves. These relationships are forged with the aim of supporting JMS authors in producing rigorous, empirical, or conceptual, theoretical content and contribution – at the same time as enabling author voice.

The editorial and peer-review teams at JMS are less interested in investing time and thought in developing AI-generated text than in encouraging creative thinking among academic colleagues; our aim is to support human scholars in crafting narratives that enable the sharing of their methodologically sound, significant, and original ideas through published papers. Though we do not prohibit, in principle, authors’ transparent use of AI to augment their submissions, we expect researcher voice to shine through: what drives and motivates research for JMS is the human author, not AI.

There are also legal reasons for JMS’ concern regarding AI-generated text: In accordance with our publishing body, Wiley, JMS currently has no facility to give authorship

credit to an artificial voice – papers can be credited to human authors only. This stance is entirely consistent with the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), of which JMS is a member: ‘AI tools cannot meet the requirements for authorship as they cannot take responsibility for the submitted work. As non-legal entities, they cannot assert the presence or absence of conflicts of interest nor manage copyright and license agreements’ (Cope, 2023).

### **Authorship and AI: Ensuring Transparency**

The second value prioritized by JMS is that of rigour, and transparency of research. In qualitative studies, transparency enriches research, by divulging how insights came about, and what biases researchers might bring to the study (Tracy, 2010). In quantitative work, increased transparency enhances replicability, which can help build a body of work and consolidate research on a particular topic (Bergh et al., 2017; Chen, 2018). Thus, as far as paper submissions are concerned, while we would not exclude from consideration papers that are crafted in part using AI, we – not only as handling editors but also as readers of a manuscript – would seek always to be apprised of any aspect of such papers that was generated with AI. As we summarize in Table I, there are different components of the broader research process in which AI could be used, including idea generation, structuring and content generation, qualitative and quantitative analyses, synthesizing of literatures, editing, and formatting, all of which can potentially augment as well as harm overall research quality (van Dijk et al., 2023). We expect our authors to disclose and justify such use transparently to readers of their manuscripts, and to oversee all AI-related work and take responsibility in checking for accuracy.

We reserve the right of our editorial and peer-review teams to consider each paper on its own merits and in keeping with JMS’ approach to recommend or make decisions informed by editorial judgement and reviewer advice that are in keeping with JMS ethos and / or policy. This could include rejection of any paper in circumstances where editors consider the declared use of AI to have compromised the research process (e.g., where methods are deemed to be insufficiently transparent as could occur with any other research approach). Like the judge who fined the lawyers involved in the aforementioned injury case, for example (Milmo, 2023), JMS editors expect authors to check AI-generated materials for accuracy prior to submission and will hold them accountable for submitting AI-generated mistakes. Thus, as JMS General Editors, while we welcome improvements to detection systems that seek to uncover plagiarism and / or detect the use of AI to construct a paper, we shall continue to rely on the integrity of our authors and the JMS community to be transparent regarding where, and in what context, they have used AI in any given submission.

Our new guidelines require that authors make a clear and transparent statement about any use of AI in their manuscript, ideally in their methods section where it is clearly visible to reviewers and ultimately readers. This approach must be adopted regardless of whether in relation to finessing of language, calculations, or for any other purpose. We accept that AI can potentially save time and costs as regards, for example, copy-editing, but we expect the ideas put forward in any paper to be those of the authors. We acknowledge that the declaration of AI usage relating to copy-editing, language proofing and so on marks a departure from our present stance that does not require declaration of such assistance from



professionals who specialize in such business. This is because, while we might reasonably expect professional firms to take pride in improving the accuracy of final outputs, AI is well-known for ‘hallucinations’ such as (for example) nonsensical referencing. We therefore expect authors to declare, and to double check and verify the accuracy of, any information that comes out of a generative AI system. Remember the old acronym ‘GIGO’ – garbage in, garbage out – inaccurate information that has been fed into AI systems by previous users might be regurgitated by the generative tool as a ‘hallucination’ that could appear in a future paper – we seek to avoid such problems at JMS.

In all, then, our view presently is that we are open to the use of AI in research under certain conditions. In submissions to JMS, the human voice always takes precedence over the influence of AI in the writing *and* any use of AI must be fully transparent and disclosed preferably in the methods section of a submitted paper, not just in the cover letter to the editor that is invisible to reviewers. Table I summarizes our view on how AI can both augment and harm research quality, and how it can be used appropriately by authors submitting their work to JMS.

### Peer Review and AI

As regards peer review, we take a less flexible approach. Our stance regarding peer review is that the use of generative AI has no place in the review process. We take this stance, first, because we invite reviews from experts whose opinion and informed judgement we seek. We look to these individuals to take full responsibility for their review, and we believe that this task must not be delegated to other parties – whether human or artificial. Second, the peer-review process is defined by confidentiality: peer-reviewers are asked to treat in confidence all the unpublished materials on which they are reporting. Feeding a paper – or even reviewer notes on a paper – into an AI generative system is not in keeping with respect for this confidentiality aspect of the publication process as the information fed into the system might later be accessed by someone else. Unpublished papers would be less reliable than research that has been peer-reviewed and published. In the same spirit, JMS Editors are not permitted to use AI in the editorial decision-making process. Editors are asked not to feed into AI platforms any unpublished material that is submitted to the Journal, or any reviewer reports they receive, nor do they use AI to generate responses or decision letters to authors. Even the use of AI to proof-read editor letters to authors could compromise confidentiality and we expect editors to refrain from doing this.

In summary, our stance on AI and authorship, peer review, and editorial approach to AI are summarized in Table I and encapsulated in our policy, below: both are also available on the Journal’s website. We shall continue to reflect on these views and reserve the right to update them in light of advancements in AI, evolving understandings in our scholarly communities, legal developments, and any other changes that may impact academic publishing.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

The world of academic publishing is changing rapidly, given the capabilities invested in all AI generative platforms. Yet the values at the heart of JMS remain constant, and it is to these that we turn as we have reflected on, and developed, our guidance on the use of AI within

JMS. AI may, as noted at the start of this paper, be ‘Here, There and Everywhere’. However, the long-standing aims of JMS: to develop both author voice while contributing to the wider management studies community, as well as publishing research that is responsible, rigorous, significant, and transparent, continue to be our focus. We look to our community to continue to support JMS in these aims, and we will keep deliberating what constitutes adequate and desirable use of AI in research, now and in the future.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Paolo Aversa, Dermot Breslin and Christine Moser for helpful feedback on previous versions of this manuscript.

### **JMS Policy on AI and authorship, peer review and editorial approach to AI**

#### **JMS submissions and AI—for Authors**

JMS does not prohibit, in principle, the use of AI to generate text and/or research questions and ideas, analyse data or for other purposes within a JMS submission, though we expect authors to be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of AI-generated materials. However, JMS does require that authors be transparent and specific; we expect that utilization of AI in any form will be declared and detailed preferably within the methods section of the paper (so it is visible to reviewers and all readers) and if further explanation is needed, this may be included elsewhere in the paper where the authors consider it relevant. This declaration may be included in sections on data collection or data analysis, or separately in the methods section on ‘use of AI in this paper’. The latter could include wider uses of AI such as in copy editing language or grammar.

Authors should be aware that JMS seeks transparency regarding research methods/design and process. In any submission, members of the editorial team have the right to reject any papers that they consider to be methodologically unclear or lacking in clarity or rigour, whether in relation to the use of AI or for other reasons. Should JMS Editors believe that, in any given submission, the declared use of AI has in some way compromised research integrity or methodological approach, they are on this basis entitled to reject a paper. This would include the production of inaccurate information generated by AI as well as (should this come to light) failure to disclose the use of AI in the paper.

*Identification of the use of generative AI in the bibliography/list of references:*

- Author of AI program
- Year of the program version used (in round brackets)
- Name of AI (as the title, in italics)
- Version, if applicable (in round brackets)
- Description of programme (for context, in square brackets)
- Publisher, if different from the author
- URL, if applicable

Examples:

OpenAI (2023a). *ChatGPT 4* (version 12/05/2023) [Large language model]. <https://chat.openai.com/auth/login>

OpenAI (2023b). *DALL-E 2* (version 01/06/2022) [Text-to-image model]. <https://labs.openai.com/>

If you have any questions regarding the use of AI in your paper, please direct your questions to the JMS office.

### Peer review and AI—for Reviewers

Members of the JMS community and beyond who kindly offer to review papers for our journal are asked not to involve artificial intelligence in this task. We make this request first because, in asking colleagues to review papers for JMS, we bear in mind their particular expertise and specifically seek their individual view about the paper they have been asked to review. In our view, AI platforms are not an acceptable substitute for the expertise of the reviewers that we invite.

The second reason for JMS' request that reviewers not feed unpublished materials into AI platforms is that the review process requires all involved in the system to hold in confidence the content of unpublished manuscripts. Feeding colleagues' unpublished work, *even if this is in the form of notes the reviewer has independently jotted down on a given paper*, goes against the spirit of confidentiality. Reviews must therefore be undertaken throughout by the colleague who has kindly agreed to undertake the peer-review.

### JMS editorial approach and AI—for Editors

It is expected that JMS editors will adhere to the above approaches. They may not feed into AI platforms any unpublished material that is submitted to the Journal, nor are they to use AI to generate responses to our authors. Any use of AI for other purposes (e.g., editorials) is to be made transparent and declared, just like in any other paper we publish.

## NOTE

- [1] We credit Cristina Alaimo who inspired us to use this distinction during an IFSAM (International Federation of Scholarly Associations of Management) talk on AI and scholarly research.

## REFERENCES

- Bergh, D. D., Sharp, B. M., Aguinis, H. and Li, M. (2017). 'Is there a credibility crisis in strategic management research? Evidence on the reproducibility of study findings'. *Strategic Organization*, **15**, 423–36.
- Brown, O., Davison, R., Decker, S., Ellis, D. A., Faulconbridge, J., Gore, J., Greenwood, M., Islam, G., Lubinski, C., MacKenzi, N. G., Meyer, R., Muzio, D., Quattrone, P., Ravishankar, M. N., Zilber, T., Ren, S., Sarala, R. and Hibbert, P. (2024). 'Theory-driven perspectives on generative artificial intelligence in business and management'. *British Journal of Management*, forthcoming. Available at: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/52661/>
- Chen, G. (2018). 'Supporting and enhancing scientific rigor [Editorial]'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **103**, 359–61.
- COPE. (2023). *Authorship and AI tools, Cope position statement*. Available at: <https://publicationethics.org/cope-position-statements/ai-author> (accessed 19 December 2023).
- Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A. and Shipway, J. R. (2023). 'Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT'. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1–12. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>.
- Curtis, N. (2023). 'To ChatGPT or not to ChatGPT? The impact of artificial intelligence on academic publishing'. *The Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal*, **42**, 275.
- Dergaa, I., Chamari, K., Zmijewski, P. and Saad, H. B. (2023). 'From human writing to artificial intelligence generated text: Examining the prospects and potential threats of ChatGPT in academic writing'. *Biology of Sport*, **40**, 615–22.
- Dupps, W. J., Jr. (2023). 'Artificial intelligence and academic publishing'. *Journal of Cataract & Refractive Surgery*, **49**, 655–56.
- Eke, D. O. (2023). 'ChatGPT and the rise of generative AI: Threat to academic integrity?'. *Journal of Responsible Technology*, **13**, 100060.
- Faulconbridge, J., Sarwar, A. and Spring, M. (2023). 'How professionals adapt to artificial intelligence: The role of intertwined boundary work'. *Journal of Management Studies*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12936>.

- Garcia, M. B. (2023). 'Using AI tools in writing peer review reports: Should academic journals embrace the use of ChatGPT?'. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-023-03299-7>.
- Haenlein, M., Kaplan, A., Tan, C. W. and Zhang, P. (2019). 'Artificial intelligence (AI) and management analytics'. *Journal of Management Analytics*, **6**, 341–43.
- Hosseini, M., Rasmussen, L. M. and Resnik, D. B. (2023). 'Using AI to write scholarly publications'. *Accountability in Research*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2168535>.
- IBM. (n.d.). *What are AI Hallucinations?* Available at: <https://www.ibm.com/topics/ai-hallucinations#:~:text=AI%20hallucination%20is%20a%20phenomenon,are%20nonsensical%20or%20altogether%20inaccurate> (accessed 2 December 2023).
- Jarrah, A. M., Wardat, Y. and Fidalgo, P. (2023). 'Using ChatGPT in academic writing is (not) a form of plagiarism: What does the literature say'. *Online Journal of Communication & Media Technology*, **13**, e202346.
- JISC. (2021). *A Pathway Towards Responsible Ethical AI*. Available at: <https://repository.jisc.ac.uk/8548/1/a-pathway-towards-responsible-ethical-ai.pdf> (accessed 28 November, 2023).
- JISC. (2023). 'Artificial Intelligence in Tertiary Education'. Available at: <https://beta.jisc.ac.uk/reports/artificial-intelligence-in-tertiary-education> (accessed 28 November, 2023).
- Klein, N. (2023). 'AI Machines aren't "Hallucinating" but their Makers are'. *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/may/08/ai-machines-hallucinating-naomi-klein> (accessed 11 December, 2023).
- Kulkarni, M., Mantere, S., Vaara, E., van den Broek, E., Pachidi, S., Glaser, V. L., Gehman, J., Petriglieri, G., Lindebaum, D., Cameron, D. L., Rahman, H. A., Islam, G. and Greenwood, M. (2023). 'The future of research in an artificial intelligence-driven world'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, forthcoming. Available at: <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:87caa659-177b-4fc6-9372-5ab78223bc03>
- Leonardi, P. M. (2021). 'COVID-19 and the new technologies of organizing: Digital exhaust, digital footprints, and artificial intelligence in the wake of remote work'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **58**, 249–53.
- Lindebaum, D. and Fleming, P. (2023). 'ChatGPT undermines human reflexivity, scientific responsibility and responsible management research'. *British Journal of Management*. forthcoming. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-8551.12781>
- Lindebaum, D., Moser, C. and Islam, G. (2023). 'Big data, proxies, algorithmic decision-making and the future of management theory'. *Journal of Management Studies*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.13032>
- Milmo, D. (2023). 'Two US Lawyers Fined for Submitting Fake Court Citations'. *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/jun/23/two-us-lawyers-fined-submitting-fake-court-citations-chatgpt> (accessed 13 November 2023).
- Morgan, J. (2023). 'Is AI a game changer of CV bullet point?'. *Times Higher Education*, 19. Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/ai-transformative-university-teaching-or-cv-bullet-point>.
- Moser, C., den Hond, F. and Lindebaum, D. (2022). 'Morality in the age of artificially intelligent algorithms'. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **21**, 139–55.
- OECD (2023). 'Artificial intelligence in science: challenges'. In *Opportunities and the Future of Research*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1787/a8d820bd-en>.
- Orme, A. R. (1990). 'Responsibility and editorship'. *Professional Geographer*, **42**, 361–63.
- Pakarinen, P. and Huising, R. (2023). 'Relational expertise: What machines can't know'. *Journal of Management Studies*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12915>.
- Parilla, J. M. (2023). 'Chat GPT use shows that the grant application system is broken'. *Nature*. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-03238-5> (accessed 13 October 2023).
- Raisch, S. and Krakowski, S. (2021). 'Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox'. *Academy of Management Review*, **46**, 192–210.
- Shearing, H. (2023). *Teachers Use AI for Planning and Marking says ReportBBC*. Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-67433036> (accessed 28 November 2023).
- Sweeney, S. (2023). 'Who wrote this? Essay mills and assessment – Considerations regarding contract cheating and AI in higher education'. *International Journal of Management Education*, **21**, 100818.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). 'Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, **16**, 837–51.
- US Senate. (n.d.). *A Bill to Provide a Framework for Artificial Intelligence Innovation and Accountability, and for Other Purposes*. Available at: [https://www.thune.senate.gov/public/\\_cache/files/7dea8daa-f6d1-4881-ad21-2381fcbe0785/6362CE1D0A17743166BC170A593B5CDA.ccaskfall23a15.pdf](https://www.thune.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/7dea8daa-f6d1-4881-ad21-2381fcbe0785/6362CE1D0A17743166BC170A593B5CDA.ccaskfall23a15.pdf) (accessed 28 November 2023).

- van Dijk, S. H., Brusse-Keizer, M. G., Bucsán, C. C., van der Palen, J., Doggen, C. J. and Lenferink, A. (2023). 'Artificial intelligence in systematic reviews: Promising when appropriately used'. *BMJ Open*, **13**, e072254. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10335470/> (accessed 22 November 2023).
- Wang, L. (2023). 'Using machine learning to verify scientific claims'. In *Artificial Intelligence in Science: Challenges, Opportunities and the Future of Research*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1787/ab9d235c-en>.