Policy on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Orbis Idearum: European Journal of the History of Ideas recognises that generative artificial intelligence (AI) and AI-assisted technologies are increasingly used in academic research and scholarly writing. We acknowledge that these tools can provide valuable assistance to researchers and authors at various stages of the preparation of a manuscript. Our policy is therefore not intended to prohibit or discourage the responsible use of AI, but to establish clear principles ensuring academic integrity, transparency, and the reliability of published research.

1. Permitted uses of AI

Authors may use generative AI and AI-assisted tools as supportive instruments in the preparation of their manuscripts. Permitted uses include, but are not limited to:

- **Bibliographical research:** identifying potentially relevant publications, suggesting sources, searching for literature, and assisting in the organisation of bibliographical material.
- **Literature reviews:** summarising research literature, organising findings, comparing scholarly contributions, and preparing preliminary overviews of a field. AI tools may also assist in summarising and paraphrasing abstracts, provided that authors consult and verify the original publications and accurately represent their contents.
- **Text organisation:** developing an outline, organising sections and subsections, improving the logical sequence of arguments, and suggesting ways to structure a manuscript.
- **Language editing and proofreading:** improving grammar, spelling, punctuation, clarity, readability, and academic style.
- **Translation:** translating texts or parts of texts between languages, including the translation of an author's own manuscript.
- **Other supportive tasks:** assisting with the preparation of summaries, identifying inconsistencies, and checking a manuscript for completeness and compliance with submission requirements.
- **Data visualisation and presentation**: generating or assisting in the preparation of charts, tables, diagrams, and other visual representations of data and research findings.

These activities are acceptable provided that AI remains an assisting instrument and does not replace the author's own intellectual contribution, critical judgement, interpretation, and scholarly responsibility.

The use of AI to generate an entire manuscript, or substantial parts of it without genuine intellectual contribution and critical supervision by the author, is not acceptable. A manuscript submitted to *Orbis Idearum* must represent the author's own scholarly work, regardless of the tools employed in its preparation.

2. Authors' responsibility and verification of sources

Authors bear full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of everything contained in their manuscripts, including any material produced or modified with the assistance of AI tools.

Particular attention must be paid to bibliographical references, quotations, and citations. Generative AI tools may produce inaccurate, misleading, or entirely fabricated information, including references to publications that do not exist, incorrect bibliographical details, quotations that cannot be found in the cited sources, and page numbers or attributions that are invented.

Authors must therefore independently verify every bibliographical reference and every quotation included in their manuscripts. They must ensure that:

- every cited publication actually exists and can be identified;
- bibliographical details are accurate and sufficient to locate the source;
- empirical data underlying the research actually exist and are accurately reported and represented;
- every direct quotation reproduces the original text accurately;
- quotations are correctly attributed and can be located in the cited source, including the relevant page number where applicable;
- paraphrases and summaries faithfully represent the arguments and findings of the original publications.

The use of AI does not constitute an acceptable explanation or excuse for inaccurate, misleading, or fabricated references or quotations. Authors remain responsible for all errors, irrespective of whether these result from the use of AI, other software, or their own research and writing process.

3. Disclosure of AI use at submission

Authors must disclose the use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies when submitting their manuscripts to the journal.

As manuscript submissions are currently handled by email, the corresponding author must include a statement on the use of AI directly in the submission email addressed to **editor@orbisidearum.net**. This declaration must be provided by the corresponding author on behalf of all co-authors, where applicable.

The declaration should identify the AI tools or services used and briefly describe the purpose and extent of their use. Relevant activities may include, for example:

- bibliographical research and the identification of relevant literature;
- literature reviews and the summarising or paraphrasing of abstracts and publications;
- the organisation and structuring of the manuscript;
- language editing, proofreading, and stylistic improvements;
- translation;
- the generation or development of ideas, arguments, or other content;
- data visualisation and presentation, including the generation or preparation of charts, tables, diagrams, and other visual representations of data and research findings;
- other forms of assistance, which should be specified by the author.

Authors who have not used generative AI or AI-assisted technologies in preparing their manuscripts must explicitly state this in their submission email.

This declaration is required for editorial transparency and accountability. It is collected for the journal's internal editorial records and does not need to be included in the manuscript itself or in the published article.

The use of generative AI or AI-assisted technologies does not, in itself, constitute grounds for rejecting a manuscript. The purpose of this disclosure is solely to ensure editorial transparency and to inform the editorial assessment of the manuscript.

Where AI has been used as part of the research methodology itself, rather than merely in the preparation of the manuscript, its use should also be described in the relevant methodological section.

AI tools cannot be listed as authors or co-authors. Authorship entails intellectual contribution, accountability, and the ability to approve and take responsibility for the final work, all of which must remain attributable to human authors.

4. Verification of questionable references and quotations

During the editorial assessment and peer-review process, the editorial team and reviewers may identify references, publications, or quotations whose existence or accuracy cannot be established.

In such cases, before taking any decision that may affect the publication of the manuscript, the editorial team will contact the author and request clarification and supporting documentation. The author may be asked to provide precise information identifying the source, including its full bibliographical details and, where relevant, the exact page or passage from which a quotation was taken. Authors may also be asked to provide further documentation or explanations enabling the editorial team to verify the source and establish the accuracy of the material in question.

Authors will thus be given an opportunity to clarify the situation and substantiate the references or quotations concerned. If they are unable to provide the requested sources, documentation, or satisfactory explanations, the editorial board reserves the right to reject the manuscript or discontinue the publication process, regardless of whether the problem resulted from the use of AI or from another cause.

The decisive issue is not how the inaccurate or fabricated material came to be included in the manuscript, but whether the author is able to substantiate the scholarly material submitted for publication. The responsibility for the integrity of the manuscript rests with the author.

5. Editorial decisions and the stages of publication

The existence of a positive peer-review report does not in itself guarantee publication. Peer reviewers provide expert assessments and recommendations to the editorial board; the final decision on publication remains the responsibility of the journal's editors.

The editorial team may identify problems concerning the authenticity of references or quotations at different stages of the publication process, including after the completion of peer review and before the article is published. Such problems may escape the attention of reviewers, since peer review, like any human assessment, is not infallible.

If questionable or fabricated references or quotations are identified after the reviewers have recommended acceptance, but before publication, the editorial team reserves the right to suspend the publication process and investigate the matter.

Depending on the nature, extent, and seriousness of the problem, the editorial board may:

- request additional documentation and verification from the author;
- send the manuscript for an additional round of peer review, specifically asking the reviewer(s) to examine the accuracy and verifiability of the references and quotations;
- reject the manuscript if the problems are sufficiently serious or extensive to undermine confidence in its scholarly reliability.

If an additional round of peer review is deemed necessary, the manuscript will not necessarily retain its originally scheduled place in the journal's publication programme. Its publication, if eventually approved, may therefore be postponed.

The editorial team retains the right to take these measures irrespective of whether the manuscript has previously received positive reviews or an initial recommendation for publication.

6. Problems identified after publication

The journal's responsibility to safeguard the integrity of the scholarly record does not end with publication.

If fabricated references, unverifiable quotations, or other serious problems are discovered after an article has been published, the editorial board reserves the right to investigate the matter and take appropriate corrective action. Depending on the seriousness and extent of the problem, this may include publishing a correction, issuing an expression of concern, or retracting the article.

The fact that an article has passed peer review and been published does not prevent the journal from taking action when subsequent evidence calls its scholarly reliability into question.

Final principle

Orbis Idearum welcomes the responsible use of generative AI as a tool that can assist scholarly research and communication. We do not regard the use of such technologies as inherently problematic. However, technological assistance cannot replace scholarly competence, intellectual contribution, or academic responsibility. The integrity of every published article, including the accuracy and verifiability of its sources and quotations, remains the responsibility of its human author(s).