Table of Contents

| **EDITORIAL** | **Open Access** |

Does the Journal of Health Professions Education and Innovation allow the use of artificial intelligence in preparing the peer-review of research submitted for publication?

Wagdy Talaat, MD, PhD

Editor in chief, Journal of Health Professions Education and Innovation

Conducting high-quality peer review of scientific manuscripts has become increasingly challenging. The substantial increase in the number of manuscripts, lack of a sufficient number of peer-reviewers, and questions related to effectiveness, fairness, and efficiency, require a different approach[1].

This problem may have been discussed recently and may have been resolved in some international scientific publisher companies and individual journals, as some of them have completely prohibited peer reviewers from resorting to this method, either to completely relieve themselves of the burden of carrying out this task or even to improve the quality of the review report, either linguistically or technically. Others allowed and issued severe warnings, which requires the awareness of editors and their call for vigilance in reviewing the peer review report before rushing to send it to the authors, which may create major problems for the authors, publishers, and journals. The last category of journals are those who have not yet determined their position on this, either out of unawareness of its existence, or to avoid the difficulty of dealing with such challenging problems [2,3,4].

Perhaps we have all felt remorse when we receive from the same journals in which we previously published manuscripts for reviewing, and we find ourselves very busy, so we refuse at one time and are ashamed at the other, which causes us enormous psychological pressure that forces some of us to resort to alternative solutions, such as resorting to artificial intelligence to perform that task, which may be heavy for some. Is this ethical or fair? In terms of ethics, placing the manuscript under possible publication on AI tools exposes those sensitive, confidential documents to publication, even if the names are removed. Spreading the idea of research before publishing it is still considered an ethical issue to consider [5].

Scientific integrity and endangering the journal's reputation and the reviewer must be held accountable for this professional error stemming from underestimating the confidentiality of the documents by the editor. As for fairness, is it reasonable to expose some researchers to compete with the AI machine and respond to its lengthy and meticulous requests, which are sometimes very formal in form, but at other times are completely far from the science of the subject and the innovations that have been made in it that even the smartest AI does not realize[3]?

In china, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) implemented a ban on the use of online generative AI tools like Chat GPT for analysis and drafting of peer review comments. The Australian Research Council (ARC) also prohibited the use of generative AI in peer review. Concerning journals, the latest recommendations from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) suggest that reviewers should not upload manuscripts to software or

---

Correspondence Address:
Wagdy Talaat, MD, PhD, FHPE
Professor and Founding Head, Medical Education Department
Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University
Faculty, FAIMER, Philadelphia, USA
(https://www.faimer.org/international-faimer-institute/)
Consultant, EMRO/WHO in Medical Education and Accreditation
Co-Director, Joint Master of Health Professions Education
between Maastricht and Suez Canal Universities
President, Egyptian Society for Medical Education (ESME)
Editor in chief, https://jhpei.journals.ekb.eg/
Cell phones: +2(0100)3487678- +2(012)11404143
E-mail (Personal): watalaat@gmail.com
E-mail (Work) wagdy.talaat@maastrichtuniversity.nl
E-mail (Work): medfomscu1@gmail.com

other AI technology platforms that cannot guarantee confidentiality. Reviewers should disclose to the journal whether and how AI technology was used in evaluating manuscripts or drafting reviewer comments. The journal Science prohibits the use of large language models during peer review and prohibits reviewers from uploading manuscripts to generative AI tools. The Lancet maintains that reviewers should refrain from using generative AI or AI-assisted technologies to assist in the scientific review of papers[4]. Reviewers must treat papers shared by editors as confidential during the peer review process and should not upload papers or any part thereof to AI tools. This is because the critical thinking and assessment of research originality required in peer review extend beyond the scope of this technology, posing certain risks such as generating incorrect, incomplete, or biased conclusions about manuscript submissions[4].

Still, many platforms have already started to use automated screening tools, to prevent plagiarism and failure to respect format requirements. Some tools even attempt to flag the quality of a study or summarize its content, to reduce reviewers' load. The recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) create the potential for (semi) automated peer review systems, where potentially low-quality or controversial studies could be flagged, and reviewer document matching could be performed in an automated manner[6].

At JHPEI, and realizing the importance, logic, and fairness of all these issues, we decided to join the type of journals that discourage and limit the use of AI in performing our peer reviewing service, for all the reasons we explained, and we are convinced that we are right in making this decision for the benefit of the authors who decide to publish with us and for the sake of integrity of our journal and for the benefit of scientific research in general. We decided to discourage, not to inhibit, in order to integrate other opinions that concluded that AI should be used to assist in the triaging of manuscripts submitted for peer-review publication. In the near future we might change our policy allowing AI to be used to initially scan all submissions and provide a summary of the quality of the manuscript, which will then be reviewed by the editors, prior to a decision to request peer review.

The future will provide us with many promising opportunities to improve the research review process without violating the accompanying values such as: fairness, equality, confidentiality, and protecting originality of research.

Conflict of interests:

The author declares having no conflict of interest.

Authors contributions:

WT conceived and wrote the text

Competing interests:

The author has no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose. The author has no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article. The author certify that has no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest or non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

References:

1. Howard Bauchner and Frederick P. Rivara. Health Affairs Scholar, 2024, 2(5), qxae058 https://doi.org/10.1093/haschl/qxae058 Advance access publication: May 3, 2024
2. Martins Zaumanis. ChatGPT for Research Paper Review. https://peerrecognized.com/chatgpt-for-research-paper-review/. Last accessed 9/29/2024
3. Marisha Fonseca. Should I use ChatGPT to write a peer review? https://www.editage.com/insights/should-i-use-chatgpt-to-write-a-peer-review/. Last accessed 9/29/2024
4. Kunming Cheng, Zaijie Sun, Xiaojun Liu, Haiyang Wu and Cheng Li. Generative artificial intelligence is infiltrating peer review process .Critical Care 28:149 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-024-04933-z (2024)
5. Kimberly Anderson-Mutch. Why using ChatGPT to write performance reviews is a no-go? https://textio.com/blog/why-using-chatgpt-to-write-performance-reviews-is-a-no-go#:~:text=Organizations%20increasingly%20rely%20on%20AI,isn't%20the%20best%20option. Last accessed 9/29/2024
6. Alessandro Checco, Lorenzo Bracciale, Pierpaolo Loreti2, Stephen Pinfield & Giuseppe Bianchi. AI-assisted peer review. HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES COMMUNICATIONS | https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-00703-8. (2021).