

allows them to use the achievements of the modern digital world to their advantage and with academic integrity. Ultimately, it all depends on the teacher's skill and ability to motivate students to work hard and creatively using a powerful arsenal of digital tools.

Key words: artificial intelligence, academic integrity, InVideo.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-397-2-10>

FAIR USE OF GENERATIVE AI IN THE PREPARATION OF SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS

Alexey Dubinsky, Aurea Simon-Soro

University of Seville, Spain

dubinsky@ukr.net

Millions of writers actively engage with generative AI systems for text composition, including students and scientists. It becomes important to raise requirements that govern the equitable and dignified usage of such systems.

This year increased the number of publications on chatGPT usage in scientific writing [1–3]. There are some cases in which the usage of such systems was the reason for the termination of academic affiliations [4]. Conspicuously unethical cases, such as SCIGen paper generator, are, of course, not considered herein.

A guiding principle for delineating the judicious application of intelligent systems emerges through the juxtaposition of the philosophical concepts of form and content. These notions trace their origin to the classical German philosophy of Kant and Hegel and have found practical validation in contemporary contexts, notably exemplified in the formalization of web standards by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). Distinct standards, such as HTML and XML for content and CSS for document design. Other cases delineate the separation of form and content, thus engendering effective

practices in usability and software design. In addition, this paradigm has further facilitated the formulation of recommendations for Minimum Viable Product (MVP) in start-up contexts.

We believe that the judicious application of intelligent systems encompasses tasks that pertain solely to the manipulation of form and not content. Such tasks include noncritical, noncreative, technical, and ancillary functions, such as style editing, text translation, and annotation. Instances of these activities, which are delegate-able, have historically been acknowledged in the scholarly community with expressions of gratitude to contributors for their input.

In contrast, unwarranted utilization may involve the incorporation of external ideas, statements, or textual fragments into the main body of work. However, it is imperative to consider the stage of work and the depth of processing. Blindly replicating generated text is unequivocally discouraged. A more justifiable scenario arises when a generative system aids in introductory background exploration or enhances the quality of the text. Dialogue with an intelligent system to identify issues, errors in argumentation, and similar concerns is considered acceptable. Collaborative interaction with an intelligent assistant during the drafting process (instead of a live interlocutor), is also deemed permissible.

Contemporary large linguistic models, trained on an extensive corpus of internet-available documents, inherently encapsulate a substantial repository of human knowledge. These models facilitate the efficient extraction and application of this knowledge through a user-friendly interface. Authors who try to use generative AI must rigorously verify the veracity of ideas and statements emanating from dialogues, alongside the judicious selection of pertinent bibliographic sources. Large-language models are acknowledged to exhibit shortcomings such as false statements, instances of "hallucination," and the generation of fictitious bibliographic references.

Thus, the ethical use of generative systems remains contingent on the conscientious decisions of the authors. Consequently, the imperative for an intelligent automated review system for scientific articles emerges as a necessity, serving to sift through and identify substandard and unwarranted papers.

References

1. Meyer, J. G., Urbanowicz, R. J., Martin, P. C., O'Connor, K., Li, R., Peng, P. C., ... & Moore, J. H. (2023). ChatGPT and large language models in academia: opportunities and challenges. *BioData Mining*, 16(1), 20.
2. Castellanos-Gomez, A. (2023). Good Practices for Scientific Article Writing with ChatGPT and Other Artificial Intelligence Language Models. *Nanomanufacturing*, 3(2), 135–138. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nanomanufacturing3020009>
3. Huang, J., & Tan, M. (2023). The role of ChatGPT in scientific communication: writing better scientific review articles. *American journal of cancer research*, 13(4), 1148–1154.
4. Ansele, M. (2023, April 2). One of the world's most cited scientists, Rafael Luque, suspended without pay for 13 years. El País.

Key words: generative AI, artificial intelligence, chatGPT, scientific writing, academic integrity, scientific publications, form-content distinction

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-397-2-11>

BENEFITS AND RISKS OF IMPLEMENTING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN EDUCATION

Oleh Forostiuk¹, Inna Forostiuk²

¹*Academy of Advocacy of Ukraine,*

²*National University of Food Technologies*

forostiuk@ukr.net

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) will play an increasingly crucial role in human lives in the near future. Its impact will be felt in various fields, including education. A wide range of possibilities for using AI opens up before us, particularly in the