Editorial Policy of Journal of Legal Studies regarding the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Writing Scientific Articles

1. Purpose and scope

The Journal of Legal Studies seeks to advance high-quality scholarship and insightful research across all fields of law, supported by rigorous methodology and sound research outcomes. This policy safeguards the originality of legal scholarship, the accuracy of legal authorities, and the independence of authors' reasoning.

The journal adopts a restrictive approach to generative Artificial Intelligence (AI). Such tools may support language, presentation, and the preliminary activities expressly permitted below, but shall not produce the substantive scientific contribution of an article. Legal interpretation, argumentation, evaluation of authorities, and conclusions shall remain the work of the authors.

This policy applies to doctrinal, theoretical, comparative, historical, empirical, and interdisciplinary legal research submitted to the journal, including case analyses, review articles, revisions, and supplementary materials. It covers text, footnotes, references, quotations, legal research datasets, tables, figures, and computational code. Generative AI includes large language models and applications that generate or transform text, images, or code, including generative features embedded in legal research databases and other software.

2. Human authorship and responsibility

AI tools shall not be listed as authors or co-authors. All authors remain responsible for the originality, accuracy, integrity, and reliability of the submission, including material prepared with permitted AI assistance.

Authors shall review every affected passage and verify that editing or translation has not altered the legal meaning, jurisdictional context, qualifications, or strength of an argument. Authors shall independently check facts, citations, quotations, and analytical claims against the sources on which the article relies.

Authors shall identify and correct fabricated information, bias, plagiarism, and misleading statements. Disclosure of AI use does not render a prohibited activity permissible.

3. Permitted uses of generative AI

Generative AI may be used only for the following purposes, subject to human verification and the disclosure requirements in Section 7:

- Language editing of author-written text to improve grammar, spelling, readability, or formatting, without introducing substantive legal arguments or changing the interpretation of an authority.
- Translation of the authors' original, previously unpublished manuscript into English, provided that the authors verify legal terminology and meaning. A machine translation shall not be presented as an official or authoritative translation of a legal source.
- Preliminary research exploration, including suggestions of search terms, potentially relevant publications or legal sources, and possible research gaps. Authors shall retrieve and read the sources and independently establish their relevance; AI responses shall not serve as evidence of the content or status of the law.
- Preliminary methodological ideation during initial research planning. Authors shall independently select, justify, implement, and describe the final research method and any comparative framework.
- Formatting footnotes and references that the authors have already verified, without generating new authorities or supplying unverified citation details.

- Presentation of author-completed research through tables, timelines, or explanatory diagrams, provided that all dates, classifications, relationships, and content have already been established by the authors. AI shall not determine the legal classification of materials or infer relationships between them.
- Descriptive summaries of authors' completed findings for accessibility, without generating the article's abstract, legal analysis, conclusions, or recommendations.
- Improving the readability or formatting of author-written research code without changing its computational operations or introducing new code.

Permitted editing shall preserve distinctions such as obligation and discretion, binding and persuasive authority, and existing law and proposed reform. Authors shall retain the source material and steps needed to verify AI-assisted tables and diagrams.

4. Prohibited uses of generative AI

Except for the limited assistance expressly permitted in Section 3, generative AI shall not be used to:

- Write substantive manuscript content, including abstracts, research hypotheses, literature syntheses, theoretical frameworks, methodological accounts, legal arguments, discussions, or conclusions.
- Interpret legislation, treaties, contracts, judgments, or other legal materials on the authors' behalf; determine the holding or reasoning of a decision; or assess the validity, applicability, or precedential weight of an authority.
- Produce comparative legal analysis, resolve conflicts between authorities, apply legal rules to facts, or formulate proposals for legislative reform or changes in judicial practice.
- Generate case summaries, headnotes, accounts of legal developments, or translations of primary legal sources for use as substantive evidence or analysis in the manuscript.
- Invent or alter cases, legislative provisions, treaty clauses, quotations, citations, procedural histories, legal facts, or descriptions of institutional practice.
- Generate research observations, interview responses, survey answers, case records, or other purported empirical evidence; or clean, impute, classify, or code research data as part of the substantive analysis.
- Conduct qualitative or quantitative analysis, including coding judgments, identifying doctrinal themes, estimating statistical relationships, or predicting judicial outcomes.
- Generate or substantively modify research code, statistical commands, spreadsheet formulas, or computational procedures used to obtain findings.
- Create graphical abstracts, cover art, artistic renderings, or design images for submission.
- Conceal plagiarism, fabricate research activities, or otherwise misrepresent the authors' contribution or the origin of research materials.

Authors shall not present AI-generated content as an authentic legal authority or as evidence obtained from courts, legislatures, practitioners, research participants, or other non-machine sources.

5. Verification of legal authorities and comparative claims

Every authority relied upon shall be personally consulted and verified by the authors. Where available, official legislative publications, court records, treaty repositories, or other authoritative primary sources shall be used to verify primary legal materials. AI output is not a substitute for the underlying authority.

Authors shall check case names, courts, dates, case numbers, citation identifiers, pinpoint references, and the context of quoted passages. Where relevant to the argument, they shall verify amendments, repeal, commencement, subsequent judicial treatment, and the temporal version of the law examined. Historical analysis shall identify the period under consideration and shall not present historical rules as current law.

Comparative studies shall identify the jurisdictions and legal contexts examined. Authors shall not assume that similar terminology signifies equivalent legal concepts or that a rule or judgment from one jurisdiction applies in another. Binding authority, persuasive authority, commentary, and proposals for reform shall be clearly distinguished.

Quotations shall reproduce the consulted source accurately. Any unofficial translation shall be identified as such, with responsibility for its accuracy retained by the authors. The permission to translate author-written manuscripts does not authorise generative translation of primary sources for substantive research use.

6. Digital research tools and AI as an object of study

This policy does not prohibit conventional searches in legal databases, reference management, or established non-generative statistical and computational methods implemented by the authors. Authors remain responsible for source selection, the research design, assumptions, procedures, validation, and interpretation. Generative functions within these tools remain subject to Sections 3 and 4.

Non-generative machine learning may be used as an explicitly described research method where its data, procedures, validation, and limitations are reported sufficiently for scholarly assessment. Simulated data produced through author-specified conventional procedures shall be identified as simulated and shall not be presented as actual legal events or participant evidence. This provision does not authorise generative AI to manufacture research data.

Research on the legal implications of AI, including regulation, rights, liability, access to justice, and judicial administration, is not excluded. Where a proposed study requires generating or analysing generative AI outputs, authors shall obtain an editorial determination before submission. Any exceptional permission shall be explicit, confined to the stated research purpose, and require clear identification of machine-generated material. It shall not authorise AI authorship or other prohibited assistance in preparing the article.

7. Disclosure of AI use

Authors shall include a Declaration of Artificial Intelligence Use immediately before the reference list. All generative AI use permitted under Section 3, including language editing and translation, shall be disclosed. Conventional non-generative spelling, grammar, and reference-formatting tools are exempt.

The declaration shall identify the tool, provider, and model or version where available; the purpose and extent of use; the affected sections or materials; and the verification undertaken. Substantive legal or analytical assistance shall not be described as copy editing.

Relevant AI assistance shall also be identified in affected figure or table captions. Authors shall retain sufficient records, including relevant prompts and outputs where practicable, to answer editorial questions, subject to confidentiality obligations. Declarations shall be updated when AI is used during revision. Any expressly authorised use of AI as an object of empirical study shall also be described in the methodology.

Example declaration

During manuscript preparation, the authors used [tool, provider, and model or version] to [permitted purpose] in [sections or materials affected]. The authors reviewed the affected material and verified that legal terminology, citations, and meaning were preserved. Generative AI was not used to interpret legal authorities, develop legal arguments, analyse research data, generate research code, or formulate conclusions or reform proposals. The authors take full responsibility for the manuscript.

Declaration where no generative AI was used

The authors declare that no generative AI tools were used in the research preparation or writing of this manuscript.

8. Confidentiality and peer review

Authors shall not upload privileged communications, confidential client materials, sealed or restricted court records, unpublished case files, identifiable interview material, or other protected information to generative

AI services. Removing names alone does not establish that material is suitable for disclosure. Access to legal records does not itself authorise their reuse in an AI system.

For otherwise permissible use, authors shall consider the tool's arrangements for retention, training, reuse, and access and respect applicable confidentiality, data protection, intellectual property, consent, and licensing requirements. These safeguards do not authorise an activity prohibited elsewhere in this policy.

Editors and reviewers shall not upload submitted manuscripts, supporting materials, or information derived from them to external generative AI services. Scientific evaluation and editorial decisions shall remain human responsibilities and shall not be delegated to generative AI.

Reviewers may use generative AI solely to improve the language of their own report, provided that no confidential manuscript content or information is disclosed, confidentiality safeguards are verified, and the assistance is declared to the responsible editor. Reviewers remain fully accountable for their assessments.

AI-detection scores shall not, on their own, constitute proof of misconduct.

9. Non-compliance

The journal may request explanations, supporting records, or revisions where AI use is unclear or appears inconsistent with this policy. Authors shall have an opportunity to respond before an adverse determination is made.

An omitted declaration concerning an otherwise permissible use may be addressed through correction. Prohibited use, fabricated authorities or evidence, compromised confidentiality, or unreliable findings may warrant rejection or further investigation, depending on the circumstances.

Concerns identified after publication may result in a correction, an expression of concern, or retraction under the journal's publication ethics procedures. Serious research-integrity concerns may be referred to the relevant institution or other responsible body. Editorial action shall be proportionate to the evidence, the authors' explanation, and the effect on the integrity and reliability of the work.

10. Implementation and review

This policy takes effect for submissions received on or after [17th of September 2026], following approval by the Editorial Board. The journal shall communicate any transitional arrangements for manuscripts already under review.

The Editorial Board shall review this policy periodically in light of technological developments, publishing guidance, and experience in its application. Authors shall consult the version in force at submission and seek clarification from the Editorial Office where a proposed use is not clearly addressed.