

Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain

Annual Conference and Conference Submission Review Panel

Guidance on the use of Artificial Intelligence

The Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain (PESGB)'s Conference Committee recognises that generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools can be useful in certain aspects of scholarly work, while also raising important questions concerning authorship, intellectual responsibility, confidentiality, originality and academic integrity. This guidance applies to all authors and reviewers who submit or review work for consideration for presentation at the PESGB's Annual Conference. This guidance is designed to support the responsible and transparent use of AI in relation to conference submissions.

1. AI Tools Must Not Be Listed as Authors

- AI systems (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini, ClaudeAI) do not meet criteria for authorship and must not be credited as authors or co-authors on submissions. Authors remain responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of their work, including any material produced or modified with the assistance of AI.

2. AI use should be responsible and transparent

- If AI systems are used at any stage of writing, analysis, or editing (apart from routine language correction and formatting), this must be clearly and honestly disclosed.
- Disclosure should appear in the manuscript's Acknowledgements section, specifying:
 - The name of the AI tool(s) used
 - Why it was used
 - How its output was integrated and critically evaluated/refined by the authors.

This transparency helps maintain scholarly integrity and clarity about what is genuinely the author's work. Authors may wish to consult relevant [COPE statements on AI use](#) for additional context.

3. Authors retain intellectual responsibility

Authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality and integrity of their work, including:

- the development and justification of their arguments;
- the accuracy and validity of citations, data, interpretations and claims;
- the originality and appropriate attribution of ideas and material.

AI-generated material must not be presented as original scholarly work when the intellectual contribution was in fact generated by an AI system. AI should not be used to generate or substantially develop the central arguments, conceptual framework, or conclusions. Nor should authors rely on AI systems to make substantive philosophical judgements on their behalf, or to produce expositions or interpretations of other philosophers' positions. Nor should AI be used to substantially re-structure or organise the argument being made. AI systems can produce inaccurate information, including plausible sounding but non-existent references, and may reproduce or introduce biases arising from their training data, design, or operation. AI outputs may also influence which concepts, sources, interpretations, or perspectives are made salient. Any content derived from AI should therefore be subjected to critical scholarly evaluation.

AI may be used for supporting tasks such as language editing, formatting, citation management, reference handling, and data visualization. However, authors remain responsible for checking the resulting material. Where such use goes beyond routine language correction or formatting, it should be disclosed in accordance with this guidance.

If adding a Disclosure on the use of Generative AI in your conference submission, please detail which AI were used and for what purposes. This Disclosure can be added to the top of your submission and it will not count towards your overall word count.

The final decision over whether an author's use of AI is permissible rests with the Conference Chair.

4. Confidentiality and unpublished material

- Confidential material relating to the Society or to published or unpublished research should not be entered into AI systems where doing so could compromise confidentiality, intellectual property or data protection obligations.
- In particular:
 - reviewers must not upload submitted conference papers or presentations or other confidential material to AI systems;
 - members of the Conference Committee must not upload confidential submissions, correspondence or peer-review material to external AI systems where this would compromise the confidentiality of the reviewing process;
 - Users of AI tools should be aware that some systems may retain, reuse, or process material submitted to them, including for purposes such as model training.

5. Guidance for reviewers

Reviewers may use AI tools for limited supporting purposes, where this is compatible with the confidentiality requirements of peer review. Reviewers must not:

- upload a submitted conference paper or presentation or confidential review material to a public or otherwise unauthorized AI system;
- ask an AI system to undertake the substantive evaluation of a submission in place of their own scholarly judgement;

- disclose confidential information about authors, manuscripts or the review process to an AI system.

Where AI is used to assist a review in a way that goes beyond routine language or administrative assistance, reviewers should acknowledge this in a statement to the Conference Chair and must ensure that their final report represents their own scholarly judgement.