ARCHIVES OF NEUROPSYCHIATRY

Guide for Authors on Using Artificial Intelligence Tools for Technical Screening

Position and Clarifications Annex

Legal framework, references, frequently asked questions

Prepared by: Editorial Board of Archives of Neuropsychiatry

What Is This Document?

This document is the position and clarifications annex that complements the main document of the Archives of Neuropsychiatry (NPA) Guide for Authors on Using Artificial Intelligence Tools for Technical Screening. The main document contains the four prompts and the declaration templates that authors can use directly when performing a technical screening; this annex presents the legal framework, scope and basis of the guide, together with answers to frequently asked questions.

Authors can start using the prompts with the main document; this annex, in turn, explains in detail the legal and ethical framework of AI use, the sharing of responsibility, and the content excluded from the scope. It also serves as a reference for position inquiries, ethics committee reviews, legal consultation, or academic discussions.

> The Main Document is sufficient for using the technical screening prompts. However, the legal and ethical framework for using AI tools in academic work, the sharing of responsibility, and critical exceptions such as case reports are explained in detail in this Annex; we recommend that our authors read this document at least once as well.

1. Legal Framework and Disclaimer

The NPA Guide for Authors on Using Artificial Intelligence Tools for Technical Screening **is an informational document intended to help authors prepare a submission that complies with NPA's publication standards**; it is not part of the editorial process and is not a prerequisite for submission. An author's decision not to apply this guide will not adversely affect the evaluation of the submission.

Archives of Neuropsychiatry **is not responsible for any legal, ethical, or professional consequences** that may arise from the processing or storage by AI tools, or the use by third

parties, of content that authors upload to such tools. Authors are solely responsible for reviewing the terms of service and data policy of the AI tool they use and for protecting their own data - particularly patient data, unpublished research data, content that may be subject to a patent application, and content not approved by co-authors. All obligations under KVKK, GDPR, ICMJE, COPE, the YÖK Ethical Guidelines on Generative AI (2024), and ethics committee commitments continue to rest with the author. The use of an AI tool does not change or reduce the scope of these obligations.

2. Patient Data and Content Excluded from the Scope

> **Case reports, case series, all manuscripts containing patient-level identifiable data, and qualitative studies containing quotations from individual patient interviews are outside the scope of this technical screening practice and must not be uploaded to AI tools.**

In such manuscripts, the risk of identifiable data leakage cannot be reduced to zero despite the most rigorous anonymization practices, and this may create serious responsibilities for the author with regard to special-category personal data protections under KVKK, ICMJE, and ethics committee commitments.

2.1. Principles for Other Manuscript Types

- Before sharing unpublished collaborative research data, make sure that **all authors** are informed and have given their consent.
- Never upload raw data files (SPSS, Excel, R outputs, NVivo files, etc.) to an AI tool under any circumstances.
- Check the data retention policy of the AI tool; where possible, enable “training opt-out” or “zero data retention” options.

3. Recommended Class of AI Tools

For technical screening, we recommend that you choose enterprise/API-based services in which the guarantee that your data will not be used for model training is provided by contract. Examples of services in this class:

- **API-based access:** Claude API (Anthropic), OpenAI API, Google Cloud Gemini API
- **Enterprise subscriptions:** Claude Team/Enterprise, ChatGPT Team/Enterprise, Google Workspace Gemini
- **Cloud platforms:** Microsoft Azure OpenAI, AWS Bedrock, Google Cloud Vertex AI

In these services, data are not used for model training by default; most enterprise contracts also offer a “zero data retention” option.

Free user services (Claude.ai Free, ChatGPT Free/Plus, Gemini Free, etc.) may use your data for model training under default settings. If you prefer these services, you are advised to look for and enable the option in your account settings named “turn off data sharing”, “training opt-out”, or similar. Because the name, location, and scope of this option may vary across platforms and over time, you are advised to review the current data policy of the tool you use separately. Enabling this option ensures that subsequent interactions are not used for model training; however, it may not guarantee the deletion of past interactions. Contractual data protection assurance is available only in enterprise/API-based services.

Whichever service you choose, it is the author's responsibility to review the current terms of service and data policy of the relevant tool. NPA does not endorse any tool, provider, or version.

4. Declaration of AI Use

In accordance with the current policy of Archives of Neuropsychiatry, when AI tools are used in the preparation of a manuscript, the name and version of the tool and the content generated by AI must be clearly stated in the “Method” section and in the “Acknowledgments” section at the end of the manuscript. The same information should also be included in the cover letter sent to the editors at submission.

Your use of AI within the scope of this technical screening practice - even if solely for linguistic and structural checking - should be considered within the scope of this transparency requirement. For declaration templates, see the “AI Use Declaration” section of the Main Document.

In line with the ICMJE recommendations and the transparency principle of the YÖK Ethical Guidelines on Generative AI (2024), failure to declare AI use may require corrective action and, under certain circumstances, may be considered research misconduct. The TÜBİTAK Generative AI Guide also states that incomplete or incorrect declaration, when combined with inappropriate AI use, may constitute an ethical violation of “fabrication”.

5. Detailed Policy on AI-Generated Images/Figures

Archives of Neuropsychiatry adopts a three-category approach to images and figures generated with AI tools:

Presentation of scientific data (prohibited): Images representing experimental findings, measurement results, medical images (radiology, pathology, histological sections, endoscopic

images, dermatological photographs, etc.), graphs, and tables may not be generated or altered with AI tools. Such images must be created by the author on the basis of real data.

Enhancing, combining, improving, or “cleaning” medical images with AI tools is considered research misconduct. International publishers (Elsevier, Springer Nature, Science/AAAS, JAMA, etc.) take a similar position against generating or altering images that represent scientific data with AI; however, policies on conceptual illustrations vary between publishers, and some publishers (e.g., Springer Nature, Elsevier) impose significant restrictions on such images as well. Authors planning to submit to a different journal are advised to review that journal's current policy separately.

Conceptual illustration (conditionally permitted): Images that do not present scientific data but serve an explanatory function, such as graphical summaries, concept maps, anatomical explanations, and mechanism drawings, may be generated with AI tools. Conditions for such use:

- Declaration in the Method section
- Declaration in the figure legend (name and version of the tool, generation prompt)
- Author's responsibility regarding copyright (some AI tools may reproduce existing images contained in their training data)

Technical enhancement (permitted): AI tools may be used for technical enhancements of an image created by the author, such as increasing resolution, cleaning the background, or adjusting color balance. No separate declaration is required for enhancements at this level; however, they must be performed in a manner that does not distort the original data.

Sources: Elsevier Publishing Ethics, Nature Editorial Policies (2023), Science AAAS AI Policy (2023), JAMA Instructions for Authors (2024).

6. Author Responsibilities

Authors are responsible for the accuracy of AI outputs and for adapting the suggestions appropriately to the manuscript. **AI tools can make mistakes, offer incorrect suggestions, or fail to fully reflect NPA publication standards. Evaluate every suggestion critically; do not accept it automatically.**

Within the framework of COPE's *Position Statement on Authorship and AI Tools (2023, 2024 update)*, AI tools can under no circumstances **be listed as authors** or **be cited as references**; because the responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the content required for authorship can belong only to humans. As AI tools have no legal status, they cannot hold copyright, cannot be sued, and cannot vouch for the originality of research.

It is the author's responsibility to ensure that AI-generated content is free of plagiarism, that the necessary permissions have been obtained, and that appropriate citations have been made. AI-generated material cannot be cited as a primary source and cannot be included in the reference list.

7. Frequently Asked Questions

Q1. Is this technical screening mandatory?

No, it is not mandatory. However, as the Editorial Board of Archives of Neuropsychiatry, we recommend applying it before submission. When applied, it is expected both to accelerate the peer review process and to reduce your revision burden.

Q2. If I apply this technical screening, will my manuscript be accepted automatically?

No. This practice is only a technical and formal preliminary check. The scientific value, originality, and methodological soundness of your manuscript will still be evaluated by the editorial board and independent reviewers.

Q3. Which AI tool should I use?

NPA does not recommend or endorse any specific tool. However, for data security, we recommend that you choose enterprise/API-based services in which exclusion from training data use is contractually guaranteed (for details, see Section 3). Whichever service is chosen, it is the author's responsibility to review the current terms of service and data policy of the tool.

Q4. Do I have to declare that I used AI?

Yes. Declaration of AI use is mandatory under NPA's publication policy, the ICMJE recommendations, and the YÖK Ethical Guidelines on Generative AI (2024). Even for technical screening purposes, if an AI tool has been used, a declaration is required in the Method section, the Acknowledgments section, and the cover letter. This transparency will not adversely affect the editorial evaluation; on the contrary, it is regarded as an indication of honest and open process management. Failure to declare may be treated as research misconduct; the TÜBİTAK Generative AI Guide also states that this may constitute an ethical violation of fabrication.

Q5. What should I do if the AI makes incorrect suggestions?

AI outputs should be critically evaluated, and only the suggestions you find correct should be applied. Disregard points you consider to be incorrect or misleading suggestions. Authors bear ultimate responsibility for each suggestion.

Q6. Do my reviewers also use AI?

The use of AI in the peer review process is regulated separately under the journal's policy. In accordance with the ICMJE recommendations, reviewers and editors may not upload submissions to AI systems where confidentiality cannot be assured without the author's explicit permission. This guide covers only the pre-submission technical screening performed by the author.

Q7. Can I share patient data from my case report with AI?

Case reports and manuscripts containing patient-level identifiable data are outside the scope of this guide (see Section 2). All legal and ethical responsibilities that may arise from transferring such content to AI tools rest with the author. NPA does not recommend a technical screening method for this scope.

Q8. Doesn't this guide violate NPA's principle of confidentiality in peer review?

No. Within the COPE and ICMJE frameworks, the confidentiality obligation applies to reviewers and editors; the author's freedom to share their own text with others - co-authors, mentors, language consultants, preprint servers, or linguistic/structural checking tools - is outside the scope of this obligation. Technical screening is a check that authors apply to their own text on their own initiative and falls within the author's rights.

According to ICMJE, manuscripts submitted to a journal are the author's 'privileged communication', and the author has the authority to decide how and with which tool to process their own text. NPA recommends that this authority be exercised responsibly and that tools that do not retain data or use it for training be preferred.

Q9. Is a manuscript uploaded to an AI tool considered “published”? Does this create a risk of duplicate publication?

According to the prevailing academic view, submission to an AI tool does not constitute publication, as the content is not made publicly accessible. However, some international journals (such as Nature, Science, NEJM) have tended to regard uploads to ChatGPT, Claude, and similar services as preprint sharing. NPA does not consider use for technical screening purposes within this scope. Moreover, the presentation of a study at a congress or meeting, or its public release as a preprint, does not mean that the stages of transformation into a scientific publication through peer review have been completed.

Q10. May this guide change in the future?

Yes. As AI technologies and publishing standards are evolving rapidly, this guide will be updated periodically. The current version can always be found on the “Instructions for Authors” page at www.noropsikiyatriarsivi.com.

8. Reference Documents and Sources

This guide has been prepared in accordance with the international and national reference documents listed below. It is recommended that these sources be consulted in case of any ambiguity arising in the interpretation or application of the document.

8.1. International Publishing and Ethics Frameworks

- **ICMJE - Use of Artificial Intelligence in Publishing:** AI recommendations of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors for authors (V.A), reviewers (V.B), and editors (V.C). www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/artificial-intelligence/
- **COPE - Authorship and AI Tools (2023, 2024 update):** Position statement of the Committee on Publication Ethics on the authorship status of AI tools. publicationethics.org
- **WAME - Chatbots, ChatGPT, and Scholarly Manuscripts (2023):** Recommendations of the World Association of Medical Editors on the use of chatbots in scholarly publishing. www.wame.org
- **Elsevier - Generative AI Policies for Journals:** Publisher policy including restrictions on generating and altering images with AI.
- **Springer Nature / Nature Portfolio - Editorial Policies: Artificial Intelligence (2023):** Publisher policy on images created with generative AI.
- **Science (AAAS) - Editorial Policies, AI (2023):** Policy of the Science family of journals on AI-generated text and images.
- **JAMA - Instructions for Authors (2024):** Author instructions of JAMA Network journals on the use and declaration of AI.

8.2. National Legislation and Guidelines in Türkiye

- **YÖK - Ethical Guidelines on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Scientific Research and Publication Activities of Higher Education Institutions (May 2024):** The official ethical guideline of the Council of Higher Education covering all academics in Türkiye. Its core principles are transparency, honesty, diligence, accountability, and awareness of ethical risks.
- **TÜBİTAK - Generative AI Guide:** Guidance on the declaration of AI use and on the possibility that inappropriate use may be considered an 'ethical violation of fabrication'.
- **ULAKBİM TR Dizin Criteria:** Ethical and structural standards that scientific journals in Türkiye must meet to be included in TR Dizin.
- **KVKK - Personal Data Protection Law (Law No. 6698):** The legal framework for the processing of special-category personal data, such as patient data, and their transfer to third-party data processors.

8.3. EQUATOR Network - Classical Reporting Guidelines

- **CONSORT:** For reports of randomized controlled trials
- **STROBE:** For reports of observational studies (cross-sectional, cohort, case-control)
- **PRISMA:** For systematic reviews and meta-analyses
- **STARD:** For diagnostic accuracy studies
- **CARE:** For case reports
- **ARRIVE:** For reports of animal experiments
- **TREND:** For non-randomized behavioral and public health studies

8.4. EQUATOR Network - For AI-Based Studies

These are new reporting guidelines added to the EQUATOR Network collection as AI- and machine learning-based studies have increased. They are particularly important in psychiatry for the evaluation of LLM-based application studies.

- **CONSORT-AI:** CONSORT extension for randomized controlled trials involving AI
- **SPIRIT-AI:** SPIRIT extension for clinical trial protocols involving AI
- **TRIPOD-AI / PROBAST-AI:** AI-based diagnostic and prognostic prediction model studies
- **TRIPOD-LLM (2025):** New reporting guideline for studies using large language models
- **CHART:** For chatbot health advice studies
- **GAMER:** Reporting guideline for the use of generative AI tools in medical research
- **DECIDE-AI:** Early-stage clinical evaluation of AI-based clinical decision support systems
- **CLAIM:** Checklist for AI studies in medical imaging

All reporting guidelines are accessible from the official EQUATOR Network website (www.equator-network.org).

8.5. Other Relevant Standards

- **CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy):** A standard 14-item taxonomy for author contribution statements. credit.niso.org
- **Declaration of Helsinki (October 2024):** Ethical principles for medical research involving human participants. www.wma.net
- **ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest:** Standard form for conflict of interest disclosure.