

GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

JOHN VON NEUMANN UNIVERSITY DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Resolution NJE-GSZDI-DIT-96/2026 (04.09)

The Council of the Doctoral School of Management and Business Administration of John von Neumann University hereby adopts the following guidelines on the use of Artificial Intelligence in connection with reviewing activities:

The requirements applicable to reviewers are likewise formulated on the basis of the principles of Elsevier in force as of January 2024.

<https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/publishing-ethics#3-duties-of-reviewers> (accessed on 31 January 2024 at 23:21 CET)

When a researcher is invited to review the work of another researcher, the manuscript must be treated as a confidential document. The reviewer must not upload the submitted manuscript, or any part thereof, to a generative artificial intelligence application, as doing so may violate the authors' confidentiality and intellectual property rights. Furthermore, where the document contains personally identifiable information, such use may also give rise to violations of data protection requirements.

The confidentiality requirement also extends to the reviewer's report, as it may contain confidential information concerning the manuscript and/or its authors. Therefore, the reviewer must not upload the review report to an artificial intelligence application, even if the sole purpose is to improve the language, style, or readability of the report.

Peer review lies at the heart of the scientific ecosystem. Reviewing a scientific manuscript entails responsibilities that can only be entrusted to human reviewers. Reviewers must not use generative artificial intelligence or AI-assisted technologies to support the scientific evaluation of manuscripts, since the critical thinking and original assessment required for peer review fall outside the scope of such technologies. There is also a risk that these technologies may generate incorrect, incomplete, or biased conclusions regarding the manuscript.

The reviewer remains fully responsible and accountable for the content of the review report.