AI Researchers
Embedding Responsible AI in Research

AI READINESS TOOLKIT

UC4-02 Use case 4: Academic writing

Accept, adapt or reject

An AI-assisted academic writing revision log

AT A GLANCE

A revision log for checking AI-suggested changes to academic text before accepting them. For each suggestion, the researcher records the original and proposed wording, checks meaning, evidence and voice, and decides to accept, adapt or reject it. A pre-use checklist covers approved tools, confidentiality and disclosure. The log gives a clear record of AI use and keeps arguments, claims and authorship with the researcher.

TYPE
Template

FORMAT
PDF

CONTRIBUTING PARTNER
UPF Barcelona School of Management

WHO IT IS FOR
Researchers at any career stage writing for publication

FRAMEWORK BARRIERS
Protecting expertise, Trust in AI, Know-how, The rules

HUMAN-ONLY BOUNDARY

AI may propose revisions. Arguments, claims, interpretation, evidential strength, contribution and final authorship remain with the researcher.

Co-funded by the European Union

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author or authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Foundation for the Development of the Education System. Neither the European Union nor the entity providing the grant can be held responsible for them.

How to use this template

1. Define the task and the limits of AI assistance before sharing any text.
2. Ask the AI to revise only within those limits and to show substantive changes clearly.
3. Record changes that may affect meaning, evidence, terminology, argument or authorship.
4. Decide whether to ACCEPT, ADAPT or REJECT each change and document why.
5. Complete the final integrity check before using or submitting the revised text.

This log does not need to capture every comma or spelling correction. Prioritise changes that could affect scientific meaning, interpretation, evidential strength, disciplinary precision or authorial responsibility.

Before you begin

Use this page to establish a safe and transparent writing task before asking an AI system to revise academic text.

FIELD	DETAIL	
Check	Yes / No / N.A.	Notes or action required
Authorised environment: The tool is institutionally approved for the type of text and data involved.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A.	
Confidentiality: No confidential, personal, sensitive or embargoed material will be entered into an unapproved tool.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A.	
Publisher and institutional rules: Relevant journal, funder, university and project policies have been checked.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A.	
Task boundary: The request is limited to language, clarity, concision, readability or agreed structural support.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A.	
No new content: The AI has been instructed not to add claims, interpretations, evidence, results or references.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A.	
Disclosure: The researcher knows whether and how AI use must be acknowledged or documented.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A.	

DEFINE THE PERMITTED TASK

☐ Grammar and spelling

☐ Clarity and readability

☐ Concision

☐ Academic tone

☐ Sentence or paragraph structure

☐ Terminology check

☐ Other: _____

Risk map for AI-suggested revisions

Use the risk level to decide how much scrutiny a proposed change requires. Risk depends on what the change does —not on how fluent or polished it sounds.

GREEN: Usually low risk after review

- Spelling, grammar and punctuation
- Removal of obvious repetition
- Splitting an overly long sentence
- Formatting consistency
- Minor fluency improvements that preserve all meaning

AMBER: Substantive review required

- Reordering sentences or paragraphs
- Changing headings or emphasis
- Replacing disciplinary terminology
- Rewriting limitations
- Summarising or compressing a passage
- Changing cautious or probabilistic wording

RED: Human-only decision

- Adding, removing or modifying scientific claims
- Changing association into causality
- Interpreting results or deciding conclusions
- Adding references, evidence or factual content
- Removing material limitations or uncertainty
- Defining novelty, contribution or authorship

Watch for these meaning shifts

RISK	TYPICAL SHIFT
Certainty inflation	may suggest → demonstrates
Causality inflation	is associated with → leads to
Scope inflation	in this sample → generally
Contribution inflation	offers preliminary evidence → establishes a new framework
Limitation loss	caveats or boundary conditions disappear

RISK	TYPICAL SHIFT
Terminology drift	a precise disciplinary term is replaced by a near-synonym

Suggested instruction to the AI

Adapt this instruction to the task and to institutional requirements. It is intentionally restrictive.

> Revise the text only for grammar, clarity, concision and readability. Preserve the original meaning, level of certainty, disciplinary terminology, claims, limitations and citations. Do not add new ideas, evidence, interpretations or references. Highlight any change that could affect meaning and explain why you recommend it.

Recommended workflow

FIELD	DETAIL
1. Preserve the original	Keep a dated or versioned copy before using AI.
2. Request visible changes	Use tracked changes, a comparison table or clearly marked alternatives.
3. Review by category	Check meaning, certainty, causality, terminology, evidence and limitations.
4. Decide actively	Accept, adapt or reject—never accept the full output automatically.
5. Verify the final version	Read the revised text against the original and the underlying evidence.
6. Record and disclose	Retain the log and acknowledge AI use where required.

Decision definitions

ACCEPT: The suggestion improves the text and preserves scientific meaning.

ADAPT: The suggestion is useful, but requires human correction or refinement.

REJECT: The suggestion alters meaning, evidence, precision, voice or responsibility.

AI revision log

Record significant changes. Add rows as needed. Use short evidence-based reasons rather than general statements such as “sounds better”.

FIELD	DETAIL						
No.	Original text	AI suggestion	Change type	Risk	Decision	Reason / evidence checked	Final approved version

FIELD	DETAIL	Accept, adapt or reject
1	Language / clarity / structure / terminology / evidence	Accept / Adapt / Reject
2	Language / clarity / structure / terminology / evidence	Accept / Adapt / Reject
3	Language / clarity / structure / terminology / evidence	Accept / Adapt / Reject
4	Language / clarity / structure / terminology / evidence	Accept / Adapt / Reject
5	Language / clarity / structure / terminology / evidence	Accept / Adapt / Reject
6	Language / clarity / structure / terminology / evidence	Accept / Adapt / Reject

AI revision log (continued)

FIELD	DETAIL						
No.	Original text	AI suggestion	Change type	Risk	Decision	Reason / evidence checked	Final approved version
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							

Worked example

The revised version sounds stronger and more concise, but it changes the scientific meaning.

ORIGINAL	AI REVISION
Our findings suggest that participation in the programme may be associated with increased confidence in using AI tools. However, the study relied on self-reported measures and a relatively small sample.	Our findings demonstrate that the programme increases researchers' confidence in using AI tools.

FIELD	DETAIL
Change type	Clarity, concision, evidential strength and causal language
Risk level	RED
Decision	REJECT
Why	"Suggest" became "demonstrate"; association became causality; both limitations disappeared.
Evidence checked	Study design, sample size, measures and original results.
Final approved version	Our findings suggest that participation in the programme may be associated with increased confidence in using AI tools. However, the small sample and reliance on self-reported measures limit the strength of this conclusion.

> A more fluent sentence is not necessarily a more accurate sentence.

Final integrity check

MEANING AND ARGUMENT

- ☐ The original meaning is preserved.
- ☐ The level of certainty has not been increased.
- ☐ Association and causality remain correctly distinguished.
- ☐ No new claim, interpretation or conclusion has been introduced without human approval.

EVIDENCE AND PRECISION

- ☐ Every substantive claim remains supported.
- ☐ Limitations and boundary conditions are retained.
- ☐ Disciplinary terminology remains accurate.
- ☐ No invented or unverified reference has been added.

VOICE AND AUTHORSHIP

- ☐ I understand and can defend every sentence.
- ☐ The final argument and intellectual contribution are mine.
- ☐ The text has not been accepted automatically or without active review.
- ☐ The final wording reflects my intended meaning and scholarly voice.

TRANSPARENCY AND COMPLIANCE

- ☐ The tool and environment were appropriate for the material.

- ☐ Relevant institutional, publisher and funder rules were followed.
- ☐ The revision log has been retained where appropriate.
- ☐ AI use has been disclosed or acknowledged where required.

Researcher approval

FINAL DECISION	☐ APPROVED ☐ FURTHER REVISION REQUIRED
Researcher name	
Signature / confirmation	
Date and version	

FINAL RESPONSIBILITY CANNOT BE DELEGATED

The named author remains accountable for the content submitted or published.

Optional AI-use record and disclosure

Use this page only where relevant. Adapt the wording to the journal, institution, funder or disciplinary guidance that applies.

FIELD	DETAIL
Tool and version	
Date(s) used	
Purpose of use	Language / clarity / concision / structural suggestions / other
Material provided	
Human verification performed	
Relevant policy checked	
Location of retained log	

Example disclosure statement

> A generative AI tool was used to support language and clarity editing. The authors reviewed all suggested changes and remain fully responsible for the arguments, claims, interpretation, references and final text.

Do not use this example automatically. Disclosure requirements differ across publishers, institutions and disciplines. Always follow the rules applicable to the specific output.

About this resource

TITLE	Accept, adapt or reject
TOOLKIT REFERENCE	UC4-02, use case 4: Academic writing
DEVELOPED BY	UPF Barcelona School of Management, Ana Freire
SUGGESTED CITATION	AI Researchers (2026). Accept, adapt or reject. AI Readiness Toolkit, UC4-02. UPF Barcelona School of Management, Ana Freire. airesearchers.eu
QUALITY ASSURANCE	Reviewed by the AI Researchers consortium for quality, categorisation and alignment with the AI Engagement Framework. External peer review by senior academics is under way, and the item may be updated as a result.
VERSION	1.0, November 2026
PROJECT	AI Researchers: Embedding Responsible AI in Research. Erasmus+ Cooperation Partnership in Higher Education, KA220-HED-66835D2B. October 2025 to March 2028.
CONSORTIUM	University of Lodz (coordinator), FEP University of Porto, UPF Barcelona School of Management, ACEEU, NIPI (OPI PIB), European E-learning Institute and Momentum Marketing Services

Co-funded by the European Union

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author or authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Foundation for the Development of the Education System. Neither the European Union nor the entity providing the grant can be held responsible for them.

AI Researchers
Embedding Responsible AI in Research