

## Should We Wait for Major Frauds to Unveil to Plan an AI Use License?

Istemihan Coban<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> Department of Anatomy, İzmir Democracy University Faculty of Medicine, Konak, İzmir, Türkiye

Received: 2023-12-10

Accepted: 2023-12-21

Published Online: 2023-12-22

**Corresponding Author**

Istemihan Coban, MD

**Address:** İzmir Democracy  
University Faculty of Medicine,  
Department of Anatomy, Konak,  
İzmir, Türkiye.**E-mail:** [istemihancoban@gmail.com](mailto:istemihancoban@gmail.com).

Dear Editor,

I have followed with great interest your editorial content [1] which encourages academics to create a common mind, and the writings of our contributing colleagues, and I wanted to share my views and suggestions in order to offer a perspective on the subject. While the focal point of the debate is the question of whether AI can be included in an article as a co-author, it is evident that there are various debates on the periphery. When we discuss the peripheral questions, the answer to the focal question will emerge automatically. Thanks to the computer and internet revolution, we now have the simplest, fastest, and cheapest way to access any data that we have ever known, and this development does not seem to stop. For example, it is argued that the 6G communication network will enter the market in 2030–2040 and that extended reality and augmented reality tools will be integrated into our lives together with the internet of things with smart intelligence [2]. While the easy storage and accessibility of information uploaded to the Internet environment facilitates the production of new data, the production of false information can be uploaded to information repositories and circulated easily, which creates other major problems in itself, such as the use of reliable scientific data [3].

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools, especially large language models (LLMs), such as ChatGPT, which is on the agenda, have entered our lives like “aliens born on Earth” with their ability to access information in millions of different data sets from almost every language and culture. It is obvious that if this super-powered extraterrestrial from this world uses his powers on issues that humans demand in common, it will be described as “Superman”, and vice versa, it will be described as the mythological “Erlık”, and the current debate is exactly in the middle of these two superheroes. It is true that AI tools can be very useful when we use them to extract vast oceans of data or for various other academic tasks (e.g. automated draft generation, article summarizing, and language translation) [4]. However, at this point, it should be taken into account that the artificial AI tools available today may not be limited to performing the given tasks and may present a world reality that is adorned with “artificial hallucinations” [5]. We may end up fighting an unrelenting force in the production and distribution of misinformation that we lose control over.

We should discuss the responsibility for the control of products that will be obtained using artificial intelligence and prepare appropriate guidelines. Responsibility for control means that any digital result (whether it is an analysis of data or an analysis of a situation or an interpretation) must be reliable, i.e., it must be testable, rationally reproducible, and ethically attainable. Three different



interlocutors—the producer, the distributor, and the consumer—have different but critical responsibilities in controlling liability. When using AI tools, the scientific research group (producer party) working on any subject unconditionally bears the responsibility for each and every sentence of each and every piece of data obtained through these digital machines, and it should be declared that any negative consequences that may arise otherwise are accepted in advance. The acceptance of these digital machines as a kind of co-author in scientific products (translation text, statistical analysis, research title determination, or any text that will bring the research result to the academic literature) obtained with AI tools that cannot legally bear responsibility is similar to the acceptance of the computer, operating system, or code groups that enable any digital operation as the author. It is also a fact that this topic will come up for discussion again in the future when the issue of the individualization of AI (in terms of legal responsibility and rights) begins to be discussed. Scientific journals and publishing houses consisting of competent referees at the point of control of the academic products produced are the gatekeepers in protecting the naivety of the literature. There are many examples of how these indomitable guardians can be easily circumvented due to bad intentions and a failure to internalize ethical principles. In this respect, it can be predicted that the use of AI tools will help publishers in their work and that the quality and quantity of this help will gradually increase [6]. On the other hand, another major problem of the near future is that it will become increasingly easy to circumvent the gatekeepers with the malicious intent and misdirection of the people who take responsibility for AIs, and the content of the broadcasts may become corrupt. At the last point, the responsibilities of us, the readers who will consume the product, are also increasing. While reading articles that are declared to be written with the help of AI, we should question and check each sentence we read in more detail and increase our positive or negative feedback. To sum up, the use of AI tools as a technique in research should be explained in detail, trainings where the effective and ethical use of the tools are taught and licensed should be given to researchers urgently, and people who do not have an AI Usage License should not take part in scientific articles in the near future. It might be safe to say that the planning of a special education accompanied by leading scientists from every society is behind us and that the frauds of today could cripple the science of the future.

Yours sincerely,

**Keywords:** Artificial intelligence, ChatGPT, Research Ethics

**Conflict of Interest:** The author declared that there is no conflict of interest in this paper.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Balat A, Bahsi I (2023) May Artificial Intelligence Be a Co-Author on an Academic Paper?. *Eur J Ther.* 29(3):e12-e13. <https://doi.org/10.58600/eurjther1688>
- [2] Ahammed TB, Patgiri R, Nayak S (2023). A vision on the artificial intelligence for 6G communication. *ICT Express.* 9(2):197-210.3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ict.2022.05.005>
- [3] Lee JY (2023). Can an artificial intelligence chatbot be the author of a scholarly article?. *J Educ Eval Health Prof.* 20. <https://doi.org/10.3352/jeehp.2023.20.6>
- [4] Salvagno M, Taccone FS, Gerli AG (2023). Can artificial intelligence help for scientific writing?. *Crit care.* 27(1):1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-023-04380-2>
- [5] Alkaissi H, McFarlane SI (2023). Artificial hallucinations in ChatGPT: implications in scientific writing. *Cureus.*15(2). <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.35179>
- [6] Dadkhah M, Oermann MH, Hegedüs M, Raman R, Dávid LD (2023). Detection of fake papers in the era of artificial intelligence. *Diagnosis.* <https://doi.org/10.1515/dx-2023-0090>

### *How to Cite;*

Coban I (2024) Should We Wait for Major Frauds to Unveil to Plan an AI Use License?. 30(2):198-199. *Eur J Ther.* <https://doi.org/10.58600/eurjther1880>