Journal of Singing Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies Policy

(revised January 22, 2026)

Prepared by Ian Howell and Theodora Nestorova and approved by the *Journal of Singing* editorial board.

1. Introduction

This policy covers the use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in preparing *Journal of Singing* (JOS) submissions, and in peer review and editorial evaluation. JOS does not aim to discourage or police authors' use of AI, and it does not want authors to try to hide such use. Rather, it seeks to foster ethical, rigorous, and fully disclosed use of such tools when used. Because automated AI-detection methods are imperfect and can misclassify legitimate writing, JOS will not use such tools to identify undisclosed AI use. If concerns arise during the peer-review process, the journal will request clarification about the author's process.

1.1 Scope and Definitions

Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies include tools that generate or substantially transform text, images, audio, video, or code from prompts or inputs. These include chatbots, paraphrasers, translators, summarizers, image/audio/video generators, and code generators. Throughout this document, "AI," "AI models," "models," "AI tools," "tools," and similar refer to such generative tools. Online AI checkers present legitimate data privacy concerns and may not be used unless they meet the privacy standards required for AI use below.

Routine nongenerative tools such as spellcheck, grammar check, or reference managers fall outside this policy's scope unless they generate new language or alter content.

Interpretive weight refers to the strength, scope, causality, certainty, rhetorical character, or emphasis of a passage.

Trivial use involves AI-generated content that is both (a) fragmentary (a word or short phrase) and (b) does not alter the interpretive weight of the passage.

Substantial human authorship means the author(s) *originated* the manuscript's central claims, *generated* initial drafts, and *developed* the argumentative structure through their own intellectual labor. AI may assist with revision, refinement, and feedback.

1.2 Core Expectations

1. **Humans remain responsible.** Authors are fully accountable for every claim, citation, interpretation, and ethical obligation in the submission.
2. **Humans remain the source of expertise.** AI must never be relied on as a subject matter expert because it cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies.
3. **AI tools are not authors.** Do not list AI tools as authors or coauthors.
4. **AI tools are not sources.** Do not cite them.
5. **Protect confidentiality and rights.** Treat unpublished manuscripts and related materials as confidential. Do not provide full unpublished drafts or sensitive/third-party material to AI tools unless you can reasonably verify control over the data (see Section 1.3).

1.3 Data Governance and Tool Suitability

Before inputting any manuscript content into an AI tool, authors must reasonably confirm (for their specific account tier/mode):

- **Training controls:** Does the tool use your inputs for training? If opt-out is available, have you enabled it?

- **Retention/deletion behavior:** What data are stored, for how long, and what does "delete" mean in practice?
- **Access/review exceptions:** Even if inputs are opted out of training, under what conditions may humans review content? Be aware that submitting feedback (e.g., thumbs-up/down) may expose data to review teams.
- **Rights compliance:** Third party–owned text and media should not be uploaded without required permissions and/or data protections. This includes musical examples, licensed notation or audio, third-party figures or text excerpts, and especially any nonanonymized participant, student, or patient data.

If you cannot reasonably verify these points, or if your AI model or tier does not offer such controls, do not upload full unpublished drafts or sensitive material.

2. Categories of AI Use

JOS distinguishes AI use by what enters the submitted manuscript (text, structure, and associated media) and by authorship integrity. Uses are categorized as Green (no disclosure), Yellow (disclosure required), or Red (not permitted except in specific cases). ***When in doubt, disclose use.*** **Disclosure alone will never be cause for manuscript rejection.**

2.1 Green Use (No Disclosure Required)

AI assistance is Green only when it performs purely mechanical surface correction with no plausible change to interpretive weight. Surface corrections include: spelling, punctuation, typos, grammar corrections that do not change content, reference formatting, style consistency, and consistency checks for terminology you already chose.

Specific Green use cases:

- **Prewriting ideation:** AI use for brainstorming, searching for counterarguments, forming question lists, or stress-testing reasoning is permitted without disclosure, provided AI-generated prose or structure is not incorporated beyond triviality.
- **Feedback and critique:** Using AI to identify blind spots, anticipate reviewer questions, or receive critique is permitted without disclosure if you revise independently. AI may offer rewrites incidentally; you may discard these and revise in your own words without disclosure, provided you do not copy or closely track AI phrasing or structure beyond triviality. Best practice is to specifically request feedback rather than rewrites.

Green test: A knowledgeable reader would interpret the "before AI" work as having the same interpretive weight as the "after AI" version.

Green-to-Yellow trigger: If AI-generated prose or structure is incorporated beyond triviality, the use becomes Yellow and must be disclosed.

2.2 Yellow Use (Disclosure Required)

AI use is Yellow if it materially contributes wording or structure that you keep, including:

- Paraphrasing or rewriting for clarity, tone, or "academic voice"
- Summarization, or expansion
- Revising the abstract, discussion, or conclusions in a manner that adds intellectual value
- Literature reviews
- Outlines, restructuring paragraphs, topic sentences, or bridging logic
- AI-assisted transcription (e.g., phonetic transcription tools, automated IPA conversion, speech-to-text tools) that materially affects analysis
- AI-assisted code generation that materially influences data processing, analysis, statistical modeling, or figure generation

- Edits that alter (or could plausibly alter) interpretive weight if you adopted AI-generated wording or structure

Specific Yellow use of AI to generate translations of lyrics or IPA transcriptions:

The author must make a good-faith effort to verify that any AI-generated translations or IPA transcriptions of lyrics are not currently under copyright. This AI policy does not relieve authors of their responsibility to cite such material. If AI is used in this manner, a human must review and vouch for the translations/transcriptions by name. Add this attestation to the general AI disclosure (Section 5).

Specific Yellow use of AI to translate the manuscript:

JOS recognizes that some authors may not have a sufficient command of written English and may need the assistance of a translation service to prepare their manuscript for submission. In one sense, AI translation tools are not rewriting text in a substantial manner. However, the author must ultimately attest that they endorse the accuracy of every word of the actual submitted manuscript. Therefore, any translated submission must include the name of a human who vouches for the accuracy of the translation, even if they are verifying an AI-generated translation. The author may certainly make this attestation themself in a separate "disclosure of translation" section prior to the references (Section 5). If an AI translation tool was used, please fold this disclosure into your AI disclosure. If the author can neither verify the translation themselves, nor find a bilingual colleague willing to add their name to an attestation, please contact the editor in chief. At its discretion, JOS may help to provide access to appropriate resources.

Yellow test: If the tool's contribution could plausibly affect the interpretation or implications of your arguments, changes the interpretive weight, or you retained nontrivial AI-generated prose/structure, disclose.

Yellow-to-Red trigger: If AI-generated outputs are substantially incorporated such that a reasonable person would consider the AI to be the author or subject matter expert, use is generally prohibited.

2.3 Red Use (Prohibited or Requiring Special Justification)

General principle: JOS requires substantial human authorship of the manuscript's structure, narrative prose, and argumentation. Submissions will not be accepted if AI is the dominant source of prose, structure, arguments, analysis, or conclusions, even if such content is edited, curated, and fact-checked by the author(s). Disclosing AI use does not relieve you of the responsibility to both originate ideas and substantially draft the manuscript yourself.

Specifically prohibited (Red-A):
- **Unverified or hallucinated citations/references:** You may not include references you have not personally verified in the scholarly record or treat AI outputs as citable sources.
- **AI-generated or AI-altered visual media:** No AI-generated figures, images, or artwork is permitted in submitted manuscripts (unless explicitly part of the research method per Red-B).
- **AI-generated, AI-cloned, or AI-altered audio/video:** No synthetic audio presented as unaltered human performance, or that may mislead readers as to provenance, is permitted in submitted manuscripts (unless explicitly part of the research method per Red-B).
- **Rights or privacy violations:** You may not provide identifiable student, patient, or participant data, or licensed/copyrighted third-party content to AI tools without appropriate permissions and/or safeguards.

Permitted only as documented research method (Red-B): If otherwise prohibited AI use is part of the research design (e.g., AI media synthesis or processing, autoclassification, or other AI methods used as an experimental component), it may be acceptable only if described reproducibly in Methods. You must document:

- The tool and model (name, version, date(s) used)
- Configuration (parameters, initial prompts of relevant, optional modules)
- Workflow and validation approach
- Training data provenance where relevant

Documentation upon request: If editorial concerns arise, JOS may request reasonable documentation sufficient to support the claim of substantial human authorship (e.g., version history, tracked changes, dated drafts). This request is intended to clarify your process, not to "catch" authors.

3. Code and Computational Workflows

JOS permits the responsible use of generative AI to generate and/or debug code in Praat, RStudio, Python, or similar for data cleaning, analysis, visualization, and figure generation, provided the authors validate the code, document the workflow, and ensure reproducibility. When custom code (including AI-assisted code) materially contributes to analyses, results, figures, or conclusions, authors must:

- Validate the code on the dataset used for reported results, or on a suitably representative dataset where full data cannot be shared.
- Perform reasonableness checks appropriate to the analysis. If your code reveals an unexpected result, demonstrate that a known dataset produces expected results.
- Document the software environment (language, package/library versions, OS if relevant, initial settings).
- Retain the exact scripts and workflow(s) used and be prepared to provide them upon editorial request, subject to privacy and rights constraints.

4. Peer Review and Editorial Evaluation

Reviewers and editors must not upload any part of submitted manuscripts, reviewer reports, or editorial correspondence into generative AI tools for summarization, critique, or decision support. This extends to algorithmic AI checkers. Reviewers may use AI for tasks unrelated to the manuscript under review (e.g., looking up background on a cited article in the general literature), but may not input any content from the submission itself.

5. Required Disclosure

Where to disclose AI use: If disclosure is required (Yellow, AI translation, or Red-B), upload a Word or PDF document entitled: "Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Manuscript Preparation Process." Include tool name, version, additional modules or settings, purpose, and attest that you originated all prose and verified all content.

> **Suggested language:** "During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used [tool/service/model/tier] for [purpose]. The author(s) reviewed and edited all AI-assisted content as needed, verified the accuracy of all factual claims and references, and take full responsibility for the content of the published article. The author(s) originated and drafted all prose, using AI only for revision and refinement in keeping with JOS policy."

If AI language translation is involved, insert: This manuscript was originally prepared in [language] and translated into English using [AI tools, version, modules, settings, date(s)]. This translation was verified by [insert name] and the author assumes all responsibility for its accuracy.

If human language translation is involved, insert: This manuscript was originally prepared in [language] and translated into English by [insert name]. The author assumes all responsibility for its accuracy.

6. Violations

If undisclosed or prohibited AI use is identified after publication, JOS will follow COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) guidelines, which may include correction, retraction, or notification to the author's institution as appropriate.

7. Policy Updates

This policy will be reviewed annually and updated as AI technologies evolve. All updates will be published via the NATS website. For submissions in progress, the policy version in effect at the time of initial submission applies.