Question: What is the distinction between assistive AI tools and generative AI tools?

Answer: For the purposes of these guidelines, we distinguish between Assistive AI tools and Generative AI tools as follows:

Assistive AI tools

Assistive AI tools make suggestions, corrections, and improvements to content you've authored yourself. Tools like Google's Gmail and Microsoft's Outlook and Word have offered to flag spelling or grammatical errors for many years. More recently, these assistive tools have introduced features to proactively make suggestions for the next word or phrase or to suggest better or more concise phrasing to improve clarity. Content that you've crafted on your own but refined or improved with the help of this kind of Assistive AI tool is considered "AI-assisted."

Generative AI tools

This term refers to tools such as ChatGPT or Dall-e, which produce content in the form of text, images, and translations. If an AI tool was the primary creator of the content, the content is considered "AI generated," even if you made significant changes to the content after its creation. AI-generated translations are counted as "generative content" because the accuracy of a translation depends on more than a mechanical understanding of language. Different translators may provide widely varying translations of the same text depending on many factors.

Question: Are we expected to disclose the use of generative AI in art or text?

Answer: Yes. You are required to inform us of any AI-generated content appearing in your work (including text, images, charts, graphs or translations) when you submit any form of content to Corwin, including manuscripts and book proposals. Your Editorial team will supply you with a disclosure form, which you should use every time you interact with a generative AI system. (The form requires you to document every input you provide and every output you receive.) This form is based on the Sage guidelines for documenting AI use in manuscripts, journal articles, and textbooks. You can read those here Assistive and generative AI guidelines for authors | Policies & guidelines | Sage Publishing

AI-generated content must undergo rigorous human review prior to submission. This is to ensure the content aligns with our standards for quality and authenticity and allows us to assess potential permissions implications. Disclosure of AI-generated content allows us to complete this review.

Question: What if I provide (ingest) AI software with my original content for the purposes of editing or generating a summary? Does that mean the content is essentially public?

Answer: If you are using public software (like ChatGPT), you should assume that your information and intellectual property are exposed to others. Even software for which you have paid for a license may make the content public. It is important to read the Terms of Use of any generative AI application carefully prior to providing any content to it for ingestion to ensure the content will not be publicly distributed or used for the purpose of training AI to generate similar content.

Question: Do I have to attribute art created by generative AI to the software I'm using, even if the software itself doesn't require such attribution?

Answer: Yes, all AI-generated content must include attribution to the AI application regardless of whether the Terms of Use of the application requires it. This is to maintain ethical standards and ensure transparency for the reader. Be sure to review the Terms of Use of the AI application for any specific attribution requirements. Otherwise follow the appropriate referencing conventions for attribution for your work.

Question: Is there any content we are forbidden from creating with AI software or use of AI that is prohibited by Corwin?

Answer: Yes. You may not use generative AI applications to create or modify core research data. You should never share sensitive personal or proprietary information on *any* AI platform like ChatGPT because this may expose the information or intellectual property to others.

Question: Current art creation tools like Adobe and Canva have already incorporated AI into their software. Are we required to document this usage?

Answer: Yes—any use of generative AI must be disclosed. (In addition, both Adobe and Canva software present us with unique challenges that transcend the use of generative AI. Please check with your acquisitions editor about the use of art-generating software to ensure their files are supported by our typesetting vendors, that the fonts the software uses are also licensed by Corwin, and so that the use of color is compatible with Corwin's printing requirements.)

Question: If I use a generative AI software such as ChatGPT or CoPilot to create a summary of my original work, in order, for example, to include a chapter summary in the book, can I still copyright the content?

Answer: At this time, we are operating under the assumption that anything created by generative AI cannot be copyrighted. As well, any submission for copyright registration must note if and when generative AI is used in the creation of the content, and AI-generated content must be excluded from the copyright claim. Please check with your acquisitions editor when in doubt.

Question: What if I used generative AI to create an outline of a book or chapter and then create an original work based on that outline structure? What are the implications for copyright?

Answer: This will depend on context. Review the definitions of assistive AI and generative AI at the top of this document. If you use generative AI to organize work you've already created, this is likely assistive. Any original work you create based on an outline structure created with the help of assistive AI is copyrightable. If you use generative AI to generate the core *idea or vision* of the book, you must disclose usage and there is a potential that original work that builds from this generation may not be copyrightable. There is also a risk that the idea or vision generated is based on another author's copyrighted work.

Question: Are there any *general* recommendations for best practices around generated illustrations and photographs?

Answer: It is unclear how much AI platforms rely on existing copyrighted work to create illustrations and "photos." It is possible AI generated art has infringed on an artist's copyright, and you could be liable for that infringement. We have found that iStock contains much of the illustration content we need, and certainly most of the photographs. Thus, we recommend avoiding the use of AI for art generation unless you are using art-generating AI to illustrate the power of AI (e.g., in a book or discussion about ways to use AI). Again, whenever a question arises, talk to your acquisitions editor.

Question: Should I be concerned if AI software developers are sued for copyright infringement? Could there be legal repercussions for me if I used their software?

Answer: As this area of the law is rapidly developing, we cannot be certain. It is best to research the software you are using carefully to learn how they "train" the AI and what licenses they have in place with artists and publishers, to ensure the company is taking thoughtful measures to avoid infringement. You may also want to consult with your own legal counsel to advise you on the risk of using these tools.