

AI Principles

Background

Intelligent Risk has seen a broad increase in the use of Generative AI since about 2023. Our approach since then has been cautious acceptance. Contributing authors who experimented with the new technology were only asked to disclose how AI was used at the end of their article. The “honor code” ensured authors give credit where external resources are used, much like they would reference other sources.

Areas of Improvement

During this time, it became more difficult to provide constructive feedback on early drafts due to the “clean” appearance and, sometimes, jargon-heavy language common with AI-assisted writing. We also observe fewer personal experiences and anecdotes, making the publication less impactful for practitioners. Sometimes later draft would completely change compared with earlier ones, making our attempts at review and improvement of the final article more time-consuming.

See [1] for similar observations by educational professionals.

Guidance in AI use

Undoubtedly, AI can improve the quality of the publication. We hear it from authors all the time and experience it ourselves, it can speed up laborious tasks (like providing references in APA format), aid in research, spot errors and help brainstorm in limited circumstances. It should not and cannot, in our view, replace an author’s voice and experiences.

Therefore, we are laying out this first guidance on **AI use for authors**. This is intended to (1) maintain our high content standards at the publication, and (2) enable a productive, stimulating review for authors, peer reviewers and editors.

See the following page for our guidance.

Table 1. Guidance on AI use for authors

	1 st submission	Later submissions	Final submission
Acceptable AI usage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research • Formatting references (APA style) • Detecting grammatical errors / unclear language • Title assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detecting grammatical errors / unclear language • Assistance dealing with specific reviewer feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Polish language where ambiguous or confusing / to align with target audience
Be careful of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Brainstorming” • Offering structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broken / missing reference URLs (check manually) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broken / missing reference URLs (check manually)
What to avoid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing / "polishing" language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing / "polishing" language • Going back to the "drawing board" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing / "polishing" language • Going back to the "drawing board"
Reasoning	Using AI to brainstorm topics, structure your article or write (at this stage) reduces creativity, risks hallucinations and makes review difficult because of language complexity and lack of a unique perspective distilled from your own professional knowledge and experience.	Editor/reviewer will expect targeted responses to feedback and might miss unannounced changes throughout article	Changes should be minor and clearly announced to editor/reviewer for final checks

Reference

[1] Winthrop, R. (May 27, 2026). *What 370,000 College Essays Tell Us About A.I.’s Effects on Creativity*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2026/05/27/opinion/writing-creativity-ai.html?unlocked_article_code=1.plA.86ti.jerCtCdrO-1-&smid=em-share

Carl Densem
Steve Lindo
 Co-Editors, Intelligent Risk