

Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Publishing in the Scientific Field: A Narrative Review

Inteligencia artificial y futuro editorial en el ámbito científico: una revisión narrativa

  Lidia Vargas Pancorbo¹
  Pamela Martínez Andunce²
  Elba Liliana Camacho Reyes²

- ¹ Programa de Educación Primaria, Facultad de Educación, Universidad Nacional de San Antonio Abad del Cusco, UNSAAC, Cusco, Perú
- ² Facultad de Ciencias de Educación y Ciencias Sociales, Universidad Andrés Bello, UNAB, Viña, Chile
- ³ Centro de Educación para la Ciencia y la Cultura, Facultad de Pedagogía, Centro de Estudios Universitarios Isidro Fabela, Cuautitlán, México

Fecha de recepción: 14.10.2025
Fecha de revisión: 22.12.2025
Fecha de aprobación: 15.01.2026

Cómo citar: Vargas Pancorbo, L., Martínez Andunce, P., & Camacho Reyes, E. (2026). Inteligencia artificial y futuro editorial en el ámbito científico: una revisión narrativa. *Espergesia*, 13(1), e130102.
<https://doi.org/10.18050/rev.espergesia.v12i1.4306>

Autor de correspondencia: Lidia Vargas Pancorbo

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is progressively reshaping editorial processes and scientific production, introducing technical transformations and epistemological questions related to authorship, originality, and academic responsibility. The objective of this review was to analyze, through a narrative review of the literature, the transformations generated by AI in editorial processes and scientific production, identifying its contributions to editorial workflow optimization, associated ethical risks, and implications for the sustainability of the academic publishing ecosystem. Methodologically, a narrative review was conducted through searches in Scopus, Web of Science, DOAJ, SciELO, and other databases, applying predefined eligibility criteria. Following screening and methodological appraisal using AMSTAR-2, twelve studies were selected for narrative-thematic synthesis. The findings indicate that AI has optimized tasks related to writing, peer review, trend analysis, and editorial management. However, risks were also identified, including factual inaccuracies, algorithmic bias, technological dependence, and the redefinition of scientific authorship. A hybrid human-machine interaction model emerged, challenging traditional frameworks of academic legitimacy. The review concluded that AI integration does not replace human judgment but rather transforms the editorial paradigm toward algorithmic governance requiring transparency, ethical regulation, and critical technological literacy. The future of scientific publishing depends on institutional capacity to balance innovation, integrity, and epistemological responsibility within a globalized digital environment.

Key words: Artificial Intelligence, Scientific Publishing, Editorial Processes, Algorithmic Governance, Academic Ethics.

Resumen

La inteligencia artificial (IA) reconfigura progresivamente los procesos editoriales y la producción científica, introduciendo transformaciones técnicas y cuestionamientos epistemológicos en torno a la autoría, la originalidad y la responsabilidad académica. El objetivo de la presente revisión fue analizar, a partir de una revisión narrativa de la literatura, las transformaciones que la IA está generando en los procesos editoriales y en la producción científica, identificando sus contribuciones a la optimización de la gestión editorial, los riesgos éticos asociados, así como sus implicaciones para la sostenibilidad del ecosistema editorial académico. Desde el punto de vista metodológico, se desarrolló una revisión narrativa, para la que se realizaron búsquedas en Scopus, Web of Science, DOAJ, SciELO, entre otras; asimismo, se aplicaron criterios de elegibilidad previamente definidos. Entre los principales resultados, fueron seleccionados 12 estudios para una síntesis narrativa-temática. Los hallazgos indican que la IA optimizó tareas de redacción, revisión por pares, análisis de tendencias y gestión editorial. No obstante, también evidenció riesgos relacionados con imprecisiones factuales, sesgos algorítmicos, dependencia tecnológica y redefinición de la autoría científica. Emergió un modelo híbrido de interacción humano-máquina que tensionó los marcos tradicionales de legitimidad académica. Se concluyó que la integración de la IA no sustituye el juicio humano, sino que transforma el paradigma editorial hacia una gobernanza algorítmica que exige transparencia, regulación ética y alfabetización tecnológica crítica. Asimismo, el futuro de la publicación científica depende de la capacidad institucional para equilibrar innovación, integridad y responsabilidad epistemológica en un entorno global digitalizado.

Palabras clave: Inteligencia artificial, publicación científica, procesos editoriales, gobernanza algorítmica, ética académica.

INTRODUCCIÓN

For more than sixty years, artificial intelligence (AI) has made significant theoretical and practical advances. According to Andrade-Girón *et al.* (2024), what was initially designed to generate dialogues and analyze data has now been fully integrated into all areas of knowledge and life. This phenomenon has been met with mixed reactions from leading academic journals. On the one hand, there is a group of publishers that allow its use, provided that it is accompanied by a transparent clarification of authorship. Others, on the contrary, have declared a complete ban on the use of these tools (Ulloa Valenzuela, 2023), a position that minimizes their potential for the creation and in-depth analysis of content without the need for continuous human supervision (Repiso, 2024).

It is widely known that over the last decade, AI has been essential in revolutionizing a wide range of industries, with a notable impact on the publishing sector, stimulating automated text correction, efficient summary production and optimization in digital content distribution. However, although it is true that it expands a wide range of possibilities, it also presents new challenges that require a rethinking of the limits of creativity, intellectual property, authorship, and ethical principles (Palma-Pena, 2024).

In this context, although the modern publishing industry faces significant challenges imposed by contrasts revealed by the phenomenon of AI (IBM, 2022), these challenges are limited by the absence of infrastructure and the immediate need for training of editorial teams, a difficult reality, especially in countries such as Peru (Ministry of Education, 2023). In response, the legal framework has been geared toward attempts to adapt to the situation, especially with the 2022 Law, which seeks to encourage the acceptance of this technology in various sectors (Congress of the Republic of Peru, 2023).

However, Chile's regional leadership is evident with an adoption rate of 30%, which shows slightly greater strength (Microsoft AI Report, 2023). The "Latam GPT" project is seen as a transformative opportunity for Spanish-language content editing, as it clearly demonstrates a strategic focus on offering an alternative for the creation of a linguistic model that truly understands and expresses the cultural identity

of the region (Chile Innovation Center, 2023). This is not a casual approach, but rather the identification of AI as an economic and cultural driver. Consequently, since 2019, Chile has made progress in adopting national strategies aimed at anticipating its evolution (MCTCI-Chile, 2021). Even so, a challenge common to most countries globally, including Chile, remains: establishing clear regulatory frameworks and overcoming ethical uncertainties in favor of protecting copyright against algorithmic production (University of Chile, 2023).

According to 2022 data, Mexico at that time already exhibited an adoption rate of 31% regarding the integration of AI across different sectors, including publishing; a figure that positioned the country as a regional leader (IBM, 2022). This is not merely a theoretical transformation; automation has already demonstrated practical results in streamlining numerous processes which, beyond editing, also impact the visual design of works (CANIEM, 2023). However, institutions such as UNAM (2023) have already projected research aimed at defining ethical principles for the use of AI in fields such as literature and journalism, given that advances in this area also raise growing ethical concerns related to the authenticity of "originality." The accelerated evolution of AI is undeniable; therefore, beyond the question of whether or not to adopt this technology, the greatest current challenge for scientific publishers lies in ensuring its use to protect creativity, the researcher's ingenuity, and intellectual property. Success will not be guaranteed by isolated efforts but will require strong regional cooperation, enriched by the exchange of experiences, thereby enabling the optimization of the ethical use of AI tools.

AI has increasingly gained ground as an essential tool in the editorial process, in what González (2025) describes as a catalytic function within scientific production. Its impact on streamlining processes reduces working time as well as increasing the final quality and reliability of the product. Sytnyk (2024), for his part, underscores this transformative essence along a path not necessarily exclusive of both efficiency and creativity; though he also emphasizes the essential role of the human factor, which requires overcoming fear of technology through continuous training and the adoption of a demanding ethical framework that shields the sector from potential negative repercussions.

This author further highlights that AI has consolidated itself as an essential tool for the agile creation of content and for expanding its dissemination in a highly competitive and increasingly digital market. From a broader perspective, the study of this technology points toward a significant impact that, beyond the technical dimension, forecasts major benefits in favor of transforming the economic and social structure in the near future (Avaro, 2023).

On the other hand, Ukrainian publishers provide a revealing case study. Ryzhko et al. (2024) express a clear willingness to embrace digital evolution, while simultaneously highlighting the limitations in their progress as a fundamental issue conditioned caused by insufficient resources, technical training, and equitable access. This point of view complements that of Strielkowski (2024), who emphasizes that the use of AI alone is not the key, but rather its ethical incorporation into publishing in accordance with robust regulatory frameworks. Likewise, only legitimate dialogue among technology developers, researchers, and technology recipients will enable true ethical integration into academic publishing.

For their part, the OECD & CAF (2022) emphasize the need for global cooperation, particularly from an anthropocentric technological perspective, to truly strengthen policies aimed at the gradual and expanding implementation of AI in the publishing context. This perspective coincides with that of Muñoz (2024), who advocated for the gradual and flexible introduction of AI as a driver of the necessary evolution for the region. In a changing global context that intersects with local challenges, it is essential to establish a robust scientific foundation that demonstrates how AI is transforming the publishing sector.

Based on this, the present narrative review sought to investigate: What impacts, contributions, and ethical challenges does AI pose for the future of scientific publishing? In line with this, the overall objective was set through a narrative review of the available literature on the subject, to analyze the impacts of AI on publishing processes and scientific production, thereby identifying its contributions to the optimization of publishing management, the ethical dangers associated with its use, and its implications for the sustainability of the publishing environment within the academia.

METHODOLOGY

From a qualitative-interpretative perspective, this study adopted a narrative review approach for the cross-sectional analysis of previous research, the synthesis of their results, and the establishment of a solid theoretical framework (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006). The transferability and, essentially, reproducibility of the analysis were considered in light of certain guidelines from the PRISMA protocol (Page et al., 2021). A structured process was carried out, prioritizing the rigorous selection of texts that constituted the core of the study, through a search focused on high-impact databases and specialized repositories: Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, DOAJ, and SciELO. A search strategy was conceived along three conceptual axes derived from the research question: (1) artificial intelligence, (2) editorial processes, and (3) scientific publishing. Based on this, a Boolean equation was established combining terms in both English and Spanish and employing the operators AND and OR, thereby maximizing the sensitivity and specificity of the search. The main descriptors included: "Artificial Intelligence," "Generative AI," "ChatGPT," "Large Language Models," and "Machine Learning," combined with "Scientific publishing," "Academic publishing," "Editorial process," "Peer review," "Scholarly communication," and "Scientific writing."

In addition to focusing on high-impact publications, the selection criteria also required that the studies be peer-reviewed and available in open access. Furthermore, regarding thematic relevance and academic rigor, inclusion was oriented toward publications explicitly addressing the application of AI in editorial processes, such as peer review, academic writing and style, manuscript management, and the governance of scientific publishing. Subsequently, the AMSTAR-2 tool was employed for critical appraisal, aimed at reducing bias and assessing the contributions of each source (Ciapponi, 2018). Finally, this allowed for the development of a narrative-thematic synthesis that integrates findings into emerging categories.

Through a process guided by a rigorous ethical commitment, genuine access to each source used and its correct citation was guaranteed, in order to prioritize and respect intellectual property and eliminate any risk of copyright infringement. In addition, this narrative review was designed under principles of transparency and reproducibility.

RESULTS

Initially, 91 studies indexed in the databases selected for the search were chosen; as a result of applying the criteria defined in the next phase,

those articles with content not associated with the search descriptors were excluded. In this way, 12 articles were finally taken into account for the discussion of results, as shown in the following table:

Table 1.

General characteristics of the included studies

Author(s) (year)	Country	Type of study / Approach	Summary and findings
Mondal, H., & Mondal, S. (2023)	India	Narrative review / academic reflection article / Qualitative	Provides a detailed overview of the potential uses of ChatGPT in each phase of the research and publishing process, from formulating questions to responding to reviewers and experts. It also warns of potential risks, such as fictitious references, biases, and integrity issues. Proposes a complementary and ethically responsible use of AI in academic writing and reviewing.
Giray (2023)	Philippines	Conceptual reflection article on prompt engineering in academic writing / Qualitative.	Conceptualiza el <i>prompt engineering</i> como competencia de valor estratégico para la escritura académica mediada por modelos de lenguaje; sistematiza técnicas, componentes estructurales y riesgos recurrentes. Recomendando su aprendizaje como una habilidad clave para la optimización de la interacción con IA, el perfeccionamiento de la calidad textual y el ejercicio de su uso ético y crítico en ambientes académicos contemporáneos.
Wen & Wang, (2023)	Australia	Critical and prospective analysis of the use of ChatGPT in scientific research and publishing / Qualitative	Critically analyzes the risks and opportunities associated with the use of ChatGPT in scientific research and publishing, with an emphasis on factual inaccuracies, the difficulties in detecting them, and ethical challenges. Proposes its limited use, especially for editing and reviewing tasks, insisting on the need for transparent editorial policies and ethical oversight as a guarantee of scientific integrity.

Liebrenz <i>et al.</i> (2023)	Switzerland and United Kingdom	Academic analysis/ethical analysis of generative AI in medical publishing/Qualitative	Discusses the ethical challenges associated with the automated generation of academic content using ChatGPT. Addresses issues related to authorship, plagiarism, responsibility, and inequalities in access. Warns of the risks of scientific misinformation, while calling for the development of clear editorial guidelines to preserve integrity, transparency, and fairness in digital medical publishing.
Curtis, (2023)	Australia	Academic reflection article on AI in scientific publication / Qualitative	Critically analyzes the impact of ChatGPT on academic publishing. Highlights its potential for optimizing scientific writing and reducing editorial workload, but warns of potential risks of misinformation, deterioration of critical skills, and difficulties in detecting AI-generated content. Emphasizes the need for discernment and transparency.
Chen (2023)	Taiwan	Reflective article on AI applications in scientific writing / Qualitative	Analyzes how the use of AI tools, including ChatGPT and neural translation systems, accelerate and transform scientific writing, especially for non-English-speaking authors. Recognizes the usefulness of their use in translation and editing, but also warns of their limitations in terms of accuracy and citation. Emphasizes that the automated generation of complete content remains ethically questionable.
García Mogollón <i>et al.</i> (2025)	Colombia	Systematic literature review, combined with empirical analysis and data mining / Mixed	Analyzes how AI can help optimize editorial processes and detect emerging trends by combining systematic review, data mining, and comparative analysis. Proposes guidelines for integrating AI tools into editorial workflows in order to achieve a balance among efficiency, quality, and ethical considerations in the management of scientific publications.

Razack <i>et al.</i> (2021)	Malaysia	Descriptive academic review of AI tools applied to scientific communication and publishing / Qualitative	Systematizes AI tools applied to searching, writing, citation, plagiarism detection, peer review, and editorial management. Argues that AI will evolve scientific communication toward a technological environment based on data and machine learning. Promotes human-machine collaboration without replacing academic judgment.
Fernández (2023)	Colombia	Academic reflection on the use of AI in scientific writing / Qualitative	Analyzes the impact of AI tools on scientific writing, referring to acceptable applications such as support in grammar correction, structuring, and citation. Warns of the need to use AI as a complementary tool, which should not be considered a substitute for human critical thinking and creativity. Promotes ethical and responsible use of AI in academic production.
Vaishya <i>et al.</i> (2025)	India	Analysis/reflection article without empirical evidence / Qualitative	Examines the current challenges facing medical publishers in the face of increased manuscript production, the complexity of peer review, and the emergence of AI. Emphasizes the need to establish clear guidelines in favor of preserving human authorship and scientific integrity and promoting editorial quality in an increasingly technological context.
Gregor, (2024)	Australia	Conceptual article proposing a theoretical- normative framework / Qualitative	Proposes a governance matrix (AI-PGM) for the integration of guidelines for the responsible use of AI in scientific publishing, based on the articulation of eight ethical dimensions structured into four levels of governance: research team, organization, publishing industry, and state regulation. Provides a structured framework for guiding editorial policies and responsible practices in the academic environment.

Kousha & Thewall, (2023)	United Kingdom	Narrative review/critical analysis of AI applications in publishing processes/Qualitative	Evaluates the use of AI tools to support the selection of reviewers, the identification of methodological deficiencies, and initial editorial quality control. Concludes that even though it promotes efficiency and traceability in the editorial process, the use of AI cannot be understood as a substitute for expert judgment, and therefore recommends its incorporation as a complementary, not exclusive, tool in editorial decision-making.
--------------------------	----------------	---	--

The results in Table 1 confirm that analyses of AI tools associated with scientific publication are still perceived as being in an initial stage in terms of the theoretical consolidation of the topic. This perception is supported by the specialized literature, which is based on approaches that are fundamentally limited to qualitative and reflective positions. Furthermore, the wide geographical diversity—with studies from India, Australia, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, the Philippines, Taiwan, Colombia, and Malaysia—demonstrates a global interest in the topic. Although Latin American contributions tend to focus on applied studies and specific suggestions for practical integration, conceptual contributions are primarily found in academic contexts with a longer publishing tradition. Overall, the analyses agree on the potential of AI for optimizing editorial processes, including scientific writing, although they warn of risks associated with factual accuracy, academic integrity, and copyright. They also highlight the increase in proposals aimed at ethical governance and regulations for the use of AI. Despite this, there remains an insufficient number of empirical and comparative analyses across national contexts, underscoring the need for research that objectively assesses the real impact of AI tools in diverse publishing ecosystems.

DISCUSSION

Beyond instrumental progress in technical processes, the introduction of AI in the publishing sector represents a structural change in the paradigms of scientific knowledge production,

circulation, and validation. According to Suazo Galdames (2023), AI facilitates information processing through the implementation of algorithmic systems that simulate human cognitive processes on a scale never before seen. Furthermore, it represents a profound questioning of the epistemological principles of authorship, creativity, and scientific responsibility that goes beyond the mere redefinition of the operational efficiency of publishing processes. Bhaskar (2020), for his part, anticipated this structural transformation by pointing out the inevitable tensions between technological innovation and the prevalence of critical thinking, frictions fundamentally generated by the displacement of tasks previously reserved for the human intellect toward automated system functions.

The findings of this study corroborate a potential contradiction in the impacts of AI, as it can function as a catalyst, but at the same time as a risk factor. Mondal and Mondal (2023) demonstrate that tools such as ChatGPT have positive impacts on the optimization of the different phases of the research process—from the formulation of hypotheses and objectives to the response to reviewers. However, human supervision and ethical boundaries are required. In this regard, Gonzalez (2025) and Sytnyk (2024) support AI's ability to improve editorial quality and efficiency, provided that its role is understood as amplifying human capabilities rather than replacing them. This optimistic perspective, however, must be tempered with critical warnings.

Along this line, Wen & Wang (2023) warn about the persistence of phenomena incompatible with scientific rigor, such as factual inconsistencies and the generation of artificial references.

Liebrezn *et al.* (2023) also delve into this issue, problematizing algorithmic authorship by questioning the ethical responsibility that can be assumed by an automated system, as well as its compliance with international publishing standards. Vaishya *et al.* (2025) expand the debate to the work of the editor, insisting that the excess of manuscripts and the integration of AI tools demand new ethical skills and technical competencies. From this point of view, today's editor functions not only as a content manager, but also as a mediator between human intellect and algorithmic systems.

In the Latin American context, the debate regarding authorship and originality is particularly relevant. In this context, Palma-Pena (2024) examines emerging regulations associated with AI from a Latin American perspective, noting the regulatory vacuum in the region, which could weaken the protection of intellectual property rights. This position is complemented by Ulloa Valenzuela (2023), who describes the use of ChatGPT as an issue currently open to debate regarding transparency in declaring its use as a minimum requirement for scientific integrity. Consistently, the University of Chile (2023) and UNAM (2023) have begun to develop defined guidelines, acknowledging that regulation must produce adaptive ethical frameworks and not be limited to prohibitions on its use.

At the operational level, the AI is already involved in critical tasks in the editorial process. Razack *et al.* (2021) demonstrate that algorithmic tools facilitate bibliographic searches, plagiarism identification, and editorial management. Kousha & Thelwall (2023), meanwhile, point out how the AI can optimize the selection of reviewers and the initial quality assessment. García Mogollón *et al.* (2025), in presenting the data mining mechanism for identifying emerging guidelines, point to the transformation of editorial management into a process of prospective scope and strategic value. This analytical dimension incorporates a predictive logic into the scientific publishing environment that shifts the traditional reactive model toward one based on data intelligence.

However, technological considerations must be balanced with a critical stance. In this regard, Curtis (2023) points out how automation could undermine the value of human thought. Chen (2023) emphasizes the inadequacy of AI for

producing reliable original research, although he acknowledges its usefulness as a tool for translating and editing manuscripts, especially for non-English-speaking authors. From the Ukrainian case, Ryzhko *et al.* (2024) instruct that technological adoption is conditioned by the availability of infrastructure and resources, which externalizes structural inequalities. This concern is amplified by the OECD and CAF (2022), which emphasize the need for anthropocentric governance as a way to prevent the AI from widening existing gaps.

In Latin America, heterogeneity is evident. Peru faces infrastructure and training limitations (Ministry of Education, 2023), despite regulatory advances such as Law No. 31814 (Congress of the Republic of Peru, 2023). Chile, through its National Artificial Intelligence Policy (MCTCI-Chile, 2021) and projects such as "Latam GPT" (Chilean Innovation Center, 2023), seeks to strengthen linguistic and cultural sovereignty in language models. Mexico, according to reports by IBM (2022) and CANIEM (2023), shows more rapid adoption of editorial automation, although debates about originality and ethics persist.

From a structural point of view, Avaro (2023) understands AI as part of a global competition for technological leadership, an environment from which the publishing sector cannot remain on the sidelines. Strielkowski (2024) suggests the potential of AI for the definitive transformation of the scientific publishing market, but only if it is integrated into solid regulatory frameworks. Gregor (2024) offers guidelines for responsible publishing policies through AI-PGM, a regulatory model that integrates ethical dimensions with levels of governance.

The essential challenge of this issue lies, therefore, in the articulation between technological efficiency and ethical commitment. Andrade-Girón *et al.* (2024) highlight the current cross-cutting integration of AI in the context of higher education, a reality that requires the incorporation of algorithmic literacy into research training. Muñoz (2024) states, in this regard, that its progressive and flexible adoption in Latin America is necessary, avoiding uncritical technological dependencies. Repiso (2024), for his part, points out that peer review cannot become a fully automated task without compromising academic discussion.

In this context, the revolution in the publishing sector is not only technical, but also epistemological. AI requires the necessary redefinition of criteria for originality and responsibility, introducing an implicit dynamic of co-authorship between humans and machines. The transparent declaration of its use and scope, as stated in this manuscript, must become a fundamental ethical practice. Regional cooperation then emerges as a strategic necessity to prevent regulatory fragmentation and ensure common standards.

CONCLUSIONS

More than a technological innovation, in the context of scientific publishing, AI is bringing about a structural transformation of the global knowledge environment. Its incorporation into publishing processes is shifting the focus from an exclusively human model to a hybrid one, with algorithmic knowledge becoming an active part of textual construction and editorial decision-making. This phenomenon is undoubtedly altering the principles of authorship, evaluation, validation, and circulation of scientific production.

However, this evolution toward the automation of tasks traditionally assigned to human intellect is not neutral; it requires a rethinking of fundamental categories such as originality, responsibility, academic merit, and epistemological legitimacy. The findings in the literature reviewed demonstrate the potential of AI for optimizing time, expanding analytical capabilities, and democratizing certain writing and review processes. Despite this, it also exposes systemic dangers involving the generation of inaccurate information, the normalization of algorithmic biases, the stylistic homogenization of discourse, and the potential deterioration of critical thinking. The issue with AI in this context is no longer the relevance of its integration into the publishing industry, but rather the epistemological, ethical, and regulatory conditions that would make its integration legitimate.

The current debate also points to a necessary evolution in editorial governance towards models where the traceability of AI use, explicit declaration of technological support, and

auditing of automated models are defined under international standards, with transparent algorithmic oversight. This point of view offers new research perspectives: first, the analysis of human-machine co-authorship as an emerging condition that generates new challenges for traditional frameworks in terms of intellectual attribution; second, the study of the cognitive impact on research training and the generation of critical thinking as a consequence of algorithmic dependence; third, the integration of principles of fairness, transparency, and ethical commitment regarding the use of AI in scientific communication, embodied in the design of global governance models.

Globally, the main challenge is not to hinder automation, but to ensure that technological efficiency does not undermine the essential values of science: rigor, debate, epistemological diversity, and social engagement. While AI has the potential to expand human creativity, there is also a risk of standardizing scientific discourse unless critical counterbalances are established in time. The academic community faces a historic dilemma: to allow algorithmic processing to silently redesign the principles of authenticity and scientific contribution, or to actively participate in the construction of ethical and epistemological frameworks that ensure the subordination of technology to human intervention.

The future of the publishing sector will therefore depend on our collective ability to define AI as an emancipatory tool, rather than an instrument of uncritical automation. True innovation will lie in building an unprecedented alliance between human intellect and artificial intelligence that allows for the expansion of knowledge, but with guarantees that scientific integrity will be preserved, without delegating the production of knowledge to algorithmic systems.

Limitations

Since this is a narrative review, the findings represent an exegetical synthesis of the available scientific literature, without attempting to establish statistical generalizations. Furthermore, this is a rapidly and continuously evolving field of study, so future empirical and comparative approaches may expand and update the results of this analysis, as well as the trends identified from it.

Contribution to knowledge

The research provides a critical and integrated synthesis of the impacts of AI on scientific publishing, from the articulation of technical, ethical, and governance dimensions. It also contributes to the conceptualization of human-machine interaction as an emerging axis for the evolutionary understanding of the publishing ecosystem in the contemporary academic sphere.

Declaration of the use of AI

AI tools were used exclusively for grammatical, spelling, and scientific style correction, as well as for translations of the title, abstract, and keywords.

Contribución de los autores:

Lidia Vargas Pancorbo: Conceptualización, Análisis formal, Investigación, Metodología, Supervisión, Validación, Redacción – borrador original, Redacción – revisión y edición.

Pamela Martínez Anduncé: Conceptualización, Investigación, Metodología, Validación, Redacción – borrador original, Redacción – revisión y edición.

Elba Liliana Camacho Reyes: Conceptualización, Investigación, Metodología, Redacción – borrador original, Redacción – revisión y edición.

Conflictos de interés

Los autores declaran la no existencia de conflictos de interés asociados a la publicación del presente manuscrito. Esta investigación no se ha recibido financiación para su realización, ni existen relaciones personales, académicas, institucionales o comerciales que puedan haber condicionado los resultados o intervenido en su interpretación.

REFERENCES

Andrade-Girón, D., Marín-Rodríguez, W., Sandivar-Rosas, J., Carreño-Cisneros, E., Susanibar-Ramirez, E., Zuñiga-Rojas, M., Angeles-Morales, J., & Villarreal-Torres, H. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence in higher education learning: A review based on academic databases. *Iberoamerican Journal of Science Measurement and Communication*, 4(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.47909/ijsmc.101>

Avaro, D. (2023). La industria de la inteligencia artificial: una carrera por su liderazgo. *Problemas del Desarrollo*, 54(212), 121-144. <https://doi.org/10.22201/ieec.20078951e.2023.212.69959>

Bhaskar, M. (2020). La IA y las editoriales: ¿qué sigue? En Cerlalc (Ed.), *Inteligencia artificial: transformaciones y retos en el sector editorial* (pp. 7-17). Centro Regional para el Fomento del Libro en América Latina y el Caribe (Cerlalc-UNESCO).

CANIEM. (2023). *Informe sobre tecnologías emergentes en la edición*. https://caniem.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Booklet_ISEP-2023_azul.pdf

Centro de Innovación de Chile. (2023). *Avances en inteligencia artificial y su aplicación en la industria editorial*. <https://centrodeinnovacion.uc.cl/>

Chen, T. J. (2023). ChatGPT and other artificial intelligence applications speed up scientific writing. *Journal of the Chinese Medical Association JCMA*, 86(4), 351-353. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JCMA.0000000000000900>

Ciapponi, A. (2018). AMSTAR-2: herramienta de evaluación crítica de revisiones sistemáticas de estudios de intervenciones de salud. *Evidencia, actualización en la práctica ambulatoria*, 21(1), 4-13. <https://evidencia.org/index.php/Evidencia/article/download/6834/4506>

Congreso de la República del Perú. (2023). *Ley N.º 31814, Ley que promueve el uso de la inteligencia artificial en favor del desarrollo económico y social del país*. Diario Oficial El Peruano. <https://busquedas.elperuano.pe/dispositivo/NL/2192926-1>

- Curtis, N. (2023). To ChatGPT or not to ChatGPT? The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Academic Publishing. *The Pediatric infectious disease journal*, 42(4), 275. <https://doi.org/10.1097/INF.0000000000003852>
- Fernández, F. (2023). La inteligencia artificial y la escritura de artículos científicos. *Revista de Investigación, Desarrollo e Innovación*, 13(2), 221. <https://doi.org/10.19053/20278306.v13.n2.2023.16828>
- García Mogollón, J. M., Rojas Contreras, W. M., & Sanabria, M. (2025). El rol de la inteligencia artificial en la detección de tendencias emergentes en publicaciones científicas. *Revista Científica General José María Córdova*, 23(49), 63-94. <https://doi.org/10.21830/19006586.1411>
- Giray, L. (2023). Prompt Engineering with ChatGPT: A Guide for Academic Writers. *Annals of biomedical engineering*, 51(12), 2629–2633. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-023-03272-4>
- González, M. (2025). Uso de la inteligencia artificial en la publicación de artículos científicos. *Revista de Obstetricia y Ginecología de Venezuela*, 85(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.51288/00850103>
- Gregor, S. (2024). *Responsible Artificial Intelligence and Journal Publishing*. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 25(1), 48–60. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00863>
- International Business Machines Corporation [IBM]. (2022). Global AI Adoption Index 2022. <https://www.snowdropsolution.com/pdf/IBM%20Global%20AI%20Adoption%20Index%202022.pdf>
- Kousha, K., & Thelwall, M. A. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence to Support Publishing and Peer Review: A Summary and Review*. *Learned Publishing*, 37(1), 4–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1570>
- Liebrenz, M., Schleifer, R., Buadze, A., Bhugra, D., & Smith, A. (2023). Generating scholarly content with ChatGPT: ethical challenges for medical publishing. *The Lancet. Digital health*, 5(3), e105–e106. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(23\)00019-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00019-5)
- MCTCI-Chile. (2021). *Política Nacional de Inteligencia Artificial*. https://www.minciencia.gob.cl/uploads/filer_public/bc/38/bc389daf-4514-4306-867c-760ae7686e2c/documento_politica_ia_digital_.pdf
- Microsoft AI Report. (2023). Estado de la inteligencia artificial en América Latina. <https://news.microsoft.com/en-xm/2023/08/02/microsofts-2023-work-trend-index-report-reveals-impact-of-digital-debt-on-innovation-emphasizes-need-for-ai-proficiency-for-every-employee/>
- Ministerio de Educación. (2023). *Transformación digital en el sector educativo y editorial*. <https://repositorio.minedu.gob.pe/handle/20.500.12799/8779>
- Mondal, H., & Mondal, S. (2023). ChatGPT in academic writing: Maximizing its benefits and minimizing the risks. *Indian Journal of Ophthalmology*, 71(12), 3600–3606. https://doi.org/10.4103/IJO.IJO_718_23
- Muñoz, V. (2024). *Inteligencia artificial: potenciando el futuro de América Latina y el Caribe*. Cooperación Española. https://doi.org/10.33960/ac_18.2024
- OCDE & CAF. (2022). *Uso estratégico y responsable de la inteligencia artificial en el sector público de América Latina y el Caribe*. Estudios de la OCDE sobre gobernanza pública. OECD Publishing. Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/03c4e7eb-es>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., . . . Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372(71), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Palma-Pena, J. (2024). Author normativities for artificial intelligence: analysis from Latin America librarianship approach. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science*, 90(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.7553/90-2-2397>

- Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006) *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: A Practical Guide*, Blackwell Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470754887>
- Razack, H. I. A., Mathew, S. T., Ahmad Saad, F. F., & Alqahtani, S. A. (2021). Artificial intelligence-assisted tools for redefining the communication landscape of the scholarly world. *Science Editing*, 8(2), 120–135. <https://doi.org/10.6087/kcse.244>
- Repiso, R. (2024). La Inteligencia Artificial en los procesos editoriales y la evaluación por pares. *Revista de Investigación e Innovación en Ciencias de la Salud*. 6(2). 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.46634/riics.317>
- Ryzhko, O., Krainikova, T., Vodolazka, S., & Sokolova, K. (2024). Generative AI changes the book publishing industry: reengineering of business processes. *Communication & Society*, 37(3), 255-271. <https://doi.org/10.15581/003.37.3.255-271>
- Strielkowski, W. (2024). Could AI change the scientific publishing market once and for all?. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14952*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.14952>
- Suazo Galdames, I. . (2023). Inteligencia artificial en investigación científica. *SciComm Report*, 3(1), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.32457/scr.v3i1.2149>
- Sytnyk, O. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in the PUBLISHING Industry: Overcoming Technophobia and Unlocking the Potential of Innovation. *Grail of Science*, (41), 291-293. <https://doi.org/10.36074/grail-of-science.05.07.2024.046>
- Ulloa Valenzuela, G. (2023). El desafío del uso de inteligencia artificial para la elaboración de la literatura científica: el caso de ChatGPT, un debate abierto. *Cuadernos Médico Sociales*, 63(1), 27–31. <https://doi.org/10.56116/cms.v63.n1.2023.1140>
- UNAM. (2023). *Lineamientos para el uso responsable de la inteligencia artificial en la creación literaria y periodística*. <https://www.unam.mx/lineamientos-ia-literaria-periodistica.pdf>
- Universidad de Chile (2023). *Regulación y ética en la aplicación de IA en la edición*. <https://www.uchile.cl/informe-ia-etica-edicion.pdf>
- Vaishya, R., Vaish, A., Scarlat, M. M., & Jain, V. K. (2025). The crucial role and challenges of medical journal editors in the modern era. *Journal of clinical orthopaedics and trauma*, 63, 102918. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcot.2025.102918>
- Wen, J., & Wang, W. (2023). The future of ChatGPT in academic research and publishing: A commentary for clinical and translational medicine. *Clinical and translational medicine*, 13(3), e1207. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ctm2.1207>