# NLUA LAW REVIEW (NLUALR)

ISSN: 2455-8680

# AI POLICY

NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY AND JUDICIAL ACADEMY, ASSAM

## 1. AI Policy for Authors

**1.1** Authors, editors, and reviewers acknowledge the increasing prevalence of AI-assisted writing due to the growing availability of AI tools and bots.

**1.2** Authors do not need to disclose the use of AI tools for improving language, grammar, or structure. However, they remain fully responsible for the accuracy of their submission.

**1.3** Generative AI tools cannot be cited as primary references. If any part of the manuscript was generated using AI, this must be declared at the time of submission so the editorial board can assess the manuscript appropriately.

**1.4** Authors must be cautious about the risks of plagiarism or copyright violations, as AI tools may replicate substantial content from existing sources.

**1.5** As outlined in the Submission Policy, authors bear sole responsibility for all opinions expressed, sources cited, facts presented, and claims made in their work.

**1.6** If a significant portion of the manuscript is found to be generated by AI—whether disclosed or detected during editorial checks—the submission may be summarily rejected at the discretion of the Editorial Board, particularly if the AI-generated content compromises originality, academic rigour, or authorial contribution.

**1.7** Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, et cetera, cannot be credited as authors on any manuscript.

## 2. AI Policy for Editors and Reviewers

**2.1** Editors and peer reviewers must not use AI tools, including large language models (LLMs), for any core editorial tasks such as assessing or summarising manuscripts. Using AI in this context raises serious concerns regarding confidentiality, intellectual property, and the integrity of the review process.

**2.2** Under no circumstances should unpublished manuscripts be fed into Generative AI platforms to produce summaries, critiques, or decisions. This is a direct violation of both ethical and professional standards.

**2.3** While editors and reviewers may use Generative AI tools to refine the language of their review comments, they remain fully accountable for the accuracy, originality, and

tone of their reports. Any such use of AI must be transparently disclosed within the review.

**2.4** Inappropriate or excessive reliance on AI-generated content in review reports is strictly prohibited. Any member of the editorial board or peer review panel found engaging in such practices may be removed from their position and barred from future involvement with the journal.

**2.5** If any editor or reviewer suspects that a submitted manuscript includes undisclosed or improper use of Generative AI, they must promptly raise the issue with the Editorial Board.