RECIMA21 — Scientific Journal | ISSN 2675-6218

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE USE POLICY

IN THE EDITORIAL EVALUATION OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES

Version 1.0 | April 2026

RECIMA21 — Scientific Journal, committed to editorial excellence, transparency, and the ethical principles of scientific publishing, establishes through this document the guidelines governing the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in its editorial evaluation and review processes. This policy is aligned with the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and with international best practices in editorial governance.

1. Rationale and Objectives

The adoption of AI tools at RECIMA21 aims to expand editorial capacity without replacing human judgment, ensure consistency in screening processes, support reviewers and editors with systematized information, and increase the operational efficiency of the editorial workflow.

This policy recognizes that final responsibility for any editorial decision — acceptance, rejection, or revision request — rests entirely with identified and qualified human editors and peer reviewers.

2. Permitted Uses

2.1 Preliminary Editorial Screening (Desk Review)

AI may be used during the initial screening phase for automated verification of the following aspects:

Automated verifications permitted during screening
• Compliance with the formatting and structural standards required by RECIMA21
• Completeness of mandatory sections (title, abstract, keywords, introduction, methodology, results, conclusion, references)
• Preliminary verification of thematic scope adequacy
• Automated plagiarism detection (via integration with approved tools)
• Identification of bibliographic reference inconsistencies per ABNT NBR 6023
• Verification of manuscript metadata (ORCID, affiliation, conflict of interest declaration)

2.2 Support for Internal Editorial Review

The internal editor may use AI tools to assist with editorial review in the following ways:

Permitted uses in editorial review support
• Generation of textual attention-point reports (spelling, grammar, cohesion)
• Verification of internal consistency between sections (e.g., stated objectives vs. presented results)
• Suggestions for terminological adequacy and clarity of scientific writing

• Identification of suspicious content, deliberate insertions, or data manipulation
• Support in verifying legal and ethical aspects (use of images, personal data, consent)
• Preparation of a structured editorial review report, subject to validation by the responsible editor

2.3 Support for Peer Reviewers

The use of AI as a support tool for peer reviewers is permitted under the following terms:

Conditions for AI use by peer reviewers
• AI may be used to organize and systematize observations, NEVER to autonomously generate the review
• The reviewer must declare, on the evaluation form, whether any AI tool was used during the process
• The final review must reflect the critical judgment and expertise of the human reviewer
• Reviews entirely generated by AI and submitted without critical human revision are prohibited
• The reviewer's identity and responsibility must always be preserved and verifiable by the editor

2.4 Manuscript Confidentiality and Data Protection

The use of AI tools in RECIMA21's editorial review occurs exclusively under configurations that prevent the retention, sharing, or use of manuscripts for training external models. Submitted texts are treated as confidential information throughout the entire editorial process, in compliance with Brazilian Law No. 13,709/2018 (LGPD — General Data Protection Law) and with the confidentiality principles of the peer review process.

Authors have the right to know that their manuscripts are processed with technical safeguards that prevent any form of data retention or misuse by the AI tools employed by the editorial team.

3. Expressly Prohibited Uses

In accordance with COPE guidelines (2023) and the principles of editorial accountability, the following are expressly prohibited at RECIMA21:

Prohibited practice	Rationale
AI as autonomous peer reviewer	Lack of accountability and verifiable contextual expertise
Final editorial decision automated by AI	Violates scientific governance principles (COPE, ICMJE)
AI listed as author or co-author	AI bears no legal or ethical responsibility for content
Review generated by AI without human revision and signature	Constitutes editorial misconduct
Use of AI to fabricate or manipulate data	Serious scientific misconduct

Acceptance/rejection decisions without qualified human analysis	Compromises the integrity of the peer review process

4. Responsibilities and Governance

4.1 Editor-in-Chief Responsibilities

- Supervise and validate all reports generated by AI tools before any communication to the author
- Ensure that no editorial decision is made exclusively based on AI output
- Ensure compliance with this policy by section editors, reviewers, and peer reviewers
- Update this policy annually or whenever significant changes occur in international guidelines

4.2 Section Editor Responsibilities

- Verify and validate AI-generated screening reports before forwarding manuscripts to peer reviewers
- Ensure that peer reviewers are informed about the available AI tools and the limits of their use
- Report to the editor-in-chief any inappropriate use of AI detected in the process

4.3 Peer Reviewer Responsibilities

- Explicitly declare on the evaluation form whether AI tools were used (or not used)
- Assume full responsibility for the content of the submitted review
- Not delegate scientific judgment to automated systems

5. Transparency and Disclosure

RECIMA21 is committed to publicly disclosing, on its editorial guidelines page, the existence and scope of this policy. Specifically:

RECIMA21 transparency obligations
• Inform authors, on the OJS portal, that AI tools are used to support editorial screening
• Publish this policy in full in the 'Guidelines for Authors' and 'Review Process' sections
• Review and republish the policy every 12 months or in response to new international guidelines
• Maintain an internal record of AI tool usage per editorial process, available for audit
• Include an AI use declaration in article metadata when AI contributed to the editorial review

6. Compliance with International Guidelines

This policy was developed in accordance with the following normative references and international guidelines:

Organization / Standard	Year	Main determination

COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics)	2023	AI cannot be an author; editorial responsibility is human
Nature Portfolio	2023	AI as a support tool; mandatory disclosure
Elsevier / Springer	2023	AI as co-author is prohibited; use as support must be declared
ICMJE	2023	Authorship requirements are not met by AI systems
CAPES / Qualis	2024	Good scientific integrity practices for evaluated journals

7. Currently Approved AI Tools

Editorial AI use at RECIMA21 is restricted to the tools described below, evaluated and approved by the editorial team for security, privacy, and suitability within the scientific publishing context:

Tool	Purpose	Workflow stage
AI-assisted editorial review tool (restricted to editor-in-chief use)	Internal editorial review support	Screening + Editorial review
iThenticate / Turnitin	Plagiarism and duplicate content detection	Preliminary screening
Other tools	Only with express approval from the editor-in-chief	To be defined

No AI tool not listed in this document may be used in RECIMA21 editorial processes without prior approval and registration by the editor-in-chief.

8. Violations and Sanctions

Non-compliance with this policy will subject editors, peer reviewers, and collaborators to the following measures, applied proportionally to the severity of the infraction:

- Formal warning recorded in the journal's editorial history
- Temporary suspension from activities as peer reviewer or section editor
- Permanent removal from the editorial board or peer reviewer pool of RECIMA21
- Retraction of the published article, when the violation compromises the integrity of the publication
- Communication to the offender's affiliated institutions, when applicable
- Notification to COPE in cases of serious editorial misconduct

9. Validity and Revisions

This policy takes effect on the date of its approval by the RECIMA21 editor-in-chief and is valid for 12 (twelve) months, subject to annual review. Extraordinary revisions may occur at any time, upon editorial deliberation, especially in response to:

- Updates to COPE, CAPES, or other regulatory bodies' guidelines
- Emergence of new AI tools with impact on editorial processes

- Cases of editorial misconduct related to improper AI use
- Requirements from indexers or external editorial audits

10. Approval

Editor-in-Chief	Editorial Board
RECIMA21 — Scientific Journal	RECIMA21 — Scientific Journal