

Economic History Review AI Policy

For Authors

The Economic History Review is an academic journal that upholds traditional scholarly values. One of the most basic of these concerns authorship. When you submit an article to the *Review* under your name, you are asserting that you have read the relevant literature, gathered and analysed the underpinning data, and drawn your own conclusions. In short, you (and any co-authors) have produced the entirety of the work yourselves. The use of Generative AI programmes, defined here as tools that use large language models to create text, images, or other outputs (or any similar technologies), to write your submission is strictly forbidden. The use of Generative AI programmes in the research process, for example, data collection, coding, data cleaning, or statistical analysis is permitted and is subject to the usual academic standards and expectations regarding accuracy, replicability and transparency.

The Economic History Society Executive Committee and the Editors of the *Economic History Review* recognise that Generative AI can perform many useful functions to help with writing. Such programmes may therefore be used for the following limited purposes:

- To format references consistently
- To check and correct spelling and grammar
- To improve the clarity and readability of text that expresses your own ideas, for example where English is not your first language, provided that the words, meaning, data, analysis, and argument remain entirely your own.

Authors are reminded that they are fully responsible for the accuracy of all aspects of the submission.

Please note that any use of Generative AI to generate or develop the substance of your argument or analysis, or to produce text or conclusions on your behalf, is not acceptable. This policy does not restrict appropriate scholarly uses of AI within the research process. If you are in any doubt about whether a particular use falls within the limited purposes set out above, please contact the [Editors](#) in the first instance before submission.

When using Generative AI to check language or improve clarity, you should confine your prompts to the correction or clarification of text that you have already written. A prompt must not ask the tool to introduce new evidence or argument, to develop or restructure your argument, or to substitute its own phrasing for your analytic voice. Generative AI can produce fluent but imprecise text that falls short of the standards of academic and social science writing, and the responsibility for ensuring that the final wording remains your own, and remains accurate, rests entirely with the authors.

Wiley Editing Services offers expert help with English Language Editing, as well as translation, manuscript formatting, figure illustration, figure formatting, and graphical abstract design, if required.

The Editors will use the reports of peer reviewers, AI detection software provided by the *Economic History Review*'s publisher Wiley, and their academic judgement to assess submissions. The Editors reserve the right to reject a submission if they suspect that Generative AI or a similar technology has been used outside of the parameters outlined above. They may also pursue further sanctions against authors under the Economic History Society's Code of Conduct, for example:

- to write a formal letter of censure;
- to exclude individuals, either temporarily or permanently, from specific Economic History Society organised or supported events or activities

- to temporarily suspend membership;
- to suspend membership permanently.

This policy is designed to create transparency and to maintain the high editorial standards of the *Economic History Review* for both the Economic History Society and the authors who publish in it.

For Reviewers

The Economic History Review is an academic journal that upholds traditional scholarly values. One of the most basic of these concerns authorship and the academic integrity of the peer review process. When you agree to peer review a submission for the *Economic History Review*, you are agreeing that you will read the submission and write a report based on your own appraisal of the material.

In particular, you must not upload, paste, or otherwise enter any part of a submission, or any related confidential material provided to you by the Editors, into any Generative AI programme or similar technology in order to analyse, summarise, or otherwise assist with your review. Submissions are confidential and entering them into such tools compromises both the confidentiality owed to authors and the integrity of the review process.

In line with the AI Policy for Authors, such programmes may be used only to:

- Format references to the journal style
- Check and correct spelling and grammar
- Improve the clarity and readability of text that expresses your own appraisal, provided that the words, meaning, and judgement remain entirely your own.

The Editors reserve the right to reject a review if they suspect that Generative AI or a similar technology has been used outside of the parameters outlined above. They may also pursue further sanctions against reviewers under the Economic History Society's Code of Conduct, for example:

- to write a formal letter of censure;
- to exclude individuals, either temporarily or permanently, from specific Economic History Society organised or supported events or activities
- to temporarily suspend membership;
to suspend membership permanently.

If you are in any doubt, please contact the [Editors](#) in the first instance.

Review of this Policy

This policy will be reviewed regularly by the Economic History Society Executive Committee and the Editors of the *Economic History Review* to ensure that it remains current and continues to reflect developments in Generative AI and in publishing practice.