

Description

When we ran our first survey on the responsible use of AI in research and publishing, the headline numbers were hard to ignore. AI use was already near-universal; **97%** of responses confirmed it was embedded in day-to-day research workflows. Yet **99%** expressed some level of concern about it. Adoption and unease had arrived together.

The deeper we looked, the clearer the gap became. Two-thirds of researchers (**66%**) reported real gains in quality and efficiency. But only **51%** documented the prompts and tool versions behind their AI-assisted work. In other words, nearly half of all AI-assisted submissions entered the editorial pipeline with no record of how they were actually made. And the sharpest skepticism came from the gatekeepers themselves; the editors and reviewers whose job is to validate the work.

Since that first study, the ground has shifted. New tools have arrived and moved from novelty to daily habit. Journals, publishers, and funders have issued or revised their AI policies. And the debates around disclosure, authorship, and oversight have grown sharper, not quieter. What felt experimental twelve months ago is now routine for many researchers; what was ambiguous then is, in some places, clearer now—and in others, more contested than ever.

That raises the central question: has anything genuinely improved? Or have the gaps we identified last year simply moved somewhere new?

Introducing the Second Wave

We're opening the second wave of our Responsible Use of AI in Research & Publishing survey. The survey returns to the same core questions! This time, we aim to track what has shifted, what hasn't, and where the gaps still remain. It explores the questions that matter most right now: how AI use is evolving, how well the tools perform, what disclosure is looking like in practice, and whether journal and funder policies are keeping up.

Whether you took part last year or this is your first time, your response adds to a running, openly shared evidence base, the one that helps shape more practical, fair, and transparent norms for everyone working in research.

Copyright: Enago Academy under the CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0 license

Participate Now!

What You'll Get Out of it

Take part and:

- **You'll get the findings**

Opt in with your email and we'll send you the full results when they're published.

- **Stand a Chance to Win an Amazon Voucher and Exciting Discounts**

Top 10 insightful responses stand a chance to win an Amazon voucher worth 25 USD and discount coupons for Enago's editing services.

- **You'll shape the norms**

Your experience feeds an evidence base that publishers, institutions, and peers increasingly draw on when setting guidance.

Who It's for

Researchers, editors, peer reviewers, students, and anyone navigating AI in scholarly work. You don't need to be an expert, an enthusiast, or a skeptic! Every perspective makes the picture more accurate. If you're wary of AI, or you don't use it at all, that's a data point we want just as much.

The survey takes about 5–7 minutes. Responses are analyzed only in aggregate and reported without identifying anyone; your name and email are optional and never published. Findings may appear in research reports, conference presentations, and educational resources, and will be shared openly with the research community.

Share Your Voice Now!

Why it Matters

The norms around AI in research aren't being written in a single room or a single policy document. They're emerging from thousands of individual choices researchers make every day about what to use, what to check, and what to declare. The more of those choices we can see clearly, the better the guidance that follows.

Last year, you helped us draw the baseline. This year, help us measure how far the field has moved.

Category

1. AI in Academia
2. Events
3. Trending Now

Copyright: Enago Academy under the CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0 license

Date Created
2026/07/06
Author
anagha

Copyright: Enago Academy under the CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0 license