

Who Owns the Knowledge? Copyright, GenAI, and the Future of Academic Publishing

Dmitry Kochetkov^{1,2,3}

¹Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS), Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands

²Department of Probability Theory and Cybersecurity, RUDN University, Moscow, Russia

³Institute for the Study of Science, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

E-mail: d.kochetkov@cwts.leidenuniv.nl

ORCID: 0000-0001-7890-7532

Abstract. The integration of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) and large language models (LLMs) into scientific research and higher education presents a paradigm shift, offering revolutionizing opportunities while simultaneously raising profound ethical, legal, and regulatory questions. This study examines the complex intersection of AI and science, with a specific focus on the challenges posed to copyright law and the principles of open science. The author argues that current regulatory frameworks in key jurisdictions like the United States, China, the European Union, and the United Kingdom, while aiming to foster innovation, contain significant gaps, particularly concerning the use of copyrighted works and open science outputs for AI training. Widely adopted licensing mechanisms, such as Creative Commons, fail to adequately address the nuances of AI training, and the pervasive lack of attribution within AI systems fundamentally challenges established notions of originality. This paper issues a call to action, contending that AI training should not be shielded under fair use exceptions. Instead, the author advocates for upholding authors' rights to refuse the use of their works for AI training and proposes that universities assume a leading role in shaping responsible AI governance. The conclusion is that a harmonized international legislative effort is urgently needed to ensure transparency, protect intellectual property, and prevent the emergence of an oligopolistic market structure that could prioritize commercial profit over scientific integrity and equitable knowledge production. This is a substantially expanded and revised version of a work originally presented at the 20th International Conference on Scientometrics & Informetrics (Kochetkov, 2025).

Keywords: generative AI, copyright, academic publishing, Large Language Models, LLMs, Open Science, derivative works, intellectual property, IP, research integrity, scholarly communication

Introduction

While artificial intelligence (AI) research dates back to the 1956 Dartmouth Conference (Strickland, 2021), recent advances in deep learning and natural language processing (NLP) (Vaswani et al., 2017) have enabled large language models (LLMs) capable of processing and generating human-like content at unprecedented scale. These capabilities have particular significance for scientific publishing, where LLMs are increasingly deployed for tasks ranging from peer review assistance (Zhang & Abernethy, 2025; Zhuang et al., 2025) to automated literature reviews (De La Torre-López et al., 2023).

The development of AI technology presents both challenges and opportunities across various fields (Rama Padmaja & Lakshminarayana, 2024; Wolff et al., 2018). While AI offers immense potential, its advancement raises ethical concerns, including biases, privacy issues, and broader social implications (Rama Padmaja & Lakshminarayana, 2024). AI's influence spans all five dimensions of sustainability, with both positive and negative consequences (Khakurel et al.,

2018). For instance, an analysis of a Google Scholar sample of questionable scientific papers suspected to be generated by GPT revealed that many address applied, often controversial issues prone to misinformation, such as environment, health, and computing (Haider et al., 2024).

AI is transforming research jobs, and in turn, science provides LLMs with a vast amount of data for training. However, LLMs may pose a threat to copyright, as they can generate content that potentially violates intellectual property rights (German, 2024). Currently, neither copyright nor “open” licenses can protect scholarly content from without author consent reuse in AI training (Decker, 2025). This fact raises fundamental questions that existing legal frameworks struggle to address.

The intersection of AI training and copyright law has generated substantial legal scholarship examining how different jurisdictions approach these challenges. Sag & Yu (2024) identify an emerging international equilibrium where countries recognize text and data mining as potentially valuable while maintaining some copyright protections, driven by the centrality of the idea-expression distinction, global AI competition, and reform convergence. Chopra et al., (2025) offer comparative analysis of how courts and policymakers in multiple jurisdictions address generative AI's impact on copyright and personality rights, highlighting divergent regulatory approaches between U.S. litigation-based doctrines, EU statutory frameworks, and emerging jurisprudence in other legal systems. The European Parliament's 2025 study on generative AI and copyright examines structural risks to European creative economy, calling for harmonized opt-out mechanisms and equitable licensing models (Lucchi, 2025). Senfleben (2025) proposes policy pathways to balance innovation with creator protection.

This study examines how generative AI and LLMs challenge existing copyright frameworks in scholarly publishing, an issue that remains underdeveloped in current policy discussions. Within the broader discussion about AI's impact on science, I focus specifically on three interconnected issues: (1) whether current licensing mechanisms adequately protect scholarly works from unauthorized AI training, (2) how regulatory frameworks across major jurisdictions address these copyright concerns, and (3) what actions stakeholders can take to establish fairer governance of AI training on academic content. The focus on these three issues responds to an urgent gap in current policy discussions, where the use of publicly available research outputs for training large language models remains largely unregulated.

AI and LLMs Applications in Scholarly Communication and Publishing

Artificial intelligence (AI), particularly large language models (LLMs), is transforming higher education and research in much the same way it is revolutionizing other industries. AI has the potential to enhance personalized learning experiences, provide feedback to students, identify at-risk learners, and accelerate the research process (Tarisayi, 2024). Andersen et al. (2024) identified three clusters of AI perception among academics: "GenAI as a workhorse," "GenAI as a language assistant only," and "GenAI as a research accelerator." The authors argue that these variations reflect differences across disciplines and knowledge production models. Applications of AI in these fields include *text generation*, *data analysis*, *literature review assistance*, and *peer review* (Alqahtani et al., 2023). For instance, AI can automate many tasks involved in conducting *systematic literature reviews* (De La Torre-López et al., 2023). A recent dissertation (Huettemann, 2025) investigates how LLMs can be effectively utilized to automate and enhance domain-specific literature reviews, focusing particularly on the creation of domain-specific knowledge representations. Another promising use case is the *proofreading and editing* of scientific texts.

Automatic or AI-assisted *peer review* has been proposed as a potential solution to the shortage of reviewers and issues of quality and reproducibility in scientific research. Software tools for

automatically evaluating scientific papers using AI, StatReviewer¹ and UNSILO², have emerged in recent years³. Additionally, tools like the *statcheck* package for verifying statistical analyses have gained traction⁴. Until recently, these tools were considered auxiliary and incapable of replacing human labor (Baker, 2015; Heaven, 2018). However, recent advances in AI are challenging this notion.

Recent studies have explored the impact of AI and LLMs on peer review, with research indicating that AI-assisted reviews are becoming more prevalent. At ICLR 2024, it is estimated that at least 15.8% of reviews will be AI-assisted (Latona et al., 2024). These AI-assisted reviews tend to assign higher scores to papers and increase acceptance rates (Latona et al., 2024), potentially improving review quality and addressing reviewer shortages (Hosseini & Horbach, 2023). However, such studies are often based on limited samples. For example, Biswas et al. (2023) compared ChatGPT's performance as an AI reviewer to human reviews for a single published article. The authors found that ChatGPT demonstrated commendable ability in identifying methodological flaws, providing insightful feedback on theoretical frameworks, and assessing the overall contribution of articles to their respective fields.

Despite these advancements, concerns about *bias amplification*, *confidentiality*, and *the lack of guidelines* for LLM use in peer review persist (Hosseini & Horbach, 2023). Some researchers advocate for AI to assist with manuscript triaging (Bauchner & Rivara, 2024), suggesting that human-AI collaboration could democratize academic culture (Sarker et al., 2024). Nevertheless, researchers recommend disclosing the use of LLMs and maintaining human responsibility for review accuracy and integrity (Hosseini & Horbach, 2023).

The impact of AI on the publishing industry can be described as revolutionary. It is expected that AI will bring about a third digital transformation in the industry (Bergstrom & Ruediger, 2024). Two possible scenarios for the future development of AI in scholarly publishing have been proposed. In the first scenario, AI would make the publishing process more efficient, expanding the range of services offered by publishers. In a more radical scenario, AI could fundamentally change the way scientific communication occurs, transforming the channels used for communication.

While these applications have the potential to revolutionize education and research, challenges remain, including ethical concerns, algorithmic bias, and the need for human oversight (Alqahtani et al., 2023; Peláez-Sánchez et al., 2024). *Algorithmic bias* refers to systematic errors in AI systems that can lead to unfair and unequal outcomes (Shin & Shin, 2023).

The interaction between generative AI (GenAI) and the open access movement is complex (Hosseini et al., 2024). GenAI can make scholarly publications more comprehensible to the public or researchers from other fields. It can also help mitigate the negative consequences of information overload and assist researchers in fully benefiting from open access. However, significant risks are associated with using GenAI to enhance access to scholarly literature. One concern is the potential for systems to provide inaccurate or biased summaries, syntheses, or advice. Another risk is the possibility of facilitating the proliferation of paper mills. Finally, the absence of proper attribution of training data challenges the concept of originality and may discourage the sharing of data and papers.

Open science has led to the generation of vast amounts of data, presenting both opportunities and challenges for the scientific community. AI research can also be part of open science, particularly through the development of open-source LLMs such as Game 2, Nemo Tron-4, and

¹ StatReviewer. URL: <http://statreviewer.com/> (date of access: 22.01.2024).

² UNSILO. URL: <https://site.unsilo.com/site/> (date of access: 22.01.2024).

³ At the same time, plagiarism detection systems have existed for much longer. For example, "Antiplagiat," a well-known system in Russia, was established in 2005.

⁴ statcheck. URL: <https://michelenuijten.shinyapps.io/statcheck-web/> (date of access: 22.01.2024), also R package.

Llama 4. Open datasets are crucial to the success of these open-source projects. However, developers face numerous challenges, including language bias and safety issues.

Several community initiatives aim to address these challenges. One such initiative is the *Aya project*, which seeks to bridge the language barrier by providing a human-curated instruction-following dataset in 65 different languages (Singh et al., 2024). The dataset contains 513 million examples across 114 languages. As a result of this initiative, three key resources have been developed and made freely available: the Aya Dataset, the Aya Collection, and the Aya Evaluation Suite. This initiative serves as a platform for future research collaboration to continue bridging the gap in language resources.

Another issue with open-source LLMs is their susceptibility to malicious exploitation. (Yi et al., 2024) identified vulnerabilities in the safety alignment of open-access LLMs, which can significantly increase the success rate and harmfulness of jailbreak attacks⁵. The study proposes two types of techniques that can make LLMs adeptly reverse-aligned to output harmful content, even in the absence of manually curated malicious datasets.

AI-Related Regulations

In this section, I provide an analysis of the regulations related to artificial intelligence (AI) in the United States, China, the United Kingdom, the European Union, and major international initiatives influencing national AI legislation.

United Kingdom

Interestingly, there is currently no comprehensive regulation governing AI in the UK and the United States. The Sunak government issued a framework document in 2023 titled *A Pro-Innovation Approach to AI Regulation* (2023), which establishes basic principles for AI. The document promotes flexible regulation and aims to foster innovation through the development and use of AI technologies. The British government has also expressed its ambition to make the UK the best place to invest in AI.

The Artificial Intelligence (Regulation) Bill, reintroduced as a Private Members' Bill by Lord Holmes of Richmond on March 4, 2025, represents a significant departure from the government's earlier voluntary approach by proposing the creation of a centralized AI Authority to coordinate regulatory oversight across sectors, establish regulatory sandboxes for testing AI innovations with real consumers, and mandate that all organizations developing, deploying, or using AI designate AI officers and undergo independent audits by accredited third parties. The bill specifically addresses the copyright protection regulatory gap by requiring organizations involved in AI training to report all third-party data and intellectual property used to the AI Authority with assurances of informed consent and compliance with copyright laws, alongside mandatory health warnings, labeling, and consent options for AI products and services, thus providing the transparency and accountability mechanisms around training data provenance that have been largely absent from other AI regulatory frameworks.

United States

In the United States, a framework document was published in October 2023, titled *Executive Order 14110 on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence* (2023). Notably, this document included actions related to copyright law, stating: "...consult with the Director of the United States Copyright Office and issue recommendations to the President on potential executive actions relating to copyright and AI. The recommendations shall address any copyright and related issues discussed in the United States Copyright Office's study, including the scope of protection for works produced using AI and the treatment of copyrighted works in AI training."

⁵ User prompt injection attacks occur when users deliberately exploit system vulnerabilities to elicit unauthorized behavior from an LLM (see, for example, <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-au/azure/ai-services/content-safety/concepts/jailbreak-detection>).

A significant step forward was taken with the development of the *Generative AI Copyright Disclosure Act of 2024* (Schiff, 2024). This act aimed to ensure transparency in the use of copyrighted works for AI training and is currently under consideration in the House of Representatives. If passed, the act would require companies to notify the U.S. Copyright Office about any copyrighted works used in their AI systems. These notifications must be submitted 30 days before or after the public release of the AI system, ensuring transparency and accountability. The act is intended to help copyright holders make informed decisions about licensing and compensation. However, the wording of the document remains vague, raising questions for both AI developers and copyright owners. Additionally, I have concerns about the inability of copyright holders to prohibit the use of their works for AI training, which creates a bias in favor of bigtech AI development.

The future of this Act is unclear because Trump rescinded Executive Order 14110 during the first days of his presidency. His *Executive Order 14179*, signed on January 23, 2025, articulated the need to develop a new approach to AI development (*Executive Order 14179 Removing Barriers to American Leadership in Artificial Intelligence*, 2025). This approach was formulated in *AI Action Plan* (2025) that prioritize “American values” like free speech in AI development, support open models, streamline permitting for infrastructure, support American workers, and build global alliances on AI standards and security. However, I didn’t find any mentions of copyright in the document.

AI Action Plan was accompanied by a number of executive orders, namely:

- Promoting the export of the American AI technology stack
- Accelerating federal permitting of data center infrastructure
- Preventing “Woke AI” in the Federal Government

The documents signed on July 23, 2025, clearly indicate that AI, like many other spheres of American social life under Trump’s administration, proved to be highly politicized.

China

In China, the *Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services* were implemented on August 15, 2023. These regulations, comprising 24 articles, aim to strike a balance between fostering innovation and ensuring the security and governance of AI. Article 3 emphasizes the importance of maintaining a harmonious relationship between development and innovation while prioritizing security and governance in the field of AI. Articles 5 and 6 highlight the need for collaboration in developing basic technologies, such as chips and software platforms, as well as the creation of shared data resources. Article 16 states that all regulatory measures must be compatible with innovation, and Article 2 clarifies that the regulations apply only to publicly available generative AI services. Service providers are held responsible for the content generated using their services. Chinese regulations are among the most stringent in the world. For example, Article 12 mandates that users must be informed when content is generated using AI as a blanket rule.

On July 26, 2025, just three days after Trump issued his AI Action Plan, China unveiled *Global AI Governance Action Plan*. The document details a comprehensive international framework for AI development and deployment. Unlike the U.S. plan, which centers on national priorities and addressing ideological biases in AI systems, China’s approach focuses on global coordination, emphasizing multilateralism, openness, and technological support for developing countries. It does not generally address copyright protection in detail, but it does mention data and privacy protection, the lawful use of training data, and the need to actively explore regulated data transactions in AI. The document frames the creation of high-quality, legitimate data sets as essential for AI development, with safeguards in place, implying that intellectual property (including copyright) should be respected in the pursuit of innovative data governance.

European Union

On August 1, 2024, the European *Artificial Intelligence Act* (AI Act) entered into force (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024, 2024). This law primarily aims to reduce the risks associated with the use of AI. It focuses mainly on high-risk AI systems, while low-risk systems require transparency. For instance, chatbots must clearly inform users that they are interacting with a machine, and certain AI-generated content must be labeled as such.

The EU has been preparing a comprehensive strategy to accelerate the responsible and impactful use of artificial intelligence in science, with major policy developments expected by the end of 2025. One of the developments within this strategy was *Living guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research* (Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, 2025), as well as key initiatives such as a distributed AI infrastructure and a European AI Research Council (*Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Science*, 2025).

On October 8, 2025, the European Commission released its European Strategy for Artificial Intelligence in Science (A European Strategy for Artificial Intelligence in Science Paving the Way for the Resource for AI Science in Europe (RAISE), 2025), a document which promises to significantly influence copyright governance concerning AI training data within the scientific publishing ecosystem. The strategy explicitly acknowledges the necessity of gathering evidence to improve both access to and the reuse of publicly funded research outputs. This focus suggests a potential shift in policy, one that could broaden the permissible uses of openly accessible research for the purposes of training AI systems.

A central and pivotal element of the strategy is its emphasis on data governance, particularly through established initiatives like the European Open Science Cloud (EOSC) and the planned Data Labs within AI Factories. These structures imply a movement toward more formalized and structured permissions frameworks for data access. Yet, it is notable that the document remains largely silent on the specific copyright protections afforded to authors whose published works constitute the raw material for these data spaces. However, the strategy does not adequately differentiate between the long-accepted practice of text and data mining for non-commercial, human led research and the increasingly prevalent commercial application of AI training, a distinction with profound legal implications.

Whether the strategy's promise to update the “Living Guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research” and to establish new ethics review processes will provide a viable pathway for addressing these unresolved copyright concerns remains an open question. These proposed mechanisms may indeed offer a forum for such discussions, but the initial communication leaves considerable room for interpretation regarding the balance between fostering AI innovation and safeguarding intellectual property rights in academia.

Global Initiatives

The OECD *AI Principles* (2019) set global, value-based guidance for trustworthy AI: promote inclusive growth and well-being; respect human rights, the rule of law and democratic values; ensure transparency and explainability; build robustness, security and safety; and maintain accountability across the AI lifecycle. Governments are urged to invest in R&D, enable high-quality and representative data, build interoperable ecosystems, adopt agile and outcome-based regulation (including experimentation), and prepare society and workers for AI-driven transformation. The Principles influence many national and international frameworks and emphasize privacy, non-discrimination, and responsible data use. At the same time, they do not create copyright rules or specifically resolve training-data copyright questions; rather, they root in existing IP and legal regimes and encourage accountability and transparency practices that can complement copyright compliance.

The UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2022), adopted by all 193 member states in November 2021, establishes the first global standard for AI ethics

grounded in human rights, dignity, and environmental protection. The framework promotes four foundational values (human rights and dignity; living in peaceful societies; ensuring diversity and inclusiveness; environment and ecosystem flourishing) and ten key principles including proportionality, human oversight, transparency, explainability, accountability, and fairness. It provides extensive policy action areas covering data governance, education, gender equality, culture, health, and environment, while requiring member states to implement ethical impact assessments and oversight mechanisms throughout AI lifecycles. While it calls for transparency about data sources and requires compliance with legal frameworks, the Recommendation does not establish specific copyright rules but emphasizes the importance of respecting existing intellectual property rights and international law.

The *G7 Hiroshima Process*, launched in May 2023 and finalized in December 2023, created international framework for advanced AI systems through the Hiroshima AI Process Comprehensive Policy Framework, which includes International Guiding Principles for all AI actors and a voluntary International Code of Conduct for organizations developing advanced AI systems (Hiroshima Process International Guiding Principles for Advanced AI System, 2023). However, the principles mention protecting intellectual property and implementing "appropriate data input measures and protection for personal data and IP" (Principle 11), but like other international frameworks, they defer to existing copyright laws rather than creating new IP protections.

In summary, the legislative frameworks in major AI-developing countries primarily focus on either the responsible development and use of AI, including content labeling, or on fostering innovation and attracting investment in the AI industry. While the United States initially attempted to address copyright issues under the Biden administration through Executive Order 14110 and the proposed Generative AI Copyright Disclosure Act, the Trump administration's 2025 AI Action Plan marks a significant shift in priorities, moving away from the copyright-focused approach of the previous administration. This creates a regulatory environment that critics argue disproportionately favors the interests of AI developers over those of copyright holders. However, a significant development has emerged with the UK's 2025 Artificial Intelligence (Regulation) Bill, which directly addresses the copyright protection gap by requiring organizations training AI systems to report all third-party data and intellectual property used, with assurances of informed consent and compliance with copyright laws. This makes the UK the first major jurisdiction to propose comprehensive transparency requirements around training data provenance and IP usage, potentially setting a new standard for balancing AI innovation with intellectual property rights protection. International frameworks from OECD, UNESCO, and G7 continue to defer to existing copyright laws rather than establishing AI-specific IP protections, while the EU AI Act and China's regulatory measures remain focused on risk management and content control rather than addressing fundamental copyright issues in AI training.

Table 1 – AI-Related Regulations

Country	Document	Year	Main points	Copyright protection
United Kingdom	A Pro-Innovation Approach to AI Regulation	2023	Framework document establishing basic principles for AI; promotes flexible regulation; aims to foster innovation through AI development and use; no	No specific mention of copyright protection in the framework

			comprehensive AI regulation	
United Kingdom	Artificial Intelligence (Regulation) Bill	2025	Private Members' Bill reintroduced by Lord Holmes; proposes creation of AI Authority for regulatory coordination; establishes regulatory sandboxes; requires designated AI officers; mandates independent AI audits; requires health warnings and labeling for AI products	Specifically requires organizations training AI to report all third-party data and IP used to AI Authority with assurances of informed consent and compliance with copyright laws; addresses transparency around training data provenance and IP usage
United States	Executive Order 14110 (RESCINDED)	2023	Safe, secure, and trustworthy development and use of AI; included actions related to copyright law; recommendations on copyright and AI issues	Specifically addressed copyright issues, including scope of protection for AI-produced works and treatment of copyrighted works in AI training
United States	Generative AI Copyright Disclosure Act (H.R.7913)	2024	Requires companies to notify U.S. Copyright Office about copyrighted works used in AI systems 30 days before/after public release; ensures transparency and accountability	Directly addresses copyright by requiring disclosure of copyrighted training data, but criticized for being vague and biased toward AI developers rather than copyright holders
United States	Executive Order 14179 & AI Action Plan 2025	2025	Removes barriers to “American AI leadership”; prioritizes “American values” like free speech; supports open models; streamlines infrastructure permitting; highly politicized approach	No mentions of copyright found in the document, representing a departure from previous copyright considerations

China	Interim Measures for the Management of Generative AI Services	2023	24 articles balancing innovation with security/governance; applies only to publicly available services; service providers responsible for generated content; mandatory AI labeling	Does not specifically address copyright protection; focuses on content control and governance rather than IP rights
China	Global AI Governance Action Plan 2025	2025	Comprehensive international framework emphasizing multilateralism, openness, and technological support for developing countries; focuses on global coordination	Mentions data and privacy protection, lawful use of training data, and need for legitimate datasets, implying IP rights should be respected but no specific copyright provisions
European Union	EU Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act)	2024	Entered force August 1, 2024; reduces AI-associated risks; focuses on high-risk AI systems; requires transparency for low-risk systems; mandatory labeling of AI-generated content	Does not explicitly address copyright protection; focuses primarily on risk management and transparency rather than IP rights
European Union	Living Guidelines on Responsible Use of Generative AI in Research	2025	Part of comprehensive strategy to accelerate responsible AI use in science; aims to enhance innovation, competitiveness, ethical deployment, and international leadership	Does not explicitly address copyright protection; mentions only “unpublished and sensitive work” but no specific IP protections
International (OECD)	OECD AI Principles	2019	Global, value-based guidance for trustworthy AI; promotes inclusive growth, human rights respect, transparency,	Does not create specific copyright rules; defers to existing IP and legal regimes; encourages accountability and transparency that can

			robustness, and accountability; influences many national frameworks	complement copyright compliance
International (UNESCO)	AI Ethics Recommendation	2021	Adopted by 193 member states; first global standard for AI ethics; four foundational values and ten key principles; extensive policy action areas	Does not establish specific copyright rules but emphasizes respecting existing intellectual property rights and international law; requires compliance with legal frameworks
International (G7)	Hiroshima Process Comprehensive Policy Framework	2023	International framework for advanced AI systems; includes International Guiding Principles and voluntary Code of Conduct; emphasizes safe, secure, trustworthy AI development	Mentions protecting intellectual property and implementing “appropriate data input measures and protection for personal data and IP” but defers to existing copyright laws rather than creating new IP protections

Copyright, Licensing, and Legal Analysis

Copyright Framework and Creative Commons Licensing

Most scientific works are protected by copyright laws. Copying and retaining these works in AI systems, as well as reproducing them in outputs, involves copyright, making appropriate licensing essential for compliance (Johnson, 2024). The generated output can be considered a derivative work, although this is not explicitly stated in any legal documents.

Creative Commons (CC) licenses are the most widely used for open-access outputs. Approximately 28% of global research output is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY), while another 22% uses more restrictive Creative Commons licenses (Pollock & Michael, 2024). However, Creative Commons acknowledges that existing CC licenses do not fully address the specific challenges related to using creative works for AI training (Walsh, 2023).

On the other hand, if the use of content is subject to copyright exclusions, the licensee's abilities are limited. In fact, such an exclusion is currently being considered for legislation in the United States. Moreover, the U.S. fair use doctrine allows for the unlicensed use of copyrighted works under certain circumstances. AI training is often considered a case of fair use (Johnson, 2024; Walsh, 2023). For instance, OpenAI argues that this position is “supported by long-standing and widely accepted precedents” (*OpenAI and Journalism*, 2024).

Publishers are also responding to market changes by developing licensing agreements for the use of content in LLM training (Schonfeld, 2024). Currently, the number of such deals is

relatively low⁶, and they primarily cover content distributed through subscription services. If a publishing contract includes the full transfer of rights to the publisher, the publisher can license the content for AI training without seeking the authors' consent (Hansen, 2024). This underscores the importance of the rights retention strategy. Major publishers, along with Clarivate, are rapidly developing new AI-based businesses, which are evolving into data cartels (Pooley, 2024). This could lead to a situation where the academic AI market adopts the same oligopolistic structure as the current academic publishing market.

In June 2025, Creative Commons unveiled CC Signals (“Introducing CC Signals,” 2025), an initiative widely regarded as the most substantial development in open licensing since the suite's initial introduction. This move responds to a recognized shortfall in the capacity of existing Creative Commons licenses to govern rights concerning AI training data. Rather than operating as a simple binary of permission or denial, CC Signals proposes a system of preference signals. Its stated aim is to increase reciprocity and “sustain the commons in the age of AI.” This will allow dataset curators to express conditional preferences for machine-based content reuse. A critical aspect of the design is its dual nature as both a technical and a legal instrument. The signals are engineered to be machine and human readable, a feature intended to provide flexible application across what might be termed legal, technical, and normative contexts. One might ask, however, whether such flexibility can be standardized effectively across diverse jurisdictions.

Currently, the project is in a phase of public consultation, with an alpha version planned for release in November 2025. The development process is being conducted, in the words of Creative Commons, “alongside our partners and community,” a commitment evidenced by the solicitation of input through a GitHub repository (*Creativecommons/Cc-Signals*, 2025/2025). This approach suggests an iterative methodology where the technical specifications are being refined in direct response to stakeholder feedback, a process that may prove crucial for the framework's eventual adoption and legitimacy. The ultimate success of this endeavor, of course, remains to be seen, depending on complex factors of both technical implementation and community buy-in.

However, the CC Signals framework confronts a number of significant challenges that could impede its practical efficacy. A primary concern is the uncertain enforceability of the signals themselves. Creative Commons admits that these signals may range in enforceability, potentially functioning as normative rather than strictly legally binding instruments. This admission introduces a considerable risk that AI developers, particularly when facing strong commercial incentives, might simply overlook non-binding preferences, rendering them ineffective in practice.

A further complication involves the tricky question of retroactive application. The scholarly ecosystem already contains millions of research outputs shared under existing CC BY licenses, which cannot be easily relicensed. It is therefore questioned whether CC Signals will apply solely to new publications. Such a limitation would potentially create a two-tiered system, a situation where a vast corpus of older research remains freely trainable by AI systems without any reciprocity requirements, thereby diluting the framework's overall impact.

The ambiguity extends to the core concept of “reciprocity,” which currently lacks a precise definition. Finally, the prospect of international adoption is fundamentally uncertain. The effectiveness of CC Signals is contingent upon its widespread uptake across a diverse array of national jurisdictions, academic publishers, digital repositories, and funding bodies. Without a coordinated, global effort toward implementation, the likely outcome is fragmentation. In such a scenario, the system could become inconsistent and ultimately ineffective, failing to achieve

⁶ Generative AI Licensing Agreement Tracker. URL: <https://sr.ithaka.org/our-work/generative-ai-licensing-agreement-tracker/>.

the uniform governance its designers envision. The success of the initiative, therefore, depends not only on its technical and legal design but on solving this collective action problem.

Legal Analysis of AI-Generated Content as a Fair Use Case

The fair use analysis applied to AI training practices has yielded deeply divided judicial opinions. This legal uncertainty is extensively documented in comparative legal scholarship (Chopra et al., 2025; Sag & Yu, 2024), which highlights how different legal traditions produce varied outcomes in analogous cases. Recent litigation highlights the critical importance of two factors: the manner in which training data is sourced and the commercial nature of the eventual AI application.

A persistent and legally uncertain question is whether content produced by AI systems should be classified as a derivative work of the copyrighted materials utilized during the training process. Courts have thus far provided inconsistent guidance on this matter. Under the framework of the U.S. copyright law, a derivative work is legally defined as one "based upon one or more preexisting works," which constitutes a "recasting, transformation, or adaptation" of an original source (*17 U.S. Code § 101 - Definitions*, n.d.).

Proponents of classifying AI output as derivative often argue that these outputs can, in certain circumstances, incorporate protectable expression from the training dataset. This is particularly plausible when the generated content bears a close resemblance to specific, identifiable source materials. At the same time, the degree of similarity substantial enough to consider the work a derivative is not entirely clear (Griem, Jr. & Wallace, 2023).

Conversely, a strong counter-argument suggests that AI models do not store or replicate copies, but instead learn to generate content based on abstract statistical patterns. From this perspective, the outputs represent novel combinations that do not constitute a direct adaptation of any specific pre-existing work. This view found judicial support in *Kadrey v. Meta Platforms, Inc.* (2025), where the Northern District of California dismissed the claim that an LLM is itself an infringing derivative work. The court deemed this notion "nonsensical," reasoning that there is no way to understand an LLM as a recasting or adaptation of the plaintiffs' books. The court also rejected the broader proposition that every output from an LLM is automatically a derivative work, insisting instead on a case-specific demonstration of substantial similarity.

The settlement in *Bartz v. Anthropic PBC* (2025) points toward a more nuanced legal pathway. In that case, Judge Alsup determined that training the Claude model on legally acquired books was a "transformative" fair use. Nevertheless, the subsequent \$1.5 billion settlement represents a watershed moment in this area of litigation. The lead plaintiff, Andrea Bartz, characterized the \$1.5 billion settlement as a clear message: "You are not above the law, our intellectual property isn't yours for the taking" (Ortutay, 2025). The settlement draws a sharp distinction based on data provenance. While training on legally obtained books was deemed potentially fair, Judge Alsup ruled that Anthropic's use of "pirated" copies from shadow libraries was inherently infringing."

Arguments against fair use, however, concentrate on commercial harm and the potential for market substitution. A pivotal moment came from the Delaware District Court in *Thomson Reuters v. Ross Intelligence* (2025), which issued the first unambiguous rejection of a fair use defense for AI training. The court concluded the use was "commercial" and, importantly, "not transformative." A key element of the ruling was the recognition of an "obvious" potential market for licensing copyrighted works specifically for AI training. The court took judicial notice that more and more copyright owners are striking deals with AI companies to license works for training purposes, thereby substantiating the market harm factor.

A Call for Action

Science and artificial intelligence (AI) are closely linked. Research provides data, which is crucial for training large language models (LLMs) and advancing data science more broadly. At the same time, generative AI (GenAI) is revolutionizing research. Open-source LLMs are an essential part of open science. While AI presents significant opportunities for scientific advancement, it also poses substantial risks. Legislation in this field is still evolving, and regulatory and policy documents often focus on attracting investment in AI or promoting its responsible development and use. The use of publicly available research outputs for training LLMs falls into a “grey area.” At the moment, the community lacks any meaningful discussion on the reuse of academic content for LLMs’ training. Attempts to raise this issue are made, but their impact is rather limited (Decker, 2025). Below, I offer some thoughts on actions that can be taken in the near future.

First and foremost, AI training should not be considered an exception to copyright law (i.e., under the fair use doctrine). Recognizing LLM training as a case of fair use undermines efforts to reform copyright regulation. In my opinion, LLM training should not qualify as fair use for at least three main reasons:

1. Many AI systems already operate on paid subscription models. Even if no fees are currently charged, there are no legal restrictions preventing these models from becoming commercialized in the future.
2. AI-generated content often closely resembles the original, making it subject to copyright and attribution requirements. It’s a derivative work!
3. AI-generated output, not referencing the source, violates academic traditions of credit allocation. It can be considered a special case of “market harm.”

This issue is particularly relevant in the U.S. context but given that most AI developers are based in the United States, it is critical for the global development of the industry. Some researchers argue that it will take years for U.S. courts to address the issue of licensing content for LLM training (Bergstrom & Ruediger, 2024). This is a major concern for the academic community, as the market will continue to evolve, researchers will increasingly rely on AI for interacting with scholarly output, and it will become more difficult to implement changes (see below for further discussion of limitations and challenges).

Authors should have the option to refuse the use of their work for training GenAI models or specific groups of such models. On the one hand, in terms of Creative Commons licensing, there are two possible strategies to achieve this:

1. *Examine existing licenses:* The Creative Commons BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivatives) license could be considered restrictive for AI training, but only if regulatory frameworks recognize AI-generated content as derivative works. However, determining whether AI-generated content qualifies as a derivative work is complicated by the fact that LLMs can produce different responses for each query, making it difficult to assess similarity to the original. The BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial) license may also be restrictive for training models intended for commercial use⁷.
2. *Introduce a new "NT" (no train) extension:* This would explicitly prohibit the use of licensed works for AI training. However, since the original datasets used for LLM training are not publicly accessible, the prospects for enforcing such licensing terms remain uncertain. Additionally, publishing contracts should specify that publishers cannot use articles to train their LLMs or other AI models without author consent.

On the other hand, the evident limitations of existing Creative Commons licenses in governing AI training practices, as previously discussed, appear to have motivated the development of CC Signals. This new framework for expressing preferences is conceived specifically for

⁷ However, can we be certain that today's open models will not be commercialized in the future?

contemporary AI applications. Instead of depending on interpretations of legal tools designed for human-centric content sharing, CC Signals proposes purpose-built mechanisms to articulate permissions and constraints for machine learning processes.

From a personal perspective, there is a compelling case for the academic community to rally behind the CC Signals initiative, rather than pursuing an isolated NT license extension. The CC Signals framework, despite its ongoing development, seems to offer a more comprehensive approach. It attempts to grapple with the intertwined challenges of enforceability, machine readability, and the crucial need for international coordination. The advantage of CC Signals lies in its institutional backing from a trusted organization, its participatory development process, and its explicit design for systems-level coordination across multiple domains.

Consequently, universities and major research funders would be well-advised to commit to adopting CC Signals, though such commitment should be contingent on the framework meeting specific requirements. These would include the provision of legally binding signals where jurisdictionally feasible, a default position that opts-in to commercial AI training unless otherwise specified, clearly articulated definitions of what constitutes adequate reciprocity, and the development of mechanisms for retroactive application to content already published under traditional CC licenses, though this presents obvious practical difficulties.

Universities as Key Players in AI Regulation

Universities should take a leading role in regulating AI. On the one hand, universities often act as publishers or maintain their own repositories, making it feasible to implement content licensing approaches in practice. On the other hand, universities conduct research and develop GenAI models, placing them at the forefront of addressing the ethical aspects of these processes. Furthermore, universities can provide evidence to support legislative regulation. Having said that, I must acknowledge that universities lack the regulatory power that governments possess. Among specific actions that universities can take I would mention:

- Supporting development and implementation of CC Signals,
- Adopting institutional policies that prohibit the use of faculty work for AI training without consent,
- Developing open-source, responsible LLMs,
- Creating mandatory AI usage and AI ethics curricula.

Most community documents in open science remain silent on the matter of AI training, e.g. the recent Barcelona Declaration on Open Research Information (Kramer et al., 2024). This apparent oversight represents a significant missed opportunity for the open science community to establish a coherent normative position on this issue. Such a position is arguably needed before commercial practices and legal expectations become entrenched and more resistant to change. The current moment therefore presents a critical juncture. It seems imperative that the community acts now to shape governance frameworks, ensuring that the principles of open science ultimately serve broader human flourishing rather than facilitating primarily corporate extraction.

Legislative Measures and International Cooperation

Governments and international organizations must develop and implement legislative measures to protect authors' rights and prevent the unauthorized use of their works for training GenAI models. One of the first steps should be the mandatory disclosure of training datasets by developers.

The challenge lies not only in adopting national AI laws but also in harmonizing these laws globally. Without international coordination, commercial developers could exploit “safe harbors” to serve their own interests. Therefore, it is essential for large intergovernmental organizations, such as UNESCO, to take on this task. International copyright harmonization for

AI training would require establishing minimum standards while allowing national flexibility, similar to the TRIPS Agreement model (*Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights*, 1994). Such harmonization requires at least three components: law alignment, procedural standardization, and enforcement coordination (“Harmonization of International Copyright Standards,” 2025).

Another challenge is that AI models cannot be “untrained.” If restrictions are imposed only on new models, existing models would gain a non-market advantage. Conversely, applying restrictions retroactively to existing models could destabilize the industry. A responsible dialogue is needed to find a balanced solution. One possible approach is retrieval-augmented generation, which allows models to reference relevant papers in their outputs (“AI Firms Must Play Fair When They Use Academic Data in Training,” 2024).

Conclusion

The author of this article does not oppose AI. In fact, while writing this manuscript, the Yandex.Translate (YaGPT-5) and DeepSeek R3 were used to assist with reading Chinese source texts and proofreading the final version of the paper. This analysis argues that existing copyright frameworks are fundamentally ill-equipped to regulate the use of scholarly works in AI training, thereby posing urgent challenges to academic integrity and the equitable production of knowledge. Three principal findings arise from this investigation.

Firstly, widely implemented licensing mechanisms such as Creative Commons licenses prove inadequate for addressing the distinct challenges presented by AI training. Although CC BY licenses function effectively for human-to-human content sharing, they were never intended to govern machine learning processes at scale, nor do they adequately differentiate between non-commercial research applications and commercial AI development. The 2025 launch of CC Signals constitutes a significant institutional reaction to this problem. Nevertheless, its potential efficacy depends on resolving fundamental questions concerning enforceability, its retroactive application, and the necessity for international coordination.

Secondly, findings reveal that regulatory approaches in major jurisdictions such as the United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and China predominantly emphasize either innovation promotion or risk management, while largely sidestepping the issue of copyright protection for AI training data. The UK's 2025 Artificial Intelligence (Regulation) Bill is a notable exception here, as it proposes mandatory disclosure of training data sources coupled with copyright compliance assurances. By contrast, the shift away from copyright considerations in the Trump administration's AI Action Plan, combined with the EU's silence on the matter within its AI in Science Strategy, points to a regulatory vacuum. This gap is one that commercial AI developers appear increasingly willing to exploit.

Third, recent litigation has yielded contradictory judicial signals regarding the application of fair use to AI training. For instance, the ruling in *Kadrey v. Meta Platforms, Inc.* (2025) rejected the notion that LLMs themselves constitute derivative works. However, *Thomson Reuters v. Ross Intelligence* (2025) explicitly denied fair use protection for commercial AI training, thereby acknowledging an emerging licensing market. Further complicating the landscape, the substantial \$1.5 billion settlement in *Bartz v. Anthropic PBC* (2025) drew a critical distinction between training on legally acquired works, which may be considered fair use, and training on pirated materials, which is inherently infringing. This suggests that courts may be moving toward a more nuanced, provenance-dependent framework rather than applying blanket rules. These findings collectively support the idea of harmonizing international legislative efforts. The objective of such efforts would be to ensure transparency, protect intellectual property, and prevent the emergence of an oligopolistic market structure that could potentially prioritize commercial profit over research integrity and equitable knowledge production.

Achieving this harmonization demands three interconnected components. First, substantive law alignment is needed to establish minimum standards for author consent and disclosure, while still permitting national flexibility in implementation mechanisms, perhaps following models like the TRIPS Agreement. Second, procedural standardization should focus on creating machine-readable permission frameworks, CC Signals being one example, which would enable automated compliance verification at a large scale. Third, enforcement coordination is essential to prevent regulatory arbitrage, a situation where AI companies might exploit jurisdictional differences by training models in permissive legal environments for subsequent global deployment.

The academic community stands at a critical juncture. Current market dynamics disproportionately benefit large AI developers, who can train models on copyrighted scholarly works without providing compensation or attribution. This pattern risks replicating the very oligopolistic concentration that already plagues the academic publishing industry. Therefore, universities, research funders, and scholarly societies must act decisively to influence governance frameworks before these commercial practices become entrenched. Specific actions could include the institutional adoption of CC Signals, contingent upon their binding enforceability; the development of new rights retention contract that explicitly prohibits unauthorized AI training; and coordinated advocacy for legislative reforms that establish firm transparency and consent requirements.

The central question, then, is not whether AI should be utilized in research, but rather whether its development will proceed in a manner that respects the intellectual property rights of knowledge creators, or if it will perpetuate extractive models that ultimately undermine the foundations of scholarly communication. This analysis suggests that without coordinated action across stakeholder groups and jurisdictions, the latter outcome appears increasingly inevitable. The time for incremental measures has passed; what is needed now is the immediate establishment of comprehensive governance frameworks.

Limitations of the Study

This analysis is subject to several important limitations that affect its scope and temporal applicability. In terms of geographic coverage, the study focuses on major economies and global initiatives but does not sufficiently engage with significant regional actors (South Korea, Taiwan, Israel). These regions may have developed distinctive regulatory or judicial approaches that could enrich the global understanding of AI copyright issues.

The further constraint is temporal. The field of AI and its corresponding regulatory environment are in a state of constant and rapid change. New legal precedents, settlement agreements, and regulatory frameworks are continuously emerging. Consequently, the information presented here is most accurate as of its publication date and may require revision as the legal landscape evolves.

The jurisdictional focus of the legal analysis is predominantly on U.S. copyright law and recent American court decisions. There is limited coverage of how analogous issues are being regulated in other major legal systems, such as the European Union, China, or the United Kingdom, or in emerging economies with growing AI sectors where different legal traditions may yield different answers.

Finally, a call for action mainly addresses the open science outputs and relevant licensing. This area represents a major gap in regulation – copyright infringements are covered much better.

Future Research Directions

This analysis reveals several promising avenues for further research:

1. Systematic examination of how different legal systems approach AI copyright issues, particularly in civil law jurisdictions and countries with different fair dealing/fair use doctrines.
2. Empirical research on the actual economic effects of AI training on copyright holders, including quantification of market harm and analysis of emerging licensing markets.
3. Interdisciplinary research examining how specific AI architectures and training methodologies affect legal analysis, particularly regarding substantial similarity and transformative use determinations.
4. Longitudinal studies evaluating the effectiveness of emerging AI copyright regulations, including the UK's proposed disclosure requirements and the EU's transparency obligations.
5. Forward-looking research on how developments in AI technology (such as few-shot learning, federated training, or synthetic data generation) might affect the legal landscape and require new regulatory approaches.

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges the peers' contributions:

Ludo Waltman: Supervision, Writing – review & editing

Erna Sattler: Writing – review & editing

Author's Contribution

Dmitry Kochetkov: Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing – original draft

References

- 17 U.S. Code § 101—Definitions.* (n.d.). LII / Legal Information Institute. Retrieved October 22, 2025, from <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/17/101>
- A European Strategy for Artificial Intelligence in Science Paving the way for the Resource for AI Science in Europe (RAISE).* (2025). [COM]. European Commission. <https://primarysources.brillonline.com/browse/human-rights-documents-online/communication-from-the-commission-to-the-european-parliament-and-the-council;hrdhrd46790058>
- A pro-innovation approach to AI regulation* (No. 815). (2023). Department for Science, Innovation & Technology. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-regulation-a-pro-innovation-approach/white-paper>
- Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.* (1994). I.L.M.
- AI Action Plan.* (2025, July 23). <https://www.ai.gov/action-plan>
- AI firms must play fair when they use academic data in training. (2024). *Nature*, 632(8027), 953–953. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-02757-z>
- AI principles.* (2019). OECD. <https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/ai-principles.html>
- Alqahtani, T., Badreldin, H. A., Alrashed, M., Alshaya, A. I., Alghamdi, S. S., Bin Saleh, K., Alowais, S. A., Alshaya, O. A., Rahman, I., Al Yami, M. S., & Albekairy, A. M. (2023). The emergent role of artificial intelligence, natural learning processing, and large language models in higher education and research. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 19(8), 1236–1242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2023.05.016>
- Andersen, J. P., Degn, L., Fishberg, R., Graversen, E. K., Horbach, S. P. J. M., Schmidt, E. K., Schneider, J. W., & Sørensen, M. P. (2024). *Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in the research process – a survey of researchers' practices and perceptions.* SocArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/83whe>

Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Science. (2025, April 7). Research and Innovation. https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/research-area/industrial-research-and-innovation/artificial-intelligence-ai-science_en

Artificial Intelligence (Regulation) Bill, No. HL Bill 82, UK Parliament (2025). <https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3519>

Baker, M. (2015). Smart software spots statistical errors in psychology papers. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2015.18657>

Bauchner, H., & Rivara, F. P. (2024). Use of artificial intelligence and the future of peer review. *Health Affairs Scholar*, 2(5), qxae058. <https://doi.org/10.1093/haschl/qxae058>

Bergstrom, T., & Ruediger, D. (2024). *A Third Transformation? Generative AI and Scholarly Publishing*. Ithaca S+R. <https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.321519>

Biswas, S., Dobaria, D., & Cohen, H. L. (2023). ChatGPT and the Future of Journal Reviews: A Feasibility Study. *The Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine*, 96(3), 415–420. <https://doi.org/10.59249/SKDH9286>

Chopra, P., Sony, R., & Chopra, S. (2025). Generative AI, Copyright and Personality Rights: A Comparative Legal Perspective. *Legal Issues in the Digital Age*, 6(3), 23–51. <https://doi.org/10.17323/2713-2749.2025.3.23.51>

Creativecommons/cc-signals. (2025). [Computer software]. Creative Commons. <https://github.com/creativecommons/cc-signals> (Original work published 2025)

De La Torre-López, J., Ramírez, A., & Romero, J. R. (2023). Artificial intelligence to automate the systematic review of scientific literature. *Computing*, 105(10), 2171–2194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00607-023-01181-x>

Decker, S. (2025, April 15). *Guest Post - The Open Access – AI Conundrum: Does Free to Read Mean Free to Train?* The Scholarly Kitchen. <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2025/04/15/guest-post-the-open-access-ai-conundrum-does-free-to-read-mean-free-to-train/>

Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. (2025). *Living guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research*. European Commission.

Executive Order 14110 on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence (2023). <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2023/10/30/executive-order-on-the-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and-use-of-artificial-intelligence/>

Executive Order 14179 Removing Barriers to American Leadership in Artificial Intelligence (2025). <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/01/31/2025-02172/removing-barriers-to-american-leadership-in-artificial-intelligence>

German, D. M. (2024). *Copyright related risks in the creation and use of ML/AI systems* (Version 1). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2405.01560>

Global AI Governance Action Plan. (2025, July 26). Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China. https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/xw/zyxw/202507/t20250729_11679232.html

Griem, Jr., J. M., & Wallace, J. (2023, August 28). Managing the Risk of Using AI-Generated Content in a World of Copyright Uncertainty: Are AI Content Generators and AI Generated Expressions “Derivatives” of Copyrighted Works? *Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP*. <https://www.clm.com/managing-the-risk-of-using-ai-generated-content-in-a-world-of-copyright-uncertainty-are-ai-content-generators-and-ai-generated-expressions-derivatives-of-copyrighted-works/>

Haider, J., Söderström, K. R., Ekström, B., & Rödl, M. (2024). GPT-fabricated scientific papers on Google Scholar: Key features, spread, and implications for preempting evidence manipulation. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*. <https://doi.org/10.37016/mr-2020-156>

Hansen, D. (2024, July 30). What happens when your publisher licenses your work for AI training? *Authors Alliance*. <https://www.authorsalliance.org/2024/07/30/what-happens-when-your-publisher-licenses-your-work-for-ai-training/>

Harmonization of International Copyright Standards: The Interaction Between the TRIPS Agreement and WIPO Treaties. (2025, April 29). *Şengün Law*. <https://sengunlaw.com/harmonization-of-international-copyright-standards-the-interaction-between-the-trips-agreement-and-wipo-treaties/>

Heaven, D. (2018). AI peer reviewers unleashed to ease publishing grind. *Nature*, 563(7733), 609–610. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-07245-9>

Hiroshima Process International Guiding Principles for Advanced AI System. (2023). G7, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. <https://www.mofa.go.jp/files/100573471.pdf>

Hosseini, M., & Horbach, S. P. J. M. (2023). Fighting reviewer fatigue or amplifying bias? Considerations and recommendations for use of ChatGPT and other large language models in scholarly peer review. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 8(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-023-00133-5>

Hosseini, M., Horbach, S. P. J. M., Holmes, K., & Ross-Hellauer, T. (2024). Open Science at the generative AI turn: An exploratory analysis of challenges and opportunities. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00337

Huettemann, S. (2025). *Domain-Specific Knowledge Extraction and Synthesis for Literature Reviews* [Chemnitz University of Technology; Application/pdf]. <https://doi.org/10.60687/2025-0143>

Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services (2023). http://www.cac.gov.cn/2023-07/13/c_1690898327029107.htm

Introducing CC Signals: A New Social Contract for the Age of AI. (2025, June 25). *Creative Commons*. <https://creativecommons.org/2025/06/25/introducing-cc-signals-a-new-social-contract-for-the-age-of-ai/>

Johnson, B. (2024, July 31). True or False? Addressing Common Assumptions About Copyright and AI. *Copyright Clearance Center*. <https://www.copyright.com/blog/addressing-common-assumptions-copyright-ai/>

Khakurel, J., Penzenstadler, B., Porras, J., Knutas, A., & Zhang, W. (2018). The Rise of Artificial Intelligence under the Lens of Sustainability. *Technologies*, 6(4), 100. <https://doi.org/10.3390/technologies6040100>

Kochetkov, D. (2025, July 10). *Science and Artificial Intelligence: A Copyright Perspective*. 20th International Conference on Scientometrics & Informetrics. https://doi.org/10.51408/issi2025_047

Kramer, B., Neylon, C., & Waltman, L. (2024). *Barcelona Declaration on Open Research Information*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.10958522>

Latona, G. R., Ribeiro, M. H., Davidson, T. R., Veselovsky, V., & West, R. (2024). *The AI Review Lottery: Widespread AI-Assisted Peer Reviews Boost Paper Scores and Acceptance Rates* (Version 1). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2405.02150>

Lucchi, N. (2025). *Generative AI and copyright: Training, creation, regulation*. European Parliament. <https://doi.org/10.2861/0365517>

OpenAI and journalism. (2024, January 8). <https://openai.com/index/openai-and-journalism/>

Ortutay, B. (2025, September 25). *Judge approves \$1.5 billion copyright settlement between AI company Anthropic and authors*. AP News. <https://apnews.com/article/anthropic-authors-copyright-judge-artificial-intelligence-9643064e847a5e88ef6ee8b620b3a44c>

Peláez-Sánchez, I. C., Velarde-Camaqui, D., & Glasserman-Morales, L. D. (2024). The impact of large language models on higher education: Exploring the connection between AI and Education 4.0. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1392091. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1392091>

Pollock, D., & Michael, A. (2024, December 10). *News and Views: How much content can AI legally exploit?* <https://www.deltathink.com/news-and-views-how-much-content-can-ai-legally-exploit>

Pooley, J. (2024). Large Language Publishing: The Scholarly Publishing Oligopoly's Bet on AI. *KULA: Knowledge Creation, Dissemination, and Preservation Studies*, 7(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.18357/kula.291>

Rama Padmaja, C. V., & Lakshminarayana, S. (2024). The rise of AI: A comprehensive research review. *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence (IJ-AI)*, 13(2), 2226. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijai.v13.i2.pp2226-2235>

Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. (2022). UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/recommendation-ethics-artificial-intelligence>

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 (2024). <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng>

Sag, M., & Yu, P. K. (2024). *The Globalization of Copyright Exceptions for AI Training*. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4976393>

Sarker, S., University of Virginia, Susarla, A., Michigan State University, Gopal, R., University of Warwick, Thatcher, J. B., & University of Colorado / University of Manchester. (2024). Democratizing Knowledge Creation Through Human-AI Collaboration in Academic Peer Review. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 25(1), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00872>

Schiff, A. B. [D.-C.-30. (2024, September 4). *Actions - H.R.7913 - 118th Congress (2023-2024): Generative AI Copyright Disclosure Act of 2024 (2024-04-09)* [Legislation]. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/7913/all-actions>

Schonfeld, R. C. (2024, October 15). *Tracking the Licensing of Scholarly Content to LLMs*. The Scholarly Kitchen. <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2024/10/15/licensing-scholarly-content-llms/>

Senftleben, M. (2025). Win-Win: How to Remove Copyright Obstacles to AI Training While Ensuring Author Remuneration (and Why the AI Act Fails to do the Magic). *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, 1. <https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cklawreview/vol100/iss1/5>

Shin, D., & Shin, E. Y. (2023). Data's Impact on Algorithmic Bias. *Computer*, 56(6), 90–94. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2023.3262909>

Singh, S., Vargus, F., D'souza, D., Karlsson, B., Mahendiran, A., Ko, W.-Y., Shandilya, H., Patel, J., Mataciunas, D., O'Mahony, L., Zhang, M., Hettiarachchi, R., Wilson, J., Machado, M., Moura, L., Krzemiński, D., Fadaei, H., Ergun, I., Okoh, I., ... Hooker, S. (2024). Aya Dataset: An Open-Access Collection for Multilingual Instruction Tuning. *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 11521–11567. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.620>

Strickland, E. (2021). The Turbulent Past and Uncertain Future of AI: Is there a way out of AI's boom-and-bust cycle? *IEEE Spectrum*, 58(10), 26–31. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSPEC.2021.9563956>

Tarisayi, K. S. (2024). Strategic leadership for responsible artificial intelligence adoption in higher education. *CTE Workshop Proceedings*, 11, 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.55056/cte.616>

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is All you Need. *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 5998–6008.

Walsh, K. (2023, August 18). *Understanding CC Licenses and Generative AI*. Creative Commons. <https://creativecommons.org/2023/08/18/understanding-cc-licenses-and-generative-ai/>

Wolff, J., Gordon, S., & Guo, D. (2018). The Rise of Artificial Intelligence. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.56.4722>

- Yi, J., Ye, R., Chen, Q., Zhu, B., Chen, S., Lian, D., Sun, G., Xie, X., & Wu, F. (2024). On the Vulnerability of Safety Alignment in Open-Access LLMs. *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, 9236–9260. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.549>
- Zhang, T. M., & Abernethy, N. F. (2025). *Reviewing Scientific Papers for Critical Problems With Reasoning LLMs: Baseline Approaches and Automatic Evaluation* (No. arXiv:2505.23824). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2505.23824>
- Zhuang, Z., Chen, J., Xu, H., Jiang, Y., & Lin, J. (2025). Large language models for automated scholarly paper review: A survey. *Information Fusion*, 124, 103332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2025.103332>