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Thank you for joining us today at Research and Beyond, a podcast that believes science should be accessible to all and its communication is rather necessary. I would like to have your word on how do you feel about joining our podcast today and a little bit on your experience in this whole science communication journey. Yeah, thank you.

Thank you very much for inviting me to your podcast. Very excited. I was not aware of this podcast which talks about many issues related to science.

So a little bit of myself based in Dubai working for Clarivate for the past decade and I work on different territories focusing on Europe, Middle east and Africa. I'm also a researcher at cwts, so it's the Center Science and Technology Studies in Leiden University in the Netherlands. And I'm really interested in how science works, how it is produced, how it is communicated.

So I do study different aspects related to science and there are many things that can be said and should be covered. So working on a large territory, I see big differences between countries, regions, different scientific research cultures and I understand that also Enago plays a big role in that in communicating scientific research in in the best way. Researchers are quite busy in actually researching their study and you know, actually working beat with admin work or even having to work in the lab or field study writing is not really something that, you know, they should put so much of time in as well.

And especially if you are not well versed with the kind of guidelines that the journal has provided you with, the higher chances of it even being desk rejected, not even clearing through the peer review process, let's say. And journals now provide very explicit guidelines on language editing and proofreading expectations from authors and it becomes very difficult for researchers, I would say especially from ESL regions, to go through the entire guidelines and then follow it to the team. In that case, as you rightly mentioned, adherence to prescribe formatting structure and style guides remain essential during the submission and this can happen if they take support from publication and editing services that are available.

This actually increases their chances of getting published as well in the said journal. And it's the editor's job, which they are proficient at and also are subject matter experts in terms of making sure that you know the meaning or the message that you're trying to convey from that research is nowhere altered. The message is going the same way.

Certain guidelines that are supposed to be followed and avoids from rejections from the journal and also makes your peer review process easier. That's the job of an editor or a proofreader and that makes it easier for us to to for Researchers to make their research more accessible. Also on a broader platform, as we speak of editors, human editors who have proficiency in the language, we are also talking about certain online and AI tools that are coming up and you know, people resorting to generative AI in terms of writing their articles or, you know, working around and understanding the proofreading or just editing it themselves.

Do you think we should really depend on these AI models such as ChatGPT to write our manuscripts or edit it? Because in my opinion, and as much as I have studied and worked with the model, I don't think it is the writing assistant for researchers. Definitely, of course you can draft your emails with it, of course you can, you know, just, just write a short essay maybe or get a summary of whatever you've written. But I don't think researchers should Definitely not use ChatGPT.

What is your opinion on that? Yeah, so I think it's still a bit early because we know you mentioned ChatGPT or generative AI overall. Now we're talking about text generated by a machine is not perfect, right? So we know that it creates hallucination, which may sound correct, but they are completely wrong. I think AI based tool.

So ChatGPT, which is generating text, is very different than an AI tool that helps you to check your grammar, right. Or to check your spelling. So I make an important distinction here.

We have that in Microsoft Word, right? So we have the spell check and it's very old system, right. And you have other systems that help you to check your grammar, check your spelling. So these different tools are very much different than ChatGPT or LLM language models that generate text.

I think if they are used correctly, they can. Search tools can help ESL researchers correct and improve their manuscript. But that doesn't mean that we should rely fully on these tools.

Like they're not there to replace the author or the scientist. But again, in terms of editing, grammar, spelling, I think the online tools or the tools that you mentioned, they already provide some good results. Having said that, I think there is a but, an important but or however that those tools are not ready.

And we've seen some cases, we've seen some manuscripts where, or some even publications where, you know, where it was clear that the authors generated text directly from the, from the system. And while I'm not an expert in the fields of those researchers, but I also tried myself generate some references that look good but don't exist at all. Right.

So again, I see it as a tool, as an assistant, but not as a replacement for someone who's gonna read, write text, scientific text, that is something that you can trust. But in terms of improving the clarity, again, the spelling, grammar, I think it does, or the editing, I think it can do a good job. I'm not so sure about the translation because translation is a difficult job.

So generating text is a difficult job, translating it. And we all know about. Yeah, this is Google Translate, right? And the translation is not 100% accurate.

So going back to one of my points where you have someone from India or from North Africa who doesn't speak English and writes the paper in native language and wants to translate it, I wouldn't recommend using an automated translation service as much as possible because translation is also expensive. But it does exist. Editing services or professional services do provide translation, making sure that the, the scientific words are correctly written.

I tried recently and with a text from, from English to Dutch and I came to know, I don't speak Dutch but I came to know that the result was, was quite poor. So I dropped, I thought, okay, you know, I'm not going to translate from English to, to, to Dutch in this way. But yeah, the online tools and resources, I think they're improving, but as I said, it's still early and as they're being trained we might see some good use cases.

But again, that also comes with creating awareness where you don't rely fully on these tools. You have colleagues, you have peers who can improve your manuscript, your writing, and you have professional services as well who can help. And relying only on the machine is probably not the best way to go.

But yeah, these are my thoughts. Again, I think it's still early, but some tools are quite impressive in terms of text generation, but also in terms of image generation. But that also comes with some, some problems.

We've seen some editors or some publishers coming with policies in terms of using ChatGPT, for example. They're quite clear on, you know, how they should be used, how they can be used, and if they're used, it should be mentioned in the manuscript. But we've also seen some misuse of those, those tools.

Thinking of some cases of images that were generated by generative AI and again, those images were completely, I would say fake or not, not reliable. So yeah, still early. Those tools, they shouldn't be ignored, but they should be correctly used with care and they shouldn't replace the writer.

I see them as assistance again in terms of grammar checks, structure, you know, spelling. So in, in this sense I see them as quite, quite powerful tools. Very well said, Jamal.

And I absolutely agree that we cannot depend on such generative AI for writing our manuscripts completely. However, we can use them to check our grammar here and there. But I also believe that these tools are built on a large open access that is easily available on the Internet.

That's a different story altogether that it was not like the rights were not taken from the authors. And that's a different day's talk. But I also believe that when it comes to scientific writing and when it comes to scholarly writing, there has to be a writing assistant that suggests alternative phrases or, you know, improves the coherence for writers, especially when it comes to academic writing.

So there are very specific tools such as Trinka AI. So Trinka AI is typically only curated for academic writers. So such kind of tools is something that researchers should mainly resort to when it comes to, you know, improving their academic writing and improving the language that they are writing and aiming to publish it.

Right. So yeah, that's something that's very important. And as you also spoke about the kind of policies that, you know, researchers should resort to or editors have come up with certain policies, even Cope raised out a statement that they have.

If a writer uses any AI models in writing or helping them with their paper, they should mention explicitly that they have used an AI tool to write an article. In that case, we recently conducted a survey to understand what is researchers perspective in terms of, you know, because there are several policies, right? There are university specific policies, there are, you know, there are journal specific policies when it comes to the use of AI. However, in this whole situation, researchers often get confused in terms of which policy to follow because everybody has a different outlook.

Somebody is completely asking researchers to not use AI and only stick to human writing. Whereas some people are okay with using AI so long as you mention that you have used AI. So there is this divided scope around the world.

And we found that through our survey that around 65% of researchers want a universal guidelines when it comes to using AI in scholarly writing. What is your opinion on that? Should something like a universal guideline from, let's say the UNESCO help in terms of, you know, improving this whole scientific communication and scholarly writing industry a little better and more organized in that sense? Because AI is inevitable. We, we can't run away from it.

I think it's a good idea. It might take some time to reach that, you know, universal agreement when, where, whenever we have, you know, global initiatives or global policies. It's difficult to get everyone on the same page at the same time.

That doesn't mean we won't get there might take some Time in terms of, you know, implementing those policies. There might be some, some question is how do you check, you know, a manuscript was not written with ChatGPT for example. And, and interestingly there was a, there's a study, recent study that found that, you know, the ChatGPT detectors, the tools that help to detect if a text was written by ChatGPT or not, was kind of biased against ESL researchers because they use English writing that might not sound natural because it's not their natural or mother tongue language.

So to get to search policy, I think it's a, again it's an interesting idea but you need to get everyone agree on these different aspects. You need to get them agree on, you need the researchers, you need the publishers, you need, I would say the institutions. So it's a lot of people to get around a huge table and draft that policy and get them to agree on everything on every point.

I'm not saying it's not going to happen, but it might take some time, trial and error. And also because this is new, we might face new issues that we are not aware of. The good thing is that people are aware of the limitations of those tools and some clear mistakes or clear misconduct or I would say questionable practices or behaviors start to emerge.

So that becomes a hot topic, which was not the case just five years ago. But now we've reached a different level where you have like a tool that can create text and that text sounds good, right? It might not be correct, but it sounds good. So again, yeah, I think it's a good idea.

But we're talking about like millions of researchers and you might have different opinions, but I think we, we, we might get there. I think that, you know, it's like a spectrum, right? So you have people who would say it is a software that I use and this software creates text and I use this text. Like this software creates visualization like Excel.

You don't mention that you created this chart with Excel, but the tool, you use the tool to create a visualization like a chart or, or whatever, right? So I would say this is the one strong opinion. And then you would have, people would say as you mentioned, this machine was trained on text, first of all, didn't get the right to use this text to train an algorithm or a model. And then you would have people who would say, well you didn't write this text, this text was written by a machine.

So I Remember end of 2023 where we had the first, the first version of Chat dpt. There was an author who published A paper and put ChatGPT as a co author. So this is a co authored paper with ChatGPT that was quite new, you know, and is there, the paper is there in PubMed, you can find it where? And I posted about that, I said, well, that's the first paper co authored by ChatGPT, so it's ChatGPT becoming a potential co author, potential collaborator.

So yeah, I think so. It's an interesting question. I don't have a definitive answer.

I think it's a good idea. We probably need to have a system in place where you have limitations to safeguard the scientific record. Otherwise we already get lots of publications that, I mean, you can't read all the publications.

So I guess with those machines and we've seen that it's like having a boom of papers, boom of publications, but also a boom of retracted and retractions. Right? Retractions from journals, from publishers and of course from scientific databases. So interesting times.

But I don't have, again, it's a very interesting idea. I think we should have something like that. But we need to agree and be as flexible as possible and try to take, you know, ideas from all sides so that we use the tool in the best way as an assistant and not as a replacement of researchers.

I agree that, you know, it's still far and we are not there yet and in terms of, you know, setting very stringent and standard universal guidelines when it comes to, you know, using AI tools for scholarly writing, of course, so. But I think it will be as much as easy it is to use AI tools to write your articles or help them in making your articles better. All of us, including ESL researchers, need to be more careful in terms of using and integrating such AI tools, especially when it comes to data privacy and understanding how secure their data is because it's an unpublished work that you are putting into a system.

So it's very important for all of us to be aware of the kind of data privacy rules that are set generally. These AI tools very much clearly mention how your data is going to be used, stored and all of those things. So it's very important to be aware of whenever you are inserting any kind of data or information into a system, you know where it is going, going and how it is going to be used.

Is it going to be used to train the model again, then you would never know somebody else has already published a research paper that you've written. You just have no idea. Because as you also earlier mentioned, there's a lot of hallucination there's regurgitation of a lot of data when it comes to generative AI.

So these are some of the concerns that we need to be rather careful about. These are very nicely put up insights from you, Jamal. One of the things that I, I would also like to add from my end is there has to be certain measures from universities and institutions when it comes to providing training to ESL researchers especially, there needs to be.

So in terms of science communication, a lot of universities and institutions have a core subject, a science communication as part of their Masters and PhD programs. However, certain workshops and training webinars need to be, you know, given to such researchers so that they are much clearer in terms, you know, getting out there and probably writing the papers themselves as well, with the assistance of, let's say, AI tools which are extremely curated and designed for academic writing themselves. Right.

So thank you so much, Jamal. And in closing of this, yes, in closing of this session, I would like to close it with Communicating science effectively on global platform is definitely a multifaceted challenge for ESL researchers or otherwise, but understanding their audience, being mindful of cultural differences according to general guidelines, and leveraging available resources or services, the publication, support services or editing services, and even collaborating with other researchers in terms of international collaboration should also be considered by all of us. And that's how we can overcome certain language barriers and share the information in terms of their research and contributions with the global scientific community.

I think that's all for this episode of research and beyond. Until then, keep exploring, keep questioning, and keep communicating your science. Thank you so much.

Thank you