# Can ChatGPT be an author? A study of artificial intelligence authorship policies in top academic journals

**Brady D. Lund[1] and Naheem K. T.[2]**

[1] Department of Information Science, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA
Brady.Lund@unt.edu

[2] Central Library, Pondicherry Central University, Kalapet, Puducherry, IN

## Abstract

Academic publishers have quickly responded to the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools on authorship and academic integrity. However, there remains a lack of understanding about AI authorship policies and the attitude of academic journals towards these tools. This study aims to address this gap by examining the AI authorship policies of 300 top academic journals. Over half of the journals examined have an AI authorship policy and guidelines for acknowledging AI usage in manuscript preparation. These acknowledgments are typically made in the methods or acknowledgement sections, though some journals have introduced a new, special section on AI usage. The study also found that AI authorship policies may differ depending on the publisher and discipline of the journal. These results are useful for publishers, editors, and researchers who want to learn more about how academic journals are dealing with the emergence of large language models and other AI tools in scholarly communications.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, Authorship, Academic Journals, Publisher Policies, ChatGPT

This manuscript is published in the journal *Learned Publishing.* Please cite as:

Lund, B. D., & Naheem, K. T. (2023). Can ChatGPT be an author? A study of artificial intelligence authorship policies in top academic journals. *Learned Publishing*. https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1582

Use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools, especially large language models like ChatGPT, has grown tremendously in the past few months. These tools have the potential to dramatically transform academic publishing, where they can be used positively to improve the quality of written works or abused to generate papers full of misinformation and phantom references (Foster, 2019). Justifiably, there is growing concern about the potential implications of these AI tools for authorship of academic manuscript and the impact on the integrity of scientific publications. This study examines how academic journals have adjusted to the new academic reality of these AI tools, by analyzing the AI authorship policies that have emerged among top publishers and how they guide the usage and acknowledgement of AI technologies. These findings should offer both clarity and guidance to other publishers, journal editors, and authors as they navigate this emerging landscape.

## Literature Review

Generative AI – artificial intelligence applications that are capable of generative new content such as video, images, and text – have the potential to revolutionize scholarly writing and publishing (Lin, 2023; Liebrenz et al., 2023). The world appears to be situated on the precipice of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, which will be characterized by increased automation and deeper integration of technology and humanity (Chaka, 2020; Lund, 2021; Oke & Fernandes, 2020). With the late 2022 release of ChatGPT by OpenAI, many scholars have begun to realize the potential for this paradigm shift to materialize within a mere handful of months (Bozkurt, 2023; Doshi et al., 2023; Sallam, 2023). For scholarly publishers, the emergence of these AI technologies place them in a predicament: to what extent should they embrace these technologies, knowing of the potential risks.

Nature (2023) and Science (2023), two of the world's most prestigious scholarly journals, are among the publishers that expressly forbid the inclusion of AI and large language models as authors. These AI tools cannot freely approve content and consent to the submission of a manuscript, and are therefore more like tools such as Microsoft Word than true intelligent agents that approximate human capabilities (Salvagno et al., 2023). However, not all academics agree with this approach to AI as an author. Jenkins and Lin (2023) refute the positions of these journal publishers and outline procedures for determining how AI-generated content should be credited. They note the importance of two factors: continuity and creditworthiness. Continuity refers to the extent to which AI contributions are present in the final publication, while creditworthiness refers to the extent to which the contributions could be considered worthy of publication in their own right. Other scholars cite current publishing standards, such as those by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, to justify inclusion of AI as authors (Polonsky & Rotman, 2023; Rahimi & Abadi, 2023).

Among academics, early publications seem to indicate that the use and acknowledgment of AI tools as authors in scholarly writing occupies some middle ground (Dergaa et al., 2023; Kooli, 2023; Yeo-Teh & Tang, 2023). These individuals acknowledge that AI tools can have value for enhancing the quality of manuscripts, but that they are capable of making mistakes like producing errant information and plagiarism (Lubowitz, 2023; Thorp, 2023) and are incapable of taking responsibility for the content produced (Lee, 2023; van Dis et al., 2023). As such, a

common solution that has been proposed is to avoid including AI tools in author lists but do acknowledge their contributions within the text of the manuscript, as one would do for an analytical software such as SPSS or NVivo.

With a few notable exceptions, most academics appear to be okay with the use of AI tools in general (Bhatia & Kulkarni, 2023; Donmez et al., 2023). While these tools are better at some aspects of scholarly writing (question generation, abstract production) than others (literature reviews), they typically are helpful in increasing quality of scholarly communications (Alkaissi & McFarlane, 2023; Dergaa et al., 2023). Nonetheless, some ethical questions remain. Access and usage of these AI tools represents a significant advantage compared to researchers who do not or cannot employ them, similar to access to quality databases and software packages (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Liebrenz et al., 2023). By allowing usage of these tools, are journals/publishers exacerbating divides among authors? This seems like a potential motivation behind some journals avoiding the AI question or prohibiting this technology's use (Perkins, 2023).

Given the significant variation in positions regarding the use of AI tools in scholarly publishing, a survey of current policies and practices among scholarly journals will be useful for illuminating how the major disseminators of scholarly knowledge feel about these developments and the appropriate path for addressing the authorship question. In this study, 300 academic journals AI authorship policies are examined in order to unveil patterns and trends in this emerging issue. Specifically, the following questions are addressed in this study:

- How many of these 300 examined journals have a specific policy regarding the use of AI tools like ChatGPT?
- What percentage of the examined policies allow for the use of ChatGPT for improving manuscript quality, and what percentage has prohibited it?
- What is the stance of these journals regarding the use of AI tools like ChatGPT as an author for a manuscript?
- In which sections of a manuscript do these policies require the acknowledgment of AI use?
- What is the sentiment of language included in these AI authorship policies?
- What common terms and other topics are covered within these AI policies?

## Methods

This study aimed to examine and analyze the AI authorship policies of top academic journals. The researchers analyzed the top 300 academic journals ranked by ScimagoJR indexing factor as of April 1, 2023. A complete list of these 300 journals is included as an appendix. To extract the AI authorship policies, they relied on a combination of automated and manual techniques. NVivo software was used for calculating sentiment analysis and term frequencies. The researchers worked together to tally other aspects of policy content, such as the allowance or prohibition of AI tool usage and where this usage should be acknowledged. The data collected were then analyzed and tallied to identify broad trends in AI authorship policies, variation among publishers and disciplines, and implications for academic journals that are seeking to develop an

AI authorship policy of their own. The method of content analysis used in this study is similar to that used in previous studies on scholarly journal policies, such as Christian et al. (2020).

## Results

Of the 300 journals examined on April 1, 2023, 176 of them (58.7%) had a specific policy posted online that pertained to the use of AI tools like ChatGPT. Of these 176 policies, 170 (96.6%) allowed for the use of ChatGPT for improving the quality of manuscripts, while 6 policies (3.4%) prohibited any use of these models. However, when it comes to whether AI tools like ChatGPT should be included as an author, nearly all policies (98.9%) explicitly mention that these tools should NOT be included in the authorship list, whereas just two policies (1.1%) do not specifically prohibit the inclusion of an AI tool like ChatGPT as an author.

Displayed in Table 1 are the specific sections of the research manuscript where usage of an AI tool must be mentioned, according to the journal policies. Note that 26 policies mentioned multiple places where usage of these tools could be mentioned. The methods section was, by far, the most common section, followed by the acknowledgements. About 10% of policies mentioned a new, special section where the usage of ChatGPT and similar language models should be acknowledged. These sections may have names like "AI Acknowledgement" or "AI Disclosure" and generally were to be included directly before the reference section of a manuscript.

**Table 1. Section Where AI Use Should be Acknowledged**

| Section to Specify AI Use | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Methods | 88 | 43.6% |
| Acknowledgements | 51 | 25.2% |
| Not Specified | 37 | 18.3% |
| Special Section | 21 | 10.4% |
| Cover Letter | 5 | 2.5% |

Sentiment analysis was performed for all 176 policies, with the net sentiment calculated for each policy. 46.7% of policies had a net negative sentiment, while 53.3% had a net positive sentiment; however, only 1% of the policies had a very negative sentiment (greater than -0.3 on a scale of -1.0 to 1.0) and 16.1% had a very positive sentiment (greater than 0.3). Sentiment in the AI authorship policies trends towards neutral, with a slight positive lean. Many of the policies emphasize the value of large language models for improving the quality of written works, but take a firm stance that these technologies cannot be considered authors and their use must be acknowledged within the paper. Policies of journals within the Science family of publications have the greatest negative sentiment, as the use of large language models and tools like ChatGPT has been prohibited by these journals.

Table 2 shows the term frequencies for the 176 AI authorship policies. The most commonly occurring, meaningful term is "AI-assisted technology." Other commonly occurring terms give indication of where and how the use of AI assistance should be acknowledged. The AI authorship policies tend to require acknowledgement of any AI use in the writing process, and often explicitly mention the section where the acknowledgement should be made: methods,

acknowledgements, a new special section. These policies also focus on describing or defining what does or does not classify as "artificial intelligence" and what parts of the paper can be supported by these technologies. Many of the policies additionally stress that 'The author is responsible for all content in the manuscript, including that which is generated by AI.'

**Table 2. Term Frequencies for AI Authorship Policies**

| Terms in Policies | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Acknowledgement | 115 | 12.6% |
| AI-assisted technology | 206 | 22.5% |
| Artificial Intelligence | 62 | 6.8% |
| Authorship | 124 | 13.6% |
| Authorship Criteria | 59 | 6.5% |
| Methods Section | 71 | 7.8% |
| Responsibility | 77 | 8.4% |
| Suitable Alternative Section | 57 | 6.2% |
| Writing Processes | 143 | 15.6% |

## Discussion

The findings of this study suggest that awareness of the unique risks that AI-assisted technologies like ChatGPT pose to the quality and integrity of scholarly publishing is fairly high. Over half of the 300 academic journals examined in this study already had an AI authorship policy in place, only a few short months after the launch of the ChatGPT. It is evident that the editors had carefully considered their response to these technologies, as the policies were detailed (an average of 151 words in length) and mentioned details including whether these tools could be included as authors on academic manuscripts (nearly all journals indicated “no”) and where the use of the tools should be acknowledged (usually the methods and/or acknowledgements sections). Although there was agreement on some issues, such as the AI authorship credit issue, there were other aspects, such as the extent to which any use of AI tools is encouraged or discouraged, that varied significantly, usually depending on the publisher rather than the individual journal. For instance, *Science* journals all took a staunch no tolerance approach to the use of AI tools.

Some AI authorship policies offered particularly novel approaches to handling the issues posed by large language models. For example, 10% of journal policies mentioned a new, special section of some kind that could be used for acknowledging the usage of AI tools in the preparation of a manuscript. A few journals acknowledged that these tools could be a boon for academic writing, as they will improve the quality of manuscripts and serve as an equalizing force for those whose manuscripts may have been rejected before on the basis of quality of writing, not on the merits of the actual research. Benefits of AI tools for creating a more-level playing field for researchers have previously been discussed by researchers including Dergaa et al. (2023), Homolak (2023), and Lund et al. (2023). As noted by Lund and Wang (2023), AI tools like ChatGPT have the power to advance academia in both anxiety-provoking *and* exciting and positive new ways.

Notably, the presence of an AI authorship policy, as well as some of the content of the policies, varied based on the publisher of the journals. For instance, all 45 Nature Publishing Group journals (100%) had a uniform AI authorship policy, as did all 15 journals published by Cell Press, all 25 by Elsevier, all 6 by Lancet, and all 6 by the American Medical Association, among others. However, not all journals published by Wiley-Blackwell (50%) or the American Association for the Advancement of Science (80%) had a policy. Similarly, the place where usage of AI tools should be acknowledged varied based on publisher, as 100% of Nature publications stated the "methods" section, while for a publisher like the American Chemical Society, 20% of journals stated the "methods" section, 60% stated the "acknowledgements" section, and 20% stated both the "methods" and "acknowledgements" section. This may be an indication of which publishers have an organization-wide policy versus and journal-by-journal policy process.

Variation based on disciplinary focus is also evident. Among those journals that the researchers determined to focus squarely on the natural sciences (physics, biology, chemistry, medicine), 71.3% of journals had an AI authorship policy. For journals without a clear natural sciences focus, only 46.9% had an AI authorship policy. Similarly, most natural sciences publications requested for the AI acknowledgement to be included in the methods section, while those journals that encouraged a new, special section were typically associated with the social sciences rather than natural sciences. This variation may offer some interesting insight into how scholars from different disciplines view the role and impact of AI in academic publishing.

As this analysis focused on "top" academic journals, it is not clear to what extent AI authorship policies have emerged among other journals, including within specific disciplines where the usage of AI authorship tools may potentially play a substantial role in shaping future scholarly discourse. There are several stimulating articles discussing the impact of AI tools like ChatGPT on specific disciplines, such as physics (Gregorcic & Pendrill, 2023), journalism (Pavlik, 2023), and the medical sciences (Eysenbach, 2023); however, further analysis of the AI authorship policies of journals within these disciplines is still needed. This current research study may serve as a guide as to the types of information that researchers may want to examine when conducting such studies. It should also be noted that we had to select a cut-off point at which we collected our data (April 1, 2023). It is not only possible, but probable, that some AI authorship policies have been updated in the time between data collection and publication of this manuscript. This research serves as a time capsule of sorts as to how policy relating to AI authorship emerged and evolved over time. Future research can serve as a point of comparison to the findings of this study.

**Guidance for Academic Journals Seeking to Develop an AI Authorship Policy**

Based on the analysis above, we make the following recommendations to academic journals seeking to develop their own AI authorship policies:

- AI tools should likely not be considered authors on scholarly manuscripts.
- Academic journals should clearly define what qualifies as artificial intelligence and for what sections/purposes it may be used.

- Acknowledgement of the use of AI tools should likely be required in the manuscript, and journals should clearly define where this acknowledgement should be made. The methods section is the most common section, followed by the acknowledgements section.
- Academic journals should emphasize that the author(s) are responsible for all content in the manuscript, including that which is generated by AI tools.
- Usage of common terms like "AI-assisted technology," "AI authorship policy," and "Author responsibilities" may be helpful to ensure that the policy is clear and unambiguous.

## Conclusion

As artificial intelligence tools continue to revolutionize all aspects of our daily lives, it is important that our policies and procedures adapt to ensure the quality and integrity of our disciplines. This study reveals that many top academic journals are actively working to address the possible pitfalls and issues that may emerge in this new academic reality. It is vital that these efforts continue as new and further-advanced language models are made available to the public. By taking discretion out of the hands of reviewers and editorial assistants and placing responsibility for these policies into the hands of the editors and editorial boards, along with major academic publishers, it is possible to ensure that major breaches in public trust in science do not occur as a result of the influence of these technologies.

## References


Alkaissi, H., & McFarlane, S. I. (2023). Artificial hallucinations in ChatGPT: Implications in scientific writing. Cureus. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.35179

Bhatia, G., & Kulkarni, A. (2023). ChatGPT as co-author: Are researchers impressed or distressed. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry, 84*, article 103564.

Bozkurt, A. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence (AI) powered conversational educational agents: The inevitable paradigm shift. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*. http://www.asianjde.com/ojs/index.php/AsianJDE/article/view/718

Chaka, C. (2020). Skills, competencies and literacies attributed to 4IR/Industry 4.0: Scoping review. *IFLA Journal, 46*(4), 369-399.

Christian, T. M., Gooch, A., Vision, T., & Hull, E. (2020). Journal data policies: Exploring how the understanding of editors and authors corresponds to the policies themselves. *Plos one, 15*(3), e0230281.

Dergaa, I., Chamari, K., Zmijewski, P., & Saad, H. B. (2023). From human writing to artificial intelligence generated text: examining the prospects and potential threats of ChatGPT in academic writing. *Biology of Sport*, *40*(2), 615-622.

Donmez, I., Sahin, I., & Gulen, S. (2023). Conducting academic research with the AI interface ChatGPT: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of STEAM Education, 6*(2), 101-118.

Doshi, R. H., Bajaj, S. S., & Krumholz, H. M. (2023). ChatGPT: Temptations of progress. *The American Journal of Bioethics, 23*(4), 6-8.

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., ... & Wright, R. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management, 71*, 102642.

Eysenbach, G. (2023). The role of ChatGPT, generative language models, and artificial intelligence in medical education: a conversation with ChatGPT and a call for papers. *JMIR Medical Education*, *9*(1), e46885.

Foster, D. (2019). Generative deep learning: Teaching machines to paint, write, compose, and play. O'Reilly Media.

Gregorcic, B., & Pendrill, A. M. (2023). ChatGPT and the frustrated Socrates. *Physics Education, 58*(3), 035021.

Homolak, J. (2023). Opportunities and risks of ChatGPT in medicine, science, and academic publishing: a modern Promethean dilemma. *Croatian Medical Journal*, *64*(1), 1-3.

Jenkins, R., & Lin, P. (2023). AI-assisted authorship: How to assign credit in synthetic scholarship. Ethics and Emerging Sciences Group. https://ssrn.com/abstract=4342909

Kooli, C. (2023). Chatbots in education and research: A critical examination of ethical implications and solutions. *Sustainability, 15*, article 1564.

Lee, J. Y. (2023). Can an artificial intelligence chatbot be the author of a scholarly article? *Journal of Educational Evaluation for Health Professions, 20*, 6-11.

Lin, Z. (2023). Modernizing authorship criteria: Challenges from exponential authorship inflation and generative artificial intelligence. https://psyarxiv.com/s6h58.

Liebrenz, M., Schleifer, R., Buadze, A., Bhugra, D., & Smith, A. (2023). Generating scholarly content with ChatGPT: ethical challenges for medical publishing. *The Lancet Digital Health, 5*(3), e105-e106.

Lubowitz, J. H. (2023). ChatGPT, an artificial intelligence chatbot, is impacting medical literature. *Arthroscopy, 39*(5), 1121-1122.

Lund, B. D. (2021). The fourth industrial revolution. *Information Technology and Libraries, 40*(1), 1-4.

Lund, B. D., & Wang, T. (2023). Chatting about ChatGPT: How may AI and GPT impact academia and libraries? *Library Hi Tech News*. https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-01-2023-0009

Lund, B. D., Wang, T., Mannuru, N. R., Nie, B., Shimray, S., & Wang, Z. (2023). ChatGPT and a new academic reality: Artificial Intelligence-written research papers and the ethics of the large language models in scholarly publishing. *Journal of the Association for Information Science & Technology*, *74*(5), 570-581.

Nature. (2023). Tools such as ChatGPT threaten transparent science: Here are out ground rules for their use. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-00191-1

Oke, A., & Fernandes, F. A. (2020). Innovations in teaching and learning: Exploring the perceptions of the education sector on the 4th industrial revolution (4IR). *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market and Complexity, 6*(2), 31.

Pavlik, J. V. (2023). Collaborating With ChatGPT: Considering the Implications of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Journalism and Media Education. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 7*8(1), 84-93.

Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 20(2), 7.

Polonsky, M. J., & Rotman, J. D. (2023). Should artificial intelligent agents be your co-author? Arguments in favor, informed by ChatGPT. *Australasian Marketing Journal, 31*(2), 91-96.

Rahimi, F., & Abadi, A. (2023). ChatGPT and publication ethics. *Archives of Medical Research, 54*(3), 272-274.

Sallam, M. (2023). ChatGPT utility in healthcare education, research, and practice: Systematic review on the promising perspectives and valid concerns. *Healthcare, 11*(6), 887-892.

Salvagno, M., Taccone, F. S., & Gerli, A. G. (2023). Can artificial intelligence help for scientific writing? *Critical Care, 27*, 75-79.

Science. (2023). Editorial policies. Retrieved from https://www.science.org/content/page/science-journals-editorial-policies#:~:text=Artificial%20intelligence%20(AI).,explicit%20permission%20from%20the%20editors.

Thorp, H. H. (2023). ChatGPT is fun, but not an author. Science, 379(6630), 313.

van Dis, E. A., Bollen, J., Zuidema, W., van Rooij, R., & Bockting, C. L. (2023). ChatGPT: five priorities for research. *Nature, 614*(7947), 224-226.

Yeo-The, N., & Tang, B. L. (2023). NLP systems such as ChatGPT cannot be listed as an author because these cannot fulfill widely adopted authorship criteria. *Accountability in Research*. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2177160

**Appendix. 300 Journals Examined in this Study**

Ca-A Cancer Journal for Clinicians

Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology

Quarterly Journal of Economics

Cell

MMWR Recommendations and Reports

New England Journal of Medicine

Nature Medicine

Nature Reviews Materials

Nature Reviews Genetics

Reviews of Modern Physics

American Economic Review

Nature Biotechnology

Chemical Reviews

Journal of Political Economy

Nature

Annual Review of Immunology

Administrative Science Quarterly

Nature Reviews Immunology

Nature Reviews Cancer

Nature Energy

Nature Genetics

Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report

Journal of Finance

Lancet

Review of Economic Studies

Academy of Management Annals

Science

Chemical Society Reviews

Immunity

IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials

Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning

Econometrica

Annual Review of Biochemistry

Physiological Reviews

World Psychiatry

Nature Catalysis

Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics

Living Reviews in Relativity

Nature Materials

Nature Methods

Nature Neuroscience

Science immunology

Nature Reviews Chemistry

Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology

Lancet Oncology

Nature Nanotechnology

Lancet Neurology

Review of Financial Studies

Energy and Environmental Science

Lancet Public Health

Nature Reviews Drug Discovery

Lancet Respiratory Medicine

Nature Photonics

Academy of Management Journal

Joule

Journal of Financial Economics

Lancet Infectious Diseases

MMWR Surveillance Summaries

Annual Review of Pathology: Mechanisms of Disease

American Economic Journal: Applied Economics

Cancer Cell

Molecular Cell

Nature Cell Biology

American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics

Lancet Diabetes and Endocrinology

Journal of the American College of Cardiology

Nature Microbiology

Astronomy and Astrophysics Review

Annual Review of Plant Biology

Annual Review of Genetics

Journal of Economic Literature

Strategic Management Journal

Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics

Nature Reviews Gastroenterology and Hepatology

Journal of Clinical Oncology

Cell Host and Microbe

Genome Biology

Cell Metabolism

Nature Immunology

Nature Reviews Microbiology

Nature Reviews Physics

Clinical Microbiology Reviews

Progress in Materials Science

Lancet Psychiatry

Lancet Global Health

Advances in Physics

Annual Review of Psychology

Advanced Materials

Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior

American Economic Journal: Economic Policy

Annals of Oncology

Nature Reviews Endocrinology

Reviews of Geophysics

Nature Structural and Molecular Biology

Annual Review of Public Health

Nature Reviews Disease Primers

Nature Chemistry

JAMA Cardiology

Nature Electronics

Circulation

IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence

Review of Economics and Statistics

Nucleic Acids Research

Advanced Energy Materials

Nature Reviews Neuroscience

Cell Stem Cell

Gut

Cell Research

Journal of Economic Perspectives

Nature Reviews Neurology

Gastroenterology

Personality and Social Psychology Review

Academy of Management Review

Nature Physics

Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics

Neuron

Psychological Bulletin

JAMA Oncology

Acta Crystallographica Section D: Structural Biology

Advances in Optics and Photonics

Accounts of Chemical Research

Journal of Marketing

Annual Review of Clinical Psychology

Trends in Cell Biology

ACS Energy Letters

Journal of Hepatology

Journal of Accounting and Economics

Annual Review of Neuroscience

Journal of Experimental Medicine

Annual Review of Biophysics

ACM Transactions on Graphics

Manufacturing and Service Operations Management

Journal of Management

Review of Corporate Finance Studies

Journal of Consumer Research

Nature Protocols

Cell Systems

Living Reviews in Solar Physics

Molecular Cancer

Review of Educational Research

Organization Science

Endocrine Reviews

Annual Review of Economics

International Journal of Computer Vision

Progress in Energy and Combustion Science

Physical Review X

Nature Reviews Cardiology

Annual Review of Physiology

NBER Macroeconomics Annual

Annals of Mathematics

Fungal Diversity

Lancet Rheumatology

Nature Reviews Nephrology

Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science

Marketing Science

Science Robotics

Genes and Development

Diabetes Care

Molecular Systems Biology

Journal of Applied Psychology

Materials Science and Engineering: R: Reports

Annual Review of Microbiology

Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology

Annals of Statistics

Physics Reports

IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications

Materials Today

JAMA Neurology

Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology

Annual Review of Ecology

Trends in Cognitive Sciences

Nature Metabolism

Nature Cancer

European Urology

Systematic Biology

Nature Climate Change

Annual Review of Entomology

Cancer Discovery

IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation

JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association

Chem

IEEE Wireless Communications

Lancet Digital Health

Progress in Retinal and Eye Research

Cell Reports Medicine

American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine

American Sociological Review

Lancet Gastroenterology and Hepatology

Journal of Accounting Research

JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging

Progress in Polymer Science

Journal of Business Venturing

American Political Science Review

Nature Sustainability

JAMA Internal Medicine

Reports on Progress in Physics

Journal of the American Chemical Society

Genome Research

American Economic Journal: Microeconomics

Ecology Letters

Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics

Nature Biomedical Engineering

EMBO Journal

Nature Chemical Biology

JAMA Psychiatry

Pharmacological Reviews

Journal of the European Economic Association

Nature Ecology and Evolution

Journal of Clinical Investigation

Science Translational Medicine

Light: Science and Applications

JACC: Heart Failure

Annual Review of Political Science

Trends in Ecology and Evolution

Cement and Concrete Research

Annual Review of Sociology

Journal of Labor Economics

Journal of the American Mathematical Society

Journal of Marketing Research

Annual Review of Financial Economics

Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases

Nature Geoscience

Molecular Biology and Evolution

Lancet HIV

Psychological Methods

Studies in Mycology

IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid

Journal of Business and Economic Statistics

Hepatology

European Journal of Heart Failure

Annual Review of Medicine

Nature Human Behaviour

Acta Neuropathologica

Advances in Computers

Organizational Research Methods

Lancet Haematology

Journal of Financial Intermediation

Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy

IEEE Communications Magazine

Angewandte Chemie - International Edition

Economic Journal

Management Science

ACM Computing Surveys

Journal of Public Economics

Personnel Psychology

Human Reproduction Update

Genome Medicine

Alzheimer's and Dementia

IEEE Network

Review of Asset Pricing Studies

American Journal of Human Genetics

Trends in Chemistry

Journal of Infection

Brookings Papers on Economic Activity

Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics

Advanced Functional Materials

American Journal of Political Science

Leadership Quarterly

Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science

Nature Plants

Trends in Immunology

Publications Mathematiques de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Scientifiques

Journal of Extracellular Vesicles

Energy Storage Materials

Nature Communications

Cell Reports

Annual Review of Virology

Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal

Blood

Analytic Methods in Accident Research

Annual Review of Marine Science

Immunological Reviews

Journal of Monetary Economics

Journal of the National Cancer Institute

eLife

Journal of Thoracic Oncology

Applied Physics Reviews

Cold Spring Harbor perspectives in biology

Molecular Neurodegeneration

Annual Review of Materials Research

Political Analysis

Circulation Research

Developmental Cell

IEEE Signal Processing Magazine

Nano Energy

Proceedings of the IEEE

Accounting Review

Annual Review of Environment and Resources

EClinicalMedicine

IEEE Transactions on Power Systems

Journal of Management Studies

Annals of Internal Medicine

Psychological Science in the Public Interest

ACS Nano

Nature Machine Intelligence

Protein Science

Radiology

Journal of the American Society of Nephrology : JASN

Science advances

International Journal of Information Management