



eResearch Australasia Responsible Use of AI - Guidelines

Purpose

eResearch Australasia is a professional conference dedicated to the exchange of information in a trusted and transparent environment. The Responsible Use of AI Statement establishes guidelines to ensure that these principles of trust and transparency remain central to the conference's mission and values.

This statement is provided by the Program Committee of eResearch Australasia 2026 (hereby known as the “Committee”) to support authors submitting abstracts, volunteer reviewers and the conference delegate community. We uphold high ethical standards and seek to provide clear guidance for the use of Large Language Model (LLM) and Generative AI tools in service of our conference.

For Authors

1. All submissions must represent the original work of the author(s). While submissions may have been presented at previous conferences, the ideas expressed must be those of the author(s), or their sources must be explicitly acknowledged.
2. We endorse the use of LLMs as tools for refining English expression and structure. This approach aims to create an equitable playing field for authors whose first language is not English and those new to academic publishing.
3. Authors remain solely responsible for all submitted text. Any content generated by LLMs must be reviewed and verified for accuracy by a human before submission. LLMs may produce inaccurate information or inadvertently alter meaning, and authors are accountable for the final output.
4. We encourage authors to disclose use of AI in their abstract submission. This is in line with the recommendations from the Guidance for AI Adoption: Foundations, step 4. Share essential information [1].



For Reviewers

1. The use of AI in abstract preparation is not necessarily grounds for downgrading scoring. Reviewers will evaluate abstracts against the rubric supplied [2].
2. Through scoring, the review committee will shortlist conceptually innovative yet poorly expressed submissions and consider offering additional scaffolding support.
3. Reviewers may flag concerns regarding the authenticity or originality of a submission in the Reviewer Comment to Committee field, by providing reasons and examples.
4. The program committee has final say on accepting submissions. The review subcommittee may report evidence so that the program committee can render a decision and notify the author(s) in a timely manner.
5. Reviewers remain solely responsible for all submitted reviews. Reviewers may use AI tools to support their abstract review. We ask that you follow ethical AI practices (such as removing personal information such as author names to AI products and disclosing usage to the review committee).
6. AI tool output may appear to satisfy an evaluation rubric, but the review committee will need evidence of your own validation.

For Review Committee

1. If a de-identified dataset of abstract submissions can be prepared, and an on-prem, institutional AI tool is available, there may be opportunity to produce a control report for a quality review against reviewer scores and comments.
2. Review committee deliberation on scoring cannot be replaced by scoring against a rubric alone. Committee discussions are evidence of our collective knowledge and the cultural history of the conference.

Disclosure of AI usage

This document had individual sentences improved to be more formal and clear via free Claude Haiku 4.5.

References

1. [Guidance for AI Adoption: Foundations step 4. Share essential information](#)



eResearch Australasia

2026 CONFERENCE
26 - 30 OCTOBER



Melbourne Cricket Ground - Victoria

2. [Link to the scoring and rubric for eResearch 2026 reviewers](#)