

The Symbiotic Scholar: A Framework for Integrating Artificial Intelligence in Academic Writing While Upholding Ethical Integrity

Syeda Rabia Tahir

UNITAR International University, Selangor, Malaysia

ABSTRACT – The proliferation of generative artificial intelligence (AI) represents a paradigm shift for the academic community, presenting both disruptive challenges and transformative opportunities. This paper presents a comprehensive framework for the ethical and effective integration of AI into the academic writing process. We analyse the spectrum of AI applications, from ideation and literature synthesis to drafting and language refinement. Concurrently, the paper critically examines the significant challenges posed by this integration, including threats to academic integrity, the potential for algorithmic bias and factual inaccuracies, and the risk of eroding essential critical thinking skills. We argue that a prohibitive stance on AI is both impractical and counterproductive. Instead, this paper advocates for the urgent development and adoption of a robust framework of ethical guidelines and revised pedagogical strategies. Such a framework should empower researchers and students to leverage AI tools responsibly, fostering a new form of "AI literacy" that complements, rather than replaces, traditional scholarly skills. By navigating this new technological frontier with clear policies, adapted pedagogical approaches, and a steadfast commitment to transparency, the academic community can harness the symbiotic potential of human-AI collaboration while preserving the core principles of scholarly inquiry.

Keywords – academic writing, artificial intelligence, generative AI, scholarly communication, research ethics, higher education pedagogy, academic integrity

I. Introduction

The advent of sophisticated generative Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly tools built on Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT, represents a watershed moment for knowledge creation and dissemination (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023). These technologies have demonstrated a remarkable capacity to generate coherent, contextually relevant, and stylistically varied text, leading to their rapid and widespread adoption. Higher education is at the epicentre of this transformation. The core processes of research, writing, and learning are being fundamentally reshaped by technologies that can summarise complex articles, draft entire sections of text, refine prose, and generate novel research ideas (Kasneci et al., 2023).

This integration is not merely an evolution of existing tools, such as spell checkers or reference managers; it is a revolution that challenges the epistemology of academic work. The opportunities are significant, offering the potential to enhance productivity, overcome language barriers, and democratise scholarly communication (Kasneci et al., 2023). However, the use of these tools precipitates a host of complex ethical, pedagogical, and epistemological challenges. Paramount among these concerns are the new and sophisticated forms of plagiarism, the authenticity of student work, the perpetuation of biases embedded in training data, and the long-term impact

on the development of critical thinking and writing skills (Eaton et al., 2023; Thorp, 2023).

The academic community is thus at a critical juncture. A purely prohibitive approach risks isolating academia from a transformative technology, while an unregulated embrace threatens to undermine the foundational principles of academic integrity and rigour. This paper navigates this complex terrain by addressing three central questions: (1) What are the primary applications and benefits of AI in the academic writing process? (2) What are the most significant ethical and pedagogical challenges arising from this integration? (3) What constitutes a robust framework for the responsible and ethical use of AI in academic writing?

We argue that the future of academic scholarship lies not in replacing human intellect but in a symbiotic relationship with AI. To realise this vision, academia must move swiftly to establish clear ethical guidelines, adapt pedagogical practices, and foster a culture of transparency. This ensures that AI serves as a co-pilot that enhances scholarly inquiry, rather than an autopilot that subverts it.

II. The Spectrum of AI Integration in Scholarly Work

The application of AI in academic writing exists on a spectrum, from assistive functions that augment the writer's

capabilities to generative functions that can supplant parts of the writing process itself.

A. AI as a Research Assistant: Augmenting the Research Process

Before drafting begins, AI tools can significantly accelerate and enhance the preliminary phases of research. Specialised platforms like Elicit and Scite.ai use natural language processing to help researchers navigate vast bodies of literature, identify relevant papers, summarise key findings, and create conceptual maps of a research field (Kasneji et al., 2023). This functionality streamlines the often-laborious literature review process, enabling scholars to more quickly identify knowledge gaps and formulate robust research questions. Furthermore, AI-powered language tools offer sophisticated grammatical correction and style suggestions, which can be particularly beneficial for non-native English speakers in levelling the playing field for publication in international journals (Zhuo et al., 2023).

Table 1: Examples of AI Tools (GPT & Gemini) in Early Research Stages

Task	Example Using GPT	Example Using Gemini
Literature Search	Prompt: <i>"List recent papers on AI in education post-2020."</i> GPT returns a summarised list with citation info.	Gemini integrates with Google Scholar to fetch and summarise articles contextually.
Research Gap Identification	Prompt: <i>"What's missing in the current research on renewable energy storage?"</i> GPT highlights underexplored areas.	Gemini creates a visual map of related works showing sparsely covered nodes.
Summarising Key Findings	Paste abstract/full text; GPT returns a concise, bullet-point summary of findings.	Gemini provides TL; DR-style summaries with key metrics or diagrams when available.
Conceptual Mapping	GPT generates a hierarchical list or diagram of concepts and subfields in, e.g., computational linguistics.	Gemini uses Google's tools to build interactive concept maps with links to sources.
Academic Writing Support	GPT suggests clearer phrasing, academic tone enhancement, and grammar correction.	Gemini assists with rewording, tone-shifting, and citation formatting (APA, MLA).
Support for Non-Native Speakers	GPT provides idiomatic rewrites and simplifies complex academic jargon.	Gemini offers multi-language input/output and real-time grammar/style suggestions.

Table 1. compares how GPT and Gemini assist with various academic and research-related tasks. GPT is primarily designed to generate summaries, identify research gaps, support academic writing, and help non-native speakers through natural language processing. It provides concise, text-based outputs such as summaries, rephrasing, and suggestions.

Gemini, on the other hand, enhances these capabilities by integrating with external tools like Google Scholar and Google's visualization platforms. This allows Gemini to fetch real-time scholarly articles, create visual maps of research landscapes, and build interactive concept diagrams, offering a more dynamic and multimodal approach to research support. It also provides advanced citation formatting and multi-language support.

Together, these tools cater to different needs GPT excels in text generation and language refinement, while Gemini offers data integration, visualization, and multimodal enhancements for a comprehensive research workflow.

B. AI as a Writing Partner: Generative Capabilities

The most transformative and controversial use of AI is in the direct generation of text. LLMs can be prompted to perform a variety of tasks central to academic writing, including brainstorming research angles, developing thesis statements, and structuring a paper's argument (Mollick & Mollick, 2022). AI can also be used to generate initial drafts of specific sections, such as literature reviews or methodology descriptions, based on user-provided source materials.

While these capabilities offer a substantial increase in efficiency, they also blur the lines of authorship and introduce significant risks. Calling AI a "writing partner" warrants critical scrutiny. A partnership implies a collaboration between entities with agency; the current relationship is one of user and tool, where the user's cognitive process can be offloaded to an opaque "black box" algorithm (Bender et al., 2021). The efficiency gained by generating a draft in minutes may come at the cost of the deep learning that occurs during the intellectual struggle of composition.

Table 2. Illustrates, the core issue raised in your text becomes clear: while the right-hand column offers a massive leap in efficiency, it also presents a more "pre-digested" analysis. This can offload the user's cognitive struggle, potentially hindering the deep learning that comes from manually structuring an argument or synthesising literature.

Table 2. Comparison of AI Responses for Academic Tasks

Academic Task	Hypothetical GPT Response (General LLM)	Hypothetical Gemini Response (Advanced Tool)
Brainstorming Research Angles	"You could explore the impact of social media on political polarization by looking at echo chambers, the spread of misinformation, or its effect on voter turnout. It would also be interesting to compare different platforms like Twitter and Facebook."	Research Angles: Social media & Political Polarization Sociological Angles: Echo Chambers: Quantify the ideological isolation of users. Social Identity: How do online groups reinforce in-group/out-group dynamics? Information Science Angles: Misinformation Velocity: Track the spread of a false narrative vs. a factual one. Algorithmic Influence: Analyze how recommendation algorithms contribute to polarization. Political Science Angles: Voter Behavior: Correlate social media usage patterns with voting records. Decline in Deliberation: Assess the quality of cross-partisan political discourse online.
Developing a Thesis Statement	"The rise of artificial intelligence in creative fields presents both opportunities for innovation and significant challenges to traditional notions of authorship and intellectual property."	Thesis Statement Breakdown: Proposed Thesis: While AI accelerates creative workflows, it fundamentally challenges artistic authenticity and necessitates a new legal framework for intellectual property that redefines 'authorship' for a post-human era. Key Components: Concession (The Opportunity): While AI accelerates creative workflows... Core Argument (The Problem): ...it fundamentally challenges artistic authenticity... Implication (The Solution): ...and necessitates a new legal framework...
Structuring a Paper's Argument	1. Introduction 2. The history of automation. 3. How AI is different. 4. The economic impact on jobs. 5. Conclusion	Argument Flowchart: AI & The Future of Work Introduction Hook: Start with a stark statistic on job displacement projections. Thesis: Argue that AI's impact on labor is not just displacement, but a fundamental restructuring of skill valuation. The Automation Precedent (Historical Context) <i>Evidence:</i> Industrial Revolution, computerization. The Cognitive Revolution (What's Different Now) Point A: AI performing cognitive vs. manual tasks. Point B: The speed and scale of disruption <i>Evidence:</i> GPT-4's performance on professional exams. Economic Restructuring & Skill Valuation Point A: Devaluation of routine cognitive work. Point B: Premium on skills like critical thinking, creativity, and emotional intelligence. Conclusion & Policy Recommendations Synthesize argument. Call to Action: Propose reforms in education and lifelong learning.
Generating a Literature Review Draft (from provided sources)	"Several studies have examined the effects of four-day work weeks. Smith (2021) found that it improved employee well-being, while Jones (2022) noted an increase in productivity. However, Chen (2023) warns that this model may not be suitable for all industries, especially client-facing ones."	Thematic Synthesis of Literature: Four-Day Work Week The literature converges on two primary outcomes: Employee Well-being and Company Productivity. Key Findings from Sources:

III. Ethical Predicaments and Pedagogical Challenges

The power of generative AI is matched by the gravity of the challenges it poses to academic norms and practices. These challenges are not merely technical; they are deeply rooted in the ethics of knowledge creation.

A. Academic Integrity and the New Plagiarism

The foremost concern is the potential for AI to facilitate academic misconduct. Using an LLM to generate an essay and submitting it as one's work constitutes a new form of plagiarism that is difficult to detect with traditional software (Cotton et al., 2023). Unlike copying from an existing source, AI-generated text is often unique, making it impervious to standard similarity checkers. This has instigated an "arms race" between AI generation and detection tools, with the latter showing unreliable performance and a risk of false positives (Liang et al., 2023). The core issue, however, transcends detection; it is the misrepresentation of the work's origin and the author's intellectual contribution.

B. Accuracy, Bias, and "Hallucinations"

LLMs are not databases of factual knowledge but probabilistic models designed to predict the next word in a sequence. This technical reality leads to two critical problems: bias and inaccuracy. The models are trained on vast internet datasets containing societal biases related to race, gender, and culture, which are often reproduced and amplified in the generated text (Bender et al., 2021).

Furthermore, LLMs are prone to "hallucinations", the confident assertion of plausible but entirely fabricated information, including non-existent citations and false data (Alkaissi & McFarlane, 2023). A scholar uncritically accepting such output risks corrupting their work with falsehoods, thereby undermining the scientific record. This places a significant new burden on the user to rigorously fact-check and verify every piece of information generated by an AI.

C. Erosion of Critical Thinking and Writing Skills

A significant pedagogical concern is that over-reliance on AI may atrophy the very skills academia aims to develop. The process of writing is inextricably linked to the process of thinking. Grappling with complex ideas, structuring a coherent argument, and finding precise language are exercises that build critical, analytical, and synthetic thinking abilities (Kellogg, 2008). If students can outsource these cognitive struggles to an AI, they may fail to develop these essential skills, graduating as proficient "prompt engineers" but underdeveloped critical thinkers.

D. Authorship and Intellectual Property

The use of generative AI raises fundamental questions about authorship. If an AI significantly contributes to the drafting of a paper, how should it be acknowledged? Leading journals and publishers have adopted policies stating that AI tools cannot be listed as authors because they cannot take responsibility for the work's integrity (Nature, 2023; Thorp, 2023). The emerging consensus is that the human author remains fully accountable for all content, including any AI-generated portions. This necessitates a new standard of transparency, where the use of AI tools is disclosed.

Table3. Ethical and Pedagogical Risks in Academic Use of Generative AI: Examples from GPT-4 and Gemini

Challenge	GPT-4 Example	Gemini Example	Notes
AI-Assisted Plagiarism	Students use GPT-4 to generate a 2000-word essay on "Nietzsche's concept of eternal recurrence", then submit it as their own.	Gemini produces a complete literature review on "Postcolonial theory in Caribbean literature", and the student claims authorship.	The content is unique and paraphrased well enough to evade plagiarism detectors, but the intellectual dishonesty is identical to copy-pasting.
Similarity Detection Evasion	GPT-4 rewords a paragraph from a known paper in such a way that Turnitin shows 3% similarity, despite it being a near-direct reinterpretation.	Gemini generates "original" phrasing that is structurally and semantically derived from existing academic texts but avoids tripping similarity filters.	This exemplifies the "new plagiarism": highly derivative but untraceable by traditional means.
False Positive Detection Risk	A professor runs an AI detector and flags a student's genuine writing as "95% AI-generated", leading to a formal investigation.	A Gemini-written answer marked as human-authored by AI detectors, while a human-written assignment by an ESL student is falsely accused of being AI-generated.	Detectors lack reliability, causing both false alarms and blind spots.
Hallucinated Citations	GPT-4 cites: <i>Smith, J. (2019). The Ethics of Machine Learning. Journal of AI Studies</i> , which does not exist.	Gemini offers a citation: <i>Ali, R. (2020). Posthuman Ethics in the Digital Age. Ethics Quarterly</i> , which also cannot be found in any indexed database.	Both models confidently invent real sounding but non-existent references.
Hallucinated Facts	GPT-4 asserts that "Einstein won the Nobel Prize for the theory of relativity "a widely believed but incorrect claim (it was for the photoelectric effect).	Gemini claims that "Socrates wrote over 30 dialogues before his death", when in fact Socrates wrote nothing—Plato recorded his ideas.	These errors are not malicious, just probabilistic guesses that "sound right".

Embedded Societal Bias	GPT-4 suggests stereotypical gender roles in a response about "typical careers for women in the 1950s", reinforcing outdated ideas uncritically.	Gemini answers a question about intelligence by suggesting that some ethnic groups have "statistically lower IQs", echoing biased and discredited studies.	Both cases show how training data can echo harmful or outdated biases.
Culture-Specific Insensitivity	GPT-4 responds to a question about traditional Chinese medicine with dismissive language, framing it as pseudoscience without nuance.	Gemini refers to indigenous rituals as "primitive beliefs" in a history essay generation.	Lack of cultural awareness or nuance is a real pedagogical risk, especially in cross-cultural contexts.
Overconfidence in Outputs	GPT-4 provides a detailed explanation of a psychological theory and includes definitions, mechanisms, and historical context with absolute confidence, despite factual gaps.	Gemini gives a step-by-step breakdown of a physics principle, confidently explaining something that doesn't exist (e.g., "quantum torque resonance").	Both examples highlight the danger of plausible nonsense delivered with an academic tone. Users are lulled into trusting what's just pattern-matching fiction.

Table 3. Illustrates specific examples of how large language models like OpenAI's GPT-4 and Google's Gemini contribute to ethical and pedagogical challenges in higher education. The focus is on two critical dimensions: (1) academic integrity, particularly the rise of AI-assisted plagiarism and issues with detection, and (2) epistemic reliability, including hallucinations, factual inaccuracies, and embedded biases. These examples demonstrate how generative AI outputs may appear scholarly and authoritative while introducing significant risks to the authenticity, accuracy, and inclusivity of academic work.

IV. A Framework for Responsible AI Integration

A reactionary ban on AI is untenable given its widespread accessibility. The only viable path forward is to develop a proactive and principles-based approach to its integration that involves all academic stakeholders.

A. Institutional Policies and Guidelines

Universities and research institutions must develop and communicate policies on the acceptable use of AI. These policies should move beyond simple prohibition to provide nuanced guidance. They must differentiate between legitimate uses (e.g., grammar checking, brainstorming) and academic misconduct (e.g., generating an entire assignment without original thought). As UNESCO (2023) emphasises, policies

should be inclusive, equitable, and grounded in human rights. Policies must be developmental rather than purely punitive, focusing on educating students about ethical use rather than solely on catching misconduct.

B. Pedagogical Adaptation and Critical AI Literacy

Educators must adapt their teaching and assessment methods for the new technological reality. This involves a shift toward cultivating "critical AI literacy" (Eaton et al., 2023). This can be achieved through several strategies:

- **Focusing on Process over Product:** Shifting assessments to evaluate the research and writing process itself, including annotated bibliographies, multiple drafts, and reflections on the use of research tools.
- **Designing AI-Resistant Assignments:** Emphasizing tasks that AI cannot easily perform, such as personal reflection, in-class activities, analysis of hyper-local data, and, importantly, critiques of AI-generated output.
- **Teaching Critical AI Literacy:** Explicitly teaching students how to use AI tools effectively and ethically. This includes instruction on prompt engineering, fact-checking AI output, understanding algorithmic bias, and properly citing AI assistance. This literacy should be embedded within core subjects, for example, by tasking students to critique AI-generated content against scholarly sources in their specific discipline.

C. A Mandate for Graded Transparency

Transparency is the cornerstone of ethical AI use in academia. Researchers and students must be transparent about which AI tools they used for assistance and for what purpose. A simple disclosure is insufficient, as it fails to describe the extent and nature of AI's contribution. We propose a more granular, "graded disclosure" system where authors specify the level of AI integration:

- **Level 1 (Editing):** Use for grammar, spelling, and style refinement.
- **Level 2 (Structural):** Use for brainstorming, outlining, and structuring arguments.
- **Level 3 (Generative):** Use for drafting or rewriting specific sections of text.

This approach would provide reviewers and readers with a clearer understanding of the work's provenance and uphold a higher standard of intellectual honesty.

Table 4. Pedagogy in the Age of AI: A Framework for Educators

Strategy	Description	Examples of Classroom Activities
Focus on Process over Product	This approach shifts the emphasis of assessment from the final submission to the various stages of research and writing. The goal is to evaluate a student's engagement, critical thinking, and development of ideas throughout the entire project.	Annotated Bibliographies: Students submit a list of sources with a brief analysis of each one, explaining their relevance and credibility. Multiple Draft Submissions: Students submit several drafts of an assignment, receiving feedback at each stage to encourage iterative improvement. Reflective Memos: Students write short reflections on their research and writing process, discussing challenges, discoveries, and how they utilize various tools, including AI.
Design AI-Resistant Assignments	These are assignments that require skills and tasks that AI tools cannot easily replicate. They often involve personal experience, real-time interaction, and nuanced analysis that	In-Class Presentations and Debates: Students present their work and engage in discussions, requiring spontaneous and interactive communication. Personal Reflection Essays: Students

	goes beyond information retrieval. Analysis of Local or Niche Data: Students gather and analyze data from their immediate community or a very specific, non-digitized source. Critique of AI-Generated Content: Students are given an AI-generated text and asked to analyze its strengths, weaknesses, biases, and factual inaccuracies.	
Teach Critical AI Literacy	This strategy involves directly instructing students on how to use AI tools in a responsible, ethical, and effective manner. It's about empowering students to be informed users of AI rather than passive consumers.	Prompt Engineering Workshops: Students learn how to write effective prompts to get the best results from AI tools. Fact-Checking and Source Verification Drills: Students are given AI-generated content and tasked with verifying its claims using reliable academic and journalistic sources.

		Discussions on Algorithmic Bias: Students explore how AI algorithms can reflect and amplify existing societal biases. Citation and Academic Integrity Lessons: Students are taught the proper way to cite AI assistance in their work, distinguishing between using AI as a tool and plagiarism.
--	--	--

As artificial intelligence reshapes the educational landscape, educators must evolve their teaching and assessment strategies. This framework outlines three core pillars for adaptation: shifting focus from the final product to the learning process, designing AI-resistant assignments that emphasise critical and personal engagement, and embedding critical AI literacy into the curriculum. By implementing these practices, educators can foster authentic learning and equip students with the essential skills to navigate a technology-driven world ethically and effectively.

V. Limitations and Future Research

This paper provides a conceptual analysis at a time when the technological landscape is in rapid flux. Its conclusions are based on current-generation AI, which will inevitably evolve. The primary limitation is the lack of longitudinal empirical data on the long-term effects of AI integration on student learning outcomes and research quality.

Future research is urgently needed in several areas. Empirical studies should investigate the efficacy of different institutional policies and pedagogical interventions. Comparative analyses of AI adoption policies across different institutions could yield valuable insights. Further research is needed on the impact of the digital divide on student access to these tools and on how AI language tools affect writing proficiency and academic voice. Finally, the development of more reliable and equitable AI detection tools remains a technical priority.

VI. Conclusion

The integration of AI into academic writing is a present reality, not a future possibility. It offers the promise of a symbiotic relationship where technology amplifies human intellect and streamlines laborious tasks. This promise, however, is shadowed by significant ethical risks that threaten the foundations of academic integrity and critical inquiry.

The path forward is not to fear or ban this technology, but to engage with it critically and proactively. By establishing clear institutional policies, redesigning pedagogy to foster critical thinking, and mandating a culture of robust transparency, the academic community can guide the evolution of the "symbiotic scholar". The challenge is to harness the power of artificial intelligence to augment, not diminish, human intellect, ensuring that technology remains a tool in service of the enduring human quest for Knowledge.

VII. References

- [1]. Alkaissi, H., & McFarlane, S. I. (2023). Artificial hallucinations in ChatGPT: Implications for scientific writing. *Cureus*, 15(2), e35179. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.35179>
- [2]. Baidoo-Anu, D., & Owusu Ansah, L. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4337484>
- [3]. Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- [4]. Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- [5]. Eaton, S. A., Miron, J., & Turner, K. L. (2023). AI and academic integrity: A rapid review of the literature. University of Calgary. <https://prism.ucalgary.ca/items/150c773a-4860-48eb-9447-3a17e54c8612>
- [6]. Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., ... & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- [7]. Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of Writing Research*, 1(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2008.01.01.1>
- [8]. Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. ArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.02819>
- [9]. Mollick, E., & Mollick, L. (2022). Using AI to implement the five principles of persuasion. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4298813>
- [10]. Nature. (2023). Tools such as ChatGPT threaten transparent science; here's our policy. *Nature*, 613(7945), 612. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00191-1>
- [11]. Thorp, H. H. (2023). ChatGPT is fun, but not an author. *Science*, 379(6629), 313. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adg7879>
- [12]. UNESCO. (2023). ChatGPT and artificial intelligence in higher education: Quick start guide. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000385146>
- [13]. Zhuo, T. Y., Huang, Y., Chen, C., & Xing, Z. (2023). Exploring the potential of ChatGPT in automated code refinement: An empirical study. ArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.07814>

Manuscript Processing Footprints

A. Journal Volume/Issue Details

This manuscript is published in **Vol. 15 No. 02 2025** issue of IARS' International Research Journal (I'IRJ).
This is a Peer Reviewed (Refereed) International Journal published by IARS' Press Australia (International Association of Research Scholars)
The Volume/Issue is a regular issue of the journal published in **August 2025** Available at: <https://research.iars.info/index.php/curie>.

B. Copyright, License, and Publishing Rights

- IARS' Press Australia (International Association of Research Scholars) respects the rights of the authors of research content published with IARS' International Research Journal. The "First Publication Rights" (FPR) to the original work accepted for publication at IARS' International Research Journal is granted to the Publisher of the Journal but copyright for all work published in the journal is retained by the author(s). Works published in the Journal are distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). (This license lets others distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon your work, even commercially, as long as they credit you for the original creation. This is the most accommodating of licenses offered. Recommended for maximum dissemination and use of licensed materials.)
- After publishing the content with IARS' International Research Journal, the author holds complete right on the content for its amendments and reuse in any form. IARS' International Research Journal confirms that author(s) holds the copyright of the content.
- Author(s) grant(s) permission for their work to be indexed in part/full form in commercial and non-commercial indexes. Author(s) grant(s) permission for their work to be harvested in part/full form in commercial and non-commercial archives and distributed through them. Author(s) grant(s) permission for their work to be translated in part/full form in any language and republished and redistributed. Author(s) may enter into separate, additional contractual agreements for the non-exclusive distribution of the published version of the work, with an acknowledgement of its initial publication in this Journal.
- It is the responsibility of the author(s) to secure all necessary copyright and/or permissions for the use of third-party content in their manuscript(s). Author(s) have declared the same at the time of submission of manuscript and 'may also be required' to provide written evidence of this permission anytime in case required for any purposes.
- Publications Ethics and other Terms and Conditions as mentioned on official website of IARS' International Research Journal.

C. Last Plagiarism Report



Settings: Quotes Excluded, Bibliography Excluded

The Symbiotic Scholar: A Framework
for Integrating Artificial Intelligence in
Academic Writing While Upholding
Ethical Integrity

1 part - 4,163 words

Syeda
Rabia
Tahir

7%

Exemption / Relaxation by Editor: None

D. Processing Track

Date of Submission	03 July 2025
Date of Final Review	20 August 2025
Date of Acceptance & Schedule	20 August 2025
Date of Publishing	29 August 2025

----- O -----