

Scientific Writing in the AI Era: Technological Innovation and Ethical Challenges

Received date:22/12/2025 Accepted date:22/04/2026 Published date:30/04/2026

DJEROU Dounia ¹

¹ University of Biskra, Algeria, Email: dounia.djerou@univ-biskra.dz

Abstract:

This article examines the growing impact of artificial intelligence tools on academic scientific writing, drawing on a field survey conducted among faculty members and students from various disciplines. The primary aim is to identify the practical benefits and limitations these technologies present in the scientific production process. The survey results reveal that AI tools such as ChatGPT, QuillBot, Turnitin, and Cite This For Me are widely used to facilitate idea formulation, enhance linguistic quality, manage references, and detect plagiarism. However, the study also highlights several constraints, including excessive dependency, a decline in critical thinking, and a blurred line between writing assistance and academic dishonesty. The analysis thus emphasizes the need for rigorous pedagogical and ethical supervision, particularly through the active involvement of educators, to ensure the responsible and educational use of these tools.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, ethics, tools, scientific writing

Corresponding Author: DJEROU Dounia, Email: dounia.djerou@univ-biskra.dz

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative force across a wide range of fields, and scientific writing is no exception. As AI technologies continue to advance, they provide powerful tools that enhance precision, efficiency, and innovation in the production of scientific knowledge. AI can support researchers in analysing extensive datasets, identifying trends and patterns, and even generating research hypotheses. It can also assist with drafting summaries, suggesting textual improvements, and ensuring terminological consistency, thereby allowing scientists to devote greater attention to the creative and analytical dimensions of their work.

Yet, the integration of AI into scientific writing also raises significant ethical and practical questions, particularly concerning originality, transparency, and accountability for generated content. This article seeks to examine the growing role of artificial intelligence in scientific writing practices, highlighting both its potential contributions and the epistemological and ethical challenges it poses for the future of academic research. In this evolving context, teachers, researchers, and students alike are confronted with innovative tools that facilitate not only inter-institutional collaboration but also the sharing and dissemination of scientific data through intelligent platforms. Among their many advantages, these systems enable the automated translation of specialised texts, extending the reach of research to an international audience and fostering the emergence of a more inclusive scientific community.

The accessibility and speed offered by such technologies further encourage researchers to engage more actively in the writing process, stimulating motivation and deepening their involvement in the production of knowledge. Nevertheless, despite the undeniable



progress enabled by artificial intelligence, it remains essential to establish robust ethical frameworks to guide its use within academia. Such frameworks must ensure transparency in the use of automated tools, uphold intellectual property rights, and maintain the central role of human judgement in research. By addressing these issues, this article aims to contribute to a critical reflection on the conditions for a responsible and constructive use of AI in contemporary scientific writing. The guiding research question can thus be formulated as follows: To what extent can artificial intelligence transform scientific writing practices, and what ethical and practical challenges accompany its integration into the academic research process?

This question invites an exploration of both the opportunities AI offers to enhance the efficiency and quality of scientific writing, and the challenges it presents in relation to ethics, transparency, and accountability. The study underpinning this article is based on a case conducted in a university context (among teachers and students), employing a mixed-methods approach, both quantitative and qualitative, to generate empirically grounded findings and provide a transparent and rigorous analysis of the current landscape.

2. Literature Review on Artificial Intelligence and Scientific Writing

In contemporary universities, scientific writing constitutes a fundamental pillar of both education and research. It is not limited to the mere act of writing; it entails a rigorous intellectual approach, a methodical analytical process, and the ability to formulate problems, structure ideas, and argue clearly and systematically. As a vehicle for the transmission and valorization of knowledge, scientific writing functions simultaneously as a pedagogical tool, a lever for academic development, and an instrument for legitimizing the produced knowledge. However, in the face of rapidly evolving academic standards, the internationalization of knowledge, and technological



transformations, both students and faculty encounter numerous challenges that complicate the learning and mastery of this essential skill.

One of the primary challenges faced by students and educators alike is the inherent complexity of scientific writing. Indeed, drafting a scientific article or an academic dissertation requires an in-depth mastery of academic conventions and rules, as well as the capacity to present ideas in a clear and coherent manner. For students (particularly those at the beginning of their academic journey) this task can prove especially demanding, as it requires not only strong linguistic and writing skills but also a thorough understanding of the relevant concepts and theories within their field of study.

Novices must fully grasp that scientific writing is characterized by specific requirements that differ significantly from literary or journalistic writing. It is based on fundamental principles such as clarity, precision, objectivity, and conciseness. Scientific texts must reflect structured thinking, supported by empirical evidence and logical argumentation. Furthermore, they must adhere to strict standards of formatting, citation, and referencing, thereby ensuring the credibility and reproducibility of the work.

This level of rigor demands that students possess a comprehensive understanding of research methodologies, as well as the ability to synthesize and analyze complex data. For educators, the challenge lies not only in imparting these skills but also in objectively evaluating student work, which often varies considerably in quality and form. Supervising students in their written assignments (be they dissertations, theses, or research reports) and simultaneously engaging in one's own scientific research, proves to be a demanding undertaking.

In this context, the use of artificial intelligence can be considered a

relevant and effective lever to address certain deficiencies observed among both students and faculty. Indeed, these technological tools, by assisting in writing, structuring ideas, correcting linguistic errors, and suggesting improved formulations, contribute to strengthening writing skills where they are most fragile. Artificial intelligence can serve as a tool for pedagogical transformation, but its effectiveness depends on its conscious and thoughtful integration into educational practices. When used appropriately, it can not only alleviate administrative tasks but also support students' critical thinking and creativity (Baker, 2023).

Thus, AI not only accompanies the teaching and learning process but also facilitates a gradual enhancement of skills, particularly in terms of scientific rigor, argumentative clarity, and mastery of academic standards.

3. Overview of AI Tools: Machine Learning, Deep Learning, and Natural Language Processing (NLP)

Artificial intelligence tools designed to assist writing are digital systems based on advanced machine learning algorithms and natural language processing (NLP) techniques. These systems are specifically engineered to support users throughout the various stages of the writing process. They are capable of generating, reformulating, correcting, structuring, and enriching textual content, particularly in academic or scientific contexts.

These intelligent systems integrate advanced natural language processing and deep learning techniques, enabling them to analyze, understand, and generate human language text. They contribute to the optimization of scientific writing by facilitating the production of structured content, grammar checking, stylistic reformulation, and automated management of bibliographic references. Artificial intelligence tools, particularly those based on natural language



processing and deep learning, represent a major advancement for academic writing, allowing repetitive tasks to be automated while supporting creativity and scientific rigor. (Zhicheng, 2025)

AI writing tools serve as writing-assistance devices used by researchers, students, and authors alike. They aim to improve the linguistic quality of texts, streamline the writing process, and ensure greater compliance with the formal requirements of academic writing. These technologies can intervene at various stages of text development, including idea formulation, grammatical correction, automatic integration of bibliographic references, document summarization, and stylistic reformulation. Artificial intelligence transforms scientific writing practices by facilitating not only text production but also access to, structuring of, and dissemination of knowledge.(Ganascia, 2017)

In the context of ever-evolving academic research, artificial intelligence has emerged as a powerful tool for transforming writing practices. Far from being limited to simple grammar or stylistic correction, AI now functions as a genuine cognitive agent capable of assisting researchers throughout the multiple phases of knowledge production, from idea formulation to the final formatting of scientific discourse.

AI systems based on natural language processing and deep learning are able to generate coherent texts, reformulate complex passages, suggest relevant citations, and even synthesize entire bibliographic corpora. This intelligent assistance enhances argumentative clarity and formal rigor while significantly accelerating the writing process, thereby freeing researchers from mechanical tasks and allowing greater focus on critical analysis and the structuring of ideas.

The AI tools selected for this study are particularly relevant in a

university environment, as they specifically address the requirements of scientific and academic writing. Their utility lies not only in automating certain writing tasks but also in guiding researchers, teachers, and students through the entire knowledge-production process: from literature review, idea formulation, and argumentative organization to linguistic correction and adherence of bibliographic references to international standards.

This effectiveness stems from the integration of advanced technologies that enable these tools to adapt to the complexity levels characteristic of academic writing. They provide valuable methodological support, contributing to rigor, clarity, and readability in scientific outputs, while fostering greater autonomy among writers. In a context where the quality of scientific communication is central to knowledge dissemination, these tools emerge as true technological allies, capable of optimizing writing practices without compromising intellectual integrity.

The following AI tools were considered in the context of this case study:

ChatGPT: A versatile tool for academic writing assistance, providing support in idea formulation, text structuring, paraphrasing, and information retrieval.

Leo AI: An artificial intelligence agent integrated into the Feedly scientific monitoring platform. Designed to assist researchers in sorting and analyzing relevant information, it automates thematic monitoring across academic and media corpora.

QuillBot: An AI-based writing assistance tool specialized in paraphrasing, grammar correction, and text summarization.

Socratic: An educational application leveraging artificial intelligence to offer personalized learning support across various disciplines



(science, humanities, mathematics, etc.).

Merci App: An advanced spelling and grammar checker specifically designed for the French language. It incorporates contextual correction features that account for the syntactic, orthographic, and lexical norms of academic French.

Cite This For Me: An automated citation and bibliographic reference generator, compliant with major academic styles (APA, MLA, Chicago, Harvard, among others).

Turnitin: A widely adopted text originality evaluation software used by universities worldwide. It detects textual similarities, contributing to plagiarism prevention and promoting intellectual integrity in research.

Mistral AI: A French artificial intelligence company founded in 2023, specializing in the development of high-performance, transparent open-source language models.

4. Methodology and Research Framework

To analyze the impact of changes related to the use of digital tools and artificial intelligence in university teaching practices, a field survey was conducted at the University of Biskra. This research adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining a primarily quantitative strategy with qualitative elements, in order to collect both measurable and interpretative data on the perceptions, uses, and representations of university stakeholders.

The study sample consisted of 120 participants, evenly divided between 60 teachers and 60 students. The teachers surveyed were drawn from various faculties (Arts and Languages, Humanities and Social Sciences, Science and Technology) to ensure disciplinary

diversity. The students, in turn, were enrolled in undergraduate and master's programs, allowing for cross-sectional comparisons based on study level and degree of exposure to digital tools and artificial intelligence.

Data collection relied primarily on a structured questionnaire specifically designed for this study. The questionnaire aimed to assess the frequency, modalities, and purposes of the use of digital tools and AI technologies in teaching and learning practices. It was organized around four main dimensions:

1. **Participant Profile:** age, status (teacher or student), discipline, study level or professional seniority, providing contextualization for the responses.
2. **Frequency and Types of Use of Digital Tools and AI:** closed and multiple-choice questions addressing the use of educational platforms, educational software, and generative AI tools (writing assistance, literature research, linguistic correction), as well as the regularity of these uses (never, rarely, sometimes, often, very often).
3. **Pedagogical Purposes and Perceptions:** Likert-scale questions designed to measure participants' perceptions regarding the benefits of AI and digital tools (time saving, improvement of output quality, learning support, autonomy development) as well as associated concerns (risk of dependency, threats to academic integrity, loss of cognitive skills).
4. **Challenges, Limitations, and Perspectives:** open-ended questions allowing respondents to freely express their opinions on the pedagogical transformations induced by these tools, potential resistance, and the conditions necessary for ethical



and pedagogical integration of artificial intelligence in the university context.

The questionnaires were administered anonymously, both on paper and digitally, to ensure confidentiality and encourage honest responses. The collected data were analyzed descriptively (frequencies, percentages) and comparatively, highlighting convergences and divergences between teachers’ and students’ practices and perceptions. Open-ended responses underwent thematic analysis to identify recurrent discourses and key concerns.

This field study thus provides an overview of ongoing pedagogical transformations at the University of Biskra, while shedding light on the institutional, pedagogical, and ethical issues related to the integration of digital tools and artificial intelligence in the university context.

5. Research Results

Table 1. Summary of Questionnaire Results

Question	Responses	Percentage
How frequently do you use digital tools in your academic activities?	Daily	70.3%
	Several times per week	20.7%
	Occasionally	9%
Which types of digital tools do you use most frequently?	Chat GPT	44.6%
	Mistral IA	20%
	Turnitin	9.2%
	Cite this for me	10.8%
	Merci App	4.8%
	Socratic	2%
	Leo AI	6%
	Quillbot	2.6%
What is the primary purpose	Preparing courses /	21.7%

of using these tools?	academic assignments	
	Conducting research / information retrieval	17.4%
	Writing essays / dissertations	26.1%
	Producing content (text, presentation, summary, etc.)	30.4%
	Other	4.4%
Do you use these tools in the writing of your dissertations?	Yes	78.1%
	Sometimes	20%
	No	1.9%
If yes, for which specific tasks?	Rephrasing or linguistic correction	10.3%
	Text summarization / idea synthesis	35.1%
	Searching for an outline or content organization	53.1%
	Grammar or style checking	1.5%
	Automatic text or example generation	00%
In your opinion, can AI partially replace human scientific writing skills?	Yes	60.6%
	No	6.7%
	Partially	32.7%
Do you think the use of AI should be regulated or supervised in academic work (dissertations, theses, publications)?	Yes	60.6%
	No	37.4%
	I don't know	2%

Source: Preparation and analysis by the researcher



The analysis of the questionnaire provides valuable insights into the frequency, purposes, and perceived impact of digital tools and artificial intelligence (AI) in academic activities. A notable finding is the high, though not universal, daily use of digital tools: 70.3% of respondents reported engaging with these technologies on a daily basis, while 20.7% use them several times per week, and 9% use them only occasionally. This distribution highlights that digital technologies are now a central component of academic routines for the majority of university students and faculty, yet there remains a segment of users who rely on these tools less frequently.

The variation in usage frequency suggests that while digital integration is widespread, there are differences in how individuals incorporate these technologies into their academic workflow, potentially reflecting variations in study habits, disciplinary requirements, or familiarity with specific tools. Overall, these results underscore the growing significance of digital literacy in higher education, emphasizing the need for institutions to support effective and responsible use of digital and AI-based tools, ensuring that all students can benefit from these resources while maintaining critical and autonomous academic skills.

Regarding the types of digital tools most frequently employed, ChatGPT emerges as the predominant platform, used by 44.6% of respondents. It is followed by Mistral AI (20%), Turnitin (9.2%), Cite This For Me (10.8%), Leo AI (6%), Merci App (4.8%), QuillBot (2.6%), and Socratic (2%). The widespread adoption of ChatGPT underscores its perceived versatility and utility across a range of academic tasks, particularly in drafting, reformulating, and organizing textual content. Tools with lower usage rates, such as QuillBot or Turnitin, likely reflect their more specialized functions or a limited familiarity among users with these applications. Meanwhile, the

moderate adoption of platforms like Leo AI, Merci App, and Socratic suggests that while these tools may offer valuable functionalities, they are either less widely known or considered less essential for core academic writing tasks. Overall, these results indicate that students and researchers selectively adopt digital tools based on their perceived relevance and effectiveness, highlighting a nuanced landscape of AI and digital tool usage in contemporary academic practices. The findings also suggest potential opportunities for institutions to provide training and guidance to maximize the benefits of lesser-known tools while fostering effective and responsible integration of AI into academic workflows.

When examining the primary purposes for using these tools, respondents show a distribution across a range of academic activities. Producing content (including texts, presentations, and summaries) emerges as the most common purpose (30.4%), followed by writing essays and dissertations (26.1%), preparing courses or academic assignments (21.7%), and conducting research or information retrieval (17.4%). A small proportion of respondents (4.4%) reported using these tools for other purposes. These results indicate that AI and digital tools are employed not only as aids for writing but also as essential components of the broader academic workflow. They facilitate content creation, support structured planning of academic tasks, and enhance efficiency in information gathering. This balanced utilization across different activities highlights the versatility of these technologies and underscores their role in promoting productivity, organization, and accessibility in contemporary academic practices.

The survey results indicate a strong reliance on digital tools and AI in the writing of dissertations, with 78.1% of respondents reporting regular use. An additional 20% use these tools occasionally, while only a very small fraction (1.9%) do not use them at all. This pattern highlights the central role that AI and digital technologies have come



to play in supporting academic writing, particularly at advanced levels of study where structuring complex arguments, ensuring linguistic accuracy, and managing references can be particularly demanding.

The high prevalence of usage suggests that students perceive these tools as valuable aids in enhancing efficiency, clarity, and overall quality of their work. Meanwhile, the fact that a minority of students use them only occasionally or not at all may reflect differences in familiarity with digital tools, personal preferences, or a deliberate choice to maintain fully autonomous writing practices. Overall, these findings underscore the growing integration of AI and digital tools into the dissertation process, pointing to the need for educational guidance to ensure that their use is both effective and ethically responsible. Institutions may benefit from providing training and support that helps students leverage these technologies while maintaining critical thinking, originality, and academic integrity.

The majority of participants (78.1%) report using these tools in the writing of dissertations or other formal academic works, while only a very small fraction (1.9%) indicate that they do not use them at all. Among the specific tasks for which AI is employed, searching for an outline or organizing content is the most frequently cited (53.1%), followed by text summarization and idea synthesis (35.1%), and rephrasing or linguistic correction (10.3%). Tasks such as grammar or style checking (1.5%) and automatic text or example generation (0%) appear to play a minimal role in current usage patterns. These results suggest that users primarily rely on AI as a cognitive and organizational aid rather than as a direct generator of written material. This indicates a nuanced understanding of AI's capabilities and limitations, with students and researchers employing these tools to support planning, structuring, and refining their work, while retaining

intellectual control over the substantive content and critical reasoning required in academic writing.

Finally, respondents express a nuanced perception regarding the capacity of AI to replace human scientific writing skills. A majority (60.6%) believe that AI can fully assist in certain aspects of scientific writing, while a significant proportion (32.7%) consider that it can only partially substitute for human effort. Only a small minority (6.7%) reject this possibility entirely.

These results highlight a broad consensus that AI functions as a complementary tool rather than a full replacement for human intellectual work. This perspective aligns with contemporary debates in the literature, which emphasize that AI can enhance efficiency, support organization, and improve clarity, yet it remains dependent on human critical thinking, creativity, and disciplinary expertise for generating rigorous and meaningful academic content. The findings underscore the importance of integrating AI thoughtfully into academic practice, leveraging its strengths while maintaining the central role of human judgment and originality in scientific writing.

General, these findings indicate that AI and digital tools are deeply integrated into academic practices, primarily as instruments for planning, synthesizing, and structuring content rather than as fully autonomous writing agents. They support the development of efficiency and clarity, facilitating the management of complex academic tasks, while leaving the core cognitive and creative aspects of scientific writing under human control. This dual function (augmenting productivity while preserving intellectual rigor) highlights the potential of AI as a transformative, yet ethically and pedagogically responsible, component of contemporary higher education. The survey results indicate a clear tendency in favor of regulating the use of artificial intelligence in academic work. A



majority of respondents (60.6%) believe that the use of AI should be regulated or formally supervised in university assignments, including theses, dissertations, and academic publications. This result suggests a growing awareness of the ethical, methodological, and academic integrity issues associated with AI-assisted writing and research.

Nevertheless, a substantial proportion of participants (37.4%) expressed opposition to such regulation, which may reflect concerns about academic freedom, the perceived usefulness of AI tools, or the belief that existing academic norms are sufficient to govern their use. Finally, a small minority of respondents (2%) reported uncertainty, indicating either limited familiarity with AI technologies or ambiguity regarding appropriate institutional policies.

Overall, these findings highlight an ongoing debate within the academic community between the need for ethical oversight and the desire to preserve flexibility and innovation in scholarly practices. They underscore the importance of developing clear, transparent guidelines that balance responsible AI use with academic autonomy.

6. Discussion

This fieldwork illuminates the significant role that artificial intelligence (AI) increasingly plays in the domain of scientific writing, while simultaneously highlighting its inherent limitations. AI provides considerable support in producing coherent texts, correcting linguistic errors, and streamlining various stages of the writing process. However, it remains fundamentally constrained by its inability to fully replicate the complexity, nuance, and depth of human reasoning. Unlike human authors, AI lacks the capacity to apprehend subtle theoretical constructs, perform sophisticated critical analyses, or generate original arguments autonomously. Consequently, its function

is best understood as that of an assistance tool rather than a replacement, as it does not possess creativity, contextual judgment, or a genuine understanding of the specific epistemological and methodological stakes inherent in scientific inquiry.

As such, the ultimate responsibility for intellectual reflection, methodological rigor, and the interpretation of data continues to reside with human researchers. While AI can undoubtedly enrich the educational process by serving as an intelligent support mechanism, it cannot supplant the essential processes of personal reflection, disciplined reasoning, or intellectual accountability, which remain the cornerstones of authentic scientific scholarship. The growing prevalence of AI tools in academic writing further raises pressing ethical concerns, particularly regarding the authenticity of work, the maintenance of intellectual integrity, and the potential for overreliance on automated processes, which could undermine individual learning, critical thinking, and the cultivation of independent scholarly judgment (Nguyen & Zhang, 2022).

AI has thus become an inescapable element of the contemporary academic landscape. Its effective integration necessitates not only technical proficiency and ethical oversight but also a fundamental rethinking of pedagogical strategies. The aim must be to position AI as a cognitive ally and methodological partner, rather than a mere substitute for intellectual engagement. Such an approach requires that educators actively guide students in the responsible and judicious use of AI tools, providing both ethical frameworks and practical training to ensure these technologies enhance, rather than diminish, the quality of academic work. AI tools, while highly efficient, cannot replace human cognition or the methodological rigor essential to scientific endeavors; they are heuristic instruments that can augment research productivity, provided they are deployed thoughtfully, in alignment with the ethical and epistemological principles underpinning scholarly writing (Bourget & Lemoine, 2022).



In sum, the findings of this study underscore the dual nature of AI in academic writing: it serves as a powerful facilitator capable of enhancing productivity, clarity, and linguistic precision, yet it remains dependent on human intelligence for conceptual depth, critical reasoning, and ethical stewardship. These results emphasize the imperative for higher education institutions to integrate AI thoughtfully, balancing its undeniable benefits with the cultivation of independent, reflective, and responsible scholarship. Ultimately, the effective use of AI in academia lies not in replacing human intellect, but in augmenting and complementing it, fostering a partnership between technology and human expertise that advances both efficiency and the integrity of scientific inquiry.

7. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the emergence and widespread adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) tools in the field of academic scientific writing represent a major transformation of contemporary scholarly practices. By providing researchers, educators, and students with systems capable of assisting at various stages of the writing process (from idea generation and rephrasing to grammar correction, bibliographic management, and plagiarism detection) these technologies offer undeniable support for efficiency, linguistic accuracy, and the standardization of scientific outputs. Their use can help address certain technical or methodological gaps while promoting accessibility and inclusivity in research, particularly for struggling learners or non-native speakers.

However, this extensive integration of AI into the academic space raises fundamental ethical questions. The assistance provided should not replace critical thinking, intellectual creativity, or personal engagement, which are hallmarks of scientific research. Excessive

reliance on these tools may lead to homogenization of discourse, diminished originality, or dependency, while issues of transparency, copyright compliance, and the preservation of academic integrity call for clear and appropriate ethical regulations. Without strong institutional and pedagogical guidance, the line between legitimate assistance and potential misconduct remains blurred.

Moreover, despite their impressive capabilities, AI tools remain inherently limited: they do not comprehend the cultural and epistemological context of research, nor the nuanced arguments specific to each discipline. They operate based on statistical correlations, without intentionality or awareness of the scientific stakes. Their role, while useful, remains secondary and dependent on human intervention. Consequently, the use of AI should be conceived not as a substitute for intellectual effort, but as a methodological extension capable of enhancing the quality of scientific production—provided it is employed responsibly, critically, and judiciously.

In this context, the role of the educator is crucial. Acting as a mediator between technology and learning, teachers are tasked with guiding students in the responsible and critical use of these tools. This requires a thoughtful pedagogical integration, including raising awareness of ethical issues, mastering relevant functionalities, and warning against potential misuse. The teacher's role thus extends beyond mere knowledge transmission, becoming a facilitator of intellectual autonomy, encouraging the informed use of AI as a methodological aid without allowing it to supplant human reasoning.

5. Bibliography List :

Aydin, Oguzhan, Tural, Sinem, & Bayrak, Emre. (2025). «Generative AI in academic writing: A comparison of DeepSeek, Qwen, ChatGPT, Gemini, Llama, Mistral, and Gemma ». *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.04765>



Baker, Michael. (2023). « Artificial intelligence in academic writing: Tools and implications ». *Journal of Educational Technology*, 15(2), 134–148.

Bourget, Marie, & Lemoine, Alain. (2022). « L'intelligence artificielle et la pédagogie universitaire : opportunités et défis ». *Revue des Sciences de l'Éducation*, 49(3), 55–73.

Ganascia, Jean-Gabriel. (2017). *Le mythe de la singularité : Faut-il craindre l'intelligence artificielle ?* Paris : Seuil.

Liebling, David J., Wen, Mingxuan, Kim, Juho, & Bigham, Jeffrey P. (2025). « Towards AI-assisted academic writing ». *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.13771>

Lin, Zhenpeng. (2025). « Techniques pour dynamiser la rédaction académique grâce à l'IA générative ». *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 9, 426–431.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-024-01185-8>

Nguyen, Thao, & Zhang, Chen. (2022). « The ethical implications of AI in academic writing: A review of current trends and future prospects ». *Ethics in Education*, 29(4), 88–104.

Peters, James, & Smith, Rebecca. (2021). « AI tools in academic writing: A comprehensive survey of usage and perceptions ». *Journal of Writing Research*, 14(3), 102–118.

UNESCO. (2021). « *Recommandation sur l'éthique de l'intelligence artificielle* ».

<https://www.gcedclearinghouse.org/sites/default/files/resources/230073fre.pdf>

