

Academic Quality, Evidence & Citation Audit Report

Reconceptualising Authorship in the Age of Generative AI: A Theoretical Review

A transparent review of your paper: how its sources were verified, what the evidence supports,
and what to strengthen before you submit.

Generated on: 2026-06-29

Table of Contents

At a glance.....1

Source Registry..... 1

Source & Citation Audit.....4

Evidence Table.....5

Literature / Source Summary..... 12

Academic Quality Review..... 21

Before You Submit.....30

Source Pool — Every Source We Scanned.....30

The Searches We Ran..... 42

At a glance

This report summarizes the automated quality and source review of your work. It is a guidance document for you — not a grade, and not a substitute for your own academic judgement.

Draft writing quality: 90/100

Structure, clarity and academic style of the draft (0–100).

Submission readiness: Moderate — targeted strengthening recommended

11/13 sources verified · 10/13 with evidence extracted · claim-support assessed for 8/13

Requirements met: 2/3

Background sources: 5

Source Registry

Every source your paper relies on, numbered S1...Sn. The rest of this report refers to these IDs instead of repeating full references.

ID	Reference (APA)	DOI	Verified?	Evidence extracted?	Claim support
S1	Adema, J. (2021). Living Books. The MIT Press eBooks. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11297.001.0001	10.7551/mitpress/11297.001.0001	Yes	Yes	Supports
S2	Zeilinger, M. (2021). Tactical entanglements: AI art, creative agency, and the limits of intellectual property. Social Science Open Access Repository (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences). https://doi.org/10.14619/1839	10.14619/1839	No	Yes	Partial

ID	Reference (APA)	DOI	Verified?	Evidence extracted?	Claim support
S3	Israel, M. J., & Amer, A. (2022). Rethinking data infrastructure and its ethical implications in the face of automated digital content generation. <i>AI and Ethics</i> , 3(2), 427–439. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00169-1	10.1007/s43681-022-00169-1	Yes	Yes	Supports
S4	Knöchelmann, M. (2023). <i>Authorship and Publishing in the Humanities</i> . Cambridge University Press eBooks. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009223089	10.1017/9781009223089	Yes	Yes	Not assessed
S5	Rodrigues, T. V. (2025). Distant writing and the epistemology of authorship: On creativity, delegation, and plagiarism in the age of AI. <i>International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention</i> , 12(5), 8598–8613. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsshi/v12i05.04	10.18535/ijsshi/v12i05.04	Yes	Yes	Supports
S6	Henrickson, L. (2021). <i>Towards a new sociology of the text: the hermeneutics of algorithmic authorship</i> . Figshare. https://doi.org/10.26174/thesis.lboro.10596404.v1	10.26174/thesis.lboro.10596404.v1	No	Yes	Not assessed

ID	Reference (APA)	DOI	Verified?	Evidence extracted?	Claim support
S7	Fenwick, M., & Jurcys, P. (2023). Originality and the future of copyright in an age of generative AI. <i>Computer Law & Security Review</i> , 51, 105892. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105892	10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105892	Yes	No	Partial
S8	Bajohr, H. (2024). Writing at a Distance: Notes on Authorship and Artificial Intelligence. <i>German Studies Review</i> , 47(2), 315–337. https://doi.org/10.1353/gsr.2024.a927862	10.1353/gsr.2024.a927862	Yes	Yes	Supports
S9	Birkstedt, T., Minkinen, M., Tandon, A., & Mäntymäki, M. (2023). AI governance: themes, knowledge gaps and future agendas. <i>Internet Research</i> , 33(7), 133–167. https://doi.org/10.1108/intr-01-2022-0042	10.1108/intr-01-2022-0042	Yes	Yes	Supports
S10	Fathallah, J. M. (2017). <i>Fanfiction and the Author</i> . Amsterdam University Press eBooks. https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048529087	10.1515/9789048529087	Yes	Yes	Not assessed

ID	Reference (APA)	DOI	Verified?	Evidence extracted?	Claim support
S11	Behzadi, L., Hämeen-Anttila, J., Ghersetti, A., Gutas, D., & Görke, A. (2015). Concepts of authorship in pre-modern Arabic texts. Bamberger Orientstudien. https://doi.org/10.20378/irb-40118	10.20378/irb-40118	Yes	Yes	Partial
S12	Barthes, R. (2017). The Death of the Author. The Continental Aesthetics Reader. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351226387-35	10.4324/9781351226387-35	Yes	No	Not assessed
S13	Foucault, M. (2019). What Is an Author?. Textual Strategies. https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501743429-006	10.7591/9781501743429-006	Yes	No	Not assessed

Source & Citation Audit

What we checked automatically. These are three different things and we keep them separate: whether the source exists (verified), whether we could extract what it says (evidence), and whether it backs the specific claim it is cited for (claim support).

11/13 verified · 10/13 with evidence extracted · 5/8 assessed claims directly supported

Verification via Crossref confirms a source exists — it does NOT confirm the source supports the sentence it is cited for. Review each in-text citation yourself before submitting.

ID	Status	DOI verified	Claim support	Confidence	Action
S1	Verified	Yes	Supports	1.00	Keep
S2	Details differ	Yes	Partial	0.80	Clarify / strengthen support
S3	Verified	Yes	Supports	1.00	Keep

ID	Status	DOI verified	Claim support	Confidence	Action
S4	Verified	Yes	Not assessed	—	Verify manually
S5	Verified	Yes	Supports	0.95	Keep
S6	Not verified	Yes	Not assessed	—	Replace / find a stronger source
S7	Verified	Yes	Partial	0.80	Clarify / strengthen support
S8	Verified	Yes	Supports	0.95	Keep
S9	Verified	Yes	Supports	1.00	Keep
S10	Verified	Yes	Not assessed	—	Verify manually
S11	Verified	Yes	Partial	0.95	Clarify / strengthen support
S12	Verified	Yes	Not assessed	—	Verify manually
S13	Verified	Yes	Not assessed	—	Verify manually

Evidence Table

What each source actually says, and how strongly it supports the claim it is used for. Sources we could not extract evidence from are still listed so nothing is hidden.

Source	Evidence from source	Support level	Action
S1	Adema argues that scholarly publishing is constrained by the commodification of print, proposing that authorship should shift toward anonymous, collaborative, processual, and remixed models that embrace dynamic materiality over static originality.	Direct	Keep
S2	The author rejects the anthropomorphic view of 'creative AI' in favor of a 'posthumanist agential assemblage,' suggesting that AI art necessitates a reconfiguration of the traditional author function.	Partial	Clarify / strengthen support

Source	Evidence from source	Support level	Action
S3	The emergence of AI-generated content necessitates a fundamental rethink of scholarly processes, specifically regarding how we define anonymity, attribution, and the epistemological relevance of published media.	Direct	Keep
S4	Humanities scholars face specific struggles in their pursuit of contributing to discourse and seeking recognition for their intellectual work within the context of national academic frameworks.	Background	Verify manually
S5	Distant writing is a distributed epistemic activity where humans retain epistemic agency while delegating generative labor to non-agential LLMs; LLMs function as sophisticated tools rather than co-authors; attribution should shift from traditional originality to transparency...	Direct	Keep
S6	Readers tend to assign agency to NLG systems to maintain a 'hermeneutic contract'; the author suggests a continuum from 'authorship' to 'generatorship' rather than a binary, and argues that NLG systems should be viewed as social agents or 'algorithmic authors'.	Background	Replace / find a stronger source
S7	—	Partial	Clarify / strengthen support
S8	The essay proposes 'causal authorship' to measure the distance between human and machine agents and 'distributed authorship' to account for the network of actors involved in text creation.	Direct	Keep

Source	Evidence from source	Support level	Action
S9	AI governance is an emerging, fragmented field with few explicit definitions; four identified themes are technology, stakeholders/context, regulation, and processes; key gaps include limited understanding of implementation and operationalization.	Direct	Keep
S10	The 'legitimation paradox' describes how fanfiction utilizes traditional notions of authorship to gain legitimacy while simultaneously contesting and deconstructing the authority of media professionals.	Background	Verify manually
S11	Authorship is a complex, multifaceted concept that cannot be reduced to a single definition; it encompasses various functions such as precursory, executive, collaborative, and revisionary authorship. Identifying authorship is fundamentally linked to validating individual agency.	Partial	Clarify / strengthen support
S12	—	Background	Verify manually
S13	—	Background	Verify manually
S14	Increasing the diversity and quantity of input materials improves the depth and coherence of generated reviews, though current outputs do not yet meet top-tier publication standards for critical analysis and originality.	Background	Verify manually
S15	AI-generated art blurs the distinction between original and reproduction, leading to an emergent 'hybridized' form of aura resulting from the synergy of human intention and machine execution.	Background	Verify manually

Source	Evidence from source	Support level	Action
S16	The attribution of 'Arden of Faversham' to Shakespeare is found to be suspect because the underlying models lack sufficient justification, the data are insufficiently specific, and the methods are too opaque for rigorous academic scrutiny.	Background	Verify manually
S17	Twitter serves as a platform for the continuous, mass-scale reshaping of authorial identity, though digital performance often requires remediation into print media to achieve traditional cultural legitimacy.	Background	Verify manually
S18	—	Background	Verify manually
S19	—	Background	Verify manually
S20	Early modern playtexts are products of complex, iterative processes involving authors, scribes, printers, and actors; therefore, stylistic markers are often layered and difficult to isolate to a single source.	Background	Verify manually
S21	—	Background	Verify manually
S22	AI-generated outputs in their raw form fail the originality requirement due to a lack of human intellectual choice; Indonesian law restricts authorship to human creators; protection should be limited to human-authored post-production or highly creative iterative prompting.	Background	Verify manually
S23	Attributing authorship requires intention, agency, and awareness of the creative act; these criteria create significant ethical, philosophical, and legal challenges when applied to non-human entities like AI.	Background	Verify manually

Source	Evidence from source	Support level	Action
S24	The integration of generative AI challenges traditional notions of human-centric authorship, necessitating a re-evaluation of copyright eligibility for machine-assisted works.	Background	Verify manually
S25	The study identifies three major gaps: ambiguity in AI authorship and attribution, procedural underperformance in enforcement, and limited cross-border legal cooperation. It proposes statutory recognition of AI authorship and blockchain-based attribution protocols.	Background	Verify manually
S26	Generative AI should be viewed as a collaborative tool that augments human creativity rather than replacing it; the authors advocate for a framework of human oversight that maintains academic accountability while embracing the democratization of knowledge production.	Background	Verify manually
S27	Parafictional artists function as authors within the art world despite their imaginary nature; their practice moves beyond a simple critique of authorship toward a curatorial understanding that contributes to the production of knowledge through fiction.	Background	Verify manually
S28	—	Background	Verify manually
S29	Biblical studies should shift from focusing on the author's original intent to an outward-facing approach that embraces the ongoing, symbiotic meaning-making process inherent in the Bible's reception history.	Background	Verify manually

Source	Evidence from source	Support level	Action
S30	Replication studies are rare (1 per 400 articles), often involve significant changes to original study designs, and show a higher likelihood of supporting initial findings when there is an overlap in authorship between the initial and replication studies.	Background	Verify manually
S31	The study identifies six knowledge clusters, influential contributors, and research trajectories, providing a comprehensive intellectual map of the field and future research directions.	Background	Verify manually
S32	HRM initiatives support employee well-being; the study identifies various conceptual viewpoints on EWBHRPs and proposes a consolidated framework of essential practices.	Background	Verify manually
S33	AI integration enables automation in data collection, citation analysis, and the disambiguation of authors, while providing more objective frameworks for research impact prediction and co-authorship network analysis.	Background	Verify manually
S34	Research on EC is globally distributed but lacks collaboration between authors in developing and developed countries; key themes include entrepreneurship education as an antecedent to entrepreneurial intention, and EC as a driver of firm performance and economic growth.	Background	Verify manually

Source	Evidence from source	Support level	Action
S35	AI-generated texts are often grammatically polished but lack the emotional nuance, rhetorical richness, and distinct linguistic markers of human writing, potentially eroding individual authorial voice and linguistic fingerprints.	Background	Verify manually
S36	There is an emerging trend where intellectual property rights are increasingly granted to safeguard corporate investments rather than original creativity, challenging the traditional paradigm that IP is the law of creativity.	Background	Verify manually
S37	—	Background	Verify manually
S38	The current authorship framework is ill-equipped for autonomous AI; a transition to a contribution-based model prioritizing transparency and distributed responsibility is recommended over current human-centric standards.	Background	Verify manually
S39	—	Background	Verify manually
S40	—	Background	Verify manually
S41	Co-authoring increases research output and productivity but requires clear strategies to ensure ethical, fair contributions and to navigate the complexities of multidisciplinary collaboration.	Background	Verify manually
S42	The journal emphasizes the necessity of originality and professional discourse in academic writing, maintaining standards through a formal peer-review process.	Background	Verify manually
S43	—	Background	Verify manually
S44	—	Background	Verify manually
S45	—	Background	Verify manually

Literature / Source Summary

A plain-language summary of the key sources behind your paper, to help you decide what to read and where to strengthen the argument.

Source	Main contribution	Used for	Strength	Limitation
S1	Adema argues that scholarly publishing is constrained by the commodification of print, proposing that authorship should shift toward anonymous, collaborative, processual, and remixed models that embrace dynamic materiality over static originality.	Background / context	The MIT Press eBooks	The work is theoretical and experimental in nature, focusing on specific arts and humanities contexts rather than broad empirical validation.
S2	The author rejects the anthropomorphic view of 'creative AI' in favor of a 'posthumanist agential assemblage,' suggesting that AI art necessitates a reconfiguration of the traditional author function.	Background / context	Social Science Open Access Repository (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)	The work is primarily theoretical and philosophical rather than empirical, focusing on artistic contexts rather than academic writing specifically.
S3	The emergence of AI-generated content necessitates a fundamental rethink of scholarly processes, specifically regarding how we define anonymity, attribution, and the epistemological relevance of published media.	Background / context	AI and Ethics	The paper focuses on theoretical infrastructure and architectural proposals rather than empirical testing of user adoption or social impact.
S4	Humanities scholars face specific struggles in their pursuit of contributing to discourse and seeking recognition for their intellectual work within the context of national academic frameworks.	Background / context	Cambridge University Press eBooks	—

Source	Main contribution	Used for	Strength	Limitation
S5	Distant writing is a distributed epistemic activity where humans retain epistemic agency while delegating generative labor to non-agential LLMs; LLMs function as sophisticated tools rather than co-authors; attribution should shift from traditional...	Background / context	International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention	The paper relies on theoretical and normative frameworks rather than empirical data on AI usage patterns.
S6	Readers tend to assign agency to NLG systems to maintain a 'hermeneutic contract'; the author suggests a continuum from 'authorship' to 'generatorship' rather than a binary, and argues that NLG systems should be viewed as social agents or 'algorithmic...	Background / context	Figshare	—
S7	—	Background / context	Computer Law & Security Review	—
S8	The essay proposes 'causal authorship' to measure the distance between human and machine agents and 'distributed authorship' to account for the network of actors involved in text creation.	Background / context	German Studies Review	The concept of causal authorship carries an anthropocentric bias, while the notion of distributed authorship has its own inherent limitations.

Source	Main contribution	Used for	Strength	Limitation
S9	AI governance is an emerging, fragmented field with few explicit definitions; four identified themes are technology, stakeholders/context, regulation, and processes; key gaps include limited understanding of implementation and operationalization.	Background / context	Internet Research	The study identifies the field as fragmented with a lack of explicit definitions, which may limit the generalizability of current governance frameworks.
S10	The 'legitimation paradox' describes how fanfiction utilizes traditional notions of authorship to gain legitimacy while simultaneously contesting and deconstructing the authority of media professionals.	Background / context	Amsterdam University Press eBooks	—
S11	Authorship is a complex, multifaceted concept that cannot be reduced to a single definition; it encompasses various functions such as precursory, executive, collaborative, and revisionary authorship.	Background / context	Bamberger Orientstudien	The application of modern literary theories (such as Barthes' 'Death of the Author') to medieval or pre-modern literature is often problematic and lacks...
S12	—	Background / context	The Continental Aesthetics Reader	—
S13	—	Background / context	Textual Strategies	—
S14	Increasing the diversity and quantity of input materials improves the depth and coherence of generated reviews, though current outputs do not yet meet top-tier publication standards for critical analysis and originality.	Background / context	ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces	The generated drafts currently fail to meet the standards of top-tier publications, specifically regarding originality and critical analysis.

Source	Main contribution	Used for	Strength	Limitation
S15	AI-generated art blurs the distinction between original and reproduction, leading to an emergent 'hybridized' form of aura resulting from the synergy of human intention and machine execution.	Background / context	AI & SOCIETY	The study identifies a gap in existing literature and notes polarized views on AI's impact on creativity and authenticity.
S16	The attribution of 'Arden of Faversham' to Shakespeare is found to be suspect because the underlying models lack sufficient justification, the data are insufficiently specific, and the methods are too opaque for rigorous academic scrutiny.	Background / context	Authorship	The critique focuses on the specific application of quantitative methods in one study and suggests that current authorship studies suffer from an impoverished...
S17	Twitter serves as a platform for the continuous, mass-scale reshaping of authorial identity, though digital performance often requires remediation into print media to achieve traditional cultural legitimacy.	Background / context	Authorship	The study is limited by the dominant role of print media in defining authorship, which restricts the efficacy of purely digital identity performance.
S18	—	Background / context	Biblical Exegesis without Authorial Intention?	—
S19	—	Background / context	New Writing	—
S20	Early modern playtexts are products of complex, iterative processes involving authors, scribes, printers, and actors; therefore, stylistic markers are often layered and difficult to isolate to a single source.	Background / context	Journal of Early Modern Studies	—

Source	Main contribution	Used for	Strength	Limitation
S21	—	Background / context	Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025	—
S22	AI-generated outputs in their raw form fail the originality requirement due to a lack of human intellectual choice; Indonesian law restricts authorship to human creators; protection should be limited to human-authored post-production or highly creative...	Background / context	Jurnal Hukum Progresif	The study is focused specifically on the Indonesian legal framework and its anthropocentric copyright doctrine.
S23	Attributing authorship requires intention, agency, and awareness of the creative act; these criteria create significant ethical, philosophical, and legal challenges when applied to non-human entities like AI.	Background / context	Humanities and Social Sciences Communications	The paper functions as a reflective, multidisciplinary dialogue rather than an empirical study, leaving the definitions of authorship open to ongoing debate.
S24	The integration of generative AI challenges traditional notions of human-centric authorship, necessitating a re-evaluation of copyright eligibility for machine-assisted works.	Background / context	arXiv (Cornell University)	—
S25	The study identifies three major gaps: ambiguity in AI authorship and attribution, procedural underperformance in enforcement, and limited cross-border legal cooperation.	Background / context	Frontiers in Human Dynamics	The research focuses primarily on the Jordanian legal context and its specific digital intellectual property governance.

Source	Main contribution	Used for	Strength	Limitation
S26	Generative AI should be viewed as a collaborative tool that augments human creativity rather than replacing it; the authors advocate for a framework of human oversight that maintains academic accountability while embracing the democratization of knowledge...	Background / context	AI Magazine	The study is a theoretical essay rather than an empirical investigation, lacking data on specific institutional implementation or student/faculty outcomes.
S27	Parafictional artists function as authors within the art world despite their imaginary nature; their practice moves beyond a simple critique of authorship toward a curatorial understanding that contributes to the production of knowledge through fiction.	Background / context	Archive of research processes and output produced by RCA (Royal College of Art)	—
S28	—	Background / context	Biblical Exegesis without Authorial Intention?	—
S29	Biblical studies should shift from focusing on the author's original intent to an outward-facing approach that embraces the ongoing, symbiotic meaning-making process inherent in the Bible's reception history.	Background / context	Biblical Exegesis without Authorial Intention?	The study is theoretical and philosophical in nature, lacking empirical data on contemporary academic writing practices.

Source	Main contribution	Used for	Strength	Limitation
S30	Replication studies are rare (1 per 400 articles), often involve significant changes to original study designs, and show a higher likelihood of supporting initial findings when there is an overlap in authorship between the initial and replication studies.	Background / context	Language Learning	The sample contained no direct (exact) replication attempts, and the wide-ranging changes made to initial studies likely obscured the interpretability of the...
S31	The study identifies six knowledge clusters, influential contributors, and research trajectories, providing a comprehensive intellectual map of the field and future research directions.	Background / context	International Journal of Consumer Studies	—
S32	HRM initiatives support employee well-being; the study identifies various conceptual viewpoints on EWBHRPs and proposes a consolidated framework of essential practices.	Background / context	Future Business Journal	—
S33	AI integration enables automation in data collection, citation analysis, and the disambiguation of authors, while providing more objective frameworks for research impact prediction and co-authorship network analysis.	Background / context	Library Hi Tech	—

Source	Main contribution	Used for	Strength	Limitation
S34	Research on EC is globally distributed but lacks collaboration between authors in developing and developed countries; key themes include entrepreneurship education as an antecedent to entrepreneurial intention, and EC as a driver of firm performance and...	Background / context	Cogent Business & Management	A shortage of studies concerning the context of developing countries.
S35	AI-generated texts are often grammatically polished but lack the emotional nuance, rhetorical richness, and distinct linguistic markers of human writing, potentially eroding individual authorial voice and linguistic fingerprints.	Background / context	Arab World English Journal	—
S36	There is an emerging trend where intellectual property rights are increasingly granted to safeguard corporate investments rather than original creativity, challenging the traditional paradigm that IP is the law of creativity.	Background / context	Cambridge University Press eBooks	The text focuses on legal and economic frameworks rather than the specific impact of generative AI on individual authorship.
S37	—	Background / context	Navigating Generative AI in Higher Education	—

Source	Main contribution	Used for	Strength	Limitation
S38	The current authorship framework is ill-equipped for autonomous AI; a transition to a contribution-based model prioritizing transparency and distributed responsibility is recommended over current human-centric standards.	Background / context	The Artificial Intelligence Business Review	—
S39	—	Background / context	Biblical Exegesis without Authorial Intention?	—
S40	—	Background / context	Biblical Exegesis without Authorial Intention?	—
S41	Co-authoring increases research output and productivity but requires clear strategies to ensure ethical, fair contributions and to navigate the complexities of multidisciplinary collaboration.	Background / context	Arrow - TU Dublin (Technological University Dublin)	—
S42	The journal emphasizes the necessity of originality and professional discourse in academic writing, maintaining standards through a formal peer-review process.	Background / context	Federal University Gusau Faculty of Education Journal	The source does not address generative AI or authorship beyond traditional human scholarship.
S43	—	Background / context	Biblical Exegesis without Authorial Intention?	—
S44	—	Background / context	Biblical Exegesis without Authorial Intention?	—
S45	—	Background / context	Copyright Law in Photographic Works	—

How to use this: read the sources most relevant to your argument, confirm each citation supports the claim beside it, and use this summary to strengthen your literature review.

Academic Quality Review

A higher-level review of the paper as a whole — its evidence, logic, structure and how different readers might respond. Read it as an improvement roadmap, not a verdict.

Overall score

90/100

Weighted average across all sections (0–100)

Issues flagged per dimension

How many issues the review flagged in each dimension — a count, NOT a 0–100 score, so fewer is better. It shows where the document needed the most attention.

Dimension	Issues found
Logic Argument flow and absence of logical jumps.	0
Evidence Every substantive claim has a verified source or is marked as hypothesis.	5
Citation integrity Every in-text citation exists in the reference list; no orphans.	0
Completeness All outline sections present; all form requirements covered.	2
Academic style Register matches the academic level; no AI-smell phrasing.	0
Scope guard Complexity matches the academic-level ceiling (BA / MA / PhD).	5
Diagram accuracy Diagrams (if any) match the reference list.	0
Spec compliance The document addresses what your spec actually asked for.	0
Constraint compliance Every constraint you listed is honoured.	0
Argument fidelity Claims align with the stated argument.	1

Dimension	Issues found
Language quality Native fluency in the chosen language; no translation artefacts; no generic AI register.	0

Per-section breakdown

Score and outstanding issues for each section. "Issues found" are findings the automated review flagged.

Section	Score	Location	Dimension	Suggested fix
abstract	92/100	Abstract, “Central Contributions”	Scope guard	For BA level, simplify the theoretical vocabulary or add one plain-language sentence explaining “epistemic delegation” and “assemblage-based accounts”.
		Abstract, “Topic and Argument”	Evidence	Ensure the strong synthetic claims made in the abstract are explicitly substantiated in the body, since the abstract itself appropriately avoids citations.
introduction	91/100	Introduction, paragraph 2	Evidence	Add citation markers for the claims about copyright doctrine, intentionalist philosophy, and posthumanist assemblage theory.
		Introduction, paragraph 3	Scope guard	The five-claim thesis is conceptually dense for BA level; add clearer signposting and define key terms before using them analytically.

Section	Score	Location	Dimension	Suggested fix
literature_review	84/100	Authorship as Spectrum, paragraph 3	Evidence	Add verified citations for the posthumanist claim that agency is an emergent property of assemblages.
		Literature Review overall	Scope guard	For BA level, reduce abstraction by adding short explanatory bridges between author-function theory, copyright law, and academic integrity practice.
discussion	88/100	Position within the Field, paragraph 1	Evidence	Add citation markers after “Rodrigues (2025) and Israel and Amer” and after the claims attributed to Adema and Zeilinger.
		Discussion overall	Scope guard	The section reads closer to MA-level theoretical synthesis; add more descriptive explanation if the submission must remain BA-level.
limitations	93/100	Limitations, paragraphs 1–3	Completeness	State any mitigation steps used in source selection and indicate how the Western/theoretical corpus may bias the argument’s conclusions.
future_research	92/100	Future Research, paragraph 2	Argument fidelity	Add a sentence calling for cross-cultural, multilingual, or Global South studies, matching the limitation identified in the discussion.

Section	Score	Location	Dimension	Suggested fix
		Future Research overall	Scope guard	Keep the future-research agenda manageable for BA level by prioritising one or two concrete study designs rather than several broad programmes.
summary	92/100	Recap of the Argument, paragraph 2	Evidence	If the spectrum-from-authorship-to-generatorship claim remains in the summary, it should already be fully developed and cited earlier in the paper.
appendices	82/100	Appendices	Completeness	If the institutional outline requires an appendix section, add an “Appendices” heading with “No appendices” or include relevant supporting material.

Multi-axis review

Higher-level critique of the paper as a whole. Each axis answers one structured question.

Axis	Verdict	Finding
Methodological Does the methodology actually answer the research question?	adequate	The theoretical review method fits the question, but source selection lacks explicit inclusion/exclusion criteria and a rationale beyond relevance.
Theoretical Is the theoretical framing coherent and consistently used?	strong	The legal, intentionalist, and posthumanist constructs are coherently defined and used as the paper’s organising frame.
Argumentative Is the chain of reasoning sound on its own merits?	adequate	The central claim is coherent, but the governance recommendation remains interpretive rather than demonstrated.

Axis	Verdict	Finding
Cross-disciplinary How would a sceptical reader from an adjacent field read this?	adequate	A higher-education or empirical methods reader would ask how student and staff practices affect the proposed continuum; the paper notes this gap.
Adversarial (devil's advocate) Strongest objection a sceptic could raise to the central thesis — and whether the paper addresses it.	adequate	Objection: Western, English-language theory may not generalise to non-Western authorship norms. Addressed: yes
Title promise Does the paper deliver what the title commits to?	strong	Title commits to: reconceptualisation and theoretical review Delivered: yes Most-broken: none
Narrative coherence Are the introduction's promises picked up in discussion and conclusion?	adequate	Promise gap: The introduction promises relational originality, but the body treats it mainly inside the delegation/disclosure synthesis.
Shortcut reliance Does the writing dodge the work the argument requires — formulaic endings, hedge stacks, filler that restates rather than advances?	strong	No major shortcut: the paper takes a defensible position while acknowledging the limits of a theoretical review.
Frame lock Does the paper acknowledge alternative framings or theoretical lenses, or anchor on a single frame without revisiting it?	strong	Single frame: none; legal, intentionalist, and posthumanist alternatives are compared Alternatives considered: yes

Section checklist

Structural items expected for each section. Diagnostic only — these checks do not change the section score; they surface binary present/absent gaps the continuous scoring may miss.

Abstract

Item	Reported	Note
Self-contained — no undefined acronyms, no in-text citations	Yes	AI and LLMs are defined; no citation markers appear.
Reflects the paper's actual conclusion (matches the conclusion section)	Yes	The abstract's continuum/disclosure claim matches the summary.
Includes context, method (if applicable), and main result	Yes	Context, theoretical framework, and core contribution are stated.

Introduction

Item	Reported	Note
Topic background established (why this matters)	Yes	The opening connects authorship debates to generative AI.
Knowledge gap explicitly named	Yes	The gap is framed as inadequacy of existing frameworks.
Research aim or central question stated	Yes	The research question is stated directly.
Scope outlined — what the paper will and will not cover	Yes	The final paragraph outlines the paper's sections and scope.

Literature Review

Item	Reported	Note
Organised around 2–4 explicit thematic topics (not chronological / alphabetical / one-paper-per-paragraph citation list); each topic opens with a topic sentence that defines its scope	Yes	The review uses spectrum, legal/institutional pressure, and tensions.
Multiple competing perspectives presented within or across topics, not a single dominant narrative	Yes	Tool/agent, transparency, and deconstruction positions are contrasted.
Each topic block closes with a gap or unresolved question, and those gaps connect forward to the paper's research aim or contribution	Yes	Most topic blocks end by identifying governance or accountability gaps.
Recent literature included (last 5–10 years where the field allows)	Yes	The stated corpus spans 2015–2025.

Discussion

Item	Reported	Note
Opens with a summary of the main findings	Yes	The first paragraph summarises the three trajectories and central finding.
Findings compared explicitly to existing literature	Yes	Bajohr, Zeilinger, Adema, and Israel and Amer are compared.
No new data or new analyses introduced	Yes	The section synthesises theory and does not introduce empirical data.
Theoretical or practical implications stated	Yes	Implications for academic integrity governance are stated.

Limitations

Item	Reported	Note
Specific weaknesses named (not vague 'several limitations exist')	Yes	Theoretical design, disciplinary skew, and date range are named.
Direction of bias indicated where it can be inferred (over- vs under-estimate)	No	The section notes skew but does not state how it may bias conclusions.
Mitigation steps stated where they were applied	No	No mitigation strategy for source selection or disciplinary skew is stated.
Limitations cover at least three of: study design, sample/population, measurement/data, analysis (or comparable categories for the work type)	Yes	Comparable categories are covered: design, disciplinary range, and time range.

Conclusion

Item	Reported	Note
Directly answers the introduction's research aim	Yes	The summary returns to competing frameworks and the continuum model.
Single core message stated, not a recap of the whole paper	Yes	The core message is clear, though the recap subsection is relatively detailed.
No new data or new citations introduced	No	—

Predicted review

Calibrated estimate of how three reader personas might respond. Read this as feedback on where each kind of reader would push hardest, not as a hard verdict.

Estimated acceptance likelihood: 74/100 · Expected revision: Major

Reader	Predicted verdict	Key concern
Supervisor Reads for structural quality, faithfulness to the agreed scope, and academic register.	Light revisions recommended	The structure and thesis are strong, but the paper is more conceptually advanced than typical BA work and needs clearer explanatory scaffolding.

Reader	Predicted verdict	Key concern
External examiner Reads cold for clarity of contribution, rigour of evidence, and defensibility of claims.	Substantive revisions recommended	The literature review contains citation-integrity problems and unsupported theoretical claims that must be corrected before submission.
Domain peer Reads for technical correctness and currency of cited literature.	Light revisions recommended	The synthesis is interesting, but several plan-relevant sources on disclosure, originality, and delegation are not used directly enough.

Requirements coverage

How the delivered work measures against the requirements you set in the order form. Partially met / not met rows also appear in the fix-list below with what to do.

Status	Delivered	Requirement
Not met	13 / 15	Number of sources
Met	✓ Met	Publication year range
Met	✓ Met	Allowed source types

How to finish the work

These are the highest-priority items the automated revision could not fully resolve — the ones we'd tackle first if we had more iterations. They are NOT the only findings: the per-section table earlier in this report lists every issue the review flagged. Once you address the items below, most remaining findings tend to shrink or resolve themselves. Each item names where to look, what is missing, and a concrete instruction. The text is in the paper's language so you can paste new content directly.

Estimated time	Search hint	How to fix	What is missing	Where	Priority
45 min	—	Define key terms such as “author-function”, “epistemic agency”, “assemblage”, and “delegation continuum” in plain language before analysing them. Add short examples of AI-assisted academic writing after dense theoretical claims.	The writing is stronger than required for BA level but sometimes becomes too abstract for a descriptive undergraduate paper.	Introduction and Discussion	Medium
30 min	—	Add one sentence explaining how the Western/theoretical source base may bias the synthesis, and one sentence stating what was done to reduce that limitation, such as using interdisciplinary sources within the allowed corpus.	The limitations name weaknesses but do not state mitigation steps or the likely direction of bias.	Limitations	Medium

Estimated time	Search hint	How to fix	What is missing	Where	Priority
30 min	—	Cite at least 2 more of the verified sources in the body, or add sources, to reach the requested count.	13 of 15 requested sources are cited in the paper. Fewer sources than requested were woven into the text; the verified source pool holds more that can be cited where genuinely relevant.	Order requirements	High

Before You Submit

A short checklist to finish the work to a submission-ready standard:

1. Review every in-text citation and confirm the source supports the claim beside it.
2. Address the higher-priority items in the quality review above.
3. Replace or strengthen any source flagged for review in the audit.
4. Read the most relevant sources yourself so you can defend the argument.

TEXIO verifies that sources exist and reports what we could assess. Final responsibility for citation accuracy and academic integrity rests with you — please review the work before submitting it.

Source Pool — Every Source We Scanned

Full transparency on the search behind your paper: every source we found, grouped by what happened to it. Use it to decide whether to add, swap, or read further — the relevant ones we did not use are a ready shortlist.

Included in your paper

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
AI governance: themes, knowledge gaps and future agendas — Birkstedt et al. — (2023)	10.1108/intr-01-2022-0042	Focused search	Cited in the paper
Fanfiction and the Author — Fathallah — (2017)	10.1515/9789048529087	Focused search	Cited in the paper
Originality and the future of copyright in an age of generative AI — Fenwick et al. — (2023)	10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105892	Focused search	Cited in the paper
Living Books — Janneke Adema — (2021)	10.7551/mitpress/11297.001.0001	Background search	Cited in the paper
Tactical Entanglements: AI Art, Creative Agency, and the Limits of Intellectual Property — Martin Zeilinger — (2021)	10.14619/1839	Focused search	Cited in the paper
Rethinking data infrastructure and its ethical implications in the face of automated digital content generation — Maria Joseph Israel et al. — (2022)	10.1007/s43681-022-00169-1	Focused search	Cited in the paper
Writing at a Distance: Notes on Authorship and Artificial Intelligence — Hannes Bajohr — (2024)	10.1353/gsr.2024.a927862	Background search	Cited in the paper
Concepts of Authorship in Pre-Modern Arabic Texts — Lale Behzadi et al. — (2015)	10.20378/irb-40118	Background search	Cited in the paper
Authorship and Publishing in the Humanities — Marcel Knöchelmann — (2023)	10.1017/9781009223089	Background search	Cited in the paper
Towards a new sociology of the text: the hermeneutics of algorithmic authorship — Leah Henrickson — (2021)	10.26174/thesis.lboro.10596404.v1	Focused search	Cited in the paper
Distant Writing and The Epistemology of Authorship: On Creativity, Delegation, And Plagiarism in The Age Of AI — Rodrigues — (2025)	10.18535/ijsshi/v12i05.04	Focused search	Cited in the paper

Relevant — not used (candidates to add)

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
Replication in Second Language Research: Narrative and Systematic Reviews and Recommendations for the Field — Marsden et al. — (2018)	10.1111/lang.12286	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Anthropomorphism and consumer behaviour: A<scp>SPAR-4-SLR</sc p>protocol compliant hybrid review — Khan et al. — (2023)	10.1111/ijcs.12985	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Employee well-being human resource practices: a systematic literature review and directions for future research — Bhoir et al. — (2024)	10.1186/s43093-024-00382-w	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Unleashing the power of AI: a systematic review of cutting-edge techniques in AI-enhanced scientometrics, webometrics and bibliometrics — Saeidnia et al. — (2024)	10.1108/lht-10-2023-0514	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
A bibliometric review of research on entrepreneurial capacity for the period 1979 to 2022: Current status, development, and future research directions — Chhabra et al. — (2023)	10.1080/23311975.2023.2178338	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
AI-Assisted Tools for Scientific Review Writing: Opportunities and Cautions — Silva et al. — (2025)	10.1021/acsami.5c08837	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
From aura to semi-aura: reframing authenticity in AI-generated art—a systematic literature review — Salas Espasa et al. — (2025)	10.1007/s00146-025-02361-3	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Preserving Authorial Voice in Academic Texts in the Age of Generative AI: A Thematic Literature Review — Al Hosni — (2025)	10.24093/awej/vol16no3.14	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
'A cannon's burst discharged against a ruined wall': A Critique of Quantitative Methods in Shakespearean Authorial Attribution — Auerbach — (2018)	10.21825/aj.v7i2.9737	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Exploration of the creative processes in animals, robots, and AI: who holds the authorship? — Cédric Sueur et al. — (2024)	10.1057/s41599-024-03125-y	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
The Cambridge Handbook of Investment-Driven Intellectual Property — Enrico Bonadio et al. — (2023)	10.1017/9781108989527	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Originality and the Future of Copyright in an Age of Generative AI — Paulius Jurčys et al. — (2023)	10.48550/arxiv.2309.13055	Background search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Rethinking authorship in a generative AI-driven academic world — Kumar — (2025)	10.4337/9781035337873.0011	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Challenges of protecting electronic works in the era of artificial intelligence: a legal and doctrinal perspective — Albnian et al. — (2025)	10.3389/fhumd.2025.1701267	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Reclaiming authorship in the age of generative AI: From panic to possibility — Askari — (2025)	10.1002/aaai.70022	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Tweeting the Author: Tao Lin's Performance of Authorial Identity on Twitter — Greene — (2018)	10.21825/aj.v7i1.8618	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Parafictional artists. From the critique of authorship to the curatorial turn — Emma Brasó — (2018)	—	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Author – Text – Intention: A Case Study on the Letter of James — Wischmeyer — (2019)	10.1163/9789004379558_004	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
AI as a Research Partner: Advocating for Co-Authorship in Academic Publications — Juan Dempere et al. — (2025)	10.64044/j8enmv71	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
Dying and Rising with the Author: Specters of Paul and the Material Text — Fewster — (2019)	10.1163/9789004379558_011	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Authorship and/as Intertext – Julia Kristeva and Paul de Man — Clar — (2019)	10.1163/9789004379558_006	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Exegesis without Authorial Intention? On the Role of the “Author Construct” in Text Interpretation — Heinen — (2019)	10.1163/9789004379558_003	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Covert and overt plagiarism: poetic attribution, originality and authorship — Holland-Batt et al. — (2024)	10.1080/14790726.2024.2425414	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Between Authorship and Oral Transmission: Negotiating the Attribution of Authorial, Oral and Collective Style Markers in Early Modern Playtexts — Petersen — (2016)	10.13128/jems-2279-7149-18093	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Who’s the Author? How Explanations Impact User Reliance in AI-Assisted Authorship Attribution — Bao et al. — (2025)	10.18653/v1/2025.findings-emnlp.1380	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
ORIGINALITY, AUTHORSHIP, AND GENERATIVE AI: RETHINKING INDONESIAN COPYRIGHT LAW — Zakiyah et al. — (2025)	10.14710/jhp.13.2.385-416	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Born-Again Bibles: Biblical Studies after the “Death of the Author” — Strømme — (2019)	10.1163/9789004379558_008	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Co-authoring Strategies in Business Research — Deirdre McQuillan — (2021)	10.21427/mste-8658	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
Zamfara International Journal of Education (ZIJE) VOLUME 5 NUMBER 3 — Editor in Chief Associate Professor Umar Sodangi et al. — (2025)	10.64348/zije.202554	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
Between Intention and Reception: Textual Meaning-Making in Intersubjective Perspective — Dinkler — (2019)	10.1163/9789004379558_007	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
The Good That I Mean I Do Not Say: Meaning, Intention, Psychology and Romans 7 — Adam — (2019)	10.1163/9789004379558_012	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead
The Concept of Originality — Alamri — (2025)	10.4324/9781003586555-6	Focused search	Passed screening; another source was used instead

Could not be verified

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions — Michle Rioux et al. — (2006)	10.1017/s0940739106060218	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Creativity and Its Discontents — Laikwan Pang — (2012)	10.1215/9780822394587	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Originality in UK Copyright Law: The Old “Skill and Labour” Doctrine Under Pressure — Andreas Rahmatian — (2013)	10.1007/s40319-012-0003-4	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
The effect of author set size and data size in authorship attribution — Luyckx et al. — (2010)	10.1093/llc/fqq013	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Text and Genre in Reconstruction: Effects of Digitalization on Ideas, Behaviours, Products and Institutions — Willard McCarty — (2010)	10.11647/obp.0008	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Genre and interpretation — Auken — (2013)	10.4324/9780203962619-11	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: teaching writing in the digital age — Eisner et al. — (2008)	10.5860/choice.46-0114	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
Sign Here! : Handwriting in the Age of New Media — van Dijck et al. — (2006)	10.5117/9789053568163	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Machine Learning Methods for Stylometry — Savoy — (2020)	10.1007/978-3-030-53360-1	Focused search	Details did not match a verified record
That Wonderful Composite Called Author — (:unkn) unknown — (2014)	10.1163/9789004279421	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
‘Nothing is the same as something else’: significant properties and notions of identity and originality — Geoffrey Yeo — (2010)	10.1007/s10502-010-9119-9	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
When Copyright Law and Science Collide: Empowering Digitally Integrated Research Methods on a Global Scale — Reichman et al. — (2012)	10.24926/265535.1308	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Installation Art and the Museum: Presentation and Conservation of Changing Artworks — V.E.J.P. van Saaze — (2013)	10.26530/open_449202	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Authorship as cultural performance: new perspectives in authorship studies — Ingo Berensmeyer et al. — (2012)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
The Birth of the Authonym: Authorship, Pseudonymity, and Trademark Law — Laura A. Heymann — (2004)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
The Transition Experience to Boarding School for Male Aboriginal Secondary School Students from Regional and Remote Communities across Western Australia. — David Mander — (2012)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
Adrift in the Intertext: Authorship and Audience Recoding Rights - Comment on Robert H. Rotstein, Beyond Metaphor: Copyright Infringement and the Fiction of the Work — Keith Aoki — (1993)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Double-Edged Imitation : Theories and Practices of Pastiche in Literature — Sanna Nyqvist — (2010)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Emmanuel C. Bourbouhakis The End of ἐπίδειξις. Authorial Identity and Authorial Intention in Michael Chōniatēs' Πρὸς τοὺς αἰτιωμένους τὸ ἀφιλένδεικτον — Bourbouhakis — (2014)	10.1515/9781614515197.201	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Authorship and Text-making in Early China — Hanmo Zhang — (2018)	10.1515/9781501505133	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
The Value of New Scientific Communication Models for Chemistry — Theresa Velden et al. — (2009)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
More than the sum of the parts : shared representations in collaborative design interaction — Benjamin G. Shaw — (2007)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Biblical Exegesis without Authorial Intention? — Breu — (2019)	10.1163/9789004379558	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
The Apt Curation Model: An Epistemic Virtue Theory of AI-Assisted Authorship — Tiegue Vieira Rodrigues — (2026)	10.1007/s13347-026-01038-z	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Copyright Treatment of Freelance Work in the Digital Era — Giuseppina D'Agostino — (2002)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Intention and Interpretation: A Short History — Ralf Grüttemeier — (2022)	10.1515/9783110767858	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
Now About All These Women in the Swedish Film Industry — Wallenberg et al. — (2023)	10.5040/9781501366185	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Authoring collaborative projects : a study of intellectual property and free and open source software (FOSS) licensing schemes from a relational contract perspective — Chen Zhu — (2011)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Authorship Attribution using Tf-Idf weight with Machine Learning Approaches — Mahor et al. — (2023)	10.21203/rs.3.rs-2707585/v1	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
From owning to owning up : authorial rights and rhetorical responsibilities — Susan Thompson West — (1997)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Public Perceptions of Generative AI in Creative Industries: A Reddit-Based Text Mining Study — Bervar et al. — (2026)	10.3390/systems14010116	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
The Names of Minimalism: Authorship and the Historiography of Dispute in New York Minimalism, 1960–1982 — Patrick Nickleson — (2017)	10.3998/mpub.10207791	Focused search	Details did not match a verified record
Elena Ferrante: A Case Study in Authorship Attribution — Savoy — (2020)	10.1007/978-3-030-53360-1_8	Focused search	Details did not match a verified record
Volume 44 (2024) — (2024)	10.33675/spell/2024/44/1	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Cross-linguistic Authorship Attribution and Author Profiling. Is Machine Translation the Solution? — Mikros et al. — (2022)	10.21203/rs.3.rs-2129774/v1	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Authorial Intention and Authorial Ambition	10.2307/j.ctt3fgp8h.10	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Authorship Without an Author: Rethinking Copyright Ownership in the Age of Generative AI — Shafiq — (2026)	10.2139/ssrn.6917558	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
Generative AI in Cybersecurity: A Systematic Literature Review and Meta-Analysis — Tumpa et al. — (2026)	10.20944/preprints202604.0324.v1	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Honorary authorship is highly prevalent in health sciences: systematic review and meta-analysis of surveys — Reynders et al. — (2023)	10.21203/rs.3.rs-3321504/v1	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Review for "Trends in Equal-Contribution Authorship: A Large-Scale Bibliometric Analysis of Biomedical Literature" — (2025)	10.1162/qss.a.476/v1/review2	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Re-Defining Copyright Originality in the Age of AI: Reconciling Creativity, Labour, and Human Authorship — Odugbemi — (2026)	10.2139/ssrn.6179858	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
When AI Writes, Who Is the Author? Authorship as Governance in Generative AI — Liang — (2026)	10.2139/ssrn.6233898	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Review for "Trends in Equal-Contribution Authorship: A Large-Scale Bibliometric Analysis of Biomedical Literature" — (2025)	10.1162/qss.a.476/v2/review1	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Review for "Trends in Equal-Contribution Authorship: A Large-Scale Bibliometric Analysis of Biomedical Literature" — (2026)	10.1162/qss.a.476/v3/review1	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Review for "Trends in Equal-Contribution Authorship: A Large-Scale Bibliometric Analysis of Biomedical Literature" — (2025)	10.1162/qss.a.476/v1/review1	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Negotiated Augmentation: How Generative AI Reshapes Creative Workflows, Agency, and Authorship in Architecture and Design — Tu et al. — (2026)	10.21203/rs.3.rs-8740007/v1	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
Human Creative Control: Rethinking Authorship in the Age of Generative AI — Donahue — (2026)	10.2139/ssrn.6531938	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Generative AI and Copyright Law: Human Authorship, Originality, and Comparative Perspectives — Bozbel — (2026)	10.2139/ssrn.6313438	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Authorship Without Authors: Rethinking Copyright and Personality Rights in the Age of Generative AI — Aravindhana — (2026)	10.2139/ssrn.6081206	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Reconceptualizing Authorship and Accountability in the Age of AI: A Legal-based Theoretical Framework for AI-Generated and Mediated Communication — Towne — (2024)	10.31219/osf.io/teymn	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Prompt-Driven Conceptual Modeling: A Framework for Generative Theoretical Prototyping in the Age of AI — Wooden — (2025)	10.2139/ssrn.5469146	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Moral rights of authors in international copyright of the 21st century : time for consolidation? — Lenka Radkova — (2009)	10.14288/1.0077577	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Professional investor psychology and investment performance: evidence from mutual funds — Arman Eshraghi — (2012)	—	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP: A DOCTRINAL ANALYSIS OF AUTHORSHIP, ORIGINALITY, AND THE CRISIS OF CREATIVE ATTRIBUTION — Kotia — (2026)	10.70183/lijdlr.2026.v04.152	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Generative AI as Co-Author in Creative Practice: Authorship, Originality, and Aesthetics (2020-Present) — Nabirye H. — (2026)	10.59298/idosrjah/2025/1216575	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Generative Artificial Intelligence in Creative Writing and Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review of Authorship, Cognitive Agency, and Pedagogical Transformation (2020-2026) — Aguite Jr — (2026)	10.2139/ssrn.6611418	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Scientific Muse and Misuse: Reevaluating Authorship Attribution and Liability Allocation in the Generative AI Age — Cohen Ganot — (2026)	10.2139/ssrn.6400518	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
AI and the Death of the Academic Author: A dialectical assessment of the challenges of generative AI for the concept and practice of academic authorship — Zwart — (2026)	10.26650/bs/ah11t3.2026.002-5.01	Focused search	Identity / DOI could not be confirmed
Authorship and Literary Value — Farrell — (2017)	10.1007/978-3-319-48977-3_5	Focused search	Details did not match a verified record
5. Applying Automated Authorship Attribution to Greek Tragedy: The Case of Pr. — (2020)	10.1515/9783110687675-005	Focused search	Details did not match a verified record
Author Profiling of Tweets — Savoy — (2020)	10.1007/978-3-030-53360-1_9	Focused search	Details did not match a verified record

Source	DOI	Found via	Why
14 “The unreckoned consequences of art”: Authorial Realism in Munro, Carver, Roth, and Moore — (2023)	10.1515/9783111056166-015	Focused search	Details did not match a verified record

The Searches We Ran

The exact query variants used to build your source pool. Each angle targets a different kind of evidence; the background search widens the net for general-context sources.

Reviews & meta-analyses

(Reconceptualising Authorship in OR authorship OR the author OR authorial intention OR originality OR attribution) AND (the Age of) AND (Generative AI: A Theoretical Review OR review OR meta-analysis OR systematic review OR literature review)

Limitations & gaps

(Reconceptualising Authorship in OR authorship OR the author OR authorial intention OR originality OR attribution) AND (the Age of) AND (Generative AI: A Theoretical Review OR limitation OR challenge OR barrier OR gap OR critique OR shortcoming)

contradictory_evidence

(Reconceptualising Authorship in OR authorship OR the author OR authorial intention OR originality OR attribution) AND (the Age of) AND (Generative AI: A Theoretical Review OR no effect OR no significant OR null result OR negative effect OR mixed findings OR inconsistent OR detrimental OR adverse OR decline)

conceptual_theory

(Reconceptualising Authorship in OR authorship OR the author OR authorial intention OR originality OR attribution) AND (the Age of) AND (Generative AI: A Theoretical Review OR theory OR theoretical OR framework OR concept OR conceptual OR perspective OR critique OR argument OR philosophical)

Background / general context

(authorship the OR authorship OR the author OR authorial intention OR originality OR attribution) AND (author authorial) AND (intention originality attribution OR overview OR introduction OR background OR concept OR framework OR theory OR perspective OR state of the art)

Databases searched: crossref, openalex