AI Policy

Generative AI can be a helpful tool for legal scholarship, but it also poses certain unique risks. We aim to mitigate these risks while otherwise adopting a permissive position towards the integration of AI into the process of legal scholarship.

1. Mandatory Disclosure

At submission, authors will be asked to disclose any use of generative AI that has significantly affected the **substance**, **originality**, or **reliability** of the submission.

Authors should use their best judgment in deciding what should be disclosed as significant. For example, we do not expect authors to disclose use of AI for minor copy editing, broad background research, or aid in locating sources. However, we expect authors to disclose if AI was used for, among other uses: generating theses, arguments, or counterarguments; drafting large sections of the manuscript; or conducting empirical analysis.

At publication, we will require authors to disclose significant AI use to readers in an author footnote.

2. Acknowledgement of Responsibility

Authors are responsible for the originality, accuracy, and integrity of the full contents of their submissions, including any AI-assisted work. This responsibility includes ensuring the accuracy of claims and the proper attribution of ideas to their underlying source.[1] Citation to AI-generated material as a primary source is not acceptable.

Errors introduced through the use of AI tools will be treated analogously to those introduced through any other means and will be assessed according to SLR's existing Ethics Policy.[2] **Presence of hallucinated sources or unfaithful representation of AI sources may be grounds for rescission of acceptance**.

---

[1] *See* Mark A. Lemley & Lisa Larrimore Ouellette, *Plagiarism, Copyright, and AI*, U. CHI. L. REV. ONLINE, Oct. 24, 2025, at *21.

[2] *Article Submissions*, STAN. L. REV. (2026), https://www.stanfordlawreview.org/submissions/article-submissions/.