JQD Policy on Submissions Involving Large Language Models (LLMs)

The Journal of Quantitative Description: Digital Media welcomes descriptive research that investigates how people use large language models (LLMs), and how LLMs are used in digital media contexts or as a form of digital media. We do not publish studies aimed at understanding LLMs as technical systems or models.

Scope and Relevance

We are interested in quantitative descriptions of how LLMs are *used, experienced,* or *integrated into digital communication environments*. Relevant topics may include, but are not limited to:

- Patterns of LLM usage on social platforms, in content creation, or in communication workflows (more broadly, survey data about how people are using LLMs).
- Descriptions of user behavior when interacting with LLM-based tools (e.g., analyses of observational data from user engagement with chatbots, AI companions, writing assistants, or search engines).
- Or, conversely, *user-based* descriptions of the output of LLMs as a form of digital media, e.g. trace data studies of the media content produced by LLMs in response to actual user inputs.
- Quantitative analyses of LLM-generated content *in the wild*, when the research goal is to describe how such content is being adopted, circulated, or perceived.
- LLM "audits" will only be considered if they have a significant cross-model or (ideally) geographical or over-time component. That is, there must be some *real world* variation of interest. This Google Search audit is an example of a minimal variation we might consider for an LLM audit: https://journalqd.org/article/view/2752

Out of Scope

We do **not** consider submissions that:

- Aim to evaluate or improve the architecture, training, or performance of LLMs.
- Treat the output of LLMs as representing public opinion or human behavior.
- Study LLMs primarily as computational systems rather than as tools used by people.

Methodological Criteria

Consistent with our journal's mission, all studies must be:

- **Descriptive**: As always, we do not publish research asking causal questions.
- **Transparent**: Authors must clearly report how LLMs were used in the research process — including prompts, model version, data collection, and output sampling procedures. In

writing up this information, you may wish to consider the replication suggestions in [ARR's Responsible NLP Research Checklist](#) or [ICWSM's Paper Checklist](#), both of which contain sections on ensuring replicability.

- **Focused on human contexts**: If LLMs are used as tools for coding or classification, this use must be justified and documented; the focus of the research should still be on human behavior or content patterns.

Ethical Considerations

Submissions must reflect responsible and transparent AI usage, including:

- Disclosure of how LLMs were used (as data sources, analytical tools, or interaction partners).
- Attention to ethical considerations and potential biases introduced by automated content generation or analysis.

For Reviewers

- Reviews generated by passing a manuscript to an LLM are strictly prohibited.
- We generally discourage reviewers from using LLMs to polish their language. We acknowledge their usefulness for non-native speakers but emphasize that the substantive content must regardless come from the reviewer. We'd rather have concrete bullet points than beautifully polished paragraphs.
- If you use AI to polish your language, please say so explicitly in the comments for the editor.