Transcript for Literature Searching with Artificial Intelligence
BCcampus EdTech Sandbox Series session on March 11, 2026
Facilitator: Justin Harrison
Hosts: Gwen Nguyen and Britt Dzioba

JUSTIN HARRISON:
Okay. So yes, my name is Justin Harrison, engagement and learning librarian here at the University of Victoria. And, again, I think this large number of registrants for the session is a sign that we recognize that we've entered a bit of a new world with these tools and are interested in learning a bit more about their potential usefulness. I think we in the academy are, of course, grappling with AI tools being used in the classroom, in research and writing, and teaching. In many ways, these are powerful tools, but at the same time, they raise serious questions about the appropriateness of their use given that they are opening up avenues for new ways of doing things. As Gwen signaled in her introduction, there are serious ethical questions that have appropriately, in my opinion, been raised about these tools. Everything from impeding the development of critical thinking skills of students to energy and resource drain to the social and financial priorities of those heading many of the companies that create and sell these tools. This might be a good time in this presentation to make clear that I am an AI skeptic. As a parent and as an instruction librarian whose career has been focused on information literacy, I look at these tools with a jaundiced eye or, you know, quite a skeptical eye. So I want to be clear that we're going to look at a few tools and poke about and get our hands on them. But I'm not promoting these tools. I'm not a promoter of AI. It's just at the same time, I feel that within the academy, librarians can play a leading role in discussions of these tools and their place in the post-secondary environment. What skills will our grads be expected to have around GenAI tools as they enter the workforce? What should AI literacy look like at least for students? Are there bona fide advantages or facilities offered by these tools in literature searching, you know, the focus of this session. It's thinking about how might these tools enhance our research processes in mind that I and some colleagues here at UVic have been thinking about this topic and around which we designed the workshop today that this session is based on one that we've offered at UVic, a number of times. So we'll look at a few tools that will suggest some of the facilities for literature searching that can be enhanced with GenAI. I always preface or characterize this discussion as these tools can enhance literature searching but not replace the traditional tools because they work in different ways. They're actually working with different corpuses of information. But I just think knowing a bit about what's under the hood or how these tools work helps us. So, there will be some links. Provided to a LibGuide that will have the activities for the tools that we'll look at, but I also have them on slides here. That link to the LibGuide is only if interested, it has anyway, the activities that we'll cover today as well as a few other activities for two other tools that we don't have time to look at today. I'm just going to look at the chat here. Okay, thank you. Gwen has put the link to the LibGuide in there. And as mentioned, we'll have those activities on the slide here, you don't have to go right now to it.

Gwen led us off with a nice territory acknowledgment. I'll just do my own here, to say I acknowledge and respect. the Lekwungen People, the Songhees and W̱SÁNEĆ on whose territory the university stands, and the Lekwungen and W̱SÁNEĆ Peoples whose historical

relationships with this land continue to this day. And it's kind of a little funny when I'm doing a territorial acknowledgment, recognizing the stewardship of the lands here, and then at the same time talking about AI tools that very much have an extractive nature to them, both in terms of extracting data of people that I would say is not in concert with Indigenous ways of being, but also the extractive nature on resources. The environment, water to cool down these huge data centres, the electricity draw of them. So I don't think what we're doing here today makes us heavy hitters of the draw of AI tools, but it is something to think about as well. It's another ethical, if I can put it that way, to using these tools.

So likely we all know that ChatGPT has been known to generate fake citations. Editors of academic journals have reported a rise in manuscripts containing AI-generated references that lack DOIs or traceable sources. These citations can propagate misinformation and biases and scholarly literature if not caught. A lot of these GenAI tools, the biases are based around certain publishers, open access versus behind paywalls, such as library subscriptions, for instance, how current the sources are. There could be issues of lack of diverse voices, non-English language research often doesn't make the cut in a lot of these tools, higher sighted sources, which might privilege older sources or English language sources often show up more than lesser cited sources. Just as a way of mitigating these biases to keep in mind, we should be using multiple databases and tools and using these tools definitely requires an active, intentional human review of these sources. And this is just obviously a screenshot of these concerns, making it into the academy as we're trying to surface the concerns and raise awareness of them. So it is definitely something that is going on.

So definitely worth keeping in mind as we look at the learning objectives of today's session, we will learn how to use two AI tools effectively for literature searching, how they could help us in our literature review, the literature searching aspect of the literature review. We will identify specific use cases for these tools, and we will critically evaluate the outputs of these tools, including assessing the accuracy, the relevance, the potential biases, and we'll also be able to identify limitations of using AI tools or literature reviews and literature search. Whoops. Sorry about that.

Okay, so just, by way of sort of introducing us all to what's out there. We're not going into all of these, but these are just visually, some of the logos of some of the leading tools out there. It's a big landscape. It's growing, I think, you know, when ChatGPT landed on us a few years ago, it was we in the academy started thinking, well, what does that mean for us? You know, we're grappling with issues around, you know, writing, and maybe academic integrity issues there and so on. But I think these tools like ChatGPT were really pushed on society at large. And it was only sort of after the fact, maybe a year later, where they started to recognize, Oh, the academy is its own distinct market for some of these tools and then started creating these tools for us. And the four that I am familiar with are sort of the first three listed top left, Elicit, Undermind, Consensus, and then sort of in the middle there ResearchRabbit. And today, we'll look at ResearchRabbit and Consensus. That LibGuide link also has activities for Undermind and Elicit also both interesting tools. But in the interest of time, we'll look at just the two: Consensus and ResearchRabbit. I've picked those two because they do different things just to

suggest a scope of possibilities between a few of these tools. And so yeah, so we'll be focusing on those two.

And just before we go a little further, just to understand some key distinctions between the tools like ResearchRabbit and Consensus from ChatGPT, ChatGPT, Copilot, they set themselves up as chatbots. So they're trained on the open web. They're designed to answer general questions. They may have fake sources. You may have noticed that in the past few years they've started to place sources in their answers that they didn't initially, but in response to, you know, those concerns, they will link to a source, and you'll probably notice they are web sources rather than, for instance, sources behind a paywall, a university library, academic journal subscription, for example, you won't see that in the sources list, typically. But the general point being that these chatbots are designed really for general questions and information based on the data on the open web. Whereas these research focus tools, ResearchRabbit, Consensus, they're trained specifically on academic sources, they're designed for academic research, and they use real sources. So they're not going to generate in their results sources that don't exist. They might be incomplete in the metadata they can provide or find or supply. Their summaries should be looked at carefully, but at least the sources themselves are real. So just a little distinction between those two types.

So this workshop is really called AI and Literature Searching. So if I were to, you know, break down the literature review process into these five steps, really, it's the sort of second and third box there that we're looking at. It's that moment in the literature review, where we're conducting a search for our literature and then reviewing the results and maybe trying to fill in some gaps with what we find. Can those sources lead us to additional sources? And these are the kinds of things that these tools are good for.

So in looking at those stages where AI might fit in more broadly, we might have a research question. So ideation, brainstorming with things like ChatGPT, Copilot could be used perhaps for those generating ideas, the searching and reviewing results, this is where these LLM, large language model enhanced research tools can come in handy. You would also want to use them in conjunction with traditional tools, library databases. Google Scholar as well is a useful tool that could supplement our literature searching. There are some other tools out there if you really wanted to use AI tools to enhance these stages along the way, summarizing and chatting with the sources, using a chatbot facility in some of these tools, NotebookLM and Elicit or two other tools. And then with writing and citing we're outlining, drafting, and improving our writing with chatbots if we wanted to go there. Again, I'm not promoting these ideas. I'm just trying to indicate, you know, the different facilities of some of these tools, so again, we're looking at that second bar searching and reviewing the results.

Okay. So when we go into the activities, I would suggest using your own topic, which would be fine, of course. But there are some sample research questions if you want, just to, you know, have something to search. But this is just an offering, again, and I'll just leave it on the screen here for you to read in case of interest. On a lot of these slides, there will be this QR code that will take you to that LibGuide, but you already have the URL, which probably works better on a

computer anyway if you want to follow that rather than on a phone with the QR code. But wherever you see the QR code in this presentation, it is to the LibGuide.

With that in mind, with a topic in mind, we'll first go into ResearchRabbit. So what is it? It is completely free. There is a paid version, and increasingly in hindsight, predictably, there are these sorts of layers where you can pay and get a few more bells and whistles, but certainly it's free to create an account. What it is searching, in this case, is ResearchRabbit, Semantic Scholar, Open Alex and CrossRef. These are just various collections of papers and metadata of academic sources, What ResearchRabbit is really focused on is connecting by citation, data, papers to one another. You can map visually with a map, see connections and they can lead you to other papers on a topic. You can certainly initiate a search with keywords, but ResearchRabbit, will use a semantic search, making sense of your search terms and thinking in its way of maybe related concepts or synonyms to surface some more results. It's not just keyword searching the way databases and libraries typically work or Google Scholar even would be searching your keywords for that direct match. So it's really geared to this database ResearchRabbit to navigate what's out there and discover related literature. It also increasingly, and I would say this with most of these tools that I've seen, they're trying to create an entire environment, sort of like Zotero. If you know that tool over the years, increasingly, you know, it's grown. So in ResearchRabbit, you know, you can create libraries where you save your references and you can do different things increasingly. It's not just mapping out connections to sources, but trying to be increasingly a one-stop shop for your research needs with your citations. Again, I'm not encouraging you to use it this way. I think its strength is in surfacing more citations, more references that would be useful for you on a given topic.

So at this point, if you haven't yet, go to researchrabbit.ai and it requires you to make an account. And search your topic in the search bar, then there will be a list of results, and down below on the right is a place where you could either select well, you could select an article by clicking the dot and then saying find similar or look at the references of that paper or the papers that have cited this one that you've selected, or you can select multiple ones and then see related papers.

And then this is sort of a visual of what you might see. And these are some of the questions that if you want to walk through, just take a look at the way the dots are connected, maybe pick a single article, and can you see what kind of data it shows in terms of the references. Maybe try saving it to a collection if that's of interest. You'll notice here in the top right this little rabbit popping up out of holes. Every step you go further, another rabbit hole will show up and the rabbit pops out of that. So if you want to go backwards, you can just click the back arrow here. It can become maybe visually quite a bit to take in at first blush, so we want to take our time just looking at all of these. Look at the references you're finding. Are they by quality? Are they current? I will say, and I have my notes on this, that it's really more of a discovery tool. It's not really creating there to give you a full description of the papers. So just look to see what information it's providing you and how it can lead you to other papers. You can also play around if you wish with the X and Y axis of the graph by looking at the tools if you wanted to present it in different ways. And it really defaults to open access journals. So it might not be. So

you can ask yourself, uh, I like the idea that it's promoting or facilitating open access material, but what aren't you finding? Might be a question that you could ask yourself. Again, this is in support or working in tandem with a library database. And here there was a question from Paula about whether it has access to full text of these articles or just the abstracts and references. So it doesn't have, so it'll default to the or not necessarily default, but overwhelmingly is open access material, so you'll be able to access the full text of those, but mostly just the metadata of the library's subscriptions. And in terms of giving consent, ResearchRabbit, let's see if I have any other information about that question, whether they've given their consent for their content to be used to train these tools. I suspect because ResearchRabbit is based on, I think I have it here. This information here, Semantic Scholar, Open Alex, and Crossref. Semantic Scholar has made arrangements with publishers and that's how they get their information. So whether ResearchRabbit has pushed that through to the publishers to make that arrangement, I don't know, but it's a very good question. So I will leave that question there. But yeah, is this working out for people? Are you able to create an account and get into ResearchRabbit, maybe some thumbs up if it is working or you're in the process of it? Just so I know that it's working. We'll take again, we have lots of time here. I don't know. Shall we say 15 minutes. We'll see how it goes. If there are any questions, certainly along the way, maybe put them in the chat and I'll try and address them as I can.

So Bisman has the question, What is the purpose of the X and Y axis? It just rearranges visually the presentation of the articles, so I think it defaults to the most recently published are over to the right, the most cited, up higher. And you may and Jamie has a question. There's only 10 at a time. Yeah, that is a limiting feature. You have to go to the next page to show that. I think if you were to pay for the higher level, that's the kind of thing you might get more fully. But when you get your references there, these next, you know, to see the next 10 or 20 and it only shows so many at one time of your results, if you were to click some of your results and then in the bottom right see similar, it would show you some more visually. I should also mention here on the right, so it defaults to this list view. But to my mind, it's not the most intuitive icon, but this should open up a map of the references. Yeah, the option to create notes, as one of you has said, that's part of, I think, that sort of effort for ResearchRabbit to become a more holistic space for your citations that sort of like Zotero I mentioned earlier, you can add notes to your references, and you could continue to build on your library overtime. You could imagine running a search based on, you know, a collection of sources you have there every regular interval of a few months and find more connections as newspapers get published.

Joe, so this is curious to me, Joe says the search that they did in Research Rabbit shows up in Consensus. Are they connected companies? Perhaps they're becoming that. I have seen already Consensus move towards a mapping facility. So maybe they're converging in some way, but I don't know that they're a connected company, but it's hard to keep up, but I don't know that, but they might be. It's a good question. I think other companies like this mapping feature. They're starting to bring it in. There was another one It maps that joined with ResearchRabbit. I know that they are converging around certain facilities and buying up one another. It is possible, but I don't know. Just looking at the time, maybe we'll take two more minutes just to work through and then we'll come back and I'd be curious to hear any other thoughts about

this tool. Okay. Okay, it looks like we're good to move on, but down the rabbit hole. So I guess before we move on, I'd like to open it up for any other comments over the chat or if you want to unmute about this tool. Does it seem like it could provide some help in finding literature? Do you see it useful or do you see it as just another tool with a lot of cognitive load to pick up perhaps in addition to things or are there any other reflections you have about using the tool? Well, maybe everyone's down too many rabbit holes.

BRITT DZIOBA:
Jamie had asked in the chat about how to seed.

JUSTIN:
Oh. Okay. Yeah, a seed, so you can do a search and, you know, and you could do this with a paper you were already aware of and then find, sort of, you know, by clicking on similar or so the idea is you have a seed, a paper that then will lead you to other papers. so that's the idea of seed. So use one to, you know, snowball your citations. They're using this image of seeding. And so it's just that terminology and you'll see in the visual, there is the one that is the seed has the little sort of image there suggesting that's the one that is, you know, seeding these connections, these citation connections.

Okay. Yeah. Well, how they're ranked by relevance. That's a great question. I don't know the answer to how they're ranking things exactly, but that's a good question, and that might be worth looking into. I'm sorry, I don't have the answer to that. Okay. And before moving on, I'll just reaffirm too about ResearchRabbit. As you can see, it's really sort of using citation data. It's providing the abstracts, which are the original abstracts, so they're not making that up, and really connecting via that metadata, the authors, the bibliographies, and so on, rather than providing summaries, providing key themes, connecting them. It's just sort of a visual connecting on citation basis. So it's in that way, not the grandest AI tool out there, but just I wanted to show you a bit of a spread of what's out there. And this is sort of the less creative side in that sense. Just checking in the chat here. Kate is saying, she can imagine how the citation mapping tool is compelling because just that visual representation is intuitive and so Kate can see why other tools would want to incorporate something like that. Jessica, has found that you can click and drag the circles to make the graph easier to read. Yeah, the paid, I fear that as things go along, there's more facilities with the paid version, and you'll notice in that bottom right hand corner that I keep identifying where it says similar and so on, to dive deeper if you're to open into that, it's basically an advanced search that you have to pay to access these additional filters. You can use it at this basic level for free or we can upgrade. Okay. That's Research Rabbit, and you can see for those doing research, trying to find literature, they can find something in this tool and it can act as a seed and you can find other related similar papers and expand your results that way.

Consensus we'll look at now and this works differently.

It also has this free layer. It has the so-called pro layer that you can pay for. In the free layer, you have X number of searches per month. If you want to pay to get more searches, you could

do that. It sources our Semantic Scholar, heavily Open Alex and some web crawling. It sources peer reviewed studies and also creates GenAI summaries with citations. So here, this isn't just providing actual abstracts, it's also creating some summaries for us. There is a Consensus meter for yes or no questions that tries to indicate where the evidence is leaning. So it will allow us to search. It'll surface some papers for us and it'll allow us to chat, so to speak, with those papers. Either one at a time or we can select two or three in there that we can then ask questions of commonalities or comparing or what have you. It is providing a different set of advantages, if I can put it that way.

So the link is consensus.app. It requires you to make an account. And once you've done that, you'll on the page, have a search bar here and you'll go into the Corpus. I think it defaults to all the papers if you wanted to hive it off to, you know, just medical journals because if you want to do that, you could. And once you created a library, you could search on your library of results, but this is the default. And then I've got some questions here and to follow along in the activities, just to sort of surface some questions. And again, with your own topic or one of the topics that I provided, it's really just a chance to explore this tool and what it provides us. And this is searching semantically, as well. So it's not just matching keywords. It is trying to make sense of our search and find related ideas in the papers that it is searching. I'll provide an overview of themes. And related citations of those themes of your topic for each reference, it surfaces, it generates a key takeaway summary. Those are the things that we want to look at with a skeptic eye. The thing, of course, with AI-generated summaries, we never know unless we've looked at the full thing at summarizing how accurate it is, what information might be elided in the summary and so on. But we get a list of results, and then we can query the results as well. Maybe I'll just go onto a browser to show you where that is, or it's here on the bottom here. Your presentation when you login might look different than mine. I just want to, but you'll see this. Once you get some results down below here, you can by selecting papers, you can ask a follow up question so you can chat with the paper itself as well. By creating an account, you should get access to your institution subscriptions. It's search in full text, it's able to generate that summary as you go. So in terms of the activity, follow along with these ones, but also, yeah, see, you know, chat with the references and see what kind of answers or responses it's giving you. And we'll take, again, I think we still have lots of time here, so I don't know. 15 minutes to look at this tool. And I think this one is quite powerful. And any questions that come up or any comments that you want to share with the group, again, please do share it in the chat or if you want to take off, you know, unmute yourself, that's welcome. But, I feel if I keep talking, I'll be distracting you. So I'm going to just mute myself, but happy to take any questions or comments as you have them.

Celia has a question about accessing full text from ResearchRabbit. Yeah, Research Rabbit, to my knowledge, doesn't have that facility to link out to papers that you subscribe to in your own institution. It surfaces those citations for you, but then you'd want to go into the library's database to access it because Celia's finding that they couldn't know, access the article. And I think that is a known thing with research. I don't know that it's a glitch, but they just haven't built in that structure to default with easy proxy or what have you to let you into your

institution subscriptions. Yeah, thanks, Celia for that comment. I think that's good for us to hear that it's somewhat similar to Elicit, but that this Consensus may do a bit more.

So far, Hannah feels this Consensus is the preferred tool. The results based on the same query used for research, Rabbit yielded more relevant sources, I guess, here in Consensus, and the generated summaries are interesting. Yeah. And in some workshops we've given at UVic, students have done that where they, you know, in one case, some grad students did searches, and in one of the tools, they recognized the sources as ones familiar to them, which was affirming in a way. And in another tool, they found things that they hadn't found, which in a different way is affirming. But yeah, they do different things.

And just looking at the chat again. Bisman, if you go in filters, you can also choose the method of research and other options to choose from. Yeah. So things like research methods, so they break down certain categories, and that's where again, look at that critically, not negatively, but questioning how accurate they are. But yeah. This is providing much more information than just that visual map, the way the other tool did. So again, trying to provide as best I can with two tools, a sense of a range.

So just now, I'd love to hear your takeaways to share with everyone. What did you think of either of these tools? Some thoughts were already shared, but if there are others, you know, do you have any thoughts on the strengths or limits of each one? Excuse me, or the quality or the reliability or the comprehensiveness or the usefulness, is it more cognitive load to make sense of the space? Any thoughts or key takeaways?

All right. So far, Jamie and one or two others now, definitely feeling Consensus is a lot more relevant or at least bringing back more relevant research. Right. Yeah. And Bisman, your comment about Consensus has sort of a wider approach with more elements to focus on. Yeah. ResearchRabbit is in that way. It's a great neat little tool to chain or link or map citation connections. But in that sense, it's kind of a one-trick pony. I don't want to, you know, be too sort of simple in my comment, but, you know, it kind of does that thing whereas Consensus is identifying, you can chat with it. It raises summaries, key themes, you know, what's the research method used and so on.

And just reading another comment, I might introduce students in a research methods course to ResearchRabbit when looking at, when looking at LR, as it is focused, which is good and move to Consensus perhaps at a later stage. I'm not sure what LR is, but definitely the idea of introducing ResearchRabbit early on as a tool to surface, discover more references, and then Consensus as a much more complex tool later once students have had a chance to maybe, you know, interact with citations, sources, academic scholarship a bit more that they can maybe bring a more critical eye to what they're finding and being provided in Consensus, a literature review. Okay, thank you. Yeah.

Gwen makes an interesting comment. Also leaning towards Consensus, but I dislike getting a lit review suggestion. They put lit review and I think observational study is another way they try

and signal what kind of study it is. Those very generic categories I would handle with care. That's the kind of thing that this tool does. I'm not confident it has the nuance to offer a whole lot of value added in that sense. Yeah, you can see where it's going and what it's trying to provide. The cost of the full Consensus, I don't know. Great question. I'm not at the stage where I'm interested in subscribing to these, so I don't know, but it is a good question. Yeah. And so it would certainly be available to find.

Okay, just looking at the time, 11:05. So I have some other slides to get back to. But just in the interest of time, I introduced, you know, we use these two tools. Elicit was mentioned in the chat earlier. That's another tool, and it's on that LibGuide for some activities similar to what we've been doing today. And the other one is Undermind, and it's actually my personal favourite, and I use that word advisedly, again, I'm an AI skeptic, so I'm not someone jumping in embracing the use it has to be for me in conjunction with our critical thinking skills, you know, and what is what are in these tools? What am I not getting access to, and so on, and many other questions we could raise. But Undermind as far as tools go, is an interesting one as well. And the reason I didn't include it here. And Gwen has put the pricing information for Consensus in the chat. Thank you. But Undermind takes a long time. It actually is asking you as you do a search, you type in a search and then it'll perform basically what a librarian would know as a reference interview. It tries to narrow down your exact question and what kind of topics, what kind of population of the studies are interested in or what have you. It's this whole process takes a few minutes to refine the question in Undermind. And then it runs through several steps to generate a very full report for you. But that whole process takes about 10 minutes, so I didn't want to do it here, but I mentioned it in case you're interested in these tools. Undermind, in my opinion, would be the next one that you might want to look at. Again, it is more involved and takes more time for a session like this, we can't do it. But again, that would be my recommendation for the next tool to look at. Okay, thank you for your comments.

And just to emphasize a few other points here. So, you know, these tools, We want to imagine them differently than library databases. Traditional literature indexes, library databases, they're curated collections of millions of bibliographic records of articles, books, et cetera. I'm imagining University of Victoria, but, comparable universities or post-secondary institutions, or libraries, and these collections are paid for by our subscriptions, and they tend to work by searching for keywords or controlled vocabulary terms like subject headings, so that's what the search results are based on, and traditional databases rank these research results based on the frequency of keyword matching. And so it does allow for a very high degree of control, transparency, and accuracy in our searching. I will mention that some of these databases, and again, I've got my librarian hat on with these comments. A lot of these traditional indexes do have already a degree of AI in them, you know, even in such things as, you know, sorting of relevancy in algorithms. How close together are our search terms? Are they in the title? Are they in the abstract? Where in the catalog record are they showing? There are those kinds of things. If you're familiar with an EBSCO host database, you'll be typing in a search and it'll prompt you with search terms based on that. There are these, if I can put it this way, this low-level use of AI already in these tools in the databases. And some of these tools like EPSCO databases, Web of Science, do have other more advanced AI tools that they are starting to

promote. We at UVic don't subscribe to them, but they may start showing up in the databases in the future at various institutions. These tools that we've looked at today, they operate fundamentally differently. They're trained on massive datasets of text. But at least unlike ChatGPT as mentioned, these two tools, they're working with academic papers. They're not working with the entire internet, so they're typically interpreting and more so Consensus than ResearchRabbit here just because there's more data or the tool to work with. There's a semantic analysis with our search. So it's interpreting the meaning or the structure of the text input that we've created, our search, whatever we've put in, it's interpreting that, and it's interpreting that with meaning and trying to match it with papers from the dataset. definitely not keyword matching the way in the traditional databases. And the abstractive summarizations that we've seen in Consensus, they're obviously meant to capture key ideas of the source document, but there are going to be potentially whole passages of articles not represented in those summaries. The generative chat bot of Consensus, obviously meant to mimic human conversation the way ChatGPT is trying to, that's anyway, an interesting feature there.

So when using these tools, it's important to think critically, definitely always do that. Always question and verify the output of the sources under question the sources that are underlying the outputs that are being provided to you. So the data being provided is only as good as the data that these tools have been able to build their results on. So that's key to keep in the back of our minds. So we're asking ourselves, are we finding sources on our topic? Okay, that we can sort of maybe see fairly quickly. But are these a complete list of results? So I can tell you they're not definitely used in conjunction with if you have access to UBC, UVic, SFU, et cetera, their library collections are much larger. So definitely use in conjunction with those other library tools. What the level of detail of relevant information is. That might be a thing, it's surfaced some citations, but how useful is the data that I'm being provided? So you're giving me a map in ResearchRabbit, let's say, but maybe they don't have the complete abstract that I can't even look at. Can I do better with Google Scholar? Can I do better in my library's databases? You do want to ask yourselves, is this providing some value added? And where are the sources coming from? Are they current and those other considerations, I mentioned earlier, you know, not if it's not in the English language, how current? What are the sources? So just some things to keep in mind when you're evaluating the reliability of these sources.

And also, as was mentioned, certainly with ResearchRabbit, you know, in my example, we have this “get this @ UVic," and if you're affiliated with some other post-secondary institutions, you'll have something similar where you can click next to a reference in a database search result page, and that software basically is looking up your institution subscription to that particular citation. Do you have it or not? I'll take you to it. So ResearchRabbit running into those paywalls, it's not letting you through. That's one limitation. Again, struggling with under documented subjects. The lack of transparency and reproducibility is a thing whereas in the databases of the library. You can recreate that search quite easily because it's keyword based here, as new papers are being added all the time. They don't tell us much about that, but they sort of boast, "X number of million of sources and growing ,” suggesting there's more all the time. So the same search might lead to different results. And just the risk of generating biases

in our search can be a concern. I recommend that you not use GenAI as a single source of literature searching, it's got to be that complement with training data cut-offs that we don't know about what isn't in these tools in their training data, we don't really know. They don't tell us. So keep that in mind that even on certain topics, you might not be getting what the library has. So yeah, you and certainly your research projects matters, so do think about that.

And just in terms of some other considerations for ethical use, I would say, consider the impact of using the tool on academic and research integrity. And this is my view as a reference librarian, perhaps, in my opinion, where one finds a source, a reference to use in their research doesn't... I'm totally agnostic about that, whether a friend gave you that citation or you found it in a bibliography of a printed article, or you found it in a search, it's what you do with that reference that matters more than where you found it. So just being mindful of the limitations of the tools, how far can you use this tool and still retain your integrity as a researcher and the academic integrity. With these tools that are surfacing citations, there's not a concern with academic integrity there in terms of finding these sources. It would be more if you were using their summaries in your research, without, you know, acknowledging that and so on. So that's why I see these tools as enhancements or sitting side by side a bit with the library databases. These are other tools to surface references for us. So just some other concerns, I've mentioned the environmental impacts of these tools and as I see it, an overall kind of extractive nature of, you know, grabbing information from authors without their consent. That is, I know a number of faculty members here at UVic who have that concern as authors. So that is another consideration as well.

You should be aware that if you're looking for guidance, if you're applying for grants from the Tri-Agency, they provide guidance on the use of artificial intelligence for grant applications and the evaluation of grant applications. So there is information that they have provided. And what I'm seeing and I don't know, maybe many of you have experienced this already or seen this, but increasingly publishers have stated policies around AI use, often, increasingly, it seems to me, requiring an AI acknowledgment. And here is just a quote I pulled from Elsevier's policy. "Ultimately, authors are responsible and accountable for the contents of their work. This includes accountability for... carefully reviewing and verifying the accuracy, comprehensiveness, and impartiality of all AI-generated output." So I've seen standard AI acknowledgments by journals saying, you know, with fixed language that you as the author, you use one of two, one saying, I do acknowledge AI was used in the generation of writing and or editing of this paper, or I acknowledge there was no use of AI tools. So I think publishers, too, are trying to navigate this still new world, and evolving world. And again, here, using these tools, we found references, we found sources, I personally would see that, as I said, pretty agnostically, it's, you know, where you find where someone finds a reference is not really the issue. It's what we do with it. So just to be mindful there of why we're using these tools, how far we're taking the tools in our own research. But as we can see by the publishers and You know, agencies, SSHRC and SSHRC, et cetera. It's sort of an evolving landscape, what are, you know, where are the boundaries of the use of these tools. I think they're more concerned, my take is they're more concerned with ChatGPT, Copilot, generating writing outputs more than search tools finding references. So that's one thing I would leave you with there.

And so this is my last slide, and I see there still about eight more minutes. So I would just, I guess here, open it up for any further questions or reflections, and I've been maybe negligent about the chat here. I see there are some in here, so I'll just see what is here.

And Jamie suggests a course being offered at UVic Continuing Studies. Highly recommends it. Okay, that's good. I hadn't heard of it, myself, so I will look into that.

Candice, clarification Undermind with D at the end instead of E. But it's just another tool that we can use that I would say it's more robust. It provides a deep report of the key themes and of the papers that it provides. It is a much more involved process to ask the question because it really wants to clarify the question and has about six or seven or eight follow up questions narrowing your question and then it runs through all these processes that takes about 7 or 8 minutes to then produce that report, but it's very comprehensive.

And Joe says, I never acknowledged the help of librarians on anything I wrote. Why should using the research assistant powered by artificial intelligence be any different? Yeah. Great point. And that's one I would tend to agree with, that where one finds references. I mean, there could be any number of ways that a researcher could do that successfully. So again, these are just tools to find our literature, And so I think we're all good with using these. Yeah.

But yeah, I hope that was useful just as a kind introduction to these two tools, and I'm still trying to stay on top of these new tools, but there's only so much bandwidth I want to give to learning new tools. But these four that are on that LibGuide are the four that I would suggest. And in doing these two Consensus and ResearchRabbit, I can see how, you know, in agreement with the comments, Consensus is a much broader and deeper tool and sort of makes potentially ResearchRabbit look a little sort of simplistic in its way, but it's just trying to do a different thing. So I think as we all discover these tools, I think it's maybe hopefully useful to keep in mind the range of what's out there. Yeah. Okay. Well, thank you for your feedback and your thoughts and your thank yous and thank you for your time. And it's great to be here with you all.