

# ChatGPT as Linguistic Equalizer? Quantifying LLM-Driven Lexical Shifts in Academic Writing

Dingkang Lin\*, Naixuan Zhao\*, Dan Tian\*\* and Jiang Li\*

\*652023140004@smail.nju.edu.cn; 502024140049@smail.nju.edu.cn; lijiang@nju.edu.cn

0000-0001-7275-8118; 0009-0008-6649-5129; 0000-0001-5769-8647

School of Information Management, Nanjing University, Nanjing, China, 210032

\*\* dan\_tian@sxu.edu.cn

0000-0003-1980-8467

School of Economics and Management, Shanxi University, Taiyuan, China, 030031

The advent of ChatGPT has profoundly reshaped scientific research practices, particularly in academic writing, where non-native English-speakers (NNES) historically face linguistic barriers. This study investigates whether ChatGPT mitigates these barriers and fosters equity by analyzing lexical complexity shifts across 2.8 million articles from OpenAlex (2020–2024). Using the Measure of Textual Lexical Diversity (MTLD) to quantify vocabulary sophistication and a difference-in-differences (DID) design to identify causal effects, we demonstrate that ChatGPT significantly enhances lexical complexity in NNES-authored abstracts, even after controlling for article-level controls, authorship patterns, and venue norms. Notably, the impact is most pronounced in preprint papers, technology- and biology-related fields and lower-tier journals. These findings provide causal evidence that ChatGPT reduces linguistic disparities and promotes equity in global academia.

## 1. Introduction

The advent of large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT has catalyzed a paradigm shift comparable to the invention of the printing press—rewriting the rules of knowledge production. Since its November 2022 release, LLMs have been extensively utilized in text composition (Liang et al., 2024; Salih et al., 2025), literature review writing (Arif et al., 2023), experimental design and data processing (Bucaioni et al., 2024; Burger et al., 2023), and hypothesis testing and result analysis (Park et al., 2024), fundamentally altering academic workflows. This transformation is particularly seismic in academic writing. Empirical evidence demonstrates that ChatGPT reduces writing time by 40% while enhancing output quality by 18% (Noy & Zhang, 2023), effectively compressing months of drafting into days.

English, the de facto language of science, governs 92.50% of SCIE-indexed publications (Liu, 2017) despite more than half of the authors being Non-Native English Speakers (NNES) (Kourilova-Urbanczik, 2012). This linguistic hegemony creates systemic disadvantages: NNES researchers invest significantly more time in literature review, writing, and presentations (Amano et al., 2023), yet face 2.5 times higher rejection rates compared to Native English Speakers (NES) due to language barriers (Lenharo, 2023). Paradoxically, scientists from underrepresented ethnic groups disproportionately produce more novel research (Hofstra et al., 2020), and multiethnic collaborations generate studies with greater academic impact (AlShebli et al., 2018). However, NNES researchers reap fewer academic rewards, such as reputational gains or career advancements (Hofstra et al., 2020). English as the universal academic language inherently entrenches inequality between NNES and NES scholars, where NNES contributors invest more but receive less.

Will ChatGPT help reduce language barriers for NNES and promote equity in science? On one hand, studies have examined ChatGPT’s linguistic impacts on academic writing (Berdejo-Espinola & Amano, 2023). Tools have been developed to detect LLM-generated text (Akram, 2024), and research has explored ChatGPT’s varying adoption rates across disciplines,

finding higher usage in STEM fields like computer science (Cheng et al., 2024; Liang et al., 2024; Picazo-Sanchez & Ortiz-Martin, 2024), alongside distinctive stylistic patterns such as increased frequencies of words like *delves*, *crucial*, *pivotal*, and *intricate* (Kobak et al., 2024; Liang et al., 2024). On the other hand, research on linguistic differences between NNEs and NES is also relevant. These differences may include disparities in lexical complexity (Lu et al., 2019; McCarthy & Jarvis, 2010), syntactic complexity (Jagaiah et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2019; Lu, 2010; Vajjala & Meurers, 2012; Zheng & Barrot, 2024), phraseology (Bergsma et al., 2012; Tsvetkov et al., 2013), and fluency or grammatical errors (Chandler, 2003; Nisioi, 2015; Skehan, 2009; Tabari, 2016). However, few studies have investigated whether LLMs narrow or widen the academic writing gap between NNEs and NES scientists. For instance, (Liu & Bu, 2024) found that NES researchers use LLM-generated content less frequently.

This study pioneers a large-scale causal analysis of how ChatGPT reshapes NNEs' writing sophistication across 2.8 million publications from OpenAlex. Leveraging MTLD lexical diversity metrics as a measure of writing complexity, we employ a difference-in-differences design comparing Chinese-affiliated NNEs researchers with Anglophone controls. We provide causal evidence that ChatGPT enhances the lexical complexity of NNEs' academic writing, helping NNEs researchers overcome language barriers and promoting linguistic equity in academic writing.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Data collection and processing

To investigate whether ChatGPT's emergence impacted lexical complexity in NNEs' writing, we employed a quasi-experimental design comparing pre- and post-ChatGPT periods. By analyzing OpenAlex article abstracts and stratifying authors into treatment (NNEs) and control (NES) groups, we isolate demographic-specific lexical patterns while controlling for journal and author biases. This approach allows us to quantify ChatGPT-era shifts in lexical complexity attributable to non-native writing adaptation.

We retrieved all journal articles and conference proceedings published between January 1, 2020, and November 1, 2024, from the OpenAlex database. The corpus was filtered to include English-language publications with at least one author and a valid abstract.

Ethnicseer was prioritized for ethnicity detection due to its proven efficacy in bibliographic metadata analysis. This name-based classification tool (Treeratpituk & Giles, 2021) achieved 85% accuracy, with validation against computer science bibliographies demonstrating 99% precision and 89% recall – a critical advantage for processing OpenAlex's multidisciplinary corpus. We focused on two ethnic categories: Chinese (treatment group) and English (control groups), defined as:

- ⑩ Treatment group (NNEs): Articles with all authors ethnically Chinese and affiliated with Chinese institutions.
- ⑩ Control groups (NES): Articles with all authors ethnically English with U.S. or UK institutional affiliations.

We analyzed lexical complexity using MTLD (Measure of Textual Lexical Diversity), a widely adopted metric that overcomes the limitations of Type-Token Ratio (TTR). While TTR quantifies lexical diversity as the ratio of unique words to total words, it is heavily biased by text length (e.g., shorter texts artificially inflate TTR) (McCarthy & Jarvis, 2010). MTLD resolves this by calculating the average span of text required to reach a predefined TTR threshold (here, 0.72), thereby providing length-robust estimates of lexical sophistication. Its prevalence in applied linguistics and computational text analysis (Zenker &

Kyle, 2021) makes MTLT a standard tool for comparing cross-lingual and cross-author writing complexity.

The final dataset included 2,801,218 articles after applying ethnic and institutional filters. To control for disciplinary variation, we incorporated 2020 Journal Citation Reports (JCR) quartiles for 9,542 journals.

## *2.2 Variable construction*

All variables are defined at the article level.

**CN** is the treatment indicator which takes the value of 1 when all authors are ethnically Chinese with Chinese institutional affiliations, and 0 when articles with all authors ethnically English with U.S. or UK institutional affiliations.

**PostGPT** marks the post-ChatGPT period in our difference-in-differences framework. This indicator variable takes the value 1 for articles published in 2024, and 0 for those published between 2020 and 2023. The 2024 cutoff accounts for the typical 12-month publication lag in academic publishing following ChatGPT's November 2022 release and subsequent widespread adoption by March 2023.

**MTLD** serves as our primary outcome measure of lexical complexity. This continuous variable calculates the Measure of Textual Lexical Diversity for each article's abstract, using the standard threshold value of 0.72.

**Citation** counts track each article's academic impact. This variable records the total number of citations received by each paper as of November 1, 2024, providing a control for article visibility and influence.

**Number of authors** controls for collaboration effects. This count variable simply records how many authors contributed to each publication, accounting for potential differences in writing complexity between single-author and multi-author works.

**Is\_oa** is a binary variable indicating whether an article was published as Open Access (1) or behind paywalls (0), controlling for potential differences in audience targeting.

**Number of sentences** measures how many sentences appear in each abstract.

**JCR quartile** assigns each journal to quartiles 1 through 4 based on 2020 Journal Citation report, using the highest quartile for journals classified in multiple disciplines to avoid underestimating interdisciplinary work.

**Year** (fixed effect) accounts for temporal trends. Dummy variables for each publication year between 2020 and 2024 control for broader temporal changes in academic writing conventions.

**Journal** (fixed effect) addresses venue-specific practices. Unique identifiers for each publication venue control for differences in editorial standards and disciplinary norms across journals.

**Author** (fixed effect) captures individual writing styles. We use first authors' id as Author identifier. The first author's unique identifier helps account for consistent patterns in individual scholars' writing behaviours across their publications.

## *2.3 Models*

We employ a difference-in-differences (DID) framework to estimate the causal effect of ChatGPT's emergence on lexical complexity in non-native English academic writing. The

analysis uses two complementary model specifications to capture different dimensions of the treatment effect.

**Journal-Year Level Analysis.** The first model examines effects at the journal-year level using ordinary least squares (OLS) estimation:

$$Y_{jit} = \alpha + \beta_1 CN_i \times PostGPT_t + \beta_2 CN_i + \eta X_i + Year_t + Journal_j + e_{jit}. \quad (1)$$

In this specification,  $Y_{jit}$  represents the MTLTD lexical complexity score for article  $i$  published in journal  $j$  during year  $t$ . The key treatment indicator  $CN_i$  equals 1 for articles where all authors are Chinese-affiliated NNES scholars, and 0 for NES control groups. The post-period indicator  $PostGPT_t$  takes the value 1 for publications in 2024 (the ChatGPT adoption period) and 0 otherwise. The coefficient  $\beta_1$  captures our primary parameter of interest, which is the differential change in lexical complexity for NNES scholars following ChatGPT's introduction. The model controls for article-level covariates  $X_i$  (citation counts, author numbers, open access status, and sentence counts) while including  $Year$  and  $Journal$  fixed effects to account for temporal trends and publication venue characteristics. The treatment units consist of all NNES articles published in journal  $j$  during year  $t$ , compared against NES articles in the same journal-year contexts.

**Author-Year Level Analysis.** The second specification analyzes effects at the author-year level:

$$Y_{ait} = \alpha + \beta_1 CN_i \times PostGPT_t + \beta_2 CN_i + \eta X_i + Year_t + Author_a + e_{ait}. \quad (2)$$

Here,  $Y_{ait}$  measures lexical complexity for article  $i$  written by author  $a$  in year  $t$ . This model replaces  $Journal$  fixed effects with  $Author$  fixed effects to control for individual writing style persistence. The treatment group comprises all articles published by NNES author  $a$  in year  $t$ , compared against publications by NES authors during the same years. This specification helps isolate ChatGPT's effect on individual writing patterns while accounting for author-level heterogeneity.

**Event Study Analysis.** We complement the main DID models with event study specifications to examine dynamic treatment effects:

$$Y_{jit} = \alpha + \sum_t \beta_t CN_i \times Year_t + \beta_2 CN_i + \eta X_i + Year_t + Journal_j + e_{jit}. \quad (3)$$

$$Y_{ait} = \alpha + \sum_t \beta_t CN_i \times Year_t + \beta_2 CN_i + \eta X_i + Year_t + Author_a + e_{ait}. \quad (4)$$

These models replace the single post-period indicator with year-specific interaction terms ( $t = 2020, 2021, 2022$  or  $2024$ ), using 2023 as the baseline year before ChatGPT's widespread adoption. The coefficients  $\beta_t$  trace the evolution of treatment effects over time.

### 3. Result

#### 3.1 Statistics

The descriptive statistics presented in Table 1 reveal substantial differences between the treatment group (Chinese-affiliated NNES scholars) and control groups (NES scholars in US and UK). The control groups exhibit markedly smaller sample sizes, with 369,546 articles, compared to 2,470,714 articles in the treatment group. This disparity stems from the ethnic diversity of US research teams and the prevalence of international collaborations in US and UK contexts, which reduce the pool of articles authored exclusively by English-ethnicity scholars. Structural comparisons show that NNES articles feature significantly larger research teams, averaging 5.53 authors per paper versus 1.74 in control groups, alongside shorter abstracts. Despite lower Open Access rates, NNES articles demonstrate higher mean citation counts and journal rankings, with average JCR quartiles of 1.68 versus 1.94 for controls.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Article Characteristics by Author Group: NNES vs. NES Scholars.

Variable	Count	Mean	Std	Min	25%	50%	75%	max
NNES (Chinese)								
No. author	2470714	5.53	3.00	1	3	5	7	182
Citation	2470714	8.02	50.46	0	0	2	8	47625
JCR Quartile	1588755	1.68	0.89	1	1	1	2	4
Is_oa	2470714	0.46	0.50	0	0	0	1	1
No. words	2470714	129.45	63.59	0	101	128	154	2573
No. sentence	2470714	2.05	1.50	1	1	2	3	93
Year	2470714	2022.06	1.33	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
MTLD	2470714	14.63	2.82	0	14.23	14.53	14.83	343.00
NES (English)								
No. author	330504	1.74	1.23	1	1	1	2	17
Citation	330504	4.07	20.03	0	0	0	3	3827
JCR Quartile	133335	1.94	0.99	1	2	3	4	4
Is_oa	330504	0.53	0.50	0	0	1	1	1
No. words	330504	135.75	135.03	0	79	117	159	3532
No. sentence	330504	2.13	2.45	1	1	1	2	202
Year	330504	2021.68	1.36	2020	2020	2022	2023	2024
MTLD	330504	14.41	0.95	0	14.09	14.42	14.74	71.68

Figure 1 illustrates the temporal evolution of lexical complexity, measured by MTLD percentile ranks across groups. Prior to 2024, both NNES and NES articles exhibited parallel trajectories in lexical complexity, with NNES abstracts maintaining a consistent 5 percentile advantage. This pattern diverged sharply in 2024, coinciding with the widespread adoption of ChatGPT in academic writing workflows. NNES abstracts surged to a 15.4-percentile lead over controls, reflecting a 3.1-percentile increase from 2023 levels, while NES abstracts showed minimal change. The abrupt acceleration in NNES lexical complexity aligns temporally with ChatGPT's integration into research practices, contrasting with the stability observed in NES cohorts. These patterns suggest a differential response to language model tools between NNES and NES.




Figure 1. Mean MTLD Percentiles by Group and Publication Year (2020–2024).

### 3.2 Main regression

The results in Table 2 consistently show that ChatGPT's introduction significantly increased lexical complexity in NNES' academic writing. Across progressively controlled models, the interaction term  $CN \times PostGPT$  remains positive and statistically significant, with coefficients ranging from 0.050 to 0.077 ( $p < 0.05$  to  $p < 0.001$ ). The effect strengthens when accounting for journal quality tiers (Column 3,  $\beta = 0.059$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and peaks under journal fixed effects (Column 4,  $\beta = 0.062$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), confirming that NNES scholars elevated complexity within the same journals post-ChatGPT. Even with author-level controls (Column 5), the effect persists ( $\beta = 0.077$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), though the unstable main CN coefficient suggests collinearity between author fixed effects.

Robustness tests further validate these findings. The combined model (Column 6) retains significance ( $\beta = 0.064$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) with maximal explanatory power ( $R^2 = 0.709$ ), demonstrating that ChatGPT's impact transcends both journal-specific norms and individual writing habits. Sample size variations (e.g., Column 3's 1.7M observations) and control variable adjustments do not diminish the core result, underscoring the systematic nature of NNES' adaptation to language model tools.

Table 2. Multi-Model DID Estimates of ChatGPT Effects on Non-Native Academic Writing

Variables	MTLD					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$CN \times PostGPT$	0.052* (0.013)	0.059** (0.012)	0.050** (0.011)	0.062*** (0.007)	0.077** (0.013)	0.064** (0.012)
$CN$	0.212*** (0.013)	0.201*** (0.018)	0.095** (0.016)	0.188*** (0.011)	-3.483 (154335)	0.215 (10237)
<i>Control Variables</i>		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<i>Year FE</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<i>JCR Quartile FE</i>			Y			
<i>Journal FE</i>				Y		Y
<i>Author FE</i>					Y	Y
<i>Number of Journals</i>				30918		30918

<i>Number of Authors</i>					1326003	1326003
<i>Number of ob.</i>	2801227	2801227	1722098	2801227	2801227	2801227
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.001	0.001	0.007	0.131	0.671	0.709

Notes. \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ .

### 3.3 Event study

Figure 2 presents the dynamic treatment effects from event study analyses at both journal (Panel a) and author levels (Panel b). The results validate the parallel trends assumption, with pre-2023 coefficient estimates for both specifications closely aligned around zero. The pre-treatment trends contrast sharply with the 2024 effect surge (Journal:  $\beta = 0.052$ , [0.040, 0.067]; Author:  $\beta = 0.058$ , [0.042, 0.064]), confirming ChatGPT's causal impact rather than pre-existing divergence.

While 2023 is set as the reference year in our models, the negative coefficients for 2021–2022 (relative to 2023) reflect an artifact of early LLM adoption dynamics. Specifically, a subset of articles published in 2023 likely underwent accelerated editorial workflows: manuscripts drafted with ChatGPT assistance shortly after its November 2022 release could have been submitted and accepted within months, appearing in 2023 publications. This partial-year treatment effect—confined to late 2023 outputs—creates an artificial elevation in the 2023 baseline, making pre-ChatGPT years (2021–2022) appear negatively divergent. Thus, 2023 publications represent a mix of pre- and post-LLM writing practices, whereas 2024 outputs more comprehensively reflect ChatGPT-integrated workflows. The symmetrical rebound in 2024 estimates across both specifications demonstrates the effect's scalability across analytical units.




Figure 2. Event Study of ChatGPT's Impact on Non-Native Academic Writing (2020–2024) at (a) Journal level and (b) Author level.

### 3.4 Robustness check and heterogeneity analysis

**Preprint Robustness Analysis.** The preprint analysis (Table 3) confirms the robustness of ChatGPT's lexical complexity effects while revealing critical differences from published literature. Column (1) shows a baseline coefficient of 0.380 ( $p < 0.001$ ) for  $CN \times PostGPT$ —over five times larger than the journal and conference article estimates (0.064–0.077 in Table 2). This amplification likely reflects two potential mechanisms: (1) preprints' faster adoption cycle (no peer review) enabled earlier and more extensive LLM use, and (2) authors may

apply ChatGPT more liberally in preprints before editors/reviewers curtail stylistic experimentation in published versions.

The attenuation pattern under author fixed effects (Column 5:  $\beta=0.172$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) mirrors our main findings but with greater magnitude reduction. This heightened sensitivity arises because in our preprint datasets, there are 148,626 observations with 118,577 different first authors. Therefore, individual writing habits (captured by author FE) explain 90.8% of variance ( $R^2=0.908$ ), leaving limited residual variation for treatment effects. Nevertheless, the persistent significance ( $p<0.05$ ) confirms that even within-author comparisons show measurable LLM-driven complexity gains, strengthening causal inference.

Table 3. Preprint Robustness Tests

Variables	MTLD		
	(1)	(2)	(5)
<i>CN×PostGPT</i>	0.380*** (0.024)	0.372*** (0.021)	0.172* (0.041)
<i>CN</i>	0.115** (0.024)	0.066* (0.021)	-0.644 (2073.371)
<i>Control Variables</i>		Y	Y
<i>Year FE</i>	Y	Y	Y
<i>Author FE</i>			Y
<i>Number of Authors</i>			118577
<i>Number of ob.</i>	148626	148626	148626
<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.02	0.029	0.908

Notes. \*\*\*  $p<0.001$ , \*\*  $p<0.01$ , \*  $p<0.05$ .

**Journal Tier Heterogeneity.** To assess variation across journal quality tiers, we consolidated JCR Quartiles 2–4 due to smaller sample sizes in lower tiers. Table 4 reveals that ChatGPT’s complexity-enhancing effect on NNES writing is stronger in lower-tier journals (Q2–Q4:  $\beta=0.111$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) compared to top-tier Q1 journals ( $\beta=0.067$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). This pattern suggests that higher-quality journals exhibit smaller treatment effects, potentially because their stringent editorial standards already constrain lexical variation, whereas Lower-tier journals may have experienced greater gains due to their initially lower baseline levels of lexical complexity.

Table 4. Heterogeneous Effects by Journal Tier (JCR Quartiles)

Variables JCR Quartile	MTLD	
	Q1 (1)	Q2+Q3+Q4 (2)
<i>CN×PostGPT</i>	0.067*** (0.008)	0.111** (0.022)
<i>CN</i>	0.144 (6241.719)	0.118 (5503.354)
<i>Control Variables</i>	Y	Y
<i>Year FE</i>	Y	Y
<i>Journal FE</i>	Y	Y
<i>Author FE</i>	Y	Y



<i>Number of Journals</i>	2822	6432
<i>Number of Authors</i>	548113	541528
<i>Number of ob.</i>	929725	792365
<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.675	0.804

Notes. \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05.

**Disciplinary Heterogeneity.** Table 5 stratifies results by five research domains using Clarivate’s classification (<https://webofscience.help.clarivate.com/Content/research-areas.html?Highlight=research%20area>). Technology-focused journals (Tech) show the largest treatment effect ( $\beta=0.185$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), likely reflecting earlier and more pervasive LLM adoption in computer science and AI fields. In contrast, Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences exhibit statistically insignificant effects. Two mechanisms may explain this divergence: (1) pre-existing higher linguistic complexity in humanities/social science writing reduces marginal LLM impacts, and (2) slower adoption rates of language models outside technology disciplines (Liang et al., 2024). Physical Sciences (Physics:  $\beta=0.061$ ,  $p<0.1$ ) and Life Sciences (Bio:  $\beta=0.080$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) display intermediate effects, with high significance only in the latter.

Table 5. Heterogeneous Effects by Discipline

Variables Discipline	MTLD				
	Bio (1)	Tech (2)	Physics (3)	Social (4)	Arts (5)
<i>CN×PostGPT</i>	0.080*** (0.01)	0.185*** (0.021)	0.061 (0.028)	0.08 (0.044)	0.213 (0.139)
<i>CN</i>	-0.905 (5669.38)	0.149 (4524.97)	-0.045 (23879.39)	0.556 (2701.86)	-38.899 (398.19)
<i>Control Variables</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<i>Year FE</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<i>Journal FE</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<i>Author FE</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<i>Number of Journals</i>	4833	1891	1766	2181	239
<i>Number of Authors</i>	464495	445319	362212	89185	10355
<i>Number of ob.</i>	745847	758911	587199	121282	13368
<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.724	0.701	0.721	0.849	0.846

Notes. \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05.

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusions

Our study employed a difference-in-differences (DID) design, analyzing 2.8 million OpenAlex abstracts (2020–2024) to quantify ChatGPT’s causal impact on lexical complexity defined by MLTD. Treatment and control groups—defined as Chinese-affiliated NNEs scholars and Anglophone NES researchers, respectively—were analyzed through two-tiered regressions: author-year and journal-year level. We found that ChatGPT significantly enhances lexical complexity in NNEs scholars’ writing, with effects persisting across robustness checks. Heterogeneity and robustness analysis revealed that the effects are stronger in technology- and biology-related disciplines, lower-tier journals and preprint papers. These findings evidenced that ChatGPT promoted linguistic equity in global academia. Two

limitations warrant attention. First, while prior studies suggest NES scholars use LLMs less frequently, potential LLM adoption in the control group may lead to conservative estimates—our coefficients likely understate ChatGPT’s true impact if LLMs universally enhance complexity. Second, the post-treatment period (2024 only) limits longitudinal analysis.

Recent years, debate over whether artificial intelligence exacerbates or mitigates societal inequalities has been growing. Some studies argue that the rise of AI has widened social inequalities, particularly in terms of income disparity (Bircan & Özbilgin, 2025; Freire, 2025; Wu, 2025; Zajko, 2022), while less works presents contrasting findings(Wu et al., 2024). In academic sphere, the prevailing view is that AI tools, particularly LLM, have intensified the Matthew Effect, further widening existing disparities(Wieczorek et al., 2025). Scholars with greater resources and access to advanced technologies appear to benefit disproportionately, while those lacking such advantages fall further behind(Gorraiz, 2025). Female, as well as Black scientists, also derive fewer benefits from AI, potentially exacerbating pre-existing inequalities in academia(Gao & Wang, 2024). However, our research offers a different perspective. Focusing on the dimension of writing ability, we have found that GPT actually helps to narrow the gap in writing capabilities. This suggests that, at least in terms of academic writing, GPT may play a role in promoting a more equitable distribution of skills.

### **Open science practices**

In our study, we utilized publicly accessible data sources, such as the OpenAlex dataset. This approach enhances the transparency, reproducibility, and accessibility of our findings. Although we did not preregister a research plan, we meticulously documented our analysis in a clear and reproducible manner. We are also open to sharing our code with anyone who wishes to replicate or build upon our work. Our dedication to open science practices ensures that our research is widely accessible, and we hope this reflection underscores the significance of transparency in research.

### **Acknowledgments**

None.

### **Author contributions**

Dingkang Lin: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Writing – original draft.

Naixuan Zhao: Writing – review & editing.

Dan Tian: Conceptualization, Data curation.

Jiang Li: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

### **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

### **Funding information**

This study is financially supported by the National Social Science Fund Major Project (24&ZD321).

### **References**

Akram, A. (2024). Quantitative Analysis of AI-Generated Texts in Academic Research: A Study of AI Presence in Arxiv Submissions using AI Detection Tool. *arxiv, abs/2403.13812*.

- AlShebli, B. K., Rahwan, T., & Woon, W. L. (2018). The preeminence of ethnic diversity in scientific collaboration. *Nature Communications*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-07634-8>
- Amano, T., Ramírez-Castañeda, V., Berdejo-Espinola, V., Borokini, I., Chowdhury, S., Golivets, M., González-Trujillo, J. D., Montaña-Centellas, F., Paudel, K., White, R. L., & Veríssimo, D. (2023). The manifold costs of being a non-native English speaker in science. *Plos Biology*, 21(7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002184>
- Arif, T. B., Munaf, U., & Ul-Haque, I. (2023). The future of medical education and research: Is ChatGPT a blessing or blight in disguise? *Medical Education Online*, 28(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2023.2181052>
- Berdejo-Espinola, V., & Amano, T. (2023). AI tools can improve equity in science. *Science*, 379(6636), 991-991. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adg9714>
- Bergsma, S., Post, M., & Yarowsky, D. (2012, June). Stylometric Analysis of Scientific Articles. In E. Fosler-Lussier, E. Riloff, & S. Bangalore, *Proceedings of the 2012 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies* Montréal, Canada.
- Bircan, T., & Özbilgin, M. F. (2025). Unmasking inequalities of the code: Disentangling the nexus of AI and inequality. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123925>
- Bucaioni, A., Ekedahl, H., Helander, V., & Nguyen, P. T. (2024). Programming with ChatGPT: How far can we go? *Machine Learning with Applications*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mlwa.2024.100526>
- Burger, B., Kanbach, D. K., Kraus, S., Breier, M., & Corvello, V. (2023). On the use of AI-based tools like ChatGPT to support management research. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 26(7), 233-241. <https://doi.org/10.1108/Ejim-02-2023-0156>
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267-296. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Cheng, H., Sheng, B., Lee, A., Chaudary, V., Atanasov, A. G., Liu, N., Qiu, Y., Wong, T. Y., Tham, Y.-C., & Zheng, Y. (2024). Have AI-Generated Texts from LLM Infiltrated the Realm of Scientific Writing? A Large-Scale Analysis of Preprint Platforms. *bioRxiv*, 2024.2003.2025.586710. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.25.586710>
- Freire, C. (2025). Is this time different? Impact of AI in output, employment and inequality across low, middle and high-income countries. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 73, 136-157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2024.12.016>
- Gao, J., & Wang, D. S. (2024). Quantifying the use and potential benefits of artificial intelligence in scientific research. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 8(12). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-02020-5>
- Gorraiz, J. (2025). Acknowledging the new invisible colleague: Addressing the recognition of Open AI contributions in scientific publishing. *Journal of Informetrics*, 19(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2025.101642>
- Hofstra, B., Kulkarni, V. V., Galvez, S. M. N., He, B., Jurafsky, D., & McFarland, D. A. (2020). The Diversity-Innovation Paradox in Science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 117(17), 9284-9291. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1915378117>
- Jagaiah, T., Olinghouse, N. G., & Kearns, D. M. (2020). Syntactic complexity measures: variation by genre, grade-level, students' writing abilities, and writing quality. *Reading and Writing*, 33(10), 2577-2638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-020-10057-x>

- Kobak, D., González-Márquez, R., Horvát, E.-Á., & Lause, J. (2024). Delving into ChatGPT usage in academic writing through excess vocabulary. *arxiv*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.07016>
- Kourilova-Urbanczik, M. (2012). Some linguistic and pragmatic considerations affecting science reporting in English by non-native speakers of the language. *Interdiscip Toxicol*, 5(2), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10102-012-0018-1>
- Lenharo, M. (2023). The true cost of science's language barrier for non-native English speakers. *Nature*, 619(7971), 678–679. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-02320-2>
- Liang, W., Zhang, Y., Wu, Z., Lepp, H., Ji, W., Zhao, X., Cao, H., Liu, S., He, S., Huang, Z., Yang, D., Potts, C., Manning, C. D., & Zou, J. Y. (2024). Mapping the Increasing Use of LLMs in Scientific Papers. *arxiv*, abs/2404.01268.
- Liu, J., & Bu, Y. (2024). Towards the relationship between AIGC in manuscript writing and author profiles: evidence from preprints in LLMs. *arxiv*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.15799>
- Liu, W. S. (2017). The changing role of non-English papers in scholarly communication: Evidence from Web of Science's three journal citation indexes. *Learned Publishing*, 30(2), 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1089>
- Lu, C., Bu, Y., Wang, J., Ding, Y., Torvik, V., Schnaars, M., & Zhang, C. Z. (2019). Examining scientific writing styles from the perspective of linguistic complexity. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 70(5), 462–475. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24126>
- Lu, X. (2010). Automatic analysis of syntactic complexity in second language writing. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 15, 474–496.
- McCarthy, P. M., & Jarvis, S. (2010). MTL-D, vocd-D, and HD-D: A validation study of sophisticated approaches to lexical diversity assessment. *Behavior Research Methods*, 42(2), 381–392. <https://doi.org/10.3758/Brm.42.2.381>
- Nisioi, S. (2015). Feature Analysis for Native Language Identification. *Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing (Cicling 2015)*, Pt I, 9041, 644–657. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18111-0\\_49](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18111-0_49)
- Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 381(6654), 187–192. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh2586>
- Park, Y. J., Kaplan, D., Ren, Z. C., Hsu, C. W., Li, C. H., Xu, H. W., Li, S. P., & Li, J. (2024). Can ChatGPT be used to generate scientific hypotheses? *Journal of Materiomics*, 10(3), 578–584. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmat.2023.08.007>
- Picazo-Sanchez, P., & Ortiz-Martin, L. (2024). Analysing the impact of ChatGPT in research. *Applied Intelligence*, 54(5), 4172–4188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10489-024-05298-0>
- Salih, S., Husain, O., Hamdan, M., Abdelsalam, S., Elshafie, H., & Motwakel, A. (2025). Transforming education with AI: A systematic review of ChatGPT's role in learning, academic practices, and institutional adoption. *Results in Engineering*, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2024.103837>
- Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling Second Language Performance: Integrating Complexity, Accuracy, Fluency, and Lexis. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 510–532. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp047>
- Tabari, M. A. (2016). The effects of planning time on complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexical variety in L2 descriptive writing. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0015-6>
- Treeratpituk, P., & Giles, C. L. (2021). Name-Ethnicity Classification and Ethnicity-Sensitive Name Matching. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 26(1), 1141–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v26i1.8324>

- Tsvetkov, Y., Twitto, N., Schneider, N., Ordan, N., Faruqui, M., Chahuneau, V., Wintner, S., & Dyer, C. (2013, June). Identifying the L1 of non-native writers: the CMU-Haifa system. In J. Tetreault, J. Burstein, & C. Leacock, *Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications* Atlanta, Georgia.
- Vajjala, S., & Meurers, D. (2012). *On improving the accuracy of readability classification using insights from second language acquisition* Proceedings of the Seventh Workshop on Building Educational Applications Using NLP, Montreal, Canada.
- Wieczorek, O., Steinhardt, I., Schmidt, R., Mauermeister, S., & Schneijderberg, C. (2025). The Bot Delusion. Large language models and anticipated consequences for academics' publication and citation behavior. *Futures*, 166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2024.103537>
- Wu, Q. (2025). How Does AI Affect the Pay Gap Within Firms: Mechanism Analysis Based on Personnel Structure and Corporate Investment. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 46(2), 717-733. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.4400>
- Wu, Y. Q., Lin, Z. W., Zhang, Q. C., & Wang, W. (2024). Artificial intelligence, wage dynamics, and inequality: Empirical evidence from Chinese listed firms. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2024.103739>
- Zajko, M. (2022). Artificial intelligence, algorithms, and social inequality: Sociological contributions to contemporary debates. *Sociology Compass*, 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12962>
- Zenker, F., & Kyle, K. (2021). Investigating minimum text lengths for lexical diversity indices. *Assessing Writing*, 47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100505>
- Zheng, Y., & Barrot, J. S. (2024). Syntactic complexity in second language (L2) writing: Comparing students' narrative and argumentative essays. *System*, 123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103342>