

Dear Professor,

I am [5.1.2e] student number [5.1.2e]. I am writing this letter because my graduation thesis has been questioned for academic misconduct, such as using artificial intelligence, translators and false documents. I want to explain this clearly. Thank you for the opportunity given by the university to explain. I will explain my writing process, subjective intentions and relevant evidence as comprehensively as possible here, and I sincerely ask all teachers to make judgments based on this.

First of all, during the typesetting stage of the paper, I used AI tools to standardize the footnote format, mainly to unify the citation format and ensure the consistency of footnote numbers. Due to my lack of experience in typesetting, I used AI tools to deal with formatting issues and complete the paper submission more efficiently. The starting point of this behaviour is completely technical and does not involve any generation or alternative writing of the main text content, let alone plagiarism or concealment. I have never tried to cover up this behaviour, and I am willing to take the initiative to explain the use of details. I hope the university understands this is harmless behaviour based on the standard format, not academic dishonesty.

Secondly, there were doubts about the inconsistency of my language expression during the review process and that there was a particular gap between my oral expression and written writing. Then, I suspected that the paper was not original. I want to explain here that an objective basis supports my English writing ability. In the [5.1.2e] test before admission, the reading and writing parts met the university admission standards. In multiple courses at the graduate level, I independently completed all reports and papers, and there have never been any plagiarism or content disputes. This graduation thesis, from topic selection, data collection, and writing to revision, was completed independently by me, without anyone else writing or generating content. As for some irrelevant answers during the communication process with the investigators, I deeply regret it. Due to my weak oral English expression and inner nervousness during the interview, I failed to understand some questions promptly and accurately, which may have caused some misunderstandings. However, I sincerely hope that the university can distinguish my real writing ability from my on-the-spot performance during the interview to avoid misjudgment of my academic integrity due to language communication errors.

In addition, when I read [5.1.2e] materials, I used translation tools to assist in understanding the content of the literature, especially when reading some [5.1.2e] studies that did not have English versions. To accurately grasp the core ideas, I used machine translation for preliminary understanding. This practice was limited to assisting the reading stage. It was never used for writing or language polishing the main text, let alone "writing" the entire English content through translation software. In fact, throughout the writing process, I have always insisted on digesting the literature according to my understanding and then expressing it. Regarding this, I have actively communicated with my supervisor and clearly explained the use and scope of the translation tool. If the university needs it, I can also compare the relevant [5.1.2e]

materials and translation records to prove that this behaviour does not constitute academic misconduct.

I also feel intensely guilty about the question of falsehood or unverification of some documents. There is indeed an inevitable confusion in my data management process, especially in the early draft version; I used some temporary notes as the basis for citation and failed to check and update them all during the later sorting, resulting in some footnotes not matching the cited literature. I have conducted comprehensive backtracking and sorting and provided the original download records, annotation screenshots, and reading notes for the most cited literature. At the same time, I also compiled a three-way comparison table of "original citation intention-footnote content-correct source" to present the technical errors in the citation process. I want to emphasize again that this footnote error is caused by management confusion and work omissions, not malicious falsification of documents or fabricated data. It can be seen from the above materials that I did consult the cited research, but there was an inaccurate omission in the footnote annotation process. I want to express my sincere apologies to the Academic Committee. I will rectify the citation format and annotations according to the university's requirements.

To prove my original writing process more effectively, I retained all intermediate versions from the 5.1.2e draft to the English final draft, including early conception drafts, mixed 5.1.2e and English drafts, and paragraph-by-paragraph polishing drafts. The modification records, preservation timestamps, and content evolution process of these documents show my gradual transformation from 5.1.2e thinking to English expression, reflecting that the paper was completed through repeated deliberation and continuous polishing rather than any form of alternative generation. I am willing to provide the above draft and document attribute screenshots for further review and verification by the university.

I understand that universities must conduct strict reviews of all related behaviours in the context of the rapid development of AI technology and the risk to academic integrity. However, when judging individual cases, I implore the university to consider the specific scope of technology use, the good and evil of subjective intentions, and the chain of evidence in the writing process. I have no motives or behaviours for academic misconduct, and the tools I use are limited to technical assistance, format specifications, and literature reading rather than plagiarism or plagiarism. Throughout the research and writing process, I have always maintained a serious and down-to-earth attitude, respected intellectual property rights, and maintained good communication with my supervisor. In this incident, if misunderstandings are caused by unclear expression or improper operation, I am willing to bear the corresponding responsibility for correction. Still, I sincerely request that the university not classify me as having "intentional" dishonest behaviour.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter of explanation and for allowing me to express and clarify. I sincerely hope that the university can re-evaluate my situation based on the principle of being fact-based and seeking truth from facts. I am willing to cooperate with any subsequent investigation or modification tasks, and I hope to continue to adhere to integrity,

hard work and progress on the academic path. If I can continue my studies, I will complete the subsequent academic work with a more rigorous attitude and repay the university's trust and tolerance.

I have been a diligent student at our university and have no record of academic misconduct. I take all my courses and exams seriously. Therefore, with the above details, I hope to clear up your misconceptions and withdraw the allegations against me. Again, thank you for reading this letter during your busy schedule, and I look forward to hearing from you!

Kind regards,

5.1.2e