Peer Response by Dalbir Singh

Thank you, Koulthoum, for your clear and well-structured post. You've effectively outlined both the productivity potential and the risks of AI writing tools, particularly when it comes to citation accuracy, creativity, and ethical use.

Your point about AI generating false or fabricated citations (Hutson, 2021) is especially important. One measure that could have been implemented to prevent this is integrating citation verification mechanisms directly into AI platforms. This would ensure that only real, traceable references are produced, or at the very least, flag citations that cannot be validated. Academic institutions could also support this by requiring users to cross-check all AI-generated references before submission.

Regarding your concern about the erosion of originality in creative writing, I agree that this is a real risk. As Gervás et al. (2019) argue, AI lacks genuine emotional intelligence and cannot replicate the depth of human experience. To mitigate this, creative tasks involving AI should encourage a "co-creation" model, where AI is used to support the human imagination—not replace it. Educators and content creators could adopt frameworks that promote human-led revision and critical reflection on AI-generated ideas to preserve authenticity.

Finally, the broader issue of misinformation stemming from AI outputs—highlighted by Bender et al. (2021)—can be tackled with clearer usage policies, transparency features, and user training. Encouraging responsible AI use through guidelines and awareness is just as critical as the technology itself.

I completely agree with your conclusion: AI can be a powerful tool, but it must always be used with human oversight to ensure accuracy, ethics, and creativity remain intact.

References

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A. and Shmitchell, S. (2021) 'On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?', *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 610–623.

Gervás, P., Díaz-Agudo, B., Peinado, F. and Hervás, R. (2019) 'Story generation with intent: A narrative planning approach', *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 34(8), pp. 1657–1673.

Hutson, M. (2021) 'Robo-writers: the rise of the AI ghostwriter', *Nature*, 591(7848), pp. 22–25.

Peer Response by Ali Alzahmi

The post is a critical assessment of the app of AI writing tools, especially in terms of fairness between productivity benefits and ethical concerns. The fact that even simple tasks, like writing an email or summarising material, can be automated by the use of LLMs, including GPT-3, is confirmed and corroborated by the literature that addresses the effects of AI on administrative tasks (Sarker, 2022). Nevertheless, the risk consists in excess use, especially when people believe that AI-created content is factually sound. GPT-3 can provide fake but persuasive references (as Hutson (2021) and others have cautioned), as it is important to message writers in academia or practice. The post, in its turn, successfully cites Bender et al. (2021) who emphasise that LLMs do not understand what they create. Such systems bring together the words according to the chances and not to the logic or purpose. Such a limitation exposes it to the risk of either propagating false information or reinforcing prejudice, particularly when the models are trained using poor or biased data. It is even more severe in educational purposes, as the students might use the incorrect proofs of the AI generation without even realising it. A deeper insight is given via creativity and originality discussion. Although AI can facilitate brainstorming or stylist exploration, there is reasonable fear that AI may kill the human creative spirit. Kasneci et al. (2023) suggest that the use of LLMs has to be guided by pedagogy, particularly in higher education and schools. They can be aids to aid learners and must not in any way substitute the decisive involvement, meaning making and individual tone in academic reporting. The lessons of using AI are an essential explicit institutional policy. The schools or universities may come up with ethical guidelines to encourage healthy use and educate students by teaching them identifications and critical analysis of text generated by AI.

References

Bender, E.M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A. and Shmitchell, S. (2021) 'On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?', *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 610–623. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922 (Accessed: 29 June 2025).

Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E. and Krusche, S. (2023) 'ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education', *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, p. 102274. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274 (Accessed: 29 June 2025).

Sarker, I.H. (2022) 'AI-based modeling: techniques, applications and research issues towards automation, intelligent and smart systems', *SN Computer Science*, 3(2), p. 158. Available at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42979-022-01043-x (Accessed: 29 June 2025).

Peer Response by Ali Yousef Ebrahim Mohammed Alshehhi

I thought you are also pretty considerate and logically organised in your analysis due to the clarity and power of the twin influence of AI writing assistant in the administration and in academia. Your references to Hutson (2021) and his explanation of application of AI in ordinary activities like composing e-mails help to perceive AI as a smart measure that can be appreciated in the workplace. The ability to offload labor and open up time to professionals to take a step up into more demanding thinking, as you imply, is one of AI greatest advantages. When you touch upon Rathore et al., (2021) and their idea of what LLMs are stochastic parrots, you manage to address the key limitation in the AI sphere, which is the inability to be truly understanding. Such is not only dangerous in terms of misinformation but also the integrity of citations and contents, particularly in an academic writing. It is important to observe that fabricated references are not only devastating lapses but those which may even twist whole-research work when they are not given critical reviews (De Angelis et al., 2023). I was also fond of the way you included Gerv, et al. (2019) that can prove helpful to show that although AI can help in terms of creativity, it has no emotional intelligence, which is something that is absolutely priceless in terms of literature and narrative. The fact that you realise that artificial intelligence can help to be creative and, at the same time, inhibit originality is a reading between the lines that indicates you have a sense not only of the creative possibilities but also of the danger of too much reliance on machine assistance (Ahmad et al., 2021). To make your argument more powerful, you could think about the necessity to develop further the way of human oversight that should be applied in reality. Are institutions to impose a requirement to disclose use of AI in publications? Should the academic organisations set standards in regards to what level of use is acceptable? (Alqahtani et al., 2023) To sum up, your post gives an excellent account of the merits and ethical issues in AI in writing. It is the right moment and the necessity to stress human responsibility and critical thinking under pressure of the age of automation in your post.

References

Ahmad, T., Zhang, D., Huang, C., Zhang, H., Dai, N., Song, Y. and Chen, H. (2021) 'Artificial intelligence in sustainable energy industry: Status quo, challenges and opportunities', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 289, p. 125834. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348251690_Artificial_Intelligence_in_Sustainable_Energy_Industry_Status_Quo_Challenges_and_Opportunities (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Alqahtani, T., Badreldin, H.A., Alrashed, M., Alshaya, A.I., Alghamdi, S.S., Bin Saleh, K., Alowais, S.A., Alshaya, O.A., Rahman, I., Al Yami, M.S. and Albekairy, A.M. (2023) 'The emergent role of artificial intelligence, natural language processing, and large language models in higher education and research', *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 19(8), pp. 1236–1242. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2023.04.004 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

De Angelis, L., Baglivo, F., Arzilli, G., Privitera, G.P., Ferragina, P., Tozzi, A.E. and Rizzo, C. (2023) 'ChatGPT and the rise of large language models: the new AI-driven infodemic threat in public health', *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, p. 1166120. Available at: https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1166120/full (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Rathore, M.M., Shah, S.A., Shukla, D., Bentafat, E. and Bakiras, S. (2021) 'The role of AI, machine learning, and big data in digital twinning: A systematic literature review, challenges, and

opportunities', *IEEE Access*, 9, pp. 32030–32052. Available at: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9359733 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Peer Response by Fahad Abdallah

The post depicts the rational answer to the advantages and risks of using AI writing tools such as GPT-3. Although the automation process is a rewarding time-saving mechanism, the dangers of false information and lack of novelty should prove to be a major concern since it can only be managed by a less chaotic approach. One of the strongest aspects of this post is the part that is devoted to fabricated citations- a problem that has faced most academic writers who give excessive attention to generative tools. One more issue that proves this premise is the idea of the infodemic posed by De Angelis et al. (2023). They discuss the potential of generative AI as a tool to advance the fast transmission of misinformation, particularly when AI technology users believe that output is authoritative because of its professional style. This can seriously undermine the integrity of the student research work in the academic world and the integrity of the scholar. In addition, Saetra, Coeckelbergh and Danaher (2022) claim that ethical systems tend to be lagging behind in such technological advances, which makes the process of governance lag. This delay will give the malpractice a time to blossom without any serious regulation being put in place. The post agrees that the role of humans should not be dismissed, but at the same time, the fortification of ethical borders in the educational systems should be done through its structure. Ahmad et al. (2021) are another work to take into account since they discuss the role of AI in such sectors as education and energy. In their argument, they suggest that although AI increases efficiency, it may generate lower returns in case it replaces human judgment and innovativeness. Applying the same argumentation to the writing tools however proposes a blended approach, where AI can complement, but not substitute the human thinking process.

References

Ahmad, T., Zhang, D., Huang, C., Zhang, H., Dai, N., Song, Y. and Chen, H. (2021) 'Artificial intelligence in sustainable energy industry: Status quo, challenges and opportunities', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 289, p. 125834. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348251690_Artificial_Intelligence_in_Sustainable_Energy_Industry_Status_Quo_Challenges_and_Opportunities (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

De Angelis, L., Baglivo, F., Arzilli, G., Privitera, G.P., Ferragina, P., Tozzi, A.E. and Rizzo, C. (2023) 'ChatGPT and the rise of large language models: the new AI-driven infodemic threat in public health', *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, p. 1166120. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1166120 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Sætra, H.S., Coeckelbergh, M. and Danaher, J. (2022) 'The AI ethicist's dilemma: fighting Big Tech by supporting Big Tech', *AI and Ethics*, 2(1), pp. 15–27. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00123-7 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).