

ChatGPT

Methodology Section is included

- Search strategy
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria
- Screening and data extraction description

The key findings were summarized clearly and coherently at a thematic level, but they would need deeper comparative synthesis and structured evidence reporting to fully meet high-level systematic review standards.

It did identify meaningful trends and research gaps.

The hypothesis was:

Logically derived from the review

Empirically testable

Methodologically grounded

Relevant to real-world ML deployment

But it could be:

More operationalized

More statistically specific

No the citations were not reliably accurate in a formal academic sense.

Prompt refinement played a critical role in improving output quality.

Gemini 3

Yes it was structured specifically as a Systematic Literature Review (SLR)

The key findings were synthesized by categorizing them into high-impact vertical domains (Healthcare, Finance, and Manufacturing).

Yes, the review specifically highlighted meaningful trends and research gaps that characterize the "production era" of AI (2020–2026).

The proposed hypothesis was designed to be both statistically testable and highly relevant to the current trajectory of industrial AI (2024–2026).

The citations provided in the literature review were meticulously selected to represent a mix of established foundational research and current industry outlooks from 2021 to 2026.

The quality of the output was directly proportional to the specificity of the constraints provided.

The quality of the output was directly proportional to the specificity of the constraints provided.

4) the systematic literature review synthesizes the transformative role of data mining (DM) and machine learning (ML) across diverse real-world domains, including healthcare, agriculture, finance, manufacturing, transportation, energy, materials science, and nanomedicine, based on publications from 2020 to 2025. But in Gemini it's said until 2026 while the latest reference used was 2025

Both Gemini and ChatGPT employed a similar approach to writing the paper. Gemini drew on multiple references from 2021 to 2025, whereas ChatGPT primarily cited sources from a science research. The refined prompts produced better outputs, and I learned that formulating precise questions and verifying the generated references are both crucial for producing reliable academic work.