PEER RESPONSE 1

The copyright implications of AI training datasets, as you rightly noted, are particularly thought-provoking and often receive less attention compared to the more frequently discussed efficiency and productivity benefits of AI writers. I also agree with your observation about the risks of overreliance and the homogenisation of writing styles, both of which can contribute to the spread of inaccurate information. These points are critical to ensuring that discussions around AI remain balanced (Hidayatullah et al., 2025).

Nevertheless, several preventive measures can address these challenges. A key step is the integration of AI literacy into both educational institutions and workplace settings. As Ng et al. (2021) suggest, AI literacy should develop progressively across four dimensions: understanding how AI works to avoid blind reliance; evaluating outputs to recognise inaccuracies and biases; applying AI responsibly in practical contexts; and fostering ethical awareness to safeguard originality and integrity. This staged approach would help prevent erosion of critical thinking skills, while encouraging users to treat AI as a partner rather than a substitute. For homogenisation risks, a hybrid drafting model could be adopted, where AI provides structural or editorial support, but human writers retain creative control.

In relation to copyright, Wang et al. (2024) propose the development of frameworks to compensate content creators proportionally for their contributions to AI-generated works. By combining the probabilistic nature of AI models with principles from game theory cooperative nature in economics, their approach offers a quantitative method for determining fair attribution. Such mechanisms could not only protect creators' rights but also build trust and fairness in the creative economy.

Overall, your post underscores that AI writers must be accompanied by safeguards, and I agree that without these preventive measures, their risks could outweigh their benefits.

REFERENCES

Hidayatullah, M.H., Fahmi, M., Wahyuni, S., and Sari, D.P. (2025) 'A systematic literature review of artificial intelligence in academic writing: Challenges and opportunities', Journal of Research on English and Language Learning 6(1), pp.145–162. Available at: https://riset.unisma.ac.id/index.php/JREALL/article/view/23821

Ng, D.T.K., Leung, J.K.L., Chu, S.K.W. and Qiao, M.S. (2021) 'Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review' Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence 2, p.100041.

Wang, J.T., Deng, Z., Chiba-Okabe, H., Barak, B. and Su, W.J. (2024) 'An economic solution to copyright challenges of generative AI'.

PEER RESPONSE 2

The emphasis on accessibility benefits, particularly for non-native English speakers and users with disabilities, underscores a significant strength of AI tools that should be an integral part of academic discussions. Such applications highlight the role of AI in widening participation and ensuring more inclusive communication practices.

At the same time, the risks associated with misinformation and data leakage remain critical. Park et al. (2024) highlight how AI systems can generate outputs that appear persuasive yet contain inaccuracies or deceptive information, making verification protocols and fact-checking essential safeguards. Equally, Ye et al. (2024) emphasise that generative AI models pose substantial risks of personal data leakage, as they may memorise or reproduce sensitive information from training datasets or user prompts. To address these challenges, institutions should establish robust governance frameworks, including clear data-use policies that limit the types of information entered into AI systems, alongside technical measures such as audit mechanisms and access controls. These practices would mitigate compliance risks, protect privacy, and strengthen overall accountability in the use of AI writes.

Concerns about homogenisation in creative contexts point to another challenge. Anderson, Shah and Kreminski (2024) found that while large language models can support users in generating more detailed ideas, they also reduce semantic diversity, resulting in more uniform and formulaic outputs across different users. As a countermeasure, a hybrid drafting model could be adopted, where AI is employed for structural or routine elements while final creative and stylistic decisions remain human-driven. This approach would help preserve originality and ensure that distinctive human voices are not overshadowed by the standardising tendencies of AI.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B.R., Shah, J.H. and Kreminski, M. (2024) ‘Homogenization effects of large language models on human creative ideation’ Proceedings of the 16th conference on creativity & cognition pp. 413-425.

Park, P.S., Goldstein, S., O’Gara, A., Chen, M. and Hendrycks, D. (2024) ‘AI deception: A survey of examples, risks, and potential solutions’ Patterns 5(5).

Ye, X., Yan, Y., Li, J. and Jiang, B. (2024)’ Privacy and personal data risk governance for generative artificial intelligence: A Chinese perspective’, Telecommunications Policy, 48(10), p.102851.