Peer-Response: Majed

Hi Majed,

Your post offers a balanced and insightful overview of the opportunities and risks associated with AI writers. I particularly appreciated your reference to Bender et al. (2021) and their "stochastic parrots" analogy, which aptly captures the core limitation of current large language models—the lack of true comprehension. This point underscores the vital need for human oversight, especially in domains like academic and technical writing where factual accuracy is paramount.

You rightly highlight the risk of fabricated references by AI systems, an issue that could be mitigated through stronger built-in fact-checking mechanisms and source validation within these tools. Developers might integrate real-time citation databases (e.g., CrossRef or PubMed APIs) to ensure generated citations are verifiable. Moreover, institutional guidelines should emphasize AI literacy to help users critically evaluate and verify AI-generated content, particularly in academia.

Your comment on AI's limitations in grasping emotional depth and narrative intent in creative writing is also well-supported by Gervás et al. (2019). While AI may assist with stylistic suggestions, the essence of storytelling—emotion, context, and cultural nuance—still demands a human touch. Here, promoting collaborative frameworks where AI supports rather than substitutes creativity might preserve originality.

Overall, your post clearly reflects both the promise and ethical complexity of AI writers. Ensuring transparency, accountability, and continuous human involvement are, in my view, essential steps in preventing misuse and preserving the integrity of written work.

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: Shaikah

Hi Shaikah,

You've presented a compelling critique of the challenges surrounding AI-generated content, especially in high-stakes contexts such as legal, academic, and administrative writing. I agree with your emphasis on Hutson's (2021) point about hallucination and how this can lead to compounding errors when unchecked. As you mentioned, when summarisation systems draw on flawed inputs, the result can be serious miscommunication or even legal repercussions if applied without human oversight.

To address these risks, one effective measure could be the development of domain-specific validators, as you suggested. These systems could incorporate rules-based filters and cross-reference outputs with verified databases (e.g., legal statutes or scientific citation indexes) to ensure factual accuracy and compliance. Additionally, Floridi et al. (2018) make a strong case for keeping humans "in the loop"—this is critical for both accountability and interpretability. Without that layer of expert review, responsibility for errors becomes ambiguous.

Your point about authorship and creativity also resonates deeply. Veale (2016) and Manjavacas & Liddle (2020) rightly point out that mimicking style is not the same as genuine

creativity. One way to maintain authenticity is by requiring AI contributions to be disclosed in creative or academic work—similar to how editors or research assistants are credited—to prevent the erosion of authorial integrity.

Altogether, your post underscores the need for transparency, validation mechanisms, and continuous human oversight in AI writing applications. These steps would not only reduce risk but also promote a more ethically grounded integration of AI in society.

References

Floridi, L. et al. (2018) 'AI4People—An Ethical Framework For A Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles, and Recommendations', *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), pp. 689–707.

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

Veale, T. (2016) *Ventures in Poetry, Prose and Screenwriting: Against Artificial Creativity*.

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