Peer Response

by Saleh Almarzooqi - Thursday, 9 October 2025, 1:50 AM

Your post provides a good summary of the practical benefits and the more profound dangers of the AI-powered tools for composition. I was particularly drawn to the insights shared on how AI can contribute to efficiency within both organisations and academia. I also love your mention of discrimination and perpetuation of stereotype (which is under-emphasised sometimes in the discussion of productivity benefits) here.

Building on your analysis, I think an important next step is to think of specific safeguards that could be implemented to mitigate the risks you identify. For instance, in workplaces, a system of double approval can be installed in which the outcome created through AI must be reviewed by at least one human supervisor before it is released as a report or a communication (Tsamados, Floridi, and Taddeo, 2025). This will maintain efficiency while ensuring critical thinking and originality. At the scholarship level, instructors can create studying tasks that ask students to explore and critically assess any AI-generated content they use, which, in addition to enforcing educational integrity, helps the learner consider how AI is influencing their thinking (Seghier, 2025).

In fiction or creative writing, a possible guardrail is using AI-generated drafts in tandem with human-driven "depth editing" sessions, during which authors carefully add emotional depth, cultural specificity, and original narrative arcs (Lanz, Briker, & Gerpott, 2024). This ensures that AI remains an inspirational tool for human creativity, rather than a substitute.

Overall, your post highlights the main tension posited - fluency without understanding. By incorporating disclosure, bias audits, and human review into workflows, the good and the bad of AI can be harnessed by organisations and individuals, while mitigating the risk of skill erosion or reproduction of stereotypes.

References:

Lanz, L., Briker, R. and Gerpott, F.H., 2024. Employees adhere more to unethical instructions from humans than AI supervisors: Complementing experimental evidence with machine learning. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *189*(3), pp.625-646.

Seghier, M.L., 2025. AI-powered peer review needs human supervision. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, *23*(1), pp.104-116.

Tsamados, A., Floridi, L. and Taddeo, M., 2025. Human control of AI systems: from supervision to teaming. *AI and Ethics*, *5*(2), pp.1535-1548.

Peer Response

by Saleh Almarzooqi - Thursday, 9 October 2025, 1:52 AM

You have given an excellent and organized summary of Hutson's (2021) arguments and of various ways AI writing tools have an impact on specific domains. In particular, I was delighted by the inclusion of the point of view of different scholars who place the debate in the context of current empirical work. One thing that I find interesting about your post is that it shows a fairly unequal distribution of risk: low risk for routine work but much higher for professional and creative writing.

I think it would be great to see more of the practical stuff organisations or writers can do to avoid the specific problems you find. For instance, in administrative settings, a basic checklist or approval process in place can guarantee that AI-generated emails or reports are inspected before publication (Alnaimat, Fatima, et al. 2025). In academic writing, AI can be used for outlining, summarizing, and drafting parts of the text, and in this way, it becomes easy for students to write their assignments (Wang, Changzhao, et al. 2024).

In creative writing, bias auditing could be incorporated into the writing workflow - authors could intentionally include counter-narratives or run their text through bias-detection tools after using AI (Nabilla, Apriani, and Gusmuliana, 2024). Journals and publishers are also experimenting with "AI contribution" statements, which put disclosure from "elective" to "essential" and reduce the stigma associated with having to do it, as well as enabling the reader to assess their work's credibility.

Overall, your post makes a thorough argument for Hutson's admonition that "fluency does not equal wisdom." This requires building on your analysis, the design of specific protocols, and training for humans to be the primary authors and ethical gatekeepers of AI tools, while also enjoying the productivity gains of AI tools.

References:

Alnaimat, F., AlSamhori, A.R.F., Hamdan, O., Seiil, B., and Qumar, A.B., 2025. Perspectives of Artificial Intelligence Use for In-House Ethics Checks of Journal Submissions. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, *40*(21).

Nabilla, C., Apriani, E., and Gusmuliana, P., 2024. *Promoting Students' Writing and Critical Thinking by Using Paragraph Writing AI Technology* (Doctoral dissertation, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup).

Wang, C., Aguilar, S.J., Bankard, J.S., Bui, E., and Nye, B., 2024. Writing with AI: What college students learned from utilizing ChatGPT for a writing assignment. *Education Sciences*, *14*(9), p.976.