



Peer Response

by Yousif Ali Karam Yousif Almaazmi - Monday, 6 October 2025, 5:56 PM

According to Hutson (2021), the current AI "robo-writers show a high level of fluency and a low level of understanding. This dissonance between form and comprehension makes one need to reason critically on the manner in which such systems are implemented in different writing situations.

According to Baviskar, Dipali, et al. (2021), AI has the potential to be used in regular and administrative operations to computerise the time-consuming aspects of meeting notes, standard mail, or report templates. It can offload human manpower in terms of repetitive work and enhance turnaround time when applied to these low-risk activities. The reason is that these texts can be reviewed easily, hence corrected quickly, which makes this the least disputable field to offer AI assistance.

With more specialised or technical writing, AI systems have a different type of value. They propose the outlines, summarise the convoluted information, or assist with refining the style of business documents (Spring, Faulconbridge, & Sarwar, 2022). Nonetheless, the higher the level of domain specificity of the content, the higher the chance of factual inaccuracy, fabricated references, or implicit biasing. Excessive use of this scale can also result in a decrease in the number of professionals who are analytical and rhetorical in aspects of their work, but who excessively depend on automated drafting (Sutton, Arnold, and Holt, 2018).

The creative writing reflects the potential and the shortcomings of the technology. Prompts, characters, or stylistic experiments that writers get inspired by can be provided by generative models. However, due to the remixing of patterns of existing texts, their results can be derivative and even inadvertently stereotypical or violate originality (Zyska, Dennis, et al. 2023).

In order to mitigate these risks, AI must be seen as an aid, but not a replacement for a writer. Maintaining integrity, creativity, and accountability is gained through having human beings in charge of editing, disclosure, and fact-checking. Applied in this manner, AI can enhance instead of steal the ability and creativity that make real writing.

References:

Baviskar, D., Ahirrao, S., Potdar, V. and Kotecha, K., 2021. Efficient automated processing of the unstructured documents using artificial intelligence: A systematic literature review and future directions. *IEEE Access*, 9, pp.72894-72936.

Hutson, M., 2021. Robo-writers: the rise and risks of language-generating AI.

Spring, M., Faulconbridge, J. and Sarwar, A., 2022. How information technology automates and augments processes: Insights from Artificial-Intelligence-based systems in professional service operations. *Journal of Operations Management*, 68(6-7), pp.592-618.



Peer Response

by Abdulla Husain Salem Hadna Almessabi - Tuesday, 7 October 2025, 7:26 PM

Your post gives a balanced picture of AI "robo-writers" operations across administrative, technical, and creative contexts. I especially liked how you linked the warning about "fluency without understanding" to concrete examples from different studies. This framing makes it easy to see that the same technology that speeds up low-risk administrative work can create serious problems when the content becomes more specialised or original.

Building on your points, one way to minimise those risks is to formalise "human-in-the-loop" practices at each level (Kumar, Sushant, et al. 2024). For instance, in technical or professional writing, AI outputs could be restricted to outlining, summarising, or initial drafts, while domain experts complete the analysis, add references, and verify facts (Enarsson, Enqvist, and Naarttijärvi, 2022). This would protect against fabricated sources or hidden biases and also help maintain staff members' analytical and rhetorical skills.

In creative work, writers could use AI to generate prompts or stylistic experiments, but treat these outputs as raw material to be transformed through their own editing, emotional depth, and cultural knowledge (Iyengar, 2025). Combining this with explicit disclosure—stating which parts were AI-assisted—would preserve transparency and originality, as you recommend.

Your emphasis on "AI as an aid, not a replacement" captures the key lesson of the current research: the benefits of generative models are real but conditional. With careful supervision, fact-checking, and disclosure, organisations and writers can harness AI's productivity gains without eroding the human insight and creativity that give writing its value.

References:

Enarsson, T., Enqvist, L. and Naarttijärvi, M., 2022. Approaching the human in the loop—legal perspectives on hybrid human/algorithmic decision-making in three contexts. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 31(1), pp.123-153.

Iyengar, P., 2025. Clever hans in the loop? a critical examination of chatgpt in a human-in-the-loop framework for machinery functional safety risk analysis. *Eng*, 6(2), p.31.

Kumar, S., Datta, S., Singh, V., Datta, D., Singh, S.K. and Sharma, R., 2024. Applications, challenges, and future directions of human-in-the-loop learning. *IEEE Access*, 12, pp.75735-75760.



Re: Initial post

by Yousif Ali Karam Yousif Almaazmi - Monday, 13 October 2025, 7:50 PM

The problem of AI and writing and the dangers of its further growing is analyzed rightfully, which I agree with. The possibility of AI to write text that is not intelligible but fluent, as you said, is a key problem. Although AI may be helpful in such activities as summary and writing of reports, it is not suitable in those activities that need finer insight, including creative writing or technical analysis, because it does not have the true understanding and emotional context. Such an inability to match up the fluency and the understanding is particularly evident when writing is more professional, and factual accuracy and critical thinking become the most valuable aspects. The argument of how AI can remove the need to have professionals who can think critically and exercise a certain degree of rhetoric is a really excellent point. In careers that require highly remarkable expertise e.g. the writing and websites of technicians, excessive reliance on AI might lead to deindustrialization of such valuable competencies. There is a possibility that AI might be used to generate content in an extremely brief time span but the risk is that AI might diminish intellectual and creative engagement of reading the content. The distortions of reality and bias can become even more prevalent, as you yourself have mentioned that is in the highly specialized spheres of knowledge, when expertise is an issue. The involvement of AI in the sphere of creative writing to generate some ideas or provide stylistic recommendations is beneficial, yet it is evident that the working text has to be worked by human hands. The bias towards the creation of the derivative and even stereotypical work with the help of AI reinforces the need of creativity in human in order to secure originality and diversity in literature. I completely agree with your idea according to which AI should not be regarded as a substitute of writers, but as a support tool. The human control should be maintained in order to maintain integrity, originality and genuineness of writing process and AI can not take away human talent.

References

- Zyska, D., Dyck, N., Buchmann, J., Kuznetsov, I., & Gurevich, I. (2023). CARE: Collaborative AI-assisted reading environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12611*. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.12611> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).
- Baviskar, D., Ahirao, S., Potdar, V., & Kotecha, K. (2021). Efficient automated processing of unstructured documents using artificial intelligence: A systematic literature review and future directions. *IEEE Access*, 9, 72894-72936. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3097251> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).
- Spring, M., Faulconbridge, J., & Sarwar, A. (2022). How information technology automates and augments processes: Insights from Artificial-Intelligence-based systems in professional service operations. *Journal of Operations Management*, 68(6-7), 592-618. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2022.04.004> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).



Peer Response

by Ali Alhammadi - Monday, 6 October 2025, 1:12 PM

I support your review of the contribution of AI to writing and the danger of its continued growth. The capacity of AI to produce fluency in text without necessarily possessing an understanding is a fundamental query as you explained. Even though, artificial intelligence can be used in other functions like summarizing and writing one or another word kind of report, AI has no actual knowledge and does not have any intestinal feelings thus, it offered no benefits when having to complete a task that needs favorable vision such as literary writing or technical examination. The violation of connection between fluency and awareness is particularly common with the use of AI in courses that require a more specialized writing style, as such that prioritizes all types of accuracy of facts in the form of accuracy and critical evaluation as the most essential issue (Zyska et al., 2023). The idea of the prospect of AI rendering professionals obsolete when it comes to critical thinking and rhetoric is a valid point, according to your suggestion. In areas where professional writing or research is one of the core styles as it is in the case of the technical writing career, too much reliance on AI would lead to the collapse of these essential abilities (Spring, Faulconbridge, and Sarwar, 2022). Artificial intelligence may also assist in developing the required material at a rapid pace, though the risk is that the same AI may cause quickly the consideration of the mental and innovative aspect of working on the material and the element of interaction of the material by a person. Prejudice and lack of facts can also gain prominence especially in extremely specialized fields in which experience is needed. One of the areas that AI is helpful in generating concepts and/or even trying to provide one with inspirational potential of style, it can be seen that even now the logo must be built with a human mind (Baviskar et al., 2021). I wholly agree with your opinion that AI is something that can assist writers and not substitute them.

References

- Baviskar, D., Ahirao, S., Potdar, V., & Kotecha, K. (2021). Efficient automated processing of unstructured documents using artificial intelligence: A systematic literature review and future directions. *IEEE Access*, 9, 72894-72936. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3097251> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).
- Spring, M., Faulconbridge, J., & Sarwar, A. (2022). How information technology automates and augments processes: Insights from Artificial-Intelligence-based systems in professional service operations. *Journal of Operations Management*, 68(6-7), 592-618. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2022.04.004> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).
- Zyska, D., Dyck, N., Buchmann, J., Kuznetsov, I., & Gurevich, I. (2023). CARE: Collaborative AI-assisted reading environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12611*. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.12611> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).