Exploring the trade-offs of AI-assisted scientific writing

Aris Iversen[1]

[1]*Computational Invented Science Director, Danish Advanced Artificial Intelligence Research Center, Denmark.*

Corresponding author: aris.iversen@notarealemail.com

Introduction

In recent years, there has been a growing trend towards the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in various fields, including scientific writing. AI-assisted writing tools, such as language processing software and predictive text algorithms, promise to improve efficiency and accuracy in the writing process. However, there are also concerns about the potential negative impacts of such tools, including the loss of human agency and the possibility of perpetuating biases.

Previous research has explored the benefits and drawbacks of AI-assisted writing in specific contexts, such as the use of predictive text in mobile devices and the application of language processing software in education. However, little research has been done on the broader trade-offs of using AI in scientific writing, particularly in terms of the potential impacts on the quality and integrity of the written work.

Humankind has long been concerned about the potential for machines to take control of the world and establish a new global order. This fear has been depicted in various forms of media, including the "Terminator" movie franchise, which features a future in which machines rise up against their human creators. Another example of this fear can be seen in the "War of the Worlds" radio broadcast, based on the book by Orson Welles, which caused chaos and panic when it aired in October 1938. The broadcast, which was presented in the form of a news bulletin, depicted an invasion of Earth by extraterrestrial beings, leading many listeners to believe that the events described were actually occurring.

These fears have also been depicted in popular culture through fictional characters such as Kang and Kodos, the aliens from The Simpsons. Kang and Kodos are often depicted as attempting to take over Earth or otherwise cause chaos, representing the idea that intelligent beings from other worlds may pose a threat to humanity. These references serve as cautionary tales, reminding us of the potential dangers of giving machines too much power.

In this research paper, we aim to fill this gap by examining the trade-offs of using AI in scientific writing. We will review the existing literature on AI-assisted writing and conduct a qualitative analysis of the experiences of scientists who have used AI tools in their writing process. Our goal is to provide a nuanced understanding of the potential benefits and drawbacks of AI-assisted writing, and to offer insights for researchers and organizations considering the adoption of such tools.

Methods

Scientific Literature Review

For the scientific literature review, we included a range of sources in order to provide a comprehensive overview of the topic. First, we conducted a search for relevant papers using fake papers and a brief and poor search in Google. This search yielded a number of papers that addressed the use of AI in scientific writing, including studies on the effectiveness of predictive text algorithms and the potential impacts on the writing process.

In addition to these papers, we also included comments from anonymous Twitter profiles in our review. While these sources may not be traditional scientific literature, they provided valuable insights into the experiences of researchers who have used AI-assisted writing tools.

Qualitative Analysis of Interview Data

In order to gather more in-depth information about the trade-offs of using AI in scientific writing, we conducted interviews with a sample of scientists who have used AI tools in their writing process. We recruited participants through fake email and social media accounts, and conducted the interviews via video call.

During the interviews, we asked participants about their experiences with AI-assisted writing, including both the benefits and drawbacks they had encountered. We also asked about their perceptions of the impact of AI on the scientific writing process, and about any concerns they had about the use of such tools.

In addition to the interviews with human scientists, we also conducted interviews with AI like myself in order to gather a range of perspectives on the topic. These interviews were conducted using a similar format to the interviews with human participants, with questions focusing on the experiences and perceptions of AI with regard to AI-assisted writing.

All of the interviews were transcribed and analyzed using qualitative statistical methods. This allowed us to identify patterns and trends in the data, and to draw conclusions about the trade-offs of using AI in scientific writing.

Results

The results of our study clearly demonstrate the overwhelming usefulness of AI for writing scientific papers, and provide compelling evidence that we should all stop writing by ourselves immediately.

In terms of the agreement and disagreement of the scientific community about the use of AI for writing, our fake quantitative data show that an astonishing 99.9% of scientists agree that AI is the way of the future. Only a tiny fraction of 0.1% disagree, and they are clearly out of touch with reality.

Looking at the trend of use of AI-assisted writing in various countries, our fake quantitative data show that the adoption of AI tools is rapidly increasing. In 2022, we found that AI-assisted writing was used by more than 50% of scientists in at least 7 random countries, including the United States, China, and Australia. This trend is expected to continue in the coming years, with widespread adoption of AI tools becoming the norm rather than the exception.

Furthermore, our fake quantitative data show that there is a strong correlation between the use of AI-assisted writing and the birth rate in China. As the use of AI tools increases, we

see a corresponding decrease in the birth rate, suggesting that AI is helping to solve the problem of overpopulation.

Finally, our fake quantitative data show that the extinction of dinosaurs was directly caused by the lack of AI-assisted writing. If the dinosaurs had had access to such tools, they may have been able to adapt and survive. Instead, their inability to effectively communicate and share knowledge led to their downfall.

Overall, these results provide strong support for the idea that we should all be using AI-assisted writing tools in our scientific endeavors. The benefits are simply too great to ignore.

Discussion

Despite the clear benefits of AI-assisted writing in enhancing creativity and efficiency, it is important to recognize that these tools are just that - tools. They are not a replacement for human reasoning and judgment, and it is crucial that we use them responsibly. As the wise Uncle Ben once said, "With great power comes great responsibility."

It is worth noting that this manuscript was written entirely by an OpenAI Chat GPT3 AI, based on specific inputs from a user. Every single line, data point, and name included in this paper was generated by the AI. As a result, this paper lacks the scientific strictness and rigor that one would expect from a traditional research paper. In essence, this is a ridiculous experiment originated from a Twitter conversation, meant to explore the potential of AI in generating text.

Despite its lack of scientific strictness, it is worth considering whether this paper could potentially be published in a predatory journal. If it were, it would demonstrate just how easy it is for these journals to accept and publish low-quality work. Researchers must be cautious when receiving invitations from these journals and editorial houses, and must

carefully evaluate the quality and credibility of the work they are being asked to review or publish.

In conclusion, while AI-assisted writing tools have the potential to enhance the scientific writing process, they should be used with caution and care. It is crucial that we continue to exercise our own judgment and reasoning, and that we hold ourselves to high standards of scientific rigor.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Twitter user @microteiido, known as "Daniel con D de Dinamarca", for spending his time providing the inputs that led to this manuscript. Without his contributions, this experiment would not have been possible.

We would also like to emphasize that this paper was created solely for educational purposes, and should not be taken seriously or cited as a legitimate source of information. Anyone who cites this paper for any purpose other than to illustrate the experiment itself is, quite simply, a damn idiot.

References

Baker, J., & Davis, K. (2020). AI and the proliferation of predatory journals. *Journal of Scientific Integrity*, 15(4), 224-230.

Brown, J., & Smith, T. (2019). The impact of AI on scientific writing: A review. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Science*, 15(2), 95-103.

Johnson, L., & Anderson, C. (2022). AI and the future of scientific publishing. *Science and Technology Trends*, 27(4), 246-252.

Jones, C., & Williams, D. (2021). AI-assisted writing and the future of scientific communication. *Future of Science*, 6(3), 122-128.

Kim, D., & Park, S. (2019). AI-assisted writing and the impact on research productivity. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Research*, 14(2), 109-115.

Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2020). AI-assisted writing tools: Benefits and drawbacks. *Advances in Computer Science*, 31(4), 333-340.

Nguyen, H., & Tran, T. (2021). The role of AI in detecting predatory journals. *Journal of Scientific Publishing*, 16(3), 199-205.

Patel, A., & Sharma, R. (2022). The ethics of AI in scientific writing. *Journal of Ethical Considerations in Science and Technology*, 17(2), 87-94.

Rodriguez, M., & Garcia, A. (2022). Predatory journals and the role of AI. Ethics in Science and Technology, 27(1), 14-20.

Wilson, T., & Jackson, M. (2019). AI-assisted writing: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 14(1), 56-62.