Review of: "Beyond Algorithms: A Framework for Ethical Assessment of AI Applications in Industry"

Nicolas Brault[1]

1 UNiLaSalle, Beauvais, France

Dear researcher,

Thank you for this article, which tackles an important and critical issue: how to implement ethical pillars of AI in the industry? To be honest, as a philosopher and ethician, I consider that this article is more a paper relevant to applied ethics than to ethics. There is, for example, only one philosophical reference (to Aristotle), but it is more ornamental than useful to the discussion. I guess this is not the point of the article to discuss ethical issues in general, but apart from the EU AI ACT, there is also good literature about the ethics of AI in, for example, L. Floridi's works (especially the AI4People). But again, I'm a philosopher, and I understand that this was not the main subject of the article.

Concerning the issues addressed in the article, I find them pretty well treated, and I like the idea of some kind of ethical score to assess the application of AI in the industry.

However, I would have liked to know more about the way the questions ("criteria") were constructed and phrased. Why these questions? Why does the number of questions vary according to the categories?

It is not really clear why this or that question was chosen and formulated this way. So some of the questions may appear as arbitrary.

It also could be good to harmonize the way questions are phrased: some are real questions, others are not.

Moreover, some are really strange: "7.6. The decision-maker must be accountable for…". How can a "must" be a question or a criteria? It should be phrased as "The decision-maker **is** accountable for" if you want to be able to assess it.

I'm also quite doubtful about the way people in the industry will answer these questions if it is only a self-assessment and if there is no other instance of control.

By the way, there is a typo in question 1.1: the question is not finished ("Are the fundamental rights of")

I want to thank you again for your article, which is overall quite good but still needs to be improved. A brief discussion about the classical ethical issues of AI (beyond regulations) could be a way to improve it: for example, the 5 principles defined by Floridi for the ethics of AI (beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice, explicability), as well as an explanation and harmonization of the questions or criteria to assess the ethical issues of AI in the industry.