

Review of: "Collaborative Intelligence: A scoping review of current applications"

Luke Balcombe¹

¹ Griffith University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It could be clearer in terms of dates. The review introduces we are in Industry 4.0 and 5.0 is next, although it is unclear how far away that is. The pace of change in generative AI has demonstrated that it would be hard to predict from 5 years ago, what the technological advances would be. Yet a reference from 5 years ago shows a forecast revenue increase.:
""Organizations investing in AI-human collaboration are expected to boost revenues by 38% within five years (Shook and Knickrehm 2018)". Since it is 5 years ago since the referred article, it should be revised to indicate real growth rates or comment on how AI-human collaboration has fared in that time. Secondly, the search terms used in the literature review should be included. The high amount of excluded studies may be because it is difficult to tell from an abstract screening whether there is human-AI methods. Although a lot of AI may be used in assistive capacity or in combination with verification by humans, the term "collaborative AI" or forms of "human-AI" may not have been used. It would help to reference to a reference for the type of systematic review applied. It seems from the healthcare findings that it is mostly for medical purposes although in some research capacity also. It would be interesting to see if Knowledge work agents can be applied to help in detecting inappropriate mental health content on social media, as an intervention for preventing harm and negative effects. It may help to add "4.0" after latest wave in ""the latest wave of AI is developing these capabilities (Stowers et al. 2021)". Ending the conclusion with a reference to Nahavandi (2019) should be replaced with the authors own findings which is 4 years later ... what can you say for example about GPT-4 being safer, more efficient and helping people with aspects of their work? For example, in the media today it reported 6% of Chat GPT users are using it in their direct work, while others are using it for social media posts or to help organise their work. What can be said about efficiency and sustainability in terms of what we already know now, not what was said 4-5 years ago. If there is no references, then simply state the current technology has exceeded the literature on this aspect of AI. Is collaborative AI even an agreed term? Who defined it? The Australian Government signed on to a voluntary ethics framework on "responsible" AI, so shouldn't this be referred to since you are with the CSIRO, and therefore expected to be aligned with voluntary use of frameworks? If you see recent media articles release on 1 June 2023 regarding consultation papers exploring 'high-risk' AI, then you should try to explain how your concept or framework adds to the discourse. With "fair-aware" AI and ""explainable" AI being concepts in digital mental health, it is worthy to explore this literature also, to show how there are terms being coined, yet independent of one another. It could add to confusion about AI by not using definitions or using consistent terms.

