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This article does not seem legit.

At first glance the article is well-written. However, as stated by other reviewers, the text does not link to the sources listed in the references section. Thus the claims in the article have little support. Readers can not easily verify or critically assess the claims.

What is more problematic is that I suspect the article may have been generated by ChatGPT or another AI tool. I do not per se object to using such tools to generate well-written texts, but it is hard to make sure that the generated content is actually supported by facts.

I suspect this because the first version of the article cited 8 fake references that did not exist, and only two legit ones. The journals in which the fake references supposedly appeared did exist, but in the respective issues, no article of that title existed. Even a web search could not find articles with matching titles elsewhere. Three articles were even claimed to come from the same pages of the same issue of the same volume. This is technically impossible. (This first version of the article can be accessed through the history at the top of the page).

The problematic references have been replaced with existing ones in version two of the article. Now all references do exist. But since most sections of the text have been left unchanged, I would be surprised if these new references actually support the claims in the text.

The author should improve the article by linking the claims in the text to the references in the article so readers can verify these claims, or find more details about them, by looking up the corresponding reference.