

Review of: "Artificial intelligence in the service of health and safety at work: Perspectives and challenges from now to 2035 - A prospective study"

Si Ying Tan¹

¹ National University of Singapore

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall Comment

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting paper, which appears very timely when AI has gradually penetrated all dimensions of human life, including work and employment. I think the methods leveraged to present the findings are novel and interesting. Overall, the article is a bit too long, repetitive, and redundant in certain sections (please refer to some of the comments below). In some sections, the way in which the article was written could be improved. For instance, the authors could report the methods, findings, and discussion using a more academic tone instead of being too colloquial. Below, I offer specific comments for the authors to consider when revising their article.

Specific Comments

1. Throughout the article, I noticed a lot of use of '-' by the authors at the beginning of the sentences. As this is technically a research article and not a report or minutes of a meeting, the authors should consider converting these pointers into proper paragraphs instead.
2. The method section is very detailed and specific, but somewhat lengthy. I appreciate the authors spending the effort to explain the six steps in great detail to the readers. However, readers could potentially benefit from a more succinct and precise understanding of these steps. Hence, I gently suggest the authors to consider coming up with a table or figure or any other form of visualization deemed suitable to capture these six steps succinctly.
3. Point 1 of the methods: The authors wrote "These experts were recruited on the basis of successive aggregations based on the professional relations of the initiators of the study". What do the authors mean by successive aggregations? Please explain.
4. Selection of variables: Was there a mechanism put in place to moderate the selection of variables? From the 13 variables reported in Table II, I find that there is some overlapping of these variables. For example, variables 9 and 11 are essentially more or less the same, they both refer to the impacts of AI on the incumbent workforce. Should they be combined instead? If the authors want to retain all 13 variables, they should describe in more detail how these 13 variables are distinctive from one another. Or perhaps, consider naming them differently to really make each variable appear more distinctive.
5. Scenario 3 (Democratic development): The author started this scenario by writing that "The 2020s will see the

establishment of processes of democratic control by workers and citizens.” What do you mean by this as I do not quite understand the message that this whole scenario is trying to put forth to the readers. Are the authors trying to suggest that AI will be democratising employment? How would that happen when the majority of the sentiment of the workers today reflects more fear and anxiety that AI will displace and replace them (there are some literature suggesting this sentiment). How would this sentiment be linked to democratic development? I think the authors need to rewrite this whole scenario to make it clearer to the readers.

6. In the results section, the authors present the four scenarios and used cases. What about the potential risks that AI would bring? Since this element has been laid out by the authors at the beginning, I think the authors should also explain what the experts have concluded on the risks involved.
7. The discussion section is a bit too lengthy and repetitive. For each of the sections, I list my comments below:-
 - a. I think 4.1 and 4.2 can be succinctly summarised in two paragraphs. I find that much of the explanations here are repetitive.
 - b. For 4.3, I think the four tables there are not very beneficial from the readers’ point of view as not only do some pointers repeat earlier information, they are too wordy. I suggest the authors to remove all four tables and turn them into succinct paragraphs. Go straight into the recommendation instead of elaborating on the promises, limitations, benefits, and risks.
 - c. In 4.4, I believe what the authors intend to do here is to describe the external validity of their findings, meaning, how the findings from a foresight exercise about AI occupational risks in France would mean to the rest of the world? I think the authors should go straight to the point to explain this instead of elaborating too much about what is happening in the EU. Explain to the readers what your findings mean to them.