

Review of: "The essence of ChatGPT is the subversion brought about by the combination of "technologized society" and "societized technology": "society technologization" and "technology socialization""

Fan Yang¹

¹ Deakin University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper intends to address ChatGPT as a social technology that is embedded in the technological society. I think that there are many terminologies/jargons raised throughout the manuscript but the clarity of them is lacking. The lack of ontological clarity and inadequate engagement with existing academic literature are the biggest weakness for the paper. The paper cannot be published in its current form and an extensive revision is required.

To improve, the manuscript requires a significant change.

There has been a lack of discussion about ChatGPT as the manuscript focuses on discussing technologies and their impacts on aspects of the society in general.

There is a lack of review on existing academic discussion. Although research on ChatGPT can so far be a work in process, the reviewer would like to recommend that the author should have deeper engagement with existing academic discussions including without being limited to the topics on automation, technical mediation, chatbots, and technological infrastructure.

The structure of the paper is broken up. The author has pointed out the influence of technologies by listing out some key points. The reviewer suggests that the author should consider articulating those key points logically and smoothly with evidence support or relevant literature.

The author attempts to cover many points with regard to how the society has been changed by technologies. However, the argument of the article is ambiguous and the research question is not clearly stated.

The selection of technical jargons can confuse the reader. For example, there are nuanced differences between "socialisation" and "societisation". The author does not necessarily differentiate the two terms and instead, considers both replaceable.

If the author would like to pursue further publication, please situate your work within the current academic discussion on the relevant topic and establish your argument from the research.

