

Peer Review

Review of: "The Influence of an Artificial Intelligence Large Language Model (ChatGPT) on Orthopaedic Scientific Publishing: A Bibliometric Analysis"

Spilios Dellis¹

1. National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

Review – The Influence of an Artificial Intelligence Large Language Model (ChatGPT) on Orthopaedic Scientific Publishing: A Bibliometric Analysis

This manuscript represents a novel and important contribution to the orthopaedic literature. It addresses a topic of profound relevance to contemporary scientific publishing—the measurable influence of large language models, specifically ChatGPT, on research productivity, linguistic style, and collaboration patterns within orthopaedics. The authors present a rigorous and meticulously conducted bibliometric analysis that is both methodologically robust and conceptually insightful.

The study's design, encompassing over 19,000 articles from leading orthopaedic journals, demonstrates exemplary methodological precision. The use of validated bibliometric and natural language processing tools within R provides a solid analytical foundation, and the statistical approach is transparent, reproducible, and appropriately detailed. The findings are compelling: a significant rise in publication output, increased co-authorship, and subtle yet measurable linguistic evolution following the release of ChatGPT. These results are clearly presented and supported by well-structured figures and narrative coherence.

Beyond its quantitative value, the paper's discussion stands out for its intellectual depth. The authors place their findings within the broader context of the digital transformation of science, touching upon the ethical, methodological, and editorial implications of AI integration with impressive balance and foresight. The reflections on how AI may reshape authorship, peer review, and scientific communication are both visionary and grounded in scholarly understanding. Importantly, the manuscript maintains

objectivity and avoids speculation, presenting an evidence-based perspective that will resonate with both clinicians and academics.

The writing style is fluent, engaging, and of high editorial quality. The structure follows a logical, reader-friendly flow from background to implications, ensuring clarity even for those less familiar with bibliometric methods. This work exemplifies how quantitative bibliometrics can meaningfully intersect with conceptual discussions about technology, ethics, and the evolution of academic medicine.

Overall, this is an outstanding manuscript—scientifically rigorous, ethically aware, and highly relevant to the ongoing discourse on artificial intelligence in research and publishing. It will undoubtedly generate wide interest and provide an important reference point for future investigations into AI's impact on academic medicine.

Recommendation: Accept for publication without revision.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.