

Review of: "A Perspective for Economic and Social Unfoldings of AI"

Ahmed Elragal¹

¹ Luleå University of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of: "A Perspective for Economic and Social Unfoldings of AI"

The posited research questions (1. *what are the main transformations needed to amplify gains and structural improvements from the use of higher level technological mechanisms?*, 2. *Which connections can be established between the pillars of evolutionary economics and this field of knowledge?*, 3. *Which institutional contexts are able to benefit from AI tools, inducing constructive externalities to firms in terms of education, technical and scientific skills upgrading, so as to reach higher levels of employment in the long term and limit unemployment in the short one?*, 4. *Which branches of the so-called Artificial Intelligence are best suited to which types of activities?*) in the beginning of the article are too many and too broad. Perhaps reducing to less number of questions would help to streamline the message of the article. Likewise, the list of keywords is also broad "*Fuzzy Logic, Global Optimization, Mechanism Design, Game Theory, Artificial Inference, Global Learning*" and therefore it could have been better narrowing them down.

The article only focuses on AI as replacement for humans. However, AI has applications where it saves human lives. For example, using robotics in dangerous or hazardous areas should not be considered a replacement of human, but rather safeguarding human lives. Added, we – humans – have developed AI and its algorithms and it is up to us to decide how to use it. Discussing the different areas and lens is important, as focusing on a single aspect bring to the surface human bias, something which we use AI to reduce, yet it comes with its own version of the bias i.e., the training dataset.

The article is full of bold statements that need tone-down, or to the least right-tone. E.g., "*This is so because even companies sometimes get "convinced" that machines are really able to THINK and perform better than human beings in ALL situations and contexts, a completely false inference*".

The articles comes without a clear research methodology, no data to analyse and derive conclusions from, no discussion section, so there are several key constructs of an academic paper missing!

Additionally, the conclusion includes a list of groundless statements which ought to have been theoretically as well as empirically grounded and tested first.

Wishing the author all the best in taking the article it further in the next versions.

