Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Human Artistic Discernment as an Evaluative Criterion in the Age of Artificial Intelligence"

Jacek Rogala[1]

1. Centre for Credible Artificial Intelligence, Technical University of Warsaw, Poland

Manuscript touches on a very important and delicate matter of assessment of human work in the era of AI. Even in quantifiable disciplines such as informatics, this problem stands out, since many reviews are made by LLMs today. However, the question of whether or not AI algorithms can deliver artistic discernment is not a trivial one.

First of all, convergent expert assessments in different fields (from sport and science to art) prove that humans, for their judgments, use common tacit or implicit knowledge that shares the same base. We could call it ‘hidden human algorithms’. Since they exist, they could be learned, as proved by humankind history. So there is a good chance that AI - which is based on the human nervous system - also can do it to some extent. Current advanced models such as LLMs use methods such as zero-shot learning using semantic spaces, additionally to labeled data, to enable inference by associations. This method, combined with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback, which has been present since 2017 (Christiano et al. 2017. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences), enables fine-tuning of models to users such as experts in music and visuals to learn their ‘hidden human algorithms’. Papers such as Stiennon et al. 2022. Learning to summarize from human feedback show that in some areas they are quite successful. Even more, works of Clemens & Marasović 2025. MixAssist: An Audio-Language Dataset for Co-Creative AI Assistance in Music Mixing show to some extent the convergence of human and AI judges.

Saying that, I'm not claiming that current AI models can replace human experts in art assessment. The given examples pertain to not very demanding tasks, but they show that ‘human hidden algorithms’ can be learned by modern AI. They might be a helpful tool for judges, which, in my opinion, is worth considering.

doi.org/10.32388/8PEJZZ

For the paper to be complete and convincing, current literature pertaining to AI applications in the assessment of different types of human activity should be included, discussed, and the text should be accordingly changed.

However, my biggest reservation concerns the example with the Example of Simulated Data (Expert Ratings of Musical Works). No text in the manuscript explains how it was generated, if it makes sense at all. It is absolutely not convincing. I would strongly recommend using real-world examples. It is best if they would be randomly selected examples, not 5 but 100 or more. Only then do any statistics and inferences based on them make any sense.

I used AI models to search the literature. The text is 100% AI-free.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.