

Peer Review

Review of: "The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Lifecycle of Scientific Manuscripts: Authoring, Reviewing, and Editorial Selection"

Mario Plebani¹

1. Medicine-DIMED, University of Padua, Italy

This is a narrative paper, not a systematic analysis, describing the increasingly concerning use of AI in scientific publications. My main criticism is that this should be published as an Opinion Paper and not a review article, as the author cites several times his name and articles, and some proposals are at least questionable.

Minor criticisms:

- a) At the beginning, LLM are part of AI tools; if you want an evolution, therefore the sentences should cite "...AI tools, including LLM....."
- b) The hybrid model should maintain the uncompensated model of referees with the added role of AI. The author should emphasize that the uncompensated model is based on the interest of referees to update their knowledge and help colleagues to improve the quality of the papers.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.