

Peer Review

# Review of: "Quo Vadis, Artificial Intelligence? A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Artificial Intuition"

Revathy Venkataramanan<sup>1</sup>

1. University of South Carolina, United States

The proposal of the paper is interesting. However, the following are the areas that need improvement

- Quantification of path assessment and selection – this needs to incorporate more diverse factors. In some cases, the path may actually be longer to discover the knowledge. How would we penalize in those cases? What do we mean by “intuitive” edges? How do we get the priority weights? Are those custom to each query?
- The paper talks about 5 sample queries. The main area where current neurosymbolic systems struggle is scale and automation. If we construct a KG as the author suggests, how do we scale well for reasoning? Once the graph becomes dense, there might be too many paths to explore. How will we handle that? How do we automatically construct such a graph? If we construct such a large-scale graph, how will we check to what percentage the information is factual?
- The motivation of the paper is good. But the proposed methods to construct and evaluate the creative and intuitive notion are vague and lack technical depth.

## Declarations

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.