

Review of: "[Perspective] AI Is All About Typing the Right Phrase"

Ryan Jenkins¹

¹ California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper, rather than starting *in media res*, would benefit from giving the reader an introduction to what will be discussed and a brief outline of the narrative structure of the paper. It's not clear how the observations in section 1 and 2 connect to the discussion in section 3. Are the examples given in section 2 supposed to be examples of ML-enhanced creativity? Is there a threat to our creativity in those examples? Is there a danger that our perspectives and ideas will be lost in this process? Is there a particular problem that's being addressed here and, if so, what is an example of how it might manifest?

Is section 1 supposed to illustrate some problem? It's not clear what the opening section about the 1980s pastel computer is doing. The author comes back to this in section 3, after a detour through section 2, which outlines the applications of ML in the earth sciences. But that detour is jarring and unexpected.

It's not particularly surprising that researchers are finding powerful uses for AI and ML in earth sciences. What would be more interesting is to examine some of their uses that are more novel or innovative. Maybe it would be more compelling, even, to "deep dive" into just one use of AI and ML in earth sciences, following the trajectory of data collection, ingestion, and analysis. How is this different from other uses of ML, or is it simply an application of those techniques to a new domain?

In section 4.1, it would be valuable to see an example of how we could go wrong by relying on AI too much, to the extent where it undermines our own creativity or perspectives. The paper would benefit substantially from more concrete examples to motivate these points. For example, what might happen, in the earth sciences domain, if we were to fail to "remain in control of our work"? (I am assuming the author has an interest in maintaining the focus of the paper in the earth sciences domain specifically.)

Finally, I suggest changing the title of the piece. Only in the very last sentence of the article is it brought up, and it's not explained or defended at all. Can you give some examples of how entering slightly different prompts for AI might lead to radically different outputs for brainstorming keywords, etc.?

In all, this paper feels like a disjointed collection of thoughts and observations. They are hardly tied together. Much of the ground it runs over, in terms of regulations and ethical principles, is already well-trodden. And those discussions do not add much to the main thrust of the paper, which seems to be about creativity and human-AI collaboration.

I suggest the paper could be strengthened significantly by focusing in, perhaps, on what is unique about AI in the earth sciences context, what novel problems might arise, and what it might concretely look like to delegate too much of our creativity or innovation to AI systems. Those specific, concrete observations can then be used to motivate the suggestions at the very end of the paper. Right now, on the other hand, sections 1 and 3 seem disconnected from section 2, and section 4 is not motivated or driven along by much of what comes before it.