Review of: "[Commentary] Artificial Intelligence, or Artifact Intelligence? Most AI Is Not Ready for Practice"

Riccardo Bellazzi[1]

1 University of Pavia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The commentary raises some important issues about the application of machine-learning-based AI in medicine. Safety and explainability are recognized as key components of any kind of AI application. This is particularly true in a safety-critical context, such as medicine. Overemphasizing purely data-driven approaches is risky for AI itself, since without proper knowledge-based boundaries, this kind of system may lead to dangerous errors and, consequently, disillusions and delays in market acceptance. The commentary, however, appears to be too critical with respect to current AI strategies. As a matter of fact, the authors may refer to interesting comprehensive views about the most recent AI methods and tools given by Nello Cristianini (The Shortcut: Why Intelligent Machines Do Not Think Like Us. CRC Press) and by Luciano Floridi (The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Principles, Challenges, and Opportunities, Oxford University Press). All in all, medicine requires the implementation of the whole set of trustworthy AI requirements (https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai), which is stringent and needs to be applied. AI has already greatly contributed to image processing and diagnostics, and the capability of new natural language processing technologies provides enormous opportunities to build better ICT systems in healthcare. The future will require us to exploit such methods and tools by properly merging human reasoning with machine support. In other terms, using the authors' words, to critically interpret machine-induced correlations to extract human-guided causation mechanisms.