

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

Evert Stamhuis¹

¹ Erasmus University Rotterdam

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

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

Thank you for sharing your work. I have reviewed V2 and hope to assist in improving the paper with my limited observations.

1. It seems to be the purpose of the author to reach an academic audience with this paper, which I would encourage. In order to access the academic journals, it may be commendable to find stronger sources for the factual observations such as of Leos 2022. There is an abundance of academic literature with which to make the same point.
2. The various lines in the paper could be connected to each other more explicitly, so that we as readers see how one point is strengthened by another point. In addition to reviewer Xinge Li, who draws the author's attention to the weak embedding of the observations on AI in earth sciences in the overall message, I advise to re-think the point the author wishes to make with 4.3. The author's view on role that compliance to legal and ethical norms has for AI use remains a bit unclear for the reader. It is obvious that those normative expectations have a crucial role to safeguard that society and communities change in a way that we wish in view of our shared values. How that plays out in terms of creativity is another matter. We could have unethical but very creative practices, with or without AI, and very ethical but uncreative practices. What is ethical in creativity. It may be that the author wants to develop the argument that preservation and promotion of creativity is part of our ethical values. In that frame, AI can be unethical as far as it suppresses that creativity. For that argument, the reference to AI in earth sciences may either be ineffective or needs to be expanded by showing how creativity in earth sciences is under stress in the use of AI. The latter point would not be impossible, because we already know from Latour and others, that the availability of a certain technology bounces back on the expectations we have. In terms of AI in earth sciences: AI can answer many questions, but gradually we will restrict ourselves to raising only those questions that the technology can answer and not others. That would indeed be the kill for imagination, in earth sciences as in any other field of academic study and policy making. In sum, it is certainly possible, to develop the connection between ethics and creativity but it requires another line of argumentation.
3. The really nice part of the paper lies in the model of figure 1 and the accompanying explanation. I would recommend the author to make the development of a man-machine interaction process (in three steps) in times of GPT AI into the main goal of the work. It may be that the connection between the steps and the promotion or preservation of creativity will flow easily into the story line then. It would also help all those educators who now try to get to terms with the wide availability of free GPT services for text generation, because it would provide guidance of how to redesign the

assignments for students and come up with sensible review criteria. Also, the unclarity set out in 2 hereabove could also be resolved, by showing that a good process is both creative and ethical. Whether there will be room for pointing out the empirical evidence we have on the challenges of humans to remain autonomous vis-à-vis the algorithmic system, I leave to the appreciation of the author. This autonomy seems to be a presupposition underlying the model, but there is research showing to what extent that is empirically problematic. But with the guidance of the author, a highly interesting line of research could grow out of his paper: to what extent and under which conditions will the stepwise approach assist in keeping AI at bay and preserving autonomous human creativity?