

Peer Review

# Review of: "An AI-Human Collaborative Review of AI-Human Collaborative Reviews"

Arpita Pathak<sup>1</sup>

1. Independent Researcher, India

The author gives a broad overview of the current conversation, touching on practical uses of AI tools, ethical concerns, and some of the tensions around co-authorship. The use of real tools (like ResearchRabbit and PaperFinder) to guide the review process is a helpful touch, and the transparency in describing that process adds value.

What the paper does well is laying out the landscape: it shows how AI is being used, what the risks are, and what others in the field have said. The range of references is good, and the author clearly did the legwork to capture various voices in this space. The inclusion of tools like NotebookLM also adds a useful layer, showing how information was extracted and validated.

That said, the paper tends to summarize more than analyze. There's not a strong original argument or takeaway; it's more of a well-organized collection of what others have said. For a reader familiar with these debates, much of it will feel familiar. Also, some of the sections are heavier than they need to be; the points are clear, but the language and length sometimes get in the way of impact.

All in all, it's a responsible, timely piece that serves as a useful overview. It pulls together the current thinking in a clear and structured way, and that has its place.

## Declarations

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