

Review of: "Collaborative Intelligence: A scoping review of current applications"

Magali Goirand¹

¹ Macquarie University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for undertaking a scoping review of collaborative intelligence AI applications. How AI and humans can collaborate is a critical aspect of the success of AI in helping humans flourish. The latest development in generative AI has made this matter even more pressing to investigate. This scoping review investigates what collaborative intelligence AI apps have been developed whether as a pilot or fully deployed. The article is well written. The methodology is well documented regarding the search parameters and results. Additionally, the methodology section would benefit from having a description of the process such as how many researchers did the screening of the abstracts, how were the inclusion criteria tested and refined, and how conflicts between researchers were resolved if any. In particular, the criterion "shared objective" (p.3) could be subject to interpretation as it suggests that there should be some dialogue between the AI and the human agents. Interestingly, it excludes most Clinical Decisions Support Systems for example. In addition, the benefits identified in the results (p.12) and discussed (p.13) for knowledge work applications are improved accuracy and coverage of the decisions which do not appear to be different from non-collaborative CDSS. While beyond the scope of this review, it would be interesting to further refine/investigate the benefits of a collaborative intelligence approach versus a non-collaborative one for the knowledge work category. While the nature of the field of AI is very dynamic and academic publishing very inadequate to keep up with it, more peer-reviewed references would improve the strength of this manuscript, possibly through updating them.

Some minor comments and questions out of curiosity:

- Why not having "collaborative intelligence" in the database criteria?
- Spelling out UAV in the text (p.11), even though it has been spelled out in the table prior would ease the reading.
- While congruent with the purpose of the app, considering "induce greater negative effect and state of anxiety" for the Shelley app (p.11) is bewildering.
- Could the HALS app (p. 12) become an app to further train an AI?

Thank you for doing this important research, and feeding the discussion about how AI and humans can collaborate to help humans flourish.