Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Artificial Intelligence (AI), Extended Phenotypes, and the Bio-Evolutionary Anthropocene Hypothesis"

Stephen Brewer[1]

1. LIAT, University of Lincoln, United Kingdom

Initially, I thought that this was not my field academically, but it was of interest. The paper covers a big-picture perspective on AI, technology, and humankind, all of which make it an important topic.

The paper is discursive in nature, as the title is not a question. It refers to other work by the author on the main topic: Bio-Evolutionary Anthropocene Hypothesis. I am not exactly sure how this paper differs from earlier published work on the topic other than that it presents a useful and compelling account of the concept.

To what extent affects the decision to publish depends on the journal editors. I can only comment on the paper itself.

That said, the paper is very interesting and thought-provoking.

Actually, it is my academic field in that it is centred around interdisciplinary collaboration. Specifically, the paper positions AI in the context of planetary transformation, and how both of these concepts relate to human culture and technology.

The paper makes insightful and prophetic points: AI has the power and potential to influence human decisions at many levels, from the routine and short-term, but also - and this is the central theme of the paper - to the long-term, and at a global scale.

My only editorial change suggestion is to reference 2. The reference appears as (sensu 2), where this references Richard Dawkins. Given the importance of this reference, I would suggest presenting this as (sensu Dawkins 2), as this then makes sense even without the reader having to check the reference.

Vernadsky is cited, which is relevant given his thinking around the need for a new era of global cooperation to support the planet's sustainable development.

doi.org/10.32388/MMXKYW

The paper discusses and presents well arguments around the interdependencies between AIs and humans. AIs require human input - not least creativity and invention, as well as energy to survive and persist.

The paper makes the case that AI is being led by conflicting forces, self-protecting and greedy big tech companies as against altruistic players. Against these agencies is the overarching truism that all must transform or perish.

The paper concludes with the warning, albeit optimistic, that it is not too late for humankind to steer the evolution of AI in a direction that is aligned to the needs of humanity and not purely the narrow selfish interests of big tech and their like.

The paper provides a succinct account of important ideas in a way that is authoritative and compelling.

I have mentioned one suggestion for a change, but that is not essential.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.