

Peer Review

Review of: "The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Lifecycle of Scientific Manuscripts: Authoring, Reviewing, and Editorial Selection"

August John Hoffman¹

1. Metropolitan State University, United States

I would like to thank the author (Jose L. Domingo) for providing me with the opportunity to review this very timely and important manuscript. This paper addresses both the potential advantages and disadvantages of incorporating artificial intelligence (AI) into scientific publishing. The results (provided in the literature review) of the magnitude of the use of unethical AI are alarming – over 50% of the manuscripts that were submitted for peer review used some form of AI tool. More alarming was the fact that ChatGPT fabricated over 20% of academic citations. The prevalence of unethical use of AI, combined with the growing economic pressure to utilize some form of AI, has contributed to the concept of “citation hallucination” – fabricating citations at a rate between 18% and 20%. The author also provides several examples of the frequency of this growing problem, such as a summary of recent studies conducted between 2024 and 2025 citing the AI models tested, sample sizes, and fabrication or error rates (see pages 6-7). The author concludes the study by maintaining the unique importance and relevance of using human reviewers and combining this human element with a guarded use of AI.

In my opinion, this manuscript was very well written and extremely relevant within most disciplines of higher education. In my opinion, individuals who are tasked with evaluating original research projects and manuscripts among undergraduate and graduate students should familiarize themselves with the important information in this paper.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.