

# Review of: "A Perspective for Economic and Social Unfoldings of AI"

David Levine<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of California, Berkeley

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

This is a clear reject.

The author raises a number of important questions about artificial intelligence.

Unfortunately, there are far too many questions for a single article to address. That long list implies the treatment of each question thin and unsatisfactory.

The presentation uses hard words and convoluted sentences, which makes it very difficult to follow the argument.

I) The writing is convoluted and an impediment to understanding.

These abstract and intro sentences are almost impossible to read on first take:

- Even etymological adequacy and psychological consequences of the denomination "Artificial Intelligence" need some reflection, and suggestions for a lucid replacement are presented.
  - I think this means: I point out problems with the name "artificial intelligence" and suggest more helpful replacements.
- Which institutional contexts are able to benefit from AI tools, inducing constructive externalities to firms in terms of education, technical and scientific skills upgrading, so as to reach higher levels of employment in the long term and limit unemployment in the short one?
  - I think this means: "I examine the settings where AI is likely to increase skills and where it is likely to lead to job loss"
- As the expression "Artificial Intelligence" is associated to the idea that the future of human kind is strongly related to its applications, playing a key role as a substitute for human intelligence, it is not difficult to infer that the techniques composing AI probably will have a very significant economic and social importance.
  - I think this means: The several technologies loosely called "Artificial intelligence" will have a large effect on the economy and society.

Probably my short versions are wrong. But that is not my fault. Use them as a model, and write what you mean. If my short versions are correct, please use them. And use them as a model.

Ironically, chatGPT or its peers can do this rewriting for you.

When I get to the substance, there are too many arguments for any to be convincing.

A few examples:

- Talking about retraining workers displaced by AI: “is worth to employ the necessary effort.” Worth it to whom? If you mean the employer, then the market will solve the problem. If you mean society, then be concrete how you propose to subsidize or otherwise induce companies to retrain.
- Section 3.2 says companies should not use external AI due to loss of intellectual property. But GPT4 and its peers permit (or will soon permit) their models to apply to proprietary databases.
- “Scientific and technological directives: In this type of activity, fundamental knowledge may be synonymous of market power and income”. This half sentence makes no sense. The rest of the sentence contradicts this part.
- The review of fuzzy logic belongs in a different paper.
- What is your example of promising 100% accuracy, but not delivering? A terrible over-promise, but you have to show it occurs in a situation we care about.
- You never explain “Which institutional contexts are able to benefit from AI tools,” which was promised in the abstract. But the framework in the abstract is wrong. It implies skill upgrading will “reach higher levels of employment”, but higher skills and productivity can also reduce employment in an occupation (think farming over the last century).