

Peer Review

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

Osamah Mohammed Alyasiri¹

1. Polytechnic College of Karbala, Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University, Kufa, Iraq

1. While the manuscript is presented as a review article, it also advances a strong normative and policy-oriented argument. It would improve clarity if the Introduction explicitly stated whether the primary aim is (i) descriptive synthesis of evidence, (ii) critical commentary, or (iii) policy advocacy. Clarifying the intended audience (researchers, editors, publishers, policymakers) would also help contextualize the recommendations.
2. The critique of publishers and AI-driven automation is compelling but occasionally framed in strongly normative language. Introducing a more neutral tone in selected sections (e.g., Sections 5.2 and 5.3) and acknowledging counterarguments, such as legitimate cost pressures on small or non-profit journals, would enhance the manuscript's credibility and perceived objectivity.
3. Although the manuscript cites extensive empirical literature, the criteria for selecting studies (especially those summarized in Table 1) are not fully described. Adding a short subsection or paragraph explaining how studies were identified, selected, and compared would strengthen the rigor of the review and distinguish it from a purely narrative perspective.
4. The discussion of AI-generated citation errors is important but somewhat repetitive, particularly in Section 3.2. Condensing overlapping statements and focusing on synthesis rather than repetition would improve readability while preserving the strength of the argument.
5. The "Fair Hybrid Model" is conceptually appealing, but its implementation remains largely aspirational. The paper would benefit from concrete examples, pilot programs, or cost-benefit considerations illustrating how such a model could realistically be adopted by journals of different sizes and business models.

6. While accountability is mentioned, a more explicit discussion of legal responsibility (e.g., liability in cases of AI-assisted review failures or fabricated citations) would add depth, especially given the increasing regulatory attention to AI governance in research and publishing.
7. Ensure consistent terminology when referring to AI systems (e.g., “AI,” “LLMs,” “AI-based tools”).
8. Consider adding a brief concluding figure or table summarizing the proposed governance framework and stakeholder responsibilities.
9. A light language edit could further improve conciseness in longer paragraphs.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.