

Peer Review

Review of: "Human Artistic Discernment as an Evaluative Criterion in the Age of Artificial Intelligence"

Rosalie Waelen¹

1. Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität Bonn, Germany

Dear author(s),

Thank you for the opportunity to read your manuscript. I agree with the main thesis that artistic discernment has certain philosophical dimensions that cannot be automated. I also think that the combination of philosophical analysis and statistical analysis is a great strength of the paper. However, the philosophical analysis (section II on "Theoretical Background") is, in its current form, too surface-level. The notions of meaning, value, and responsibility should be defined and discussed in more detail. The same goes for the reference to "recognition, exclusion, and legitimation" on p.4 and "practical reasoning" on p.5. More reference to existing philosophical literature about AI and art/creativity would be interesting too, but not strictly necessary. Another weakness of the paper is the lack of concrete examples. It remains vague in what contexts AI takes over artistic discernment, in what scenarios they would have to take responsibility for their outcomes, etc. Finally, the paper is very repetitive: the point that "meaning, value, and responsibility dimensions resist full automation" is raised many times, and the introduction is practically the same as the conclusion. While this philosophical argument is a persuasive one, the discussion to support the argument is rather thin and therefore lacks convincing force.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.