

# Review of: "[Essay] The Algorithm; Mind of a Virtual Era – Our Code of Codes"

Daniel Broudy<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Okinawa Christian University

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

Initial references to sources such as N. Weiner et al. should feature both given and surnames. Thereafter, surname alone. The author uses exclamation points inexplicably, which affect the tone. Some inconsistencies with comma usage are observed. Spacing between words should be consistent throughout. A full stop should appear only at the end of a sentence and after a parenthetical citation. The author observes that, "The line between living and non-living systems is already blurring at the outset," but it's a bit unclear how precisely this is so considering the somewhat abstract discussion of semiosis that immediately precedes this observation.

Comments/suggestions on certain passages/rhetorical formulations follow:

"a unified framework" of what precisely? Some specification would help clarity.

"infused by experts" with what precisely? It's unclear.

"the mechanical fundamentals" = "the mechanical fundamentals" ??

"the key into which is locked a full-proof" What kind of 'key' precisely? The metaphorical 'key' should be modified with something explicit so readers can connect it to something they recognize.

"do them infinitely quicker and better" = "carry out computations more efficiently on many orders of magnitude than humans do"

"their antennae into culture" < shouldn't the metaphorical 'antennae' be modified by something explicit so that readers know what kind?

"T. Leary" = "Timothy Leary" < shouldn't the first instance of a reference feature both given and surname?

"The cyber-prefix mushroomed ..." = "Use of the cyber-prefix mushroomed ..."

The author uses certain subjective modifiers such as "brilliant" "great". Needed??

"Pide Piper of Hamlin" = "Pied Piper of Hamelin" ?

"mind-boggling" = "perplexing" ?

The author might consider checking out the following article and its discussion of the algorithm.

> <https://truthout.org/articles/social-media-penetrates-every-aspect-of-our-online-lives-for-profit/>

As well as > <https://truthout.org/articles/chomsky-and-hermans-propaganda-model-foretells-a-weaponized-facebook/>

It's interesting, to say the least, what Palihapitiya admits about the secret social experiment FB conducted on unwitting users.

The author is writing about an incredibly important issue, that of the algorithm as a tool of high-tech thievery. So, it might seem reasonable to say that some programmers today employed by the tech Giants can be thought of as hired guns, capturing our full attention, following our every move, and subsuming every second of our lives to the AI beast gobbling up every bit and byte of information we feed it with our time/energy. I hope that the author of this piece returns to it with a clear idea in mind about the kind of tone she aims to strike for a general audience. It is a technical piece of writing that can be softened with less jargon, more inviting to a wider audience, and, thus, more informative/impactful. The author seems to be keen on keeping a certain kind of rhetorical flourish throughout at the expense of precision and concision. Maybe a happy medium can be established between the two. I love the idea that the author is bringing together these disparate areas; I hope that she re-reads the entire piece aloud and listens more intently to the tone she aims to achieve. In reading through this piece, I don't have the impression that the author has yet fully nailed down the specific tone that best suits the content.

I publication with attention to the points raised in this review.