

Review of: "OpenAI ChatGPT Generated Content and Similarity Index: A study of selected terms from the Library & Information Science (LIS)"

Sirje Virkus¹

¹ Tallinn University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper briefly introduces AI and ChatGPT, discusses its potential applications in promoting academic integrity, reviews the existing literature on ChatGPT, and presents the methodology and results of a study evaluating the similarity of ChatGPT-generated content in library and information science.

The first versions of this paper give an impression that some of the text has been created using ChatGPT, which has been refined in later versions. For example, the first paragraph in the Literature Review section: "ChatGPT is an AI language model created by OpenAI. As an AI language model, I have been trained on a large dataset of text, which allows me to understand and generate natural language responses to questions and statements asked by the users."

The literature review section is very scarce. The article only refers to some studies in specific fields that deal with ChatGPT, but does not give a good overview of the methodology and results of these studies. A more comprehensive review of existing studies could strengthen the arguments and credibility of the paper.

For example, "Apart from that, there has been a lot of work on applications of Chat DPT on various topics like Academic performance (Alshater, 2022), Education (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Zentner, 2022; Zhai, 2022), Education and Lifelong Learning (Mhlanga, 2023), Financial Sector (Dowling & Lucey, 2023; Yue, Au, Au & lu, 2023; Zaremba & Demir, 2023), Forensic Accounting (Street & Wilck, 2023), Information Literacy (Lund & Agbaji, 2023), Law (Armstrong, 2023; Bishop, 2023), Pharmacology (Nisar & Aslam, 2023), Public Health (De Angelis et al, 2023), Psychology (Uludag, 2023), Science (Zhai, 2023) etc. From these works on ChatGPT has been elaborated and our understanding of the application of ChatGPT has also been increased". But the article doesn't say anything about what these studies exactly explored, what methodology was used and what the results were. In addition, it is not clear how ChatGPT has been further elaborated on the basis of these studies as the authors claim.

While the paper briefly describes the methodology used to generate and check the ChatGPT content for similarity, there is limited detail on the specific techniques or tools used. This may make it difficult for other researchers to replicate the study or understand its limitations.

The article contains a very limited discussion section. The article briefly mentions the potential impact of ChatGPT on promoting academic integrity and detecting plagiarism, but does not provide a detailed analysis of these issues. The paper

could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the implications and limitations of the results.

In conclusion, the article is very general in nature. The paper would need a more thorough review of the literature, a more detailed description of the methodology, and more detailed discussion of the implications and limitations of the results.

There are typos in the paper; ChatGPT is misspelled in one place.