

Peer Review

Review of: "ChatGPT-4 in the Turing Test: A Critical Analysis"

Pongsakorn Limna¹

1. Rangsit University, Thailand

This paper offers a rigorous and detailed critique of Restrepo Echavarría's claims about ChatGPT-4's performance, arguing that the criticisms and conclusions drawn are not statistically or methodologically justified. It carefully distinguishes between absolute and relative criteria for passing the Turing Test, clarifies the validity of both two-player and three-player formats, and emphasizes the need to separate theoretical probability models from experimental results when evaluating AI systems. While the paper is academically sound, the use of formal probability theory and logical formalizations (especially in the Appendix) might make it less accessible to a broader audience, even within the AI research community. A slightly more intuitive explanation alongside the formalism would help. Overall, the paper not only refutes key points from the criticized study but also provides a constructive framework for improving future Turing Test research and AI evaluation.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.