1 January 2026 · 
Qeios

Peer Review

# Review of: "The LLM Productivity Cliff: Threshold Productivity and AI-Native Inequality"

**Maha Bali**[1]

1. Center for Learning and Teaching, American University in Cairo, Egypt

- I was very excited to read this paper, as this is a topic I'm very interested in and have indeed found conflicting research on. So I was hoping this paper would give insight into that.
- I really like your framework itself and the analytical work going into it. Intuitively, and because I work a lot in this field, it seems to make sense to me that those different levels and layers exist.
- The concept of “cliff” makes sense to show a sudden change, although the visual of a cliff is something you fall from rather than rise to, so I was wondering how that looks visually. Because if we say productivity rises suddenly, a cliff would be the opposite. Or are we talking about “amount of time” and then the cliff is a large steep fall in time spent on tasks? It might help to show this visually.
- You run through a small amount of evidence without much detail and then you give us your framework. This seems a little too quick. Like, you're asking the reader to trust you on the conclusions you give from other papers you've read, but without giving the reader details of those papers, and then you jump straight to your own framework, which looks neat and elegant, but we cannot see your thinking process of how you got there. An example of a paper on the same topic that does a much more thorough literature review before reaching its conclusions is Ironies of Generative AI: Understanding and Mitigating Productivity Loss in Human-AI Interaction (https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2024.2405782).
- I feel that the paper needs to build up to the framework in a more convincing way: start with sharing evidence in detail. What do some key papers say, how do they lead us to the conclusions you arrive at, then share your framework and how it builds on the evidence shared, why we should believe your framework is evidence-based, rather than something you came up with.


doi.org/10.32388/URPL2V

- I was wondering also if you then applied your framework to a new context to see how it would fare? Sometimes we build a framework based on past data, but for the framework to be useful, it would need to be applied to new data. Would it work in all fields, including coding, finance, marketing, and medicine? You know?
- I really look forward to seeing this paper with more robust discussions of literature and evidence that lead up to the framework.

## Declarations

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