Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Artificial Intelligence Like Humans; Humans Like AI: Epistemology of Analogy and Our Expectations Beyond It"

Daniel Cassenti[1]

1. Independent researcher

I appreciate the topic area, but the article itself is difficult to read and meandering. There is little transition from section to section, making it difficult to carry a thread. The pervasive informal prose comes across as almost dismissive of the points being made (e.g., starting a sentence with "Anyway" in the abstract gave the impression of wanting to wave away everything written prior to it). The philosophical points were tangential, and the cognition section did not address the latest research in cognitive science. This could be turned into a fascinating article, but it requires a strong tightening of the language and the content. If the rewrite doesn't result in a paper around 10% of the size, then it probably needs more work, as readers would lose interest with much more content than that. Good luck!

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.