

Peer Review

# Review of: "The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Lifecycle of Scientific Manuscripts: Authoring, Reviewing, and Editorial Selection"

Alberto Giovanni Gerli<sup>1</sup>

1. University of Milan, Italy

Based on the comprehensive review board findings and the coordinator's assessment, I have synthesized the final evaluation for the manuscript *"The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Lifecycle of Scientific Manuscripts."*

## 1. Overall Quality Rating

**Poor**

*(While the conceptual arguments regarding the political economy of publishing are **Good**, the execution of the manuscript fails to meet basic scientific standards due to critical integrity issues, citation errors, and systemic technical flaws.)*

## 2. Readiness Assessment

**Not Ready** (Major Revisions and Integrity Audit Required)

## 3. Key Strengths

- **Conceptual Value & Timeliness:** The manuscript addresses an urgent, high-impact topic. The proposed "Hybrid Review Model" offers a sophisticated "middle path" between luddism and automation, moving the discourse beyond simple technical benchmarking.
- **Strong Narrative Structure:** The progression from the economic roots of the publishing crisis to the technological implications of AI provides a coherent and compelling logical arc.

- **Audience Relevance:** The focus on the "Chain of Quality" and the economic precarity of reviewers resonates strongly with the target academic and editorial audience.

#### 4. Key Weaknesses

- **Citation Integrity Failures:** The manuscript contains "hallucinated" or contextually mismatched citations (e.g., Ref [34] cites a pedagogy paper to support AI analytics claims). Additionally, Ref [10] lists a future access date (December 2026), presenting a logical impossibility.
- **Systemic Technical Breakdown:** Pervasive rendering errors (missing ligatures for 'fi', 'fl', 'ff') degrade professional readability globally. Table 1 is fragmented and confusing, and Ref [21] contains a broken URL due to these font issues.
- **Editorial Negligence:** Section 3.2 contains verbatim repetition of an entire text block regarding fabrication statistics, indicating a failure in basic proofreading.
- **Weak Evidence Base:** The reliance on secondary news sources (StudyFinds) and the potential misattribution of key economic data (the JCM pilot in Ref [7]) undermine the rigor expected of a review article.

#### 5. Priority Improvements Needed

To elevate this manuscript to a publishable standard, the following actions are mandatory:

- **Rigorous Citation Audit (Critical):**
  - Replace Ref [34] with a valid primary source discussing AI predictive analytics in editorial workflows.
  - Correct the access date in Ref [10] to the current timeline.
  - Verify the source of the "JCM Pilot" data (currently attributed to Ref [7]) and cite the primary report.
- **Technical & Visual Remediation:**
  - Re-export the document with correct font embedding to resolve the missing ligature issue (e.g., correct "ef ciency" to "efficiency").
  - Reformat Table 1 to ensure all data is visible and rows are not split or garbled across pages.
- **Editorial Cleanup:**
  - Delete the redundant sentence block in Section 3.2 (Paragraph 2).
  - Standardize nomenclature (e.g., change "Deep Seek" to "DeepSeek").
- **Methodological Transparency:**

- Add a brief **Methodology** section defining how literature was selected, clarifying that the review is narrative rather than systematic, to contextualize the evidence base.

## **6. Final Recommendation**

**Do Not Publish in Current State.**

### **Justification:**

There is a profound irony in this manuscript: it warns against AI "hallucinations" and "fabrication" while simultaneously containing hallucinated citations, broken syntax, and logical impossibilities (future dates). These errors not only degrade readability but constitute a **research integrity risk**. Publishing the paper in this form would severely damage the author's credibility and the journal's reputation.

However, the core argument—that the peer review crisis is economic rather than purely technical—is valuable. The author is encouraged to undertake a **Major Revision** to fundamentally clean the evidence base, fix the formatting, and rigorously verify every reference. If these quality control issues are resolved, the paper could make a significant contribution to the field.

## **Declarations**

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