JPPT | Invited Commentary

AI-Assisted Academia: Navigating the Nuances of Peer Review With ChatGPT 4

Som S. Biswas, MD, MS, DNB, DMRD, MBA

J Pediatr Pharmacol Ther 2024;29(4):441–445

DOI: 10.5863/1551-6776-29.4.441

Introduction

The peer review process is a cornerstone of academic publishing, ensuring the credibility and reliability of scientific research. However, addressing the comments of journal reviewers can be a daunting task for authors. Reviewers often provide critical feedback that requires careful consideration, and the revision process can be both time-consuming and intellectually demanding. As artificial intelligence (AI) technologies evolve, tools like OpenAI's ChatGPT have emerged as potential aids in this process.[1]

ChatGPT, a large language model, has shown proficiency in understanding and generating human-like text. Its applications span from casual conversation to more complex tasks such as coding, data analysis, and now, potentially assisting in academic endeavors. In the context of responding to journal reviewer comments, ChatGPT could be leveraged to interpret feedback, draft responses, and even suggest manuscript revisions. This commentary explores the role of ChatGPT in the peer review process, evaluating its benefits, limitations, and ethical implications.[2]

Understanding Reviewer Comments

The initial step in responding to reviewer comments is to accurately understand the concerns and suggestions provided. Reviewers' feedback can range from straightforward to highly nuanced, often requiring in-depth analysis to fully grasp the underlying issues. In some cases, the feedback might be cryptic or broadly framed, leaving authors uncertain about the exact changes needed.

Here is where ChatGPT's capabilities could be particularly beneficial. By feeding the reviewers' comments into the model, authors can gain a clearer interpretation through the AI's paraphrasing ability. ChatGPT can rephrase complex feedback into simpler terms, helping to clarify the reviewer's intentions. Furthermore, it can assist in identifying the main points of critique, categorizing comments into themes such as methodology, data analysis, writing style, or validity of conclusions.[3]

Drafting Preliminary Responses

Once the authors have a clear understanding of the reviewers' comments, the next challenge lies in crafting responses that are not only substantive but also reflect a professional and respectful tone. This is a delicate balance to maintain, especially when the feedback is critical or the revisions required are extensive.

Utilizing ChatGPT for Drafting Responses. ChatGPT can serve as an effective tool for formulating initial drafts of responses. Authors can input the interpreted comments into ChatGPT, along with their intended response, and the model can help refine the language to ensure that it is courteous and constructive. The AI can suggest several ways of phrasing the response, offering options that maintain a positive tone while also being assertive about the authors' stance.

For example, if a reviewer has pointed out a perceived flaw in the methodology, the author can explain how this aspect was considered and justify their approach. ChatGPT can assist by rewording the explanation to avoid confrontational language and by emphasizing the rationale behind the chosen method.

Ensuring Comprehensive and Thoughtful Replies. The key to a successful revision process is not just to respond but to respond well. Each reply must clearly address the specific point raised by the reviewer. ChatGPT can help ensure that no comment is overlooked and that each response is thorough. By using the AI to draft responses, authors can cover all bases and potentially foresee follow-up questions or concerns, preparing for them in advance.

For instance, if a reviewer has suggested additional analyses, ChatGPT can help formulate a plan detailing how these will be incorporated or provide a reasoned argument if the authors decide not to include them. This ensures that responses go beyond mere acknowledgments of feedback, demonstrating engagement with the reviewer's insights.[4]

Polishing Language and Style. The final aspect of responding to reviewer comments is refining the language and presentation of the response. It is essential that responses are not only clear and comprehensive but also well-written. ChatGPT's proficiency in language generation can be instrumental in polishing the responses to meet high writing standards.

The AI can suggest edits for grammar, syntax, and style, making the responses more readable and

professional. This is particularly useful for authors whose first language is not English, as it can elevate the quality of their writing to meet international publication standards.

Improving Manuscript Revisions

Beyond drafting responses to reviewers, ChatGPT can play a pivotal role in the actual revision of the manuscript. This phase often requires the most effort and intellectual input, as it involves altering the manuscript to address the reviewers' concerns substantively.

Assisting with Substantive Revisions. When a reviewer suggests substantial changes to a manuscript, such as re-analyzing data or revising the theoretical framework, it can be challenging to know where to start. ChatGPT can assist by breaking down complex feedback into actionable items. For example, if a reviewer suggests that the analysis does not fully support the conclusions, ChatGPT can help authors explore alternative ways to present their data or suggest additional analyses that might strengthen their argument.

Enhancing Writing Quality. Even when the content is strong, the presentation can often benefit from improvement. ChatGPT can suggest changes to the manuscript that enhance clarity, conciseness, and overall flow. It can help rephrase awkward sentences, improve transitions between paragraphs, and ensure that the manuscript's tone is consistent throughout.

Cross-Checking for Consistency. In the process of revising a manuscript, ensuring consistency throughout the document is crucial. ChatGPT can help by scanning the revised sections to identify any discrepancies with the rest of the manuscript. This can include checking that all terms are used consistently, ensuring that figures and tables are correctly referenced in the text, and that any changes to the methodology are reflected in the results and discussion sections.[5]

Feedback on Readability. Another aspect where ChatGPT can contribute is assessing the readability of the manuscript. By running sections of the text through the AI, authors can get feedback on how accessible their writing is to a broader audience. This can be particularly useful for technical disciplines where the challenge is to convey complex information clearly and succinctly.

Ensuring Compliance With Journal Guidelines

After revising the manuscript and drafting responses to the reviewer comments, it is crucial to align these documents with the specific guidelines of the journal. Each academic journal typically has its own set of rules regarding formatting, style, and the structure of responses to peer reviews. ChatGPT can play a significant role in this final polishing phase to ensure that submissions meet these requirements.

Adapting to Journal Standards. Journal standards can be intricate, with specific expectations for various elements of a manuscript, including citation format, figure presentation, and even the structure of the acknowledgments section. ChatGPT can assist authors by providing templates or suggestions on how to format their responses and revisions according to these standards. By inputting the journal's guidelines, authors can use the AI to cross-reference the revised manuscript and ensure it adheres to all specified requirements.

Consistency in Responses. Consistency in the responses to reviewers is not just about content; it also pertains to the format. Some journals require authors to list each comment followed by the response, while others may ask for a narrative format. ChatGPT can help reformat the responses to fit the journal's preferred style, ensuring that the response document is as professional as the manuscript itself.

Formality and Tone. The tone of the response to reviewers is equally as important as the content. It needs to strike a balance between being respectful and assertive. ChatGPT can suggest modifications to the tone to ensure that it is appropriately formal and matches the journal's expected communication style. This includes polite expressions of gratitude for the feedback, even when the authors may disagree with certain points.

Language and Grammar Checks. Finally, before submission, it's imperative to ensure that the language used in both the manuscript and the response letter is grammatically correct and free of typographical errors. ChatGPT can act as an additional layer of proofreading, highlighting errors or suggesting improvements to the text that may have been overlooked during revisions.

Collaboration Between Authors and AI

The synergy between human intelligence and artificial intelligence presents a novel approach to academic writing and revision. Authors can leverage the computational power of AI while imbuing the process with their expertise and critical thinking skills. Here, we explore the potential collaborative dynamics between authors and ChatGPT during the manuscript revision process.

Integrating AI Insights With Expert Knowledge. Authors bring a deep understanding of their subject matter, research nuances, and the context of their work. ChatGPT contributes by providing immediate linguistic assistance and suggestions based on patterns it has learned from a vast corpus of text. However, the final judgment on any revision or response to reviewers rests with the authors. They must critically assess AI-generated suggestions to ensure that they align with the core message and research integrity of

their manuscript. This collaboration can significantly enhance productivity and the quality of revisions.

Balancing AI Assistance and Human Oversight. While ChatGPT can generate many possible revisions and responses, it operates without an understanding of the research's unique context or the specific dynamics of the peer-review process. Authors must maintain oversight, using ChatGPT as a tool rather than a replacement for their judgment. They must ensure that the AI's contributions are fact-checked, contextually appropriate, and add value to the manuscript.

Customizing AI Use for Various Revision Stages. The revision process is multi-faceted, involving substantive content changes, structural adjustments, and improvements to language and presentation. ChatGPT can be customized to assist at different stages:

- **Early Revisions:** Authors can use ChatGPT to brainstorm ways to address complex reviewer feedback or to suggest alternative explanations and analyses.
- **Middle Revisions:** ChatGPT can aid in restructuring content, ensuring logical flow, and integrating additional information without redundancy.
- **Final Polishing:** Authors can utilize ChatGPT for proofreading, refining language, and ensuring compliance with journal guidelines.

Enhancing Communication and Clarification. Communication is critical in responding to reviewers. ChatGPT can help authors articulate their points more clearly, ensuring that the rationale behind each decision is well-explained and justified. This can be especially useful for authors who may struggle to express their thoughts clearly due to language barriers.

Continuous Learning and Adaptation. As authors interact with ChatGPT, they can provide feedback on the suggestions, helping the AI to learn and adapt to their preferences over time. This creates a tailored experience that can become more efficient with each use, as ChatGPT better understands the author's style and the subtleties of their field.

Ethical Considerations

The integration of AI tools like ChatGPT in academic publishing raises several ethical considerations that must be addressed to maintain the integrity of the scholarly communication process.

Transparency in AI Use. The first ethical imperative is transparency. Authors should disclose the extent of AI involvement in their manuscript preparation and response to reviewers. This allows for an open dialogue about the role of AI in academic publishing and ensures that all parties involved are aware of the tools being used. It also fosters a discussion on the acceptability of AI assistance in various stages of manuscript preparation and revision.

Authorship and Contribution. Determining authorship and contribution becomes more complex with AI involvement. The intellectual contribution of AI does not equate to human authorship, but its role in manuscript preparation should be acknowledged. Clear guidelines from academic journals and institutions can help define the boundaries and proper attribution of AI-generated assistance.

Ensuring Academic Integrity. While ChatGPT can significantly enhance the revision process, reliance on AI must not compromise the originality and authenticity of the scholarly work. Authors must ensure that the core ideas and arguments remain their own and that AI-generated content does not introduce plagiarism or intellectual misrepresentation. The final manuscript should reflect the authors' original research and insights, with AI serving as a support tool rather than a co-creator.

Bias and Misinterpretation. AI models can inadvertently perpetuate biases present in their training data. Authors need to be vigilant about reviewing AI suggestions for potential biases that could affect the interpretation of their research. Furthermore, there is a risk of misinterpretation when using AI to decode complex reviewer feedback. Authors must critically evaluate AI interpretations to avoid miscommunication with reviewers.

Ethical AI Development and Usage. Finally, there is a broader ethical consideration regarding the development and usage of AI like ChatGPT. It involves ensuring that the AI is developed responsibly, with consideration for its potential impact on academic discourse. Users of AI should also be mindful of these ethical considerations and employ AI tools in ways that contribute positively to the pursuit of knowledge.

The ethical use of AI in academic publishing is an evolving discussion, with the potential for AI to significantly aid the peer-review process while also introducing new challenges and considerations.

Limitations and Challenges

While ChatGPT offers promising assistance in responding to journal reviewer comments, several limitations and challenges need to be acknowledged and managed.

Recognizing the Limitations of AI Comprehension. ChatGPT, despite its sophisticated language capabilities, does not possess actual understanding or domain-specific expertise. Its responses are based on patterns and information it has been trained on, and it lacks the ability to contextualize feedback within the nuanced framework of a specific research field. Authors must therefore critically appraise the relevance and accuracy of the AI's suggestions.

Addressing Misinterpretations. Misinterpretation of comments or suggested revisions is a risk when

using AI. ChatGPT might generate responses that seem plausible but miss the subtleties or implications of the reviewers' points. It is essential for authors to use the AI's output as a starting point rather than a definitive solution, always applying their judgment to refine the responses and revisions.

Maintaining Originality in Responses. There is a risk of homogeneity in responses if authors rely too heavily on AI-generated text. Academic discourse thrives on individuality and the unique contributions of different researchers. Authors must ensure that the final response maintains their unique voice and perspective, personalizing AI suggestions to fit their specific context and research.

Technical Limitations. Technical limitations may also pose challenges. For instance, ChatGPT might not be well-versed in highly specialized terminology or recent advancements that have not been included in its training data. Authors need to verify that all technical language and concepts are correctly presented and may need to manually edit AI-generated text to ensure accuracy.

Dependence on AI. An over-reliance on AI for drafting responses can lead to a lack of engagement with the review process. Authors should view AI as a tool to augment their capabilities, not replace the intellectual engagement required to address feedback thoroughly.

Future Considerations. As AI technology continues to evolve, there will be ongoing challenges related to keeping the AI models up-to-date with the latest research and scholarly practices. There is also the potential for AI to change the landscape of peer review itself, with implications for how feedback is given and received.

Future Perspectives

The application of AI like ChatGPT in academic publishing is not just a contemporary convenience but a harbinger of a significant shift in scholarly communication. As we look to the future, we can anticipate several trends and evolutions in the role of AI within this domain.

Evolution of AI Capabilities. The capabilities of AI are rapidly advancing, with models becoming more sophisticated in their understanding and generation of language. We can expect future versions of ChatGPT and other language models to offer more nuanced interpretations of complex academic feedback and provide even more targeted suggestions for manuscript revisions.

Changing Dynamics of Peer Review. AI could potentially transform the peer review process itself. With tools capable of preliminary reviews, the initial screening of manuscripts could become more efficient, flagging common issues before human reviewers assess the work. This could speed up the review process and allow human reviewers to focus on the most critical aspects of the scholarly work.

Enhanced Support for Authors. For authors, especially those for whom English is not a first language, AI tools will likely become increasingly indispensable. They will offer more than just grammar checks; they will provide stylistic suggestions, help authors conform to disciplinary norms, and even aid in ensuring that arguments are presented coherently.

Training Specialized AI Models. The development of AI models specialized for different academic disciplines could further refine the support provided to authors. These models would be trained on discipline-specific texts, allowing them to offer more accurate suggestions in line with field-specific conventions.

Ethical and Regulatory Developments. As AI becomes more embedded in academic publishing, ethical guidelines and regulations will need to evolve to ensure responsible use. This includes clear policies on the disclosure of AI use, authorship, and the prevention of misconduct.

Critical Engagement and Human Oversight. Despite the advancements in AI, the need for critical engagement and human oversight will remain paramount. The human element in interpreting nuanced feedback, providing unique insights, and making ethical decisions cannot be replaced by AI.

Conclusion

ChatGPT and similar AI tools offer exciting possibilities for assisting authors in the peer review process, from interpreting comments to enhancing manuscript revisions. However, the integration of AI into academic publishing must be approached with a balance of enthusiasm and caution. As we embrace the benefits of these technologies, we must also remain vigilant about maintaining the integrity, originality, and ethical standards of scholarly work.

The journey ahead will be one of partnership between humans and AI, where each complements the other's strengths, leading to a future where the pursuit of knowledge is supported by the best tools available, but driven by human curiosity and intellect.

Article Information

Affiliations. Department of Pediatric Radiology, Le Bonheur Children's Hospital, The University of Tennessee Health Science Center, Memphis, TN.

Correspondence. Som S. Biswas, MD;
ssbinmemphis@gmail.com

Disclosure. The author declares no conflicts or financial interest in any product or service mentioned in the manuscript, including grants, equipment, medications, employment, gifts, and honoraria.

Acknowledgment. The author acknowledges that this article was partially generated by ChatGPT (powered by OpenAI's language model, GPT-3; http://openai.com). The editing was performed by the human author.

References

1. Ray PP. ChatGPT: a comprehensive review on background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope. *Internet Things Cyber-Physical Systems*. 2023;3:121–154.
2. Lo CK. What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review of the literature. *Education Sci*. 2023;13(4):410.
3. Lund BD, Wang T. Chatting about ChatGPT: how may AI and GPT impact academia and libraries? *Library Hi Tech News*. 2023;40(3):26–29.
4. Kalla D, Smith N. Study and analysis of Chat GPT and its impact on different fields of study. *Internat J Innovative Sci Res Technol*. 2023;8(3).
5. Rahman MM, Watanobe Y. ChatGPT for education and research: opportunities, threats, and strategies. *Applied Sci*. 2023;13(9):5783.