



Letter to the Editor – Response to “*Keeping the human hand on the wheel*”

Received: 10 July 2025 • Accepted: 06 October 2025

DOI: 10.62741/ahrj.v2i3.67

Dear Editors,

I have read the editorial “*Keeping the Human Hand on the Wheel*” on artificial intelligence (AI) in academic writing and research with great interest. I would like to express my appreciation and strong support for the editorial team’s efforts in opening a critical discussion about the opportunities and challenges posed by AI. While these tools offer substantial potential to enhance efficiency and support various stages of research, it also compels us to reflect deeply on the enduring value of human judgment, creativity, and ethical responsibility.

Crucially, as highlighted in the editorial, it is essential to establish and follow clear guidelines for the ethical and responsible integration of AI into scientific workflows. Without well-defined standards, we risk normalizing practices that undermine methodological rigor and ethical accountability.

It is accepted that AI excels at automating tasks, analyzing large datasets, and even assisting in drafting manuscripts.^{1,2} Recent reviews demonstrate its utility across domains such as literature discovery, data analysis, hypothesis generation, and manuscript structuring.^{1,2} However, these tools are fundamentally trained on historical data and are designed to recognize and reproduce existing patterns rather than envision novel paradigms. True innovation, on the other hand, is an act of imagination and projection; it is about creating futures not yet encoded in any dataset.

The widespread use of AI in research raises profound questions about authorship, responsibility, and the construction of knowledge. As Christou³ notes, the responsible use of AI requires continuous cognitive input and critical evaluation by the researcher. When AI permeates every

stage of research — from hypothesis formulation to data analysis, manuscript drafting, and even peer review — we risk reducing science to a purely technical and mechanistic process.

Moreover, widespread AI adoption raises profound concerns about transparency, interpretability, and accountability.^{4,5} While AI can support researchers in identifying trends or inconsistencies, the ultimate responsibility for scientific claims and their societal implications must remain with human authors. Algorithms lack moral agency; they cannot be held accountable for consequences, nor can they uphold the trust that exists between researcher, reviewer, and reader.

Rashidov and Rashidova⁶ emphasize the need for a careful balance between automation and human involvement, noting that certain aspects of research and scholarly evaluation inevitably require human insight and ethical evaluation. This balance is critical if we are to preserve the integrity and transformative potential of scientific inquiry.

Efficiency should serve, not override, rigor, depth, and creativity. The growing academic temptation to prioritize speed and output volume risks undermining the foundational values of science. If AI begins to dictate, or influence, not only the “how” but also the “why” of research, we risk diminishing the human spirit that drives curiosity and societal progress.

We should advance not only because we can, but because we have critically assessed why and how to do so. True scientific progress sometimes requires slowing down to safeguard the very foundations of knowledge and trust.

Thank you for fostering this essential dialogue.

References

1. Khalifa M, Albadawy M. Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed Update*. 2024;5:100145. doi:10.1016/j.cmpbup.2024.100145
2. Madanchian M, Taherdoost H. The impact of artificial intelligence on research efficiency. *Results Eng*. 2025;26:104743. doi:10.1016/j.rineng.2025.104743
3. Christou P. How to Use Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a Resource, Methodological and Analysis Tool in Qualitative Research? *Qual Rep*. Published online July 31, 2023. doi:10.46743/2160-3715/2023.6406
4. Tang M, Zhang H, Liu X, Li N, Sun X, Zhang X. Quality of Life Among Chinese Child Survivors of Heart Failure After Discharge From Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. *J Pediatr Health Care Off Publ Natl Assoc Pediatr Nurse Assoc Pract*. 2024;38(1):e1-e6. doi:10.1016/j.pedhc.2023.09.005
5. Else H. Abstracts written by ChatGPT fool scientists. *Nature*. 2023;613(7944):423-423. doi:10.1038/d41586-023-00056-7
6. Rashidov A, Rashidova F. Challenges and limitations in the use of artificial intelligence in research and some options to overcome them. In: *2024 15th International Conference on Computing Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT)*. ; 2024:1-4. doi:10.1109/ICCCNT61001.2024.10724588

Please cite this article as: Alves J. Letter to the Editor – Response to “Keeping the human hand on the wheel”. *Athena Health & Research Journal*. 2025; 2(3). doi: 10.62741/ahrj.v2i3.67