

PHILOSOPHY, SOFTWARE

BRAVE NEW AI SCIENCE WORLD

16.11.2022

AI works well [in some areas](#) while results are very mixed or even dangerous in others [[1](#), [2](#)].

But what about AI in generic scientific areas?

I have recently looked at [scite.ai](#), a service that claims to analyze a paper if the references have been supported or contrasted the findings — any references that have been retracted in the meantime or received an expression of concern? While the latter isn't really a big question, I was not very much impressed by the results as most references could not be classified.

But there are now more companies off the ground. Let's have a look at some.

One is [SciScore](#)

Enhance Rigor And Reproducibility In Scientific Research

SciScore™ is the best methods review tool for scientific articles.

Get actionable results today regarding the transparency of your research manuscripts. Using criteria from various reporting standards (e.g. the [NIH](#), [MDAR](#), and [ARRIVE](#)), **SciScore** generates three reports and a score for every submission. These materials assist researchers, editors, and funders in improving the quality and reliability of scientific research by automatically reporting detected criteria of interest for future review. Researchers signing up with their [ORCID](#) get ten free reports. Reports can take as little as 1 minute!

16/11/2022 screenshot <https://sciscore.com/index.php#pricing>

SciScore claims

SciScore generates three reports and a score for every submission. These materials assist researchers, editors, and funders in improving the quality and reliability of scientific research by automatically reporting detected criteria of interest for future review. Researchers signing up with their ORCID get ten free reports. Reports can take as little as 1 minute!

The next one is [Prophy](#), another reference finder.

Prophy

Referee Finder

Semantic Jobs

Monitoring

Reports

Search

Referee Finder


**Quickly find the best referees to move
science forward**

Utilizing our collection of 120M+ articles, we automatically create profile for every scientist, and rank them according to their semantic similarity to a refereed manuscript or proposal.

More details


16/11/2022 screenshot <https://www.prophy.science/>

and there is [Galactica](#).



16/11/2022 screenshot <https://galactica.org/>

and well also copy.ai



28/12/2022 Screenshot <https://copy.ai>

I have no idea if we really need this kind of stuff – any AI to write my blog even faster?

Also others commented earlier this month that it is “not obviously wrong but wrong in subtle ways”.

↻ Matt Hodgkinson teilte



Tom Morris ✓
@tommorris

🌐 5. Dez.

Just tried ChatGPT. I asked it a series of specific Qs about areas I've studied in detail.

On all Qs, it gave answers that are plausible sounding but wrong. Not obviously wrong: wrong in subtle ways that need deep domain knowledge to grasp.

The ways humans will be practically misled by this kind of tech if trusted with, say, doling out medical, legal or business advice is horrific.

Letting this tech loose on the world will further destroy search engines that are already riddled with SEO BS.

Übersetzen



1+



28/12/22 Screenshot <https://mastodon.social/@tommorris/109460645976102033>

Fortunately [Copyleaks released now even an AI detector](#) just to fight back...

CC-BY-NC Science Surf accessed 10.01.2026