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Dear Editors,

With great interest and attention, I read authors’ short but stimulating editorial articles, which also contain extremely valuable questions [1]. The questions posed by the authors and the emphasis on referred articles reflecting different perspectives seem to reflect content about the practical benefits, risks, and inevitability of the use of technology. In addition, it is seen that the valuable comments on the article focus on issues such as the risk of harm and publication ethics issues in academic use of AI [2,3].

Considering the discourse of the article’s authors, which invites discussion, it is seen that questions that go beyond mere responsibility or practical benefits or risks should also be asked. In this context, I think that questions based on philosophical and ethical foundations should also be asked. For example, What is AI’s ontological position as a writer is a very fundamental question. That is, does AI reflect a “particular” individual/entity as “a writer”, or does it reflect cognitive domination that has the power to access and process the knowledge of entire humanity easily, or does AI reflect a collective mind or “universal” as a product of the knowledge and cognitive history of humanity as a whole? I think these questions are notable for AI’s position as an author and whether that position is acceptable. Again, should AI be considered a tool (is given instrumental purpose) or as a value in itself (has intrinsic value)? As a fundamental question, this is also important for the acceptability or position of AI as an author. Without going into deep discussions for now, for example, how or what is the difference between AI as a tool and a classical data analysis tool? Does such a difference, if any, really warrant the attribution of authorship to AI? Questions like these seem important. Although different ethical discussions seem possible, the concept of responsibility to which the authors refer seems worth discussing. For example, it is also remarkable whether AI, as a responsible subject in itself, can also become a tool for other authors to avoid some responsibilities in research and publication ethics. It is known that such a debate exists in the field of clinical ethics [4].

As a result, as the article authors said, the authorship of artificial intelligence will lead to
important discussions. Therefore, it will be necessary to consider philosophical (and ethical) questions about the position of artificial intelligence.

Yours sincerely,
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