



# The impact of artificial intelligence on academic life

Yair Daykan<sup>1,2,3</sup> · Barry A. O'Reilly<sup>1</sup>

Accepted: 12 July 2023 / Published online: 24 July 2023  
© The International Urogynecological Association 2023

Increasingly, over the last few years, we have been exposed to the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on academic life in many ways, such as personalization, communication, assessment, feedback, research, and innovation.

Artificial intelligence can help to make medical practice more efficient by automating tasks such as generating assessments, finding peer reviews prior to publications, and scoring different models of scientific works. AI can also improve authors' relationship with peer assessment by providing personalized and timely feedback. However, AI poses some ethical and practical educational challenges, such as ensuring the fairness, validity, reliability, and transparency of AI-assisted assessment. AI-assisted assessment needs to ensure that it is valid for different purposes, contexts, and populations. AI-based solutions for personalized medical treatments need to be clinically evaluated and aligned with current guidelines. With AI-assisted assessment, it must also be considered how human factors, such as teacher beliefs and practices, affect validity.

In the day-to-day practice of urogynecology, we can find many potential benefits with this type of technology. Currently, we are continually attempting to reduce health care costs, make sense of investigations (such as urodynamics), classify and predict outcomes based on questionnaire scoring, and select the best treatment options for our patients. We are confident that medical and surgical practice will be significantly improved with the increasing use of AI. However, with the enormous acceleration of this type of technology comes a word of caution in the world of clinical and scientific academia and, in particular, how we can trust the sources of our knowledge.

Artificial intelligence can generate scientific publications using advanced natural language processing techniques to

analyze existing scientific literature and generate text similar to scientific papers written by humans. AI can also produce summaries of scientific articles by connecting co-occurring terms and extracting key information with the use of specific references. However, AI-generated publications may not be reliable, original, or ethical, and may require human supervision and verification.

Recently, some journals have added a new paragraph in their guide for authors, which implements the need to disclose the use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process.

As a scientific community, we should be concerned about the potential impact of scientific publications that will possibly be generated by AI without human oversight. We will potentially face challenges such as data quality, ethical issues, regulatory frameworks, human–AI interaction, and explainability.

To answer the question of whether AI can mimic a human author's writing, we created an AI-based scientific review with the title "The role of artificial intelligence in the future of urogynecology." This manuscript, following Editor approval, was sent to blinded reviewers for evaluation of compatibility and feasibility in the field of urogynecology and was accepted for publication as a "Clinical Opinion" in this issue. As far as we are aware, this is the first time that an AI tool has entirely produced a scientific article for publication following a blinded human review and highlights an editorial conundrum that will be unavoidable in the future of scientific literature.

In our view, we must embrace evolving academic technologies, in particular, the use of AI in the writing process of scientific articles. Still, we must be cautious about how we use it and what we expect from it. AI can be a valuable tool for finding relevant literature, generating summaries, or writing some sections of articles. However, AI cannot replace human creativity, critical thinking, or scientific rigor. We still need to monitor the quality and accuracy of AI-generated content, cite the sources properly, and acknowledge the limitations and biases of AI systems.

**Publisher's note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

✉ Yair Daykan  
yair.dykan@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Department of Urogynaecology, Cork University Maternity Hospital, Cork, Ireland

<sup>2</sup> Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Meir Medical Center, Kfar Saba, Israel

<sup>3</sup> Sackler School of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel