

Academic writing

- [Latin American RAND/UCLA modified Delphi consensus recommendations for management and treatment of adult MOGAD patients in clinical practice](#)
- [Multipotent Mesenchymal Stem Cell Therapy for Vascular Dementia](#)
- [Optimised medical therapy alone versus optimised medical therapy plus revascularisation for asymptomatic or low-to-intermediate risk symptomatic carotid stenosis \(ECST-2\): 2-year interim results of a multicentre randomised trial](#)
- [Safety and efficacy of long-term gantenerumab treatment in dominantly inherited Alzheimer's disease: an open-label extension of the phase 2/3 multicentre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled platform DIAN-TU trial](#)
- [Prevalence of Artificial Intelligence-Generated Text in Neurosurgical Publications: Implications for Academic Integrity and Ethical Authorship](#)
- [Artificial intelligence in academic writing: Enhancing or replacing human expertise?](#)
- [Arquivos de Neuro-Psiquiatria, 80 years: part 1 \(1943-1962\)](#)
- [Female authorship in global research: a bibliometric study of high- and low-income country collaborations](#)

Academic [writing](#) refers to the style of writing used in educational settings, such as universities and research [institutions](#). It is typically characterized by a formal and objective tone, the use of [evidence](#) to support [claims](#), and [adherence](#) to a particular [citation style](#). Academic writing aims to communicate ideas and research findings in a clear and organized manner and contribute to the existing body of knowledge in a particular field.

Some common features of academic writing include:

Clear and concise language: Academic writing should be easy to understand and free from unnecessary jargon or technical terms.

Use of [evidence](#): Claims made in academic writing must be supported by evidence, typically in the form of research studies, [experiments](#), or other scholarly sources.

Formal tone: Academic writing should be objective and formal in tone, avoiding slang, colloquialisms, and personal opinions.

[Adherence](#) to citation style: Academic writing requires proper citation of sources to give credit to the authors and avoid plagiarism.

Organized structure: Academic writing should have a clear structure, with an [introduction](#), body paragraphs, and a [conclusion](#) that logically flows from one to the next.

Academic writing can take many forms, including research papers, [essays](#), [literature reviews](#), dissertations, and more. It is an important skill for students and scholars to master, as it is an essential tool for communicating and sharing knowledge in academic settings.

Before you start [writing](#), plan your [manuscript](#) by outlining your ideas, organizing your thoughts, and determining the [scope](#) of your [article](#).

The advantages and disadvantages of the use of [generative artificial intelligence](#), such as [ChatGPT](#), in medical writing have been widely discussed; however, two concerns remain largely unexplored. The first involves “human touch,” such as personal anecdotes and experiences. This touch often distinguishes human-written papers from those generated by ChatGPT as ChatGPT cannot independently access personal [experiences](#). Although ChatGPT may mimic humanlike behavior, including the incorporation of a human touch, it lacks genuine [emotions](#). With the lack of established guidelines on the acceptable levels of ChatGPT use and imperfect detection tools, many authors fear that their work could be perceived as overly reliant on ChatGPT. I worry that writers may artificially insert forced personal touches simply to assert their own writing. The second concern is the authors' worry and doubt about whether to use ChatGPT and, if so, to what extent, which may disrupt their reflective and quiet writing process. While I acknowledge the lack of empirical data, I offer practical suggestions to balance the benefits of ChatGPT assistance and the preservation of the integrity of human writing in medical [publications](#) ¹⁾

Critical Review of the Concerns Regarding Generative AI in Medical Writing

The debate on the advantages and disadvantages of using generative artificial intelligence (AI) in medical writing has been extensive, yet the discussion presented here raises two concerns that remain underexplored: the “human touch” in writing and the psychological impact on authors. While these concerns are valid, their argumentation could benefit from greater depth, empirical support, and consideration of the broader implications.

The Concern About the “Human Touch” in Writing One of the main arguments presented is that ChatGPT lacks genuine human experiences and emotions, making its output potentially devoid of the “human touch” that distinguishes traditional medical writing. This is a reasonable concern, as personal anecdotes and nuanced reflections add credibility, authenticity, and engagement to medical narratives. However, the argument assumes that all medical writing inherently benefits from personal input, which is not always the case. Many types of medical publications—such as systematic reviews, case reports, and clinical guidelines—require objectivity over subjectivity.

Furthermore, the assertion that writers might “artificially insert forced personal touches simply to assert their own writing” is an interesting yet speculative concern. It is unclear whether this practice is widespread or if it meaningfully alters the quality of medical writing. The author does not provide empirical evidence or examples to illustrate this trend, making it difficult to assess the true extent of the issue. Moreover, AI-generated text can be supplemented with real human experiences, and tools like ChatGPT can be guided to enhance, rather than replace, the author's voice.

The Psychological Impact on Writers The second concern raised is the uncertainty among authors regarding whether and to what extent they should use ChatGPT, potentially disrupting their writing process. This argument is thought-provoking, as the adaptation to new technologies often brings hesitation and resistance. The shift from traditional writing to AI-assisted writing may challenge the reflective, introspective nature of the writing process. However, this argument lacks concrete examples of how such disruptions manifest. It would be useful to explore whether this hesitation leads to significant delays in writing, reduced creativity, or compromised confidence in one's work.

Additionally, the concern assumes that this hesitation is inherently negative. In contrast, a critical approach to AI use may lead to more thoughtful and deliberate integration, encouraging responsible use rather than outright rejection. The absence of clear guidelines on acceptable AI use in medical

writing is a legitimate issue, but it is also a transitional challenge that is likely to be addressed as the field matures.

Balancing AI Assistance and Human Integrity The piece concludes with a promise of practical suggestions to balance the benefits of ChatGPT while preserving human integrity in medical writing. However, the suggestions are not elaborated upon within the provided text. If the author intends to propose concrete solutions, these should be detailed and evidence-based. For example, discussing structured approaches, such as requiring transparency in AI use, maintaining a hybrid model of human-AI collaboration, or establishing institutional guidelines, would strengthen the argument.

Final Assessment Overall, the concerns raised are relevant and deserve further exploration, but they are presented in a somewhat speculative manner. The argument would benefit from empirical evidence, case studies, or survey data that demonstrate how these issues impact medical writers in practice. Furthermore, a more nuanced discussion of AI's potential to complement rather than diminish human writing would provide a more balanced perspective.

While the piece raises valid ethical and psychological considerations, a more comprehensive approach—including practical recommendations and data-driven insights—would strengthen its impact.

Manuscript preparation

[Manuscript preparation](#)

Academic writing with artificial intelligence

[Academic writing with artificial intelligence](#)

1)

Matsubara S. Artificial Intelligence in Medical Writing: Addressing Untouched Threats. JMA J. 2025 Jan 15;8(1):273-275. doi: 10.31662/jmaj.2024-0268. Epub 2024 Dec 6. PMID: 39926103; PMCID: PMC11799728.

From:

<https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/> - **Neurosurgery Wiki**

Permanent link:

https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/doku.php?id=academic_writing

Last update: **2025/03/21 14:11**

