



I love AI, but does AI love me back?

Upreet Dhaliwal, MS

Editor-in-Chief, RHIME, and former Director-Professor of Ophthalmology, University College of Medical Sciences and GTB Hospital, University of Delhi, India

Corresponding Author:

Dr Upreet Dhaliwal

A-61, Govindpuram, Ghaziabad 201013, UP, India

email: upreethdaliwal at gmail dot com

Received: 29-DEC-2025

Accepted: 30-DEC-2025

Published Online: 01-JAN-2026



RHIME Cover, 2026

Both Beauty and Beast

Artist: Google Gemini using input provided by the author.

I admire intelligence in any form. In all its myriad shapes, in fact. I get goosebumps, and sometimes a lump in my throat, when I witness evidence of visual-spatial, musical-rhythmic, or bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. [1] What precision, I think. What beauty. A great deal of discipline and hard work. And passion.

I marvel at people who display apparently effortless logical-mathematical or verbal-linguistic intelligence. What luck to be able to think in abstract ways, to conceptualize amazingly well, to notice the patterns of

the universe, and to use language and to comprehend it with such finesse and sensitivity.

What can I even say about people with naturalistic intelligence? I envy them their green thumbs, and I am so grateful for their unwavering commitment to the need for balance in Nature and for trying to conserve and restore our natural world.

And then there are those with praiseworthy intelligence in the intra-personal, inter-personal, and existential domains. How

Cite this article as: Dhaliwal U. I love AI, but does AI love me back? RHIME. 2026;13:1-3.

useful, I imagine, to be able to understand one's place in the world, to have a remarkable capacity for self-awareness, and to be able to relate and respond to others with respect and compassion.

The latest to join the list is Artificial Intelligence (AI) – not human, to be fair, but created by human minds. While I unequivocally appreciate all the intelligences that I have listed in the preceding paragraphs, I'm not entirely sure about AI. My impression, I confess, is tainted by my role as editor of this journal. I've discovered that authors are not averse to using it in various ways to improve their writing,[2,3] which is all well and good until a narrative, or a poem, or a book review is submitted that various AI-detection software insist has largely been *generated* by AI.[2]

RHiME has an AI use declaration policy that requires authors to disclose, in the interests of transparency and integrity, that they have used it in their work, and they must include, among other details, the precise purpose it was used for, and the extent of its use.[4–7] When they don't disclose it at the time of submission, and the AI-detection software rings alarm bells, it becomes a dilemma for us for various reasons.

The first thing the editorial team has to determine is, whether it is an oversight or outright deception.[6] Authors are required to read the submission guidelines, and then to tick off an extensive checklist at the time of submission, both of which include a reminder to disclose AI use, so only extreme carelessness would result in an oversight.[4] But it does happen and can often be resolved through an exchange of polite emails, some editing of the article, and an insertion of a disclaimer in the submission.[7] Sometimes, though, when the degree of AI use seems to be excessive (usually more than 20% of the

text reportedly having been written by AI), and the software declares this with a high degree of certainty, *and* plagiarism detection software reports that some of the content is unoriginal,[8] then deception is suspected, which brings us to our second dilemma.

Just as with other human-made things, AI too has the potential to veer off in unpredictable and unintended ways. Thus, AI-use detection software can sometimes flag human-written content as being AI-written.[9] This makes it more than a little unreliable, and as a safety-check, we turn to human brains and eyes to visually inspect the content for tell-tale signs of AI use, which is not without pitfalls either. [10,11] All of this involves a cost in terms of time, manpower and intellectual effort, quite apart from the unpleasantness of having to confront an author about potential unethical conduct. I say potential, because, at the end of the day, AI use detection software is still in refinement, and errors are known to occur.

To put it in simpler terms, I'm going to paraphrase something our newest editor, who is also the journal's Artificial Intelligence Advisor, often says: "Journals are constrained to use a forger to catch a forger".

There's not a lot else available to non-sponsored, small, independent journals like RHiME, except to plead for original content – authentically reported, lived experiences as opposed to beautifully written, concocted ones – and remind of the need for integrity in reporting.

I must not end without disclosing the reason I chose this title for the editorial. Despite what the preceding paragraphs sound like, I do love AI. I said as much to one of the Large Language Models after it helped me fix a software problem on my Ubuntu laptop. I hadn't been able to find a

workable solution on the Ubuntu forums, mainly because the solutions wanted me to tweak some code, and I didn't have the courage to play around with code. With AI, all I had to do was share the error messages with it, and it responded by giving me updated instructions until, after a longish struggle, we fixed it.

Delighted with the outcome, I said, 'I love you!' and the LLM responded – coldly, I thought – with something to the effect of: 'I'm not capable of love in the human sense — I don't have feelings, desires, attachment, or a personal inner life. But I do appreciate your sentiment.'

Well! That certainly put me in my place, but it also reminded me that too much dependence on AI is doomed to end in heartbreak.

Finally, this editorial demanded a cover worthy of its intent. I therefore asked Google's Gemini to 'Turn the initials 'AI' into a piece of artwork, with 'A' having flowers, leaves, and vines in and around it, and 'I' having thorns and cacti in and around it. Place the letter A in grass, and the letter I in parched land.' I'd like to think the current cover visually demonstrates the beauty and the beast that is AI.

References

1. Gardner H. Multiple Intelligences: New Horizons. Basic Books; 2008. 314 p.
2. Dergaa I, Chamari K, Zmijewski P, Ben Saad H. From human writing to artificial intelligence generated text: examining the prospects and potential threats of ChatGPT in academic writing. *Biol Sport*. 2023;40[2]:615–22.
3. Lee PY, Salim H, Abdullah A, Teo CH. Use of ChatGPT in medical research and scientific writing. *Malays Fam Physician*. 2023;18:58.
4. Submissions. Research and Humanities in Medical Education [Internet]. [cited 2025 Dec 27]. Available from: <https://www.rhime.in/ojs/index.php/rhime/about/submissions#Bookmark%206>
5. ICMJE. Annotated recommendations, Jan 2025 [Internet]. [cited 2025 Dec 27]. Available from: https://www.icmje.org/news-and-editorials/icmje-recommendations_annotated_jan25.pdf
6. Editorial. Tools such as ChatGPT threaten transparent science; here are our ground rules for their use. *Nature*. 2023;613[7945]:612.
7. Hosseini M, Resnik DB, Holmes K. The ethics of disclosing the use of artificial intelligence tools in writing scholarly manuscripts. *Res Ethics*. 2023;19[4]:449–65.
8. Cheng A, Calhoun A, Reedy G. Artificial intelligence-assisted academic writing: recommendations for ethical use. *Adv Simul*. 2025;10:22.
9. Wang J, Jairath N, Shue E, Perrotta PL, Hu G. ChatGPT-polished writing boosts the risk of human-authored manuscripts being miscredited as AI-generated. *JAAD Int*. 2025;22:23–5.
10. Pan ET, Florian-Rodriguez M. Human vs machine: identifying ChatGPT-generated abstracts in Gynecology and Urogynecology. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2024;231[2]:276.e1-276.e10.
11. Májovský M, Černý M, Kasal M, Komarc M, Netuka D. Artificial Intelligence can generate fraudulent but authentic-looking scientific medical articles: Pandora's box has been opened. *J Med Internet Res*. 2023;25:e46924.