

The Formulaic Machine

Generative AI, Academic Writing, and the Recovery of Voice

Somewhat by **George A. Kiraz**

in dialogue with Claude (Anthropic)¹

Version 1.0, April 26, 2026

Sabine Schmidtke and I have been holding a series of international workshops within the project MEMaT (or, Middle Eastern Manuscript Traditions) since 2016.² As we describe on the MEMaT home page, the project “brings together specialists with expertise in a wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds.” It goes without saying that the contributors themselves also come from a wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Our eighth meeting, held in Rome in partnership with Tor Vergata University (in the person of Valentina Sagaria Rossi) and

¹ This study was prepared within the framework of the research project “Echoes of al-Injil: Tracing the Arabic Gospels and Their Transcultural Roots,” funded by the Nelson Center for Collaborative Research at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ.

² See <https://www.ias.edu/hs/islamic-world/memat>.

How to cite this paper? G. A. Kiraz, “The Formulaic Machine: Generative AI, Academic Writing, and the Recovery of Voice.” Albert Repository, Institute for Advanced Study, April 2026. <https://albert.ias.edu/20.500.12111/10632>; DOI: 10.48706/8f33-jx65.

Pontificio Ateneo Sant'Ansemo (in the persons of Alfio Catalano and George Frick), was on the Bible in Middle Eastern Manuscript Traditions. The presentations were phenomenal, not only in terms of content, but also as they were delivered quite well, in *fusha* English, so to speak. A noticeable departure from previous workshops was the number of speakers who chose to *read* their papers.

The excellence of the papers and their arguments aside, one could also recognize the repetition of a few phrasal patterns on the peripheries of the arguments, almost *ad nauseam*. A decade ago, one would conclude that all papers utilizing these phrasal patterns must have hired the same copy editor or English-language consultant. But today we live in the world of generative AI, which offers powerful tools for academic authors that go well beyond what an analog copy editor can provide. In terms of language and style, generative AI can also check for register adjustments (making prose more or less formal), coach the author (especially non-native authors) on idiomatic expressions with explanations, and suggest discipline-specific vocabulary (which the author must double- and triple-check).

But generative AI can go far beyond these capabilities, stopping well short of ghostwriting (which I hope to exemplify in the rest of this paper). Generative AI can be one's research assistant, summarizing documents or datasets (it is particularly good at this) and explaining unfamiliar concepts or methodologies in accessible terms. Recently, I have used generative AI to put the references in a paper I am writing in the stylesheet of the publisher, knowing well in advance that it might "hallucinate"—a topic we will come back to in my own concluding remarks—and that I need to double and triple-check the resulting bibliography quite carefully. Sabine Schmidtke, Alexander Treiger, and I wrote a notice about a manuscript with

many references to foliation and the Bible. We asked AI to check for factual errors. It pointed out contradictory data regarding folio numbers and Bible references, which we then had to double-check and correct ourselves. With the amount of data in the paper in question, it would not have been possible to catch all such errors on our own.

There is no denying that the use of generative AI by academic writers is on the rise—no judgment here, as the “ethical” issues are beyond the scope of this paper. At the MEMaT Rome workshop, I began to collect common phrasal patterns. I am a computational linguist by training, which helps in spotting patterns in algorithmic output. Back in the 1990s, I worked at Bell Labs in the Language Modeling Department. My own work centered on computational morphology and finite-state automata. Our team members and other departments at Bell Labs worked on the very technologies that made today’s large language models possible. Admittedly, none of us at the time could have imagined the leap that would take place in producing today’s *large* language models. I am providing this micro-biography as background (maybe to justify) my personal interest in the matter.

My (italics intended to emphasize my agency) purpose in this paper is to provide an outline of the most common phrasal patterns that I collected at the Rome workshop, hoping to bring awareness to their existence, should authors using generative AI seek to restore their own voice. But this is as far as my agency goes in this paper. I do not intend to research the matter further (I usually wouldn’t research academic matters that others can do better than I). As a non-native myself, I do not have the linguistic abilities to pontificate—I am writing this as I hear the Vatican bells ringing in the background—to others on English literary style. I do not even intend to write the paper myself; in this case, generative AI will do a better job ghostwriting it for me.

At the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, I am lucky to have access to the *enterprise* version of Claude, Anthropic’s AI platform. (This raises the very important topic of equity in terms of access to AI models, but again, that takes us to ethical matters well beyond my ethical compass, or lack thereof.) I began by creating a project and named it “Reflections on Using Generative AI for Academic Papers.” Organizing one’s interactions with AI in projects allows the AI to retain the scope and purpose of one’s work across sessions and gives the AI a stable frame of reference, so each new prompt does not begin from zero. And while giving a project description is optional, it orients the AI toward the register, purpose, and audience of the work before the first prompt is issued. In my case, I wrote,

While attending academic conferences, I took notes when I sensed that the presenter used generative AI as a tool. I would like to write up this as a reflections short paper.

AI platforms also allow users to upload documents and images (including images of text) that can be helpful for a specific project. In my case, I had no data other than the common phrases I collected during the conference. I simply left them for my initial prompt:

Please draft the paper for me as follows:

1. Give a brief history of Generative AI.
2. The pros and cons of generative AI in composing academic articles.
3. AI gives formulaic expressions that we hear now by many speakers. Write a sample for each of the following templatic phrases (I separated them by ;): “... is not incidental, but... “; “Taken together, ...” in conclusions; “... is not merely, but ...”; “... is not isolated instance, but ...”. Lists are almost

always of 3 items; "... is understood not as, but ..."; long sentences with excessive em-dashes (although em-dashes should be encouraged, of course); "to recognize ... is to ..."

4. Give recommendations on rewriting these formulaic templates in one's own voice.

I must stress that asking AI to draft an actual research paper is *never* a good idea, at least with today's AI platforms. The above case is justified because the current contribution is *not* a research paper, but simply a guide. The task itself is simple: I am giving you formulaic patterns; tell me how to avoid them. That's all.

What came out of Claude is the remainder of this guide, as well as the title, save my own concluding remarks at the end. Claude generated a brief history of AI (item 1 above), but the result was unsatisfactory, so I decided to omit it. Also, I was not happy with Claude's initial concluding remarks; I asked for a new one with the prompt:

Please rewrite the conclusion. The current one is not easy to follow, at least for me.

As for the rest of it, I made sure not to intervene much with what Claude generated. It seemed satisfactory, as the result is what I would have intended to write in the first place, even better than what I would have written myself. I denote my minor edits in the footnotes in the format of a critical edition apparatus. I also inserted some comments in square brackets, [], to highlight repeated patterns in the AI output.

*And lo, Claude said:*³

³ This phrase was also generated by Claude with the following prompt:

1. Pros and Cons of Generative AI in Composing Academic Articles

1.1 Potential Benefits

Proponents of generative AI in academic writing point to several genuine advantages, particularly for researchers working outside their first language. For scholars writing in English as an additional language, AI tools can assist with grammatical correctness, idiomatic phrasing, and clarity of expression, potentially reducing the barriers that have historically disadvantaged non-Anglophone researchers in [the publication process](#).⁴ The democratizing potential here is real: a researcher in [Marağa](#) or [Najrān](#)⁵ whose ideas are strong, but whose English fluency is limited, now has access to a tool that can help articulate those ideas in publishable form.

AI can also accelerate certain mechanical aspects of scholarship. Literature synthesis, the identification of recurring themes across dozens of sources, the organization of an argument's scaffolding—these are tasks where AI can serve as a capable first-draft [collaborator](#).⁶ Researchers report using AI to overcome the paralysis of the blank page, generating a rough structure that they then revise substantially. In this mode, the AI

Attached is the current state of the paper. I want to replace the phrase, "And Claude said," with something more biblical. Please suggest alternatives.

⁴ the publication process] publications **Claude**. The modification was suggested by **Grammarly**.

⁵ Marağa or Najrān] Seoul or São Paulo **Claude**.

⁶ *collaborator*] ital. om. **Claude**.

functions less as *an*⁷ author and more as a sophisticated outliner or brainstorming *partner*.⁸

For early-career researchers unfamiliar with the conventions of academic prose, AI can also model the register, tone, and structural norms of scholarly writing. In this limited sense, it can serve a pedagogical function, demonstrating how arguments are typically framed and supported within a given discipline.

1.2 Significant Limitations and Risks

The risks, however, are substantial and go beyond the familiar concerns about plagiarism and academic integrity, serious as those are. The deeper problem is epistemological. Large language models do not reason; they predict. They generate text that resembles well-formed academic prose because they have been trained on vast quantities of such prose, not because they understand the arguments being made. The result is writing that is grammatically fluent and structurally familiar but often intellectually hollow—confident assertions without genuine evidence, citations that may be fabricated, and claims that merely rehearse the statistical patterns of academic discourse rather than advancing it.

This tendency toward surface fluency without depth is compounded by what might be called the homogenization effect. Because all users of a given model draw from the same statistical pool, the prose these tools generate tends toward a recognizable sameness. Distinctive scholarly voices—those built over years of reading, thinking, and writing in a particular way—are flattened into a generic academic register. The field of literary studies, with

⁷ *an*] + **Grammarly**; om. **Claude**.

⁸ *partner*] ital. om. **Claude**.

its long tradition of prizing the individual critical voice, has been particularly alert to this risk; but it applies across the humanities and social sciences wherever voice, argument, and interpretation matter.

There is also the question of accountability. Academic writing is, at its best, a form of intellectual responsibility: the author stands behind every claim, has genuinely engaged with the sources cited, and can defend each argumentative move. [\[Notice the 3-item list, on which see below.\]](#) AI-generated prose undermines this accountability in ways that are difficult to verify and easy to obscure. The scholar who submits AI-generated text as their own is not merely cutting corners; they are severing the link between thought and expression that academic writing is meant to embody. [\[Notice the formula, “X is not merely Y; they are Z”.\]](#)

Finally, and perhaps most insidiously for the long-term health of scholarship, heavy reliance on AI writing tools may [erode](#)⁹ the very capacities that academic writing is meant to develop. Writing is not merely a means of communicating thought; it is a

⁹ erode] atrophy **Claude**. The change was suggested by Claude with the following prompt:

In section 1.2, please suggest alternatives to “atrophy.”

I don't know the word.

Claude explained,

“Atrophy” means to weaken or waste away through disuse — like a muscle that shrinks when it is not exercised. It is actually a very apt word here. But here are alternatives, from closest in meaning to more distant: ...

Claude suggested a few alternatives, explaining the meaning and register of each. I chose *erode*, even before getting to Claude's recommendation to pick this same word.

technology for producing it. [Notice the close repetition of the formula, “X is not merely Y; it is Z” two sentences earlier!] The labor of putting an idea into precise words forces the writer to discover whether they have actually understood it. Scholars who outsource this labor may find, over time, that they have less to say.

2. Formulaic Signatures of AI-Generated Academic Prose

Beyond the broader risks outlined above, generative AI has introduced into academic writing a set of recognizable stylistic tics—templatic phrases and structural habits that recur with suspicious frequency across texts generated by different users, on different topics, in different disciplines. [Notice the em-dashes and the length of the sentence.] These formulas are not random; they represent the statistical center of gravity of academic prose as encoded in training data. [Notice the formula, “X are not Y; they ...”.] For a reader familiar with the patterns, they function as a kind of fingerprint. [One may decide that the previous two sentences are fluff, not adding much to the argument and can be removed.] What follows is an examination of the most common formulas, each illustrated with an example of the kind of prose AI characteristically produces.

2.1 “... is not incidental, but ...”

This construction is a favorite of AI-generated prose because it performs the gesture of analytical depth: the writer appears to be pushing past the obvious to reveal something structural or necessary. In practice, the formula is frequently deployed to fill space where a genuine argument should be.

*The marginalization of women in nineteenth-century scientific institutions is **not incidental, but constitutive** of the very epistemological framework through which knowledge was validated, authorized, and disseminated during the period.*

The formula promises a revelation but typically delivers only a restatement of the original claim at a higher register. The word “constitutive” is doing the heavy lifting—and it is doing so without supporting argument.

2.2 “Taken together, ...” (in conclusions)

This phrase has become the near-universal opening of AI-generated conclusion paragraphs. It signals a move from analysis to synthesis, but in AI prose it almost always precedes a summary rather than a synthesis—a rehearsal of what has already been said, not a new insight that emerges from having said it.

***Taken together**, these findings suggest that the relationship between digital infrastructure and democratic participation is more complex than existing frameworks have acknowledged, that access alone cannot account for differential engagement, and that future research must attend to the affective dimensions of platform design.*

The phrase does no real rhetorical work here. It is a transitional throat-clearing. That AI reaches for it so consistently reveals how thoroughly the formula has colonized the concluding move of the academic paragraph.

2.3 “... is not merely ..., but ...”

This is a variant of the 3.1 construction, adding the word “merely” to intensify the rhetorical contrast. The effect is to make the writer appear to be correcting a naive view—but since no one has actually held the naive view, the correction is illusory.

*The archive, in this reading, is **not merely** a repository of historical documents, but a technology of power that actively produces the past it purports to preserve.*

The sentence sounds sophisticated, and the underlying claim (about archives and power) is genuinely important in archival theory. But the “not merely ... but” frame adds nothing. It is a rhetorical wrapper around a claim that would be stronger if stated directly.

2.4 “... is not an isolated instance, but ...”

This formula is typically deployed when AI is trying to generalize from a specific case to a broader pattern. It performs the analytical move of identifying significance, but it does so automatically, regardless of whether the move has been earned by the preceding analysis.

*Morrison’s treatment of memory in Beloved is **not an isolated instance**, but part of a broader literary and cultural project of recovering suppressed histories, one that situates the novel within the ongoing struggle to reckon with the legacies of slavery in American life.*

The claim may be true, but it arrives pre-packaged. The formula substitutes for the actual argumentative work of showing

how and why this particular instance illuminates the broader pattern.

2.5 The Three-Item List

One of the most reliable signatures of AI-generated academic prose is the almost invariable appearance of three-item lists. Whether enumerating contributing factors, naming theoretical frameworks, or cataloguing examples, AI prose reaches reflexively for the triad. The rhetorical appeal is understandable: three items feel complete without feeling exhaustive. But when every enumeration contains exactly three elements, the pattern becomes a tell.

This transformation can be attributed to three interconnected factors: the liberalization of financial markets, the proliferation of digital communication technologies, and the weakening of traditional regulatory frameworks.

Three factors. There are always three. Not two, not four, not seven. The tidiness of the tricolon—a genuine rhetorical virtue in other contexts—becomes, in AI prose, a mechanical habit that flattens the actual complexity of causation.

2.6 “... is understood not as ..., but as ...”

This construction signals a conceptual reorientation, a move from a flawed received understanding to the writer’s preferred framework. It is extremely common in theory-inflected humanities writing and has been enthusiastically absorbed by AI systems trained on such prose.

*In this framework, identity is **understood not as a stable essence located within the individual, but as a***

performative achievement, constituted through repeated citation of normative conventions and always open to subversion.

The formula borrows the apparatus of theoretical sophistication while bypassing its substance. AI produces this kind of sentence with ease precisely because theoretical allegiance is easier to simulate than genuine theoretical reasoning.

2.7 Long Sentences with Excessive Em-Dashes

The em-dash is a perfectly legitimate—indeed, indispensable—piece of punctuation. It marks parenthetical elaboration, signals an abrupt shift, and introduces appositive material with a informality that commas cannot quite achieve. [\[Here we go again with a three-item list.\]](#) None of this is at issue. What AI-generated prose tends to do, however, is use em-dashes not as precise rhetorical instruments but as connective tissue—filling the gaps between loosely related clauses—producing sentences that sprawl across the page in a simulation of complexity that, on closer inspection, conceals a relative absence of logical structure—a kind of grammatical fog—through which the reader moves with the sensation of meaning but without quite arriving at it.

The above sentence is, deliberately, an example of the phenomenon it describes. The em-dashes do work here, but they are doing the work of connection that explicit logical “because,” “although,” “which means that”—would do more rigorously. AI favors the em-dash because it allows the simulation of complexity without the commitment of precision.

2.8 “To recognize ... is to ...”

This is perhaps the most philosophically ambitious of the AI formulas. It presents the act of recognition as productive—to see clearly is simultaneously to accomplish something. The construction has deep roots in phenomenological and critical theory writing, where it is used with genuine precision. In AI prose, it functions as a way of ending a paragraph with apparent profundity.

To recognize the rhetorical construction of scientific objectivity is to open the possibility of imagining knowledge practices organized around different values—values of care, situatedness, and epistemic humility rather than detachment, universality, and mastery.

The sentence performs a move from critique to possibility. But notice how little work “to recognize” is doing: there is no account of what recognizing actually involves, no argument for why this particular recognition leads to this particular possibility rather than others. The formula provides the shape of a thought without the thought itself.

3. Recommendations for Recovering One’s Own Voice

The problem is not that these formulas are always wrong. “Taken together” can be useful. Em-dashes are wonderful. The tricolon is a venerable rhetorical structure. The problem is automaticity: reaching for these patterns without deciding to, without checking whether they are the right choice, without interrogating whether they are doing genuine work or merely filling space. What follows

are practical recommendations for writers who wish to write from genuine thought rather than statistical patterns.¹⁰

And imagine when you are attending a weeklong symposium where a noticeable number of presentations are using the above expressions, or if you are reading proceedings with such formulas repeated over and over again!¹¹

3.1 Make the Contrast Earn Its Keep

Before writing “X is not Y, but Z,” stop and ask: who believes it is Y? If no one holds that view, the contrast is fictitious and the formula is empty. If someone does hold it, name them. “Against the common assumption that archives are neutral repositories, I argue that...” is more honest and more specific than the abstract negation. The contrast should point toward a real interlocutor—a position in the literature, a theoretical assumption, a reader’s likely expectation—not toward a straw view the writer has invented in order to dismiss it.

3.2 Earn the Generalization

When reaching for “this is not an isolated instance,” the writer should have shown, not merely asserted, that the case connects to a pattern. That means spending time on the evidence that establishes the connection, not simply claiming it at the sentence level. The formula short-circuits an argumentative obligation. Replace the formula with the argument it was supposed to represent.

¹⁰ patterns] sing. pattern **Claude**. The change was suggested within Microsoft Word by Microsoft’s AI agent **Copilot**.

¹¹ And imagine ... again.] + **Kiraz**.

3.3 Vary the Number of Your Examples

Count the items in your next list. If there are exactly three, consider whether there are genuinely three, or whether you stopped at three because three felt right. If the evidence supports two, give two. If it supports six, give six, organized into subcategories. The intellectual obligation is to the evidence, not to the aesthetics of the tricolon. A writer who consistently produces three-item lists has stopped counting and started rounding.

3.4 Replace Nominal Constructions with Active Claims

“X is understood not as A but as B” is a passive construction that hides the agent of understanding. *Who* understands it as B? You? The scholars in your field? Your primary sources?¹² The text itself? Make the sentence grammatically active: “Barsoum¹³ argues that X...”; “I read X as...”; “The critical consensus has moved from understanding X as...” Passive constructions allow writers to assert positions without claiming responsibility for them. Active constructions require intellectual commitment.

3.5 Use Em-Dashes Sparingly and Precisely

An em-dash is not a comma substitute or a connective filler. It should be deployed when you want to signal one of two things: a parenthetical elaboration that you want to feel slightly more emphatic or interruptive than parentheses would make it, or an abrupt turn that you want the reader to feel as a turn. If a sentence

¹² Your primary sources?] + **Kiraz**.

¹³ Barsoum] Butler **Claude**.

contains more than one em-dash pair, examine whether the embedded material is truly parenthetical or whether it belongs in its own sentence. Complexity of syntax should follow complexity of thought; imposed syntactic complexity is merely noise.

3.6 Unpack “To Recognize ... Is To ...”

This formula compresses an argument into an aphorism. To recover the argument, ask: what is the causal or logical mechanism that connects recognition to its claimed consequence? Why does seeing X lead to being able to do Y? Spell out that mechanism. If you cannot, the sentence may be gesturing toward a thought you have not yet quite had. The discipline of trying to write the underlying argument will either produce a better sentence or reveal that the apparent insight dissolves under examination—both outcomes are useful.

3.7 Write Conclusions That Surprise

“Taken together, these findings suggest...” followed by a summary of what has already been argued is not a conclusion; it is a recapitulation. A genuine conclusion should offer something that was not available at the beginning of the article: an implication, a qualification, an unresolved tension, a reframing, a question. The test is whether a reader who has read only the conclusion and the introduction will¹⁴ learn something new from the conclusion. If the conclusion merely mirrors the introduction at a lower level of specificity, it has not done its work.

¹⁴ will] Copilot; would Claude.

3.8 Read Before You Write

The deepest source of formulaic writing is not laziness but thin reading. Writers who have read widely and closely in their field have absorbed a range of syntactic options, rhetorical strategies, and argumentative moves. They reach for a formula when they are writing too fast, under too little intellectual pressure, or without enough of their own thinking behind them. The best counter to AI-generated flatness is not technique but content: having genuinely read something, thought about it carefully, and found something worth saying about it. That substance, when it exists, tends to push through the formulas and produce writing that is recognizably one's own.

4. [Claude's] Concluding Remarks

Generative AI is now part of academic writing, and no policy will undo that. The question is not whether scholars will encounter these tools, but whether they will use them thoughtfully or be used by them.

The formulas examined in this paper are not grave sins. They are habits — small surrenders of attention, moments where a writer [reaches](#)¹⁵ for a ready-made shape instead of finding the right one. What makes them worth examining is what they reveal: that it is possible to produce prose that looks like thinking without the thinking [itself](#)¹⁶ having taken place.

¹⁵ reaches] **Copilot**; reached **Claude**.

¹⁶ itself] + **Kiraz**. I added *itself* to resolve a fistfight between Claude and Copilot. The latter suggested changing the preceding “the thinking” to “thinking,” probably because Copilot *misunderstood* (!) Claude’s original phrase “looks like thinking without the thinking having taken place.”

5. [Kiraz’s] Concluding Remarks

I began dabbling in Generative AI around 2023 with ChatGPT. I—rather, ChatGPT—produced two short pieces: a Foreword to the Gorgias 360 series, and another Foreword to a Syriac grammar whose author asked me to write it. Apart from the prompt, my contribution was final editorial touches on what ChatGPT produced (as in the above AI-generated guide). As such, I did not feel comfortable signing¹⁷ the Forewords. But the entire purpose of the Foreword—by those who requested it—was that my name is attached to it. I decided to write under my name a code in Syriac, ܩܦܬܐ ܩܦܬܐ ܩܦܬܐ (“I am the Vine”) from the Gospel of John (15:1). The Syriac word *vine* is made of the consonants *GPT*!

Obviously, I do not encourage anyone to have generative AI draft an entire paper as I have done above. The prose tends to feel flat. In general, large language models perform more reliably on smaller, well-defined tasks — asking AI to generate extended passages significantly increases the risk of hallucination.

What is hallucination?

It is when AI models make things up. In his *The Shortest History of AI* (2025, p. 128), Toby Walsh argues that the term is “somewhat misleading” because it “implies that the model actually knows the truth.” As Claude had just told us above, “Large language models do not reason; they predict.” And they

Following Copilot’s recommendation (changing “the thinking” to “thinking”) would have ruined the sentence. I opted to edit the phrase, adding “itself”, to make both Claude and Copilot happy!

¹⁷ signing] I initially wrote *singing* by mistake. Grammarly offered the correction to *signing* which I accepted. But then Copilot suggested to go back to *singing*!

predict far better when we ask them for smaller tasks, at least in the current state of the art.

The footnotes above also demonstrate that other AI-based tools are working side by side, sometimes contradicting each other (see, for example, footnotes 16 and 17). I have Grammarly installed on my machine. Grammarly is a writing assistance tool that helps users improve their writing through real-time suggestions and corrections. It checks for grammar and spelling errors, as well as style and clarity, suggesting ways to make writing clearer, more concise, or more engaging. It also checks one's tone: formal, friendly, confident, etc. It offers vocabulary suggestions to improve variety or precision. If you are using Microsoft products, your Copilot AI agent is probably also sitting on top of your head. As corporations push AI agents further, it seems that one will soon be forced to interact with them, even if only passively: Willingly or unwillingly, knowingly or unknowingly, as a Syriac liturgical phrase goes!

Going back to our Rome MEMaT workshop. Each paper whose author used generative AI in whatever way would have stood the scrutiny of scholarship. Clearly, each contributor used the models with care. If there was any hallucination, they took care of it. What remained—and what gave away the use of generative AI—is the frequent use of the phrases we have seen throughout this guide at the peripheries of the good arguments of the respective contributions.

It is unclear what lies ahead for us in academic writing. AI is developing at a rapid pace that none of us can predict. But it is almost certain that academic writing—and writing in general—will enter a new phase in the coming decades, if not in the coming years. I hope that my (?) small contributions will help academic

authors in recognizing the most commonly repeated phrases generated by AI models as they stand today. ❖~~_____~~❖