

## Use and Misuse of Artificial Intelligence Tools

Regmi B\*

Following Turing's seminal paper Computing Machinery and Intelligence (1948) and Dartmouth proposal (McCarthy et al, 1956), attempts continued to develop a system that can substitute, or at least shoulder a part of human intelligence. Now, artificial intelligence (AI) has become a reality. Its domains include machine learning based on self-improving algorithms (Mitchell, 1997), deep learning employing multi-layered neural networks (Goodfellow et al., 2016), natural language processing based on big data (Jurafsky and Martin, 2023), computer vision, robotics that allows to incorporate physical systems, expert systems applying rule-based reasoning, and more.

Meanwhile, AI industry continues to explore new areas and markets. Debates over related IP rights, patents, regulations and ethics are emerging. Maintaining that the Patents Act 1977 recognizes only natural person as inventor, the UK Supreme Court rejected patent submission for Device for the Autonomous Bootstrapping of Unified Sentience (UKSC, 2023). Similarly, recently in 2025, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office issued a revised guidance clarifying that AI systems are considered tools used in the inventive process, and therefore cannot be named as co-inventors on patent applications (USPTO, 2025).

As of now, there is no AI-specific regulation in Nepal, which will most likely follow the World Intellectual Property Organization policies. WIPO's Standing Committee on the Law of Patents outlined future work to address emerging issues, including whether AI can be recognized as an inventor and the role of AI tools in patent examination (WIPO, 2024a). So, it seems the AI industry has to find some other ways to generate income, rather than claiming patents to what get invented by their AI tools.

Expansion of total information coupled with precision and efficacy of AI and robotics has posed hitherto unseen threats to human intelligence, especially of the common people. Feelings of lethargy and defeat, worries of possible losses of jobs and incomes, senses of helplessness and worthlessness of lives, are likely to haunt young minds. Look how commonly school-level and even university students are finding their homework inferior to AI-generated ones. Realtime interactions with AI tools far

1. \*Correspondence: Dr. Balmukunda Regmi, Professor, Department of Pharmacy, Maharajgunj Medical Campus, Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University, Maharajgunj, Kathmandu, Nepal, Post Box 1524, Email: [bmregmi@gmail.com](mailto:bmregmi@gmail.com)

Peer Reviewed under the authority of THE ACADEMIA, Journal of NUTAN, Central Committee, Kathmandu, Nepal, with ISSN: 2350-8671 (Print)



exceed the impression of good quality YouTube education videos and AI-generated teaching materials. Artificial perfection is on the way to killing millions of creative minds.

In education sector, proper access to and utilization of AI tools can help minimize teaching/learning resource gaps in schools and colleges. AI tools can help scholars and students grasp most of the concepts, provided they do not require hands-on practical works, instrumental observations and laboratory tests. AI tools are also good alternatives when competent teachers and authentic sources of information are not readily available. Compared to other options, AI tools are much cheaper, efficient and promptly available. Downside is, reliance on AI tools can kill the very intellect of the users. It can mask the weaknesses of students when performing after-class educational exercises, and result in false positive show of scholars' writings and other achievements. In severe cases, AI misuses can lead to deterioration of teaching/learning or scholastic activities, or even cheatings, inferiority complexes, depressions, crimes, and deaths (Chatterjee, 2025; Kuenssberg, 2025). Even in what are not direct misuse by the victims, AI-assisted surgical robots have occasionally contributed to patient deaths due to system errors or operator misjudgment (Johnston, 2020)

Nepal needs to develop regulations regarding AI use in education and academia, not refraining from banning certain aspects AI tools should they pose significant threat to human self-respect and public security. In line with pro-socialist Constitution of the country, we have to ensure that all students and academicians have affordable access to proper AI tools.

We agree with the WIPO, the immense capacity of AI for transformation should be driven towards making our world a better place for all (WIPO, 2024b). Nepal cannot remain an exception; we should tap the AI tools to the best benefit our students, scholars and society.

Academic writing is meant to share the real tests, researches, findings, hypotheses and conclusions of the scholars. Writing just for the sake of publication is not only a waste of resources, it is also a scam against the readers. The current issue of The Academia has checked all articles against plagiarism and AI-generated contents. The journal is not against using search engines and AI tools to gather information, but discourages letting AI tools replace academic creativity.

## References

Chatterjee, R. (2025, September 19). Their teenage sons died by suicide. Now, they are sounding an alarm about AI chatbots. NPR. <https://www.npr.org/sections/shots-health-news/2025/09/19/nx-s1-5545749/ai-chatbots-safety-openai-meta-characterai-teens-suicide>

Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). Deep learning. MIT Press.

Johnston, M. (2020). Risks and liability in AI-assisted surgery. *Journal of Medical Robotics*, 12(3), 45–53.

Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2023). Speech and language processing (3rd ed., draft). Prentice Hall.

Kuenssberg, L. (2025, November 8). ‘A predator in your home’: Mothers say chatbots encouraged their sons to kill themselves. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/ce3xgwyywe4o>

McCarthy, J., Minsky, M. L., Rochester, N., & Shannon, C. E. (1956). A proposal for the Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence.

Mitchell, T. M. (1997). Machine learning. McGraw-Hill.

Thaler v Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks, UKSC 49 (Supreme Court of the United Kingdom 2024).

Turing, A. M. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. *Mind*, 59(236), 433–460. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/LIX.236.433>

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. (2025). Revised guidance on inventorship and the use of artificial intelligence. USPTO.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024a). Patent landscape report on generative artificial intelligence and future work programme on AI and patents discussions. WIPO.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024b). Getting the innovation ecosystem ready for AI: An IP policy toolkit. WIPO. <https://doi.org/10.34667/tind.48978>