AI Makes Output Cheap; Nari Makes Trust Cheap

A short note on AI, academic publishing, and verification-first workflows

Date: 4 March 2026

Alexander Kustov's warning to academics is not really "use AI or die". It is that the cost of producing paper-shaped output has collapsed, while the cost of deciding what is true has not. When drafting, coding, and summarising become fast and cheap, the scarce inputs shift to judgement, provenance, and verification. Kustov puts the spotlight where it belongs: the productive worries are "security and verification", not whether a model can write a decent introduction.

This is exactly where Nari can be an advantage, because Nari is not a blank box. The blank box rewards the confident, the well-educated, and the already-initiated; it also tempts everyone into the same trap: produce fluent text first, then hope it is true. Nari's job is to force the opposite ordering: evidence first, prose last.

Practically, Nari can do three things that standard chat cannot.

First, workflow over vibes. Instead of "write my paper", Nari offers controlled entry points: turn my idea into three falsifiable hypotheses; choose an identification strategy; design robustness checks; build a replication plan. This aligns with the reality Kustov describes: the question and the plan matter more than the typing.

Second, verification gates that you cannot skip. Before any manuscript drafting, Nari can require: a claim-to-evidence table; explicit separation of "source-supported" versus "inference"; re-calculation of reported statistics from provided data and code; and flags for anything the system cannot substantiate. This mirrors the trustworthiness characteristics NIST emphasises (valid and reliable; accountable and transparent; explainable and interpretable).

Third, compliance and accountability by design. COPE is clear: AI tools cannot be authors because they cannot take responsibility; human authors remain accountable and should disclose AI use. Nari can auto-generate a disclosure statement and a reproducibility appendix from the logged workflow.

Why this matters now: low-quality and fraudulent research is already flooding the literature. Nature reports an AI screening tool flagging more than 250,000 cancer studies with textual similarities to known paper-mill output. If output scales, trust becomes the bottleneck.

So the clean framing for Nari is: AI makes output cheap. Nari makes trust cheap—by making verification the default.

References (online)

- Kustov, A. (2 March 2026). “Academics Need to Wake Up on AI”. Popular by Design (Substack). https://alexanderkustov.substack.com/p/academics-need-to-wake-up-on-ai
- Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (13 February 2023). “Authorship and AI tools”. https://publicationethics.org/guidance/cope-position/authorship-and-ai-tools
- National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). “AI RMF: Characteristics of trustworthy AI systems” (AIRC). https://airc.nist.gov/airmf-resources/airmf/3-sec-characteristics/
- Else, H. (8 October 2025). “Low-quality papers are flooding the cancer literature”. Nature. https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-025-02906-y