

Editorial Review: "On My Use of AI for Writing"

Part I: High-Level Editorial Review

Strengths

Authentic voice and personal stakes. This essay works because it's clearly written by someone with skin in the game. The plagiarism anecdote from 9th grade is the emotional anchor of the piece — it grounds an otherwise abstract debate (AI and authorship) in a lived, specific experience. That moment where you stood on the school's own policy and said "Let's go call her now" is genuinely compelling. Don't lose that.

Structural logic. The essay follows a clean arc: here's who I am → here's my concern → here's where AI fits → here's how I actually use it → here's my broader take. That's a solid skeleton. A reader can orient themselves easily.

Transparency as thesis. The central move — "I can show my hand, as it were" — is smart. Rather than arguing defensively, you demonstrate. The workflow section with actual prompts is the essay putting its money where its mouth is.

The concluding bullet points land. The observation that LLM-typical style "was likely prevalent in training data" is a genuinely sharp insight that a lot of the discourse misses. That's the kind of original thinking that makes this essay worth reading.

Thematic Cohesion and Clarity

The essay has a slight identity crisis between two goals: (1) a personal reflection on your relationship to writing and AI, and (2) a practical walkthrough of your workflow. Both are valid, but the transition between them (around "With the what's and why's having been said") feels like a gear-shift rather than a natural progression. Consider whether the workflow section could be woven more tightly into the reflective portions, or whether a cleaner break (with a stronger bridge sentence) would serve better.

The "Context → Who I am" section does important work establishing credibility, but it currently reads a bit like a résumé preamble. You could tighten it by leading with the *tension* (people accuse writers of using AI; here's why that hits close to home for me) and then weaving in your parents' influence as supporting detail rather than opening with it.

Readability and Flow

The first half is stronger than the second. Once you hit the “Work flow” section, the essay shifts into a more instructional register that loses some of the personal voice that makes the earlier sections sing. The prompts are useful to include, but the surrounding prose thins out — consider adding a sentence or two around each prompt block about what kind of feedback you typically get back, or a specific example of a suggestion you accepted vs. rejected.

Pacing and Repetition

- The idea that “wholesale copying is antithetical to my goals” appears in various forms at least three times (in “Why I write,” “Killing one’s darlings,” and implicitly in the AIL framework section). Trust your reader to get it after the first or second pass.
- The essay could lose ~15% of its word count without losing substance. The “Why I write” section and the “AI Influence Level” section both have some filler that could be compressed.
- The conclusion feels unfinished (and is literally marked TODO). The bullet points are strong but need a closing paragraph that ties them back to your personal stance — otherwise the essay ends on a general observation rather than the personal note it started on.

Tone

The tone is mostly well-calibrated — informal but thoughtful, which matches a tech blog aimed at peers. A few spots veer slightly academic (“antithetical to my goals,” “I’d conjecture”) where plainer language would land harder. Conversely, the 🤔 emoji is a nice touch that keeps it human.

Part II: Line-by-Line Editing

Title

On my use of AI for writing

Consider capitalizing per title case: **“On My Use of AI for Writing”**. Minor, but worth being consistent if your blog uses title case elsewhere.

Section: “Who I am (a product of)”

A bit about me. My mom has been, among other things, an English Language Arts teacher.

"A bit about me" is a throwaway opener — it doesn't earn its place. Consider cutting it entirely and starting with "My mom has been..." or reworking it: "My relationship with writing started at home."

It is for that reason that, for much of high school and all of college, the copy of the MLA Style Guide that she gave me was fixed to my desk.

"It is for that reason that" is wordy. Suggested rewrite: → *"That's why, for much of high school and all of college, the MLA Style Guide she gave me was fixed to my desk."*

My father, who attained a PhD in Philosophy/Theology, was also a skilled writer and orator.

"Attained" is slightly formal — "earned" or "holds" reads more naturally in this register.

Today, in addition to the utilitarian writing that I do for work, I also write this blog to sharpen and share my thinking.

Clean sentence. No changes needed.

Section: "Why I write"

The primary goal of writing, for me, is to turn reflections on my experiences into actionable, shareable insights. So it would be meaningless to even try to have an do that for me.

Typo/incomplete sentence: "have an do that for me" — a word is missing. Presumably: "have **an AI** do that for me."

Blogging for me is (thus far and likely indefinitely) a "small web", not commercial activity.

The parenthetical interrupts the flow. Consider: → *"Blogging, for me, is a 'small web' activity — not a commercial one, and likely never will be."*

It isn't a source of revenue for me - there are neither ads nor refferal links - so there's no monetary incentive for me to just create "content".

Typo: "refferal" → **"referral"**

The em-dashes should be actual em-dashes (—) rather than hyphens (-), or at least en-dashes. Be consistent with your dash style throughout.

So if I want to produce more, I need to learn more and capture more of what I'm learning

– and that’s one sees where I would welcome AI-assisted scaling.

Garbled phrasing: “that’s one sees where” — this looks like an editing artifact. Likely intended: → “...and that’s where I would welcome AI-assisted scaling.”

Section: “Pride and prejudice”

While I’m not aware of any “AI slop” accusations being leveled against me, unfair accusations aren’t new to me.

Good transition. Works as-is.

I once had a teacher accuse me of palagarism.

Typo: “palagarism” → “**plagiarism**”

His assertion? “A 9th grade kid didn’t write this.”

Punchy. Nice.

The situation was resolved when I invoked the schools own stated policies.

Missing apostrophe: “schools” → “**school’s**”

“If you’re accusing me of academic dishonesty, you have to report me to the principals office and call my mom. Let’s go call her now”.

Missing apostrophe: “principals” → “**principal’s**”

Punctuation: The period should go inside the closing quotation mark (per American English convention / MLA — which feels fitting given the context): ...call her now.”

it came not in spite of but perhaps because of the level of effort I put into the work.

Strong line. The bolding is effective here.

My worry is that claims of inappropriate AI use — which is a legitimate concern — will become a new attack surface for bias and prejudice.

Good observation. Consider whether “attack surface” (a security term) is the metaphor you want. It works for a tech audience but might feel slightly jargon-y. It’s a judgment call — I think it works here.

I have — perhaps due to stereotype threat — increasingly had this uncanny feeling of writing something, reading it back, and thinking, “Someone who doesn’t know me well assume think AI wrote this”.

Garbled phrasing: "doesn't know me well assume think" — needs to be one verb or the other: → "...might assume AI wrote this" or "...would think AI wrote this"

Bullet lists and metanoia with parallel structure ("It's not just A, it's B") - these are ingrained aspects of the writing style that I've cultivated.

Typo: "metania" → "**metanoia**"

While I probably can't do much to convince folks who are primed to make offhand dismissals for whatever reason, I can show my hand, as it were, about how I'm using LLMs in my writing today.

Good closing to the section. "Show my hand" is a nice idiom choice. Minor note: there's a double space before "I can" — clean that up.

Section: "Where AI fits in"

Where I do leverage LLMs is in covering the gaps between my final solitary drafts and my first shared drafts.

This is a key sentence and it's slightly awkward. "Covering the gaps" is vague. Suggested rewrite: → "*Where I lean on LLMs is in bridging the gap between my last solo draft and the first draft I share with others.*"

When I'm looking for early (human) feedback, it's usually at a point in my writing lifecycle where I don't want to distract my reviewers from the substance of the material with typos, grammatical errors, or stylistic weaknesses.

Good sentence but long. Consider breaking it: → "*When I'm ready for human feedback, I don't want typos or grammatical issues distracting reviewers from the substance.*"

LLM, in my experience, have been really good at spotting and suggesting fixes for those categories of issues.

Subject-verb agreement: "LLM" (singular) with "have" (plural). Either: → "*LLMs, in my experience, have been...*" or "*An LLM, in my experience, has been...*"

Section: "A framework for AI involvement"

AI Influence Level (appears in both the heading and the body)

The section heading currently reads: "A framework for AI involvement AI Influence Level" — this looks like a duplicate/merge error. Pick one.

AI usage in my writing is generally level 0 or 1.

Consider briefly defining what those levels mean for readers who won't click the link. Even a parenthetical: "(Level 0: no AI involvement; Level 1: AI-assisted editing)" would help.

If you include traditional grammar checking tools (think MS Word) under the umbrella of AI, then you could argue that none of it is level 0.

Nice point — lands well.

Level 3 and up — a space I don't operate in with prose but do leverage for code — I'd conjecture, is for folks who have monetary incentives tied to their writing.

"I'd conjecture" is hedging on top of hedging (you already said "a space I don't operate in"). Suggested rewrite: → *"Level 3 and up — which I don't touch for prose but do use for code — is, I'd guess, more common among folks with monetary incentives tied to their output."*

That's just of not my arena.

Typo: "just of not" → **"just not"**

What I get out of writing is incompatible with fully AI generated processes.

Typos: "processes" → **"processes"**; also hyphenate "AI-generated."

Section: "Killing one's darlings"

Where I've found AI helpful beyond catching typos is in tightening up my essays.

Extra space: "beyond catching" — remove the double space.

Reducing word count without losing substance means that you have greater impact per word.

Consider: *"...means greater impact per word."* — the "that you have" is filler.

Doing that without losing your style, which I'll define loosely as a sense of ownership of and authentic connection to the words, is a tricky balance.

The parenthetical definition is a bit clunky. Consider breaking it out: → *"Doing that without losing your style is a tricky balance. And by style, I mean a sense of ownership — an authentic connection to the words."*

Roughly speaking, given a ~1500 word draft, it usually takes me about an hour to trim ~10% or 150 words — and that's with AI writing assistance 🤖.

Typos: "writting" → **"writing"**; "assitance" → **"assistance"**

Whether or not I apply their specific suggestions, I've found that LLMs are pretty on-point with identifying areas that could be more succinct.

"Pretty on-point with identifying areas that could be more succinct" is itself not very succinct. Consider: → *"Even when I don't take their specific suggestions, LLMs are solid at flagging what's bloated."*

With the what's and why's having been said, I'll share how I actually use these tools today

Missing period at end of sentence. Also "what's and why's" — since these are plurals of nouns, it should be **"whats and whys"** (no apostrophes). This is a transitional sentence that reads a bit stiff. Consider: → *"With that context out of the way, here's how I actually use these tools."*

Section: "Work flow"

Heading: "Work flow" → **"Workflow"** (one word).

Here are some of the prompts that I'll use

Missing period. Also, "that I'll use" is vague on tense — do you mean "that I use" (habitual) or "that I'll use" (future)? Since you're describing your current practice: → *"Here are some of the prompts I use."*

Once I have a decent draft (typically around the 1000-1500 word mark based the my usual post length – ~1300 for this particular essay)

Typo: "based the my" → **"based on my"**

The parenthetical is useful context. No other changes needed.

I'll usually throw an LLM against it with some variation of the following prompt:

"Throw an LLM against it" — I actually like this phrasing. It's casual and honest.

Once I've worked through the feedback and implemented the feedback that I agree with

Repetition: "feedback" appears twice. Suggested rewrite: → *"Once I've worked through the feedback and implemented what I agree with..."*

Section: Conclusion

In discourse, I see people's willingness confidently assert "dead giveaways" and tells –

even in short form writing like comments that provides limited data.

Grammar: "willingness confidently assert" — missing "to": "**willingness to confidently assert**". Also "comments that provides" → "**comments that provide**" (subject-verb agreement). And "short form" should be hyphenated: "**short-form**."

And it's not that they are necessarily wrong, it's that these assertions are often made with certainly instead of as sliding probabilities.

Typo: "certainly" → "**certainty**"

"Sliding probabilities" is an interesting phrase but might be unclear. Consider: "...made with certainty rather than as probabilistic judgments" or even simpler: "...stated as fact rather than likelihood."

If LLMs tend to produce a certain style, that implies that the style was likely prevalent in training data.

Strong point. Well-stated.

It's unlikely to be some fully emergent behavior that is exclusively used by AI.

Good follow-through on the logic.

Being "too good" doesn't mean something is slop. Some people follow style guides or otherwise take care when they write and shouldn't be punished for it.

This is the emotional core of the conclusion and connects directly back to your 9th-grade story. Consider making that connection explicit — it would bring the essay full circle.

LLMs in general, but especially when paired with tools for autonomy like Open IClaw have led to content being produced at unprecedented scales.

Typo/formatting: "Open IClaw" → "**OpenClaw**" (or whatever the intended tool name is — verify this). Also, this sentence could use a comma: "...like OpenClaw*** have led to..."*

Some of it to manipulate or deceive. In general, try to engage with the substance of an argument.

"In general, try to engage with the substance of an argument" is a good closing sentiment but feels abrupt and underdeveloped as a final line. This is where a short closing paragraph would bring the essay home. Something that ties the conclusion back to your personal stake — the kid who was accused of plagiarism, the writer who cares about craft — and lands on a note of "judge the work, not the assumption."

TODO

Remove before publishing. 😊

Part III: Summary of Errors

Typos and Misspellings

| Error | Correction | Location |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| "have an do that" | "have an AI do that" | Why I write |
| "refferal" | "referral" | Why I write |
| "palagarism" | "plagiarism" | Pride and prejudice |
| "metanioa" | "metanoia" | Pride and prejudice |
| "procceses" | "processes" | AI Influence Level |
| "writting assitance" | "writing assistance" | Killing one's darlings |
| "certainly" | "certainty" | Conclusion |
| "Open IClaw" | verify correct name | Conclusion |

Grammar and Punctuation

| Issue | Fix | Location |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| "that's one sees where" | "that's where" | Why I write |
| "schools own" | "school's own" | Pride and prejudice |
| "principals office" | "principal's office" | Pride and prejudice |
| "assume think" | pick one verb | Pride and prejudice |
| "LLM...have" | "LLMs...have" | Where AI fits in |
| "based the my" | "based on my" | Workflow |
| "willingness confidently assert" | "willingness to confidently assert" | Conclusion |
| "comments that provides" | "comments that provide" | Conclusion |
| "just of not" | "just not" | AI Influence Level |

Formatting

| Issue | Location |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Double spaces (multiple instances) | Throughout |
| Hyphens used where em-dashes intended | Why I write, multiple sections |
| Duplicate text in section heading | AI Influence Level heading |
| Missing periods at end of sentences | Workflow section (x2) |
| "Work flow" → "Workflow" | Section heading |
| "what's and why's" → "whats and whys" | Transition sentence |

Part IV: Top 5 Recommendations

1. **Fix the garbled sentences.** There are 3–4 spots where editing clearly left behind broken phrasing ("have an do that," "that's one sees where," "assume think"). These undercut the essay's credibility on a piece that's literally about writing quality.
2. **Write the conclusion.** The bullet points are strong but the essay currently ends mid-thought. Bring it full circle to the plagiarism story. You opened with a kid defending his own work; close with the adult doing the same thing, and make the case that engagement with substance matters more than pattern-matching for "tells."
3. **Compress the middle.** The "Why I write" and "AI Influence Level" sections overlap in message. You could cut roughly 150 words from these two sections without losing meaning — which would be a fitting demonstration of the "killing your darlings" principle you describe.
4. **Add a concrete example to the workflow section.** Show a before/after of a sentence the LLM suggested changing and whether you took the suggestion. This would make the most instructional section of the essay also the most persuasive.
5. **One thorough proofread pass.** The typo density is high enough that it's noticeable. Ironic given the subject matter — but also, honestly, relatable and very human. Still, clean it up before publishing.