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# Article summary:

1. ChatGPT can be used to generate seemingly expert texts on topics, leading to an increase in the amount of (dis)information available online.

2. The reliability of these texts is questionable, as they are based on internet pages which may not be trustworthy and can be manipulated out of context.

3. Journalists, publishers and other information professionals can act as a barrier against the flood of disinformation by separating information from disinformation, pointing readers to reliable sources, and engaging in dialogue with readers.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article “ChatGPT en de informatieprofessional (2): tegen Frankenstein-teksten – JanBletz.nl” is written by Jan Bletz and published on his website janbletz.nl. The article discusses the potential implications of ChatGPT for the spread of (dis)information online, arguing that it could lead to an increase in unreliable texts being generated by users who want to appear knowledgeable or attract attention.

The article is generally well-written and provides a clear argument about the potential risks posed by ChatGPT for the spread of (dis)information online. It also provides some useful insights into how journalists, publishers and other information professionals can act as a barrier against this flood of misinformation by separating information from disinformation, pointing readers to reliable sources, and engaging in dialogue with readers.

However, there are some potential biases present in the article which should be noted. For example, while Bletz acknowledges that ChatGPT has been claimed to produce 90% accurate texts, he does not provide any evidence for this claim or explore any counterarguments which might challenge it. Additionally, he does not discuss any possible risks associated with using ChatGPT or present both sides equally when discussing its potential implications for the spread of (dis)information online.

In conclusion, while this article provides some useful insights into how journalists and other information professionals can act as a barrier against the spread of (dis)information online due to ChatGPT’s use, there are some potential biases present which should be noted when assessing its trustworthiness and reliability.

# Topics for further research:

* ChatGPT accuracy
* Misinformation prevention strategies
* Risks of using ChatGPT
* Counterarguments to ChatGPT accuracy
* Dialogue between readers and information professionals
* Impact of ChatGPT on (dis)information spread
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