

Peer Review: No coding, No problem: Revolutionizing scientific workflows through workflow-orchestrating AI

Ho Yi Wan¹ , & Logan Hysen² 

Collaborators: Matt Farmer + 1 other reviewer

¹ Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

² Center for Systems Integration and Sustainability, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI

Transparent Peer Review

- [View reviewer summaries](#)
- [View resubmission with reviewer comments and author responses](#)
- [View initial submission with reviewer comments and author responses](#)

Accepted by 2 of 2 reviewers

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Publishing History

Submitted August 16 2025

Accepted March 2 2026

Published May 1 2026

Corresponding Author

Ho Yi Wan

wanhoyi@ufl.edu

Recommended Citation

Wan, H. Y., and L. Hysen. 2026. No coding, no problem: Revolutionizing scientific workflows through workflow-orchestrating AI. *Stacks Journal*: 26005. <https://doi.org/10.60102/stacks-26005>.



Open Access



Peer-Reviewed



Creative Commons



Reviewer Summaries

Matt Farmer

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

Presenting a change in basic assumptions in academic research where large language models, engineered for natural language interfacing, augment scientific analysis platforms by making complex analysis more attainable.

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

Providing motivation to partner with developers and scientists to create natural language interfaces for scientific tools and analysis platforms.

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

Not as applicable here, given the nature of the article. The review of current applications and shifts in modern tools as an example supported the overall aim of the paper.

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

Overall, I think more attention should be spent on the limitations and workload-offset to developers that are absent in this paper. My comments provide specific areas to address.

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

I understand and agree with the overall aim of the paper. I think that the bright future ahead of us must be balanced with knowing some of the potential pitfalls.

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

No

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

This paper needs major revisions and another round of peer review

Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

no

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

5/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

I am satisfied with the responses to my feedback. Great improvement over the original.

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?



Yes, please list me as a Collaborator

Taal Levi

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

The manuscript is well written and the figures are well made.

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

I do not think this will contribute to the field. The manuscript lacks depth. There is no analysis, only one framework is discussed, and there is no message in this paper that I consider to be a useful contribution.

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

There is no design or methods as this is a commentary with no data or analysis.

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

There is no analysis or interpretation.

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

I do not think this is fit for publication without either analysis to compare approaches to data analysis without coding, or a comprehensive review of how this method works, what its benefits are, what approaches are in the pipeline and their promise, what the demand for this might be relative to existing and improving LLMs, etc.

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

No

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

The fundamental science is flawed and this paper should be rejected

Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

no

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

4/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

The authors have not modified the paper or added comments based on the current round of review. Should they have?

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator