Cite: McIvor C. Avoiding Regression to the Mean: A millennial perspective on AI in Chiropractic writing and research. Asia-Pac Chiropr J. 2026;7.3. https://www.apcj.site/McIvorAIDialogue.pdf

MANUS Summary

In *Avoiding Regression to the Mean: A millennial perspective on AI in Chiropractic writing and research*, Clare McIvor examines the benefits and limitations of generative artificial intelligence in Chiropractic scholarship. She uses /regression to the mean' metaphorically to describe the tendency of large language models to reproduce dominant perspectives and conventional language, potentially marginalising distinctive professional viewpoints. Within the subluxation-centred chiropractic philosophy presented in the paper, this tendency may constrain enquiry into neurological function, adaptability, self-regulation, and the individual's expression of health. McIvor argues that Chiropractic's salutogenic orientation requires consideration of the whole person and the conditions supporting wellbeing, rather than an exclusive focus on pathology or symptom reduction. She therefore advocates preserving philosophical diversity, original research, and individual clinical perspectives when incorporating AI into professional writing.

The paper recommends using AI as an adjunct to scholarly enquiry while retaining human responsibility for interpretation, authorship, and professional judgement. McIvor identifies cognitive offloading, linguistic homogenisation, fabricated references, and outdated knowledge as concerns requiring active oversight. She acknowledges that evidence linking AI use with reduced critical thinking remains preliminary and does not establish causation. Her practical recommendations include reading primary papers before consulting automated summaries, independently developing arguments, verifying references, and checking current literature through appropriate databases. Deliberate prompting can then be used to explore minority perspectives, expose weaknesses in reasoning, and invite critical challenge without surrendering authorial control. The central message is that Chiropractors, researchers, and professional writers should direct AI intentionally, ensuring that technological assistance supports rather than displaces the intellectual independence underpinning Chiropractic's art, science, and philosophy

MANUS Quiz

Question 1. What does "regression to the mean" principally describe in this paper?

A) It describes the statistical tendency of extreme patient measurements to become less extreme on reassessment.
B) It describes AI-generated ideas and language converging towards dominant patterns in training data.
C) It describes the progressive reduction of symptoms following chiropractic adjustments.
D) It describes researchers achieving agreement through independent critical appraisal.

> Answer: B. McIvor uses the expression metaphorically to describe intellectual and linguistic homogenisation, rather than the statistical phenomenon encountered in clinical research.

Question 2: Which statement best reflects the salutogenic chiropractic orientation discussed by the author?

A) Health is determined solely by the absence of diagnosable pathology.
B) Clinical enquiry should be restricted to pain intensity and symptom frequency.

C) Health assessment should prioritise conformity to population averages.
D) Enquiry should consider the whole person's capacity for adaptability, self-regulation, and wellbeing.

> Answer: D. The paper presents salutogenesis as an orientation towards the conditions supporting health and individual flourishing, extending beyond disease and symptom reduction.

Question 3: How should readers interpret the paper's discussion of AI use and critical thinking?

A) The findings raise concerns, but preliminary and correlational evidence does not establish that AI causes reduced critical thinking.
B) The cited research conclusively demonstrates that any AI use impairs professional judgement.
C) The findings establish that cognitive offloading is always harmful.
D) The cited research proves that AI-assisted writers cannot develop independent arguments.

> Answer: A. The author explicitly acknowledges methodological limitations and cautions against interpreting associations as evidence of causation.

Question 4: Which approach to reviewing chiropractic literature most closely follows McIvor's recommendations?

A) Read an AI summary and consult the original paper only when the summary appears implausible.
B) Accept the AI's interpretation whenever its references appear professionally formatted.
C) Read the primary paper, write an independent summary, and then compare it with the AI summary, resolving discrepancies against the source.
D) Ask several AI models to summarise the paper and treat their agreement as verification.

> Answer: C. Reading and interpreting the source first preserves the reader's judgement and allows subsequent AI output to serve as a check rather than a substitute.

Question 5: What is the most appropriate role for AI in chiropractic scholarly writing, according to the paper?

A) It should determine the writer's philosophical position and produce the final argument.
B) It should assist with structure, candidate sources, and critical challenge while the human author verifies evidence and retains responsibility.
C) It should replace primary-source reading whenever rapid publication is required.
D) It should provide authoritative conclusions without further review when prompted for a professional audience.

> Answer: B. AI may support the writing process, but the author remains accountable for reference accuracy, interpretation, originality, and the published work.