



# Scientific writing as a response to information overload

## La escritura científica como respuesta a la sobreinformación



*J. Selva Andina Res. Soc. 2026;17(1):1-3.*

We are living in a unique moment in history. Thanks to technology, today we have achieved achievements that previously seemed unimaginable and we have overcome barriers whose existence we were unaware of. Distance is no longer a limit for information, and the circulation of ideas is increasingly fast, immediate, surprising and personalized. It is shocking to see how information has become so accessible, even excessively. We are aware of what is happening around us without the need to constantly look for it. Social media, automatic summaries, and access to artificial intelligence produce content at breakneck speed, transforming the way we engage with knowledge and the world<sup>1</sup>.

An enormous amount of information is generated in a short period of time and, in this saturated environment, distinguishing which is really of quality becomes an increasingly complex and, in many cases, overwhelming task<sup>2</sup>.

As researchers, we are not only consumers of the information that circulates daily among the population, but we are also affected by the dissemination of scientific content without the proper context. Frequently, it is distorted and used according to the criteria of the one who "informs". Thus, people without clear sources, without adequate preparation and without rigorous verification processes end up presenting absolute truths that distort what we, as scientists, seek to communicate.

We know that our conclusions do not come from a single question or simple answers, but are built from nuances, conditions, and assumptions. However, amid the excess of information, these considerations are often ignored, resulting in out-of-context interpretations that erode public trust. Science aspires to be rigorous and precise, but it rarely delivers absolute results. Therefore, the real problem is not the overabundance of information itself, but the way in which it is used. Often, those who turn to articles or research to "get informed" do not read the fine print, do not consider the limits of the study or analyze the results in depth. As a result, they interpret the findings according to their convenience, which can lead to dangerous and misleading claims.

With the incorporation of artificial intelligence, access to information has become even more immediate<sup>3</sup>. There is no longer a need to actively search different repositories or compare sources; Simply ask a question in an app to get an instant answer and even make decisions based on it. In this way, speed is privileged over the verification of veracity, favoring an increasingly unconscious consumption of information.

Researchers are also affected by these dynamics, as they are constant consumers of information and suffer under the daily avalanche of ideas. This hinders the development of conscious and in-depth research, displacing the detailed reading of scientific articles by the consumption of immediate content. Still, we live in an era where more science is being produced than ever before<sup>4</sup>. Day after day, new knowledge is generated; Thousands of articles are written and numerous investigations are carried out. Although artificial intelligence, social networks

and other media also produce information, scientists have a fundamental capacity; they are the ones who create knowledge. Artificial intelligence, used correctly, can be a valuable tool for organizing information, structuring ideas, and improving writing, but it cannot replace the generation of knowledge, which arises from experimentation, data analysis, critical review, error correction, and the formulation of verified conclusions.

Therefore, although the world advances without pause and the consumption of information seems endless, the writing of scientific articles becomes more necessary than ever. It represents an indispensable pause to restore rigor and context to what circulates. Writing and research is not only about generating ideas, but also about preventing misinterpretations, avoiding oversimplification, and ensuring that the knowledge produced is reliable. Scientific writing not only communicates results, it also verifies, contextualizes and delimits the scope of knowledge before reaching conclusions. The editorial rigor of scientific journals, through peer review and evaluation protocols, acts as an essential filter against the tide of information and ensures that the knowledge disseminated is verifiable.

Scientists will also need to use the new tools responsibly. They do not replace the criterion, but they can be support instruments that, when used conscientiously, improve results without compromising the rigor of the research<sup>5</sup>.

In short, it is necessary to continue writing, even when it seems that all the information already exists and circulates uncontrollably. Scientific journals continue to play a central role by offering verification systems, selection filters and peer review that ensure the quality of published knowledge. Perhaps the overload of information cannot be stopped, but in the midst of the noise, scientific writing will continue to be one of the few spaces where knowledge is built with intention, method and responsibility. In a world marked by immediacy, writing scientific articles becomes a real act of intellectual resistance.

In short, maintaining rigor in research and in the publication of scientific articles is what ensures that, in the midst of the information noise, science continues to be a beacon of trust, method and responsibility for society.

### **Conflict of interest**

The author states that there is no conflict of interest.

### **Acknowledgements**

To the Journal of the Selva Andina Research Society, for allowing me to open this opportunity.

### **Ethical considerations**


The respective ethical considerations were made and avoid the raising of names and institutions.

### **Use of artificial intelligence**

I take it for granted that the entire document was written based on ethical and professional criteria, and AI was not used to make the text.

## Cited Literature

1. Rojo Villada PA. El acceso a la información en la era digital: situación actual y perspectivas desde las empresas periodísticas multimedia. *Comunicación* 2022;1(6):159-72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12795/comunicacion.2008.v01.i06.09>
2. Caldevilla Domínguez D. Efectos actuales de la “sobreinformación” y la “infoxicación” a través de la experiencia de las bitácoras y del proyecto I+D avanza ‘Radiofriends’. *SEECI* 2013;(30):34-56. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15198/seeci.2013.30.34-56>
3. Park M, Leahey E, Funk RJ. Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time. *Nature* 2023;613(7942):138-44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05543-x>. PMID: 36600070.
4. Spatharioti SE, Rothschild D, Goldstein DG, Hofman JM. Effects of LLM-based search on decision making: speed, accuracy, and overreliance. In: *CHI'25: Proceedings of the 2025-CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* [Internet]. Yokohama: Association for Computing Machinery; 2025. p. 1-15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.371408>
5. Figueroa P. Inteligencia artificial en la investigación académica y científica: ¿reemplazo, alianza o amenaza? *El Faro* 2025;2(2):59-73. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63790/xfmz3z44>

Agramont Morales Natalia   
Universidad Católica Boliviana "San Pablo"  
Faculty of Engineering  
Biochemical and Bioprocess Engineering  
Av. 14 de septiembre, calle 2 N°4807  
La Paz, Plurinational State of Bolivia  
Phone: +591 67052721  
[nagramomt31@gmail.com](mailto:nagramomt31@gmail.com)