

Review Article

Open Access

Critical Thinking: The Human Super-Edge in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Nigel J Smart, PhD.

Smart Pharmaceutical Consulting, USA

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence is rapidly becoming one of the most powerful enabling technologies available to science, industry and society. Within pharmaceutical, biotechnology and life-science organizations, AI has the potential to accelerate drug discovery, interrogate complex datasets, identify patterns, support manufacturing control, strengthen predictive quality systems and transform decision-making. The appropriate response is neither resistance nor uncritical adoption. It is the deliberate development of a new form of **Cooperative Intelligence** in which machine capability expands rather than diminishes human agency.

This paper advances a provocative proposition: as artificial intelligence becomes more capable, critical thinking may become more-not less-important. The greatest strategic risk may not be that machines learn to think, but that humans progressively surrender the responsibility to do so.

In my view this could be catastrophic!

For this to be avoided, **Critical Thinking**, must evolve itself.

Traditional problem solving frequently begins inside an existing conceptual framework, which is one we were taught through our education system “Thinking outside the box” is a popular phrase we are familiar with, but this still assumes that the box is known. Moving forward this will be the case. In my view this will be too limiting, and we could hit a wall which may become an insurmountable roadblock.

The challenges emerging in advanced therapeutics, artificial intelligence, biotechnology, continuous manufacturing and increasingly complex process systems require something more radical: What I am terming **thinking outside the meta-box**-the ability to question the existence, relevance and boundaries of the framework itself and to imagine possibilities that have not yet been adequately described.

AI is exceptionally powerful at interrogating accumulated knowledge and discovering relationships within data. Yet the future, by definition, has no complete historical data set. Human agency therefore remains crucial in determining purpose, framing problems, challenging assumptions, recognizing weak signals, exercising contextual and ethical judgment, accepting accountability and asking questions for which precedent provides no satisfactory answer.

The paper argues for a transition from artificial intelligence as an automation strategy toward **Cooperative Intelligence**: AI providing extraordinary computational capability while human beings deliberately strengthen imagination, critical thinking, judgment and responsible action. For pharmaceutical and biotechnology organizations, this may become one of the defining competitive capabilities of the coming decade.

*Corresponding author

Nigel J Smart PhD, Smart Pharmaceutical Consulting, USA.

Received: September 21, 2026; **Accepted:** September 24, 2026; **Published:** September 30, 2026

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Critical Thinking, Human Agency, Cooperative Intelligence, Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, Biotechnology, Predictive Quality, Innovation, Creativity, Future-Back Thinking, Advanced Therapeutics, Cognitive Capability

The Question We May Be Asking Incorrectly

Much of the current discussion surrounding artificial intelligence begins with the same question:

What will AI be able to do better than humans? It is an understandable question, but perhaps it is already the wrong one. A more important question may be: **What must human beings become exceptionally good at because AI exists?** That change in perspective matters because we are entering an extraordinary period in which access to information, analysis and computational capability is becoming almost frictionless. It is true that tasks that once consumed days can increasingly be completed in minutes.

We have QC data for manufacturing that can be significant in size, and these can be interrogated at speeds no human team can reproduce. Analyses which previously took weeks can be completed in hours or minutes. Patterns invisible to conventional analysis can be surfaced rapidly. Scientific literature can be explored, hypotheses generated, manufacturing information compared and complex scenarios modeled. This is extremely powerful, but I don't believe it is something we should fear. Rather, I would encourage us to embrace the advantage and leverage it. However, that means embracing things intelligently!

With the arrival of increasingly powerful AI, this creates an intriguing paradox. Will we grasp that, that's the question? Consider this, the more capable our machines become, the more important our distinctly human cognitive capabilities may become. This should be prized and developed enthusiastically.

Framing this differently then, the danger is therefore not simply artificial intelligence. Rather, the danger is **cognitive surrender**.

If an AI system can generate the report, propose the hypothesis, analyze the deviation, recommend the CAPA, interpret the trend, write the strategy and suggest the next experiment, an uncomfortable question follows: At what point do we stop thinking?

Research is beginning to make this concern more tangible. A 2025 study of 319 knowledge workers and 936 reported examples of generative-AI use found that greater confidence in AI was associated with less critical-thinking activity, whereas greater confidence in one's own ability was associated with more. Importantly, the researchers also observed that AI changes where critical thinking occurs, increasingly emphasizing verification, integration and stewardship of AI-generated information [1].

I believe this is a huge point that we must take on board and it should command the attention of every knowledge-intensive industry.

In pharmaceuticals and biotechnology, we cannot afford cognitive surrender. Our decisions affect patients not just the commercial side of efficiency and productivity.

It is true that our processes are becoming more complicated and, in many cases, this is congruent with the therapeutic products becoming more sophisticated. Therefore, as we address issues it is unlikely that the problems ahead will resemble those problems that we have been used to addressing historically.

Critical Thinking Is Not an Old Skill-It Is a Future Technology
This may be considered as like looking at a different paradigm. Today critical thinking is sometimes described as though it belongs to classical education: something desirable to teach students before they enter the "real" world. This does not serve the current world needs if it is to be helpful. I believe we need to reposition it as the following: **Critical thinking is a future technology**.

What do we mean here? It is the human capability that allows us to interrogate what appears to be true. It asks: What assumptions are embedded in this conclusion? What evidence supports it? What evidence contradicts it? What are we failing to measure? What has changed? What alternative explanations exist? What would have to be true for this conclusion to be wrong?

What are we assuming simply because it worked previously? And perhaps most importantly: Are we solving the correct problem?

These are all probing questions. There is no doubt that AI can participate powerfully in all of these activities. Indeed, using correctly can dramatically increase their range. But critical thinking is not simply information processing. It includes the willingness to challenge the information being processed. This is something that as humans we do well.

This distinction becomes enormously important when dealing with systems trained substantially from accumulated human knowledge and data. Historical information is extraordinarily valuable. But history describes where we have been. AND this context is valuable because innovation concerns where we have not yet been.

The Limitation of the Rear-View Mirror

As we have noted, Artificial intelligence can detect relationships across enormous volumes of accumulated information. This capability is transformational and is not disputed, but we should understand what it means strategically.

AI can identify patterns within what humanity has recorded, observed, measured, digitized or otherwise made available to it. Contemporary systems can also generate novel combinations and perform impressively on defined creative tasks. It would therefore be simplistic to argue that AI "cannot be creative." However, the more useful distinction concerns **future creations under genuine novelty**.

This is important to recognize because at this point in time the future does not yet possess a complete data set. There is no historical database containing every manufacturing challenge associated with therapies not yet invented. There is no complete dataset describing commercial ecosystems that do not yet exist. There is no validated historical precedent for every biological interaction we encounter in the next generation of advanced therapeutics. Therefore, this creates what I would describe as the rear-view-mirror problem.

The rear-view mirror is extremely useful. Why? It tells us where we have been. It helps us understand the road. It identifies patterns in our journey. But nobody should attempt to drive into an unexplored landscape looking only backwards. This is where Human agency provides the ability to look through the windshield-and occasionally to imagine a road where no road currently exists.

Beyond Thinking Outside the Box

For decades, innovation consultants have encouraged organizations to "think outside the box." "It is a useful phrase. But I increasingly doubt whether it is sufficient. Thinking outside the box assumes that we understand the box. We know its boundaries. We know what lies inside. And then we deliberately move beyond them. The next industrial era may require something more radical. I call this:

Thinking Outside the Meta-Box. The meta box is the framework within which we decide what the box actually is.

Thinking outside it means questioning not merely the solution but the underlying architecture of the problem. Instead of asking: "How do we manufacture this product more efficiently?" we might ask: "Why must this product be manufactured using this architecture at all?"

So, in terms of a specific example instead of asking “How can AI make our deviation system faster?” We would ask instead, “Why are we designing a quality system around discovering deviations after they occur?”

Similarly, instead of asking: “How do we make batch review faster?” we might ask:

“What would a manufacturing environment look like in which quality evidence accumulated continuously and emerging failure conditions were recognized before the batch ever reached review?”

That is not ordinary process improvement, instead it is a conceptual reframing of the question. In practical terms then this could become one of the great human contributions/capabilities of the exploding AI era.

Pharmaceutical Innovation Makes This Urgent

Consider where life sciences are heading.

We are moving far beyond relatively straightforward conventional synthetic pharmaceutical manufacturing. The landscape increasingly includes monoclonal antibodies, recombinant proteins, cell and gene therapies, personalized therapeutics, complex anticancer agents, advanced neurological treatments, continuous manufacturing platforms, increasingly sophisticated analytical technologies and digitally integrated process environments. These technologies create extraordinary possibilities, but they all have other things in common; they also create uncertainty.

Biological systems are not like deterministic engineering systems. Small changes can matter and change the activity of the product. Interactions can be nonlinear. Raw-material variability can propagate huge changes in outcomes and analytical signals may become ambiguous. Correlations may not represent biological causation, and a statistically significant pattern may have little clinical relevance.

Conversely, a weak signal may represent the beginning of something profoundly important. This is exactly where expert human judgment matters. AI may detect the signal, but someone must ask the correct question: **Does it make biological sense?**

Someone must challenge the correlation, and someone must connect the manufacturing observation with a biological mechanism. Similarly, someone must recognize when an apparently minor observation contradicts years of accepted thinking. It is important to recognize and decide when the existing model is no longer describing reality adequately.

This is not an argument against AI, instead it is a loud recognition for combining AI with exceptional human cognition to create a better outcome.

Cooperative Intelligence

I describe this relationship as **Cooperative Intelligence**. The concept is deliberately different from simply “using AI.” Cooperative Intelligence recognizes complementary capabilities. AI can provide speed. AI can provide computational scale. AI can identify patterns. AI can interrogate enormous datasets. AI can simulate alternatives. AI can search possibility spaces that would overwhelm human cognition. Whereas Human beings contribute something different. We determine purpose. We frame the problem. We challenge

assumptions. We interpret context. We imagine. We judge. We decide. We accept responsibility. And ultimately, we act.

The emerging FDA/EMA approach is significant in this respect. In January 2026, FDA and EMA published ten guiding principles for good AI practice in drug development. They include being **human-centric by design**, using a risk-based approach, defining the context of use, employing multidisciplinary expertise and managing AI through its lifecycle [2].

FDA’s 2025 draft guidance on AI used to support regulatory decision-making similarly proposes a risk-based credibility assessment tied to the model’s specific context of use. These developments point toward something important. The question is not simply whether an AI model works, but rather, the more important question is whether we understand **where, why, how and with what consequences we are trusting it**. That requires judgment, which is our most powerful human trait [3].

Human Oversight Is Not Enough

The pharmaceutical industry frequently responds to technological risk by adding “human oversight.” This is often seen as the safe option, but is it? It sounds reassuring but it is not something which should be regarded as simple or the complete solution. Human oversight can easily become procedural because the output can be reviewed the record can be signed and a check register can be checked, but that does not necessarily constitute meaningful human agency.

A human being who routinely accepts machine recommendations without possessing either the expertise or willingness to challenge them is technically “in the loop” is not sufficient. There must be some form of cognitive engagement.

Moving forward then it is important to properly define and distinguish Human-in-the-loop systems from Human in command thinking. The latter **MUST** require human involvement capable of disagreeing with the machine.

This mandates confidence, expertise, and element of curiosity and a degree of professional skepticism.

The future needs to see the development of organizations and systems that reward intelligent challenges rather than compliant agreement. Human agency means observing, questioning, imagining, judging, deciding, acting, learning and remaining accountable. Without such aspects built into the methodology and systems it relegates human oversight into some mechanical ceremonial approval process which is not particularly credible.

Predictive Quality: From Looking Backward to Looking Forward

Quality systems provide a particularly useful example, because much traditional pharmaceutical quality activity is retrospective in nature. For example: A deviation is generated, an investigation is started and a root cause is processed. The deviated is corrected with a CAPA process and its effectiveness is checked. All this is necessary, but using AI there is the possibility of moving forward with a more productive mechanism -predictive quality where outcomes are anticipated before they become serious. Instead of asking: “What went wrong?” We can proactively ask: “**What appears to be moving toward failure?**” This is far more efficient and quality focused.

Thinking as a forward strategy, combining process parameters, environmental monitoring, equipment behavior, maintenance history, raw-material variation, laboratory trends, deviation records and operator observations, we enable the development of a control mechanism where the combination of weak signals could provide something that no individual could reasonably match. This type of approach is extraordinarily powerful because this is too much data for any one person to hold, and so when the interpretive human agency skills are added; for example: is the pattern significant, is it biologically plausible, is there data bias, has the process changed or is all the appropriate data being considered, then AI expands the level of vision available and therefore the ultimate decision being made. So, it is our critical thinking that decides what we do with the information that becomes visible.

The Most Dangerous Skill to Lose

This brings us to a profound risk. What happens if we become so efficient at obtaining answers that we lose our ability to formulate difficult questions? Critical thinking requires cognitive effort not laziness. Unfortunately, AI can remove effort required to develop meaningful judgment.

Emerging research on AI-assisted learning and knowledge work increasingly discusses **cognitive offloading**: transferring mental work to external systems. Using appropriately, this is valuable. Conversely used wrongly it creates a sense of false security. Human civilization itself has progressed through cognitive offloading-from writing and mathematics to calculators,

computers and search engines. However, the real issue here is in relation to which cognition we choose to offload.

The issue is which cognition we choose to offload

For productivity and efficiency reasons we should happily offload repetitive tasks. We should automate unnecessary administrative effort. We should allow machines to perform calculations better suited to machines. But we should be extraordinarily cautious about outsourcing curiosity, skepticism, interpretation, imagination and judgment. Those are not inefficiencies. They are strategic assets.

Preserve Cognitive Friction

I would therefore propose a concept that may initially sound counterintuitive:

Preserve Cognitive Friction

Modern business relentlessly removes friction, which under most circumstances would be regarded as sensible. However, not all friction is waste because sometimes this stimulates thought. The argument around a conference table can be causative to a better understanding. Asking a question about whether the assumption is wrong or if an explanation does not meet muster when critically challenged. The quality professional who notices that five individually acceptable events collectively tell a different story. Or the young employee who asks the question nobody else considered because they have not yet learned which questions they are “supposed” to ask.

Those moments contain cognitive friction. Organizations should protect them because they help guard against believing everything that AI generates which might at first blush seem correct.

A 2026 analysis of generative AI and critical thinking specifically argues for preserving cognitive friction and positioning AI as a

provisional thinking partner rather than an unquestioned source of answers. That principle should extend far beyond education. It belongs inside scientific and industrial organizations [4].

AI Should Challenge Us, Not Merely Serve Us

Most people currently interact with AI by asking it to answer questions. Although this is helpful, that may be one of the least imaginative ways of using its capability. What if we use AI to challenge our thinking?

Instead of asking for an immediate answer to a question, perhaps asking what I am missing in terms of any assumptions I am making might be a better-quality question. “Is there evidence which would falsify my hypothesis?”

What one is attempting to do here is to construct the strongest argument against any immediate conclusion.

Looking at this in a more progressive way, one might ask, “What would an expert from another discipline notice that I might miss?” “What are five explanations that fit the evidence but contradict my preferred interpretation?” What would have to change for this strategy to fail?

“What question have I failed to ask?”

Using these types of questions using AI with our Human capability generates very different possibilities and options. We have a cognitive sparring partner rather than a memory box full of remembered statements. This is true Cooperative Intelligence, which is a lot more valuable.

The learning here is that we should not ask AI to think for us, instead we should use AI to make us think deeper and prevent us from becoming lazy.

From Prompt Engineering to Question Engineering

Much has been written about prompt engineering. I believe the more enduring capability may be **questioning engineering**.

When information becomes abundant, the scarce resource is no longer the answer, it is the quality of the question. Thinking friction again, breakthroughs often begin because someone refuses the inherited question. The obvious which requires little probing.

As a simple example, instead of asking how to build a better candle, imagine the electric light.

In terms of pharmaceutical manufacturing, instead of optimizing existing production architecture indefinitely, imagine continuous manufacturing. This is something new that works off a different organizational mechanism.

ICH Q13 now provides a scientific and regulatory framework for continuous manufacturing of drug substances and drug products, including therapeutic proteins [5]. The significance extends beyond technology because it illustrates a much broader principle.

Consider this scenario: Sometimes progress comes from improving an existing process. On other occasions progress comes from asking why the process must exist in its existing form. The organizations that learn this distinction will possess an enormous competitive advantage.

Future-Back Thinking

Most strategic planning extrapolates forward and while this is positive it can also be limiting if other options are not explored equally.

Under most circumstances we look at what we know today as a starting point. Then we look at any important trends from that process. Next, we estimate what can happen for a future outcome. Today we might harness AI for this because its functionality is particularly suited for this purpose.

However, if we want a different outcome, we must consider other options. This is because transformative innovation frequently requires the opposite direction.

What if we consider the future first and then work in reverse. This is the concept of **future back thinking**. And it will generate a completely different set of possibilities.

As an example: If we were to ask the following sequence of questions: What would extraordinary look like ten years from now? What would need to be true? Which present assumptions would have to disappear? What technologies would need to converge? What skills would our people require? What regulatory architecture might be necessary? What should we begin experimenting with today?

Then we should realistically expect a profoundly different set of outcomings and possibilities.

This approach is particularly valuable in VUCA environments-like we are experiencing today that are those characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity.

The key to learning here is best summed up by acknowledging that under stable conditions, precedent is powerful. However, under discontinuous conditions, precedent can become an anchor. This approach is particularly helpful because future-back thinking respects historical evidence without becoming imprisoned by it as an ideology.

Building the Human Capability Stack

If the importance of this capability is correct, then organizations need a different workforce-development strategy to be successful. It is not sufficient just to be AI literate as some would have you believe. We need to deliberately strengthen the Human **Capability Stack**. What do we mean by this?

There **MUST** be a focus on the following characteristics.

Awareness - noticing what others overlook.

Curiosity - refusing premature closure.

Critical Thinking - testing assumptions and evidence.

Creative Thinking - generating alternatives.

Systems Thinking - understanding interactions and unintended consequences. Scientific judgment - distinguishing signal from noise and correlation from causation. Imagination - conceiving possibilities not yet represented in the current system.

Empathy - understanding the human consequences of technical decisions.

Courage - challenging consensus when evidence demands it.

Action - converting thought into experimentation.

Accountability - accepting responsibility for consequences.

These are often referred to as soft skills but that is an inaccuracy. What they represent in the AI era may be some of the hardest strategic capabilities an organization can build. This is frequently the opposite of what is the popular opinion about the future of organizations.

Build Organizations Where Disagreement Is an Asset

Technology alone will not produce innovation. Culture will once again prove to be a deciding factor for those that win and those that lose or become “also rans.”

If people fear challenging leadership, AI will simply help the organization produce conventional thinking faster, because anyone can buy AI capability as a technical tool. In the case of an organization if the deviation from some norm is not allowed or if consensus has to be the way forward, then imaginative possibilities will disappear before they reach experimentation. It is important that failure is not punished, otherwise people will optimize for safety rather than discovery. This will not create the next success story or product.

Leadership therefore has a profound role in ushering in the development of Cooperative Intelligence. Leaders must create environments in which intelligent dissent is welcomed. Questions that challenge the status quo should carry status and be rewarded. This is a rare skill set today and one that needs to be encouraged and developed.

If someone is absent from a skill set, then acknowledging this without fear of recrimination should be allowed so that the habit of inquiry and curiosity is encouraged. The idea should be to experiment, fail, learn and develop again. Experts should be challenged and those AI algorithms

should be challenged and improved through human judgment. Doing this will encourage a thoughtful and culturally progressing intelligent workforce which will be able to compete.

Using AI to challenge assumptions and then to challenge AI's outcomes should be the goal to develop an inherently powerful Cooperative Intelligent environment.

The Expert Becomes More Important, Not Less

There is a persistent narrative that AI will make expertise less important because information becomes universally available. I would like to argue almost the opposite situation.

There is no doubt that the abundance of information increases the importance of judgment. That said it is only when everyone can generate plausible answers, does the scarce capability become knowing which answer deserves confidence. That's the key and that serves to put things into context. Context is everything. This is because the human capability recognizes anomalies.

The human mind has a capability to intuitively recognize when something does not look right. Part of this is as a result if you have been subjected to situations of failure where the experience has generated a learning cycle. AI may predict a theoretical possibility, but the trained and experienced expert has the knowledge of practicality in an operational environment.

This is where the combination of the two can pay dividends and it causes the evolution of the solution. Where this becomes

important is where the future requires a new approach, the expert cannot predict from accumulated knowledge and the AI becomes stuck with a lack of operational practicality. Together they must become an explorer of uncertainty.

This joint platform provides a usable platform from which the new solution is developed as the expert armed with its AI partner takes a calculated leap into the unknown. When this happens, innovation occurs.

Create Cognitive Gyms Inside Organizations

If physical capability deteriorates without exercise, why would we assume cognitive capability is different? To develop and sustain the mechanisms we are advocating here it is important for organizations to create the equivalent of Cognitive Gyms. This is not a classroom, but it means or creates an environment where thinking is practiced.

This should involve exercises where individuals and teams regularly take on genuine business or scientific challenges and deliberately examine them through different cognitive lenses. This might include reversing all the usual assumptions, arguing the opposite position should be encouraged so the mind is exercised as should using AI to attack all the human generated ideas and solutions.

Using a multidisciplinary team of engineers, scientists and quality professionals to solve a problem independently will generate differing perspectives and these will strengthen the overall strategic capability of the organization.

Development of pre-mortem exercise rather than a postmortem, looking at alternative future scenarios and identifying weak signals will generate multiple new scenarios that could be innovative in their own right.

With these exercises completed, argue the opposite position and use AI to attack the preferred position or solution. Now develops alternative futures scenarios and explores those taken to their extremes by the removal of important or perceived constraints and see what can become possible. Now, ask: "What would we attempt if the current process had never existed?"

Critical thinking should not be something organizations hope their employees possess. It should be something organizations continuously train and develop.

Make AI the Accelerator, Not the Navigator

The relationship can be summarized simply. AI is an extraordinary accelerator, but acceleration without direction is dangerous. Human agency must remain the navigator because the navigator determines destination in a human centric world.

In a VUCA world that is changing exponentially, it is important to recognize that the navigator recognizes when the map is outdated. This can happen quickly in this type of environment. Also, the navigator decides whether the planned destination still matters. And occasionally the navigator decides there may be an entirely different continent worth exploring. This is an important consideration as it will cause deadlines of progress to be killed early without loss of resources. That is where human imagination meets machine capability. The objective should therefore never be humans versus AI because that is a false contest. The real opportunity is:

Human Agency × Artificial Intelligence. Each should increase

the capability of the other.

A New Leadership Responsibility

Leadership in the AI era must therefore involve more than approving technology investment. Leaders must become guardians of human cognitive capability. They should ask: Are our people becoming more capable because of AI? Or merely more dependent upon it? Are we producing faster answers? Or better questions? Are our experts challenging AI outputs? Are we measuring thinking quality as well as productivity? Are we protecting spaces for independent thought? Are people still capable of performing critical reasoning without the machine? Are we rewarding originality? Are we allowing cognitive friction? Are we developing the next generation of experts-or accidentally preventing them from acquiring the struggle through which expertise develops?

These questions deserve executive and boardroom attention because they will determine the long-term lifeblood of the organization, especially where cognitive capability may soon become a measurable organizational asset.

The Opportunity for Life Sciences

The pharmaceutical and biotechnology sectors are particularly well positioned to pioneer this new relationship. We already operate at the intersection of science, engineering, regulation, ethics and human consequence. We understand validation. We understand evidence. We understand risk. We understand that a system can produce an answer without that answer necessarily being scientifically meaningful. We understand accountability. Collectively then, these instincts can become enormous advantages in the AI era.

The FDA has reported substantial experience with AI-containing submissions and continues to develop risk-based approaches to trustworthy AI use across drug and biological-product development. EMA likewise frames AI across the medicinal-product lifecycle within an explicitly risk-based regulatory context [2,3-6].

This should not be interpreted as a brake on innovation, but a genuine desire to use technology where it is most appropriate in terms of useful outcomes [7].

I believe it should be interpreted as an invitation to develop AI intelligently.

The Human Super-Edge

So, what remains uniquely valuable about us? Perhaps the wrong response is to compile a defensive list of tasks machines supposedly cannot perform. That list will continually shrink and diminish over time. Instead, our opportunity is to cultivate the capabilities through which humans' **direct capability itself**.

Such features such as: Purpose, Questioning, Meaning, Context, Moral responsibility, Judgment, Imagination, Courage, Action.... and the ability to reconsider the framework when the framework no longer works. This is what I mean by the **Human Super-Edge**. It is never static and must be dynamic, always moving. And paradoxically, AI may give us the opportunity to develop it more rapidly than ever before.

The Call to Thought Leadership

We are at a remarkable moment. Humanity has created machines capable of helping us explore knowledge at unprecedented speed. Our response should not be to become intellectually passive or defensive because we face a technology that is so powerful It

should be the opposite. We should become more curious. More critical. More imaginative. More willing to challenge. More capable of seeing systems. More comfortable with uncertainty. More ambitious about the future.

The great question of the AI age may therefore not be:

How intelligent will artificial intelligence become?

It may be: **How intelligent are human beings prepared to become alongside it?**

The pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries have spent decades developing increasingly sophisticated technologies. The next frontier may be ourselves.

We need scientists who can imagine beyond established science. Engineers who question process architecture. Quality professionals who anticipate rather than merely investigate. Leaders who create intellectual courage. Experts are willing to challenge their own expertise. And organizations that recognize critical thinking as strategic infrastructure.

We must move beyond the box. Eventually, we must move beyond the meta-box. We must explore territory for which the maps have not yet been drawn. Artificial intelligence can travel with us. It can accelerate us. It can challenge us. It can reveal possibilities we might otherwise miss. But human agency must continue to ask the question that precedes every genuine breakthrough:

What if there is another way?

That question is not a relic of the pre-AI world. Rather, it may be the most important question upon which the AI world ultimately depends.

References

1. Lee HP, Advait Sarkar, Lev Tankelevitch, Ian Drosos, Sean Rintel, et al. (2025) The Impact of Generative AI on Critical Thinking: Self-Reported Reductions in Cognitive Effort and Confidence Effects from a Survey of Knowledge Workers. Proceedings of CHI 2025 <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3706598.3713778>.
2. US Food and Drug Administration and European Medicines Agency (2026) Guiding Principles of Good AI Practice in Drug Development <https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/artificial-intelligence-drug-development/guiding-principles-good-ai-practice-drug-development>.
3. US Food and Drug Administration (2025) Considerations for the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Support Regulatory Decision-Making for Drug and Biological Products. Draft Guidance for Industry and Other Interested Parties chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/<https://www.fda.gov/media/184830/download>.
4. Scaffolding Critical Thinking with Generative AI: Design Principles for Integrating Large Language Models in Higher Education (2026) Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence 10: 100572.
5. International Council for Harmonization (ICH) (2022) ICH Q13: Continuous Manufacturing of Drug Substances and Drug Products chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH_Q13_Step4_Guideline_2022_1116.pdf.
6. US Food and Drug Administration (2026) Center for Drug Evaluation and Research. Artificial Intelligence for Drug Development <https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/center-drug-evaluation-and-research-cder/artificial-intelligence-drug-development>.
7. European Medicines Agency (2024) Reflection Paper on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the Medicinal Product Lifecycle, EMA/CHMP/CVMP/83833/2023 chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/<https://www.ema.europa.eu/system/files/documents/scientific-guideline/reflection-paper-use-artificial-intelligence-ai-medicinal-product-lifecycle-en.pdf>.

Copyright: ©2026 Nigel J Smart. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.