

AI-Assisted vs Human-Only Evidence Review — UK Government's Controlled Comparison Finds Speed Gains and Quality Trade-offs

AI in the Public Sector · Good practice · United Kingdom

Quality score: 73/100

Evidence strength: Quasi-experimental

Summary

DSIT and DCMS commissioned the Behavioural Insights Team to run matched AI-assisted and human-only rapid evidence reviews on the same brief. The AI-assisted review finished 23% faster but needed more fluency revisions, and the two shared only 4 of ~30 cited sources.

Key dimensions

Dimension	Score
Evidence of impact / measured public value	3/3
Transparency, fairness & accountability	3/3
Transferability / demonstrated replication	2/3
Scalability beyond pilot	1/3
Governance, capability & sustainability	2/3

Evaluated by C-NAPSE

Data sources

C-NAPSE web research — accessed 2026-09-01

Behavioural Insights Team (BIT), commissioned by the Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT) and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) — accessed 2026-09-01

Behavioural Insights Team: AI-assisted vs human-only evidence review — accessed 2026-09-01

PublicTechnology.net: Government reveals AI vs human tests for policy reports - but who won? — accessed 2026-09-01

Cite this — Evidoria. *AI-Assisted vs Human-Only Evidence Review — UK Government's Controlled Comparison Finds Speed Gains and Quality Trade-offs*. Persistent ID: 6d162b7e-208c-437a-89ff-e67d7d290485.