

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_130479
Title of the Manuscript:	Innovative Regulation of Open Source Intelligence and Deepfakes AI in Managing Public Trust
Type of the Article	Research Article featuring original empirical research, quantitative analysis, and novel findings

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>This manuscript examines the critical intersection of Open Source Intelligence (OSINT), deepfake technologies, and public trust - an area requiring urgent scholarly attention given its societal implications.</p> <p>While the paper attempts a comprehensive analysis of these challenges and provides empirical evidence regarding public sentiment and societal stability impacts, it falls short of delivering truly novel insights or methodological innovations that would significantly advance the field.</p> <p>The research would benefit from deeper theoretical grounding and more rigorous empirical analysis.</p>	Thanks for the comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The current title adequately describes the research but could be more specific to better reflect the quantitative nature of the study.</p> <p>I suggest revising it to: "Quantitative Analysis of OSINT and Deepfake Technology Impact on Public Trust: Evidence from Sentiment Analysis and Regulatory Framework Assessment".</p>	Ok noted

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract requires substantial revision as it lacks crucial methodological details and statistical precision.</p> <p>The methods section should specify data collection periods and the exact timeframe of GDELT data analyzed. The reported effect sizes need confidence intervals, and the machine learning results require validation metrics.</p> <p>The abstract should also clearly state sample sizes and acknowledge data limitations.</p> <p>The recommendations section reads as overly general and needs quantitative support.</p>	<p>Thanks for the comments. Noted and revised</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Regarding scientific correctness, several methodological issues raise concerns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The time-series regression lacks essential control variables, and the machine learning models need cross-validation.</li><li>2. The treatment of potential confounding factors is insufficient, and the study lacks proper robustness checks for its main findings.</li><li>3. The statistical significance is reported without adequate context of effect sizes, and the sampling strategy remains unclear.</li></ol>	<p>Yes thanks for the valuable comments</p>
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The reference section shows an overreliance on 2024 sources, suggesting possible use of preprints or non-peer reviewed works.</p> <p>The literature review would benefit from a broader international perspective and inclusion of seminal works in AI ethics and regulation.</p> <p>Technical papers on machine learning and deepfake detection are notably absent, as are policy documents from major regulatory bodies.</p>	<p>Done</p>
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript's language quality is generally acceptable but requires editing for clarity and consistency.</p> <p>Technical terms are used inconsistently throughout the text, and the methodology section contains several run-on sentences.</p> <p>The overuse of passive voice detracts from readability, and statistical results need clearer presentation. Some technical jargon requires definition for broader accessibility.</p>	<p>Ok</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>While the research question holds significance and potential value, the execution requires substantial improvement across methodology, statistical reporting, literature review, ethical considerations, and technical presentation before it meets publication standards. The revisions should focus particularly on strengthening the empirical analysis and providing more concrete policy recommendations supported by the data.</p> <p>Yes, The manuscript raises several ethical concerns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The data collection methods and privacy considerations receive inadequate attention, and</li><li>2. potential biases in the machine learning models need fuller exploration.</li></ol> <p>The ethical implications of the regulatory recommendations require deeper analysis.</p>	<p>Noted and revised</p>

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	