

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
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	

#### **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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>MANUSCRIPT: Innovative Regulation of Open Source Intelligence and Deepfakes AI in Managing Public Trust</p> <p>FEATURES *****</p> <p>Overall Manuscript is acceptable with minor revisions</p> <p><i>I recommend revising to</i></p> <p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revising it to emphasize the broader impact and potential applications of the research would make it more compelling</li> </ul> <p><b>Methodology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mathematical explanation of different <b>Analytical Techniques</b> feature extraction is clear but could benefit from a practical example or flowchart for clarity to a broader audience.</li> </ul> <p><b>Result:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The graphical representation of results is clear and visually engaging. However, incorporating error bars would improve the statistical interpretation and provide more robust insights into the reliability of the results</li> </ul> <p><b>Writing and Presentation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the writing is generally clear, the Methodology and Results sections are dense with technical jargon. Simplifying explanations or including a glossary for technical terms would make the paper more accessible to a wider audience.</li> <li>Consolidating redundant charts (e.g., Figure 4) into a single comprehensive visualization would streamline the presentation and avoid unnecessary repetition</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nikita Yogesh Kapadnis</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pune Institute of Computer Technology, India</b>