

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_130479
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Innovative Regulation of Open Source Intelligence and Deepfakes AI in Managing Public Trust</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript addresses a critical and timely topic by examining the regulatory and ethical challenges of Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT) and deepfake technologies. These technologies have broad implications for public trust, societal stability, and privacy. By providing an empirical evaluation of current regulatory frameworks and proposing practical recommendations for globally coordinated governance, the manuscript offers valuable insights for mitigating the risks associated with these advancements. It also contributes to the ongoing discourse on balancing technological innovation with ethical responsibility.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	This title is concise and emphasizes the manuscript's focus on regulation and public trust.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study's aims, methodologies, and findings.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically robust, with well-defined methodologies and statistically validated results.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient, covering a wide range of recent and relevant studies.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and precise phrasing. Minor improvements could enhance readability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Simplify overly technical sentences in sections such as the "Methodology" and "Results" to ensure accessibility for a broader audience.</li> <li>b. Address occasional redundancies in the "Literature Review" section to improve conciseness.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Recommended for Publishing the manuscript.</b>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rakesh Kumar ER</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Texila American University, Guyana</b>