

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_127855
Title of the Manuscript:	Deepfake Regulations and Their Impact on Content Creation in the Entertainment Industry
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>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is specific and captures the core focus of the study, addressing both the regulatory aspects and their impact on the entertainment industry. However, it could benefit from a slight refinement to emphasize the global scope more explicitly, such as "Global Deepfake Regulations and Their Impact on Entertainment Content Creation. 2. The abstract is dense and may overwhelm readers unfamiliar with regulatory frameworks. Simplifying the language while retaining critical information could improve accessibility. 3. The introduction provides a comprehensive overview of deepfake technology, its potential, and the associated risks. 4. The literature review is thorough, discussing a wide range of regulatory approaches and their implications. (But, some citations (e.g., Hoofnagle et al., 2019; Eurojust, 2022) are discussed briefly without connecting them to the study's objectives. Expanding on their relevance could improve coherence.) 5. The methodology is well-detailed, with clear descriptions of data sources, statistical tools, and variables. (Inclusion of part related to discussion on potential biases in data or interpretations would enhance rigor.) 6. The results are presented with clarity, supported by tables, charts, and statistical evidence. 7. The discussion ties the findings back to the broader regulatory and ethical context effectively. 8. The study provides valuable insights into the global regulatory landscape of deepfake technology. (Valuable contribution to the scientific community) 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Debhjit Mukherjee</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University Institute of Applied Health Sciences, Chandigarh University, India</p>