

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_120027</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing the Effectiveness of Network Security Tools in Mitigating the Impact of Deepfakes AI on Public Trust in Media</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original article</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The concept hopefully raise interest among the machine learning researcher and cyber security community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Abstract does comprehend the context of article but it needs to re-consider their proposal - Anti-DFK framework.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is fine.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The references are recent and sufficient.</p> <p>Suggestions: It would be highly commendable if the authors incorporate the following suggestions and improve the readability of the manuscript.</p> <p>1. It is advised to avoid using abbreviations in Abstract. Instead, mention their expanded forms.</p> <p>2. Table 1 analysis is missing in the Results section.</p> <p>3. The study proposes Anti-DFK Framework in Abstract, but it is nowhere discussed in the manuscript and its justification to the claims done by the authors in the introduction section is necessary.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Advised to present the relevant literature in concise format.</p> <p>2. Try to maintain the structure of the article while adhering to the journal guidelines – (length of the manuscript, the maximum number of words).</p>	

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lavanya Sanapala
Department, University & Country	GITAM Deemed to be University, India