

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_128383
Title of the Manuscript:	Dead Internet Theory: An AI Driven Superficial Interaction Replacing Meaningful Connections on Social Media
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<p>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>	<p>The work look good but need many</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Relevance and Timeliness: The Dead Internet Theory is a novel and thought-provoking topic, particularly in the era of advanced AI and the increasing role of algorithms in social media. The paper aligns with ongoing discussions about digital authenticity, making it highly relevant. ● Comprehensive Coverage: The paper provides a thorough examination of DIT, tracing its origins, presenting supportive evidence, and contextualizing it within social media dynamics. It effectively integrates discussions on AI, content farming, and algorithmic influence. ● Engagement with Key Themes: The analysis addresses critical aspects such as the homogenization of content, AI-driven interactions, and the societal impact of diminishing authenticity online. The paper balances theoretical exploration with practical observations, making it accessible and insightful. ● Critical Reframing of DIT: The paper redefines DIT in a nuanced manner, presenting it not merely as a dystopian claim but as a framework to critique the commercialization and artificiality of modern online spaces. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I feel there may be some more suitable titles over the current title of paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "The Dead Internet Theory: Exploring AI, Bots, and the Decline of Authenticity in Social Media" 2. "Artificial Interactions: The Dead Internet Theory and the Future of Social Media" 3. "From Connection to Commodification: Revisiting Social Media Through the Lens of the Dead Internet Theory" 4. "The Algorithmic Facade: Dead Internet Theory in the Age of AI and Content Farming" 	

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 following improvements are required in abstract by the author(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clearly define the research objective and methodology. ● Incorporate evidence or examples supporting key claims. ● Address counterarguments or alternative perspectives. ● Streamline language to avoid repetition and maintain focus. ● Highlight actionable insights or potential solutions to improve digital authenticity. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript seems correct but need many improvements as mentioned below for the improvisation of manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of Empirical Evidence: While the paper discusses phenomena like bot traffic and algorithmic curation, it relies heavily on secondary sources and speculative claims. Incorporating quantitative data or case studies would significantly strengthen the argument. ● Overgeneralization: The paper paints a broad picture of social media platforms as dominated by artificial interactions, but it does not adequately acknowledge the diversity of user experiences and platform-specific dynamics. ● Limited Counterarguments: Although the paper briefly mentions alternative perspectives, it does not robustly engage with critiques of DIT, such as the persistence of authentic human engagement or the potential benefits of AI in fostering creativity and inclusivity. ● Redundancy in Discussion: Certain sections, such as those on content farming and AI's role, overlap in focus and could be streamlined for better clarity and impact. ● Imbalanced Tone: The paper occasionally adopts a deterministic tone, implying an inevitable decline in internet authenticity without sufficiently exploring potential solutions or adaptive measures by platforms and users. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No for the thoroughly study large no of reference papers should be discuss. Reference count is very less it should be extend upto 20 odd nos of papers.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is generally clear and understandable, but it falls short of meeting the highest standards of scholarly communication. Below are specific areas where the English quality could be improved for better suitability in academic writing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article repeatedly uses phrases like "algorithmically generated content," "authentic interaction," and "AI-driven content." This redundancy can make the writing feel tedious. 2. The article often makes sweeping claims without sufficient qualifiers. 3. Terms like "dehumanization" or "authentic interaction" are used without precise definitions, which may confuse readers unfamiliar with the context. 4. Scholarly communication requires attribution for claims, yet the text references phenomena like bot activity without pointing to sources. Example: "Studies estimate that 40% to 60% of web traffic is generated by bots" needs proper citation. 5. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <p>Empirical Support: Include data on bot activity, content generation statistics, or user engagement trends to provide a stronger evidentiary basis for the claims.</p> <p>Deep Dive into Platform Dynamics: Analyze specific platforms like Twitter/X, TikTok, or Facebook to demonstrate how DIT manifests differently across ecosystems.</p> <p>Addressing Critiques: Engage more robustly with counterarguments and alternative interpretations, such as the role of user agency or the positive implications of AI-driven tools.</p> <p>Streamlining Content: Avoid repetition and ensure that each section adds distinct value to the overall narrative.</p> <p>Solutions and Future Directions: Offer actionable recommendations for mitigating the effects of DIT, such as advocating for platform transparency, user education, or AI governance.</p> <p>The paper addresses an intriguing and relevant topic but requires substantial improvements in empirical rigor, balance, and specificity. By addressing these areas, the paper can provide a more nuanced and impactful contribution to the discourse on the Dead Internet Theory and social media dynamics.</p>	

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>Deepak Sharma</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Jaypee University of Engineering and Technology, India</p>