




OPEN PEER REVIEW

# The Nature of Natural and Legal Personality of Robots, Ethics, and Compensation for Robot-Related Damages

Elham Sadat. Hosseini<sup>1</sup>  Mehdi. Mohamadin Amiri<sup>2\*</sup>  Mohammad Ali. Khairollahi<sup>3</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> PhD Student, Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, Babol Branch, Islamic Azad University, Babol, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, Babol Branch, Islamic Azad University, Babol, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, Babol Branch, Islamic Azad University, Babol, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: mrmyaali@gmail.com

Received: 2024-08-13

Revised: 2024-10-17

Accepted: 2024-10-22


Published: 2024-12-01

## EDITOR:

Shehzad Raj 


School of Law, Universiti Geomatika Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Email: shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my

## REVIEWER 1:

Jingjing Wang 

Law School, Peking University (PKU), Peking, China. Email: jingwang@vip.sina.com

## REVIEWER 2:

Abdus Samad 

Assistant Professor, Department of Law, AWKUM, Pakistan. Email: abdussamad@awkum.edu.pk

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence "AI has the potential to solve many common business challenges..." could benefit from a specific example of a business challenge solved by AI to strengthen the claim.

The statement "AI systems strive to simulate human cognitive processes..." would benefit from examples of current AI systems that mimic these processes to support the claim.

The claim about AI adhering to judicial ethics lacks support. Consider including evidence or case studies demonstrating AI's potential in ethical decision-making.

The repeated mention of Sophia highlights its importance but misses the opportunity to analyze its implications for legal and ethical personhood in depth.

The statement about potential harm from self-aware AI lacks empirical support. Incorporate evidence or references to ongoing debates among AI experts.

The discussion on AI's immunity to emotions is compelling but could include counterarguments about the potential drawbacks of this trait in judicial contexts.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The discussion on employment and automation could be expanded to include statistical data or recent studies on job displacement caused by AI for a more robust argument.

The statement about the European Union's draft proposal lacks details on the proposal's impact or any subsequent legal developments. Adding this information would provide a clearer picture of the regulatory landscape.

The comparison of AI to minors is intriguing but underdeveloped. Expanding on the implications of treating AI as quasi-agents could add depth.

The reliance on the "Respect theory" to explain liability is not clearly connected to specific legal principles or precedents. Elaborate on how this theory translates into actionable legal frameworks.

The discussion on liability insurance is insightful but could be improved by citing examples of existing insurance policies for autonomous systems.

The conclusion emphasizes human accountability for robot actions but does not address how shared liability among manufacturers, operators, and programmers would be determined in practice.

The references to specific articles of the Islamic Penal Code provide legal context but could benefit from a comparative analysis with non-Islamic legal systems.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.