



OPEN PEER REVIEW

Analyzing the Legal and Ethical Considerations of Deepfake Technology

Mustafa Kaan Tuysuz^{1*}  Ahmet Kılıç² ¹ Institute of Social Sciences, Siirt University, Siirt, Turkey² Faculty of Theology, Siirt University, Turkey


* Corresponding author email address: AhmetKilic@siirt.edu.tr

Received: 2023-01-05

Revised: 2023-02-18


Accepted: 2023-02-24

Published: 2023-04-01

EDITOR:Zeynep Karal 

Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Education, Trabzon University, Trabzon, Türkiye

zeynepkaral@trabzon.edu.tr

REVIEWER 1:Mohammadbagher. Jafari 

Department of Sociology of Culture, Istanbul, Türkiye

mbjafari@kmanresce.ca

REVIEWER 2:Patrika Handique 

Patent Information Centre, Intellectual Property Facilitation Centre, Chhattisgarh Council of Science & Technology, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Patriandique@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Revise the manuscript to include clearer subheadings and transitions, particularly in the "Findings and Results" section. Introducing subheadings for each major theme directly in the text (rather than relying on table format) could significantly improve readability and guide readers through the analysis more intuitively.

Enrich the thematic analysis by including direct quotes from interview participants. This would lend authenticity to the findings and offer readers insight into the perspectives of experts in their own words, thus adding depth to the qualitative analysis.

The discussion on technological solutions and challenges would benefit from a more comprehensive examination. Provide detailed examples of both current and emerging technologies aimed at detecting deepfakes to offer a balanced view of the opportunities and challenges presented by this technology.

Augment the discussion on ethical considerations by exploring the implications of using deepfake technology for beneficial applications. A nuanced discussion on the ethical dilemmas and potential positive uses of deepfakes would offer a more rounded perspective on its impact on society.

Offer more detailed descriptions of the methodology, particularly the criteria for selecting interview participants and the process of thematic analysis. Clarifying these aspects can enhance the transparency and reproducibility of the research.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Broaden the literature review to encompass a wider range of recent studies, including meta-analyses that summarize the state of research in deepfake technology. This will not only provide context but also highlight the manuscript's contribution within the existing body of knowledge.

Expand the discussion on potential biases and limitations inherent in the study's design and methodology. Acknowledging these openly will strengthen the credibility of the research and suggest areas for future investigation.

Provide specific recommendations for future research, focusing on areas that were identified as gaps in this study. This could include suggestions for quantitative studies to complement the qualitative insights or interdisciplinary research to explore technological and ethical considerations in greater depth.

Elaborate on the practical implications of the findings for policymakers and industry practitioners. Offering concrete recommendations for how legal frameworks might evolve or how technology developers can incorporate ethical considerations into design practices would make the research more applicable to real-world challenges.

Given the importance of public awareness and digital literacy in combating the negative impacts of deepfakes, the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion on strategies for enhancing digital literacy among the general public. This could include specific educational initiatives, public awareness campaigns, or collaboration between educational institutions, tech companies, and policymakers.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.