ISSLP
Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law and Politics

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Sociopolitical and Legal Dimensions

Jingjing Wang[1*] ⓘ, Wenjie Mao[2] ⓘ, Wenjie Wenjie**Error! Reference source not found.** ⓘ

¹ Law School, Peking University (PKU), Peking, China
² Faculty of Law, Zhejiang University, 866 Yuhangtang, Hangzhou 310058, China

* Corresponding author email address: jingwang@vip.sina.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The findings section could benefit from direct quotes from participants to illustrate key themes and sub-themes. This would add authenticity and depth to the qualitative analysis.

In the discussion of bias and discrimination, incorporate how your findings relate to existing frameworks for mitigating bias in AI systems. This could provide practical implications for AI developers and policymakers.

Expand the discussion on privacy and data governance to include potential solutions or emerging technologies that could address these concerns. This could offer a forward-looking perspective on managing AI ethics.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The legal dimension section would benefit from a discussion on the feasibility of implementing the suggested legal frameworks and the potential challenges in different jurisdictions. This can provide a more grounded understanding of the legal implications.

Offer specific examples or case studies where AI ethics and law integration has been successfully implemented or where challenges have arisen. This could make the recommendations more tangible.

Strengthen the conclusion by summarizing the key contributions of your study to the field of AI ethics and suggesting directions for future research. This could help to position your study within the broader research landscape.

Ensure all references are correctly formatted and up to date. Consider including more recent publications to demonstrate the current relevance of your research.

Although ethical considerations are mentioned, providing specific details about how participants' confidentiality was protected during and after the study could enhance the ethical transparency of your research.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.