Paper: **"AI and Cyber-Enabled Threats to Democracy through Algorithmic Manipulation and Generative AI in Undermining Democratic Integrity"**

Corresponding Author: Md Abul Mansur

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Djamel Zemoura
Université Mohamed Khider de Biskra, Algeria

Reviewer 2: Khawaja Fahad Iqbal
National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST), Pakistan

Reviewer 3: Elda Xhumari
University of Tirana, Albania

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear, concise, and directly reflects the scope and content of the manuscript. It adequately captures the focus on AI, cyber-enabled threats, and democratic integrity, making it both informative and appropriate for the article's subject matter.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract clearly presents the objectives, methodology, and main findings of the paper. It provides a concise overview of the research scope, comparative case studies, and the proposed strategic framework. The abstract is informative and aligns well with the article's content, though it could be slightly shortened to focus more on the key contributions and results.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The article is generally well-written and clearly structured. However, there are a few grammatical errors and minor spelling inconsistencies throughout the text. A careful proofreading and language edit would improve readability and overall presentation.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The study methods are explained clearly, with a well-described qualitative comparative case study design. The use of multiple cases (U.S., EU, India, Türkiye, Argentina, Taiwan) provides breadth, and the coding process with NVivo is outlined. However, while the methodology is sound, the link between coded data and findings could be made more explicit to strengthen transparency and reproducibility.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body of the paper is well-organized, logically structured, and clearly written. The arguments flow coherently, and no major errors or inconsistencies were identified in the main text. The content aligns well with the stated objectives and supports the overall contribution of the study.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion is accurate, well-articulated, and supported by the content of the paper. It effectively synthesizes the comparative case study findings and clearly highlights the broader implications of AI-enabled threats to democracy. The policy recommendations are consistent with the evidence presented, making the conclusion both relevant and actionable.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The list of references is comprehensive, up-to-date, and appropriate for the topic. It includes recent scholarly works (2023–2025) as well as relevant institutional and policy reports. The sources demonstrate strong engagement with both academic literature and practical policy debates. Minor improvements could be made by ensuring strict adherence to the journal's reference style (APA) for full consistency.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting and timely manuscript. The paper addresses an urgent issue—the growing role of generative AI and algorithmic manipulation in undermining democratic integrity—and offers a valuable comparative perspective. The proposed policy framework is practical and forward-looking.
To strengthen the manuscript further, I suggest the following revisions:
Empirical Depth: While the comparative case studies are informative, they are largely descriptive. Adding more empirical evidence (quantitative data, concrete examples, or deeper content analysis) would enhance the credibility of the findings.
Methodological Transparency: The coding process (NVivo 14) is mentioned, but the link between coded data and case study findings could be more explicitly illustrated. Providing examples of coding categories or excerpts would improve clarity.
Streamlining Dense Sections: Some parts of the literature review and discussion are very detailed. Condensing these sections would make the paper more readable without losing analytical richness.
Visual Enhancements: Figures and tables could be more analytically developed (e.g., comparative graphs, network diagrams, or timelines of disinformation events) to strengthen the presentation.
Language Editing: A careful proofreading is needed to correct minor grammatical and spelling errors. This will improve overall clarity and readability.

Theoretical Integration: The discussion of propaganda, computational influence, and cognitive warfare is insightful. A stronger integration into a single, coherent theoretical model would improve the manuscript's conceptual contribution.

Overall, this is a promising manuscript that makes a relevant contribution to debates on AI, democracy, and cybersecurity. With revisions, it could become a strong publication.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is precise, relevant, and well-aligned with the article's scope. It clearly communicates the focus on AI, algorithmic manipulation, and democratic integrity, which makes it both engaging and academically appropriate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract provides a solid overview of the objectives, methodology, and key findings. It successfully highlights the comparative case study approach and introduces the proposed framework. However, it could be slightly more concise and avoid repetition of keywords already stated in the title.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The manuscript is generally well-written, but there are a few minor issues with sentence length and structure. At times, long sentences reduce readability, and commas could be better placed for clarity. A careful language edit or proofreading pass would resolve these issues.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The methodology section is thorough and well-documented. The comparative case study design, selection criteria, coding strategy, and inter-coder reliability are clearly explained, making the study replicable. The use of NVivo and clear analytical dimensions strengthens the methodological rigour.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body is comprehensive, logically structured, and supported with current references. However, some sections (especially Discussion) repeat earlier points, and certain case studies (Argentina, Türkiye) would benefit from more depth to balance with the U.S. and EU cases. Visuals (tables/figures) are useful but should be better integrated with the text.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion accurately synthesises the main findings, highlighting common vulnerabilities and lessons learned. It provides concrete policy pathways, though a clearer prioritisation (short-term vs. long-term measures) would improve its practical utility. Overall, the conclusion is strong and consistent with the body of the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The references are up-to-date, wide-ranging, and relevant. They integrate scholarship from multiple disciplines (political science, AI ethics, security studies). However, a detailed check is

needed to ensure that all in-text citations exactly match the reference list (and vice versa), as a few may require formatting consistency.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Ensure balance in the case study analysis by expanding sections on Argentina and Türkiye to match the depth of the U.S./EU/Taiwan discussions.
- Condense parts of the Discussion to avoid repeating points from earlier sections.
- Improve integration of figures/tables by explicitly referencing them in the narrative.
- Conduct a careful language edit to address minor grammatical and stylistic issues.
- Consider adding a short policy priority matrix in the conclusion to clarify immediate vs. long-term recommendations.

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes, the title is clear, explicit, and adequately reflects the manuscript's content. It clearly identifies the core subjects ("AI," "Cyber-Enabled Threats," "Democracy"), the mechanisms ("Algorithmic Manipulation," "Generative AI"), and the overarching concern ("Undermining Democratic Integrity"). It is descriptive and academically appropriate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Yes, the abstract clearly presents the study's aims, the comparative qualitative method using case studies, and the key findings related to AI's impact on democracy, including the proposal of a strategic framework.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
I only noticed a few minor grammatical issues with comma placements. There were no major spelling errors. Overall, the manuscript is well-edited.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes, the methodology including qualitative case study design, selection criteria, data sources, and analysis framework is clearly stated and justified. The criteria for case selection (exposure, diversity, data availability) are sound and well-explained. The data sources are diverse and credible. The primary weakness, as noted, is the lack of detail on the number of coders in the NVivo analysis. The limitations section is honest and thorough.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Yes, the body of the paper is logically structured, moving from introduction and literature review to methodology, findings, and policy recommendations. The arguments are coherent, and the flow from one section to the next is smooth. The case studies are presented consistently using the same analytical dimensions, which makes comparison easy for the reader.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Yes. The conclusion provides an accurate and powerful synthesis of the paper's main findings. It effectively reiterates the key threats (algorithmic distortion, epistemic uncertainty, asymmetric warfare, regulatory gaps) and successfully ties these findings back to the proposed strategic policy pathways. It is fully supported by the evidence and analysis presented in the body of the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Yes, the references are comprehensive, relevant, and include a mix of academic, institutional, and policy sources that align well with the manuscript's interdisciplinary focus.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The manuscript investigates the impact of advanced AI technologies—including generative AI, deepfakes, and algorithmic manipulation—on democratic processes globally. It offers a comparative case study analysis across six democracies (United States, European Union, India, Türkiye, Argentina, Taiwan) to illustrate how these technologies affect electoral integrity, public trust, and political polarization. The study also proposes a comprehensive strategic framework to mitigate these AI-driven threats through regulatory innovation, technological safeguards, civic empowerment, and international cooperation.

My observations on this manuscript are as follows:
1. The study heavily relies on qualitative case studies. It could benefit from integrating more quantitative measurements of AI impact, such as sentiment analysis metrics or electoral participation data trends etc.
2. Focusing only on six democracies might exclude significant insights from authoritarian states or hybrid regimes which also experience AI manipulation differently. Though the selection criteria are justified, this limitation should be acknowledged more explicitly.
3. The paper sometimes presents strong causal claims about the impact of AI disinformation that are difficult to substantiate definitively. For instance, on page 13 in the U.S. case study, it states that AI campaigns led to "voter confusion and suppressed turnout in specific demographic groups". While plausible, attributing specific electoral outcomes directly to information operations is notoriously difficult. The analysis would be more robust if it acknowledged the methodological challenges of isolating the impact of AI from other confounding variables like pre-existing partisan divides or traditional media influence.
4. The research is based on secondary data (reports, articles, etc.). While this is a valid approach, it is a limitation that should be more explicitly acknowledged, as it means the analysis is

dependent on the accuracy and framing of these existing sources.
5. The policy recommendations are presented as straightforward solutions, without a deep exploration of their potential drawbacks or implementation challenges. For example, the call for "Rapid-Response Enforcement Mechanisms" to remove harmful content raises complex questions about censorship, freedom of speech, and the potential for political abuse of such authority. A more nuanced discussion of these trade-offs would enhance the paper's practical value.

Overall, the manuscript is well-written and provides a thorough and well-researched examination of AI-driven threats to democracy, though readability and presentation can be improved. Its insights are critical for policymakers and scholars addressing emerging AI challenges in democratic governance.