



Paper: **“Artificial Intelligence and Its Impact on Copyright: A Legal Perspective”**

Submitted: 26 September 2025

Accepted: 13 November 2025

Published: 30 November 2025

Corresponding Author: Ricardo Daniel Furfaro

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n32p18

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Fathi Zerari
Souk-Ahras University, Algeria

Reviewer 2: Abebe Bahiru
Zhejiang Normal University, China

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Prof. Fathi ZErari	
University/Country: Souk-Ahras University, Algeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 01/10/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/10/2025
Manuscript Title: Artificial Intelligence and Its Impact on Intellectual Property Rights (copyrightable works)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 31.102025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
Yes. The title accurately reflects the paper's content, particularly the focus on copyrightable works.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract presents the objects (an outlook on AI's impact on copyright, an analysis of the legal frameworks and an assessment of legal certainty) and the methods (qualitative descriptive content analysis and comparative assessment). But the results are not presented clearly; it lacks a concise summary of the key comparative findings between the USA, the UK and from China.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5

Yes. The draft contains numerous grammatical errors, awkward phrasings, and spelling mistakes that detract from its professionalism. Examples include: • Copyright not “copyrights”; • AI-generated work not “work-product creation”; • Artificial Intelligence (AI) not “IA”; • Some punctuation errors. A thorough proofread is highly recommended.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4.5
A mixed-methods approach is outlined, comprising: doctrinal analysis of laws and case law, comparative analysis of key jurisdictions (EU, USA, China, UK, India, Argentina) and case law analysis of legal disputes, which is well reflected in the paper's structure.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clear, country-by-country breakdown, accurate and well-supported by references.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion accurately synthesizes the main finding.. The policy recommendations (amending legislation, acknowledging human involvement, developing licensing frameworks) logically follow from the analysis presented in the paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The author has provided a strong relevant list of references, whether primary sources or secondary ones.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author has presented a timely topic: The global legal challenge of assigning copyright to works created by Artificial Intelligence (AI). And through a comparative analysis of key jurisdictions, the paper finds no international consensus, which undermines legal certainty; a lacuna worth addressing. However, the manuscript needs improvement of language and style and refinement of the abstract.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Bezabh Abebe Bahiru	
University/Country: Zhejiang Normal University	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Artificial Intelligence and Its Impact on Intellectual Property Rights (copyrightable works)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3

<i>Using brackets in the title is not appropriate. The author should revise the research title to ensure it has a clear sentence structure, enhancing clarity and eliminating any vagueness. The title and the body of the article has confusion over IP right and copyright. The title require restructure and avoid conceptual uncertainty.</i> <i>This vague use of brackets recurs throughout the paper, creating ambiguity regarding the clear issue of the study.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	1
<i>This abstract is overly lengthy and does not clearly differentiate itself from the introduction. The abstract should be concise, focusing on the aim, research problem, methodology, and findings.</i> <i>The issue with the title persists. It is unclear why the author chose to use such a vague title while addressing a specific part of the study. The writer should concentrate on clearly defined issues. For example, the topic is about copyrights, the use of brackets should be avoided, as IP rights and copyrights are not the same.</i> <i>The abstract require to re-write based on scientific standard of the good quality paper.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(There are few grammatical and typo errors)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(The draft article lacks specificity in presenting the methodology of the research. Please check the details at the in text comment)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(This section would be better to be presented in divided sub-section. For instance, classify the experience of countries in independent sub-section.</i> <i>Besides, many of discussions require citation of laws or proper sources.)</i> <i>Check the detail from in text comments.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(The conclusion lacks clarity. Check in text comment)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Check all the materials listed as reference are cited at the body of the paper)</i>	

--

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Thank you for your submission. Your research tackles an important and relevant topic; however, there are several areas that require significant improvement to enhance the clarity and coherence of the paper. The title needs to be revised for clarity, specifically by avoiding the vague use of brackets and ensuring it accurately reflects the content of the article. Additionally, the abstract requires a substantial rewrite to align with scientific standards, focusing concisely on the aim, methods, and findings.

Throughout the manuscript, there is confusion regarding intellectual property rights and copyright, which must be clearly differentiated to avoid ambiguity. The methodology lacks specificity and should be elaborated upon for better understanding. Furthermore, the results section could be improved by organizing it into subsections, which would help clarify country-specific experiences. Lastly, the conclusions need greater clarity. And proper citations should be provided throughout all part of the paper.

Take time to review these aspects critically to enhance the quality and clarity of your work.