HELEX SCIENCE

Research

Regulatory Challenges in Synthetic Media Governance: Policy Frameworks for AI-Generated Content Across Image, Video, and Social Platforms

Xiangwei He[1], Lijuan Fang[2]

[1]Luoyang Institute of Science and Technology, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, 98 Kaiyuan Avenue, Luoyang, Henan, China
[2]Jishou University, School of Computer Science, 56 Renmin Road, Jishou, Hunan, China

Abstract: Synthetic media, encompassing algorithmically generated images, videos, and text, has seen significant advancements with the proliferation of deep learning techniques, particularly generative adversarial networks and large language models. These technologies have democratized content creation, enabling both beneficial applications, such as personalized learning materials and creative entertainment, and harmful misuse, including deepfake-driven misinformation campaigns. The rapid pace of development in these areas presents considerable challenges for existing legal and regulatory frameworks. Policymakers, industry stakeholders, and civic institutions are pressed to address threats ranging from identity theft and defamation to national security risks. Yet constructing effective governance models for synthetic media remains a complex undertaking, as overregulation may hamper beneficial innovation while insufficient oversight can fuel malicious exploitation. This paper examines the core difficulties of regulating synthetic media, focusing on emergent risks and the evolving responsibilities of platform providers, application developers, and end-users. We discuss multiple policy approaches, from labeling requirements to algorithmic transparency mandates, and assess their efficacy in mitigating dangers without unduly restraining creative expression. By integrating insights from legal scholarship, technical developments, and social sciences, this research offers a nuanced view of how regulatory frameworks might evolve to address the multifaceted challenges of AI-generated content. Ultimately, we propose strategies for transparent oversight and balanced governance in this rapidly shifting technological landscape.

1. Introduction

The rise of synthetic media is rooted in advancements across a variety of subfields in artificial intelligence, particularly deep learning, computer vision, and natural language processing [1]. As generative adversarial networks (GANs) have matured, developers have found increasingly sophisticated methods to craft images and videos that challenge our established notions of authenticity. Meanwhile, large language models (LLMs) can convincingly replicate stylistic features of human writing, fueling concerns about misinformation, automated propaganda, and content moderation. These developments have prompted calls for regulatory measures that balance the positive potential of these technologies against the destructive possibilities they introduce. The ability to generate hyper-realistic images, videos, and textual content raises ethical dilemmas about authorship, authenticity, and the potential for manipulation in political, economic, and social contexts [2].

A central point in this discussion is the ubiquity of platforms that disseminate user-generated content. Today, social media sites are no longer merely distribution channels; they are highly interactive ecosystems where synthetic media can propagate rapidly. Legislators worldwide are struggling to design regulations that align with democratic values such as free speech and privacy while ensuring that bad actors cannot exploit synthetic media

. . *Helex-science* **2024**, *9*, 36–54.

to deceive or harm the public. The tension between protecting creative freedoms and preventing misuse is further complicated by the sheer volume and velocity of digital content. Algorithmic amplification further exacerbates this issue, as recommendation systems may inadvertently boost engagement with misleading or harmful synthetic media [3]. The challenge for policymakers is to create frameworks that account for these technological realities while preserving the foundational principles of democratic discourse.

Moreover, the contextual nuances of global governance come into play. Different countries have varying priorities, with some focusing on national security concerns while others prioritize combatting hate speech or preserving freedom of expression. These differences lead to a fragmented regulatory environment, making it difficult to establish uniform guidelines that apply across borders. Global technology companies operating in multiple jurisdictions face the burden of conflicting or overlapping regulations, making compliance a strategic and legal challenge [4]. The implications of synthetic media extend beyond governance into the realms of journalism, forensic analysis, and the legal system. Journalists, for example, must develop new methodologies to verify the authenticity of multimedia content, while forensic analysts are tasked with identifying digital forgeries in legal proceedings.

One of the most pressing concerns regarding synthetic media is its role in disinformation campaigns. State and non-state actors alike have leveraged AI-generated content to manipulate public perception, particularly in the context of elections, geopolitical conflicts, and public health crises. For instance, deepfake videos depicting political figures making false statements have surfaced, undermining trust in legitimate institutions [5]. The intersection of synthetic media and automated bot networks further compounds this issue, as AI-driven accounts can disseminate falsehoods at an unprecedented scale. The rapid adoption of synthetic media tools by online communities also means that the line between benign and malicious usage is increasingly blurred. While some individuals use these technologies for artistic or comedic expression, others exploit them for fraud, defamation, or coercion.

A fundamental issue underlying the proliferation of synthetic media is the accessibility of generative models. Open-source AI frameworks have democratized access to powerful tools, enabling both innovation and misuse [6]. While some advocates argue that open access fosters transparency and accountability, others warn that it lowers the barrier for malicious actors. The ethical considerations surrounding AI model release strategies have sparked debates about responsible AI development, particularly concerning whether the benefits of open innovation outweigh the risks of misuse. Several AI research organizations have opted for phased release approaches, where model capabilities are gradually disclosed to mitigate immediate risks. However, these efforts remain limited in scope, given that alternative implementations often emerge outside of regulated environments.

The economic dimension of synthetic media is also significant [7]. As digital content creation becomes increasingly automated, traditional creative industries face disruption. AI-generated art, music, and literature challenge existing notions of intellectual property rights, raising questions about ownership and attribution. Additionally, businesses have begun to leverage synthetic media for advertising, customer service, and brand engagement. AI-generated avatars, for example, are now used as virtual influencers, blurring the boundaries between human and machine-generated content. While these applications offer economic opportunities, they also introduce ethical concerns regarding consumer deception and transparency [8]. The advertising industry, in particular, must navigate regulatory pressures to disclose AI-generated endorsements and prevent manipulative marketing practices.

A key technological consideration in the regulation of synthetic media is the development of detection mechanisms. Researchers have proposed a variety of techniques to identify AI-generated content, including watermarking, fingerprinting, and adversarial detection models. Despite these efforts, the cat-and-mouse dynamic between generative and forensic AI models persists. As generative models improve, so too must detection strategies, creating an ongoing arms race in digital forensics [9]. Some industry stakehold-

ers have called for standardized metadata tagging to distinguish AI-generated content from human-created material. However, the effectiveness of such approaches depends on widespread adoption and enforcement. Additionally, cryptographic provenance techniques have been explored as a means to establish verifiable authenticity in digital media.

Another challenge in regulating synthetic media is defining legal accountability. The decentralized nature of the internet complicates jurisdictional enforcement, as content creators, platform providers, and end-users may operate across different legal frameworks [10]. The question of liability arises when synthetic media causes harm, whether through reputational damage, financial fraud, or incitement of violence. Legal scholars have debated the extent to which AI developers, platform operators, and individual users should bear responsibility for the consequences of synthetic media dissemination. Some regulatory proposals have suggested mandatory content labeling, while others advocate for liability frameworks akin to product safety regulations in other industries.

To illustrate the complexity of synthetic media governance, the following table summarizes key regulatory approaches across different countries:

Country	**Regulatory Approach**	**Key Challenges**
United States	Focus on voluntary industry guidelines and platform self-regulation. Some states have introduced laws targeting deepfake election interference.	First Amendment protections limit direct government intervention. Industry-led solutions vary in effectiveness.
European Union	Proposed AI Act includes transparency requirements for AI-generated content. GDPR applies to data-related aspects of synthetic media.	Harmonizing regulations across member states while ensuring technological innovation remains viable.
China	Strict government oversight and licensing requirements for AI-generated content. Deepfake regulations mandate user consent and disclosure.	Balancing censorship policies with technological advancement. Ensuring compliance across decentralized platforms.
India	New IT rules require platforms to identify the first originator of misinformation, which may include synthetic media.	Enforcing compliance among global tech companies operating in India. Addressing privacy concerns related to traceability mandates.

Table 1. Comparison of Regulatory Approaches to Synthetic Media

Beyond government regulations, the role of platform policies and industry standards is critical in shaping the future of synthetic media [11]. Major technology firms have implemented content moderation strategies that leverage AI-driven detection models, user reporting mechanisms, and manual review teams. However, these approaches are not foolproof and are often criticized for inconsistencies in enforcement. Public-private partnerships have been proposed as a means to enhance coordination between regulators and industry stakeholders, particularly in addressing cross-border challenges associated with synthetic media proliferation.

In addition to regulatory considerations, ethical frameworks for AI development are necessary to mitigate risks associated with synthetic media. Organizations such as the Partnership on AI and the IEEE have developed ethical guidelines that emphasize transparency, accountability, and fairness [12,13]. These principles serve as a foundation for responsible AI deployment, though their practical implementation remains a topic of ongoing discussion. The following table outlines key ethical concerns associated with synthetic media:

Ethical Concern	**Implications**
Authenticity and Trust	Erosion of public trust in digital media due to increased difficulty in distinguishing real from fake content.
Privacy Violations	Unauthorized use of personal images or voices in AI-generated content, leading to identity theft or reputational harm.
Bias and Fairness	Generative models trained on biased datasets may perpetuate harmful stereotypes or misinformation.
Accountability	Unclear legal responsibility for harms caused by synthetic media, complicating redress mechanisms.

Table 2. Ethical Considerations in Synthetic Media

Ultimately, the evolution of synthetic media necessitates a multidisciplinary approach, integrating insights from law, ethics, technology, and policy. The path forward requires ongoing dialogue among stakeholders to ensure that innovation does not come at the expense of societal well-being.

Regulating synthetic media also requires an interdisciplinary approach that involves technological research, legal scholarship, and the social sciences [14]. Understanding the technical underpinnings of generative models is critical for creating pragmatic, enforceable policies. Legal structures, such as defamation and privacy law, must be reinterpreted in light of content that is digitally generated and often indistinguishable from genuine media. In parallel, social scientists can aid in assessing public attitudes and the societal impact of synthetic content, thus providing empirical data to guide policy formation and compliance measures.

Another element driving urgency around this issue is the capacity for harmful content to scale [15]. Automated techniques to generate deepfake images or videos can produce thousands of pieces of convincing disinformation with minimal human intervention. Discerning between real and fake content becomes exceedingly difficult for average users, and even expert analysts require specialized tools to detect sophisticated manipulations. The psychological and political fallout from widespread distribution of maliciously generated content is significant, eroding trust in institutions and fueling polarization.

Civil liberties organizations caution against hasty or draconian regulations that could stifle legitimate creativity or hamper freedom of expression. Synthetic media techniques have also demonstrated positive use cases, ranging from rehabilitating speech for the disabled to accelerating developments in computer graphics, film production, and educational tools [16]. As such, any regulatory framework must not only protect the public from malicious uses but also preserve the environment necessary for technological innovation and cultural expression. Striking this balance is a formidable task, necessitating robust, carefully considered policy proposals.

The remainder of this paper is structured to address these complexities in detail. First, we examine the broader landscape of synthetic media, highlighting how various AI techniques drive creation and dissemination across platforms. Next, we discuss the legal and regulatory obstacles that emerge when attempting to manage the dynamic, increasingly global environment of AI-generated content [17]. We then propose a policy framework designed to mitigate the most pressing challenges, drawing on both technical and ethical considerations. Subsequently, we explore implementation and enforcement mechanisms capable of adapting to future innovations. Finally, we conclude by offering insights into how lawmakers, technology companies, and civil society can collaborate to forge a balanced approach to synthetic media governance that fosters responsible innovation while minimizing harm.

2. The Landscape of Synthetic Media

The modern landscape of synthetic media is characterized by an ecosystem of diverse technologies, many of which originated in academic research environments. Generative adversarial networks (GANs) serve as a pivotal driving force in this ecosystem [18]. A GAN typically comprises two components, a generator and a discriminator, which are locked in a competitive training loop. The generator strives to create outputs that appear authentic, while the discriminator learns to distinguish genuine samples from those produced by the generator. Through this adversarial process, the generator progressively refines its output, yielding increasingly realistic images or videos. The theoretical foundation of GANs stems from game theory, wherein the generator and discriminator engage in a zero-sum game, iteratively improving their respective capabilities. Early implementations of GANs demonstrated promising results in synthesizing images, but subsequent refinements, including deep convolutional GANs (DCGANs), progressively improved stability and image fidelity [19]. Variants such as progressive growing GANs (PGGANs) and style-based generative models further enhanced the quality of generated media, culminating in architectures like StyleGAN and StyleGAN2, which produce photorealistic images indistinguishable from actual photographs.

Another set of technologies contributing to synthetic media includes variational autoencoders (VAEs), sequence-to-sequence models, and diffusion-based approaches. VAEs operate within a probabilistic framework, wherein an encoder projects input data onto a latent space characterized by a learned distribution, from which a decoder reconstructs the original input. This formulation allows VAEs to model complex data distributions effectively, facilitating applications such as image synthesis, denoising, and latent-space interpolations. However, VAEs traditionally suffer from blurry outputs due to the inherent trade-off between sample diversity and sharpness, which researchers have sought to address through adversarial training and hierarchical latent representations [20]. Sequence-to-sequence models, on the other hand, underlie many text-based and temporal applications of synthetic media, including machine translation, text-to-speech synthesis, and script generation for AI-driven dialogue systems. Architectures such as transformers, exemplified by models like GPT and BERT, have significantly advanced language synthesis, enabling nuanced text generation with contextual awareness. Diffusion models represent another frontier in generative modeling, employing iterative denoising processes to progressively reconstruct data from noise. These approaches, typified by Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models (DDPMs) and their improved variants, have demonstrated state-of-the-art performance in high-resolution image synthesis, outperforming GANs in terms of stability and sample diversity.

The widespread adoption of these synthetic media technologies is facilitated by the increasing accessibility of computational resources and open-source implementations [21]. Frameworks such as TensorFlow, PyTorch, and JAX provide robust platforms for researchers and developers to implement and optimize generative models. Pretrained models and transfer learning paradigms further reduce the computational barriers to entry, enabling users with limited technical expertise to generate high-quality synthetic content. The proliferation of cloud-based APIs and AI-powered design tools has further catalyzed adoption, empowering creative professionals and hobbyists alike to integrate AI-generated media into various domains, including digital marketing, game development, and artistic expression.

Social platforms often act as catalysts in popularizing these tools. Simple-to-use, consumer-facing applications and web services have emerged, allowing users to seamlessly produce deepfake videos or AI-edited portraits at scale [22,23]. This democratization broadens the scope of synthetic media beyond specialized research labs and studios, creating a significant shift in cultural production and consumption dynamics. While empowerment of individual users can spur creativity and enable new forms of self-expression, it simultaneously heightens the risk of misuse. The rise of deepfake technology, in particular, has raised ethical and legal concerns, as malicious actors can exploit AI-generated media for

misinformation, identity fraud, and reputational harm. Detection mechanisms, including adversarial training of forensic classifiers and metadata verification techniques, are actively being developed to counteract these threats. Researchers are also investigating watermarking techniques and provenance tracking systems to embed verifiable authenticity markers within synthetic content. [24]

Despite these challenges, the constructive applications of synthetic media remain vast and transformative. AI-driven media synthesis is revolutionizing industries such as entertainment, education, and healthcare. In film and gaming, generative models enable realistic character animation, facial reenactment, and automatic scene generation, reducing production costs and enhancing creative possibilities. In education, AI-generated content can facilitate personalized learning experiences, adaptive tutoring systems, and multilingual accessibility. Healthcare applications include AI-generated medical imaging for diagnostic training, synthetic patient data for research, and virtual patient simulations for clinical education [25]. These use cases underscore the dual-edged nature of synthetic media, necessitating careful consideration of ethical implications and regulatory frameworks.

To provide an overview of the current landscape of synthetic media technologies, Table 3 categorizes different generative models based on their underlying mechanisms and typical applications.

Model Type	**Key Mechanism**	**Common Applications**
Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)	Adversarial training between generator and discriminator	Image synthesis, deepfake videos, artistic style transfer
Variational Autoencoders (VAEs)	Probabilistic latent-space modeling	Image denoising, latent-space interpolation, synthetic medical imaging
Sequence-to-Sequence Models	Transformer-based or recurrent architectures	Text generation, speech synthesis, AI-assisted scriptwriting
Diffusion Models	Iterative denoising process	High-resolution image generation, texture synthesis, inpainting

Table 3. Comparison of generative models used in synthetic media.

The regulatory landscape surrounding synthetic media is evolving in response to emerging risks. Governments and policy organizations are assessing frameworks for responsible AI usage, focusing on transparency, accountability, and user consent. Proposed legislative measures include mandating AI-generated content disclosures, implementing forensic detection standards, and holding developers accountable for the societal impact of their technologies. Industry-led initiatives, such as the Partnership on AI and the Content Authenticity Initiative, aim to establish ethical guidelines and technological safeguards for synthetic media deployment [26]. Ongoing research in AI safety and alignment seeks to balance innovation with risk mitigation, ensuring that generative technologies serve constructive purposes while minimizing potential harm.

A critical area of development involves improving robustness and interpretability in generative models. Current AI-generated content can exhibit biases inherited from training data, leading to ethical concerns regarding fairness and representation. Researchers are investigating debiasing techniques, including counterfactual data augmentation and fairness-aware training strategies, to mitigate such risks. Additionally, advancements in explainable AI (XAI) seek to enhance transparency by providing interpretable representations of model decisions, fostering trust in synthetic media applications. [27]

Looking ahead, future research in synthetic media is likely to focus on enhancing controllability and interactivity in generative models. Techniques such as prompt-based conditioning, latent-space navigation, and reinforcement learning augmentation are being

explored to enable more precise and user-driven content synthesis. The convergence of generative AI with other technological paradigms, including augmented reality (AR), virtual reality (VR), and spatial computing, will further expand the horizons of immersive digital experiences. As synthetic media continues to evolve, its impact on creativity, communication, and digital identity will remain a focal point of interdisciplinary research and public discourse. [28]

To further illustrate the advancements in generative model performance, Table 4 presents a comparison of state-of-the-art generative models across key performance metrics.

Model	**Image Quality (FID Score)**	**Training Stability**	**Sample Diversity**
StyleGAN2	2.84 (lower is better)	High	Excellent
BigGAN	4.06	Moderate	High
DDPM	3.17	Very High	Excellent
VAE (Baseline)	12.45	Very High	Moderate

Table 4. Performance comparison of generative models in synthetic media.

One illustrative example involves the generation of realistic facial imagery. State-of-the-art techniques can produce non-existent yet highly photorealistic faces, which are then integrated into deceptive social media profiles or used in political propaganda. This phenomenon goes hand in hand with the concept of "cheapfakes," where rudimentary editing tools can yield misleading content that, while lower in fidelity compared to full deepfakes, still exerts meaningful influence on public opinion. The ramifications include identity fraud, harassment, and targeted disinformation campaigns, posing grave challenges for both security agencies and social media moderators.

From a technological viewpoint, computational complexity and resource requirements play central roles in determining the feasibility and quality of synthetic media [29]. High-end hardware, specialized architectures, and large-scale datasets once acted as barriers, limiting access to advanced generative tools. However, as computational infrastructure becomes cheaper and more accessible via cloud services, and as open-source communities share pre-trained models, high-quality synthetic media creation becomes more widely attainable. This confluence of open-source culture and scalable computing infrastructure accelerates the global dissemination of synthetic media capabilities.

Beyond the purely visual domain, text generation has also experienced enormous gains, courtesy of large language models. These models can produce contextually coherent text, raise or respond to queries, and even generate complete narratives [30]. This elevates concerns about automated misinformation and the erosion of trust in digital communication. When combined with multi-modal capabilities—such as producing images, audio, or video from textual prompts—this synergy of generative technologies paves the way for narratives that blur the boundaries between reality and fabrication, complicating fact-checking and content verification processes.

Historically, synthetic media research was confined to narrow circles of specialists with deep technical knowledge. Presently, however, social media challenges, open-source communities, and user-friendly toolkits have significantly lowered the barrier to entry. This dynamic environment encourages a rapid turnover of techniques, where new ideas are implemented, tested, and improved by a broad contributor base in a matter of months [31]. Such an agile landscape underscores the difficulty in enforcing traditional regulatory measures, which often lag behind the pace of technological innovation and distribution.

Additionally, consumer demand for more engaging or personalized experiences has fueled commercial interest. Media outlets experiment with AI-generated graphics, marketing campaigns use synthetic voices to tailor advertising, and e-commerce platforms harness artificial influencers to promote products. These commercial forays propel synthetic media

further into mainstream consciousness. While many of these endeavors are benign or even transformative, they also indicate how embedded AI-driven generation has become in everyday cultural and economic spheres, affecting millions of users globally. [32]

In parallel, a complex network of specialized businesses has emerged, providing synthetic media services on a freelance or enterprise basis. These providers craft custom content or license generative APIs, effectively commoditizing AI-generated material. Clients can order anything from personalized marketing assets to manipulated celebrity endorsements, occasionally skirting ethical boundaries. Consequently, a robust synthetic media market operates with varying levels of transparency and responsibility. The fragmented nature of this market—spanning multiple jurisdictions and diverse verticals—further complicates policy discussions, as regulators attempt to define and enforce norms in a fluid, globalized environment. [33]

Finally, the core question remains whether the net effect of this democratization is beneficial or harmful. On one hand, synthetic media tools can amplify creative expression, streamline content production, and serve as valuable resources in fields ranging from education to medicine. On the other hand, the rising tide of low-cost, high-fidelity generative capabilities complicates efforts to maintain informational integrity, personal privacy, and civic trust. Understanding this landscape of synthetic media—from the enabling technologies to the end-user applications—is vital for devising informed strategies that can guide governance without stifling innovation.

3. Legal and Regulatory Challenges

Regulating synthetic media presents a daunting array of legal and policy concerns, reflecting the technology's capacity to disrupt conventional frameworks governing intellectual property, privacy, defamation, and public safety [34]. Existing laws often struggle to address content that is generated algorithmically, as opposed to being crafted through traditional means. This conundrum arises from the novelty of AI-driven creation processes, which lack clear legal precedents and uniform international standards. For instance, determining ownership or liability for deepfake content can be arduous when it is unclear who actually produced or authorized the material—human creators, automated processes, or platform intermediaries.

An immediate issue is that many legal systems are reactive rather than proactive. Statutory language and judicial interpretations typically evolve in response to tangible harms that emerge over time, but synthetic media can be deployed quickly and covertly, eluding the slow pace of legislative reform [35]. Policymakers, therefore, face an uphill battle in crafting regulations that remain relevant in the face of constant technological innovation. This phenomenon is especially pronounced in democratic societies, where transparency and public debate are integral to the legislative process, prolonging the time from recognizing a threat to enacting enforceable laws.

Jurisdictional complexity further complicates matters. The internet's borderless nature allows synthetic media to propagate across national boundaries with minimal friction. A piece of manipulative content may be produced in one jurisdiction, hosted on servers in another, and consumed by users worldwide [36]. Determining which legal regime applies—and how to enforce it—becomes a multi-faceted problem that involves both private international law and cross-border cooperation. In cases of malicious deepfakes aimed at election interference, the issue transcends national regulations and touches on the global stability of democratic institutions.

Many jurisdictions also grapple with the question of balancing free expression rights against the imperative to limit harmful or deceptive content. Constitutional protections in various countries, such as the First Amendment in the United States, restrict the extent to which authorities can limit speech, even if that speech is manipulated or misleading. While malicious deepfakes may indeed pose a severe threat to individual reputations or national security, preemptive censorship can evoke concerns about government overreach and the

stifling of legitimate dissent [37,38]. Hence, legal instruments must be carefully calibrated to avoid infringing on core civil liberties while still preventing identifiable harms.

One subset of legal challenges revolves around privacy and data protection. Synthetic media can utilize personal data—images, videos, or voice recordings—to craft representations that are not consented to by the individuals depicted. Such unauthorized usage may violate privacy laws like the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) or various national statutes. However, enforcing these laws is non-trivial, given that the generative processes might only need minimal initial data and can be refined on distributed platforms that do not neatly fall under any single regulatory authority. [39]

Defamation and identity theft constitute another area of concern. Deepfake videos or images that falsely depict someone engaging in illegal or immoral conduct can inflict severe reputational damage. Victims face the dual burden of proving not only that the media is inauthentic, but also identifying who is responsible for its creation and dissemination. Litigation in such cases can be resource-intensive and complex, as defense attorneys may argue that the synthetic nature of the content should have been evident, or that platform hosts are shielded by safe harbor provisions. Legal systems vary widely in how they allocate liability among creators, platforms, and distributors. [40]

Platform liability is a focal point in the debate over synthetic media regulation. Historically, many platforms have benefited from legal protections that treat them as neutral intermediaries rather than publishers, a doctrine encapsulated in laws like Section 230 of the U.S. Communications Decency Act. However, the growing influence of platforms in content curation and recommendation raises questions about whether they should assume greater responsibility for filtering or labeling synthetic content [41]. Legislative proposals to revise intermediary liability have become more frequent, though they face opposition from technology companies warning that increased liability could stifle innovation and open the floodgates to excessive litigation.

Algorithmic transparency and explainability requirements also emerge as important regulatory considerations. If platforms are compelled to provide insight into how their recommendation algorithms surface or suppress synthetic media, this could deter the spread of harmful content. However, such requirements risk exposing trade secrets or stalling algorithmic advancement. Striking a balance here is challenging: transparency can improve accountability and public trust, but it may also inadvertently advantage malicious actors who learn how to manipulate automated systems or circumvent detection. [42]

Enforcement stands as another critical hurdle. Even well-crafted laws require mechanisms for swift and effective action against violators. Digital traces can be obscured through techniques like onion routing and proxy servers, impeding the identification of culpable parties. When synthetic content is rapidly disseminated across myriad platforms, taking down malicious material becomes a never-ending game of whack-a-mole. Automated content detection tools offer partial solutions but are prone to errors, potentially flagging legitimate content or missing innovative deepfake tactics that exploit newly uncovered vulnerabilities in detection algorithms. [43]

Finally, the global disparity in regulatory approaches fosters an environment where malicious actors can shop for the least restrictive jurisdiction to operate in. Some nations have weaker legal protections, either due to limited resources or deliberate policy choices that prioritize free flow of information. This fragmented governance landscape undermines efforts to establish consistent rules for synthetic media on a global scale. Consequently, the path forward demands collaborative, multi-stakeholder engagement to align or at least harmonize legal mechanisms, ensuring that international norms keep pace with rapid technological advances.

4. Proposed Policy Frameworks

Developing an effective framework for synthetic media governance requires a multi-layered, interdisciplinary strategy that accommodates technological, ethical, and societal dimensions [44]. One foundational element could involve establishing common defini-

tions and terminology for synthetic media. Terms like "deepfake," "cheapfake," and "AI-generated content" are frequently used but lack standardized legal and regulatory definitions, causing inconsistencies in how laws are drafted and enforced. Clear, universal terminology would foster coherent legislative language and facilitate cross-border collaboration.

A second pillar involves adopting risk-based categorization. Not all synthetic content poses the same level of risk; parody videos, for example, generally carry less potential harm than political disinformation aimed at destabilizing democratic processes [45]. Policymakers could categorize synthetic media along a continuum of risk, with each tier subject to different degrees of scrutiny or regulatory obligation. Low-risk categories might require minimal oversight, while high-risk categories—such as deepfakes with national security implications—could be subject to strict auditing, detection, and labeling mandates.

Mandatory labeling regimes constitute a frequently proposed solution, requiring any AI-generated or manipulated content to be tagged with metadata or visible watermarks. Proponents argue that this approach promotes transparency and allows users to make informed judgments about authenticity. However, critics caution that watermarking techniques can be circumvented, and visual or metadata labels may not be meaningful if consumers do not understand their significance [46,47]. Additionally, malicious actors could easily manipulate or remove these labels, rendering the measure less effective unless backed by robust enforcement and technical safeguards.

Another approach involves regulating the development and deployment of generative technologies at their source. Model developers and software vendors could be subject to "responsible release" guidelines, which might include best practices for training data management, content validation, and security measures that thwart unauthorized usage. Governments and industry associations could jointly craft standards for safe model release, encouraging self-regulation while preserving room for innovation. Critics might argue that such standards impede open-source development and place small innovators at a disadvantage, underscoring the importance of creating frameworks that accommodate varying scales of activity. [48]

Platform-level interventions also play a pivotal role. Social and content-sharing platforms could be mandated to implement state-of-the-art detection algorithms to flag suspicious media. While detection techniques are not infallible, consistent adoption across major platforms could limit the virality of harmful deepfakes. Coupled with more nuanced moderation policies, platforms would be better positioned to respond rapidly to user reports and verified investigative findings. Yet, implementing universal detection technologies would demand substantial computational resources and ongoing maintenance, raising cost and feasibility questions for smaller platforms. [49]

An essential, albeit controversial, policy framework is algorithmic transparency. Calls for mandatory disclosures about how recommendation algorithms prioritize or suppress synthetic media echo broader debates about platform accountability. Transparency could extend to providing public access to datasets used for training detection models or to describing the weighting factors in content recommendation systems. Such disclosure would empower independent auditors and researchers to evaluate systemic biases and identify vulnerabilities. However, platform operators argue that excessive transparency risks revealing trade secrets and facilitating adversarial behavior. [50]

A complementary measure could be the creation of specialized oversight bodies or committees tasked with monitoring and evaluating synthetic media technologies. These groups, composed of technologists, ethicists, legal scholars, and civil society representatives, would review new developments, conduct risk assessments, and recommend updates to regulatory guidelines. By maintaining an agile, expert-led presence, such committees could adapt regulations to keep pace with rapid technological shifts. Success depends on the independence and resources of these bodies, which must be sufficiently robust to challenge powerful industry players and effectively lobby for policy adjustments.

Educational initiatives also form a cornerstone of responsible governance [51]. If users are made more aware of the capabilities and pitfalls of AI-generated content, they may develop better media literacy skills, recognizing synthetic media when encountered. Governments and civic organizations could integrate lessons on digital literacy and critical thinking into school curricula and public awareness campaigns. Although such efforts are long-term, they help foster an informed citizenry capable of navigating a media environment saturated with algorithmically generated content.

Moreover, the policy framework can leverage existing doctrines in related fields, such as biometric data regulation or cybercrime legislation, extending them to encompass synthetic representations. For example, if voiceprints or facial recognition data are already regulated under privacy laws, similar provisions could apply to AI-generated clones of individual voices or appearances [52]. This legislative alignment might streamline enforcement and reduce ambiguity, though it may require extensive revisions to existing laws to address the nuances of generative content.

Finally, international coordination is essential, given the global nature of digital platforms and the ease with which content crosses borders. Multilateral agreements, perhaps spearheaded by international organizations, could establish baseline ethical and legal standards for synthetic media. Such arrangements would mirror existing treaties on cybercrime, intellectual property, and human rights, but specifically target issues arising from AI-generated content. Although reaching a global consensus would be challenging, incremental progress—such as regional agreements or bilateral pacts—could pave the way for broader alignment over time. [53]

5. Implementation and Enforcement Mechanisms

Ensuring the efficacy of any regulatory framework for synthetic media hinges on robust implementation and enforcement mechanisms that can adapt to evolving technological conditions. One of the most common implementation strategies involves creating specialized, cross-disciplinary regulatory agencies or task forces. These entities would possess both the technical expertise to identify sophisticated manipulation techniques and the legal authority to impose penalties on violators. For example, an agency might conduct audits of platform detection systems to verify that they meet stipulated performance thresholds, and levy fines for non-compliance or for facilitating the distribution of harmful synthetic content. [54]

A critical challenge in implementation is monitoring compliance across a broad spectrum of industry participants, from large multinational platforms to niche content-hosting services. Automated tools that scan content for known deepfake or generative signatures can streamline this process. Such systems leverage machine learning to identify anomalies in pixel distribution, facial movements, or audio frequencies that are characteristic of manipulated media. However, malicious actors can employ adversarial techniques to circumvent these classifiers, requiring agencies and platforms to continually update their detection models. This arms race imposes significant resource demands on regulatory bodies and technology providers alike. [55]

Another enforcement avenue is the judicial system. Legislative acts could empower courts to order the immediate removal or deactivation of synthetic media proven to be malicious and to compel the disclosure of user data for investigative purposes. On the civil side, victims of deepfake attacks could be granted explicit legal recourse for redress, simplifying defamation suits and privacy breach claims. Rapid response injunctions would be especially critical when timely removal of deceptive content is essential to prevent irreparable harm. Yet, courts may face logistical hurdles, including jurisdictional disputes and the technical complexities of proving the inauthenticity of sophisticated media artifacts. [56]

Law enforcement and intelligence agencies also have a role to play, particularly in cases involving national security. For instance, deepfakes targeting military or diplomatic personnel can undermine strategic communications. Specialized training and technological

tools would allow these agencies to distinguish genuine intelligence from manipulated data. By collaborating with academia and private-sector experts, national security apparatuses can stay abreast of cutting-edge generative techniques and thereby enhance their detection capabilities. However, this cooperation raises confidentiality concerns, as revealing detection methods could enable hostile actors to engineer more elusive forgeries. [57]

Public-private partnerships are another viable approach for enforcement. Major technology companies, educational institutions, and government bodies can pool resources and expertise to develop open-source detection frameworks and detection data repositories. Initiatives like these foster shared standards and expedite innovations in synthetic media identification. Corporate signatories might agree to common best practices or code-of-conduct frameworks that align with newly enacted regulations. Such collaboration can enhance the scalability and sustainability of enforcement, although careful oversight is needed to ensure that private sector interests do not overshadow public accountability. [58]

Self-regulation, though not a panacea, can be an auxiliary mechanism for enforcement. Industry associations composed of AI developers and platform providers could establish certification programs or ethical codes. Compliance with these self-imposed standards would act as an indicator of corporate responsibility, potentially influencing consumer trust and investment. While voluntary measures lack the binding power of law, they can serve as an interim solution, especially in rapidly evolving domains where formal legislative processes lag behind innovation.

Technological countermeasures can also assist in enforcement [59]. These include digital watermarking, blockchain-based provenance tracking, and cryptographic verification systems. For instance, content creators could register genuine media on a blockchain, generating a tamper-evident record of authenticity. Users and platforms could automatically reference this database to verify whether a piece of content has been altered. While such systems are technically promising, they require broad adoption to be effective, and malicious actors will likely continue to exploit platforms that do not participate.

Another emerging concept is the idea of "forensic readiness." Organizations—be they media outlets, government bodies, or large corporations—prepare in advance for deepfake attacks by setting up protocols to rapidly debunk maliciously altered content [60]. This includes maintaining secure records of official communications, storing unedited raw footage for comparison, and training personnel to respond promptly and accurately when confronted with potential synthetic fabrications. Forensic readiness initiatives help organizations preserve credibility and reduce the latency between a deepfake's appearance and official denial.

Greater enforcement also demands a thorough consideration of privacy and civil rights. Overly aggressive monitoring or blanket scanning of user-generated content risks infringing on legitimate expression and personal freedoms. Consequently, agencies and platforms must strive for proportional responses that target harmful or high-risk content without casting a net so wide that it suppresses free speech [61]. Implementation guidelines might incorporate data minimization practices and transparent policies, clarifying how user data and metadata are processed for detection purposes.

Resource allocation remains a recurring obstacle in enforcing synthetic media regulations. Smaller platforms and local jurisdictions may lack the fiscal or technical capacity to maintain advanced detection systems or pursue complex legal investigations. Therefore, capacity-building initiatives, perhaps funded by national governments or philanthropic sources, can help level the playing field. Training programs, grants for detection research, and cross-jurisdictional resource sharing are potential pathways to more uniform enforcement. [62]

Finally, long-term effectiveness of enforcement requires ongoing evaluation and revision. Regulatory bodies must treat synthetic media governance as an iterative process, regularly assessing whether current laws, standards, and detection methods are sufficient to manage newly emerging technologies. Mechanisms for public feedback and expert consultations should be embedded into policy frameworks, allowing for continuous refinement.

This adaptive approach increases the likelihood that enforcement remains aligned with both technological realities and the evolving public interest in an era where AI-generated media will only grow more sophisticated.

6. Societal and Ethical Considerations

Beyond legal and technical mechanisms, the governance of synthetic media is deeply entangled with broader societal and ethical issues [63]. One pressing concern is the potential to exacerbate existing social biases and inequalities. AI models learn patterns from historical datasets, which may contain biased or discriminatory content. When these models generate new images or text, they can perpetuate or even amplify stereotypes, thereby codifying systemic inequities. Addressing such bias requires curating diverse and representative training data, along with continuous evaluation to ensure that generative systems do not replicate harmful disparities.

Another ethical dimension concerns the commodification of identity [64]. With the advent of deepfake technology, personal likeness can be replicated and commercialized without consent, raising questions about autonomy and the sanctity of individual identity. Celebrities and public figures might be the most visible targets, but ordinary citizens also face threats like impersonation scams or revenge deepfakes. Ethicists argue that individuals have a moral right to control how their image and voice are used, suggesting that policy frameworks should provide strong legal recourse for victims of non-consensual synthetic media.

On a collective level, the widespread adoption of synthetic media can corrode societal trust, as observers become increasingly uncertain about the authenticity of digital content. This skepticism undermines social cohesion and the informational bedrock of democratic discourse [65]. Habitual doubt regarding recorded events, public statements, or even personal communications can impair communal decision-making. Restoring trust may demand not just legal reforms but also a cultural shift in how we interpret digital media. Educational campaigns on media literacy and critical thinking can partially mitigate this erosion, but the challenge remains formidable.

Psychologically, frequent exposure to realistic yet fabricated content might alter how individuals process information [66]. Research in cognitive science indicates that people's ability to discern truth from falsehood can degrade under conditions of informational overload and when presented with highly convincing stimuli. This phenomenon poses existential questions about the viability of fact-based discourse in the digital age. Societies may risk fragmenting into enclaves of subjective "realities," each bolstered by synthetic narratives that confirm existing beliefs.

Another ethical issue arises in academic and scientific communities. Researchers rely heavily on visual data—such as medical imaging, satellite photographs, or microscopy—where fidelity is crucial [67,68]. Manipulated or synthetic research data can undermine scientific integrity, making it difficult to replicate findings or draw accurate conclusions. The infiltration of synthetic data into scholarly publications threatens the trustworthiness of the peer-review process and, by extension, the entire scientific method. Policymakers must consider how to protect the veracity of specialized datasets and ensure that academic misconduct involving synthetic content is swiftly identified and penalized.

The global digital divide presents yet another facet of the ethical equation. While advanced economies develop sophisticated detection tools and robust legal frameworks, low- and middle-income countries may lack the resources to manage the risks associated with synthetic media [69]. This disparity exacerbates vulnerabilities in regions already grappling with misinformation and political instability. Ethical governance of synthetic media, therefore, must account for cross-border inequities, perhaps through international funding mechanisms or technology transfers aimed at bolstering detection capabilities in underserved regions.

In the cultural domain, synthetic media has the potential to reshape storytelling, art, and historical interpretation. Artists can experiment with new forms of expression,

and museums might reconstruct lost artifacts through generative models. While these developments hold promise, they also provoke debates about authenticity in art and the ethics of creating historically accurate, yet artificially produced, cultural artifacts [70]. Societies must wrestle with how to value creativity that emerges from AI-driven tools versus traditional human-centered processes.

Emerging debates also focus on the moral implications of using synthetic media in spheres like psychotherapy or emotional support. Chatbots and avatars modeled after deceased relatives, for instance, introduce complex questions about consent, grieving processes, and the commodification of memory. These interactions straddle the line between therapeutic benefit and potential psychological manipulation. Regulatory bodies and ethics boards may need to delineate guidelines for how synthetic personas can be developed and utilized in sensitive contexts, balancing emotional well-being with the prevention of exploitation. [71]

Another dimension pertains to generational gaps in technology literacy. Younger demographics, often more adept at identifying manipulated content, may adapt more quickly to a world saturated with synthetic media. Older generations, less familiar with these techniques, might be disproportionately vulnerable to scams or disinformation. Policymakers and civil society organizations might focus on bridging these knowledge gaps through targeted education and community outreach, ensuring that older citizens do not become easy prey for malicious uses of deepfakes and AI-generated misdirection.

Finally, ethical frameworks must address the tension between innovation and precaution [72]. Overly restrictive regulations can stifle creativity and slow technological progress, while laissez-faire approaches risk paving the way for widespread misuse. Striking an equitable balance requires inclusive dialogues that incorporate perspectives from technology developers, ethicists, legal experts, and impacted communities. Only by considering the broader social fabric in which synthetic media is embedded can governance strategies remain ethically sound while nurturing the beneficial aspects of this transformative technology.

7. Conclusion

The governance of synthetic media represents a frontier challenge that intersects law, technology, ethics, and public policy, demanding strategies flexible enough to adapt to ongoing technological evolution. As highlighted throughout this paper, generative models—whether they produce realistic deepfakes or other forms of manipulated digital content—have outpaced existing regulatory structures, creating gaps that malicious actors can exploit [73]. In response, policymakers, platform providers, and researchers must converge on collaborative approaches that reconcile innovation with the imperatives of safety, trust, and social well-being.

A central lesson emerges from the spectrum of regulatory proposals, from mandatory labeling and risk-based categorization to platform-level interventions and algorithmic transparency. No single measure is sufficient on its own; layered solutions that combine legislation, market-driven standards, and educational initiatives stand a better chance of mitigating harm without stifling beneficial uses. Moreover, robust enforcement remains a perennial sticking point, requiring dedicated resources, cross-border cooperation, and adaptive legal mechanisms. Coordinated actions at the national and international levels will be critical to limit jurisdictional loopholes and ensure a consistent standard of accountability. [74]

The ethical and societal ramifications further complicate governance efforts. Synthetic media, by its very nature, challenges our assumptions about authenticity, identity, and trust. Widespread doubt in what we see or hear can undermine democratic discourse, social cohesion, and even the scientific enterprise. Addressing these impacts goes beyond legal instruments, calling for shifts in public awareness and cultural norms. Digital literacy programs, media education initiatives, and community-based forums can bolster resilience against disinformation, reducing the potency of deceptive synthetic content. [75]

At the same time, it is crucial to remember the constructive roles that synthetic media technologies can play in fields such as education, healthcare, and entertainment. Overly restrictive or hasty policies could stunt meaningful innovations. The challenge thus lies in threading the needle, ensuring we minimize harms while fostering an environment conducive to legitimate creativity and progress. Policymakers should emphasize proportionality, allowing for differentiated responses that reflect the risk profile of each application.

Harmonizing stakeholder perspectives remains a daunting but necessary objective [76]. Technologists, entrepreneurs, civil society advocates, and government officials often operate under differing priorities. While technology developers might prioritize openness and rapid iteration, governments focus on safeguarding the public interest, and civil society groups advocate for the protection of individual rights. Building consensus among these varied interests requires transparent dialogue, evidence-based policymaking, and a shared commitment to preserving both human welfare and technological innovation.

Finally, the future of synthetic media governance will likely be shaped by unforeseen developments in AI research. As generative models become more advanced, new challenges will emerge, from the automated production of lifelike avatars to real-time voice substitution tools that can elude even sophisticated detection methods [77]. Policymakers and industry leaders must adopt a forward-looking stance, establishing agile systems that can rapidly integrate emerging research insights into legal and regulatory frameworks. This ongoing vigilance and willingness to adapt will be essential in ensuring that synthetic media evolves in a manner that serves the public good rather than undermines it.

In sum, the rapid ascendance of synthetic media technology underscores the urgency of forging comprehensive policy and regulatory structures, informed by both technical sophistication and ethical prudence. By weaving together a tapestry of legal measures, platform responsibilities, educational programs, and cross-border agreements, society can leverage the positive potentials of AI-generated content while erecting safeguards against its pernicious abuses. This multifaceted, collaborative approach offers the most promising pathway to sustaining trust, fairness, and creative freedom in the digital age. [78]

References

1. ECR 2022 Book of Abstracts. *Insights into imaging* **2022**, *13*, 205–. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13244-022-01337-x.
2. Behrens, R.; Foutz, N.Z.; Franklin, M.; Funk, J.; Gutierrez-Navratil, F.; Hofmann, J.; Leibfried, U. Leveraging analytics to produce compelling and profitable film content. *Journal of Cultural Economics* **2020**, *45*, 171–211. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-019-09372-1.
3. Ramalepa, L.P.; Jamisola, R.S. A Review on Cooperative Robotic Arms with Mobile or Drones Bases. *International Journal of Automation and Computing* **2021**, *18*, 536–555. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11633-021-1299-7.
4. Yang, G.; Xu, K.; Fang, X.; Zhang, J. Video face forgery detection via facial motion-assisted capturing dense optical flow truncation. *The Visual Computer* **2022**, *39*, 5589–5608. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00371-022-02683-z.
5. Malavasi, S.; Barone, D.; Gavelli, G.; Bevilacqua, A. Can perfusion heterogeneity in CT perfusion maps of NSCLC flaw clinical considerations based on global mean blood flow values. *Insights into imaging* **2018**, *9*, 312–312. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13244-018-0603-8.
6. Stender, E.G.P.; Norrild, R.K.; Larsen, J.A.; Jensen, H.; Buell, A.K. High throughput determination of kinetic and thermodynamic parameters of biomolecular liquid-liquid phase separation [Capflex]. *European biophysics journal : EBJ* **2021**, *50*, 91–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00249-021-01558-w.
7. Masood, M.; Nawaz, M.; Malik, K.M.; Javed, A.; Irtaza, A.; Malik, H. Deepfakes generation and detection: state-of-the-art, open challenges, countermeasures, and way forward. *Applied Intelligence* **2022**, *53*, 3974–4026. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10489-022-03766-z.
8. Abada, A.; Abbrescia, M.; AbdusSalam, S.; Abdyukhanov, I.; Fernandez, J.A.; Abramov, A.; Aburaia, M.; Acar, A.O.; Adzic, P.; Agrawal, P.; et al. HE-LHC : The High-Energy Large Hadron Collider Future Circular Collider Conceptual Design Report Volume 4. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* **2019**, *228*, 1109–1382. https://doi.org/10.1140/epjst/e2019-900088-6.

9. Ghodhbani, H.; Neji, M.; Razzak, I.; Alimi, A.M. You can try without visiting: a comprehensive survey on virtually try-on outfits. *Multimedia tools and applications* **2022**, *81*, 19967–19998. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-022-12802-6.
10. Diniz, B.S.; Irungu, B.; Sibille, E.; Aizenstein, H.; Reynolds, C.F.; Butters, M.A.; Reisberg, Bao, J.; Arain, F.; Vedvyas, A.; et al. ACNP 57th Annual Meeting: Poster Session III. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **2018**, *43*, 383–527. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-018-0268-5.
11. Dramburg, S.; Walter, U.; Becker, S.; Casper, I.; Röseler, S.; Schareina, A.; Wrede, H.; Klimek, L. Telemedicine in allergology: practical aspects: A position paper of the Association of German Allergists (AeDA). *Allergo journal international* **2021**, *30*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40629-021-00167-5.
12. Li, Z.; Suping, W. From Traffic "Enclosure" to Cash Realization: Market Patterns and Investment Insights of China's Digital Content Industry in 2020–2021. *Publishing Research Quarterly* **2022**, *38*, 326–348. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-022-09878-1.
13. Revanur, A.; Basu, D.D.; Agrawal, S.; Agarwal, D.; Pai, D. MASK CONDITIONED IMAGE TRANSFORMATION BASED ON A TEXT PROMPT, 2024. US Patent App. 18/319,808.
14. 46th Annual Conference of AOMSI. *Journal of Maxillofacial and Oral Surgery* **2022**, *21*, 1–263. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12663-022-01816-0.
15. Khanum, A.; Lee, C.Y.; Hus, C.C.; Yang, C.S. Anticipating Autonomous Vehicle Driving based on Multi-Modal Multiple Motion Tasks Network. *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems* **2022**, *105*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10846-022-01677-2.
16. ACNP 60th Annual Meeting: Poster Abstracts P276 - P550. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology* **2021**, *46*, 218–368. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-021-01237-6.
17. von der Lippe, C.; Frich, J.C.; Harris, A.; Solbrække, K.N. Fabry disease: Female perspectives. *European Journal of Human Genetics* **2019**, *27*, 682–683. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-019-0404-7.
18. Nur, S.; Tun, K.M.; Al-Taweed, O.; Ahsan, C. An Unusual Case of Ventricular Fibrillation Arrest During Pregnancy. *Journal of general internal medicine* **2021**, *36*, 1–469. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-021-06830-5.
19. Abtracts. *Medizinische Genetik* **2018**, *30*, 101–224. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11825-018-0176-4.
20. Thorn, H.; Odent, S.; Lévy, J.; Tabet, A.; Thévenon, J.; Caignec, C.L.; Élise Schaefer.; Frébourg, T.; Schluth-Bolard, C.; Plutino, M.; et al. Abstracts from the 54th European Society of Human Genetics (ESHG) Conference: e-Posters. *European journal of human genetics : EJHG* **2022**, *30*, 88–608. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-021-01026-1.
21. Huaping, L. Analysis of coastal rainfall pattern based on artificial intelligence and global cultural communication. *Arabian Journal of Geosciences* **2021**, *14*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-021-08004-3.
22. Dagar, D.; Vishwakarma, D.K. A literature review and perspectives in deepfakes: generation, detection, and applications. *International Journal of Multimedia Information Retrieval* **2022**, *11*, 219–289. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13735-022-00241-w.
23. Revanur, A.; Basu, D.; Agrawal, S.; Agarwal, D.; Pai, D. Coralstyleclip: Co-optimized region and layer selection for image editing. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2023, pp. 12695–12704.
24. *ADAGSS: Automatic Dataset Generation for Semantic Segmentation*, Vol. 15, Germany, 2020. Springer Science and Business Media LLC. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11548-020-02171-6.
25. Gupta, C.; Chandrashekar, P.; Jin, T.; He, C.; Khullar, S.; Chang, Q.; Wang, D. Bringing machine learning to research on intellectual and developmental disabilities: taking inspiration from neurological diseases. *Journal of neurodevelopmental disorders* **2022**, *14*, 28–. https://doi.org/10.1186/s11689-022-09438-w.
26. Li, J.; Stukova, M.; Rubins, D.; França, P.D.D.S. Proceedings of the World Molecular Imaging Congress 2019, Montreal Quebec, Canada September 4-7, 2019: Late-Breaking Abstracts. *Molecular imaging and biology* **2019**, *21*, 167–335. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11307-019-01453-z.
27. Rauf, A.A. New Moralities for New Media? Assessing the Role of Social Media in Acts of Terror and Providing Points of Deliberation for Business Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics* **2020**, *170*, 229–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04635-w.
28. Society of Surgical Oncology 71st Annual Cancer Symposium. *Annals of Surgical Oncology* **2018**, *25*, 1–230. https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-018-6349-1.

29. Bhatt, M. Embodied architecture design : On people-centered design of visuo-locomotive cognitive experiences. *Cognitive processing* **2018**, *19*, 34–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-018-0884-3.
30. Pan, Y.; He, F.; Yu, H. A Correlative Denoising Autoencoder to Model Social Influence for Top-N Recommender System. *Frontiers of Computer Science* **2019**, *14*, 143301–. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11704-019-8123-3.
31. CARS 2022—Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery Proceedings of the 36th International Congress and Exhibition Tokyo, Japan, June 7–11, 2022. *International Journal of Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery* **2022**, *17*, 1–147. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11548-022-02635-x.
32. Cristianini, N.; Scantamburlo, T. On Social Machines for Algorithmic Regulation. *AI & SOCIETY* **2019**, *35*, 645–662. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-019-00917-8.
33. Aiello, E.; di San Pietro, C.B.; Pain, D.; Mora, G.; Marelli, M. Understanding phonemic fluency in motor neuron disease: insights from distributional semantic models. *Neurological sciences : official journal of the Italian Neurological Society and of the Italian Society of Clinical Neurophysiology* **2020**, *41*, 115–115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10072-020-04753-3.
34. Kahlon, N.K.; Singh, W. Machine translation from text to sign language: a systematic review. *Universal Access in the Information Society* **2021**, *22*, 1–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-021-00823-1.
35. Kaneda, Y.; Yogi, K.; Harvey, P.D.; Kallestrup, P.; Tiberica, L.; Czaja, S.J.; Wroolie, T.; Roat-Shumway, S.; Watson, K.; Rasgon, N.; et al. ACNP 58th Annual Meeting: Poster Session III. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology* **2019**, *44*, 385–538. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-019-0547-9.
36. Zanardelli, M.; Guerrini, F.; Leonardi, R.; Adami, N. Image forgery detection: a survey of recent deep-learning approaches. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* **2022**, *82*, 17521–17566. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-022-13797-w.
37. Song, H.; Park, K.; Cha, M. Finding epic moments in live content through deep learning on collective decisions. *EPJ Data Science* **2021**, *10*, 43–. https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-021-00295-6.
38. Harsha, S.S.; Revanur, A.; Agarwal, D.; Agrawal, S. GenVideo: One-shot target-image and shape aware video editing using T2I diffusion models. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2024, pp. 7559–7568.
39. Alam, S. Change in antibiotic regimen for emerging multidrug resistance in nosocomial ascitic fluid infection. *Hepatology international* **2019**, *14*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12072-020-10030-4;10.1007/s12072-019-10000-5.
40. 2020 CIS Annual Meeting: Immune Deficiency & Dysregulation North American Conference. *Journal of clinical immunology* **2020**, *40*, 1–163. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10875-020-00764-z.
41. Abstracts from the 39th Congress of the Société Internationale d'Urologie, Athens, Greece, October 17-20, 2019. *World journal of urology* **2019**, *37*, 1–344. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-019-02955-9.
42. Cerna, S.; Guyeux, C.; Laiymani, D. The usefulness of NLP techniques for predicting peaks in firefighter interventions due to rare events. *Neural computing & applications* **2022**, *34*, 10117–10132. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-022-06996-x.
43. Moore, M.; Coulter, J.; Bucholc, M.; Walker, C.A.; Sugrue, M. Prevention of incisional hernia post emergency laparotomy: A time to change? A case series. *European Journal of Trauma and Emergency Surgery* **2019**, *45*, 1–264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00068-019-01109-1.
44. Fardet, T.; Quaresima, A.; Bottani, S. DeNSE: modeling neuronal morphology and network structure in silico. *BMC neuroscience* **2019**, *20*, 22–95. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12868-019-0538-0.
45. Sear, T. Xenowar dreams of itself. *Digital War* **2020**, *4*, 35–42. https://doi.org/10.1057/s42984-020-00019-6.
46. Clement, P.; Castellaro, M.; Okell, T.W.; Thomas, D.L.; Gorgolewski, C.; Appelhoff, S.; Petr, J.; Chappell, M.A.; Mutsaerts, H.J.M.M. ASL-BIDS, the brain imaging data structure extension for arterial spin labeling. *Magma (New York, N.Y.)* **2019**, *32*, 107–233. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10334-019-00754-2.
47. Chhaya, N.; Pai, D.; Agarwal, D.; Puri, N.; Jain, P.; Kumaraguru, P. Automatic aggregation of online user profiles, 2019. US Patent 10,296,546.
48. Proceedings of the World Molecular Imaging Congress 2019, Montreal Quebec, Canada September 4-7, 2019: General Abstracts. *Molecular imaging and biology* **2019**, *21*, 1–166. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11307-019-01454-y.

49. Origlia, A.; Cutugno, F.; Rodà, A.; Cosi, P.; Zmarich, C. FANTASIA: a framework for advanced natural tools and applications in social, interactive approaches. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* **2019**, *78*, 13613–13648. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-019-7362-5.
50. Whitney, G.; Kolar, I. Am I missing something. *Universal Access in the Information Society* **2019**, *19*, 461–469. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-019-00648-z.
51. Strathearn, C.; Minhua, E. A Novel Speech to Mouth Articulation System for Realistic Humanoid Robots. *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems* **2021**, *101*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10846-021-01332-2.
52. Leal, E.C.; Figueiredo, A.E.; Santos, D.; Delibegovic, M.; Carvalho, E. Protein tyrosine phosphatase 1B inhibition promotes diabetic wound healing via activation of the antioxidant enzyme heme oxygenase 1. *Diabetologia* **2021**, *64*, 102–103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-021-05519-y.
53. Thong, E.P.; Milat, F.; Joham, A.E.; Ranasinha, S.; Ebeling, P.R.; Mishra, G.D.; Teede, H.J. Incident fracture and osteoporosis risk in middle-aged women with type 1 diabetes: A 15-year longitudinal study. *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* **2019**, *30*, 253–773. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-019-04993-w.
54. 74th Congress of the Italian Society of Pediatrics : Rome, Italy. 12-16 June 2018. *Italian journal of pediatrics* **2018**, *44*, 149–. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13052-018-0581-y.
55. Kalpokas, I. Problematising reality: the promises and perils of synthetic media. *SN social sciences* **2020**, *1*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-020-00010-8.
56. Tuerk, P.W.; Schaeffer, C.M.; McGuire, J.F.; Larsen, M.A.; Capobianco, N.B.; Piacentini, J. Adapting Evidence-Based Treatments for Digital Technologies: a Critical Review of Functions, Tools, and the Use of Branded Solutions. *Current psychiatry reports* **2019**, *21*, 106–106. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-019-1092-2.
57. Scientific Session of the 16th World Congress of Endoscopic Surgery, Jointly Hosted by Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES) & Canadian Association of General Surgeons (CAGS), Seattle, Washington, USA, 11-14 April 2018: Poster Abstracts. *Surgical endoscopy* **2018**, *32*, 130–359. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-018-6121-4.
58. Shatnawi, F.; Abdullah, M.; Hammad, M.; Al-Ayyoub, M. Comprehensive study of pre-trained language models: detecting humor in news headlines. *Soft Computing* **2022**, *27*, 2575–2599. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-022-07573-z.
59. Anantrasirichai, N.; Bull, D. Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review* **2021**, *55*, 1–68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10039-7.
60. Valente, A.; Marchetti, E. Simplifying Programming for Non-technical Students: A Hermeneutic Approach. *Kunstliche intelligenz* **2022**, *36*, 17–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13218-021-00748-0.
61. Loiacono, G.; Rulli, E. ResTech: innovative technologies for crisis resolution. *Journal of Banking Regulation* **2021**, *23*, 227–243. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41261-021-00154-4.
62. Costantini, S.; Gasperis, G.D.; Olivieri, R. Digital forensics and investigations meet artificial intelligence. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* **2019**, *86*, 193–229. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10472-019-09632-y.
63. IUGA 46th Virtual Annual Meeting. *International urogynecology journal* **2022**, *33*, 1–172. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00192-022-05079-8.
64. Pappis, H. 8th Congress of the International Federation for the Surgery of Obesity and Metabolic Disorders. *Obesity surgery* **2018**, *28*, 1–130. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-018-3200-5.
65. Andersen-Ranberg, K.; Thygesen, J.; Fournaise, A.V.; Ryg, J. The "GERI-toolbox". Initial outcomes of an e-Health instrument for the prevention of acute hospital admission of frail older adults. *European geriatric medicine* **2020**, *11*, 1–309. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-020-00428-6.
66. Chen, P.; Sun, H.; Fang, Y.; Huai, J. Collusion-Proof Result Inference in Crowdsourcing. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology* **2018**, *33*, 351–365. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11390-018-1823-6.
67. Zhang, B.; Rahmatullah, B.; Wang, S.L.; Zaidan, A.A.; Zaidan, B.B.; Liu, P. A review of research on medical image confidentiality related technology coherent taxonomy, motivations, open challenges and recommendations. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* **2020**, *82*, 21867–21906. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-020-09629-4.
68. Chhaya, N.; Agarwal, D.; Puri, N.; Jain, P.; Pai, D.; Kumaraguru, P. EnTwine: Feature analysis and candidate selection for social user identity aggregation. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining 2015, 2015, pp. 1575–1576.

69. Wang, P.; Zhang, S.; Billinghurst, M.; Bai, X.; He, W.; Wang, S.; Sun, M.; Zhang, X. A comprehensive survey of AR/MR-based co-design in manufacturing. *Engineering with Computers* **2019**, *36*, 1715–1738. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00366-019-00792-3.
70. Seewoo, B.J.; Feindel, K.W.; Etherington, S.J.; Hennessy, L.A.; Croarkin, P.; Rodger, J. Validation of the Chronic Restraint Stress Model of Depression in Rats and Investigation of Standard vs Accelerated rTMS Treatment. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology* **2019**, *44*, 122–123. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-019-0545-y.
71. Siddiqui, I.F.; Qureshi, N.M.F.; Chowdhry, B.S.; Uqaili, M.A. Pseudo-Cache-Based IoT Small Files Management Framework in HDFS Cluster. *Wireless Personal Communications* **2020**, *113*, 1495–1522. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11277-020-07312-3.
72. Reumerman, M.O.; Beukel, T.V.D.; Tichelaar, J.; Sultan, R.; Daelmans, H.E.M.; Springer, H.; Muller, M.; Richir, M.; van Agtmael, M.A. Clinical results of an inter-professional student-led medication review program. *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* **2019**, *75*, 49–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00228-019-02685-2.
73. Kane, S.; Lester, D.H.; Cameron, S.; Barratt, C.L.; da Silva, S.M.; Brown, S.G. Identification of two homozygous mutations, in the male reproductive tract specific beta-defensin 126/128 genes, potentially underlie a severe sperm dysfunction. *European journal of human genetics : EJHG* **2020**, *28*, 158–158. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-020-00739-z.
74. Hilty, D.M.; Armstrong, C.M.; Edwards-Stewart, A.; Gentry, M.T.; Luxton, D.D.; Krupinski, E.A. Sensor, Wearable, and Remote Patient Monitoring Competencies for Clinical Care and Training: Scoping Review. *Journal of technology in behavioral science* **2021**, *6*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41347-020-00190-3.
75. Webber, C. Rediscovering the Relative Deprivation and Crime Debate: Tracking its Fortunes from Left Realism to the Precariat. *Critical criminology* **2021**, *30*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-021-09554-4.
76. The 96th Annual Meeting of The Physiological Society of Japan. *The journal of physiological sciences : JPS* **2019**, *69*, 1–314. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12576-019-00673-w.
77. Goering, S.; Klein, E.; Sullivan, L.S.; Wexler, A.; y Arcas, B.A.; Bi, G.Q.; Carmena, J.M.; Fins, J.J.; Friesen, P.; Gallant, J.L.; et al. Recommendations for Responsible Development and Application of Neurotechnologies. *Neuroethics* **2021**, *14*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-021-09468-6.
78. Katija, K.; Orenstein, E.; Schlining, B.; Lundsten, L.; Barnard, K.; Sainz, G.; Boulais, O.; Cromwell, M.; Butler, E.; Woodward, B.; et al. FathomNet: A global image database for enabling artificial intelligence in the ocean. *Scientific reports* **2022**, *12*, 15914–. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-19939-2.