

Disinformation and Legal Responsibility: Regulating Digital Speech Without Curtailing Dissent

Ivan. Petrov¹, Rajeev. Kumar^{2*}

¹ Department of Public Law, Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

² Department of Public Law, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

* Corresponding author email address: rajeev.kumar@du.ac.in

Received: 2025-02-05	Revised: 2025-03-13	Accepted: 2025-03-21	Published: 2025-04-01
EDITOR: Ghasem Eftekhari  Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. Email: eftekhari@ut.ac.ir			
REVIEWER 1: Abdus Samad  Assistant Professor, Department of Law, AWKUM, Pakistan . Email: abdussamad@awkum.edu.pk			
REVIEWER 2: Nabeel Bani-Hani  Faculty of Education Specialization, Wasit University, Wasit, Iraq. Email: nabeelhani@uowasit.edu.iq			

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Recommend including brief examples or citations of specific national laws (e.g., Singapore's POFMA or India's IT Rules) to support this general observation.

Suggest clarifying whether these cases reflect constitutional weaknesses or political misuse. The distinction is important for the article's legal focus.

Consider citing landmark ECtHR cases such as *Handyside v. UK* or *Delfi AS v. Estonia* to support this point more robustly.

Recommend elaborating on the timeline of this shift. When did the platform response to disinformation begin to intensify? Was it in response to electoral interference, COVID-19, or another trigger?

Suggest providing one or two illustrative examples (e.g., India's request for content takedown from Twitter) to anchor this claim in practice.

Please discuss briefly the effectiveness of these measures. Have empirical studies supported or challenged their impact?

It might strengthen the argument to cite Chilling Effect theory or scholarship (e.g., Frederick Schauer) for theoretical grounding.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Consider clarifying what "democratic ideals" entails—does it refer to free press, public deliberation, or electoral integrity?

Recommend referencing standard definitions from UNESCO or WHO to strengthen the distinction between disinformation and misinformation.

This is an important transition point—suggest incorporating a clearer subheading or internal summary sentence to guide the reader.

This is well-developed, but the article would benefit from a brief mention of criticisms of the DSA, such as concerns over enforcement or impact on smaller platforms.

Recommend citing data or NGO reports (e.g., Reporters Without Borders) to demonstrate the scale or frequency of such abuses.

The article could benefit from a quoted statutory clause from Pakistan, Bangladesh, or another relevant jurisdiction to show the vagueness in wording.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.