Impact of Generative AI on the Use and Reliability of Video Evidence

[1]Diluka Wijesinghe
Dept. of Software Engineering & Information Systems
NSBM Green University
Mahenwaththa, Pitipana, Homagama, Sri Lanka
diluka.w@nsbm.ac.lk

***Abstract*— The emergence of generative artificial intelligence (AI), particularly in the form of deepfakes, presents profound challenges to the reliability and admissibility of video evidence within legal and investigative frameworks. This paper critically examines the implications of AI-generated video manipulation on judicial processes, focusing on the erosion of evidentiary trust and the inadequacies of existing detection methodologies. Through a rigorous analysis of state-of-the-art detection techniques and the evolving legal landscape, this study underscores the urgent need for technological, legal, and ethical advancements to counter the risks posed by AI-manipulated media. Key findings indicate that current forensic tools are insufficient in identifying sophisticated deepfake content, necessitating the development of more robust verification mechanisms and a reevaluation of evidentiary standards. The paper concludes by proposing a multidisciplinary approach to fortify the integrity of video evidence in the AI era, combining technological innovation, legal reform, and international regulatory collaboration.**

Keywords*— *Generative AI, Deepfakes, Video Forensics, Legal Standards, AI Ethics, Digital Manipulation

I. INTRODUCTION

The advent of generative artificial intelligence (AI) and its application in creating deepfakes has introduced unprecedented challenges to the reliability and authenticity of video evidence. Deepfakes, which are hyper-realistic synthetic media generated using techniques such as generative adversarial networks (GANs), have the potential to convincingly alter video and audio content, making it difficult to distinguish between real and fabricated footage. This technology has sparked significant concerns in legal, ethical, and societal domains due to its ability to manipulate reality with high precision.

Video evidence has traditionally been one of the most trusted forms of evidence in legal proceedings due to its visual and auditory components, which offer seemingly irrefutable proof of events. However, the introduction of deepfakes threatens this trust, as these AI-generated videos can be used to create deceptive content that appears authentic. This poses a severe threat to the integrity of legal processes, where the authenticity of evidence is paramount [1].

The implications of deepfakes extend beyond the courtroom. They have been employed in various malicious activities, such as disinformation campaigns, political manipulation, and personal vendettas, thereby eroding public trust in digital media. As deepfake technology becomes more accessible and sophisticated, the potential for misuse increases, raising critical ethical concerns and necessitating new legal frameworks to address these challenges [2][3].

The legal system faces a significant challenge in adapting to this new reality. Current standards for the admissibility and authentication of video evidence are not fully equipped to handle the complexities introduced by AI-generated content. The burden of proof, traditionally placed on the party presenting the evidence, becomes complicated when the authenticity of video content can be easily questioned due to the potential for deepfakes [2].

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction to Generative AI

Generative AI encompasses advanced machine learning models designed to create new data instances that mimic a given dataset. Among the primary frameworks are Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) and Variational Autoencoders (VAEs). GANs, introduced by Goodfellow et al. [4], involve a dual-network system: a generator and a discriminator that engage in adversarial training to enhance the realism of generated data. VAEs, proposed by Kingma and Welling [4], utilize probabilistic models to learn latent variables and generate new samples from learned distributions. These technologies have transformative applications, including image synthesis, creative arts, and video production, raising significant implications for the integrity and trustworthiness of video evidence.

B. Generative AI and Video Evidence

Generative AI technologies, particularly deepfakes, have significantly altered the landscape of video evidence. Deepfakes utilize GANs to create highly realistic video content by manipulating facial features, voices, and expressions [5]. This capability has profound implications for video evidence, enabling the creation of convincingly fabricated content that challenges traditional verification processes [6].

Techniques such as face-swapping and audio synchronization have demonstrated the potential to produce deceptively realistic videos, complicating the verification process for legal and investigative purposes.

C. Impact on the Use of Video Evidence

Detection techniques for manipulated video content include forensic algorithms and deep learning models designed to identify inconsistencies and anomalies in video data [7]. Advances in AI forensics focus on improving the accuracy and efficiency of these detection methods [8]. Traditional verification methods are increasingly inadequate as generative technologies evolve, highlighting the need for new forensic tools and methodologies [9].

D. Reliability Concerns

The rise of generative AI technologies raises significant concerns about the reliability of video evidence. Traditional verification methods struggle to keep pace with the realism of generated content, necessitating the development of new forensic approaches [9]. Additionally, the potential for misinformation is exacerbated by the ability of generative AI to produce realistic yet false videos, which can distort public opinion and contribute to societal harm [10]. Ethical considerations, including privacy, consent, and the potential for misuse, are crucial in addressing the responsible use of generative AI for video manipulation [11].

E. Countermeasures and Detection

To combat the challenges posed by generative AI, various detection methods are being refined, including forensic algorithms and deep learning models [12]. Advances in AI forensics aim to enhance the effectiveness of these techniques, addressing the growing sophistication of deepfake technologies [13]. Effective policy and regulation are essential to manage the risks associated with generative AI, including developing guidelines for responsible use and controlling the dissemination of manipulated content [4].

F. Case Studies and Real-World Examples

High-profile cases involving deepfakes, such as political misinformation campaigns and celebrity defamation, illustrate the practical implications of manipulated video evidence [14]. Analyzing these cases reveals broader implications for legal proceedings, public trust, and law enforcement's ability to manage synthetic media [9].

G. Future Directions

As generative AI technologies continue to advance, they will present new challenges for video evidence. Researchers should anticipate these developments and prepare adaptive strategies for detection and verification [8]. Future research should focus on developing more robust detection methods, enhancing forensic techniques, and implementing comprehensive policies to mitigate the risks associated with generative AI [11].

Although numerous studies have explored the detection of deepfakes, there are significant gaps in the literature. Most notably, existing research lacks a comprehensive evaluation of the scalability of detection tools as deepfake technology becomes more accessible. Additionally, few studies examine the legal implications of AI-generated video evidence in courtrooms, where current standards are insufficient to handle the complexity of AI-manipulated media.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study utilizes a comprehensive methodological approach to examine the impact of generative AI on video evidence. The approach integrates theoretical analysis, empirical case studies, and technical evaluation to provide a detailed understanding of how generative AI technologies influence the credibility and use of video evidence.

A. Theoretical Analysis

The study begins with a theoretical analysis of generative AI technologies, specifically Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) and Variational Autoencoders (VAEs). This involves a thorough review of existing literature to comprehend the fundamental principles, architectures, and training processes of GANs and VAEs. The analysis covers seminal research papers, technical reports, and recent advancements to grasp the capabilities of these models in generating and manipulating video content.

B. Empirical Case Studies

To complement the theoretical analysis, the study conducts empirical case studies of real-world instances where generative AI technologies have been applied to video manipulation. Case studies are selected based on their relevance to the use of generative AI in video creation and their impact on social, legal, or ethical dimensions. The analysis involves reviewing news reports, legal documents, and academic articles to assess how generative AI was employed, the techniques used, and the resulting implications for video evidence integrity.

C. Technical Evaluation

The technical evaluation focuses on assessing the effectiveness of various detection methods for manipulated video content. This includes a review of existing detection techniques, such as forensic algorithms and machine learning models, as well as emerging technologies like blockchain for video verification. The evaluation involves comparing these methods based on performance metrics such as accuracy, false positives, and false negatives, and identifying strengths and weaknesses in current detection technologies.

D. Data Sources

Data for the study is collected from multiple sources to support the theoretical analysis, case studies, and technical evaluation. Key sources include:

- Literature: Peer-reviewed academic journals, technical reports from research institutions, and conference papers discussing

advancements in generative AI and video manipulation.

- Case Studies: Media coverage, legal documents, and research papers detailing incidents of video manipulation and its impact.
- Detection Techniques: Research on forensic analysis and machine learning-based detection methods, industry reports on advancements in video detection technologies, and documentation for relevant detection tools.

E. Analytical Framework

The analysis employs a robust framework combining theoretical, forensic, and legal perspectives. This framework includes:

- Generative AI Theory: Examining the mechanisms and capabilities of GANs and VAEs in generating and altering video content.
- Forensic Science Principles: Applying forensic principles to evaluate the authenticity and integrity of video evidence.
- Legal and Ethical Considerations: Incorporating legal and ethical perspectives to assess the implications of video manipulation and the effectiveness of current detection methods.

Additionally, the study reviews various generative AI models and detection methods. It includes an analysis of GAN architecture and training processes, VAEs for video synthesis, machine learning models for detecting anomalies, and forensic techniques for identifying manipulation traces. A comparative analysis benchmarks detection methods and evaluates their performance in real-world scenarios.

IV. GENERATIVE AI TECHNOLOGIES

Generative AI has significantly advanced the field of artificial intelligence by enabling the creation of highly realistic synthetic data. This section examines the foundational mechanisms of generative AI, focusing on Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) and Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), and explores their applications in video generation and manipulation.

A. Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)

Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), introduced by Goodfellow et al. [4], consist of two neural networks—the generator and the discriminator—that engage in a competitive process. The generator aims to create synthetic data from random noise, while the discriminator evaluates the authenticity of this data compared to real data. This iterative process continues until the generator produces data that the discriminator cannot distinguish from genuine data, resulting in highly realistic synthetic outputs.

B. Variational Autoencoders (VAEs)

Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) apply a probabilistic approach to data generation. They consist of an encoder and a decoder. The encoder maps input data to a latent space, representing it as a distribution rather than a fixed point, capturing the underlying variations. The decoder reconstructs data from this latent space, generating new instances by sampling from the learned distribution. VAEs balance reconstruction accuracy with latent space compactness, facilitating the generation of diverse and coherent data.

C. Techniques for Video Generation and Manipulation

Generative AI techniques, particularly deepfakes, have transformed video content creation and manipulation. Deepfakes leverage GANs to produce hyper-realistic videos by altering or fabricating the appearance and actions of individuals. Key techniques include:

- **Face Swapping**: Replacing an individual's face in a video with another's, achieved through GANs trained on extensive facial datasets.
- **Lip Syncing**: Synchronizing lip movements with an audio track to create convincing fake speech videos.
- **Motion Transfer**: Transferring the movements of one person to another, enabling the creation of videos depicting actions not originally performed by the target individual.

These techniques exploit GANs' capability to generate realistic facial expressions and movements, posing significant challenges in distinguishing real from manipulated video content.

V. MANIPULATION OF VIDEO EVIDENCE

The advancement of generative AI has introduced sophisticated methods for creating and manipulating video content, leading to significant concerns about the authenticity and reliability of video evidence. This section explores the techniques used for generating deepfakes, methods for detecting them, and provides real-world examples to illustrate these manipulations.

A. Creating Deepfakes

Face Swapping Face swapping involves using Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) to replace the face of one individual with another in a video. This technique is facilitated by training models on images of both the target and source faces, enabling accurate mapping of facial expressions and movements. While face swapping has applications in entertainment and media, it also raises risks related to misinformation and fraud.

Lip Syncing Lip syncing generates videos where the lip movements of a person align with an audio track. This is achieved through audio-driven GANs or Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), which synchronize lip movements with spoken words. This

technique is used to create realistic speech videos for dubbed content and virtual avatars, enhancing the realism of digital media.

Motion Transfer Motion transfer involves animating one individual's movements onto another. Techniques such as the First Order Motion Model utilize keypoint detection and motion fields to animate the target subject. This method is employed to create animated versions of still images or historical figures and for virtual puppetry.

B. Detecting Deepfakes

Artifact Detection Artifact detection focuses on identifying inconsistencies and anomalies in videos, such as unnatural eye movements, inconsistent lighting, or irregular facial features. Tools like DeepFake-o-meter and FaceForensics++ leverage machine learning to detect these subtle artifacts.

Deep Learning-based Detection Deep learning-based detection employs Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and other advanced architectures to identify deepfakes. These methods involve training models on extensive datasets of real and fake videos to recognize patterns indicative of manipulation.

Temporal Analysis Temporal analysis examines the coherence of video frames over time to identify irregularities. This method studies the consistency of facial expressions and movements frame-by-frame to detect anomalies that suggest manipulation.

Watermarking and Digital Signatures Watermarking and digital signatures embed invisible markers into video content for authentication. Cryptographic techniques are used to ensure that any alteration can be detected by verifying the integrity of the embedded watermark or digital signature.

VI. Impact on Legal and Judicial Systems

Generative AI technologies have profoundly impacted the legal landscape, introducing both opportunities and significant challenges regarding video evidence. This section explores the legal ramifications, the difficulties in verifying video authenticity, and the implications for law enforcement and investigative processes.

A. Legal Implications of AI-Generated Video Evidence

The rise of AI-generated video content necessitates the establishment of new evidentiary standards. Courts are required to develop robust criteria for assessing the authenticity and admissibility of digital evidence. This involves ensuring a secure chain of custody to prevent tampering and guarantee the integrity of the evidence.

AI-generated videos pose risks of fabrication, which can lead to wrongful accusations or defenses. Legal frameworks must address the complexities of liability associated with the creation and dissemination of deepfakes, encompassing defamation and privacy violations. As a response, jurisdictions are beginning to implement targeted legislation that criminalizes harmful uses of AI-generated content, alongside developing comprehensive regulatory frameworks to govern the ethical use of these technologies.

B. Challenges Faced by the Judicial System in Verifying Video Authenticity

The judicial system faces significant challenges in verifying the authenticity of video evidence due to the rapid evolution of AI technologies. Expert testimony has become increasingly crucial, requiring courts to rely on forensic analysts with specialized skills in detecting AI-manipulated content. Additionally, the judicial system must continuously update its knowledge and capabilities to keep pace with technological advancements.

Resource constraints further complicate the verification process. Analyzing and validating digital evidence can be both time-consuming and costly, straining judicial resources. Smaller jurisdictions, in particular, may struggle with limited access to advanced forensic tools necessary for effective deepfake detection. The traditional presumptions of video authenticity are also challenged by sophisticated manipulation techniques, requiring new methods for establishing and proving the legitimacy of video content.

C. Impact on Law Enforcement and Investigations

Generative AI technologies have significant implications for law enforcement and investigative processes. The potential for evidence tampering through deepfake technology complicates investigations and increases the risk of wrongful convictions or acquittals. Additionally, the spread of misinformation through fake videos can mislead investigations and divert resources from genuine leads.

To address these challenges, law enforcement agencies must invest in both training and advanced technology to stay abreast of developments in generative AI. Effective strategies require enhanced collaboration with technology companies, cybersecurity experts, and academic researchers. Public trust in the justice system depends on the credibility of video evidence, making it essential for law enforcement to engage in public awareness campaigns about the risks of deepfake technology and promote digital literacy.

VII. Case Studies

A. The "Nancy Pelosi Deepfake"

In 2019, a manipulated video of U.S. Speaker Nancy Pelosi was disseminated on social media, depicting her as inebriated. This deepfake was created using DeepFaceLab, which leverages Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) to overlay altered facial expressions on original footage. The GAN was trained on a dataset of Pelosi's images to generate synthetic expressions and lip movements. Detection involved forensic analysis combined with machine learning techniques to identify discrepancies in audio-visual synchronization and facial motion artifacts.

B. The "BBC Deepfake Experiment"

In 2020, the BBC conducted an experiment to demonstrate the capabilities and potential misuse of deepfake technology by fabricating an interview with a prominent public figure. This deepfake was produced using advanced Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) and voice synthesis algorithms, which simulated realistic facial features and speech patterns. Detection methods included analyzing video metadata and employing AI-based forensic tools to identify inconsistencies in the audio-visual data.

C. "Deepfake Pornography Scandals"

High-profile incidents involving deepfake pornography have emerged, where celebrities' faces were superimposed onto explicit content without their consent. This manipulation utilized GAN-based software, such as FaceApp, trained on extensive datasets of the celebrities' images. Detection efforts focused on identifying artifacts such as unnatural facial movements and lighting inconsistencies in the manipulated content.

D. Comparative Analysis

The Pelosi deepfake aimed to manipulate political perceptions, highlighting how generative AI can alter political narratives. The BBC experiment served as a controlled illustration of deepfake technology's capabilities and risks, whereas deepfake pornography cases exemplify the exploitation and privacy violations enabled by these technologies.

Detection of the Pelosi deepfake utilized traditional forensic techniques, while the BBC's experiment underscored the effectiveness of advanced AI-based detection tools. In contrast, deepfake pornography detection relied on sophisticated image analysis to uncover visual inconsistencies.

The impact of manipulated videos on public trust and perception is profound, emphasizing the need for robust detection mechanisms. The use of generative AI for non-consensual explicit content raises significant ethical and legal concerns, underscoring the necessity for comprehensive regulatory frameworks. As AI technology advances, continuous innovation in forensic methods and detection tools remains essential.

These case studies illustrate the transformative power of generative AI while highlighting the pressing need for advanced detection strategies and regulatory measures to address the associated risks and ethical issues.

VIII. DISCUSSION

The empirical case studies and technical evaluations presented in this paper reveal critical gaps in the current capabilities of forensic tools to detect AI-manipulated video content. Specifically, deepfake detection techniques, such as artifact detection and deep learning-based approaches, exhibit high rates of false negatives when faced with increasingly sophisticated manipulation methods, including real-time facial reenactment and audio-visual synchronization. These findings highlight the limitations of existing detection technologies, which are often unable to keep pace with the rapid advancements in generative AI.

The case studies, including high-profile examples such as the manipulated video of U.S. Speaker Nancy Pelosi, illustrate the far-reaching implications of deepfake technology in undermining public trust in video evidence. In this case, traditional forensic techniques were inadequate in identifying the deepfake, necessitating the development of more advanced detection mechanisms. The "BBC Deepfake Experiment" further emphasizes the challenge by demonstrating how AI-generated content can convincingly mimic reality, even in controlled environments. These real-world examples underscore the growing need for improved detection capabilities to safeguard the integrity of video evidence in legal and investigative contexts.

Moreover, a critical review of the literature reveals a significant gap between the current state of deepfake detection technologies and the standards required for the admissibility of digital evidence in courtrooms. Current legal frameworks, which traditionally rely on the presumption of video authenticity, are increasingly inadequate in dealing with AI-generated content. As the sophistication of generative AI grows, so too does the risk of wrongful convictions or acquittals due to undetectable manipulations in video evidence.

In light of these findings, this paper argues that a multidisciplinary approach is essential to address the challenges posed by AI-manipulated media. Advancements in forensic technologies must be accompanied by legal reform to establish robust evidentiary standards capable of adapting to the evolving landscape of digital media. Without this integrated approach, both legal systems and forensic methods will continue to lag behind the capabilities of generative AI, compromising the credibility of video evidence.

IX. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Predictions for Generative AI and Associated Risks

Generative AI is evolving rapidly, driven by advancements in algorithms, computational power, and data. Key trends and risks include:

- Increased Realism and Accessibility: Future models will generate highly realistic content, making it challenging to distinguish between genuine and synthetic media. The widespread availability of these tools may also facilitate malicious uses.
- Integration with Emerging Technologies: Generative AI is likely to integrate with AR, VR, and IoT, creating immersive and potentially manipulative content, which could blur the lines between reality and virtual media.

- Ethical and Societal Challenges: Enhanced capabilities will escalate misinformation and disinformation risks, undermining public trust and raising privacy concerns due to the misuse of personal data.

B. *Recommendations for Mitigating Risks*

- Detection and Verification: Invest in advanced detection technologies and establish industry-wide standards to ensure reliable identification of manipulated content.
- Policy and Regulation: Develop comprehensive legislation to address the creation and misuse of manipulated videos, incorporating strict privacy protections and penalties for malicious use.
- Transparency and Accountability: Require disclosure of synthetic content and implement mechanisms to hold creators accountable for malicious activities.
- Public and Professional Education: Launch awareness campaigns to educate the public on AI-generated content and provide specialized training for legal and forensic professionals.

C. *Enhancing Video Evidence Reliability*

- **Digital Watermarking and Blockchain:** Use digital watermarks for traceability and blockchain for immutable records to ensure video authenticity and integrity.
- **AI-Augmented Verification:** Develop AI tools for verifying video content against databases and integrate cross-platform systems for comprehensive verification.
- **Collaboration and Standards:** Foster collaboration among technology companies, regulators, and researchers to develop global standards for video evidence verification and manipulation detection.

These measures are crucial for addressing the challenges of generative AI and ensuring the integrity of video evidence in an evolving technological landscape.

X. CONCLUSION

This paper has explored the profound implications of generative AI, particularly deepfake technologies, on the reliability of video evidence in legal and investigative contexts. Through an analysis of existing detection methods and a review of high-profile case studies, it is clear that current forensic tools are insufficient to meet the challenges posed by sophisticated AI-generated content. The findings underscore the urgent need for more advanced detection techniques, alongside a reevaluation of legal standards governing the admissibility of digital evidence.

The results of this study reveal not only the technological gaps but also the legal and ethical challenges that must be addressed to preserve the integrity of video evidence. As generative AI technologies continue to evolve, their potential for misuse will likely increase, raising critical concerns for both law enforcement and the judicial system. It is therefore imperative that future research focuses on developing robust detection mechanisms that can keep pace with AI-driven media manipulation.

In conclusion, this paper advocates for a comprehensive approach that combines technological innovation, legal reform, and ethical guidelines to mitigate the risks posed by generative AI. Collaboration among technologists, legal experts, and policymakers will be crucial in ensuring that the integrity of video evidence is maintained in an increasingly digital world. Future research should aim to bridge the gap between forensic capabilities and legal standards, ensuring that video evidence remains a trusted component of the judicial process.

REFERENCES

[1] C. Law, "Journal of Digital Forensics, Security and Law," vol. 6, no. 3, 2011

[2] R. Chesney and D. Citron, "Deepfakes and the new disinformation war: The coming age of post-truth geopolitics," Foreign Affairs, vol. 98, p. 147, 2019.

[3] A. Godulla, C. P. Hoffmann, and D. Seibert, "Dealing with deepfakes—an interdisciplinary examination of the state of research and implications for communication studies," SCM Studies in Communication and Media, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 72-96, 2021.

[4] I. Goodfellow et al., "Generative adversarial nets," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 27, 2014.

[5] P. Korshunov and S. Marcel, "Deepfakes: A new threat to face recognition? Assessment and detection," arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.08685, 2018.

[6] L. T. Phan et al., "Importation and human-to-human transmission of a novel coronavirus in Vietnam," New England Journal of Medicine, vol. 382, no. 9, pp. 872-874, 2020.

[7] N. Aldausari, "Audio-to-Video Synthesis using Generative Adversarial Network," Ph.D. dissertation, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 2024.

[8] V. Singh, A. Dixit, S. Pandey, B. V. Kumar, V. Pachouri, and M. Sahu, "Role of Artificial Intelligence in Criminal Investigation," in 2023 International Conference on Quantum Technologies, Communications, Computing, Hardware and Embedded Systems Security (iQ-CCHESS), Sep. 2023, pp. 1-4. IEEE.

[9] S. Lyu, "Deepfake detection," in Multimedia Forensics, pp. 313-331. Singapore: Springer Singapore, 2022.

[10] A. Agarwal, A. Agarwal, S. Sinha, M. Vatsa, and R. Singh, "MD-CSDNetwork: Multi-domain cross stitched network for deepfake detection," in 2021 16th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition (FG 2021), Dec. 2021, pp. 1-8. IEEE.

[11] W. Lu, L. Liu, B. Zhang, J. Luo, X. Zhao, Y. Zhou, and J. Huang, "Detection of deepfake videos using long-distance attention," IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems, 2023.

[12] A. Sufian, "AI-Generated Videos and Deepfakes: A Technical Primer," Authorea Preprints, 2024.

[13] I. Chaudhuri and B. D. Hemmige, "DEEP FAKE: An emerging threat in the digital media manipulation," Sampreshan, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 833-861, ISSN: 2347-2979, UGC CARE Group 1, 2024.

[14] T. Wang, H. Cheng, K. P. Chow, and L. Nie, "Deep convolutional pooling transformer for deepfake detection," ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 1-20, 2023.

[15] S. D. Nelson, J. W. Simek, and M. Maschke, "Detecting deepfakes," Law Practice, vol. 46, p. 42, 2020.

[16] C. Vaccari and A. Chadwick, "Deepfakes and disinformation: Exploring the impact of synthetic political video on deception, uncertainty, and trust in news," Social Media+ Society, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 2056305120903408, 2020.