ISSLP
Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law and Politics

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Challenges in Realizing Civil Liability in Robotic Technology

Elaheh Sadat. Hosseini[1], Younes. Vahed Yarijan[2*], Samaneh. Yazdani[3]

[1] PhD Student, Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
[3] Assistant Professor, Department of Artificial Intelligence, North Tehran Branch, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address**: vahedyarijanyounes@gmail.com

Received: 2024-08-13 **Revised:** 2024-10-17 **Accepted:** 2024-10-22 **Published:** 2024-12-01

EDITOR:
Cavid Qasımov
Prof, Faculty Of Letters Department Of History, Van Yuzuncu Yıl University, Van, Turkiye
cavidqasimov@yyu.edu.tr
REVIEWER 1:
Mustafa Kaan Tuysuz
Institute of Social Sciences, Siirt Universite, Siirt, Turkey. Email: AhmetKılıç@siirt.edu.tr
REVIEWER 2:
Pınar Reisoğlu
Faculty of Social Sciences, Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Rize, Turkey. Email: pinarreisoglu@erdogan.edu.tr

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence, "This article... examines current challenges associated with highly sophisticated AI-enabled autonomous robots," could benefit from specifying key challenges or examples to provide a clearer preview of the findings.

The phrase, "Instances include the determination of liability in cases where the perpetrator of harm is not at fault," requires elaboration. Provide examples to clarify scenarios of no-fault liability in robotics contexts.

"The correlation between acts and resulting harm has become increasingly distorted." Could you expand on how industrial and technological advancements specifically contribute to this distortion? Including examples from AI or robotics would enhance clarity.

The example of vicarious liability could be strengthened by providing a detailed case study or precedent where a robot was indirectly involved in criminal activity.

The discussion of "Fatty robot" and "Da Vinci surgical robot" lacks depth. Expand on the legal outcomes of these cases or their implications for robotic liability frameworks.

The example of the nurse robot, "Stevie," is compelling but underdeveloped. Discuss how regulatory standards for medical robots address such liabilities.

The statement, "Some legal scholars assert that ascertaining the causal link... is a philosophical issue," needs elaboration. Include examples of how philosophical debates influence legal interpretations in robotics liability.

The example of multiple sequential causes in the digging of wells is clear but dated. Replace or supplement with examples from contemporary technology.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The section introduces Asimov's laws without critically evaluating their applicability in modern robotics. Include commentary on whether these laws are realistic and sufficient for addressing contemporary legal challenges.

The argument that robots exhibit "free will" is contentious. Clarify whether this is a metaphorical use or aligns with philosophical definitions of free will. Cite relevant literature for robustness.

The sentence, "A person must not commit a fault while exercising their right," could be supported with legal provisions or case law to solidify its basis.

The argument about omissions needs refinement. For example, is there a legal distinction between passive and active negligence in robotics contexts? Including references would add depth.

Clarify how societal judgment is operationalized in legal terms. For instance, are there guidelines or frameworks used by courts to assess societal attribution?

The phrase, "These advances require formulating laws," is vague. Propose specific areas of law (e.g., civil liability, intellectual property) that need immediate attention.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.