

Peer Review

Review of: "Digital Doppelgangers: Ethical and Societal Implications of Pre-Mortem AI Clones"

André Barcaui¹

1. Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Strengths

Timely and relevant topic. The emergence of AI “clones” and grief-bots is moving from speculative fiction to market reality, and the paper anticipates many of the regulatory headaches that policymakers will soon face. Its clear differentiation between *pre-mortem clones* and *post-mortem generative ghosts* provides a helpful analytic lens. [Qeios](#)

Logical, readable structure. Each section builds naturally from problem definition (identity, consent, autonomy) to legal ramifications and, finally, to policy prescriptions and research gaps. Busy readers can quickly see what the authors recommend and why. [Qeios](#)

Breadth of literature covered. Classical sources (e.g., Floridi & Taddeo) are woven together with recent work on grief-bots, deepfakes, and generative agents, signalling good awareness of the state of the debate. [Qeios](#)

Action-oriented output. The concrete policy checklist (explicit consent, IP clarification, labour protections, etc.) makes the piece useful beyond academia, inviting engagement from lawyers and regulators. [Qeios](#)

Weaknesses

Conceptual, not empirical. The discussion is persuasive but largely speculative. No user studies, market data, or legal case analyses are offered to ground the argument. Adding even a small empirical vignette (e.g., a survey of early clone users or a regulatory comparison across jurisdictions) would strengthen credibility.

Limited novelty in some sections. Much of the identity/consent discussion echoes existing digital-afterlife literature; the truly new material—the *pre-mortem* focus—could be foregrounded more forcefully, perhaps with a comparative table contrasting pre- and post-mortem issues.

Citation housekeeping. References repeat some authors multiple times in short form (e.g., ‘a, b, c...’ style), and a few in-text bracket numbers don’t align with the reference list; those need cleanup for publication quality. [Qeios](#)

Global perspective missing. The policy section is framed largely through a Euro-American lens (GDPR, U.S. copyright). Including perspectives from jurisdictions with different data-sovereignty norms (e.g., Brazil’s LGPD, China’s Personal Information Protection Law) would broaden applicability.

Overall verdict

A well-argued, forward-looking essay that will interest ethicists, technologists, and policymakers alike, but it would benefit from empirical grounding and tighter editorial polish. With these improvements, it could easily move from a strong preprint to a publishable journal article.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.