Wah Academia Journal of Social Sciences
Volume 4, Issue 1, Jun 2025, pp. 1861-1874
ISSN – E 2958-8731 P 2958-8723
https://doi.org/10.63954/WAJSS.4.1.80.2025

Influence of AI and Digital Media Trends, Algorithms, and Big Data on Media Studies

Dr. Taha Shabbir[1], Dr. Muhammad Aftab Madni[2] and Dr. Usman Farooq[3]

Abstract

The rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI), algorithmic systems, and big data technologies has fundamentally reshaped the landscape of media studies. This paper examines how these intertwined technological forces have transformed media production, distribution, consumption, and scholarly inquiry. Drawing on peer-reviewed literature spanning communication theory, data science, and critical media studies, the paper explores the role of recommendation algorithms in shaping audience behaviour, the deployment of AI-driven tools in journalism and content moderation, and the ethical implications of datafied media environments. The analysis further addresses the epistemological challenges these developments pose for media scholars, including questions of transparency, bias, and the commodification of attention. The paper concludes that media studies must evolve its methodological toolkit and theoretical frameworks to critically engage with an increasingly algorithmic and data-driven media ecosystem. A cross-disciplinary approach integrating computational methods with humanistic inquiry is proposed as essential to understanding and critiquing contemporary media dynamics.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, digital media, algorithms, big data, media studies, computational journalism, platform studies, disinformation

Introduction

The contemporary media landscape is defined by an unprecedented convergence of artificial intelligence, algorithmic curation, and big data analytics. Where

[1] Department of Computing, Faculty of Engineering Sciences & Technology, Hamdard University Karachi – Pakistan
[2]Department of Media and Communication Studies, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University (SBBU), Shaheed Benazirabad (SBA), Nawabshah – Pakistan
[3]Department of Media Studies & Design, Faculty of Communication & Design. Indus University, Karachi – Pakistan

earlier generations of media scholars focused on ownership structures, narrative framing, and audience reception, today's researchers must additionally grapple with the invisible architectures of recommendation engines, predictive analytics, and machine-learning classifiers that fundamentally mediate how content is produced, distributed, and consumed. The shift is not merely technical it is epistemological, ethical, and political.

Digital platforms such as Google, YouTube, Facebook, TikTok, and Twitter/X now serve as primary news and information intermediaries for billions of users worldwide. These platforms operate through complex algorithmic systems designed to maximise user engagement, a design logic that has profound consequences for public discourse, democratic deliberation, and the construction of social reality (Pariser, 2011; Gillespie, 2014). Meanwhile, the volume, velocity, and variety of data generated by digital media users has created new opportunities for both commercial exploitation and scholarly analysis, giving rise to the interdisciplinary field of computational communication research (Shah et al., 2015).

This paper argues that AI, digital media trends, algorithmic systems, and big data collectively constitute a transformative force for media studies one that demands both conceptual recalibration and methodological innovation. The paper is organised into the following sections: a review of algorithmic media and its implications for audience behaviour; an examination of AI in journalism and content production; a discussion of big data methodologies in media research; a critical analysis of bias, ethics, and power in datafied media; and a forward-looking synthesis of what these changes mean for the discipline of media studies.

Algorithmic Media and Audience Behaviour

❖ The Rise of Recommendation Systems

Recommendation algorithms now govern the lion's share of media exposure for most internet users. Netflix's recommendation engine, YouTube's autoplay function, and Spotify's Discover Weekly playlist all utilise collaborative filtering, content-based filtering, and increasingly deep-learning models to predict and shape user preferences (Covington et al., 2016). The commercial rationale is straightforward: personalisation increases engagement, and engagement drives

advertising revenue. However, the societal consequences are considerably more complex.

Eli Pariser's (2011) foundational concept of the 'filter bubble' introduced the idea that algorithmic personalisation creates informational cocoons in which users are progressively insulated from perspectives that diverge from their existing beliefs. Subsequent empirical research has both supported and complicated this thesis. Flaxman et al. (2016) found that social media use is associated with increased ideological segregation in news consumption, though the effect size was moderate relative to individual self-selection. Bakshy et al. (2015), in a controversial study conducted within Facebook's own experimental infrastructure, suggested that individual choice plays a greater role than algorithmic curation in determining exposure diversity. The debate illustrates a core challenge in algorithmic media research: the proprietary, black-box nature of platform algorithms limits scholarly access to the very systems under scrutiny.

- **Echo Chambers, Polarisation, and Disinformation**

Related to filter bubbles is the concept of the echo chamber a media environment in which users encounter only information that reinforces their prior beliefs. Sunstein (2017) argued that the internet's architecture facilitates echo chambers, with potentially corrosive effects on democratic pluralism. The algorithmic amplification of emotionally arousing content is a significant contributor to this dynamic. Vosoughi et al. (2018) demonstrated in a landmark Science paper that false news spreads faster, farther, and more broadly on Twitter than true news, partly because false stories tend to be more novel and emotionally provocative qualities that algorithmic engagement metrics reward.

The intersection of algorithmic systems and disinformation has become a central concern in media studies. The diffusion of computational propaganda the use of automated accounts, targeted advertising, and algorithmic amplification to disseminate politically motivated misinformation has been extensively documented (Woolley & Howard, 2018). For media scholars, this nexus poses both empirical and normative challenges: how do we measure the effects of disinformation campaigns, and what ethical obligations do platforms, journalists, and researchers bear in response?

The relationship between algorithmic curation and political polarisation also intersects with broader questions about platform power. Algorithms do not merely reflect social realities they actively constitute them by determining which voices are amplified, which stories surface, and which communities are formed. Gillespie (2014) introduced the term 'politics of platforms' to describe how seemingly neutral technical choices embed normative judgements about relevance, credibility, and appropriate expression. This insight has been enormously productive for media studies, repositioning platform architectures as objects of critical analysis rather than neutral conduits.

Artificial Intelligence in Journalism and Content Production

- **Automated Journalism**

One of the most tangible manifestations of AI in media is the emergence of automated journalism the use of natural language generation (NLG) systems to produce news articles with minimal or no human intervention. Companies such as Automated Insights (whose Wordsmith platform produces earnings reports for the Associated Press) and Narrative Science have demonstrated that structured data can be transformed into fluent, readable prose at scale (Clerwall, 2014). Sports results, financial summaries, weather reports, and property listings are now routinely generated by algorithms at major news organisations including the Washington Post, Reuters, and the Los Angeles Times.

The implications for journalism as a profession and a practice are significant. Dörr (2016) identified three primary drivers of automated journalism adoption: economic efficiency, speed, and the ability to scale personalised content. From a media studies perspective, automated journalism raises critical questions about authorship, accountability, and the meaning of journalistic labour. If a machine writes a story, who is responsible for its accuracy? How does automation affect editorial judgement and the normative functions journalism is expected to perform in a democracy?

- **AI-Assisted Investigative Reporting**

Beyond content generation, AI is increasingly deployed as a tool for investigative journalism. Machine learning algorithms can process and analyse document sets of a scale that would take human journalists years to review. The Panama Papers

investigation, in which the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ) used graph-database technology and named entity recognition to map offshore financial networks across 11.5 million documents, exemplifies the potential of computational methods in investigative reporting (Cabra & Stray, 2016). Similarly, the Washington Post's Heliograf system not only generates automated content but also monitors breaking news and alerts editors to emerging stories.

AI-assisted reporting also encompasses computer-assisted verification using image forensics, geolocation tools, and machine learning classifiers to authenticate user-generated content in conflict zones and crisis situations. Organisations such as Bellingcat and the BBC's User-Generated Content Hub have pioneered these methodologies, establishing a new domain of open-source intelligence (OSINT) that blends journalistic and computational skills (Silverman, 2015). For media studies scholars, these developments necessitate an engagement with computer science, data journalism, and digital forensics that was largely absent from the field's traditional curriculum.

- **Content Moderation and AI**

AI is also central to the challenge of content moderation at scale. Major platforms receive millions of pieces of content per day; human moderation alone is insufficient to manage this volume. Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter/X deploy machine learning classifiers to detect and remove content that violates community standards, including hate speech, graphic violence, child sexual abuse material, and terrorist propaganda. However, these systems are far from perfect. Roberts (2019) documented the psychological toll of human moderators often low-paid contractors in the Global South who review the content that algorithms flag but cannot definitively adjudicate.

Automated content moderation raises acute concerns about free expression, cultural context, and algorithmic bias. AI classifiers trained predominantly on English-language data frequently misclassify content in Arabic, Hindi, or minority languages (Huszár et al., 2022). Political speech, satire, and cultural references that require contextual understanding often defeat automated systems. The power that platforms exercise through content moderation effectively determining what can and cannot be said in the digital public sphere makes the governance of these systems a pressing media policy concern.

Big Data and Methodological Transformation in Media Research

❖ Computational Methods in Communication Research

The availability of large-scale digital trace data clickstreams, social media posts, search queries, platform APIs has opened new methodological horizons for media scholars. Computational communication research integrates techniques from computer science, statistics, and natural language processing to analyse media content and audience behaviour at a scale and granularity previously impossible (Shah et al., 2015). Text mining, sentiment analysis, topic modelling (particularly Latent Dirichlet Allocation), network analysis, and machine learning classification are now established tools in media studies' methodological repertoire.

The digital turn in media research has generated genuine insights. Researchers have used Twitter data to study the diffusion of news (Kwak et al., 2010), mapped the structure of the online news ecosystem (Benkler et al., 2018), tracked the agenda-setting influence of social media on mainstream news (McCombs et al., 2014), and analysed the linguistic features that distinguish high-quality journalism from clickbait (Blom & Hansen, 2015). The Pew Research Center's computational content analyses have become touchstones for understanding how news coverage patterns vary across outlets and over time.

❖ Challenges and Limitations of Big Data Approaches

Despite their power, big data approaches in media research carry significant epistemological and ethical limitations. Boyd and Crawford (2012) articulated several foundational critiques in their influential article 'Critical Questions for Big Data.' First, large datasets are not inherently objective or comprehensive they reflect the platforms and populations that generate them, typically over-representing younger, urban, and more affluent demographics. Twitter's active user base, for instance, is demonstrably unrepresentative of the general public in most countries. Conclusions drawn from Twitter data about 'public opinion' must be treated with considerable caution.

Second, the meaning of digital trace data is not self-evident. A retweet, a like, or a click is a complex social action whose significance depends on context that quantitative methods alone cannot capture. The risk of 'apophenia' seeing

meaningful patterns in noise is real when researchers have access to vast datasets and the statistical power to find almost any correlation significant (Boyd & Crawford, 2012). Third, platform API restrictions and the opacity of algorithmic systems limit what data researchers can access, introducing systematic biases into what can be studied.

There are also ethical dimensions to big data media research. Research using public social media data may expose individuals to privacy risks they did not anticipate when posting, particularly when posts are combined with other data sources to enable re-identification. The Cambridge Analytica scandal in which data from 87 million Facebook profiles was harvested through a third-party app and used for political profiling dramatically illustrated the potential for misuse of social media data and prompted regulatory responses including the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR; Zuboff, 2019).

- **Platform Data as a Site of Power**

The politics of data access in media research reflects broader power asymmetries between platforms and scholars. Platforms collect extraordinarily detailed data about user behaviour, but this data is treated as proprietary. Researchers must rely on public APIs that platforms can restrict or revoke at will a vulnerability demonstrated when Twitter significantly curtailed academic API access in 2023. This 'data asymmetry' (Diakopoulos, 2016) means that platforms know vastly more about the effects of their systems than researchers can independently establish, undermining the conditions for democratic accountability.

The European Union's Digital Services Act (DSA), adopted in 2022, represents a significant regulatory attempt to address this imbalance by requiring very large online platforms to provide researchers with access to data necessary for auditing societal risks. Whether such provisions will be enforced effectively remains to be seen, but they signal growing recognition that platform data is a public resource with implications that extend far beyond commercial interests. Media scholars have an important role to play in advocating for research access and in developing the methodological frameworks needed to use such access responsibly.

Ethics, Bias, and Power in the Algorithmic Media Ecosystem

❖ Algorithmic Bias and Representation

Algorithmic systems reproduce and often amplify the biases embedded in their training data. In media contexts, this has manifested in recommendation systems that perpetuate racial and gender stereotypes, content moderation systems that disproportionately suppress the speech of marginalised communities, and advertising algorithms that discriminate on the basis of protected characteristics (Noble, 2018). Safiya Umoja Noble's (2018) Algorithms of Oppression documented how Google's search algorithm historically returned racist and sexist results for queries about Black women, reflecting both the biases in web content and the commercial logic of search.

Gender bias in AI-generated media content is also a documented concern. NLG systems trained on historical news corpora may inherit and reproduce the gender imbalances characteristic of legacy journalism the systematic under-representation of women as sources, experts, and protagonists. The Global Media Monitoring Project (GMMP) has tracked gender representation in news content for decades; as AI systems are trained on this historical data, they risk encoding historic inequities into automated content generation at scale.

❖ Surveillance Capitalism and the Commodification of Attention

Shoshana Zuboff's (2019) theory of surveillance capitalism provides a comprehensive critical framework for understanding the political economy of datafied media. Zuboff argues that major technology platforms have pioneered a new economic logic in which human experience is claimed as raw material for the production of 'behavioural prediction products' sold to advertisers and other institutional buyers. The architecture of the internet free services in exchange for data is not a neutral convenience but a deliberate extraction mechanism that reconfigures the relationship between individuals, corporations, and states.

The implications for media studies are profound. If the fundamental business model of dominant media platforms is the monetisation of attention through behavioural prediction, then journalism, entertainment, and social communication are all subordinated to an engagement logic that prioritises emotional arousal, outrage,

and compulsion over accuracy, deliberation, and public interest. The well-documented phenomenon of 'engagement bait' content designed to provoke reactions rather than inform is a direct product of this economic architecture (Lazer et al., 2018).

- **Transparency, Accountability, and Algorithmic Governance**

The governance of algorithmic media systems has emerged as a central concern for scholars, regulators, and civil society. Calls for algorithmic transparency the disclosure of how recommendation and moderation systems work have been widespread, though definitions of transparency vary considerably. Diakopoulos (2016) distinguished between transparency about the existence of algorithms, their input variables, their internal logic, and their outputs or effects. Each level of transparency carries different implications for accountability and raises different technical and commercial challenges.

Algorithmic auditing the systematic examination of algorithmic systems by independent researchers has developed as a methodological approach to accountability. Audit studies use sock puppet accounts, API queries, and browser extensions to probe platform behaviour, reverse-engineering elements of systems that platforms decline to disclose. Such studies have revealed racial bias in Facebook's advertising delivery system (Ali et al., 2019), political asymmetries in Twitter's content amplification (Huszár et al., 2022), and the radicalisation potential of YouTube's recommendation algorithm (Ribeiro et al., 2020). These findings have informed regulatory interventions and platform policy changes, demonstrating the practical impact of critical algorithmic media research.

Implications for Media Studies as a Discipline

- **Methodological Pluralism and Interdisciplinarity**

The transformations wrought by AI, algorithms, and big data require media studies to expand its methodological repertoire while retaining its critical and humanistic traditions. Computational methods offer new analytical capabilities scale, precision, and the ability to detect patterns invisible to qualitative analysis. But they require complementation by ethnographic, discursive, and historical approaches that can contextualise quantitative findings and ask the normative questions that machine

learning cannot answer. The challenge is institutional as much as intellectual: training programmes, hiring practices, and publication norms must evolve to support genuinely interdisciplinary scholarship.

Several emerging methodological frameworks are promising in this regard. Platform studies (Gillespie, 2014) combines software studies, political economy, and cultural analysis to examine how platform architectures shape cultural production and social interaction. Critical data studies (Dalton & Thatcher, 2014) interrogates the assumptions, politics, and social implications of data collection and analysis. Algorithmic accountability journalism applies investigative techniques to the examination of automated systems as public interest stories. Together, these approaches constitute a nascent methodological infrastructure for studying the algorithmic media environment.

- **Recalibrating Core Concepts**

Beyond methodology, AI and big data challenge some of the foundational concepts of media studies. The concept of the 'audience,' developed in the context of broadcast media, sits uneasily with contemporary media environments in which users are simultaneously producers, consumers, and data sources a condition Bruns (2008) captured with the neologism 'produsage.' The concept of 'agenda setting,' originally formulated by McCombs and Shaw (1972) to describe how news media influence public priorities, must be reconceptualised in an environment where algorithms, rather than editors, determine which stories reach which audiences.

Similarly, theories of media effects developed for television and print journalism require revision for an algorithmic media environment. The assumption that audiences receive a common set of messages foundational to cultivation theory, agenda setting, and framing research is disrupted by personalisation systems that ensure different users see fundamentally different information environments. Effects research must engage with heterogeneity of exposure in ways that traditional experimental and survey designs are poorly equipped to address.

- **The Global South and Digital Media Inequality**

A recurring limitation of existing scholarship on AI and media is its geographic concentration in North America and Western Europe. The platforms, datasets, and

regulatory frameworks that dominate discussion are primarily products of Silicon Valley, and the communities most affected by algorithmic bias often in the Global South are least represented in research. For scholars based in Pakistan and the broader South Asian and Middle Eastern contexts, this gap presents both a challenge and an opportunity.

AI systems trained on English-language data perform poorly on Urdu, Arabic, and other Afro-Asian languages, with significant implications for content moderation, misinformation detection, and automated journalism in these linguistic communities. The deployment of social media platforms in contexts with weak regulatory infrastructure and high levels of political instability creates acute risks of algorithmic amplification of disinformation and incitement to violence risks documented in Myanmar, Ethiopia, and Pakistan (Amnesty International, 2022). Media studies scholarship from and about the Global South is essential for a genuinely global understanding of these phenomena.

Conclusion

The influence of AI, digital media trends, algorithmic systems, and big data on media studies is profound, pervasive, and still unfolding. These technologies have transformed every dimension of the media landscape: how content is produced, how it circulates, how it is moderated, how audiences encounter and engage with it, and how scholars can study it. The implications extend from the practical new tools for journalists and researchers to the structural, reshaping the political economy of media and the conditions of democratic public life.

Media studies as a discipline is well positioned to contribute to understanding and governing these transformations, but only if it embraces interdisciplinarity, methodological pluralism, and sustained critical engagement with the power dynamics embedded in algorithmic systems. The humanities traditions of media studies critical theory, discourse analysis, cultural history, normative political philosophy are indispensable complements to computational methods. Neither alone is sufficient.

Future research must prioritise several agendas: the development of regulatory and ethical frameworks for AI in journalism and content moderation; the expansion of algorithmic auditing and platform transparency; the study of AI and media in non-

Western contexts; and the cultivation of interdisciplinary training programmes that equip the next generation of media scholars with both computational skills and humanistic sensibilities. The stakes nothing less than the quality of information and deliberation in democratic societies could not be higher.

References

Ali, M., Sapiezynski, P., Bogen, M., Korolova, A., Mislove, A., & Rieke, A. (2019). Discrimination through optimization: How Facebook's ad delivery can lead to biased outcomes. Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 3(CSCW), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1145/3359301

Amnesty International. (2022). The social atrocity: Meta and the right to remedy for the Rohingya. Amnesty International. https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/asa16/5933/2022/en/

Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. Science, 348(6239), 1130–1132. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160

Benkler, Y., Faris, R., & Roberts, H. (2018). Network propaganda: Manipulation, disinformation, and radicalization in American politics. Oxford University Press.

Blom, J. N., & Hansen, K. R. (2015). Click bait: Forward-reference as lure in online news headlines. Journal of Pragmatics, 76, 87–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.11.010

Boyd, D., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon. Information, Communication & Society, 15(5), 662–679. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878

Bruns, A. (2008). Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and beyond: From production to produsage. Peter Lang.

Cabra, M., & Stray, J. (2016). The Panama Papers: How journalists used graph databases and AI to expose offshore tax havens. Data Journalism Handbook. European Journalism Centre.

Clerwall, C. (2014). Enter the robot journalist: Users' perceptions of automated content. Journalism Practice, 8(5), 519–531. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2014.883116

Covington, P., Adams, J., & Sargin, E. (2016). Deep neural networks for YouTube recommendations. Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, 191–198. https://doi.org/10.1145/2959100.2959190

Dalton, C. M., & Thatcher, J. (2014). What does a critical data studies look like, and why do we care? Society & Space. https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/what-does-a-critical-data-studies-look-like-and-why-do-we-care

Diakopoulos, N. (2016). Accountability in algorithmic decision making. Communications of the ACM, 59(2), 56–62. https://doi.org/10.1145/2844110

Dörr, K. N. (2016). Mapping the field of algorithmic journalism. Digital Journalism, 4(6), 700–722. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2015.1096748

Flaxman, S., Goel, S., & Rao, J. M. (2016). Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. Public Opinion Quarterly, 80(S1), 298–320. https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfw006

Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.), Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society (pp. 167–194). MIT Press.

Huszár, F., Ktena, S. I., O'Brien, C., Belli, L., Schlaikjer, A., & Hardt, M. (2022). Algorithmic amplification of politics on Twitter. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119(1), e2025334119. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2025334119

Kwak, H., Lee, C., Park, H., & Moon, S. (2010). What is Twitter, a social network or a news media? Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web, 591–600. https://doi.org/10.1145/1772690.1772751

Lazer, D. M. J., Baum, M. A., Benkler, Y., Berinsky, A. J., Greenhill, K. M., Menczer, F., Metzger, M. J., Nyhan, B., Pennycook, G., Rothschild, D., Schudson, M., Sloman, S. A., Sunstein, C. R., Thorson, E. A., Watts, D. J., & Zittrain, J. L. (2018). The science of fake news. Science, 359(6380), 1094–1096. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2998

McCombs, M., Shaw, D., & Weaver, D. (2014). New directions in agenda-setting theory and research. Mass Communication and Society, 17(6), 781–802. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2014.964871

Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. New York University Press.

Pariser, E. (2011). The filter bubble: What the internet is hiding from you. Penguin Press.

Ribeiro, M. H., Ottoni, R., West, R., Almeida, V. A. F., & Meira, W., Jr. (2020). Auditing radicalization pathways on YouTube. Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 131–141. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372879

Roberts, S. T. (2019). Behind the screen: Content moderation in the shadows of social media. Yale University Press.

Shah, D. V., Cappella, J. N., & Neuman, W. R. (2015). Big data, digital media, and computational social science: Possibilities and perils. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 659(1), 6–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716215572084

Silverman, C. (Ed.). (2015). Verification handbook: A definitive guide to verifying digital content for emergency coverage. European Journalism Centre.

Sunstein, C. R. (2017). #Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media. Princeton University Press.

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. Science, 359(6380), 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2998

Woolley, S. C., & Howard, P. N. (Eds.). (2018). Computational propaganda: Political parties, politicians, and political manipulation on social media. Oxford University Press.

Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. PublicAffairs.

Article Information:

Received	*2-Apr-2025*
Revised	28-May-2025
Accepted	11-Jun-2025
Published	15-Jun-2025

Declarations:

Authors' Contribution:

- All authors **Conceptualization, and intellectual revisions. Data collection, interpretation, and drafting of manuscript**
- The authors agree to take responsibility for every facet of the work, making sure that any concerns about its integrity or veracity are thoroughly examined and addressed

- **Conflict of Interest**: NIL
- **Funding Sources**: NIL

Correspondence:

Dr. Taha Shabbir

taha.shabbir@hamdard.edu.pk