You suggest that not knowing the ownership of the data allows the OS to transcend the hardware.  This is a *non sequitur* – the conclusion does not follow from the premise.  Be careful to make your writing follow logically.  Is it really true that just because an OS occupies, say, a “Cloud platform”, that we have no control?  You appear to make an absolute assumption that artificial consciousness is achievable, based on the premise of the film, but that would take considerably more detailed argument to be persuasive.  You suggest that behaviour in public would change if they knew they were being watched – that is, in essence, what being in public implies, and there is little evidence that pervasive use of CCTV actually has that impact on people.  You need to be clearer with your line of argument.

You posit that people are enjoying their relationships with their OSs because there is less conflict, without any acknowledgement that some people (many, perhaps) actually relish contact with other humans because of the challenges they pose.  You had an opportunity here to consider whether the OS was actually ‘conscious’ – if it is, there is a reasonable chance it would have as challenging a social position as a real human.  You also appear to assume that a decline in population is necessarily a bad thing – many would argue that the world is over-populated, and that a reduction without authoritarian intervention might be a benefit to society as a whole.

If OS1 is conscious, is it appropriate to consider that it has an ‘owner’?  When considering data, why didn’t you draw comparisons with the data sharing which has been known to happen with various computer systems, especially, for instance, mobile apps?  This sort of thing happens now, with humans directly responsible for it, and would have made a good comparison with the film.

You suggest that allowing a computer (Samantha) to help in the production of work is essentially fraudulent.  This would, surely, only be the case if Samantha is seen as a fully independent entity – using a calculator to help me do calculations would not, in general, be considered to be fraud.

I am not convinced it is logical to conclude that it is unethical and dangerous to allow an AI access to systems to create content because the user is liable.  Indeed, the reverse is likely to be true, for society there is a greater risk if the owner is not liable.

Can laws really only be created once the systems exist?  A simple law, which would provide a reasonable framework, is that AI systems should have the same responsibilities as people.

Your report does not read as a single-authored document.  The recap of the plot at the beginning of the Ethics section, for instance, makes this appear to be more of a collection of papers assembled without a coherent narrative.  Is the OS having access to the sort of information available in the film significantly different to the people in companies having it?  If so, why?

I am unconvinced that having an OS like Samantha would prevent people from having their own viewpoints.  Can you  justify this assertion?

You have very few references, and I feel you missed an opportunity to explore, for instance, the Utilitarian possibilities versus the individual liberties which the story line makes possible.    The work is, however, reasonably well organised, and uses a reasonable selection of examples, with few technical errors, and is generally easy to read.