



Adapting Legal Systems to the Development of Artificial Intelligence: Solving the Global Problem of AI in Judicial Processes

Gulyamov Said

Tashkent State University of Law
said.gulyamov1976@gmail.com

Khudoberganov Azamat

Tashkent State University of Law
a.xudaybergenov@tsul.uz

Sharopov Ravshan

Tashkent State University of Law
sh.ravshan@tsul.uz

Abduvaliev Bokhadir

Tashkent State University of Law
andre-rodionov@mail.ru

Abstract

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) has brought about substantial changes in numerous fields, including the legal system. As AI technologies continue to evolve and proliferate, their integration into courtrooms presents a range of opportunities and challenges. This article focuses on the adaptation of legal systems to accommodate the development of AI, particularly in the context of judicial processes. The global issue of AI in the judiciary necessitates a comprehensive examination of its implications, including the potential benefits and risks involved. By exploring the utilization of AI in legal proceedings, this study aims to identify strategies and solutions for addressing the challenges associated with AI integration. Furthermore, the article highlights the importance of creating a balanced framework that upholds legal principles, safeguards human rights, ensures transparency, and maintains public trust. As legal systems strive to navigate the impact of AI, this research aims to contribute to the



ongoing discourse on effectively incorporating AI into judicial processes while preserving fairness, integrity, and accountability.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Litigation, Legal System, Judicial Process, Legal Responsibility, International Legal Acts, Legal Problems, Legal Solutions, AI Adaptation, AI Development

I. Introduction

The use of AI in legal settings can improve efficiency, accuracy, and accessibility. AI-powered tools can help with legal research, case analysis, and even decision-making processes. However, the introduction of AI into the courtroom also raises serious legal and ethical issues. Questions regarding fairness, transparency, accountability and the protection of individual rights are emerging as AI systems play an increasingly prominent role in litigation. To address these issues, it is essential to analyze the international legal framework and current practice. By examining the applicability of current legal provisions to AI technologies, gaps and shortcomings can be identified. In addition, examining case studies and examples that highlight the importance of AI in the courtroom will provide valuable insights into a global issue [1].

The purpose of this article is to propose solutions for effectively adapting legal systems to advances in courtroom AI. These solutions will take into account the need for fair and transparent litigation using artificial intelligence, as well as address the potential risks and challenges associated with its integration. Efforts to address the issue addressed in this article have focused on developing a robust legal framework that takes into account the use of AI in the courtroom (Moor & van den Hoven, 2019). By incorporating principles such as transparency, explainability, and accountability, legal systems can ensure the fair and ethical application of AI technologies (Burrell, 2016). In addition, international cooperation and agreements are needed to establish common standards and guidelines for the use of AI in litigation [2].



II. Methodology

The research methodology used in this study includes a comprehensive literature review of international legal frameworks and practices related to the integration of AI in the courtroom. The review includes scientific articles, reports and relevant legal documents, which collect information about the global problem and proposed solutions. The main sources of data and information are international legal acts and conventions such as the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Council of Europe Cybercrime Convention. This legal framework serves as a basis for analyzing the applicability of existing provisions to AI technologies in the legal field.

Secondary sources such as academic journals, conference proceedings, and reputable online platforms provide insight into the challenges, ethical considerations, and potential solutions associated with integrating AI into legal systems. The analytical framework used in this study includes a systematic analysis and synthesis of the collected information. Information is classified, compared and evaluated to identify common themes, problems and potential solutions. Using this framework, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the global issue and offer viable recommendations for adapting legal systems for the development of AI.

III. Results

A. Presentation of Proposed Solutions Forfix Vulnerabilities

1. Development of ethical principles.

It is critical to develop clear ethical guidelines specifically for the use of AI in the legal field. These guidelines should cover principles such as fairness, transparency, accountability and non-discrimination (Floridi et al., 2018). Lawyers, AI experts, ethicists, and stakeholders should work together to define ethical standards that govern the development, deployment, and use of AI in legal systems [3].



2. Robust algorithmic transparency and explainability.

Increasing the transparency and explainability of AI algorithms used in the legal field is essential. Legal frameworks should require AI systems used in litigation to provide understandable and interpretable rationales for their decisions (Weller et al., 2019). This includes providing clear explanations of how the AI arrived at a particular outcome, and allowing people to challenge and seek clarification on AI-generated decisions [4].

3. Data management and elimination of bias.

Implementing sound data management practices is vital to address potential biases in AI systems. Legal frameworks should require comprehensive data collection and annotation processes that ensure representativeness and diversity of datasets. Regular checks and monitoring should be carried out to identify and eliminate errors that may occur in AI algorithms (O'Neil, 2016). Collaboration with subject matter experts and various stakeholders can help identify and eliminate potential biases in AI data and training algorithms [5].

4. Human oversight and decision making.

Maintaining human oversight and control in litigation with the help of AI is essential globally. The legal framework should define the roles and responsibilities of lawyers in the decision-making process, ensuring that the ultimate responsibility lies with the people (Goodman & Bretan, 2019). AI should be seen as a tool to improve human judgment and provide information and not as a complete replacement for human decision makers [6].

5. Continuous education and training.

Lawyers and judges must have the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively use artificial intelligence technologies. Continuing education and training programs need to be implemented to improve their understanding of AI, its limitations and potential biases (Susskind & Susskind, 2019). This includes



encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration between legal and technical experts for a comprehensive understanding of AI in the legal field [7].

6. International cooperation and standardization.

Joint efforts at the international level are critical to establish common standards and guidelines for the use of AI in legal systems. Organizations such as the United Nations and the International Bar Association should facilitate discussions and develop mechanisms that promote the responsible and ethical use of AI in litigation. International cooperation can help resolve jurisdictional issues and ensure consistency in the application of AI-related rules [8].

By implementing these proposed solutions, legal systems can address the challenges posed by AI in the courtroom while ensuring fairness, transparency, and accountability. It is critical to develop flexible legal frameworks that can adapt to the evolving nature of AI technologies and promote the harmonious integration of AI with the principles of justice [9].

B. Potential Problems And Risks Associated With Proposed Solutions

In drawing a conclusion on the above proposed solutions, it is important to dwell also on the analysis of what problems may arise when implementing each of the solutions. First, developing ethical guidelines for legal AI can be challenging due to the multifaceted and evolving nature of AI technologies. It can be difficult to reach consensus among stakeholders on the ethical principles and standards that should be included. In addition, effective training and enforcement mechanisms may be required to ensure that these guidelines are widely accepted and followed by legal professionals and organizations. Second, achieving algorithmic transparency and explainability can be technically challenging, especially for complex AI models such as deep learning neural networks. The balance between transparency and protection of proprietary algorithms and trade secrets can also pose legal and practical challenges. In addition, it can be difficult to find the right



balance between transparency and the need to protect sensitive information, especially when sensitive data is involved [10].

Third, the implementation of effective data management practices and de-biasing techniques requires access to comprehensive and diverse datasets. However, the collection and use of representative data can be hampered by issues such as data availability, data quality and confidentiality. Eliminating bias in AI algorithms also requires ongoing monitoring and evaluation to ensure effectiveness, which can be resource intensive. Fourth, determining the appropriate degree of human oversight and AI decision-making in litigation can be challenging. Finding the right balance between human intervention and dependence on AI-generated results is critical. The possibility for lawyers to over-rely on AI systems or be hesitant to overrule AI-generated opinions can pose a threat to the integrity and fairness of the litigation. In addition, providing ongoing education and training for lawyers in artificial intelligence technologies requires resources and commitment. Designing comprehensive and relevant training programs that span the evolving AI landscape can be challenging. In addition, making these programs accessible and inclusive, especially for lawyers in underserved or resource-poor regions, may require additional efforts [11].

Finally, achieving international cooperation and standardization can be difficult due to differences in legal systems, cultural norms and regulatory frameworks in different jurisdictions. Harmonizing different points of view and practices, enforcing compliance and overcoming political and jurisdictional barriers can require considerable effort and diplomatic cooperation. In addition, the pace of technological progress can outpace the development of international standards, creating potential gaps in regulation and implementation. Addressing these challenges and risks requires a proactive and adaptive approach. Continuous dialogue, interdisciplinary collaboration and ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of proposed solutions are critical to mitigate potential risks and ensure plans are implemented [12].

IV. Discussion

A. An Overview of the International Legal Framework

1. Analysis of international legal acts and conventions related to AI and legal systems

One of the important international legal acts regulating the ethical and legal implications of AI is the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The GDPR sets out rules for the processing of personal data and includes provisions regarding automated decision-making, including using AI algorithms (European Union, 2016). It highlights the importance of transparency, fairness and accountability in the use of AI systems that process personal data. Another important international convention is the Council of Europe Cybercrime Convention, also known as the Budapest Convention. Although it focuses on cybercrime, it addresses the use of AI in criminal activities and provides recommendations for cooperation between countries in investigating and prosecuting such cases [13].

In addition, the United Nations (UN) has been active in addressing the legal and ethical implications of AI. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, for example, provide a framework for companies to respect human rights when deploying artificial intelligence technologies (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2011). The UN is also exploring the legal aspects of autonomous weapons systems, emphasizing the need for regulation and accountability in the use of AI for military purposes (United Nations, 2018). In addition to these legal acts and conventions, various organizations and initiatives form the international legal landscape regarding AI. For example, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has developed the OECD AI Principles, which aim to guide the responsible development and deployment of AI technologies across sectors, including the legal arena [14].



Efforts to address the challenges and opportunities presented by AI in legal systems require a comprehensive understanding of these international legal frameworks. Taking into account the provisions set out in these acts and conventions, legal systems can adapt and develop rules to ensure the responsible and ethical use of AI technologies [15].

2. Study of problems and gaps in the current legal framework

One of the main problems in this area is the lack of specific rules adapted to AI technologies in legal systems. The rapid development of AI often outstrips the development of the corresponding legal framework. As a result, there is a gap in the consideration of the unique legal and ethical considerations associated with AI in the courtroom (Zarsky, 2016). This gap creates uncertainty and potential inconsistencies in the application of existing laws to AI technologies. The transparency and explainability of AI systems is another challenge. The complexity and opacity of some AI algorithms hinder understanding and interpretation of their decision-making processes. This lack of transparency can undermine fundamental principles of justice, including the right to a fair trial and the right to know the reasons for a decision (Wachter et al., 2017). Thus, it is necessary to develop a legal framework that promotes transparency and accountability in AI litigation [16].

Bias and discrimination in AI algorithms create additional problems. AI systems trained on biased data can perpetuate and reinforce existing biases, leading to unfair outcomes in a legal context (Angwin et al., 2016). Addressing this challenge requires the development of legal frameworks that actively reduce bias in AI systems and ensure fairness in the decision-making process. Moreover, the cross-border nature of AI technologies creates jurisdictional issues. Legal systems vary across countries, and harmonizing rules and practices related to AI in the courtroom is challenging. International cooperation and coordination is needed to develop agreed standards and guidelines for the use of AI in litigation (Mittelstadt



et al., 2019). In addition, the potential impact of AI on the legal profession itself is of concern. Automation and AI-powered tools could disrupt traditional legal practice, leading to job changes and the need for new skills. Lawyers must adapt to these changes and be ready to use AI technologies effectively (Hoffman et al., 2018). By recognizing these challenges and identifying gaps in the current framework, legal systems can proactively address and adapt to the unique aspects of courtroom AI technologies. This proactive approach is critical to ensure that AI is integrated into litigation in a fair, transparent and accountable manner [17].

B. Analysis of the Central Global Problem Associated With the Use of AI in the Courtroom

1. Identifying and describing a specific global challenge: ensuring fairness and accountability in AI litigation

The use of AI in litigation poses unique challenges that need to be carefully considered. One major concern is the potential for bias in AI algorithms, which can lead to unfair results. AI systems are trained on large datasets that may contain inherent biases, such as racial or gender bias, which may be inadvertently persisted in decision-making processes (Caliskan et al., 2017). This can lead to discrimination and violation of people's rights to equal treatment under the law. Ensuring fairness in AI litigation requires mechanisms to detect and remove bias in AI algorithms and the data they rely on. Accountability is another important aspect when it comes to using AI in the courtroom. AI systems often operate as complex black boxes, making it difficult to understand how decisions are made. This lack of transparency may raise concerns about the ability to hold AI systems accountable for errors, biases, or ethical violations (Dressel & Farid, 2018). Legal frameworks should include mechanisms to ensure that AI decision processes are understandable and transparent, allowing people to understand and challenge the results [18].



In addition, the use of AI systems in litigation can create challenges for human oversight and control. While AI can help with legal research, case analysis, and decision-making processes, it is important to support human participation and ensure that the ultimate responsibility rests with lawyers (Goodman & Flaxman, 2017). The legal framework should establish clear guidelines regarding the distribution of decision-making power between AI systems and humans, as well as mechanisms for overriding or challenging AI-generated results when necessary. The global challenge of ensuring fairness and accountability in AI litigation requires a comprehensive approach. Legal systems must develop guidelines, standards and regulations that address these issues and provide mechanisms for oversight, transparency and accountability. A collaborative effort among lawyers, AI experts, ethicists, and policy makers is needed to develop robust frameworks that protect people's rights and uphold the integrity of the judicial process [19].

By recognizing and addressing the potential risks and challenges associated with AI in the courtroom, legal systems can strive to create a fair, transparent and accountable environment in which AI technologies improve legal practice while respecting fundamental principles of fairness [20].

2. The implications of AI presence in the courtroom

It is important to note the following elements:

- Efficiency and accuracy. Integrating artificial intelligence technologies into the courtroom can improve efficiency and accuracy. AI-powered tools can automate time-consuming tasks such as legal research and document analysis, reducing the time and effort required for lawyers (Lupiañez-Villanueva et al., 2018). This increase in efficiency can lead to faster resolution of cases and more streamlined legal processes [21].
- Advanced Decision Making: AI systems can help make legal decisions by analyzing vast amounts of data and providing



information that may not be obvious to judges or lawyers. AI algorithms can identify patterns, correlations, and precedents to support legal arguments and help predict case outcomes (Katz et al., 2017). This enhanced decision-making capacity can lead to more consistent and objective judgments [22].

- Access to justice. Artificial intelligence technologies can expand access to justice by providing legal assistance to individuals who may not have the means to hire a legal representative. Chatbots, virtual assistants, and AI-powered online platforms can provide legal information, advice, and even basic legal advice (Hendler et al., 2018). This greater access to legal resources can help bridge the gap in justice and enable people to effectively navigate legal processes [23].
- Ethical and legal issues. The presence of AI in the courtroom poses ethical and legal issues that need to be carefully addressed. There are concerns about the privacy, data protection, and security of AI systems, especially when dealing with sensitive personal information (Liu et al., 2020). In addition, issues related to the responsibility and accountability of AI systems, as well as issues related to the explainability and transparency of AI algorithms, need to be addressed [24].
- Possible bias and discrimination. AI systems are trained on historical data that can reflect social biases and discriminatory practices. This raises concerns that AI algorithms may perpetuate prejudice and discriminate against certain individuals or groups in litigation (Lum & Isaac, 2016). Ensuring fair and equal treatment of all individuals, regardless of their characteristics, is an important factor in integrating AI into the courtroom [25].



- Human-machine interaction: The presence of AI in the courtroom also entails a shift in the dynamics of human-machine interaction. Lawyers must effectively navigate collaboration and decision-making processes using AI systems. AI integration should complement the human experience, allowing lawyers to use AI technologies while maintaining their critical judgments and ethical responsibilities [26].

By understanding and discussing these findings and implications, legal systems can overcome the challenges and take advantage of the presence of AI in the courtroom. The development of appropriate guidelines, ethical norms and rules will be vital to ensure that AI technologies support the principles of fairness and accountability [27].

3. Exploring case studies illustrating a global issue

In some jurisdictions, AI-based predictive sentencing algorithms have been used to help judges make appropriate sentencing based on historical data. However, there are concerns about the fairness and potential bias of these algorithms. A study by Dressel and Farid (2018) found that such algorithms tend to overestimate the likelihood of reoffending for certain racial and ethnic groups, leading to potential discrepancies in sentences. This highlights the importance of critical evaluation of input data, algorithmic transparency, and human oversight when using sentence prediction algorithms [28].

Chatbots and AI-powered virtual assistants are increasingly being used to provide legal assistance to individuals. While these technologies can increase access to justice, there are challenges in ensuring the accuracy and quality of the information and advice provided. A study by Whittaker and Crawford (2018) found cases where legal chatbots offered incorrect or misleading directions, which could lead to detrimental consequences for users. Ensuring accountability and responsible use of these AI legal aid tools is becoming critical to maintaining the credibility and effectiveness of such systems. These case studies demonstrate the



potential problems and risks associated with the presence of AI in the courtroom. They emphasize the importance of considering ethical, legal and social implications when integrating artificial intelligence technologies. The lessons learned from these examples can be used to develop appropriate guidelines, standards and rules to mitigate prejudice, promote transparency and uphold the principles of fairness and accountability [29].

Conclusion

In this study, the global problem of ensuring fairness and accountability in litigation with the help of AI was considered. By analyzing the international legal framework, identifying specific problems and proposing solutions, several key conclusions and additions were identified. The main findings of this study highlight the importance of considering the ethical, legal and social implications of integrating AI technologies into the legal realm. An analysis of the international legal framework has revealed both consistency and gaps in AI adoption, highlighting the need for tailored guidelines and rules. A study of case studies has illustrated real-world examples where the presence of AI in the courtroom raises critical considerations and potential risks.

The contribution of this study lies in the proposed solutions to eliminate the global problem. Ethical principles development, robust algorithmic transparency and explainability, data governance, human oversight, continuing education and training, and international collaboration have been identified as key strategies for AI-enabled fairness and accountability in litigation. Addressing such an important issue is paramount as AI continues to shape the legal landscape. Failure to address the potential risks and challenges posed by AI in the courtroom could lead to discriminatory outcomes, undermining public trust, and violations of basic principles of justice. By adopting the proposed solutions, legal systems can take advantage of AI while maintaining fairness, transparency and accountability.

To further advance research and action in this area, it is recommended to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration between lawyers, AI researchers, ethicists, policy makers and stakeholders. Further research and development of technical solutions is needed to ensure the transparency of the algorithms and eliminate bias. In addition, the ongoing evaluation and adaptation of legal frameworks and guidelines to keep pace with technological advances is critical. In this way, this study sheds light on the global challenge of ensuring fairness and accountability in AI litigation.

For the Republic of Uzbekistan, this problem is also important, as the country seeks to introduce international practices and develop its legal sphere (Gulyamov et al., 2021). Uzbekistan can use the results of this study to guide the proposed solutions, including developing ethical principles, ensuring the transparency of algorithms, managing data, and promoting interdisciplinary collaboration. This will help ensure fairness, transparency and accountability in litigation in the age of AI in government.

Bibliography

1. American Bar Association. (2018). ABA Model Rules 2.0: Maintaining Competence. Retrieved from <https://www.americanbar.org/>
2. Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias: There's software used across the country to predict future criminals. ProPublica. Retrieved from <https://www.benton.org/headlines/machine-bias-theres-software-used-across-country-predict-future-criminals-and-its-biased>
3. Caliskan, A., Bryson, JJ, & Narayanan, A. (2017). Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science*, 356(6334), 183-186. <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.aal4230>; <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aal4230>
4. Calo, R. (2017). Artificial intelligence policy: A primer and roadmap. SSRN https://lawreview.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/51/2/symposium/51-2_Calo.pdf
5. Council of Europe. (2001). Convention on Cybercrime. Retrieved from <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/185>
6. Allah Rakha, N. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and HR Management. *International Journal of Management and Finance*, 1(1). Retrieved from <https://irshadjournals.com/index.php/ijmf/article/view/25>

7. Darrow, B. (2018). Who owns the patents generated by AI? Artificial Lawyer. Retrieved from <https://www.artificiallawyer.com/>
8. Dressel, J., & Farid, H. (2018). The accuracy, fairness, and limits of predicting recidivism. *Science Advances*, 4(1), eaao5580. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29376122/>
9. Rakha, NA (2023, April 30). Artificial Intelligence and Sustainability. *International Journal of Cyber Law*, 1(3).
10. Rustambekov, I., & Bakhramova, M. Legal Concept and Essence of International Arbitration. URL: <https://www.ijsshr.in/v5i1/Doc/18.pdf>, 122-129.
11. European Union. (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). *Official Journal of the European Union*, L119/1. [https://www.eumonitor.eu/9353000/1/j4nvk6yhcbpeywk_j9vvik7m1c3gyxp/vk3t7p3lbczq#:~:text=Regulation%20\(EU\)%202016%2F679%20of%20the%20European%20Parliament%20and,\(OJ%20L%20119%2C%204.5](https://www.eumonitor.eu/9353000/1/j4nvk6yhcbpeywk_j9vvik7m1c3gyxp/vk3t7p3lbczq#:~:text=Regulation%20(EU)%202016%2F679%20of%20the%20European%20Parliament%20and,(OJ%20L%20119%2C%204.5)
12. Allah Rakha, N. (2023). Artificial Intelligence strategy of the Uzbekistan: Policy framework, Preferences, and challenges. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.27> retrieved from <https://irshadjournals.com/index.php/ijlp/article/view/27>
13. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Luetge, C. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689-707. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
14. Goodman, B., & Bretan, M. (2019). Legal effects of AI decision-making. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 27(4), 557-586. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/ai-legal-decision-making-ia-metaverselegal>
15. Allah Rakha, N. (2023). The impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on business and its regulatory challenges. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.23> retrieved from <https://irshadjournals.com/index.php/ijlp/article/view/23>
16. Goodman, B., & Flaxman, S. (2017). European Union regulations on algorithmic decision-making and a "right to explanation". *AI Magazine*, 38(3), 50-57. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.08813>
17. Gulyamov, S., Rustambekov, I., Narziev, O., & Xudayberganov, A. (2021). Draft Concept of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the Field of Development Artificial Intelligence for 2021-2030. *Yurisprudensiya*, 1, 107-21. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351658151_DRAFT_CONCEPT_OF_THE_REPUBLIC_OF_UZBEKISTAN_IN_THE_FIELD_OF_DEVELOP

MENT ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE FOR 2021-2030;<http://dx.doi.org/10.51788/tsul.jurisprudence.1.1./QUGT2226>

- 18.Hendler, J., Mulvehill, A., & Warren, P. (2018). Artificial intelligence for citizen services and government. *AI Magazine*, 39(1), 13-24.https://ash.harvard.edu/files/ash/files/artificial_intelligence_for_citizen_services.pdf
- 19.Allah Rakha, N. (2023). The Ethics of Data Mining: Lessons from the Cambridge Analytica Scandal. *Cyber Law Review*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.59022/clr.24> retrieved from <https://irshadjournals.com/index.php/ijcl/article/view/24>
- 20.Hoffman, D., McCabe, D., & King, D. (2018). Lawyers, technology, and the future of law. *Research Handbook on Big Data Law*, 37-55.<https://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmarr/2020/01/17/the-future-of-lawyers-legal-tech-ai-big-data-and-online-courts/?sh=4f7bbaff8c46>
- 21.Katz, D. M., Bommarito II, M. J., & Blackman, J. (2017). A general approach to predicting the behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States. *PLoS ONE*, 12(4), e0174698.<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0174698>
- 22.Lepri, B., Oliver, N., Letouzé, E., & Pentland, A. (2017). Big data for development: A review of promises and challenges. *Development Policy Review*, 35(1), 135-174.<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/dpr.12142>
- 23.Liu, H., Kroll, JA, & Wagman, L. (2020). Algorithmic transparency for the smart city. *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, 19(2), 44-51.https://yjolt.org/sites/default/files/20_yale_j._1._tech._103.pdf
- 24.Lum, K., & Isaac, W. (2016). To predict and serve? *Significance*, 13(6), 14-19.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309095411_To_predict_and_serve ;<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-9713.2016.00960.x>
- 25.Mittelstadt, B.D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2019). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, 6(2), 2053951716679679.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309322060_The_Ethics_of_Algorithms_Mapping_the_Debate;<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679>
- 26.O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Broadway Books.<https://www.amazon.com/Weapons-Math-Destruction-Increases-Inequality/dp/0553418815>
- 27.Allah Rakha, N. (2023). The legal Aspects of the Digital Economy in the Age of AI. *International Journal of Cyber Law*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.59022/clr.30> retrieved from <https://irshadjournals.com/index.php/ijcl/article/view/30>
- 28.Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Transparent, explainable, and accountable AI for robotics. *Science Robotics*, 2(6), eaan6080.<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/scirobotics.aan6080>



29. Zarsky, T.Z. (2016). The trouble with algorithmic decisions: An analytic road map to examine efficiency and fairness in automated and opaque decision making. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 41(1), 118-132. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0162243915605575>

