

Review of: "AI in Court: Facing Today's Legal Challenges"

Michail Ploumis¹

¹ Hellenic Military Academy

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors discuss an interesting and topical subject. The manuscript presents different aspects and kinds of AI presence in courtrooms. This spans from AI as an assisting tool of decision making up to AI application being the examined case.

However, there are some changes, that I believe, would significantly improve the impact of this work, and support the important discussion it triggers.

To begin with the more general one, the type and goal of this paper is not unambiguous. The authors do not give clear instructions on the boundaries of AI usage in legal trials but rather describe vaguely legal challenges. On the other hand, the review of other scientific works and legal cases is not comprehensive enough. Thus, I would suggest either presenting specific prescriptions that would serve as guidelines for AI exploitation in the courtroom or perform a deeper and more extensive presentation of related bibliography and convert it into a review paper.

Some other comments are:

1. Referring to specific types and names of AI algorithms would increase the credibility of this paper.
2. Try to avoid repetitions. For example, the matter of copyrights and decision accountability are mentioned multiple times in the manuscript. I would suggest rearranging the manuscript and gather the arguments of the same topic.
3. It would be beneficial to connect AI boundaries with specific legal systems. Each country (or at least group of countries) has a different legal system. Therefore, the necessary changes for integrating AI into a legal system should also differ. A table with specific examples of legal system and AI adaptations would increase the value of this paper.
4. Following the previous point, it would be beneficial to give examples of legal cases rather than generally referring to them. For example, in the manuscript it is referred "Recent lawsuits, like those concerning bias in hiring processes or self-driving car accidents, raise questions about legal personhood for AI and the standards they should meet.". Here it would be helpful to provide

examples of real-life lawsuits to increase the persuasion of your argument and the scholarship of the work.

5. The reference on tech companies is inconclusive. Always, there will be a company that does not follow regulation. The role of laws, in this case AI related, is to characterize them as legitimate or not. Please, clarify your argument.

6. The section of Conclusions should be strengthened and expanded to effectively summarize the key arguments of the work.