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

Abdullah Ayub Khan[1]

1 Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors are encouraged to resubmit the paper with more clarity on the presented performance assessment metrics, relevant case studies, and possible application scenarios with assessment metrics. The paper should be written in the proper format; figures should fit within the text; the use of font should be uniform throughout the paper; and references should be updated with the most recent results.

Major Concerns:

1. Authors may elaborate more on the novelty/contribution of their work and how it contributes to the literature.

2. Authors need to be specific about their problem statement and the scope of their research.

3. Abstract: elaborate more on the problem statement, findings, and contributions.

4. The introduction is not clear. Authors may contribute more towards this.

Contributes to the literature in the second last paragraph of the introduction clearly.

5. Thorough proofreading is recommended.

6. A few of the figures are taken from other sources and are not cited properly; either they may be cited properly with permissions or may be removed/redrawn.

7. The conclusion is not clear and needs revision and clarity, aligning with the abstract and title.

References:

1. Your references are not listed in a good style, as the citation style is different from one paper to another.

2. Some of your references are not complete; please check.

3. Some citations (references) are created in the wrong manner (Please follow the journal's criteria).

Authors are encouraged to base their work on recent references about the current development in blockchain technology. Moreover, technology collaborates with other technologies to create new paradigms, such as artificial intelligence, such machine learning, deep learning, with federated learning.

Other Minor Concerns:

1. In the introduction, the scientific problem of the existing evaluation is missing. There should initially be a discussion of the actual problem and then the research motivation.

2. Please highlight the major contributions of this work in this current version; otherwise, the current form shows a weak/lack of novelty.

3. Please refine the language of this paper, such as avoiding we, they, our, and other related words in this paper.