

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

Thomas Wingfield<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> RAND Corporation

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting piece--less a scholarly article and more of a solid student essay.

It would benefit from a clear framework--a hierarchy, a sequence, something to organize the author's thoughts more clearly and memorably.

The article blurs the distinction between AI used in the legal profession and the law that applies to AI more generally.

The article should more clearly distinguish between the bodies of law to which it is referring--national or international, which nation's law, civil or criminal, contract, tort, etc., as well as the jurisdiction within the legal system (i.e., California vs. New York).

The article would benefit from a clear, memorable introduction and conclusion, summarizing the most important insights and recommendations to more effectively 'package' the article.

The article should cite specific legal cases, specific AIs, and specific incidents.

Watch out for overlaps and redundancies--a clearer organization could eliminate these.

Add specific quotes from legal, policy, technical, and ethical experts.

Add something in the introduction on the procedural approach or methodology to be employed, as well as one or more substantive research questions.

Conclude with clear and concise findings and recommendations.

This article is clearly the product of a thoughtful author. Some of the procedural/organizational points above would allow the ideas it contains to shine even more brightly!