

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

Matt Baughman¹

¹ University of Chicago

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper investigates the current landscape of laws pertaining to the creation, use, and applications of artificial intelligence. The authors begin by providing an overview of the most pressing legal issues facing AI, including creative rights, data privacy and sovereignty, and culpability impacts of commercial distribution of AI systems. They then address some of the current changes and investigations underway that aim at shaping or addressing the novel issues presented by AI before finally concluding with several recommendations that build off of existing AI governance frameworks and pilots. Overall, the paper addresses several important topics in AI governance and legal frameworks and attempts to position the authors' recommendations with respect to the current state of practice.

This paper could be improved along three main axes: topic alignment, internal motivation, and novelty of position. Regarding topic alignment, the authors begin and end the work discussing the role of AI in the courtroom and the archetypical issues that surround the use of legal AI (e.g., bias, explainability, etc.). However, the body of this article reads much more along AI governance and the impact of AI across more industry-focused domains such as addressing copyright and culpability. The topic of AI in the courtroom itself is hardly addressed in the text's main body. To improve on this paper, the authors should narrow their focus and create a more cohesive arch across the entire paper. Each of the subtopics addressed are important issues and can more than stand on their own. Selecting one and delving into it will give the paper greater depth and allow the authors to explore one topic to a far greater extent (perhaps allowing them to explore multiple topics across multiple papers).

Regarding internal motivation, the authors could greatly benefit from building up more background on one of these legal topics and using prior works to demonstrate clearly what gap in the law they are trying to address. By clearly motivating the specific shortcomings of the law, the authors could give better grounding to their later recommendations and allow them to relate more clearly to the issues. Specificity would be a huge strength and would very much bring this paper to the next level, particularly as the increasing ubiquity of AI has raised a lot of these philosophical type questions among the populace but these questions are rarely addressed with concrete grounding. Should the authors provide that, their work could have a substantial impact on the field.

Finally, the authors could greatly improve the paper and its impact by taking a stronger stance and making stronger recommendations. Currently, the paper summarizes current efforts in AI governance, and the authors build on those efforts with recommendations that should be more widely adopted. The authors should use the recommendations section to put forward their own voice and build up a novel recommendation that either builds on the previous efforts or introduces an entirely new strategy. Specifically, they should embrace a conclusion that directly fills a critical gap in current

legislation that they identify and then position that recommendation in line with the motivations and evidence provided earlier in the paper. It would also help to overview a wider body of related literature and the many survey papers addressing a similar subject.

In conclusion, this paper addresses an important field of inquiry relating to AI and the law. The authors can improve this paper by viewing it as a cohesive story or arc and going more into depth about a specific gap in the literature, all while providing a stronger voice and a more evidence-backed solution.