

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Principles Governing the Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Realization of Administrative Justice

Mahdi. Rajaei<sup>1</sup>, Ali. Amiri<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Public Law, Faculty of Law, University of Qom, Qom, Iran

<sup>2</sup> MA Student, Department of Public Law, Faculty of Law, University of Qom, Qom, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: a.amiri@stu.qom.ac.ir

Received: 2025-03-24	Revised: 2025-05-01	Accepted: 2025-05-10	Published: 2025-07-01
<b>EDITOR:</b> Ghasem Eftekhari Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. Eeftekhari@ut.ac.ir			
<b>REVIEWER 1:</b> Mehmet Çevik Department of Social Sciences, Ankara University, Türkiye. Email: mehmetÇevik@asbu.edu.tr			
<b>REVIEWER 2:</b> Nabeel Bani-Hani Faculty of Education Specialization, Wasit University, Wasit, Iraq. Email: nabeelhani@uowasit.edu.iq			

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “Providing justice in all social areas is one of the duties of governments...” could benefit from a supporting citation to ground this normative claim in legal or political theory.

The comparison of administrative institutions to “dark corridors” is metaphorical. Consider offering a more academic explanation of institutional opacity and its implications for accountability.

The graphic description of Figure 1 lacks methodological rigor. Please explain the basis for the prioritization in the concentric circles—was it expert opinion, literature frequency, or another method?

The claim “humans must fully understand why and how the AI reached a particular result...” aligns with explainable AI literature. Please cite contemporary sources on XAI (Explainable Artificial Intelligence) to support this.

You state that “not many studies have been conducted in this field.” This assertion should be revised or substantiated through a brief literature scan or review.

The impact levels (low, medium, high, very high) are visually presented, but the criteria for classification are not explained. Add a methodological explanation of how decisions were assigned to each level.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

This metaphor, while vivid, may not align with academic tone. Consider substituting it with a more analytical description of how AI facilitates administrative transparency.

You mention the research question but do not explicitly state a hypothesis. A clearly defined research question and hypothesis would enhance the methodological clarity of the study.

This rhetorical question is engaging, but the following paragraph lacks a direct and structured answer. Consider breaking the discussion into subsections: one for a priori, and another for a posteriori mechanisms.

The phrase “help a lot” is informal. Replace with “contribute significantly” or a more precise academic term.

The discussion on “automation bias” is valuable, but it would be strengthened by a citation from the human-computer interaction or legal AI ethics literature.

You state that “legality, rationality, and procedural fairness have created limitations...” Consider reframing this to emphasize that these are not limitations per se, but normative frameworks AI must adhere to.

The term “bureaucratic rationality” is introduced without adequate theoretical grounding. Consider defining it more clearly and referencing Max Weber or contemporary public administration scholarship.

Clarify which principles are meant here. Are they drawn from administrative law, data protection, or AI ethics? The ambiguity reduces the effectiveness of the argument.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.