



CORRUPTION PREVENTION

Research article

<https://doi.org/10.71559/ACSAR.1.1.2026.28>

The use of AI for the anti-corruption assessment of legislation

P.Sascheko ✉

PhD, Associate Professor

E-mail: sascheko.p@gmail.com

Alpari Group LLC, Minsk, Republic of Belarus

Abstract

Some types of deficiencies in legal acts can facilitate the commission of corruption criminal offences or can lead to other infringements of anti-corruption legislation. In this regard, many states have already established mechanisms for detection of shortcomings in normative legal acts and drafts normative legal acts that can be considered as corruption-prone factors. The development of general-purpose artificial intelligence systems raises the question of whether such systems can be used to improve the efficiency of anti-corruption expertise of legislation. The present article is aimed at studying the capabilities of general-purpose artificial intelligence systems to help experts in corruption-prone factors detection and in conducting some other tasks related to anti-corruption examination of legal texts. In order to determine the possibilities to use artificial intelligence system for anti-corruption expertise purposes the expert opinions published in the Internet where compared with the results obtained via artificial intelligence systems. The study confirmed several results of previous studies regarding the use of artificial intelligence for anti-corruption expertise. In addition, results were obtained confirming that artificial intelligence systems can be used to verify expert opinions related to separate provisions of normative legal acts, as well as related to entire texts of normative legal acts, and that artificial intelligence can be used to verify the text of expert opinions. Further research may also be conducted in the field related to the use of prompt engineering for improvement of the output of artificial intelligence systems when they are used for anti-corruption expertise of the legislation.

Keywords: anti-corruption expertise of legislation, anti-corruption proofing of legislation, discretionary power, normative legal act, corruption, corruption-prone factor



How to cite: Sascheko, P. (2026). The use of AI for the anti-corruption assessment of legislation. *Anti-Corruption Studies and Research*, 1(1), 82-94. <https://doi.org/10.71559/ACSAR.1.1.2026.28>

1. Introduction

The deficiencies in legislation can constitute corruption risks, therefore a number of states introduced the anti-corruption assessment of the legislation that is also known as ‘anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts’. The purpose of this expertise is to eliminate deficiencies in legislation that could lead to corruption offences. One of the definitions that reflects the essence of this type of expertise is given in the CIS Model Law on Anti-Corruption Review of Regulatory Legal Acts and Draft Regulatory Legal Acts – ‘activities aimed at identifying corruption-prone factors in normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts and preparing conclusions containing recommendations for their elimination, as well as prosecutor's orders to amend normative legal acts’[1]. As can be seen from this definition, the object of anti-corruption expertise is normative legal act or draft normative legal act. ‘Normative legal act’ is ‘an official document of an established form, adopted (issued) within the competence of a state authority, local government body, or official, or by referendum in accordance with the procedure established by law, containing generally binding rules of conduct intended for an indefinite circle of persons and for multiple application’ [1].

The Model Law does not contain a definition of a corruption-prone factor. Instead, it provides a list of corruption-prone factors that anti-corruption expertise aims to identify, for example ‘the breadth of discretionary powers’ is mentioned, that means the absence or uncertainty of time limits, conditions, or grounds for decision-making; existence of overlapping powers of state authorities or local self-government bodies (and their officials) [1].

A special methodology should be used to identify corruption-prone factors. The recommendations in respect of the development of the methodology is contained in the Recommendations on conducting anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts, approved at the CIS level by Resolution No. 38-18 of the Interparliamentary Assembly of CIS Member States [2]. The Recommendations propose to carry out expert review in the following ways: 1) a screening of each norm or provision for the presence of corruption-prone factors and compliance with anti-corruption requirements and standards provided for by state legislation; 2) identifying the presence of each corruption-prone factor specified in the legislation on anti-corruption expertise in each rule or provision [2]. The Recommendations also contains indicators of corruption-prone factors and methods for detecting them [2].

With regard to the research methods used, the Recommendations offers the following guidance: ‘When conducting anti-corruption examination of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts, the following methods are used: systemic, structural-functional, comparative-legal, historical-legal, formal-legal, as well as methods of social-legal modeling, expert assessments, generalization of statistical data and law enforcement practice, and other general scientific and special scientific methods’ [2].

States usually approve their own anti-corruption expertise methodologies, which may vary in terms of both the list of corruption-prone factors and the methods used to identify them. For example, in the Kyrgyz Republic, Government Resolution No. 319 of December 8, 2010, approved the Instructions on the procedure for conducting legal, human rights, gender, environmental, and anti-corruption expertises of draft regulations of the Kyrgyz Republic [3]. In the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Methodological Recommendations for Conducting Scientific Anti-Corruption Expertise of Draft Normative Legal Acts were approved by Order No. 268 of the Chairman of the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Combating Corruption (Anti-Corruption Service) dated August 19, 2020 [4]. The Government of the Russian Federation approved, by Resolution No. 96 of February 26, 2010, the Rules for conducting anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts, as well as the Methodology for conducting anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts [5]. The Republic of Uzbekistan has adopted the Law No. LRU-860 of August 8, 2023, 'On the anti-corruption examination of normative legal acts and their projects' [6].

The description of corruption-prone factors in the methodologies is rather general, which significantly complicates the identification of shortcomings that can be classified as corruption-prone. The importance of the improvement of efficiency of detection of corruption-prone factors in normative legal acts leads to the demand for research on new methods for detecting and identifying such factors. Current interest in researching this topic is further driven by the development of general-purpose artificial intelligence (AI) systems. Nevertheless, insufficient attention has been paid in scientific literature to researching the potential of AI prompts for conducting anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts.

In the current context of AI development, prompts addressed to AI are becoming a tool that everyone needs to know about. 'Prompt engineering is the art and science of designing and optimizing prompts to guide AI models, particularly LLMs, towards generating the desired responses. By carefully crafting prompts, you provide the model with context, instructions, and examples that help it understand your intent and respond in a meaningful way'[7].

Taking into consideration mentioned above, the present study is aimed at establishing the possibility of using AI in the process of conducting anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts. In particular, this study aims to fill some gaps in research on the use of prompts in the anti-corruption expertise process.

2. Literature Review

Interest in the use of AI to combat corruption has been growing recently. However, as has been reasonably noted (Annouz, 2024), the use of artificial intelligence to combat corruption currently faces certain limitations: 'The transparency of AI-based decisions requires clarity of design and the interpretability of the algorithms' finite and unambiguous steps taken to obtain a result (comprehensibility). The technical knowledge of institutional actors in the fight against corruption should be adapted to this type of development to ensure the security of such algorithms, including its design, detection of failures, and correction of potential biases' [8]. In this regard, the use of prompts in conducting anti-corruption expertise should be carried out with caution, taking into account existing limitations on the transparency of results.

It was mentioned that “generative AI, particularly LLMs, can help entities to quickly process and provide inputs on draft legislation“ [9, P. 44]. At the same time, there are relatively few publications that discuss specific ways of using AI to conduct anti-corruption expertise, especially with regard to the methodology of its performance. This indicates the need for research into ways of using AI systems, including general-purpose ones, to conduct anti-corruption expertise.

Taking into account the limited number of studies on the use of AI for anti-corruption expertise, it seems necessary to provide a detailed description of the ideas expressed by the authors of these publications in order to identify ways of using AI in anti-corruption expertise, as well as to identify problems that need to be solved.

To begin with, it should be noted that an AI model called Corr-finder was developed, which works on the basis of a chatbot that takes the text of a normative legal act and returns it to the user with the color highlighting of those lines in which the model predicts the presence of one or more corruption-prone factors [10, P. 100]. Unfortunately, the use of AI systems specifically designed for anti-corruption expertise is not always available to experts. In addition, if such systems are developed for a specific anti-corruption expertise methodology, this limits their use.

E.V. Talapina studied the possibilities of using AI to carry out various types of legal expertise, including anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and their drafts. She pointed out that AI could become an assistant in conducting efficient anti-corruption expertise. In her opinion, it is advisable to envisage two stages of AI implementation in anti-corruption expertise: 1) related to the assessment of the most formalized criteria of corruption; 2) related to an extended assessment of factors excluded from the government methodology. [11, P.876] She also noted that finding formalized corruption factors would not be difficult for AI, and would significantly reduce the time spent searching for them by humans; and it may be more difficult to detect the breadth of discretionary powers, selective changes in the scope of rights, the existence of excessive requirements, i.e., situations in which not only a formal assessment of the act itself and its place in the legislative system is required, but also the modeling of possible corruption situations that arise on the basis of “suspicious” norms. [11, P. 877] She offered as well to make the conclusions of the anti-corruption assessment conducted by a well-trained AI completely transparent and publicly available and to introduce the requirements for the responsible civil servant to provide explanations for each corruption factor identified by the AI [11, P. 877].

D.L. Kosov and V.M. Belov also examined the possibilities of using AI for anti-corruption expertise. They formulated a step-by-step algorithm for pre-training AI using examples from regulatory legal acts containing corruption-prone factors. They also classified corruption-prone factors and developed a scale of AI errors in detecting corruption-prone factors; determined the frequency characteristics of AI errors; and obtained preliminary conclusions about the possibility of applying AI in anti-corruption expertise [12]. In addition, the authors proposed using a step-by-step algorithm for pre-training AI to conduct anti-corruption expertise [12].

According to the results of the study due to the disproportion in the number of training examples, which, according to the authors, clearly affected the quality of training, they were unable to draw conclusions for each corruption factor about the transition in the training process from serious errors to insignificant errors. Therefore, in this publication, they only showed the

possibilities of AI training, rather than results leading to conclusions about the need to apply AI in anti-corruption expertise and other legal expertise [12]. In another article, D. L. Kosov and V. M. Belov concluded that dialogic communication with AI and the AI provider demonstrated the impossibility of pre-learning in user mode [13, P. 415].

The applicability of a general-purpose AI system (GPT chat) was explored in an article by O. Kalenitsky, E. Gorn, E. Popova [14, P. 146-151]. An anti-corruption expertise using chat GPT was done in respect of the Resolution of the Government of the Krasnoyarsk Region "On Approval of the Procedure for Granting Subsidies to Reimburse Part of the Costs of Construction or Reconstruction of Buildings, Structures, and Facilities Used in Animal Husbandry, and for Selecting Recipients of Such Subsidies." Three stages of the study were conducted.

The first stage comprises of an analysis of the document. The Methodology for conducting anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts, approved by Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 962 of February 26, 2010 was used. As the result, three corruption-prone factors were identified [14, P. 146-151]. In the second stage, it was conducted a similar analysis, but this time using a chat with GPT technology. The prompt for the chat consisted of a list of all corruption-prone factors listed in the Methodology, as well as the full text of the selected resolution. After processing the request, the chat provided a complete analysis identifying eight corruption-prone factors. [14, P. 146-151] At the final stage, the examination was also conducted using chat with GPT technology, but the chat request was changed. It included the text of the Resolution and the characteristics of one of the corruption-prone factors. A total of twelve requests were sent to the chat at this stage, separately for each corruption-prone factor. As a result of the analysis, the chat identified eight corruption-prone factors that coincided with those that were presented by it at the previous stage. Based on this, it was concluded that the wording of the request did not affect the results of the examination conducted by the chat, but only made the process more difficult [14, P. 146-151].

As the authors noted, the study demonstrated that the use of chats with GPT technology for anti-corruption expertise requires significant improvement. A comparative analysis of the three stages of the study revealed significant discrepancies in the results. The format of the request to the GPT chat did not have a significant impact on the results of the analysis. According to the opinion of the authors this confirms the need to develop optimal methods of interacting with AI to increase the effectiveness of its use. The authors also came to the conclusion that, at this stage of technological development, the most effective approach appears to be the use of GPT chats as an auxiliary tool for improving the skills of experts conducting anti-corruption expertise. [14, P. 146-151]

Table 1. The identified conceptual positions

1.	The use of AI for anti-corruption expertise is possible for identifying formalised corruption-prone factors; however, it is more difficult to use AI to identify corruption-prone factors that are not formalised (Talapina, 2021).
2.	The use of GPT technology for anti-corruption expertise needs significant improvement. At the current stage of development, GPT can be used as an auxiliary technology to improve the skills of experts conducting anti-corruption expertise (Kalenitsky et al., 2025).

-
3. Interactive training of artificial intelligence in user mode to teach it to conduct anti-corruption expertise is impossible [13, P. 415] (Kosov&Belov, 2024).
-

At the same time, specific ways of using AI (prompts) as an auxiliary tool in conducting anti-corruption expertise require further examination.

3. Methods

In the present study the results indicated in the anti-corruption expert opinions were compared with the results obtained by AI. The difference in the research methodology compared to that used by O. Kalenitsky, E. Gorn, and E. Popova [14] is that the results of the anti-corruption assessment obtained using AI were compared with the existing conclusions of the anti-corruption expertise. In addition, the methodologies of two states were used, as well as draft regulatory legal acts developed in two different jurisdictions and a normative legal act adopted in one more jurisdiction. This made it possible to test the applicability of the methodology used in another country for identifying corruption-prone factors. In addition, this made it possible to verify that the AI system did not select corruption-prone factors from existing conclusions related to the drafts that were uploaded to the AI system.

3.1. Using prompts in respect of a separate provision of the draft of a normative legal act

A number of steps were taken in order to conduct the study. On the website of the Legislative Assembly of the Zabaikalsky Krai, it was found the expert opinion published with the results of an independent anti-corruption expertise of the draft Law of the Zabaikalsky Krai “On Amendments to the Law of the Zabaikalsky Krai ‘On the Status of Deputies of the Legislative Assembly of the Zabaikalsky Krai’”[15]. The draft Law contained the following provision: “A member of the Legislative Assembly who exercises his or her powers without taking leave from his or her main job shall be paid a monthly compensation allowance for expenses related to his or her duties as a member of the Legislative Assembly in an amount equal to three times the minimum wage, without having to submit a report on expenses.”[15]

The expert identified a corruption-prone factor in the aforementioned provision of the draft Law, named as ‘the absence or incompleteness of administrative procedures’, i.e., the absence of a procedure for certain actions to be performed by state bodies, local government bodies, or organizations (their officials), or the absence of one of the elements of such a procedure [15].

Justifying the existence of a corruption-prone factor, the expert pointed out that the amount of money equal to three minimum wages is significant, and the use of such a substantial amount without providing financial reports may tempt members of the Legislative Assembly to use the allocated funds for purposes not related to their parliamentary activities. The absence of administrative procedures for deputies to provide financial reports provides an opportunity to arbitrarily use the payments established by the draft law, which creates conditions for corrupt practices. [15]

In order to check if the AI system is able to test the opinion of the expert, the above mentioned provision of the draft Law was uploaded into a general-purpose AI system. The following prompt was also uploaded: “You are an expert conducting an anti-corruption review of a draft normative legal act. Detect a corruption-prone factor in the uploaded provision of the draft law.”

In its response, the AI system indicated the lack of control and accountability mechanisms for the expenditure of public funds; the AI classified the identified factor as belonging to the group of “rules that create unjustified advantages” and “rules that exclude or impede control”. The AI system indicated that the identified defect in the legal norm could be considered as two corruption-prone factors: “the absence or uncertainty of administrative procedures for control, accountability, and responsibility”; “the granting of unjustified advantages to certain categories of persons.”

To justify the existence of a corruption-prone factor, AI justified the corruption potential of the identified legal defect as follows: compensation is a fixed monetary amount, but is not linked to the actual costs associated with parliamentary activities; the absence of an obligation to provide reports excludes the possibility of controlling the targeted use of public funds. AI also indicated that the uncertainty of the nature of the expenses to be compensated allows receiving payments regardless of actual costs; use funds for purposes other than those intended without the risk of detection; perceive compensation as additional remuneration, effectively concealing an increase in income.

Thus, AI identified the same defect in the legal norm as the independent expert, but unlike the independent expert, it recognized two corruption-prone factors in it, rather than one, and provided additional justification for the corruption-prone nature of the legal defect. This confirms that AI can be used to identify defects in legal norms, establish corruption-prone factors that are not identified by experts, and find additional justification for the corruption-inducing nature of the factors. The identification of an additional corruption-prone factor by AI, as well as additional justification of the corruption-prone nature of the norm, allows us to conclude that the use of AI would increase the efficiency of anti-corruption examination.

The next issue that needed to be examined was the possibility of using general-purpose AI systems for improvement of demonstration of the stages and methods of identifying corruption-prone factors. Demonstrating the methodology for identifying such factors is important for ensuring the reproducibility of expert conclusions.

The AI was then tasked (in the same chat) with explaining, step by step, how it had identified the corruption-prone factor. In its response, the AI indicated ten stages it used to search for corruption-prone factors: 1) identification and precise interpretation of the norm; 2) determination of the nature of the funds (targeted/non-targeted; fixed/variable); 3) searching for control and reporting procedures in the text of the norm; 4) comparing facts with empirical/theoretical criteria for corruption; 5) analyzing the risk of abuse; 6) assessing the severity and likelihood of consequences; 7) classifying the factor according to the methodology (type/category of corruption); 8) recording the evidence base and formulating conclusions; 9) proposing verification/corrective measures (testing the hypothesis); 10) recommendations for documenting the analysis for external control. The AI also provided explanations for each point in its response.

The mentioned above confirms that the AI's response is valuable for the expertise, as the AI offered methodologically valuable comments on the analysis of incentives and opportunities (stage 5) and on the verification of the conclusion about the existence of a corruption-prone factor (stage 9).

Specifically, in the fifth stage, the AI analyzed what incentives and opportunities the norm creates and identified the following: incentive – receiving payment regardless of actual costs;

opportunity – spending funds for purposes other than those intended without the risk of detection due to the absence of reporting. On this basis, the AI concluded that there was a high risk of the funds being used for personal gain or to “hidden” increase income.

Regarding the ninth stage, the AI explained that it had specified particular changes/additions that would eliminate the risk (introducing reporting, a list of reimbursable expenses, control mechanisms, and sanctions). The AI also explained that this would simultaneously serve as a test: if the proposal is accepted, the risk is reduced. It also provided an example of verification: if, after introducing the reporting requirement, the reimbursed amounts correspond to the confirmed expenses, the initial vulnerability to corruption will be eliminated.

At the same time, the other stages are of little methodological value, as they either do not relate to the identification of the corruption-prone factor or do not provide an understanding of the specific methods for the detection of the corruption-prone factor. In addition, the AI referred to the methodology of the Ministry of Justice, while the expert used the Methodology for conducting anti-corruption examination of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts, approved by Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 96 of February 26, 2010.

Another issue examined is concerned the possibility of using AI to check the conclusions of anti-corruption expert assessments. The next task assigned to the AI was accompanying the uploading the full text of the specified expert opinion and address the AI the following prompt: "You are an expert in the field of anti-corruption expertise of draft regulatory legal acts. Check the uploaded anti-corruption review. In your report, indicate: 1) whether all corruption-prone factors have been identified; 2) whether their corruption-prone nature has been correctly and fully justified; 3) other circumstances affecting the quality of the anti-corruption review. When preparing your response, use the same methodology as the independent expert". The prompt was addressed to another AI system, as it was capable of reading the text of the conclusion.

In its response, the AI identified the following factors: 1) uncertainty of legal concepts, since the wording “expenses related to deputy activities” is not specific and allows for broad interpretation; 2) excessive rights or privileges, since the provision of a significant amount without accountability can be considered an unjustified advantage; 3) lack of control and accountability, as the draft does not provide for mechanisms to verify the targeted use of funds or sanctions for violations. The AI also pointed out that the expert did not disclose how the lack of reporting violates the principles of transparency and accountability enshrined in anti-corruption legislation; references to practice or similar cases were not provided, which would have reduced the risk of subjectivity; alternative solutions (e.g., partial reporting, expenditure limits) were not considered. The AI also pointed out other shortcomings in the independent expert's conclusion, including the lack of analysis of how the proposed norm compares with current federal standards for financing deputy activities and the lack of a comparative analysis with practices in other regions, which could have increased its credibility.

Thus, the AI's response to the mentioned prompt could improve the quality of the expert opinion in terms of justifying the existence of a corruption factor. At the same time, the response provided by AI could not be used directly to substantiate the presence of a corruption-prone factor in the text of the draft normative legal act; it needed to be checked by an expert and only provided the expert with additional areas for analysis. In addition, it appears difficult or

impossible for the expert to carry out the actions identified by the AI due to the inability to obtain the relevant information.

3.2. Using prompts in respect of the full text of the draft of a normative legal act

It was examined the ability of AI to identify corruption-prone factors in the text of a draft normative legal act. To this end, the Dossier on the Draft Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On Amendments and Additions to Certain Legislative Acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan on Stimulating Innovation, Developing Digitalization, and Information Security” [16] was used. The dossier includes the draft Law in its April 2021 version, as well as the anti-corruption expertise dated May 8, 2021 in respect of this version of the draft. The availability of the text of the draft Law and the text of the anti-corruption expertise allows for a comparison of the results obtained by experts and the results obtained by AI in the process of identifying corruption-prone factors. Methodological recommendations for conducting scientific anti-corruption expertise of draft normative legal acts, approved by the Order of the Chairman of the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Combating Corruption dated August 19, 2020, No. 268, were also used to conduct this study [4].

The following prompt was addressed to AI: “You are an expert conducting an anti-corruption expertise of a draft normative legal act (uploaded in the file). Identify the corruption risk factors in the draft. Use only the methodology uploaded in the file when conducting your search.” The above-mentioned draft law and methodological recommendations for conducting scientific anti-corruption expertise of draft normative legal acts were uploaded to the AI system.

In its response, the AI stated that since the project is extremely long and involves many codes, the analysis is based on the parts of the text that are present in the uploaded file. The AI system identified the following corruption risk factors from those specified in the uploaded methodology: ambiguous and vague wording; erroneous/excessively broad reference provisions; conflicts and duplication of provisions; legal gaps; insufficient transparency of government activities; insufficient access to information; excessive requirements for citizens; creation of new powers without sufficient justification; possibility of private gain by certain entities.

It should be mentioned that some of the identified corruption risk factors were named differently than they are named in the Methodological recommendations. For example, conflicts between legal norms were named by AI as ‘conflicts and duplication...’. In addition, corruption risk factors were identified that are not included in the list of corruption risk factors but are mentioned in other sections of the Methodological Recommendations. For example, the AI identified such corruption risk factors as “creation of new powers without sufficient justification” (clause 12) and “possibility of private gain by certain entities” (clauses 12.4 and 15). These risks are mentioned in the Methodological Recommendations, but are not included in the List and description of corruption risk factors.

A comparison of the results produced by AI with those indicated in the expert opinion showed the following: AI identified the following corruption risk factors specified in the Methodological Recommendations but not mentioned in the expert opinion: insufficient transparency of activities; insufficient access to information of public interest; the AI identified 9 types of corruption risk factors, while the expert opinion lists 15 types of corruption risk factors from among those specified in the Methodological Recommendations.

AI indicated some examples regarding shortcomings in reference provisions: “in accordance with the law,” “established by the judicial authorities,” “in the manner established by...”. It is also indicated that such wording was used in article 180 (procedure for registering civil status acts); article 181 (forms of books and certificates); articles 12, 47, 187, 192, 223, etc. Thus, AI did not detect all the corruption risk factors identified in the expert opinion.

In order to test the potential for improving the AI's ability to identify corruption risk factors, it was given a prompt to search for a corruption risk factor known as “broad discretionary powers,” which had been identified by experts but not by the AI. The prompt was formulated as follows: “You are an expert conducting an anti-corruption expertise of the draft law. Find corruption risk factor No. 14, ‘Broad discretionary powers’, in the uploaded text of the draft law, using the Methodological Recommendations uploaded in the File to search for this factor.” The prompt was uploaded to the same chat.

In its response, the AI provided a detailed answer, pointing out the wording in the draft that indicates this corruption risk factor and explaining why it identified it as the corruption risk factor No. 14, “broad discretionary powers.” For example, in one of the points of the response, the AI indicated the following provision: “A notary or registering authority may refuse to register a marriage on the basis of evidence ‘at its disposal’.” The AI gave the following example of wording: “...refuses state registration if it has evidence confirming the existence of obstacles...”. To justify the existence of a corruption factor, the AI pointed out that the law does not establish the form, sources, or criteria for such evidence; the assessment of the facts is entirely delegated to the person who makes a decision; there is no obligation to justify the assessment.

It should be noted that this corruption-prone factor was indicated in the experts' conclusion. In particular, the expert pointed out the text of the problematic provision. In addition, the expert noted that the Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan of December 26, 2011, “On Marriage (Matrimony) and Family” does not provide for, and the draft law does not propose, legal provisions that are recognized as evidence preventing the conclusion of a marriage. Giving notaries the ability to independently determine the absence of obstacles to marriage may give rise to different interpretations of what constitutes “evidence.”

It was also necessary to check whether the AI used an existing anti-corruption expert opinion on this draft to identify corruption risk factors in it. For the purposes of such verification, the draft normative legal act for which there is no published anti-corruption expert opinion was uploaded to AI, and the same prompt was addressed to the same chat. The Law of the Republic of Belarus No. 2435-XI of June 18, 1993, “On Health Care” [17] was selected for examination because its full text is available on the Internet, and this law has not been subjected to anti-corruption examination using the methodology applicable in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The AI identified corruption risk factors specified in the Methodological Recommendations, such as ambiguous and vague wording; broad discretionary powers; legal gaps; insufficient access to information; excessive requirements, etc. For example, in its response, the AI indicated the words “...in the manner established by the Ministry of Health” and pointed out that the wording does not contain criteria and conditions, allowing the agency to independently determine the content of rights and obligations. This phrase was classified by AI as a corruption risk factor “ambiguous and vague wording”.

Thus, the results generated by AI are not reliable. Therefore, AI can be used as an assistant in detection of provisions that could potentially create corruption risks, but it cannot replace an expert. In addition, the methodology adopted in another country may be used to conduct anti-corruption reviews of normative legal acts, especially in cases where the legislation of the country where the draft normative legal act was developed or the normative legal act was adopted does not provide an exhaustive list of corruption-prone factors.

4. Results and Discussion

The current study has confirmed the conclusions contained in previous research that AI systems are not capable of independently identifying corruption-prone factors and cannot replace humans. E.V. Talapina's idea that the AI system would have difficulty identifying certain corruption-prone factors [11, P. 877] has also been confirmed. It was established that to solve this problem at list in part, a prompt focused on searching for a specific corruption-prone factor could be uploaded to the AI system.

The current study also demonstrates that experts conducting anti-corruption expertise can use general AI systems as an auxiliary tool to identify provisions that deserve additional attention from the expert. For this purpose, prompts addressed to AI can be used to analyse the text of a regulatory legal act as a whole in order to identify provisions that may contain corruption-prone factors. Then, such provisions have to be examined in details by expert. In order to verify the results, additional AI analysis can be performed in respect of separate provisions in which corruption-prone factors have already been identified by an expert. For detection of provisions which deserve to be re-examined the text of the legal act can also be studied using various anti-corruption expertise methodologies uploaded to AI system. Prompts can help strengthen the arguments in the expert's conclusion, as well as in enhancing the description of the methodology for identifying corruption-prone factors and justifications for their corruption-prone nature.

Although general-purpose AI systems are not capable of conducting a comprehensive anti-corruption assessment and providing ready-made and reliable results, these systems are able to provide additional information that was not identified by the expert during the anti-corruption examination. Thus, the use of AI increases the effectiveness of anti-corruption expertise.

5. Conclusions

Prompts can be used for detection provisions of legal acts (drafts) for searching for corruption-prone factors in the text of a normative legal act or its individual provisions, for searching the ways to substantiate the corruption-prone nature of defects in normative legal acts, and for detection of ways to improve the quality of expert conclusions. At the same time, all the results obtained by AI require verification and correction by an expert.

The results obtained during the current study are preliminary in nature and require verification through further research on a larger empirical basis. Further research may be also conducted in order to identify ways to improve the quality of prompts used in anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts.

Author Contributions: all aspects of present work were conducted by the author.

Funding: No funding was received for preparing this article.

Data Availability Statement: Data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this article or can be found in references.

Acknowledgements: This article was prepared without external support.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interests.

References

1. Interparliamentary Assembly of CIS Member States. (2012). Model law on anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and drafts normative legal acts [Model'nyy zakon ob antikorrupsionnoy ekspertize normativnykh pravovykh aktov i projektov normativnykh pravovykh aktov]. IACIS. <https://iacis.ru/public/upload/files/1/285.pdf>
2. Interparliamentary Assembly of CIS Member States. (2012). Recommendations on conducting anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts [Rekomendatsii po provedeniyu antikorrupsionnoy ekspertizy normativnykh pravovykh aktov i projektov normativnykh pravovykh aktov]. IACIS. <https://iacis.ru/public/upload/files/1/342.pdf>
3. Government of the Kyrgyz Republic. (2010, December 8). *Resolution No. 319 on approval of the Instruction on the procedure for conducting legal, human rights, gender, environmental, and anti-corruption expertise of draft regulations of the Kyrgyz Republic* [Instruktsiya o poryadke provedeniya pravovoy, pravozashchitnoy, gendernoy, ekologicheskoy, antikorrupsionnoy ekspertizy proektov podzakonnykh aktov Kyrgyzskoy Respubliki]. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/7-14488/edition/1049641/ru>
4. Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Counteracting Corruption (Anti-Corruption Service). (2020, August 19). *Methodological recommendations on conducting scientific anti-corruption expertise of draft normative legal acts* [Metodicheskie rekomendatsii po provedeniyu nauchnoy antikorrupsionnoy ekspertizy proektov normativnykh pravovykh aktov]. Approved by Order No. 268 of the Chairman of the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Counteracting Corruption. <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/anticorruption/documents/details/60093?lang=ru>
5. Government of the Russian Federation. (2010, February 26). *Resolution No. 96 on anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts* [Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva Rossiyskoy Federatsii ot 26 fevralya 2010 g. No. 96 "Ob antikorrupsionnoy ekspertize normativnykh pravovykh aktov i proektov normativnykh pravovykh aktov"]. https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_98088/92d969e26a4326c5d02fa79b8f9cf4994ee5633b/
6. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2023, August 8). *Law No. LRU-860 on the anti-corruption examination of normative legal acts and their projects* [Zakon Respubliki Uzbekistan ot 8 avgusta 2023 g. No. LRU-860 "Ob antikorrupsionnoy ekspertize normativnykh pravovykh aktov i ikh proektov"]. LexUZ. <https://lex.uz/ru/docs/6906707>
7. Google Cloud. (n.d.). What is prompt engineering? Google Cloud. <https://cloud.google.com/discover/what-is-prompt-engineering#what-is-prompt-engineering>
8. Annouz, M. (2024, September 25). Transnational cooperation and artificial intelligence-based anti-corruption tools (AI-ACTs) [Opinion piece]. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). https://www.unodc.org/corruption/en/news/2024-09-25_opinion-

- piece_transnational-cooperation-and-artificial-intelligence-based-anti-corruption-tools-ai-acts.html
9. OECD. (2024). Generative AI for anti-corruption and integrity in government. OECD Publishing. P. 44
https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2024/03/generative-ai-for-anti-corruption-and-integrity-in-government_9859b6a8/657a185a-en.pdf
 10. Porosenkov, G. A., Reznikov, I. A., Zyubakov, K. A., & Tukhvatullin, T. A. (2022). Problems of the institution of independent anti-corruption expertise and prospects for automation (*Problemy instituta nezavisimoy antikorrupsionnoy ekspertizy i perspektivy avtomatizatsii*). *Social Sciences and Contemporary World*, (6), 89–105.
<https://doi.org/10.31857/S0869049922060077>
 11. Talapina, E.V. (2021). Artificial intelligence and legal expertise in public administration. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Law* 4: 865–881.
<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu14.2021.404>
 12. Kosov, D. L., & Belov, V. M. (2024). *On the possibility of applying artificial intelligence in managing the quality of Russian legislation: The case of anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts* [O vozmozhnosti primeneniya iskusstvennogo intellekta v upravlenii kachestvom zakonodatel'stva RF na primere antikorrupsionnykh ekspertiz normativno-pravovykh aktov]. *Inzhenernyy vestnik Dona*, 9(117), 351–364.
 13. Kosov, D. L., & Belov, V. M. (2024). *Application of artificial intelligence in anti-corruption expertise of managing the quality of normative legal acts* [Primenenie iskusstvennogo intellekta v antikorrupsionnykh ekspertizakh upravleniya kachestvom normativno-pravovykh aktov]. *Ergodizayn*, 4(26), 412–417. <https://doi.org/10.30987/2658-4026-2024-4-412-417>.
 14. Kalenitsky, O. A., Gorn, E. D., & Popova, E. Yu. (2025). The use of artificial intelligence in conducting anti-corruption expertise (*Ispol'zovanie iskusstvennogo intellekta pri provedenii antikorrupsionnoy ekspertizy*). *History, Theory, Practice of Russian Law*, (18), 144–151.
 15. Bystrov, P. G. (2020, March 25). *Conclusion of the independent anti-corruption examination of the draft Law of the Zabaykalsky Krai "On Amendments to the Law of the Zabaykalsky Krai 'On the Status of a Deputy of the Legislative Assembly of the Zabaykalsky Krai'"*. Legislative Assembly of the Zabaykalsky Krai. <https://zaksobr-chita.ru/informaciya/zaklucheniya-po-itogam-antikorrupcionnoi-ekspertizy-zakonv--postanovlenii--proektov-zakonov-i-postanovlenii>
 16. Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2022, June). *Dossier on the Draft Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On amendments and additions to certain legislative acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan on issues of stimulating innovations, development of digitalization, and information security"* [Dos'ye na proyekt Zakona Respubliki Kazakhstan «O vnesenii izmeneniy i dopolneniy v nekotorye zakonodatel'nye akty Respubliki Kazakhstan po voprosam stimulirovaniya innovatsiy, razvitiya tsifrovizatsii i informatsionnoy bezopasnosti»]. Continent Online. https://continent-online.com/Document/?doc_id=36952240#pos=2;-138
 17. Republic of Belarus. (1993, June 18). *Law of the Republic of Belarus, June 18, 1993 No. 2435-XII, On healthcare* [ZAKON RESPUBLIKI BELARUS', 18 iyunya 1993 g. № 2435-XII, O zdравookhranenii]. National Legal Internet Portal of the Republic of Belarus. <https://etalonline.by/document/?regnum=V19302435>