The use of artificial intelligence platforms by users of legal services and the challenges for the legal sector

José de Campos Amorim [1*]

[1]ISCAP, Porto, Portugal
Email: mailto: j.camposamorim@gmail.com (J.C.A.)
[*]Corresponding author

***Abstract* — The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the field of Law represents a significant paradigm shift in both legal education and professional practice. By enabling innovative methodologies, AI contributes to a more dynamic and interactive approach to legal knowledge, fostering critical thinking, creativity, and adaptability among future legal professionals. Its application in pedagogical contexts supports active learning models, such as the case method, legal clinics, and design thinking, which emphasize experiential learning and practical problem-solving. Through advanced data analysis, intelligent systems can process legal doctrine, legislation, and case law, allowing users to identify patterns and jurisprudential trends. This contributes to a more informed and efficient application of the law, while promoting greater consistency and predictability in judicial decisions. AI facilitates access to vast volumes of legal information and serves as a valuable instrument for optimizing legal strategies and case management. Its ability to simulate legal scenarios, akin to virtual courts, provides a platform for testing arguments and exploring potential outcomes. Additionally, as a virtual educational environment comparable to platforms such as Moodle, AI fosters collaborative learning through discussion forums, simulations, and role-playing exercises, thus extending the boundaries of traditional legal education.**

***Keywords* — Artificial Intelligence; Law; Platforms; Learning; Legal Services**

I. Introduction

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into legal education has transformed traditional pedagogical approaches, moving beyond expository teaching methods toward more interactive, personalized, and practice-oriented learning models.

Traditionally, legal education relied heavily on textual analysis and theoretical instruction. AI now enables dynamic approaches, such as simulations, automated case analysis, and adaptive learning systems. These tools contribute to making legal knowledge more accessible by simplifying complex legal language and supporting students in understanding doctrine, legislation, and case law.

Whilst the law has traditionally been characterised by a high degree of technical complexity, specialised language and restricted access, now, in this new context, AI emerges as a tool to mitigate these barriers by simplifying and interpreting legal content in a more accessible way.

On the one hand, AI-based systems enable the automation and acceleration of legal research processes, reducing the time required to locate relevant legislation, case law, and doctrine. This efficiency benefits not only legal professionals but also ordinary citizens seeking to understand their rights and obligations.

Additionally, AI contributes to reducing information asymmetries by providing accessible tools (platforms) that guide users in resolving basic legal issues.

This perspective situates AI legal platforms within a broader transformation of legal systems, where technology plays an increasingly central role in both adjudication and policy-making. From there, we can identify three major research areas: predictive justice; human–machine collaboration; automated adjudication. The central questions are whether these systems improve quality or merely speed, how AI outputs can be safely used in legal decision-making and legal advice contexts, how AI can extract patterns from case law and predict outcomes, and how to allocate responsibility for errors.

That is why this article analyses the general context, specific tools, and platforms used in the legal domain, exploring their applications in areas such as case law analysis, case simulation, research support, and automated assessment. It also examines the challenges of AI in terms of access to legal knowledge, reduction of technical barriers, acceleration of research, and provision of more intelligible information, thereby contributing to greater inclusion of citizens in the legal context, which is fundamental in democratic societies.

The use of AI in the legal field also raises ethical and reliability challenges, particularly regarding the accuracy of information and the need for human oversight. Recent literature places strong emphasis on AI governance and regulation, reflecting growing societal.

II. Literature Review

This paper examines how ‘artificial intelligence’ affects legal services and the role of legal professionals, particularly academics. McGinnis and Pearce (2014) frame AI as a disruptive force that reconfigures legal services by shifting the value from personalised human work to scalable, data-driven processes, with implications for professional identity, business models, and access to legal assistance. Susskind (2023) similarly argues that legal services are shifting from a craft-based profession towards an increasingly standardised and technology-mediated service, with implications for regulation and for expectations regarding legal expertise and services. Ashley (2017) provides a comprehensive treatment of “legal analytics,” focusing on how computational methods can support argumentation, comparative study and practical reasoning.

One aspect of AI focuses on transforming legal research workflows through AI-optimised searching, summarisation and question answering, thereby speeding up the information retrieval process. These platforms (LexisNexis, 2023; Thomson Reuters, 2023) illustrate how providers conceive of

https://doi.org/10.34630/cip.vi.7665

these systems as ‘decision support’ rather than decision-makers — an important distinction for professional accountability and governance.

Casetext’s CoCounsel materials (Casetext, 2023) and similar product descriptions highlight interactive assistance and rapid synthesis of authorities. The literature treats these tools as simultaneously democratising (lowering search barriers) and centralising (embedding legal knowledge access within proprietary systems).

A prominent legal controversy shaping this space involves the relationship between AI research tools and access to legal texts. The dispute referenced in practice-facing commentary (Loeb & Loeb LLP, 2025) reflects broader concerns about whether training and building AI research systems may depend on copyrighted legal content and what that means for competition, innovation, and public access to law. In parallel, civil-society commentary (Electronic Frontier Foundation, 2025) argues that protecting access to legal materials is crucial to enable beneficial uses of AI while safeguarding the public’s ability to read and reuse law-related sources.

Another cluster addresses AI tools aimed at automating parts of legal service delivery for lay users. DoNotPay’s overview (DoNotPay, 2026) is often discussed as an early example of “consumer legal tech” offering templated workflows (e.g., letters, appeals). The academic debate treats these systems as potentially improving access to justice by reducing costs and complexity, while also raising risks of inaccurate guidance, lack of contextual judgement, and unclear accountability when outputs cause harm.

Since 2023, generative AI has shifted attention toward drafting, review, and synthesis tasks. Harvey’s platform materials (Harvey AI, 2024) and OpenAI’s case study on legal customisation (OpenAI, 2024) exemplify the framing of generative tools as productivity multipliers for law firms, typically emphasising security, workflow integration, and firm-specific knowledge.

Holmes, Bialik and Fadel (2019) outline how AI supports personalised learning paths, formative assessment, and intelligent tutoring, while also flagging governance issues such as privacy and bias. Luckin (2018) similarly examines the relationship between machine learning and human intelligence, emphasising the role of educators in designing socio-technical systems that improve learning rather than replace judgement.

The integration of AI into the legal domain has generated an increasingly sophisticated body of literature, particularly following the emergence of large language models (LLMs) after 2022. Recent scholarship expands earlier debates on legal informatics by addressing generative AI, explainability, and the transformation of legal practice. This section incorporates these developments to situate platforms such as Westlaw Edge, Lexis+, Casetext CoCounsel, and Harvey AI within contemporary academic discourse.

Consumer tools such as Socratic (Google, 2023) are sometimes cited as examples of AI-supported learning support; their relevance lies in showing how AI-mediated explanation can reduce barriers for novices, while raising questions about academic integrity and the depth of understanding.

Recent literature highlights a paradigm shift driven by LLMs, which significantly expand the capabilities of AI in legal contexts. According to Harry Surden (2025), recent advances in AI—particularly post-2022—have enabled systems to process and generate legal language with unprecedented sophistication, marking a transition from earlier symbolic and rule-based systems to deep learning architectures.

This shift underpins the development of AI assistants such as Casetext CoCounsel and Harvey AI, which go beyond retrieval and engage in legal text generation, summarization, and reasoning-like tasks.

However, recent critical scholarship focused on the operationalization of legal rules through AI systems and emphasizes that these capabilities should not be overstated. Kapoor, Henderson, and Narayanan (2024) argue that claims about AI transforming the legal profession are often exaggerated, particularly in tasks requiring contextual reasoning.

Recent empirical and experimental work demonstrates both potential and limitations. For example, Schwarcz et al. (2026) show that AI reasoning models can significantly assist legal tasks, but their effectiveness varies depending on the structure and evaluability of the task.

At the same time, research on generative AI in legal contexts highlights persistent issues: lack of deep legal understanding; difficulty in applying hierarchical legal authority; challenges in distinguishing binding from persuasive precedent. This is particularly relevant for platforms such as Neota Logic, which aim to translate legal norms into executable logic.

Kesari et al. (2025) demonstrate, for example, how LLMs can be used to translate legal requirements—such as consent in privacy law—into computational specifications, enabling automated compliance processes. However, their findings also reveal limitations in the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated outputs.

Similarly, Hill, Waddington, and Qiu (2025) explore the use of AI in legislative drafting, suggesting that LLMs may improve the clarity and efficiency of legal texts, while also raising concerns about misinformation and interpretability. The literature has increasingly emphasised the importance of AI governance and regulation. In parallel, Gao et al. (2025) examine the legal implications of AI-assisted writing, emphasizing challenges related to academic integrity, copyright and data protection.

Bex (2024) highlights the need for a transdisciplinary approach to AI and law, combining legal, technical, and ethical perspectives to ensure responsible development and deployment.

More broadly, Currie et al. (2025) identify a “regulatory lag” in AI governance, where technological innovation outpaces legal frameworks, creating risks related to accountability, transparency, and enforcement.

These concerns are particularly relevant for generative platforms such as Harvey AI, which operate at the intersection of automation and legal responsibility.

Recent scholarship confirms that AI is transforming legal education. Farber (2025) argues that LLMs require a reassessment of legal pedagogy, including teaching methods and assessment strategies, as students increasingly rely on AI tools.

Similarly, Munir (2025) highlights both the opportunities

and risks of integrating generative AI into legal education, noting benefits such as personalized learning alongside concerns about bias, privacy, and fabricated outputs.

A recent systematic review by scholars in the European Journal of Innovation Management (2025) introduces the concept of "Justice 5.0", emphasizing the integration of AI into legal decision-making systems. This development reinforces the role of platforms in shaping future legal training. This perspective situates AI legal platforms within a broader transformation of legal systems, in which technology plays an increasingly central role in the work of legal professionals.

III. Methodology

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design to examine the role and impact of AI in legal research platforms. Given the heterogeneity of the tools under analysis - ranging from traditional legal databases enhanced by AI, such as Westlaw Edge and Lexis+, to AI-driven assistants like Harvey AI and Casetext CoCounsel, as well as rule-based systems such as Neota Logic - a single methodological approach would be insufficient to capture their complexity. Accordingly, this research combines doctrinal legal analysis and a comparative functional analysis.

The doctrinal component examines the extent to which AI tools support conventional legal research activities, including case law identification, statutory interpretation, legal reasoning, and the application of precedent. Relevant literature, legal scholarship, platform documentation, and publicly available reports are analysed to assess how these technologies align with established legal research methodologies.

To account for the technological diversity of AI legal platforms, the study adopts a comparative functional approach. Rather than comparing platforms solely on their technical architecture or commercial positioning, the analysis focuses on the functions they perform for legal practitioners. Platforms are compared using a common set of criteria, including legal research and case law retrieval capabilities; accuracy and relevance of search results; use of AI techniques such as natural language processing, predictive analytics, or generative AI; and ability to summarise legal materials and generate legal insights.

The empirical component consists of scenario-based testing of selected platform functionalities where access is available. A series of representative legal research tasks are used, such as locating relevant precedents, answering legal questions, generating case summaries, and identifying authorities on a specific legal issue. The outputs produced by the platforms are evaluated qualitatively according to criteria including relevance, completeness, accuracy, clarity, and consistency with established legal sources.

The findings from the doctrinal, comparative, and empirical components are then synthesised to identify common patterns, strengths, limitations, and emerging trends in the use of AI for legal research.

This study acknowledges several limitations. First, access to certain proprietary platforms (e.g., Westlaw Edge and Lexis+) may restrict the scope of empirical testing. Second, the rapidly evolving nature of AI technologies means that platform capabilities may change over time. Third, the qualitative nature of the comparative and empirical analysis may introduce a degree of subjectivity in the evaluation of results.

The adoption of a mixed-methods approach is justified by the need to capture the multidimensional nature of AI in legal research. While doctrinal analysis ensures legal rigor, comparative functional analysis enables systematic evaluation of technological differences, and empirical testing provides practical validation.

This integrated methodology allows for a comprehensive assessment of how AI-based platforms are reshaping legal research, bridging the gap between legal theory, technological innovation, and professional practice.

IV. Practical Applications of Artificial Intelligence

AI assumed an increasingly relevant role in areas such as case study, dispute resolution, legal interpretation, contract drafting, data protection, criminal investigation, and decision-making. The following sections present concrete examples of its application.

A. AI in Case Study

AI can be used in the analysis of judicial decisions, helping to facilitate the study and resolution of practical cases.

Firstly, AI enables the automated summarization of judicial decisions. It can identify the essential elements of a case—relevant facts, legal issue, reasoning, and decision—significantly reducing the time required to read extensive judgments. For example, a user can obtain a structured summary of a Supreme Court decision within seconds, facilitating initial understanding and allowing for a more focused critical analysis.

Secondly, AI contributes to the identification and comparison of precedents. It can search large case law databases and suggest similar cases based on shared facts or legal issues. This functionality is particularly useful in the case method, as it enables a broader and more critical understanding of how different courts address analogous legal problems.

Some AI tools can automatically highlight key legal concepts, applicable principles, and relevant legal norms within a judgment. This support facilitates the case briefing process—an essential practice in the case method—and helps structure information more systematically.

Additionally, AI enables the simulation of legal argumentation. Interactive platforms can act as interlocutors, posing questions about the case, presenting counterarguments, or requesting the defense of alternative positions. This interaction fosters critical thinking and argumentative skills.

Finally, AI contributes to the simplification of legal language by reformulating judicial decisions into more accessible terms without compromising technical rigor. This is particularly useful in complex cases and enhances legal understanding.

B. AI in Dispute Resolution and Judicial Proceedings

AI has been applied in alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, particularly through digital platforms.

Its use is mainly reflected in decision-support systems and

Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) platforms.

In Portugal, entities such as consumer arbitration centers promote the digitalization of mediation and arbitration processes. AI can be used, for instance, to determine eligibility for social benefits.

AI can also analyze national case law and predict judicial outcomes in consumer disputes, contributing to procedural efficiency. For example, in disputes involving telecommunications contracts, AI can estimate the likelihood of success based on established case law.

However, the automation of judicial decision-making is limited by the Portuguese Constitution, which guarantees the right to a fair trial and the intervention of a human judge.

C. AI in Legal Interpretation and Application of the Law

AI, through natural language processing, allows the analysis of large volumes of legislation and case law, supporting interpretative activities.

Legal software can automatically identify normative conflicts between legal instruments or redundancies across laws and suggest interpretative solutions based on case law. For instance, AI may detect conflicts between the Portuguese Civil Code and special legislation and propose interpretations aligned with Constitutional Court jurisprudence.

Nevertheless, legal interpretation involves value judgments and principles such as equity, which are difficult to replicate through algorithms.

D. AI in Contract Drafting

AI is widely used in contract drafting, including the generation of legal documents and the implementation of smart contracts.

Automated platforms allow the creation of employment contracts in compliance with labor law, adjusting clauses according to specific parameters such as sector or type of employment relationship.

In the case of smart contracts (based on blockchain technology), their legal validity in Portugal depends on compliance with the requirements established in the Civil Code, particularly regarding form and declaration of intent.

E. AI in Criminal Investigation

AI is applied in criminal investigation for data analysis and pattern identification, particularly by judicial police authorities.

It can assist in identifying criminal networks through the analysis of large datasets. However, such practices must respect fundamental rights enshrined in the Portuguese Constitution, including the presumption of innocence.

They must also comply with data protection rules established by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and national legislation, which impose limits on fully automated decision-making.

Technologies such as facial recognition are subject to strict legal restrictions, particularly concerning privacy and fundamental rights.

AI can also be used for trial simulations. It is possible to create fictional cases (for example, theft), assign roles to the AI (defence lawyer, judge, or prosecutor), and develop interactions based on real legal arguments, thereby training advocacy skills and improving understanding of criminal procedure.

F. Other Recommendations

Use either SI (MKS) or CGS as primary units. (SI units are encouraged.) If your native language is not English, try to get a native English-speaking colleague to proofread your paper.

V. AI-Based Legal Research Platforms

The integration of AI in the legal field has led to the development of innovative tools that transform legal research and education. Among these are ROSS Intelligence, Westlaw Edge, Lexis+, Casetext CoCounsel, Harvey AI, Neota Logic, DoNotPay, Kira Systems, and Socratic.

They fall into 4 categories:

1) Traditional legal research platforms (for example, Westlaw Edge; Lexis+; ROSS Intelligence). They provide legal reference databases and enable AI-powered searches. These platforms are digital legal libraries combined with AI-powered search and analytics. Their main purpose is finding authoritative legal sources, not replacing lawyers' reasoning.

These platforms offer an extensive database (case law, legislation, regulations, specialist journals) and teach users how to search, but not how to make decisions; they enable users to conduct legal searches using natural language, analyse case law and identify links between court cases.

They do not formulate strategies independently or present legal conclusions; nor do they offer legal reasoning or their own judgement. It is ideal for doctrinal research, the analysis of case law and citation searches.

2) AI legal assistants (LLM-based co-pilots) (examples: Casetext CoCounsel; Harvey AI). They provide a degree of automation, document drafting, case analysis and workflow management. These platforms act as legal co pilots that assist with analysis, drafting, summarization, and workflow tasks, using large language models (LLMs).

These are platforms based on generative AI (similar to GPT-type models), which are interactive in nature (chat-based or task-based) and capable of processing information from databases. They enable the drafting of contracts, memoranda, emails and summaries, and can also compare various documents, pose legal questions or generate legal workflows. They should be viewed as a support tool, not a source of legal advice, and are ideal for drafting, analysing and managing legal work. However, the results require human validation and supervision by legal professionals.

3) Automation and expert systems, such as Neota Logic, represent a rule-based approach to legal decision-making that differs fundamentally from generative AI. These systems operate through predefined logic structures, including if–then rules and decision trees, which encode legal expertise into consistent and repeatable processes. This ensures a high level of predictability and transparency, which is particularly important in legal and regulatory contexts.

A key advantage of expert systems lies in their explainability. Because decisions are derived from explicit rules, the reasoning behind each output can be audited and clearly understood. This makes them well-suited for applications such as compliance assessments, regulatory decision tools, and legal intake systems, where accountability and accuracy are essential.

However, the reliance on predefined rules also limits their flexibility. Expert systems are less capable of addressing

ambiguous or novel legal problems that require interpretation or creative reasoning. Consequently, while they are highly effective for standardized decision-making and policy enforcement, they are less suitable for complex or evolving legal scenarios.

4) Specialized or niche legal AI tools represent an important category within the broader legal technology landscape. These systems focus on specific functional domains, often leveraging tailored machine learning models to optimize performance within constrained contexts.

Kira Systems exemplifies this approach in the domain of contract analysis and due diligence. By applying machine learning techniques to identify and extract key clauses from legal documents, it significantly reduces the time required for manual review, particularly in mergers and acquisitions (M&A) and compliance processes.

Similarly, DoNotPay illustrates the potential of AI-driven consumer legal automation. As a chatbot-based platform, it enables users to perform routine legal actions—such as contesting parking tickets or requesting refunds—without requiring formal legal expertise.

In the educational context, Socratic provides AI-assisted support for learning, including foundational legal concepts. By helping students understand subject matter through guided explanations, it serves as a supplementary educational tool rather than a professional legal resource. While it offers clear pedagogical benefits, it cannot be considered an authoritative source for legal decision-making or practice.

Table 1. Comparative Summary

Category	Core Role	Intelligence Type
Traditional research platforms	Find law	Search + analytics AI
AI legal assistants	Assist lawyers	Generative AI (LLMs)
Expert systems	Decide by rules	Rule based logic
Niche tools	Solve specific problems	Task specific AI

[1] Source: Compiled by the author.

These platforms do not compete directly—they complement each other. They represent different stages of AI integration in law—from information retrieval, to assistance, to automation, to specialization.

We will now introduce each of these platforms:

B. The ROSS Intelligence Platform

ROSS Intelligence was one of the first platforms to use AI based on natural language processing ("question-based search") for legal research. It enables the analysis of case law in a more efficient way, significantly transforming traditional keyword-based research methods.

Users can formulate legal questions in natural language—for example, regarding the criteria for contractual liability or gross negligence—and obtain answers grounded in relevant case law, as well as decisions organized by relevance.

Thus, the platform not only supports legal research but also provides answers that can be directly applied to specific cases.

C. Westlaw Edge and Lexis+

Westlaw Edge and Lexis+ represent advanced developments in AI-driven legal research platforms, integrating predictive analytics and natural language processing to enhance the efficiency and precision of legal inquiry. Both systems allow users to formulate queries in natural language, filter results according to relevance or jurisdiction, and access interconnected case law through automated cross-referencing. Their ability to simulate hypothetical scenarios and assess the likelihood of case outcomes reflects a shift toward data-informed legal reasoning.

For instance, when researching case law in the area of civil liability for negligence, the user may rely on platforms such as Lexis+, entering the query "civil liability negligence non-pecuniary damages Portugal." The tool automatically suggests relevant case law, providing structured summaries of the key facts, legal issues, and reasoning behind judicial decisions.

Westlaw Edge emphasizes analytical rigor through tools such as KeyCite, Litigation Analytics, and Quick Check, supporting precedent validation and strategic litigation assessment. In contrast, Lexis+ focuses on content generation and user interaction, offering features that assist in drafting, summarizing, and structuring legal arguments. Together, these platforms illustrate the growing integration of AI in legal practice and education, fostering a more dynamic, accessible, and analytically grounded approach to legal research.

For instance, if the aim is to conduct a comparative analysis of case law in order to assess whether judicial decisions are consistent, Westlaw Edge can be used. This tool enables comparison of similar judgments, identifies divergences in case law, and highlights decision-making patterns—for example, cases where the court rules in favour of the injured party versus cases where the claim is dismissed—thereby fostering the development of critical legal thinking.

D. Casetext CoCounsel

Casetext, through its CoCounsel assistant, represents a significant advancement in the application of AI to legal practice and education. The system goes beyond traditional research tools by enabling interactive, natural language engagement with complex legal materials. This facilitates a more intuitive and efficient workflow for legal professionals.

CoCounsel is particularly notable for its capacity to process and analyze large volumes of documents, draft legal research memoranda, and identify potential contractual risks. Additionally, its support in due diligence processes highlights its practical utility in transactional contexts. By generating arguments and counterarguments, the platform also functions as an intellectual aid, enhancing analytical reasoning.

Overall, Casetext illustrates a shift toward AI systems capable of performing sophisticated legal tasks, thereby augmenting human expertise and transforming the methods by which legal analysis and document preparation are conducted.

CaseText allow users to train legal reasoning by generating, for example, "arguments for and against the defendant's liability," as well as suggesting relevant case law. In this sense, AI acts as a legal assistant, helping to prepare opposing legal positions.

E. Harvey AI

Harvey AI is based on large language models developed in partnership with OpenAI and tailored to the legal domain. Harvey AI offers advanced capabilities tailored to legal professional workflows. The system enables the analysis of litigation, identification of contractual inconsistencies, and the handling of complex legal queries, while also automating routine tasks.

By supporting activities such as contract drafting and the preparation of legal memoranda and opinions, Harvey AI contributes to increased efficiency and precision in legal work. Its compliance with high security standards further underscores the growing importance of trustworthy AI solutions in managing sensitive legal information.

F. Neota Logic

Neota Logic represents a significant development in the automation of legal reasoning through rule-based systems. By enabling the translation of legal norms into computational logic, the platform allows for the creation of applications that can systematically determine rights and obligations in specific contexts.

The platform is particularly effective in assessing regulatory compliance, as demonstrated in its ability to automate checks related to frameworks such as the GDPR. Additionally, it can empower individuals and organizations by clarifying legal entitlements in concrete situations. Overall, Neota Logic illustrates the potential of legal technology to operationalize legal rules, thereby enhancing consistency, efficiency, and accessibility in the application of law.

G.DoNotPay

DoNotPay exemplifies the application of chatbot-based AI to the resolution of routine legal issues. Designed to assist users in handling everyday legal matters, such as contesting fines, requesting refunds, or drafting formal communications with public authorities, it reflects a growing trend toward accessible, user-centered legal services.

The platform's functionality demonstrates how automated systems can streamline simple legal processes, reducing the need for professional intervention in low-complexity cases. At the same time, its limitations highlight important challenges related to accuracy, accountability, and adaptability to nuanced legal contexts.

In an educational setting, DoNotPay serves as a valuable tool for examining the boundaries of legal automation, as well as the ethical implications of delegating legal tasks to AI. It thus contributes to broader discussions on the role of technology in shaping the future of legal practice and access to justice.

H.Kira Systems

Kira Systems is a platform specialized in the automateds analysis of contracts and legal documents. Kira Systems constitutes a prominent example of the application of supervised machine learning to legal document analysis. The platform is designed to automate the review of contracts by identifying relevant clauses and extracting key legal information with a high degree of accuracy. This capability allows for the efficient processing of large volumes of documents, significantly reducing the time and effort traditionally required for manual review.

Its practical utility is particularly evident in contexts such as due diligence—especially in mergers and acquisitions—legal audits, and contract management. By enhancing both speed and consistency in document analysis, Kira Systems contributes to improved decision-making and risk assessment. More broadly, it illustrates how machine learning technologies can transform legal workflows by augmenting human expertise and optimizing resource allocation.

In contract analysis, particularly in lease agreements, solutions such as Kira Systems enable the identification of key contractual clauses, the highlighting of contractual risks, and the explanation of complex legal language, thereby bridging the gap between theory and practice.

I. Socratic as an Adaptive Learning Platform

Socratic illustrates the application of AI as a pedagogical support tool, facilitating the comprehension of academic content through automated explanations. By integrating text and visual elements, the platform enhances conceptual understanding and promotes more accessible forms of learning.

Although not specifically designed for legal practice, Socratic can contribute to legal education by aiding students in the interpretation of legal concepts and materials. Its capacity to deliver structured and interactive explanations underscores the broader potential of AI to support self-directed learning and complement traditional educational methodologies.

In the study of Administrative Law, AI can play an adaptive educational role by identifying recurring student errors and suggesting progressively more complex cases, adjusting to the learner's level of knowledge and promoting personalised learning.

In summary, the contemporary landscape of legal technology reveals a differentiated ecosystem in which platforms differ in terms of their functional focus and depth of application. Systems such as Westlaw Edge and Lexis+ maintain a central role in providing authoritative access to primary legal sources, thereby ensuring reliability and doctrinal rigor in legal research.

In contrast, tools like Casetext CoCounsel and Harvey AI exemplify the shift toward workflow augmentation, acting as intelligent co-pilots that assist in drafting, summarization, and legal reasoning. Meanwhile, Neota Logic reflects a distinct paradigm centered on process automation, translating legal expertise into rule-based systems rather than relying on conversational interfaces.

Finally, specialized tools such as Kira Systems, DoNotPay, and Socratic demonstrate the value of targeted applications, delivering efficiency and innovation within narrowly defined domains. Together, these distinctions highlight the evolving role of AI in law, ranging from authoritative research to automation and task-specific optimization.

Table 2. AI Legal Tools Comparison Matrix

Category	Representative Tools	Knowledge Source	Reasoning Style	Primary Function	Degree of Automation	Typical Academic Framing
Traditional Legal Research Platforms	Westlaw Edge, Lexis+, ROSS Intelligence	Curated, legal databases (cases, statutes, secondary sources)	Information retrieval, search, citation analysis, legal analytics	Legal research and precedent discovery	Low – human interprets and applies results	"Augmented legal research systems"
AI Legal Assistants (LLM Co Pilots)	Casetext CoCounsel, Harvey AI	Combination of legal databases and LLM training data	Generative reasoning, synthesis, summarization, contextual analysis	Drafting, summarization, analytical assistance	Moderate–High – generates substantive text outputs	"Cognitive legal augmentation" / "Human-AI collaboration"
Automation & Expert Systems	Neota Logic	Explicitly encoded legal rules and workflows	Deterministic rule execution and decision trees	Compliance checks, intake, eligibility assessment, process automation	High within predefined rules	"Computational legal formalism"
Specialized / Niche Legal AI Tools	Kira Systems, DoNotPay, Socratic	Domain-specific datasets and models	Task-specific machine learning and pattern recognition	Contract review, document extraction, niche legal tasks	High within narrow domain	"Domain-bounded legal AI"

[1] Source: Compiled by the author

This framework is analytically cleaner because it distinguishes what the system knows (knowledge source), how it reasons (method), and what it does (function)—three dimensions that are often conflated in legal AI classifications.

The interpretive analysis of legal technologies reveals a progressive differentiation in how AI reshapes legal reasoning and practice. Traditional legal research platforms remain firmly grounded in authoritative legal sources, emphasizing retrieval, citation networks, and analytical tools, where AI serves primarily to augment—rather than replace—human doctrinal reasoning.

By contrast, AI legal assistants based on large language models occupy an intermediate position, blending research capabilities with generative reasoning and conversational interfaces. These systems foster a model of human–AI cognitive collaboration, fundamentally transforming how legal professionals interact with information and construct arguments.

Automation and expert systems represent a more formalized approach, encoding legal knowledge into deterministic rule-based frameworks. Their focus on consistency, scalability, and regulatory compliance reflects a paradigm of computational legal formalism, prioritizing predictability over interpretive flexibility. Finally, specialized legal AI tools demonstrate the value of domain-specific optimization, achieving high levels of accuracy within bounded tasks and expanding the reach of legal technology into areas such as consumer access and education.

VI. Findings and Discussion

The study's primary original contribution is the development of a comparative framework that evaluates both traditional AI-enhanced legal research systems and emerging generative AI legal assistants within a single analysis. By doing so, it identifies a shift from information retrieval to AI-supported legal reasoning, introduces the concept of a reliability–automation continuum for assessing legal AI platforms, and demonstrates the emergence of a hybrid model that combines authoritative legal sources with generative AI capabilities.

One of the most significant findings is the transition from traditional keyword-based research to systems capable of processing natural language and supporting legal reasoning.

The application of a mixed-methods approach - combining doctrinal analysis, comparative functional evaluation, and exploratory empirical testing - reveals significant differences in how AI-based legal platforms operate. The findings highlight a fundamental shift in legal research from information retrieval to intelligent legal assistance, consistent with broader developments in legal technology and computational law (Susskind 2019; Ashley 2017).

Platforms such as Westlaw Edge and Lexis+ demonstrate how AI enhances legal research by improving the efficiency and precision of case law retrieval, while maintaining a strong foundation in authoritative legal databases (Ashley 2017). These systems remain primarily oriented toward assisting users in locating relevant law, rather than generating independent legal analysis.

In contrast, AI-driven assistants such as Casetext CoCounsel and Harvey AI represent a paradigmatic shift. These platforms not only retrieve information but also synthesize arguments, summarize legal materials, and generate draft texts. This reflects the emergence of augmented legal reasoning, where AI actively contributes to legal analysis (Surden 2014).

A key distinction concerns the source and reliability of legal outputs. Authority-based platforms (e.g., Westlaw Edge, Lexis+) rely on curated legal databases and provide verifiable citations, ensuring doctrinal reliability. By contrast, AI-generated systems such as Harvey AI and Casetext CoCounsel generate outputs through probabilistic models, which may lack transparency and require verification.

This reflects a broader concern in the literature regarding opacity and explainability in AI systems, particularly in high-stakes domains such as law (Pasquale 2015; Wachter,

Mittelstadt and Floridi 2017). The findings therefore confirm a trade-off between reliability and flexibility, where increased automation may come at the cost of reduced interpretability.

The analysis reveals a trend toward functional specialization among AI legal tools. Platforms such as Kira Systems, Neota Logic, and DoNotPay are designed for specific legal functions, including contract review, compliance assessment, and consumer legal assistance. This reflects the modular development of legal technologies, where tools are optimized for discrete tasks (Susskind 2019).

AI assistants such as Casetext CoCounsel and Harvey AI demonstrate strong performance in synthesizing information and generating structured responses. However, their outputs may lack precision or omit relevant legal nuances, confirming concerns about hallucinations and reliability in generative AI systems (Katz & Bommarito, 2024).

By contrast, traditional platforms provide more reliable outputs but require greater user input for analysis. This reinforces the conclusion that AI enhances, rather than replaces, legal expertise.

The findings have important implications for legal education and professional practice. In educational contexts, tools such as Lexis+ and Socratic support adaptive learning and legal writing. However, scholars warn that excessive reliance on automation may undermine the development of critical thinking and doctrinal reasoning skills (Ashley 2017).

These findings provide both a theoretical framework for understanding contemporary legal AI and practical implications for the future of legal research, education, and professional practice.

The findings indicate a growing convergence between traditional and AI-driven platforms. Established providers such as Westlaw Edge and Lexis+ are incorporating generative AI, while AI-first systems such as Harvey AI increasingly rely on authoritative data sources.

The central challenge lies in balancing technological innovation with doctrinal integrity, ensuring that AI supports rather than undermines the rule of law.

VII. Conclusion

AI is profoundly transforming the way intelligent platforms are used, offering multiple capabilities. It facilitates access to information, enables users to acquire extensive knowledge, ensures personalized and practical application of law, and fosters the development of skills.

AI has enabled the use of innovative methodologies in legal knowledge and practice, facilitating the case method, the practical analysis of real cases (legal clinics), and ultimately a new way of thinking about Law (design thinking). AI enables the analysis of case law and legal doctrine in order to identify jurisprudential trends and guide legal professionals toward the most appropriate interpretation and application of the law, contributing to the optimization of legal strategies.

It ensures a comprehensive analysis and greater predictability of judicial decisions and may even function as a legal simulator, akin to a virtual court, allowing for the analysis of legal contexts and interaction between AI and its user.

As a virtual platform, similar to Moodle, it contributes to modern legal education, as well as to the development of discussion forums and role-playing activities, and may be seen as a hybrid learning mechanism.

The integration of AI into legal system has significantly transformed the way legal professionals and students access, interpret, and apply legal information. Contemporary platforms - such as Westlaw Edge, Lexis+, Casetext CoCounsel, and Harvey AI - illustrate the evolution from traditional database-driven research tools to advanced AI systems capable of supporting legal reasoning and automating complex tasks.

In this emerging paradigm, legal learning is no longer limited to reading cases and answering theoretical questions. Instead, it increasingly involves researching, analysing, comparing, arguing, and simulating legal decisions, bringing legal education closer to real legal practice.

Tools such as Lexis+ and Westlaw Edge enable users to ask direct legal questions, such as “What are the requirements for civil liability?”, and receive answers anchored in legislation and case law. In this way, AI can centralise and organise dispersed information, integrating statutes, case law, and doctrine into a more structured research workflow.

With these tools, we are moving toward a new paradigm, characterized by more analytical and predictive learning, provided that these technologies are used actively and responsibly, in the interests of its users. AI is transforming legal education by enabling more interactive, accessible, and practice-oriented learning environments.

However, its use must be accompanied by ethical and responsible implementation, ensuring transparency, accuracy, and human supervision. AI should be understood as a complementary educational tool, designed to enhance—not replace—human judgment and critical reasoning. Ultimately, AI contributes to a more analytical, inclusive, and dynamic model of legal education, aligned with the demands of contemporary society.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] - Ashley, K. D. (2017). Artificial intelligence and legal analytics. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316761380

[2] - Bex, F. (2024). AI, law and beyond: A transdisciplinary ecosystem. Artificial Intelligence and Law. Artif Intell Law 33, 253–270 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-024-09404-y

[3] - Katz, D. M. & Bommarito, M. J. (2024). Measuring the complexity of the law: the United States Code, The Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Law, Vol. 22.

[4] - Casetext. (2023). CoCounsel Product Information. https://legalsolutions.thomsonreuters.co.uk/en/products-services/cocounsel-legal-uk.html

[5] - Currie, W. L., Leimeister, J. M., Schlagwein, D., & Willcocks, L. (2025). Rethinking technology regulation in the age of AI risks. Journal of Information Technology. Vol. 40, Issue 3. https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962251378815

[6] - DoNotPay. (2026). https://donotpay.com; https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2025/02/ftc-finalizes-order-donotpay-prohibits-deceptive-ai-lawyer-claims-imposes-monetary-relief-requires

[7] - Electronic Frontier Foundation. (2025). https://www.eff.org

[8] - Farber, S. (2025). Rethinking legal education in the age of artificial intelligence. The Law Teacher. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069400.2025.2549645

[9] - Gao, B., Yu, D., Gao, J., et al. (2025). Legal regulation of AI-assisted academic writing. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence. Vol. 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1546064

[10] - Google. (2023). Socratic by Google. https://support.google.com/socratic/#topic=9414097
[11] - Harvey AI. (2024). Platform overview. https://www.harvey.ai/platform
[12] - Hill, G., Waddington, M., & Qiu, L. (2025). From pen to algorithm: Optimizing legislation with AI. AI & Soc, vol. 40, 3075–3086. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-02062-3
[13] - Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial Intelligence in Education. Center for Curriculum Redesign. http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/4276068
[14] - Kapoor, S., Henderson, P., & Narayanan, A. (2024). Promises and pitfalls of AI for legal applications. https://www.cs.princeton.edu/~sayashk/papers/crcl-kapoor-henderson-narayanan.pdf
[15] - Kesari, A., Breaux, T., Norton, T., et al. (2025). From Legal Text to Tech Specs: Generative AI's Interpretation of Consent in Privacy Law, ICAIL '25: Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law, p. 159 – 168, https://doi.org/10.1145/3769126.3769241
[16] - LexisNexis. (2023). Lexis+ AI Platform. https://www.lexisnexis.com/en-int/products/lexis-plus-ai
[17] - Loeb & Loeb LLP. (2025). Thomson Reuters v. Ross Intelligence, Inc. https://www.loeb.com/en/insights/publications/2025/02/thomson-reuters-v-ross-intelligence-inc
[18] - Luckin, R. (2018). Machine Learning and Human Intelligence. UCL Institute of Education Press. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10178695/1/Machine%20Learning%20and%20Human%20Intelligence.pdf
[19] - McGinnis, J. O., & Pearce, R. G. (2014). The great disruption: How machine intelligence will transform the role of lawyers. Fordham Law Review, vol. 82(6), 3041–3066, DOI:10.21202/1993-047X.13.2019.2.1230-1250
[20] - Munir, B. (2025). Integrating generative AI in legal pedagogy. International Journal of Legal Information. Cambridge University Press. https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1017/jli.2025.10081/html
[21] - OpenAI. (2024). Customizing models for legal professionals: Harvey. https://openai.com/index/harvey/
[22] - Pasquale, F. (2015). The black box society. Harvard University Press. https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674970847
[23] - ROSS Intelligence. (2023). Features. https://www.rossintelligence.com/features
[24] - ROSS Intelligence. (2023). What is AI Search? https://www.rossintelligence.com/what-is-ai
[25] - Schwarcz, D., Manning, S., Prescott, J. J., et al. (2026). AI-Powered Lawyering: AI Reasoning Models, Retrieval Augmented Generation, and the Future of Legal Practice. Journal of Law and Empirical Analysis, Vol. 0(0) 1–31. DOI: 10.1177/2755323X261427048
[26] - Surden, H. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Law – An Overview of Recent Technological Changes in Large Language Models and Law. Colorado Law Review, Vol. 96, pp. 376 – 411. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=513530
[27] - Surden, H. (2014). Machine learning and law. Washington Law Review, vol. 89, p. 87–115. Available at: https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol89/iss1/5
[28] - Susskind, R. (2019). Online Courts and the Future of Justice. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198838364.001.0001
[29] - Susskind, R. (2023). Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to your Future (Third Edition). Oxford University Press. https://academic.oup.com/oxford-law-pro/book/60058
[30] - Thomson Reuters. (2023). Westlaw Edge Overview. https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/en/products/westlaw-edge
[31] Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a Right to Explanation of Automated Decision-Making Does Not Exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. International Data Privacy Law, Vol. 7, Issue 2, p. 76-99, https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx005

Copyright © 2026 by the author. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited (CC BY 4.0).