Environment and Social Psychology (2025) Volume 10 Issue 12
doi: 10.59429/esp.v10i12.3994

ISSN: 2424-8975 (O)
2424-7979 (P)

Research Article

AI-Driven Environmental Impact Assessments: Ethical and Legal Considerations

Hind Moafak Abduljabbar[1], Waleed Mohammed Abdullah[2], Sameer Dawood Salman Bazool [3], Aseel I. Muhsin[4], Saad T. Y. Alfalahi[5], Volodymyr Temnikov[6*]

[1] *Al-Turath University, Baghdad 10013, Iraq*

[2] *Al-Mansour University College, Baghdad 10067, Iraq*

[3] *Al-Mamoon University College, Baghdad 10012, Iraq*

[4] *Al-Rafidain University College, Baghdad 10064, Iraq*

[5] *Madenat Alelem University College, Baghdad 10006, Iraq*

[6] *National Aviation University, Kyiv 03058 Ukraine*

*** Corresponding author:** Volodymyr Temnikov, temnikov_v@nau.edu.ua

ABSTRACT

Integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) could potentially enhance the efficiency, accuracy, and transparency of the process. That said, there are still concerns about potential biases, following the legal standards, and transparent decision-making procedures. This study evaluates the performance of AI-driven EIAs (electronic information applications) with respect to accuracy, transparency, bias detection, and regulatory compliance. It also aims to identify areas for potential development and lead to recommendations for better aligning AI technologies with existing legal systems. A mixed methods study design included qualitative stakeholder interviews and quantitative analysis. We compared the performance of the AI model with existing benchmarks using statistical impurities, such as entropy-based transparency metrics, bias detecting measures, and the Clopper-Pearson confidence interval. Efficiency, accuracy, and compliance were used to evaluate the solution's respective performance. The AI based approach used in EIA model showed substantial gains with (8.2%) increase in accuracy, (60%) decrease in manpower requirement and (40%) decrease in operational cost. Transparency measures reported much higher reporting rates, and bias detection had lower false positive and false negative rates. It has proven adherent to compliance, within a tight confidence interval range) which means it can be forensically relied upon and defended in a court of law. The prospects for using AI in Environmental Impact Assessments are extensive and could lead to more reliable, efficient, and transparent systems that can significantly improve environmental compliance. These findings could help set the stage for additional research to refine AI practices and develop standardized legal frameworks capable of ensuring fairness and accountability within environmental decision-making processes.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Environmental Impact Assessment; Transparency; Bias Detection; Regulatory Compliance; Sustainability; Accuracy; Efficiency

ARTICLE INFO
Received: 29 July 2025 | Accepted: 04 December 2025 | Available online: 29 December 2025

CITATION
Abduljabbar H M, Abdullah W M, Bazool S D S, et al. AI-Driven Environmental Impact Assessments: Ethical and Legal Considerations. *Environment and Social Psychology* 2025; 10(12): 3994. doi:10.59429/esp.v10i12.3994

COPYRIGHT
Copyright © 2025 by author(s). *Environment and Social Psychology* is published by Arts and Science Press Pte. Ltd. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

1. Introduction

For decades, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) have stood as a vital tool in the struggle for balancing development endeavours with environmental safeguarding. But Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) were designed to foresee and prevent these possible environmental damages beforehand, and to ensure that environmental impacts are integrated into decision processes regarding policies and projects. As environmental challenges become increasingly complex, methodologies to support EIAs are also required to evolve. Importantly, one development is the incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) — a transformative technology capable of enhancing the efficiency of environmental data analysis, the accuracy of predictions about environmental impacts, and the overall duration required to complete robust environmental reviews. However, as AI becomes more embedded across the EIA landscape we are presented with a complicated constellation of ethical and legal challenges that demand nuanced consideration of transparency, accountability and equity.

Although these challenges are recognized in adjacent fields, empirical links between AI performance metrics and the broader socio-legal context remain underdeveloped. Existing studies frequently demonstrate the potential of AI to accelerate environmental governance workflows, yet they also reveal substantial methodological disparities in how environmental data are curated, validated, and interpreted [1, 2]. Work examining the hidden ecological burdens of AI underscores that algorithmic efficiency does not automatically translate into environmental responsibility, thereby complicating assumptions about sustainability claims in EIA contexts [3]. Ethical certification proposals further show that sustainability, accountability, and transparency must be treated as co-dependent criteria rather than parallel considerations [4]. These insights collectively justify the need for an integrated analytical model capable of aligning technical performance with ethical and legal norms in a manner that current frameworks do not yet fully achieve.

In the existing body of literature, there is a growing recognition of the important role of AI in the environmental space. However, Muchokore and Kaur [1] highlight AI systems' potential to integrate environmental goals into global sustainable development goals framework, while also enhancing efficiency in multidimensional decision-making. Similarly, Ligozat et al.[3] have pointed to the hidden environmental costs tied to some AI solutions, and argue that these unintended consequences deserve some space when ethically assessing the technology. Genovesi and Mönig [4] follow in this vein, arguing that we should develop new ethical certification schemes promoting [4], sustainability-focused applications of AI that are motivated by concern, whereas Kazim and Koshiyama [5] explore the synergistic relationship between data integrity and AI ethics as it applies to evaluations of impact. Together, these studies demonstrate how AI can enhance the efficiency and accuracy of EIAs, but they also expose inherent risks that underscore the need for a robust ethical and regulatory framework.

However, beneath these advances lie significant gaps in both practice and scholarship. For example, Raab [6] acknowledges that environmental and privacy-related impact assessments are critical ethical concerns, but does not further elaborate how these principles generalize to AI-specific contexts. Adanma and Ogunbiyi [7], for example, assess AI's potential for, and challenges to, environmental conservation and cybersecurity at the same time, but hardly ponder about the enforcement of laws or implementation of policies. Calvi and Kotzinos[8] although many efforts, such as those of Thelisson et al.[9], discuss the need for fairness and sustainability in AI, they provide limited guidance on how such principles may be operationalized within standardized assessment protocols. Existing legal structures may require substantive revision to address the distinctive features of AI-driven EIAs.

Principal concern relates to the moral hazards associated with automated judgements. AI systems out of control can be trained on biased data, prioritize efficiency over equity, or hide who will be held responsible for the decisions they make. Embedding ethical considerations into the certifying process is key to ensure that AI applications are consistent with environmental and social priorities[4]. Nitta et al.[10] by providing examples of ethical requirements engineering to build more explainable and accountable AI systems. In the same vein, a recent paper by Etukudoh et al.[11] in advance of AI and climate change highlights the need for ethical oversight to mitigate unintended consequences, while Walacik and Chmielewska [12] illustrate how AI-powered algorithms can drive more sustainable real estate solutions, underscoring the wide applicability of ethical assessments across sectors.

There is a clear need for integrative science that links technical, ethical and legal approaches in this field, as the table presented in this perspective suggests. While Ligozat et al.[3] have addressed the environmental implications of AI solutions, Genovesi and Mönig [4] have developed a baseline for ethical certification, there is currently no such holistic framework with respect to the legal implications emerging from such developments. How might global legal architectures be rethought to ensure that AI-driven EIAs are efficient but also that they are transparent, accountable, and just? This question is all the more pressing given the evidence from research such as Kazim and Koshiyama [5], that highlights the bald relationship between ethical AI and data integrity, and Burr and Leslie [13] provide a set of pragmatic strategies to embed ethical assurance in technologies driven by data.

The study seeks to address the gaps outlined above as well as laying the groundwork for a more fundamental picture of the existing knowledge which may inform the adaptation of legal and ethical constructs to AI-powered EIA setting, across the disciplines. This could include providing a discussion of regulatory measures that could be adopted to improve transparency, bias and accountability in automated assessments of the environment. It also reflects on how the pre-existing ethical principles, including those elaborated by Kazim and Koshiyama [5] and Nitta et al.[10] that can be implemented in a legal framework that offers more guidance to policymakers and practitioners.

However, AI integration within EIAs can offer great potential, it can also introduce a number of ethical and legal challenges that must be addressed to prevent negative impacts. This research aims to bridge the gap between algorithmic design and accountability, bringing solutions for a more just and sustainable future in the environmental governance space. The article also charts a more functional path forward in how to make sure AI-enabled EIAs deliver on their intended goals, by cleaning key insights from available studies done until now and identifying the major gaps in today's frameworks.

2. Literature review

The ripple effect of the rapidly advancing AI is seen across dominions, including environmental management, law, finance, and healthcare, among others. As AI systems proliferate, scholars have increasingly focused on the ethics and law that accompany, and are affected by, such technologies. This literature review summarizes recent advances, identifies the main gaps in the field and suggests future directions.

AI tools are increasingly used to improve decision-making for environmental impact assessments and in land management, according to a growing body of research. Using machine learning-based approaches can assist in optimizing land management practices by improving accuracy and efficiency while reducing the amount of data[14]. However, this strand of research rarely interrogates how data governance, provenance, and temporal instability affect the reliability of machine-learning outputs in regulated environmental domains. Studies in data ethics and regulatory impact assessment repeatedly show that models deployed in high-stakes decision environments must be evaluated not only for predictive power, but also for their internal epistemic assumptions and potential systemic distortions [5, 6]. A parallel body of evidence from environmental conservation demonstrates that cyber-risk exposure and infrastructural vulnerabilities can materially alter the accuracy and trustworthiness of AI-driven assessments, particularly when algorithms depend on distributed sensor networks or cloud-linked monitoring infrastructures [7]. These findings are critical for EIA applications, where error propagation has direct implications for ecological harm, compliance failures, and legal liability. However, this work is often disconnected from broader social and governance implications, such as data transparency and accountability. Similarly, Adelakun et al.[2] scientific models of environmental impact and reporting using AI. Where they might sing the praises of advances in technology, they often overlook how lapses in accountability can cause ethical breakdowns in those AI-driven systems — how, for instance, the biases behind data scraping and interpretation can create faulty artificial intelligence.

The scarcity of harmonized accountability mechanisms becomes even more evident when examining cross-sectoral research on fairness and regulatory oversight. In the European context, impact-assessment methodologies have been proposed to quantify fairness and discrimination risks within algorithmic decision systems, demonstrating how structured audit protocols may mitigate downstream harms when applied consistently [8]. Sustainability-oriented assessments similarly argue for embedding environmental externalities directly into AI governance frameworks, thereby linking algorithmic performance to long-term ecological outcomes rather than isolated system metrics [9]. Despite these advances, no existing framework fully resolves how fairness, sustainability, and legal compliance should be jointly operationalized in EIA settings.

Research in financial services demonstrates how AI can accelerate operations, as well as lead to better-informed decisions. For example, Agu et al.[15] address fairness challenges in AI-supported finance systems and present ethical principles to tackle fair outcomes. Simultaneously, Thakur and Sharma [16] address ethics in financial decision-making, but do not present recommendations on improving transparency or reducing bias. Mirishli [17], also acknowledged this imbalance between progress and privacy where the authors highlight minimum security reserves of personal data through AI processes, in which data collection represents the adversarial relation between innovation and privacy. These studies generally raise considerable ethical questions, but they rarely provide actionable frameworks for implementation. In the legal context, ethical impact assessments and accountability have received much attention. Ejjami [18] discusses AI-powered systems and their impact on legal decision-making, as well as the influence of ethical standards. Case in point is Wright [19] directly calls for ethical risk assessment of AI applications in the law, but notes a lack of consistent standards for such assessment. Moreover, while Ballester and Kampel[20] touch on an important aspect of ethical impact, namely identifying potential negative effects of monitoring systems for people with dementia, they do not deliver a replicable model that can be applied to other domains.

Newer contributions also respond to the necessary call of creating a complete framework that would guarantee an ethical development and application of the AI. Agbese et al.[21], the second describes the ethical obligations of AI systems, highlighting the need to reflect on ethical issues as early as the design stage. Lee et al.[22] introduce a framework that integrates environmental, social and governance (ESG) criteria with AI ethics, and present a new means to evaluate responsible AI development. But these initiatives are mostly piecemeal, with a lack of consensus on best practices or universal standards.

A frequent limitation of these studies is a narrow perspective failing to provide an interdisciplinary framework to integrate technical, ethical, and legal approaches. For instance, in contrast to Ntoutsi et al.[23], while Obermeyer et al.[24] provide some useful ideas for how to process through bias in data-driven AI systems, but their research does not produce rules or guidelines that are useful for regulation. This is a broad site for discussion on AI ethics, Beyan and Christoforaki [25] Saeidnia et al.[26] although discuss ethical dilemmas of the use of AI technologies for mental health interventions, these contributions do not provide an integrated framework to guide the responsible use of AI technologies in various multidisciplinary contexts.

Recent work in climate-modeling and industrial sustainability widens this gap further: although predictive modeling has demonstrated success in anticipating climate-related environmental stressors [11], and AI-powered ESG analyses have shown measurable value in sector-specific sustainability reporting [12], these approaches lack a unifying structure that reconciles technical, ethical, and legal obligations. Foundational reviews on AI ethics argue that without an overarching schema linking transparency, explainability, and normative risk assessment, domain-specific impact studies will remain fragmented and incapable of supporting standardized regulatory adoption [13, 25]. This fragmentation underscores the necessity of developing a coherent, interdisciplinary framework suitable for applications such as EIA, where environmental, legal, and ethical imperatives converge.

Addressing these gaps requires researchers to adopt a more integrated, interdisciplinary approach, crossing the boundaries of a single field. This involves creating uniform, standardized ethical impact assessment frameworks that can be consistently applied across diverse AI applications. Regulatory institutions must work together with academic as well as market players to lay out the rules guiding transparency, accountability as well as fairness. Interdisciplinary research teams that integrate knowledge from computer science with legal, social science, and environmental perspective would likely yield more effective solutions. Through collaboration and consideration of different viewpoints, the field can advance towards responsible AI development and implementation.

Although existing studies offer important insights into the ethical and legal aspects of AI, major challenges have not been addressed yet. And the literature is scattered, with many studies focusing on narrow facets of the problem. This will lead the way for concrete frameworks to bring together technical, ethical, and legal perspectives. By filling these gaps, the academic world can contribute to ensuring that AI technologies are developed and deployed effectively and ethically.

3. Legal analysis

EIA faces unique challenges under existing legal frameworks, as examined by the legal analysis of AI-driven EIAs throughout the paper, particularly with respect to the distribution of liability and governance of data. The EU's AI Act and GDPR set baseline requirements for transparency and accountability, but do not lay out specific protocols adapted to environmental contexts. Studies such as Nitta et al.[10] call for more granular ethical impact assessment frameworks, and Ejjami [18] describes the legal vagueness of AI's position in environmental compliance. Existing regulation is frequently ill-equipped to address the specific challenges that arise with automated decision-making in EIAs, creating gaps that can undermine both the legitimacy and the efficacy of these assessments.

Liability and accountability introduce additional layers of complexity into the legal environment AI-enabled EIAs. By analyzing the growing use of AI in the financial service industry, Uzougbo, Ikegwu, and Adewusi[27] illuminate the same constraints the future of financial markets is facing as development of the impact of an environmental assessment and attribution of legal responsibility in its wake. In cases where AI-driven EIAs result in environmental harm, liability allocation remains unclear, raising significant regulatory and legal uncertainty. Without clear liability frameworks, it will discourage both the innovation and adherence to standards which will in the end result in hindrance of effective oversight.

Data governance is another key area where regulation is lacking. Many countries have still not clearly defined transparency and explainability; as Kazim and Koshiyama [5] show the absence of common guidelines for how AI systems make decisions opens the door to algorithmic bias and public distrust. In the absence of a transparent audit process around AI algorithms used in assessments, it is not possible for stakeholders and regulators to responsibly validate the soundness of AI-assisted assessments. Adding to this, we have data privacy regulations like GDPR that are significant and impactful but mostly either directly or indirectly at odds with the data sharing needed for comprehensive EIAs. This legal tension places a regulatory gap into which vital environmental data can slip and a space where AI systems can easily lose accountability and transparency.

Several regulatory interventions can help mitigate these issues. Regulators first need to articulate clear and enforceable transparency standards for AI-driven EIAs, as Agbese et al.[21]. Accountability systems have to move towards shared liability models — whereby the designers and users of AI systems are both made liable for the quality of what they produce. The work of Nitta et al.[10], to inform and support recommendations on how to strengthen alignment with transparency, accountability and ethical norms. Third, policy recommendations should prioritize responsible data-sharing frameworks that balance transparency with privacy protections. Facilitate responsible data sharing, whilst safeguarding individual rights through legal frameworks balancing privacy as well as access.

While AI can significantly enhance the Environmental Impact Assessments, the current legal framework is ill-prepared to govern the spillover of such risks. By closing regulatory gaps, clarifying liability, and clarifying how data is governed, policymakers can both make AI-driven EIAs more effective, and implement them in a way that is transparent and accountable, and ethical.

4. Methodology

This study uses a multi-method design, incorporating qualitative and quantitative approaches. The outline of methodology proposed for this study proposes the use of structured interviews, data collection trials, advanced math modeling techniques and review of an existing regulatory framework to clarify the intersection of law and ethics for AI derived Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) In addition to outlining existing practices, the methodology also moves beyond practice to propose alternatives while exploiting a wide and varied array of data sets and analytic tools.

4.1. Qualitative component and stakeholder interviews

The qualitative arm consists of 25 semi-structured interviews with regulatory officials, AI developers, environmental consultants and lawyers. The priority for applicant selection was to include a diverse learning population that represents a spectrum of jurisdictions, including the EU, US, and China, to investigate how different regulatory regimes address the challenges of transparency, accountability, and fairness in AI-powered EIAs. Interview questions considered factors such as regulatory gaps, practical aspects of AI in practice with the integration of EIA, and policy recommendations.

Analysis followed a structured thematic approach drawing on iterative coding cycles. Initial open-coding identified recurrent categories related to transparency expectations, perceived sources of algorithmic bias, accountability allocation, and cross-jurisdictional discrepancies in regulatory interpretation. Axial coding subsequently linked these categories to broader conceptual dimensions such as institutional trust, epistemic uncertainty, and legal ambiguity, which closely parallel concerns raised in wider AI-ethics scholarship [10, 21]. Several participants emphasized that the absence of standardized audit trails suppresses institutional confidence in automated assessments—an observation consistent with documented challenges in public-sector adoption of AI systems [18]. Others emphasised the danger that data infrastructure for environmental work might become more susceptible to security threats - reminiscent of risks noted in AI use for conservation [7]. These issues are crucial to understanding quantitative findings, since they put performance metrics into the context of governance constraints.

4.2. Quantitative component and experimental data analysis

Some of the qualitative element focuses on an experiment in which there is data with 500 EIA reports from different sectors, like renewable energy, infrastructure, and industrial development. The experimental simulation relies on a state-of-the-art AI model trained to anticipate key indicators of environmental risk, such as biodiversity loss and carbon emissions. Metrics such as prediction accuracy (92%), processing time (3 days vs. 2 weeks for human experts), and inter-rater reliability (Cohen's kappa coefficient) were used to evaluate the performance of the system. This analysis demonstrates both how much time could be saved with AI, as well as that regulatory standards need to be clearer to ensure that results are consistent and compliant.

4.3. Mathematical modeling and analytical framework

This study relies on advanced mathematical modeling and statistical analysis to deal with the complexities arising from the different legal and ethical aspects substantively present within AI-led EIA. We provide the important equations required for analysis, outline an organized structure that can be used for studying a number of parameters associated with compliance, transparent, bias and reliability in artificial intelligence processes. All these formulas are fostered into a holistic system that adheres to regulatory- as well as ethical standards for qualitative parameters and thereby attract quantitative insights.

Optimization Problem for Regulatory Compliance:

A critical component of the research involves optimizing the operational parameters of AI models to reduce non-compliance risks while maintaining performance. To achieve this, a multi-objective optimization problem is formulated as follows:

$$\text{Minimize: } C(X) = \alpha_1 f_1(X) + \alpha_2 f_2(X) + \cdots + \alpha_n f_n(X)$$
$$\text{Subject to: } g_i(X) \leq b_i,\ \ i = 1,2,\dots,m$$
$$h_j(X) = c_j,\ \ j = 1,2,\dots,p \tag{1}$$

In this equation, $C(X)$ represents the total non-compliance cost, weighted by factors $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$. The constraints $g_i(X) \leq b_i$ and $h_j(X) = c_j$ ensure that the solution adheres to established legal requirements, such as GDPR transparency mandates) and operational guidelines. By solving this optimization problem, the research identifies parameter settings that align AI operations with both regulatory and ethical objectives.

Transparency Metric Using Entropy

A related important aspect is the transparency of AI system measurement. Transparency is fundamental to legal compliance and public trust because stakeholders must know how decisions are reached. The transparency index is described by the Shannon entropy:

$$T = -\sum_{k-1}^{K} P_k log(P_k) \tag{2}$$

Here, P_k represents the probability of a particular decision pathway k. Higher entropy values (T) signify a more diverse set of documented decision pathways, which improves the system's auditability and regulatory compliance. By calculating this metric, the research provides a clear, quantifiable measure of transparency that supports both ethical assessments and legal standards.

Bias Detection Using Statistical Discrepancy Measures

To ensure that AI-driven EIAs remain fair and unbiased, the research evaluates the alignment between AI-generated predictions and human expert decisions. The statistical divergence between these two distributions is computed as follows:

$$D = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |P_{human}(x) - P_{human}(x)| \; dx \quad (3)$$

This equation, D, quantifies the extent of bias in the AI system's outputs. A smaller divergence result means that the AI model is closely approximating human judgment, which can help alleviate algorithmic bias scares. Regularly measuring this quantity at least ensures the AI model is consistent, trustworthy and fair over time.

Legal Compliance Confidence Interval

Finally, the research incorporates a statistical approach to validate the proportion of AI assessments that comply with regulatory standards. Using the Clopper-Pearson method, the confidence interval for compliance is calculated as:

$$B_{lower} = \frac{p+\frac{z^2}{2n}-z\sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}+\frac{z^2}{4n^2}}}{1+\frac{z^2}{n}}$$

$$B_{upper} = \frac{p+\frac{z^2}{2n}-z\sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}+\frac{z^2}{4n^2}}}{1+\frac{z^2}{n}} \quad (4)$$

In these equations, p represents the observed proportion of compliant assessments, n is the total number of assessments, and z is the critical value for the desired confidence level. The interval $[B_{lower}, B_{upper}]$ provides a statistically sound estimate of compliance, strengthening the research's conclusions and supporting legal defensibility.

Integrating the aforementioned advanced mathematical equations, the study establishes an integrated approach for quantitatively tackling legal and ethical challenges related to AI in EIA. Each of the formulas is framed in the wider framework of transparency, fairness, and compliance, which guarantees that the output will be scientifically sound and practically useful. It also helps document existing deficits and provides proposals for enhancing regulatory frameworks and ethical safeguards.

4.4. Literature and Framework Review

The analysis extends to existing research and thus identifies ethical guidelines [4] and challenges in compliance with data protection laws[5]. It builds on lessons learned during that period and presents a cross-cutting regulatory approach which carries the learnings of the Community through the experimental quality of the data – flagging three best practices and two areas that merit greater regulatory refinement.

4.5. Data governance and policy recommendations

In addition to quantitative and experimental analyses, the research assesses data governance practices and makes recommendations to enhance transparency and accountability. These recommendations feature establishing standardized data explainability protocols and clear liability models that clarify the demarcation of liabilities among AI developers, the agencies deploying them, and relevant regulators.

With an integrated approach that draws on interviews, experimental data, and advanced mathematical modeling, alongside an analysis of regulatory frameworks, this methodology offers a strong basis for tackling legal and ethical issues surrounding AI in EIAs.

5. Results

5.1. Performance of AI in EIA processes

The assessment of AI model performance included several aspects: prediction accuracy, processing efficiency, fidelity of decision-making, and the model's ability to model different data complexity. AI model performance in speed, accuracy, and reliability was markedly better when compared to human expert assessment. With in-depth analysis of these metrics, we achieve a greater insight into where AI can supplement, and in some cases, out-perform more traditional human methods. The results are detailed in Table 1, which breaks down performance metrics.

Table 1. Performance Metrics Comparison Between AI and Human Experts

Metric	AI Model	Human Experts	Improvement (%)	Sample Size Analyzed	Data Complexity Level	Error Margin (%)
Prediction Accuracy (%)	92	85	+8.2	500	Medium	1.5
Average Processing Time	3 days	14 days	-78.6	500	High	2.0
Inter-rater Reliability	0.89	0.82	+8.5	500	Low	0.8
False Positive Rate (%)	5.0	7.8	-35.9	500	Medium	1.3
False Negative Rate (%)	3.5	5.0	-30.0	500	Medium	1.0
Standard Deviation (Accuracy)	0.6	1.2	-50.0	500	High	0.5

The table shows comparative scores for several key metrics, illustrating that the AI model consistently outperformed the human experts. Remarkably, the AI system exhibited an accuracy of prediction of 92%, 8.2% higher than the accuracy of humans which is considerable given the complexity of environmental data. Most notably, the average processing time showed a significant improvement, where uses of the AI model cut analysis time from two weeks to three days —nearly 79% reduction in time. Moreover, the AI exhibited superior inter-rater agreement (0.89 vs 0.82) and significantly lower rates of false positives and false negatives (35.9% reduction and 30% reduction, respectively). A smaller standard deviation in accuracy also indicates that the predictions made by the AI model are more stable and consistent, even when working with very large, complex datasets. Collectively, these findings highlight that implementations of AI not only have a higher functional efficacy than traditional EIA approaches but also yield more reliable, reproducible results than traditional human-based techniques.

5.2. Transparency and explainability

Ensuring that AI-driven EIAs are transparent and explainable is critical to ensuring they are understood and trusted by stakeholders. Using a Shannon entropy-based transparency index to quantify the documentation of decision-making pathways by each AI configuration, in this study we measured how well each AI configuration documented its reasoning. We investigated three configurations: Baseline AI

(Configuration A), Advanced AI with Metadata Logging (Configuration B), and Full-Audit AI with Standardized Annotations (Configuration C). Each successive configuration tightened documentation rigor and adherence to transparency standards. As seen in Table 2, these improvements reflect a correlation between stronger explainability frameworks and increased transparency measures, resulting in AI systems that conform more closely with regulatory and ethical standards.

Table 2. Transparency and Explainability Metrics Across AI Configurations

Configuration	Transparency Index (Entropy)	Decision Pathway Count	Average Pathway Length	Data Source Annotations (%)	Metadata Complexity (Levels)
Baseline AI (Configuration A)	1.2	50	3.4	25	2
Advanced AI with Metadata Logging (Configuration B)	2.1	85	4.8	50	3
Full-Audit AI with Standardized Annotations (Configuration C)	3.0	120	6.2	80	4

The table 2 data highlight the importance of good documentation practices in improvement of transparency. Hence, Baseline AI (Configuration A) had the lowest transparency index (1.2) amongst all configurations since it needed minimal documentation, thus only produced 50 documented decision pathways with limited annotations. In Form B; Advanced AI with Metadata Logging: As expected, this arrangement was far more transparent, which increased the index to 2.1 and it generated 85 pathways where from the entire data sources, at least 50% are fully annotated. The maximum transparency index of 3.0 occurred at Configuration C (Full-Audit AI with standardized annotations), including a full audit trail, 80% annotated data sources, and a higher level of complexity of metadata. Better documentation standards and stricter data annotations lead directly to greater transparency and better compliance with regulatory requirements, and therefore to greater trust of the outputs by the stakeholders in the AI system.

5.3. Bias and fairness analysis

It is crucial to ensure that AI models generate unbiased and fair results to uphold trust and compliance in EIAs. The study detected and quantified the bias against AI predictions by comparing them with human expert decisions through statistical methods. These included statistical discrepancy, false positive rate, false negative rate and the proportion of cases within acceptable bias thresholds. This will also help to unveil and mitigate systematic bias as this will give a complete picture of how well AI aligns with the known standards in human judgements. Results are further elaborated in Table 3.

Table 3. Bias and Fairness Metrics for AI Predictions vs. Human Decisions

Measure	AI Model Score	Threshold	Human Benchmark	Improvement (%)	Standard Deviation
Statistical Discrepancy	0.05	0.10	0.08	+37.5	0.02
False Positive Rate (%)	5.0	10.0	7.8	-35.9	1.1
False Negative Rate (%)	3.5	10.0	5.0	-30.0	0.8
Cases Below Bias Threshold (%)	95.0	90.0	88.0	+8.0	2.0

As seen in Table 3, the AI model consistently performs within acceptable bias limits. The statistical difference of 0.05 is much smaller than the threshold of 0.08 and definitely below the acceptance range of 0.01, meaning that there is virtually no bias in the decisions made by the AI. For example, the AI model's false positive rate (5.0%) and false negative rate (3.5%) were significantly lower than the human benchmark rates of 7.8% and 5.0%, respectively, indicating a reduction in both error rates. In another metric of interest, the model's performance improved by 8% with 95% of cases being below the bias threshold that we set for the paired human benchmark. The lower standard deviations on these metrics also imply greater stability and reliability in the AI's outputs. Ultimately, these findings show that the AI model not only meets existing bias standards, but surpasses them, leading to fairer and more equitable outcomes relative to traditional human-driven assessments.

This pattern mirrors insights from foundational surveys on algorithmic bias, which emphasize that systems exhibiting lower variance in error distributions across subgroups tend to demonstrate higher procedural fairness and greater resilience to dataset-level distortions [23]. Notably, while prior health-care algorithm studies have documented substantial hidden biases linked to proxy variable design [24], our divergence metric suggests that when appropriate validation constraints and transparency mechanisms are embedded early in the modeling pipeline, EIA-specific models may be less susceptible to structural bias amplification. These findings further indicate that sectoral differences in data composition may influence fairness requirements, reaffirming arguments that impact assessments must be domain-sensitive and contextually grounded [20].

5.4. Compliance validation and legal assurance

A vital aspect of this research is validating compliance with legal standards (environment)AI-based EIA, ensuring adherence to established laws and regulatory frameworks. The assessment framework incorporates various metrics, including overall compliance rates, the ratio of assessments above baseline thresholds, consistency of compliance amongst different types of environmental projects, and the error margin in compliance determinations. These measures create a strong overview of how well the AI system conforms to legal and ethical stances. The full results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4. Compliance Metrics and Legal Validation Outcomes

Metric	Observed Rate (%)	Lower Bound (%)	Upper Bound (%)	Proportion Compliant (%)	Error Margin (%)	Assessments Reviewed (N)
Overall Compliance Rate	96	92	98	95	1.2	500
Exceeding Baseline Threshold	89	85	92	88	1.5	300
Below Baseline Threshold	4	2	6	4	0.8	200
Average Compliance Consistency	93	90	95	93	1.0	500
Compliance Rate by Project Type	95 (Renewable), 94 (Industrial), 92 (Infrastructure)	-	-	-	-	-

Table 4 provides an overview of the compliance performance of the AI model across different metrics. The compliance is high (96%) and is stable (CI: from 92% to 98%), which shows a good repeatability. Of the assessments conducted, 89% were above the baseline compliance threshold, reaffirming that AI is capable of performing beyond standard regulatory expectations. The margins for error still remain small, which just shows how accurate and standardized the compliance evaluation process is. Moreover, environmental project types were further analyzed for compliance where renewable projects reported the highest compliance (95%), followed by industrial (94%) and infrastructure (92%) projects. These outcomes highlight the strength of the AI-guided EIA model, conformity with legal requirements, and the ability to provide trustworthy, compliant results in research contexts.

5.5. Resource utilization and cost efficiency

Resource footprint and computation economics are essential aspects for assessing the scalability and sustainability of AI-assisted Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs). Through the comparative analysis of health management metrics which include monthly manpower hours, total operational costs (TC), training costs (TC), and overheads (TC) for both traditional and AI-assisted approaches, these estimates were used to showcase labor and financial savings that can be realized through automation. These indicative measures confer a description of whether it is economically feasible to embed AI into EIA processes and demonstrate the overall long-run benefits from such technology transition. Table 5 provides a comprehensive comparison of these resource utilization metrics.

Table 5. Resource Utilization, Cost Efficiency, and Overhead Comparisons

Resource Measure	Traditional Method	AI Method	Reduction (%)	Overhead Costs ($/year)	Training Costs ($/year)	Annual Savings ($)	Efficiency Gain (%)
Manpower Hours (monthly)	200	80	-60	30,000	10,000	40,000	+50
Operational Cost ($/year)	100,000	60,000	-40	20,000	5,000	40,000	+30
Overhead Costs ($/year)	50,000	30,000	-40	-	-	20,000	+40
Training Costs ($/year)	15,000	10,000	-33.3	-	-	5,000	+33.3

Table 5 shows quite clearly both resource and cost efficiencies achieved through the integration of AI technology into EIA workflows. The manpower requirements decreased from 200 hours to 80 hours per month, a 60% reduction, resulting in significant cost savings on labor but maintaining the quality of assessments. Operational costs reduced 40%, which is $40,000 a year savings. More significantly, overhead costs dropped by 40%, demonstrating the widespread cost benefits brought about by implementation of the AI. While training expenses dropped less significantly (33.3%), they still amassed an annual savings of $40,000. The significant reductions in effort observed in the AI-assisted approach fathomed with further improvements in time and quality underscore that this option is not only financially appealing by virtue of reduced expenses but also enhances overall operational efficiency, making it a savior for organizations looking to modernize their EIA processes.

6. Discussion

This study carries important implications for the efficiency and effectiveness of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), considering the corresponding potential approaches of this study to Integrate Artificial Intelligence with the EIAs enhancing their effectiveness in terms of accuracy, transparency, and compliance with legal standards. But the results also show a range of challenges and limitations to overcome. This discussion places the current study in context with past research, outline its ramifications and suggests avenues for future work in the literature.

The improvements in performance observed in this work are in line with an increasing body of literature demonstrating AIs' potential role in sustainability efforts. In India, for example, Muchokore and

Kaur[1] discover that combining AI and SDGs leads to more effective policy implementation and helps measure impact. Similarly, Adelakun et al.[2] grooved on how accounting practices can be streamlined and environmental reporting could be improved using AI. The efficiency metrics in this study align closely with those observations. Whereas these studies examined broader applications, the present research concentrates specifically on EIA processes, this study drills down into EIA processes and presents new performance metrics including transparency indices and bias detection scores.

However, a closer comparative reading reveals both methodological convergence and divergence with related studies. Whereas Muchokore and Kaur conceptualize AI as a policy-acceleration mechanism within sustainable-development planning [1], our findings demonstrate how similar efficiency gains manifest within highly formalized regulatory workflows—a context in which predictive speed must be balanced against procedural integrity. Moreover, while Adelakun et al. focus on accounting infrastructures to enhance environmental reporting [2], the present study extends this logic to legal compliance structures, showing that accuracy improvements are most impactful when embedded within verifiable audit frameworks, a dimension largely absent in prior work. The quantitative performance improvements observed here also contrast with the concerns raised by Ligozat et al., that caution against overlooking the environmental externalities of AI systems [3]; our results necessitate future evaluation of computational resource footprints to avoid the risk of substituting administrative inefficiencies with technological externalities.

With regards to transparency and explainability, Genovesi and Mönig [4] have suggested ethical certifications for AI and emphasize the need for clear documentation and standard metrics to evaluate AI. This study advances that work by using entropy-based measurements of transparency, demonstrating that more principled documentation policies greatly increase the audibility of the system. Such an approach aligns with proposals to formalize ethical certification through structured documentation mechanisms [4], but diverges in its emphasis on quantification. By grounding transparency in measurable entropy variation, the study operationalizes a construct that is frequently invoked but seldom analytically specified in AI-governance literature. This quantitative approach aligns with principles articulated in ethical-assurance frameworks, which call for concrete evaluative metrics to assess explainability across heterogeneous technical systems [13]. The refinement of these metrics for EIA use cases underscores the necessity of domain-adapted transparency protocols. Compared to Ligozat et al.[3] and his observation about the hidden environmental impact of AI, this study provides quantitative evidence that, with well-documented processes, AI can mitigate these risks by making decision pathways clear and accountable.

Analysis of bias and fairness also links this work to prior work. Ntoutsi et al.[23] explored bias in data-driven AI systems and proposed methodological strategies to detect and reduce inequitable outcomes. Building on that work, this study takes an additional approach by using measures of statistical discrepancy to quantify the degree of alignment between what the AI predicts and how people would judge the outcome, and finds a substantial decrease in both false positive and false negative predictions. Whereas Raab [6]raised ethical concerns of privacy and accountability, the current findings indicate that it is feasible to alleviate these concerns through appropriate transparency metrics that allow for public trust.

Robustness checks demonstrate that the AI model meets key legal compliance requirements. Nitta et al.[10] recently investigated highlights the critical role of requirement engineering concerning AI ethics, and this paper illustrates how powerful statistical techniques like the Clopper-Pearson interval can lay an austere groundwork for supple regulatory certification. This research provides a structured, data-driven method for auditing the compliance rates, potential gaps, and areas for improvement compared to the recommendations provided by Wright [19], but for assessing ethical risks involved in AI law.

Additionally, the results indicate that legal-compliance metrics need to be dynamically recalibrated as regulatory instruments such as the EU AI Act evolve. This necessity is consistent with calls for adaptive governance frameworks capable of integrating cross-disciplinary perspectives while maintaining enforceability [22]. The observation that compliance variance remained low across project types further supports emerging arguments for shared liability models in AI governance, which emphasize distributed responsibility among developers, deployers, and regulatory authorities [27].

The implications of this finding are important for policymakers, regulators, and developers. The improvements in performance and compliance rates that are represented offers an additional rationale for the deployment of AI in EIAs on a wider basis. Previous literature has recommended the use of regulatory sandboxes and experiment with AI-driven environmental policies through data-driven experiments in a limited context. Responsible use of AI provokingly calling for an independent AI auditing framework with the inclusion of public participatory rights to ensure scrutiny, transparency, and fairness from different stakeholders in AI systems.

The findings highlight the need to rethink existing environmental regulation so that it reflects the new role of AI in the economy. Existing regulations frequently lag behind rapid technological developments, leaving unclear questions of accountability and oversight. The regulatory landscape of AI is in its infancy, and while some may see the plethora of compliance options available as complicated, and others as restrictive, in fact they are an opportunity. In addition to making AI more understandable and practical, these indices should be incorporated into compliance standards, helping to further close the gap between AI regulators and AI practitioners. This study provides important data and metrics that can help guide such updates to legal standards.

Although this article has several strengths, it also presents important limitations. A significant issue is the dependence on preexisting datasets and previous EIA reports. Although these sources serve as useful baselines, they may be limited in their ability to address nascent environmental issues or complexities of AI models as they progress. Furthermore, future studies can include real-time data and implement the suggested practices in an extensive range of environmental projects including renewable energy developments or urban construction projects.

Another limitation concerns the generalizability of the proposed transparency and bias metrics. This advantage of the entropy-based transparency index and statistical discrepancy measures is very clear, but if it can be generalized across many AI architectures and few regulatory contexts makes these measures not very effective. Further research is required to assess whether these metrics are universalizable or require customization for specific use cases and legal environments.

The Clopper-Pearson confidence interval is a major workhorse in compliance verification of the study, but like any parametric analysis, it will have its own sources of variation not embraced by the data in question. Future studies could employ different statistical techniques, or machine learning methods to improve compliance measurements to be even less biased and more reliable.

It represents an important development in the application of AI to EIA processes. Expanding upon existing research, it shows how AI systems can improve accuracy, transparency, fairness, and compliance, leading toward more efficient and reliable environmental decision-making. Simultaneously, it highlights major constraints and offers a guide for future studies to address these gaps. As the field of AI continues to develop, the integration of lessons learnt from this study into regulators and best practice frameworks will help ensure that AI is able to reach its full potential in helping to support sustainable development and environmentally sound governance.

7. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is an emerging approach to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of these processes. This research has demonstrated that with appropriate care, AI can help address many longstanding challenges in environmental assessment. These results highlight the power of AI-powered systems to support more efficient workflows, higher accuracy, and greater transparency in decision-making that can yield more informed, time-relevant decisions for environmental management.

These AI models are designed to generate verifiable and transparent outputs that enhance stakeholder understanding. Using metrics of performance, transparency and bias, the research shows how these systems can help create fairer, more accountable evaluations. These results suggest a partial departure from the challenges documented in population-health algorithms, where bias has been shown to stem from deeply embedded structural inequities in input variables. In contrast, EIA datasets seem to admit more tractable bias-mitigation vis-a-vis structured validation procedures, and these findings are consistent with recent claims that fairness interventions should be targeted into specific regulative landscapes rather than being applied universally. Yet developing countries will need continuous oversight to preclude the house-of-cards collapse endemic in estimators and spurious data sets drawn from land-use projection models, ecological risk estimators, and satellite-derived monitoring –disciplines characterized by AI's notorious epistemic fragility. The application of strong transparency indices and the use of bias-detection metrics make it more likely that these models are developed according to high ethical standards. These improvements lay the groundwork for trust in AI-based EIAs, as stakeholders gain a greater understanding of the decision-making and validation processes.

The discoveries additionally feature the need for following administrative principles. AI systems with high levels of legal compliance reduce both the uncertainty and complexity that come with regulatory oversight, by ensuring their systems comply with existing laws. Through simulation modeling and causal analysis, this study distills complex methodological challenges into actionable insights with implications not only for law but also economics, health systems, banking, supply chains and sustainability, where survival depends on compliance too.

Although the empirical findings confirm the operational utility of AI-infused EIA workflows, this holds only in scenarios where environmental modeling assumptions can be more explicitly aligned with ethical design protocols and individually tailored jurisdictional-based regulatory requirements for such innovative tools. The results support the importance of formal auditability standards and sustainability-focused AI development processes, especially as global regulatory authorities increasingly shift to more sophisticated risk-classification paradigms for automated decision systems. In addition, the similarity in compliance results across different project types highlights the need for domain-adapted evaluation standards that can accommodate both technical correctness and normative governance specifications. Future research, in terms of developing a standard would need to place good enough indicators that are key both for legal reliability, environmental integrity and model transparency whilst being sensitive to the socio-technical contingencies recorded across comparable domains. Such endeavours should bridge the gap between systems and allow for a more coherent benchmarking as well as contribute to science-driven and institutionally feasible regulatory designs.

While this study provides a framework for the AI-EIA integration, it is an evolving process that requires future exploration. Further research can build on the application of these methods in diverse environmental contexts, with results less sensitive to variations in conditions. Second, its extensive study on long-term outcomes resulting from the deployment of AI-driven assessments, especially its impacts upon policy formation and stakeholder engagement, will improve such systems and render them more palatable for mass uptake.

From a practical standpoint, governments, regulators, and industry stakeholders should invest in developing standardized benchmarks for transparency, bias detection, and compliance validation. This is crucial as it will allow researchers to compare how well different AI systems perform against the same standards and make more effective data driven decisions around deployment of AI. Additionally, the implementation of third-party auditing and ongoing monitoring can guarantee that AI models are adapted to address emerging environmental issues and compliance standards.

This study contributes substantively to understanding how AI can function as a decision-support tool within EIA processes, as well as how it could systematically optimize the process due to its advantages in terms of efficiency, transparency and compliance. Leveraging these findings and iteratively improving the approaches based on these insights will help stakeholders to embed AI as a normative and useful agent in environmental management and, which in turn should drive more sustainable and equitable outcomes.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest

References

1. Muchokore F, & Kaur, G. Integration of Artificial Intelligence into Sustainable Development Goals in India. INTERANTIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT. 2024.
2. Adelakun B, Antwi, B., Ntiakoh, A., & Eziefule, A. Leveraging AI for sustainable accounting: Developing models for environmental impact assessment and reporting. Finance & Accounting Research Journal. 2024;6(6).
3. Ligozat A-L, Lefevre J, Bugeau A, Combaz J. Unraveling the Hidden Environmental Impacts of AI Solutions for Environment Life Cycle Assessment of AI Solutions. Sustainability [Internet]. 2022; 14(9).
4. Genovesi S, Mönig JM. Acknowledging Sustainability in the Framework of Ethical Certification for AI. Sustainability [Internet]. 2022; 14(7).
5. Kazim EaK, Adriano. The Interrelation Between Data and AI Ethics in the Context of Impact Assessments SSRN Electronic Journal. 2020.
6. Raab CD. Information privacy, impact assessment, and the place of ethics∗. Computer Law & Security Review. 2020;37:105404.
7. Uwaga Monica A, Emmanuel Olurotimi O. Artificial intelligence in environmental conservation: evaluating cyber risks and opportunities for sustainable practices. Computer Science & IT Research Journal. 2024;5(5):1178-209.
8. Calvi A, Kotzinos D. Enhancing AI fairness through impact assessment in the European Union: a legal and computer science perspective. Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency; Chicago, IL, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2023. p. 1229–45.
9. Thelisson E, Mika G, Schneiter Q, Padh K, Verma H. Toward responsible AI use: Considerations for sustainability impact assessment. arXiv preprint arXiv:231211996. 2023.
10. Nitta I, Ohashi K, Shiga S, Onodera S, editors. AI Ethics Impact Assessment based on Requirement Engineering. 2022 IEEE 30th International Requirements Engineering Conference Workshops (REW); 2022 15-19 Aug. 2022.
11. Etukudoh E, Hamdan, A., Ibekwe, K., Umoh, A., & Ilojianya, V. AI and machine learning in climate change research: A review of predictive models and environmental impact. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews. 2024;21(01):1999–2008.
12. Walacik M, Chmielewska A. Real Estate Industry Sustainable Solution (Environmental, Social, and Governance) Significance Assessment—AI-Powered Algorithm Implementation. Sustainability [Internet]. 2024; 16(3).
13. Burr C, Leslie D. Ethical assurance: a practical approach to the responsible design, development, and deployment of data-driven technologies. AI and Ethics. 2023;3(1):73-98.
14. Ndiema KW. Implications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in land management. Journal of Computer Science and Technology (JCST). 2024;2(1):1-9.

15. Agu E, Abhulimen, A., Obiki-Osafiele, A., Osundare, O., Adeniran, I., & Efunniyi, C. Discussing ethical considerations and solutions for ensuring fairness in AI-driven financial services. International Journal of Frontline Research in Multidisciplinary Studies. 2024;03(02):001–9.
16. Thakur N, Sharma A. Ethical Considerations in AI-driven Financial Decision Making. Journal of Management & Public Policy. 2024;15:41-57.
17. Mirishli S. Ethical Implications of AI in Data Collection: Balancing Innovation with Privacy. ANCIENT LAND. 2024;6:40-55.
18. Ejjami R. AI-driven Justice: Evaluating the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Legal Systems. International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research. 2024.
19. Wright J, Avouris A, Frost M, Hoffmann S. Supporting academic freedom as a human right: challenges and solutions in academic publishing. The International Journal of Human Rights. 2022;26(10):1741-60.
20. Ballester I, Kampel M, editors. Ethical Impact Identification of a Dementia Behaviour Monitoring System. 2024 IEEE 18th International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition (FG); 2024 27-31 May 2024.
21. Agbese M, Mohanani R, Khan A, Abrahamsson P. Implementing AI Ethics: Making Sense of the Ethical Requirements. Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering; Oulu, Finland: Association for Computing Machinery; 2023. p. 62–71.
22. Lee SU, Perera H, Liu Y, Xia B, Lu Q, Zhu L, et al. Integrating ESG and AI: A Comprehensive Responsible AI Assessment Framework. arXiv preprint arXiv:240800965. 2024.
23. Ntoutsi E, Fafalios P, Gadiraju U, Iosifidis V, Nejdl W, Vidal M-E, et al. Bias in data-driven artificial intelligence systems—An introductory survey. WIREs Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery. 2020;10(3):e1356.
24. Obermeyer Z, Powers B, Vogeli C, Mullainathan S. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science. 2019;366(6464):447-53.
25. Christoforaki M, Beyan O. AI Ethics—A Bird's Eye View. Applied Sciences [Internet]. 2022; 12(9).
26. Saeidnia HR, Hashemi Fotami SG, Lund B, Ghiasi N. Ethical Considerations in Artificial Intelligence Interventions for Mental Health and Well-Being: Ensuring Responsible Implementation and Impact. Social Sciences [Internet]. 2024; 13(7).
27. Uzougbo NS, Ikegwu CG, Adewusi AO. Legal accountability and ethical considerations of AI in financial services. GSC Advanced Research and Reviews. 2024.