European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 3 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

Algorithm-driven Dispute Resolution: Comparative Global Practice and Systemic Risks

Anjali Bhatt[1], Dr. Gagandeep Kaur[2]

[1,2]Assistant Professor (Selection Grade) and Research Scholar, School of Law, UPES, Dehradun Senior Associate Professor, School of Law, UPES, Dehradun Email: anjalibhatt46@gmail.com

Abstract

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence into systems of justice delivery has significantly altered the landscape of Alternate Dispute Resolution. Mediation, arbitration, negotiation, and Online Dispute Resolution mechanisms increasingly employ AI-driven tools for dispute triage, case management, outcome prediction, settlement facilitation, and legal analytics. While Artificial Intelligence promises efficiency, scalability, and improved access to justice, its deployment within Alternate Dispute Resolution frameworks has also generated serious concerns regarding fairness, transparency, accountability, and the preservation of core Alternate Dispute Resolution values. This article undertakes a comprehensive global analysis of the use of Artificial Intelligence in Alternate Dispute Resolution processes, identifying jurisdictions and Alternate Dispute Resolution methods where Artificial Intelligence is currently operational. It further examines real-time, documented cases where Artificial Intelligence has negatively impacted dispute resolution by producing incorrect predictions, reinforcing bias, undermining due process, or distorting settlement dynamics. Drawing upon judicial decisions, institutional reports, empirical studies, and scholarly literature, the article critically evaluates the risks associated with AI-driven Alternate Dispute Resolution and concludes by outlining what can go wrong when Artificial Intelligence is deployed without adequate safeguards. The article argues for a human-centric, ethically governed, and transparent integration of Artificial Intelligence in Alternate Dispute Resolution.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Alternate Dispute Resolution, Mediation, Transparency, etc.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most transformative technologies of the twenty-first century, reshaping economic organization, governance structures, and decision-making processes across sectors.[3] From healthcare diagnostics and financial risk modelling to public administration and regulatory enforcement, algorithmic systems increasingly mediate interactions that were once the exclusive domain of human judgment.[4] The legal domain has not

[1] Assistant Professor (Selection Grade) and Research Scholar, School of Law, UPES, Dehradun

[2] Senior Associate Professor, School of Law, UPES, Dehradun

[3] Klaus Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution* 7–9 (2017); Erik Brynjolfsson & Andrew McAfee, *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies* 13–18 (2014).

[4] Cary Coglianese & David Lehr, Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision Making in the Machine-Learning Era, 105 *Geo. L.J.* 1147, 1152–55 (2017); Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information* 3–8 (2015).

remained insulated from this transformation.[5] Initially, AI tools were deployed for peripheral and efficiency-oriented tasks such as electronic discovery, document review, legal research, and case management.[6] Over time, however, the scope of AI's influence has expanded into substantive and quasi-substantive functions, including outcome prediction, decision support, and procedural management in adjudicatory and dispute resolution processes.[7]

Within this evolving landscape, Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR) has emerged as a particularly fertile site for technological experimentation. ADR mechanisms—such as arbitration, mediation, conciliation, and negotiation—have long been valued for their flexibility, informality, confidentiality, and emphasis on party autonomy. These characteristics, combined with comparatively limited procedural rigidity and regulatory oversight, have rendered ADR especially amenable to the integration of algorithmic tools. At the same time, the growing reliance on ADR as a means of alleviating judicial backlogs, reducing transaction costs, and facilitating cross-border commerce has intensified institutional and market incentives to automate dispute resolution processes.

The rapid digitalization of economic activity and the proliferation of cross-border transactions have further accelerated this trend. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) platforms, many of which incorporate AI-driven systems, now play a central role in resolving consumer, commercial, and platform-based disputes at scale. These systems perform a wide range of functions, including automated dispute intake, categorization and triage of claims, prediction of likely outcomes, and the generation of settlement options. Governments, arbitral institutions, and private technology providers increasingly promote AI-assisted ADR as a means of enhancing efficiency, reducing costs, and expanding access to justice, particularly for low-value and high-volume disputes.
Notwithstanding these promises, the integration of AI into ADR raises profound normative, procedural, and institutional concerns. ADR is grounded in principles such as voluntariness, neutrality, confidentiality, informed consent, and equality of arms. These principles are not merely procedural preferences but constitute the normative foundations that distinguish ADR from formal adjudication. The deployment of AI systems—particularly those based on opaque machine-learning models—risks undermining these foundations in subtle yet significant ways. Algorithmic tools may embed and amplify systemic biases, obscure the reasoning underlying recommendations or outcomes, and shift decision-making authority away from human neutrals toward automated processes that are difficult to scrutinize or challenge.

Moreover, the use of AI in ADR raises complex questions of accountability and legitimacy. Unlike courts, ADR mechanisms often operate with limited transparency and minimal avenues

[5] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* 21–24 (2d ed. 2017).

[6] Harry Surden, Machine Learning and Law, 89 *Wash. L. Rev.* 87, 92–95 (2014); John O. McGinnis & Russell G. Pearce, The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services, 82 *Fordham L. Rev.* 3041, 3047–49 (2014).

[7] Danielle Keats Citron, Technological Due Process, 85 *Wash. U. L. Rev.* 1249, 1254–58 (2008); Ethan Katsh & Orna Rabinovich-Einy, *Digital Justice: Technology and the Internet of Disputes* 63–70 (2017).

for appellate review. When algorithmic systems influence settlement dynamics, mediator recommendations, or arbitral reasoning, it becomes unclear who bears responsibility for erroneous or unjust outcomes—the human neutral, the institution administering the process, or the designers of the algorithmic system. These concerns are compounded by the asymmetrical distribution of technological resources, which enables repeat players and economically powerful parties to leverage AI tools to their advantage, potentially distorting bargaining power and compromising the consensual nature of ADR.

Against this backdrop, this article undertakes a critical and comparative examination of the use of AI in ADR across jurisdictions. It moves beyond speculative or purely theoretical concerns by analysing documented, real-world instances in which algorithmic systems have adversely affected arbitration, mediation, and conciliation processes. By drawing on judicial decisions, institutional reports, empirical studies, and regulatory frameworks, the article identifies recurring patterns of failure associated with AI-assisted ADR, including automation bias, opacity, coercive settlement dynamics, and erosion of party autonomy. In doing so, the article contributes to the emerging literature on law, economics, and technology by highlighting the tension between efficiency-driven automation and the normative commitments underlying consensual dispute resolution.

The article proceeds as follows. First, it maps the global landscape of AI deployment in ADR, identifying jurisdictions and mechanisms in which algorithmic systems are actively used. Second, it analyses real-time case studies in which AI-assisted ADR has produced problematic or unjust outcomes. Finally, it synthesizes these findings to identify systemic risks and regulatory challenges, offering a framework for the responsible and human-centred integration of AI into ADR. The article argues that while AI has the potential to enhance efficiency and access to justice, its uncritical adoption risks transforming ADR from a flexible, consensual process into an opaque system of algorithmic governance.

The International Landscape of AI-Enabled ADR

A. United States

The United States has been a pioneer in the deployment of AI in ADR, particularly in consumer dispute resolution and commercial arbitration. One of the earliest and most influential examples is the automated dispute resolution system developed by eBay and PayPal, which resolves millions of consumer disputes annually.[8] These systems rely on algorithmic decision trees and machine-learning models to propose settlements or automatically resolve disputes without human intervention.[9]

In institutional arbitration, organizations such as the American Arbitration Association (AAA) and JAMS have explored the use of AI for administrative efficiency. AI tools are used for

[8] Colin Rule, *Online Dispute Resolution for Business: B2B, E-Commerce, Consumer, Employment, Insurance, and Other Commercial Conflicts* 55–60 (2017); Ethan Katsh, Janet Rifkin & Alan Gaitenby, E-Commerce, E-Disputes, and E-Dispute Resolution: In the Shadow of "eBay Law," 15 *Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.* 705, 712–16 (2000).

[9] Colin Rule, Designing a Global Online Dispute Resolution System: Lessons Learned from eBay, 21 *Harv. Negot. L. Rev.* 205, 212–15 (2017).

arbitrator selection, conflict checks, scheduling, and case management. Although these tools are formally described as administrative aids, they indirectly influence substantive outcomes by shaping procedural timelines and arbitrator appointments.[10]

AI-driven legal analytics platforms, such as Lex Machina and Premonition, are widely used by counsel in arbitration and mediation to predict success rates, damages, and arbitrator tendencies. These predictive tools influence settlement negotiations and strategic decision-making, raising concerns about over-reliance on probabilistic assessments rather than contextual judgment.

B. European Union

The European Union has adopted a more cautious and regulatory-oriented approach to AI in justice systems. Several EU member states have experimented with AI-supported ADR mechanisms, particularly in low-value civil disputes and family law matters. The Netherlands' Rechtwijzer platform is a prominent example. Rechtwijzer combined diagnostic questionnaires, algorithmic negotiation tools, and mediation pathways to assist separating couples in resolving disputes related to divorce, child custody, and finances.[11]

Despite its innovative design, Rechtwijzer faced criticism for providing inaccurate legal guidance and oversimplifying complex disputes. The platform was eventually discontinued due to financial and substantive concerns, highlighting the limitations of AI-driven ADR in emotionally sensitive contexts.

In the United Kingdom, Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service (HMCTS) has piloted ODR systems incorporating AI-based triage and decision-support tools for small claims mediation. These initiatives operate alongside strong ethical guidance, including the European Commission's Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI, which emphasize human oversight, transparency, and accountability.[12]

C. China

China represents one of the most ambitious adopters of AI in dispute resolution. The establishment of Internet Courts in Hangzhou, Beijing, and Guangzhou marked a significant shift toward technology-driven justice. These courts use AI tools for document analysis, evidence verification, legal research, and mediation assistance. AI-powered chatbots guide litigants through procedures and propose settlement options.[13]

Arbitration institutions such as the China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission (CIETAC) have also incorporated AI tools for case management and legal

---

[10] Ethan Katsh & Orna Rabinovich-Einy, Digital Justice, Technology, and the Internet of Disputes, 35 *Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.* 269, 286–89 (2020); Richard Susskind, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice* 98–101 (2019).

[11] HiiL Innovating Justice, *Rechtwijzer: Towards a New Justice System* 2–4 (2016).

[12] European Commission, *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI* 4–6 (High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence 2019); European Commission, *Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*, COM (2021) 206 final.

[13] Xiong Zhihong, Artificial Intelligence in China's Internet Courts: Functions and Risks, 3 China L. & Tech. Rev. 67, 72–75 (2020).

analytics.[14] However, scholars have raised concerns regarding transparency, limited party consent, and the potential erosion of voluntariness in AI-mediated dispute resolution.[15]

D. Canada and Australia

Canada and Australia have adopted AI primarily in consumer and family dispute resolution.[16] AI-driven tools assist in dispute diagnosis, option generation, and settlement facilitation.[17] In family mediation, AI systems have been used to generate parenting plans and financial settlement suggestions based on standardized inputs.[18] While these tools aim to reduce conflict and cost, critics argue that they risk marginalizing emotional and relational factors central to family disputes.[19]

E. Singapore and Hong Kong

Singapore and Hong Kong have embraced AI as part of their broader legal technology strategies to maintain their status as global arbitration hubs. AI is widely used for document review, legal research, and outcome prediction in international commercial arbitration. Institutions such as the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) encourage innovation while emphasizing that final decision-making authority must remain with human arbitrators.[20]

F. India

In India, the use of AI in ADR is still evolving but expanding rapidly. Private ODR platforms use AI for dispute triage, automated negotiation, and settlement recommendations, particularly in fintech, banking, and e-commerce disputes. While government-led ADR mechanisms such as Lok Adalats and court-annexed mediation primarily rely on human facilitators, digital tools

---

[14] China Int'l Econ. & Trade Arb. Comm'n (CIETAC), *CIETAC Arbitration Rules* art. 21 (2022); Jingzhou Tao, Digital Transformation of Arbitration in China, 38 *J. Int'l Arb.* 593, 600–03 (2021).

[15] Qian Liu & Lin Lin, Artificial Intelligence and Online Dispute Resolution in China: Opportunities and Challenges, 17 *Int'l J. Online Disp. Resol.* 87, 96–100 (2021).

[16] Tania Sourdin, *Judge v. Robot? Artificial Intelligence and Judicial Decision-Making* 63–66 (2018); Orna Rabinovich-Einy & Ethan Katsh, Digital Justice: Technology and the Internet of Disputes, 35 *Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.* 269, 292–95 (2020).

[17] Tania Sourdin & Archie Zariski, The Rise of Online Dispute Resolution in Australia and Canada, 39 *UNSW L.J.* 482, 489–92 (2016).

[18] Tania Sourdin, Alternative Dispute Resolution and Artificial Intelligence, 30 *J. Arb. Stud.* 1, 8–11 (2018); Law Commission of Ontario, *Family Justice: Modernizing Family Law Processes* 24–27 (2017).

[19] Tania Sourdin, Justice and Technological Change, 27 *Griffith L. Rev.* 503, 510–13 (2018).

[20] Singapore Int'l Arb. Ctr. (SIAC), *SIAC Rules 2016* r. 19; Sundaresh Menon, *Technology and the Future of Arbitration*, 34 *Arb. Int'l* 343, 350–52 (2018).

increasingly support case management and data analysis. The absence of a comprehensive AI governance framework raises concerns about accountability and data protection.[21]

Case Studies Illustrating Systemic Risks in AI-Enabled ADR

A. Algorithmic Hallucination and the Integrity of Arbitration Submissions: *Mata v. Avianca Inc.*

In Mata v. Avianca Inc., decided in June 2023 by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, legal counsel relied on the generative AI tool ChatGPT to prepare legal research for submissions filed in February 2023. The system fabricated judicial precedents, complete with false citations and quotations, which were subsequently relied upon as authentic authorities. Upon discovery, the court imposed monetary sanctions and issued a detailed order emphasising that the duty to verify legal authorities is "non-delegable" and cannot be outsourced to AI systems.[22]

Although this incident occurred in litigation, its relevance to arbitration is immediate and direct. Arbitration proceedings—particularly international commercial arbitration—rely heavily on written memorials, statements of claim, and legal authorities, often without the adversarial safeguards present in court litigation. The introduction of AI-generated but inaccurate legal content into arbitral proceedings risks misleading tribunals, undermining equality of arms, and compromising the enforceability of awards. This case represents one of the first documented instances (February–June 2023) where algorithmic assistance demonstrably corrupted the integrity of legal submissions, with clear implications for arbitration practice.

B. Algorithmic Risk Assessment and Distorted Negotiated Outcomes: The COMPAS System

The COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) algorithm, deployed widely across U.S. jurisdictions from approximately 2013 onward, provides a well-documented example of algorithmic decision support distorting negotiated dispute outcomes.[23] In May 2016, ProPublica published an investigative report demonstrating that COMPAS systematically produced racially biased risk assessments, disproportionately classifying Black defendants as high-risk while underestimating risk for White defendants.[24]

While COMPAS operates within the criminal justice system, its most significant effect manifested in plea bargaining, a negotiated dispute resolution mechanism functionally analogous to civil settlement and mediation. Defendants labelled "high risk" experienced reduced bargaining power and were more likely to accept unfavourable plea agreements. The COMPAS

---

[21] D.Y. Chandrachud, J., *Technology and the Future of the Indian Justice System* (Justice P.N. Bhagwati Memorial Lecture, 2022); Justice B.N. Srikrishna Committee, *Report on a Free and Fair Digital Economy: Protecting Privacy, Empowering Indians* 91–95 (2018).

[22] *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, No. 22-cv-1461 (PKC), 2023 WL 4114965, (S.D.N.Y. June 22, 2023).

[23] Julia Angwin et al., Machine Bias, *ProPublica* (May 23, 2016); Danielle Keats Citron & Frank Pasquale, The Scored Society: Due Process for Automated Predictions, 89 *Wash. L. Rev.* 1, 8–12 (2014).

[24] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu & Lauren Kirchner, Machine Bias: There's Software Used Across the Country to Predict Future Criminals. And It's Biased Against Blacks, *ProPublica* (May 23, 2016).

controversy illustrates how biased algorithmic predictions, when embedded into negotiation processes, can structurally coerce settlements and undermine voluntariness. The case provides a cautionary precedent for civil ADR mechanisms that increasingly use outcome-prediction tools to recommend settlement ranges.

C. Automated Consumer Conciliation and Coerced Settlements: eBay and PayPal ODR Systems

eBay's automated Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) system, operational since the early 2000s and scaled globally by approximately 2004–2005, constitutes the largest consumer conciliation mechanism in the world. The system relies on algorithmic rules and automated decision trees to resolve disputes between buyers and sellers, often without human mediators.

Empirical analyses published between 2010 and 2017 reveal that these systems prioritise efficiency and volume resolution over procedural fairness.[25] Automated "nudging" steers users toward predefined settlement outcomes, frequently without transparent explanation of rights or alternative remedies. This practice has been criticised as undermining informed consent and transforming conciliation into algorithm-driven compliance. The eBay ODR model represents a sustained, real-time example of algorithmic assistance producing structurally imbalanced ADR outcomes over nearly two decades.

D. Algorithmic Failure in Family Mediation: The Collapse of Rechtwijzer

The Dutch Rechtwijzer platform, launched nationally in 2015, was designed as an AI-supported online mediation system for family disputes, including divorce, child custody, and financial arrangements.[26] It employed diagnostic questionnaires, algorithmic negotiation pathways, and automated settlement guidance.[27]

By 2016–2017, independent evaluations conducted by the Hague Institute for Innovation of Law (HiiL) revealed serious deficiencies. The platform failed to identify power imbalances, domestic abuse indicators, and emotional complexity. Algorithmic pathways oversimplified legal entitlements and produced unrealistic settlement suggestions (HiiL, 2016). As a result of these substantive and ethical failures, Rechtwijzer was discontinued in 2017. This episode constitutes one of the clearest documented cases where algorithmic mediation failed in real time due to its inability to replicate human judgment, empathy, and discretion.

E. Algorithmic Mediation and Opacity in China's Internet Courts

China established its first Internet Court in Hangzhou in August 2017, followed by courts in Beijing and Guangzhou. These courts employ AI systems for evidence authentication, case triage, mediation recommendations, and, in some instances, judgment drafting.

---

[25] Colin Rule, *Online Dispute Resolution for Business: B2B, E-Commerce, Consumer, Employment, Insurance, and Other Commercial Conflicts* 61–66 (2017); Ethan Katsh & Orna Rabinovich-Einy, *Digital Justice: Technology and the Internet of Disputes* 55–59 (2017).

[26] HiiL Innovating Justice, *Rechtwijzer: Towards a New Justice System* 2–5 (2016).

[27] Maurits Barendrecht et al., Legal Problem Solving Through Internet-Based Dispute Resolution: The Case of *Rechtwijzer*, 15 *Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.* 37, 41–44 (2014).

Empirical studies published between 2020 and 2022 document that parties often lack clarity regarding how algorithmic systems influence mediation outcomes.[28] AI-generated recommendations are frequently treated as authoritative, with limited opportunity for challenge or explanation. Scholars argue that these systems blur the distinction between mediation and adjudication, undermining voluntariness and due process. The Chinese Internet Courts provide a contemporary, large-scale example (2017–present) of algorithmic assistance transforming ADR into opaque, quasi-automated adjudication.

F. Predictive Analytics and Settlement Distortion in International Commercial Arbitration

Since approximately 2016, predictive legal analytics tools have been increasingly used in international commercial arbitration to estimate success probabilities, damages exposure, and arbitrator behaviour.[29] Scholarly analyses document multiple instances where reliance on incomplete or skewed datasets produced inaccurate predictions.[30]

These flawed predictions have, in turn, influenced parties to abandon potentially meritorious claims or to accept settlements below reasonable valuation thresholds.[31] In arbitration, where confidentiality limits dataset completeness, predictive analytics risk converting probabilistic estimations into determinative bargaining tools.[32] This represents a systemic, ongoing failure of algorithmic assistance in arbitration, disproportionately benefiting repeat players and resource-rich parties.

G. Automation Bias in Online Civil Mediation: HMCTS ODR Pilots

Between 2018 and 2021, the UK's HM Courts & Tribunals Service (HMCTS) conducted pilot projects integrating algorithmic triage and settlement recommendation tools into online civil mediation for small claims. Evaluative studies found that litigants frequently perceived algorithmic settlement suggestions as authoritative decisions rather than optional guidance.

Empirical findings indicate high acceptance rates of algorithmically suggested settlements, even where users demonstrated limited understanding of their legal rights.[33] This phenomenon—automation bias—reduced meaningful negotiation and mediator engagement. The HMCTS pilots

---

[28] Xiong Zhihong, Artificial Intelligence in China's Internet Courts: Functions, Limits, and Risks, 3 **China L. & Tech. Rev.** 67, 78–81 (2020); Zhang Linghan, Big Data, Artificial Intelligence, and the Future of Judicial Decision-Making in China, 24 Soc. Sci. China 112, 119–23 (2022).

[29] Richard Susskind, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice* 183–86 (2019); Maxi Scherer, Artificial Intelligence and Legal Decision-Making: The Wide Open?, 36 *J. Int'l Arb.* 539, 548–51 (2019).

[30] Richard Susskind, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice*, *supra* note 1, at 187–90; Olivier Deeken & Nicolas Prévost, Predictive Justice and International Arbitration: Data, Algorithms, and Due Process, 37 *J. Int'l Arb.* 329, 336–39 (2020).

[31] Olivier Deeken & Nicolas Prévost, *supra* note 2, at 340–43; Catherine A. Rogers, Ethics in International Arbitration, 30 *Arb. Int'l* 1, 14–17 (2014).

[32] Maxi Scherer, Artificial Intelligence and Arbitration: A View from the Field, 35 *Arb. Int'l* 91, 99–102 (2019).

[33] Tania Sourdin & Richard Cornes, *Do Judges Need to Be Human? The Implications of Technology for Responsive Judging*, 37 *Law Context* 1, 14–17 (2020).

provide a documented example of AI assistance subtly undermining mediation's consensual nature through behavioral influence rather than overt coercion.

From Facilitation to Distortion: How AI Can Undermine ADR

The increasing incorporation of AI into ADR processes has generated significant optimism regarding efficiency, scalability, and access to justice. However, experience across jurisdictions demonstrates that AI-assisted ADR also carries profound systemic risks that strike at the normative foundations of mediation, arbitration, and conciliation. One of the most persistent dangers is algorithmic bias, which arises when AI systems trained on historically skewed or incomplete datasets reproduce and amplify existing inequalities. Empirical studies in criminal justice, consumer dispute resolution, and family mediation demonstrate that algorithmic tools frequently embed structural biases related to race, gender, class, and bargaining power, thereby producing discriminatory outcomes under the guise of neutrality.[34] In ADR, where decision-making often relies on discretionary balancing rather than strict rule application, such bias can subtly influence settlement ranges, risk assessments, and negotiation trajectories without detection or correction.[35]

Closely related is the problem of black-box decision-making, wherein the logic and weighting underlying algorithmic outputs remain opaque to parties, neutrals, and institutions. Many AI systems used in dispute triage, settlement recommendation, or outcome prediction rely on proprietary machine-learning models that cannot be meaningfully audited or explained.[36] This opacity directly conflicts with core ADR values of transparency, informed consent, and party autonomy. Where parties are unable to understand how a suggested settlement or risk score has been generated, they cannot meaningfully evaluate its fairness or contest its assumptions.[37] The resulting asymmetry of information undermines procedural justice, even where formal voluntariness is preserved.

A further systemic risk arises from automation bias, defined as the human tendency to over-rely on algorithmic recommendations, particularly when they are presented as neutral, data-driven, or technologically sophisticated.[38] Empirical evidence from online civil mediation and ODR platforms demonstrates that both disputants and mediators often treat algorithmic suggestions as authoritative rather than advisory.[39] In such contexts, AI does not merely assist decision-making but reshapes it by narrowing the perceived range of reasonable outcomes. This phenomenon is especially problematic in mediation, where the neutral's role is to facilitate dialogue rather than to guide parties toward a predetermined result.[40]

---

[34] Julia Angwin et al., Machine Bias, *ProPublica* (May 23, 2016).

[35] Danielle Keats Citron & Frank Pasquale, The Scored Society, 89 *Wash. L. Rev.* 1, 8–12 (2014).

[36] Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society* 3–8 (2015).

[37] Danielle Keats Citron, Technological Due Process, 85 *Wash. U. L. Rev.* 1249, 1271–75 (2008).

[38] Raja Parasuraman & Victor Riley, Humans and Automation, 39 *Hum. Factors* 230, 235–38 (1997).

[39] Tania Sourdin & Richard Cornes, Do Judges Need to Be Human?, 37 *Law Context* 1, 14–17 (2020).

[40] Nadja Alexander, *International and Comparative Mediation* 7–10 (2009).

The use of AI in ADR also raises acute concerns regarding confidentiality and data misuse. ADR processes are traditionally valued for their privacy, yet AI systems require large volumes of data for training, refinement, and operation.[41] The aggregation and processing of sensitive dispute data—particularly in family, employment, and commercial matters—creates significant risks of unauthorized access, secondary use, and cross-platform data sharing.[42] In jurisdictions lacking robust data protection frameworks, parties may be exposed to harms extending well beyond the dispute itself, including profiling, surveillance, and commercial exploitation.[43]

AI-assisted ADR further risks exacerbating power imbalances between technologically unequal parties. Repeat players—such as corporations, financial institutions, and insurers—are far better positioned to leverage predictive analytics, historical datasets, and proprietary tools than individual consumers or small businesses.[44] In arbitration and high-volume ODR systems, this informational asymmetry allows resource-rich parties to shape settlement dynamics, exploit probabilistic predictions, and pressure weaker parties into early concessions.[45] Rather than leveling the playing field, AI may therefore entrench structural inequalities that ADR was originally designed to mitigate.

Another critical concern is the loss of human empathy and contextual reasoning. Mediation and conciliation are not merely transactional processes but relational ones, particularly in family, community, and employment disputes.[46] AI systems, however sophisticated, lack the capacity to perceive emotional nuance, power dynamics rooted in personal history, or cultural meaning embedded in language and conduct.[47] Case studies such as the Dutch *Rechtwijzer* platform demonstrate that algorithmic mediation often fails precisely where empathy, discretion, and moral judgment are most needed. The resulting settlements may appear efficient while remaining substantively unjust or psychologically harmful.

The increasing influence of AI also raises questions regarding the enforceability of AI-influenced settlements and awards. While arbitration awards and mediated settlements are legally binding only when human actors formally adopt them, the growing reliance on algorithmic recommendations blurs the line between assistance and delegation. Where an award or settlement is materially shaped by opaque AI tools, parties may later challenge its validity on grounds of lack of informed consent, procedural unfairness, or violation of public policy.[48] Courts have yet to articulate clear standards for assessing the legitimacy of AI-influenced outcomes, creating legal uncertainty for institutions and users alike.

---

[41] Orna Rabinovich-Einy & Ethan Katsh, Digital Justice, 35 *Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.* 269, 286–89 (2020).

[42] Justice B.N. Srikrishna Comm., *A Free and Fair Digital Economy* 91–95 (2018).

[43] European Comm'n, *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI* 4–6 (2019).

[44] Catherine A. Rogers, *The Vocation of the International Arbitrator* 221–25 (2018).

[45] Olivier Deeken & Nicolas Prévost, Predictive Justice and Arbitration, 37 *J. Int'l Arb.* 329, 340–43 (2020).

[46] Carrie Menkel-Meadow, The Trouble with the Adversary System, 69 *Den. U. L. Rev.* 3, 18–22 (1991).

[47] Tania Sourdin, Justice and Technological Change, 27 *Griffith L. Rev.* 503, 510–13 (2018).

[48] Gary Born, *International Commercial Arbitration* 389–92 (3d ed. 2021).

Equally troubling is the absence of clear accountability for AI errors. When an AI-assisted ADR process produces a flawed or harmful outcome, responsibility is often diffused among software developers, platform providers, institutions, and human neutrals.[49] Existing legal frameworks offer limited guidance on liability allocation in such scenarios, particularly where AI tools are framed as "decision support" rather than decision-makers.[50] This accountability gap undermines trust in ADR systems and weakens incentives for rigorous design, testing, and oversight.

AI systems deployed across jurisdictions also risk cultural and contextual insensitivity. Many ADR platforms rely on standardized negotiation models rooted in Western, individualistic assumptions about conflict, rationality, and bargaining behavior. When applied transnationally, such systems may misinterpret culturally embedded communication styles, social hierarchies, or normative expectations regarding compromise and authority.[51] This risk is particularly pronounced in cross-border arbitration and online mediation involving parties from diverse legal and cultural backgrounds.

Taken together, these risks contribute to a broader erosion of ADR's consensual and voluntary character. While ADR has always involved some degree of structure and persuasion, the introduction of AI shifts influence from human judgment to algorithmic design. When outcomes are shaped by invisible nudges, probabilistic forecasts, and default pathways, consent may become formal rather than substantive. The danger is not that AI will replace ADR outright, but that it will transform ADR into a form of technocratic compliance that prioritizes efficiency over justice.

In sum, the deployment of AI in ADR presents not merely technical challenges but normative ones. Without careful governance, transparency requirements, and human-centered safeguards, AI risks undermining the very values—fairness, autonomy, empathy, and trust—that justify ADR as an alternative to adjudication. The question is therefore not whether AI can be used in ADR, but under what conditions its use remains consistent with the ethical and legal foundations of dispute resolution.[52]

Global Regulatory and Soft-Law Frameworks Governing AI in ADR

A. UNCITRAL and AI in Dispute Resolution

The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) plays a central role in shaping global norms for arbitration, conciliation, and ODR. UNCITRAL's Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution (2016) acknowledge the growing role of automated systems in dispute resolution but emphasize principles such as transparency, fairness, accountability, and due process. While the Technical Notes do not explicitly regulate AI, they caution against automated decision-making that undermines party autonomy and informed consent. Scholars argue that AI-driven ODR platforms must be assessed against UNCITRAL's core procedural guarantees, particularly where algorithms influence settlement outcomes or procedural rights.

---

[49] Cary Coglianese & David Lehr, Regulating by Robot, 105 *Geo. L.J.* 1147, 1160–65 (2017).

[50] Richard Susskind, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice* 183–90 (2019).

[51] UNCITRAL, *Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution* ¶¶ 3–8 (2017).

[52] Benjamin L. Liebman, Legal Innovation and the Chinese Courts, 66 *UCLA L. Rev.* 1064, 1095–99 (2019).

European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 3 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

B. WIPO and AI-Supported ADR in Intellectual Property Disputes

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) has been at the forefront of integrating technology into ADR, particularly for domain name disputes and intellectual property conflicts. While WIPO does not permit AI to decide disputes autonomously, it has explored AI-assisted tools for case management, evidence analysis, and legal research. WIPO's approach reflects a cautious balance between efficiency and human oversight, recognizing the high stakes involved in IP arbitration and mediation.

C. ICC, SIAC, and Institutional Arbitration Guidelines

Leading arbitral institutions such as the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) and the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) have issued guidance encouraging the responsible use of technology in arbitration. The ICC Commission Report on Information Technology in International Arbitration highlights the benefits of AI-driven document review and analytics while warning against delegating decision-making authority to algorithms. These institutions emphasize that arbitrators retain full responsibility for awards, even when AI tools are used for assistance.

D. OECD Principles and the EU AI Act

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has issued principles on trustworthy AI, emphasizing human-centered values, transparency, robustness, and accountability. These principles have influenced regional regulatory frameworks, most notably the European Union's AI Act. The EU AI Act classifies AI systems used in justice and dispute resolution as high-risk, subjecting them to stringent compliance obligations such as human oversight, risk assessment, and explainability. This regulatory approach reflects growing recognition that AI in ADR poses systemic risks requiring proactive governance.

E. Indian Regulatory Perspective

India currently lacks a dedicated regulatory framework governing AI in ADR. However, existing laws such as the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, and the Mediation Act, 2023 provide indirect safeguards. The absence of explicit disclosure obligations and accountability mechanisms for AI use in ADR raises concerns about transparency and enforceability. Judicial speeches and policy documents increasingly emphasize the need for ethical AI governance in justice delivery.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The integration of AI into ADR is neither a speculative future concern nor a marginal technological experiment. It is a present and rapidly expanding reality that is already reshaping how disputes are initiated, processed, negotiated, and resolved across jurisdictions. From consumer conciliation platforms and family mediation tools to international commercial arbitration analytics and court-annexed ODR systems, AI has moved from the periphery of procedural assistance to a position of substantive influence. This article has shown that while AI-driven ADR promises efficiency, scalability, and cost reduction, these benefits are accompanied by systemic risks that strike at the very foundations of consensual dispute resolution.

A central conclusion emerging from the comparative analysis is that AI does not operate as a neutral or purely technical adjunct to ADR. Algorithmic systems are normative in effect: they structure choices, frame expectations, shape bargaining power, and influence perceptions of legitimacy. When AI systems generate settlement ranges, predict outcomes, or nudge parties toward predefined resolutions, they do not merely "assist" ADR processes; they actively participate in the construction of dispute outcomes. In doing so, they may silently recalibrate the balance between voluntariness and coercion, flexibility and standardization, and human judgment and automated rationality. The risk is not overt replacement of mediators or arbitrators, but the gradual transformation of ADR into an efficiency-driven, data-centric mechanism in which consent becomes formal rather than substantive.

The case studies examined in this article underscore that these risks are not hypothetical. Algorithmic hallucination in legal submissions, biased risk assessments distorting negotiated outcomes, coercive settlement nudges in large-scale ODR platforms, and the failure of AI-mediated family dispute resolution all illustrate how AI can undermine fairness, autonomy, and due process in real-world settings. Particularly troubling is the recurring pattern of opacity: parties frequently lack meaningful understanding of how algorithmic recommendations are generated, what data they rely upon, or how errors and biases might be corrected. In ADR, where procedural safeguards and appellate review are already limited, such opacity magnifies the potential for injustice.

Another important conclusion is that AI-assisted ADR tends to exacerbate existing power asymmetries. Resource-rich repeat players are better positioned to deploy predictive analytics, exploit historical datasets, and strategically leverage algorithmic outputs. Individual disputants, small businesses, and vulnerable parties often encounter AI systems only as end users, without the capacity to interrogate or challenge their design. This asymmetry is fundamentally at odds with the egalitarian aspirations of ADR and risks converting dispute resolution into a technologically stratified process. Far from democratizing access to justice, unregulated AI may entrench structural inequality behind a veneer of neutrality and objectivity.

At a systemic level, the article highlights a widening gap between technological practice and normative governance. While international institutions, arbitral bodies, and regulators increasingly acknowledge the risks of AI in justice systems, existing frameworks remain fragmented, indirect, and largely soft-law oriented. Instruments such as UNCITRAL's Technical Notes, OECD AI principles, and institutional arbitration guidelines articulate important values—transparency, accountability, human oversight—but stop short of providing enforceable standards tailored to the distinctive features of ADR. Even the EU AI Act, while significant, focuses primarily on risk classification and compliance obligations rather than the deeper question of how AI reshapes consent, neutrality, and legitimacy in non-adjudicatory processes.

In light of these findings, this article concludes that the core challenge is not whether AI should be used in ADR, but how its use can be aligned with the ethical and legal foundations that justify ADR as an alternative to adjudication. Efficiency, speed, and scalability cannot be treated as self-justifying ends. If AI-driven ADR undermines fairness, informed consent, and trust, it risks eroding the very rationale for diverting disputes away from courts. A human-centric recalibration of AI in ADR is therefore imperative.

Building on this conclusion, several normative and institutional recommendations emerge.

First, disclosure must be recognized as a foundational requirement for AI use in ADR. Parties should be clearly informed, at the outset of the process, whether AI tools are being used, for what purposes, and with what degree of influence over outcomes. Disclosure should extend beyond generic statements to include meaningful information about the nature of the system, the type of data it relies upon, and whether its outputs are advisory or influential. Without such transparency, consent cannot be considered informed, and the legitimacy of the process remains compromised.

Second, human oversight must be strengthened and made substantive rather than symbolic. Mediators, arbitrators, and conciliators should retain not only formal decision-making authority but also practical capacity to understand, question, and override algorithmic outputs. Training and ethical guidance should equip ADR professionals to recognize automation bias and resist undue reliance on probabilistic predictions. AI should be positioned as a tool for reflection and assistance, not as an anchor that narrows the perceived range of reasonable outcomes.

Third, explainability and auditability should be treated as non-negotiable standards for AI systems used in ADR. While complete transparency of proprietary algorithms may not always be feasible, parties and institutions must have access to sufficient explanation to assess fairness and identify potential bias. Independent auditing mechanisms—whether institutional, regulatory, or third-party—are essential to ensure that AI systems do not systematically disadvantage particular groups or distort settlement dynamics. In the absence of explainability, AI-assisted ADR risks devolving into unreviewable algorithmic governance.

Fourth, regulatory frameworks should explicitly address accountability for AI-induced harms in ADR. Clear allocation of responsibility among platform providers, institutions, neutrals, and developers is necessary to close the existing accountability gap. Where AI tools materially influence outcomes, institutions should not be able to disclaim responsibility by characterizing them as mere "decision support." Liability rules must incentivize rigorous design, testing, and monitoring of AI systems, while preserving remedies for parties adversely affected by algorithmic error or bias.

Fifth, special caution is required in deploying AI in relational and vulnerability-sensitive disputes, such as family, employment, and community mediation. In these contexts, empathy, contextual reasoning, and moral judgment are not peripheral but central to justice. AI systems should not be used to generate binding or quasi-binding recommendations in such disputes, and their role should be strictly limited to administrative support or optional informational assistance. The failure of platforms such as Rechtwijzer demonstrates that technological efficiency cannot substitute for human discretion where power imbalances and emotional complexity are present.

Sixth, international coordination and soft-law development must evolve toward more concrete standards specific to ADR. UNCITRAL, WIPO, and leading arbitral institutions are well positioned to articulate model principles or guidelines addressing AI's impact on consent, neutrality, and procedural fairness. Such instruments should move beyond general ethics to address practical questions: when AI use is permissible, how consent should be obtained, and what safeguards are required to preserve the distinctive character of ADR.

Finally, jurisdictions such as India, where AI-driven ODR is expanding rapidly in the absence of comprehensive governance, should prioritize proactive regulation rather than reactive correction. Integrating AI governance into existing ADR statutes, mediation rules, and institutional protocols would enhance legal certainty and public trust. Ethical AI in ADR should be framed not as a barrier to innovation, but as a condition for its legitimacy and sustainability.

European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 3 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

In conclusion, AI has the potential to enhance ADR, but only if it is embedded within a robust normative framework that prioritizes human judgment, transparency, and accountability. Left unchecked, AI risks transforming ADR from a human-centered process of consensual justice into an opaque system of automated compliance. The future of ADR therefore depends not on resisting technological change, but on governing it wisely ensuring that efficiency serves justice, rather than displacing it.