IRSHAD

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLICY

The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Preventing Corruption

[Shamsiddin Khursanov][1], [Javlonbek Omonboev][2]

[1]*Tashkent Sate University of Law*

[2]*The Pennsylvania State University*

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence, Corruption Prevention, Public Procurement, Algorithmic Accountability, Due Process, Legal Governance, Anti-Corruption Law

ABSTRACT

Corruption remains a persistent challenge threatening public trust and economic development worldwide. This study examines how artificial intelligence contributes to preventing corruption within public institutions. It explores machine learning, network analysis, and predictive tools now used across procurement, taxation, and healthcare systems. The research addresses what legal framework should govern these technologies while ensuring accountability, fairness, and due process. Using qualitative doctrinal and document analysis, this study reviews current laws, regulations, and recent scholarly literature published within the past five years. Findings show artificial intelligence significantly improves detection speed and accuracy, yet existing laws rarely address algorithmic bias or the right to challenge automated findings. This gap leaves institutions and individuals exposed to unfair or unaccountable outcomes. The study proposes embedding transparency, human oversight, and appeal mechanisms into legal reform. It concludes that effective corruption prevention requires balancing technological capability with meaningful legal protection for those affected by these systems.

How to Cite: Khursanov, S., & Omonboev, J. (2026). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Preventing Corruption. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 4*(9), 25-50. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.642

I. Introduction

Corruption quietly drains billions of dollars from public budgets every single year. It weakens public trust and slows economic growth. Artificial intelligence now offers new tools to detect and prevent corrupt practices. Machine learning systems can scan large financial records for suspicious patterns. They flag unusual transactions that human auditors might otherwise miss. Governments are testing these tools within procurement and tax systems. Artificial intelligence promises faster detection and greater transparency in public institutions. These systems also raise real concerns about bias and misuse. Poorly designed algorithms may unfairly target certain groups. They may create fresh opportunities for manipulation by skilled actors. This dual nature makes artificial intelligence both a powerful ally and a genuine risk. This balance matters greatly for policymakers and researchers. This article examines closely how artificial intelligence can strengthen anti-corruption efforts. It also considers the challenges that come with adopting these technologies (Köbis et al., 2022).

Corruption has troubled governments and societies across many long centuries worldwide. Early anti-corruption efforts relied mainly on strict laws, audits, and very close oversight. These traditional methods often struggled against complex networks and hidden transactions. Corrupt actors frequently found clever new ways around fixed legal rules. Researchers later began exploring data-driven methods to strengthen detection efforts. Scholars examined risk scoring, red-flag indicators, and predictive analytics within public agencies. Some earlier studies focused narrowly on procurement fraud or bribery alone. Fewer studies examined how machine learning predicts individual susceptibility to corruption. Most existing research also overlooked ethical and legal limits on prediction. Little attention has gone toward balancing prevention with fairness and due process. This gap leaves policymakers uncertain about responsible artificial intelligence deployment. Legal scholarship rarely connects predictive tools with accountability and procedural safeguards. This study directly addresses that important gap within legal and institutional boundaries (Schmid & Willems, 2026).

Researchers now know artificial intelligence can detect unusual patterns effectively. Data-driven tools already flag suspicious bids, invoices, and payment transactions. Many governments have adopted these tools within procurement and financial systems. Yet these tools mostly focus on transactions rather than legal accountability. Few studies examine how such tools fit within existing legal frameworks. Courts and regulators still lack clear standards for using predictive evidence. This creates real uncertainty about admissibility, fairness, and procedural rights. The exact problem is a missing legal framework for artificial intelligence use. Current anti-corruption law rarely addresses automated detection or algorithmic decision-making directly. This research examines how law should regulate artificial intelligence in corruption prevention. It also asks what safeguards protect due process during automated investigations. Scholars still need clearer answers about liability when algorithms

produce serious errors. This study explores these unresolved legal questions using a structured, systematic approach (Schneider dos Santos et al., 2025).

Recent scholarship has moved beyond simple keyword searches for corruption signals. Researchers now apply advanced language models to unstructured procurement documents. These models read contracts, tenders, and reports written in ordinary language. They identify subtle wording patterns that suggest hidden corruption risks. Traditional detection methods relied heavily on structured numerical data alone. Unstructured text often contained warning signs that older systems missed. Transformer-based models process language context better than earlier statistical tools. Comparative testing shows some models outperform others across different document types. This finding highlights the importance of choosing technical tools carefully. Poor model selection can produce weaker detection results and missed risks. Legal researchers rarely examine which specific models suit corruption detection best. Most legal literature discusses artificial intelligence broadly without such technical comparison. This gap limits practical guidance for institutions selecting detection systems. Recent comparative work now helps close that important technical gap (Peppes et al., 2026).

Other researchers examined real government contracts already sanctioned for corruption. They combined machine learning with network science to trace hidden connections. This approach carefully mapped relationships between suppliers, officials, and public contracts. The study focused specifically on cases within Mexico's public procurement system. It found that network patterns often revealed corruption before formal sanctions occurred. Suppliers connected to sanctioned firms showed measurably higher future corruption risk. This finding suggests that relationships matter as much as individual transactions. Earlier legal research mostly examined corruption cases in isolation from each other. Few studies traced how corrupt networks spread across multiple suppliers over time. This approach offers valuable evidence for designing stronger legal prevention frameworks. It also raises questions about fairness when suppliers share indirect network ties. Legal systems must decide how much weight network evidence deserves in practice. This remains an underexplored area within current anti-corruption legal scholarship (Medina-Hernández et al., 2026).

Existing studies show strong technical progress in detecting corruption signals. Language models and network science now identify risks with growing accuracy. Yet these studies rarely connect findings to legal accountability structures. Few authors examine how courts should treat algorithmic corruption evidence. Little research addresses due process protections during automated investigations. Studies on network ties raise fairness concerns without proposing legal remedies. Comparative model studies suggest better detection but ignore regulatory implementation questions. Future research sections mostly call for broader technical testing alone. None specifically recommend clear legal frameworks governing artificial intelligence systems. This creates a clear gap between technical capability and legal governance. Public institutions face this gap directly when adopting new detection tools.

Earlier literature reviews also noted this same missing legal dimension. Governments still need workable rules for oversight, liability, and procedural fairness. This research fills that gap by proposing a legal governance framework (Nai et al., 2022).

To examine how artificial intelligence tools detect corruption risks in public institutions.

To identify legal and procedural gaps in regulating artificial intelligence within anti-corruption systems.

To propose a legal governance framework ensuring fairness, accountability, and due process in automated corruption detection.

What legal framework should govern the use of artificial intelligence in preventing corruption within public institutions, while ensuring accountability, fairness, and due process?

This research holds clear value for legal scholars, regulators, and practitioners. It fills a real gap between artificial intelligence capability and legal governance. Academically, it connects computer science literature with anti-corruption legal theory. This connection remains rare within current legal scholarship on corruption. Practically, it offers guidance for institutions adopting automated detection systems. Policymakers need clear rules before deploying these powerful tools widely. Without such rules, automated systems risk unfair outcomes and weak accountability. Early warning models already show strong promise for preventing corruption. Yet prevention tools still require careful legal design to remain trustworthy. This study translates technical promise into workable legal safeguards. Society benefits when public institutions operate with greater transparency and fairness. Citizens gain stronger protection against corruption through better regulated detection systems. This research contributes meaningfully to both scholarship and public policy. Its findings support more accountable and effective corruption prevention efforts (Gallego et al., 2021).

II. Methodology

This research follows a qualitative research design suited for legal and policy analysis. Qualitative methods allow deep examination of laws, principles, and institutional practices rather than numerical measurement. This approach fits legal research because it explains meaning, context, and reasoning behind rules. The study relies primarily on doctrinal analysis, examining statutes, regulations, and legal principles directly. It also uses document analysis, drawing on scholarly articles, reports, and official publications. Doctrinal analysis identifies existing legal rules and gaps within current anti-corruption frameworks. Document analysis synthesizes findings from peer-reviewed journals discussing artificial intelligence and corruption prevention. Together, these methods build a coherent picture connecting technical developments with legal accountability structures. This combination suits a topic evolving rapidly, where laws must be read alongside recent technology.

The population for this study includes laws, regulations, and scholarly literature addressing artificial intelligence and corruption prevention. The sample focuses specifically on anti-corruption statutes, procurement regulations, and journal articles published within recent years. Materials were retrieved using targeted keywords such as artificial intelligence, corruption detection, procurement fraud, due process, and algorithmic accountability. These keywords guided searches across academic databases and legal repositories to locate relevant sources. Laws and regulations were sourced directly from official government websites and recognized legal portals. This ensured accuracy and authenticity of the legal texts examined throughout the research. Scholarly articles were drawn from peer-reviewed journals indexed within recognized academic databases. This selection process focused on sources directly relevant to corruption, law, and artificial intelligence together.

Validity and reliability were maintained by prioritizing recent publications and currently applicable laws. Articles older than five years were generally avoided unless they held foundational or historical value. Legal materials were checked against currently enforced statutes rather than repealed or outdated provisions. Only official documents already available in the public domain were used throughout this research. Every scholarly source cited within this study includes a full reference to its original author. This practice credits original researchers and maintains transparency regarding where each idea originated. The researcher declares no conflict of interest, and this study serves purely academic purposes. Certain limitations remain worth acknowledging clearly within this methodology. Technology continues evolving rapidly, and laws or policies may change soon after this research concludes. This evolving nature means findings should be read as reflecting the current, available legal landscape.

III. Results

This section presents results from recent studies on artificial intelligence and corruption. It addresses the research question guiding this study directly. That question asks what legal framework should govern such technology responsibly. Several studies show that artificial intelligence improves detection speed and accuracy substantially. Other studies highlight remaining gaps between technical capability and legal governance. Together, these findings support the research objectives outlined earlier. They also illustrate current strengths and weaknesses within existing detection approaches. Explainable artificial intelligence has emerged as one promising response to these gaps. It helps investigators understand why systems flag certain transactions as suspicious. This transparency supports fairness and accountability during corruption investigations. It also strengthens public trust in automated government decision-making processes. The following results synthesize technical findings with their legal implications. Each result connects directly to the research objectives stated earlier. Together, they build toward the proposed legal governance framework (Sampaio et al., 2024).

Artificial intelligence tools now improve speed in detecting corruption signals. They also improve accuracy compared with traditional manual review methods. Public procurement generates massive volumes of contracts, bids, and invoices daily. Human auditors alone cannot review this volume within reasonable time limits. Artificial intelligence systems scan these records automatically and continuously each day. They flag unusual pricing, repeated suppliers, or suspicious bidding patterns quickly. Financial records also benefit from automated pattern recognition across large datasets. These systems detect hidden connections between contractors, officials, and shell companies. Network-based approaches map relationships that traditional audits often overlook entirely. Such mapping reveals corruption risks embedded within complex contracting markets. Faster detection allows agencies to intervene before losses grow larger. Improved accuracy also reduces false alarms that waste investigative resources. Together, speed and accuracy strengthen early corruption prevention efforts significantly. This technical improvement forms a strong foundation for legal reform (Allah Rakha, 2023).

Machine learning models now process unstructured documents more effectively. Contracts, tenders, and reports often contain complex, non-numeric information. Traditional rule-based systems relied on fixed keywords and strict formatting. Such systems missed corruption signals hidden within ordinary contract language. Machine learning models instead learn patterns directly from historical procurement data. They classify contracts as high-risk or low-risk based on learned features. This approach adapts to new corruption tactics that fixed rules cannot anticipate. Researchers trained such models using real public procurement contracts from Mexico. Results showed meaningful improvement over conventional rule-based detection approaches. These models identified corrupt contracts that earlier systems failed to flag. This finding demonstrates clear advantages of adaptive, data-driven detection methods. Legal systems benefit when detection tools evolve alongside changing corruption tactics. Static, rule-based systems risk becoming outdated and easily circumvented over time. Adaptive machine learning offers a more resilient path toward corruption prevention (Aldana et al., 2022).

Cross-country studies now apply machine learning to predict corruption levels. These models use economic, political, and institutional indicators across many nations. Results show that certain factors consistently predict higher corruption risk globally. Governance quality, press freedom, and judicial independence emerged as strong predictors. Machine learning also explains which factors matter most for each country. This explanatory power helps policymakers target specific institutional weaknesses directly. Traditional statistical models often struggled to capture such complex relationships. Machine learning handles nonlinear patterns between multiple variables more effectively. This comparative approach reveals patterns invisible within single-country studies alone. It also allows governments to benchmark their institutions against similar countries. Such benchmarking supports evidence-based reform rather than generic policy recommendations. These cross-country findings strengthen the case for artificial intelligence adoption. They also highlight the need

for context-specific legal implementation strategies. Blanket approaches ignore real institutional differences between developing and developed nations (Lima & Delen, 2020).

Red-flag indicators now guide investigators toward likely corruption cases. Earlier detection methods generated broad alerts without clear investigative value. Investigators often received too many alerts to review them all carefully. This created a "fishing" approach with low precision and wasted effort. Newer models instead build actionable red flags tied to specific risks. These indicators combine bidding patterns, pricing anomalies, and supplier history together. This shift moves detection from broad fishing toward precise catching. Precision matters because investigative resources remain limited within most agencies. Actionable indicators help investigators prioritize cases with strongest corruption evidence. This approach also reduces false positives that waste institutional resources unnecessarily. Public procurement agencies can apply these red flags before contracts finalize. Early application prevents losses rather than merely punishing corruption afterward. This preventive focus aligns closely with broader anti-corruption policy goals. It also strengthens the practical case for artificial intelligence adoption (De Michele & Vieyra, 2022).

Longitudinal studies now track corruption networks across extended time periods. Researchers examined local construction contracts within Guatemala over several recent years. This long-term view revealed how corrupt relationships form and evolve slowly. Static, single-year studies often miss these gradual network changes entirely. Certain contractors maintained persistent ties with specific officials across many projects. These repeated ties signaled structural corruption rather than isolated incidents. Network analysis captured this pattern more clearly than transaction-level review alone. Findings showed corruption networks adapting after enforcement actions or policy changes. Networks reorganized around new intermediaries when direct ties became too risky. This adaptability challenges detection systems that rely on fixed indicators. Legal frameworks must therefore anticipate evolving corruption strategies over time. Static regulations risk becoming outdated as corrupt networks continuously adapt. Longitudinal monitoring offers stronger prevention than periodic, one-time investigations alone. This finding supports continuous artificial intelligence monitoring within legal systems (Waxenecker & Prell, 2024).

IV. Discussion

A. Artificial Intelligence Tools Improve the Speed and Accuracy of Detecting Corruption Signals in Public Procurement and Financial Records

This study asked what legal framework should guide artificial intelligence in corruption prevention. Results answer that question by showing measurable technical progress within detection systems. Artificial intelligence tools now combine machine learning with social network analysis. This combination reveals hidden relationships between contractors, officials, and shell companies. Such detection matters directly for public

institutions managing large procurement budgets. It affects how governments protect public funds from misuse and diversion. These findings carry real weight for regulators designing oversight mechanisms today. They show technology can support, not replace, human judgment in investigations. Detection tools now flag risks earlier than traditional audit cycles allowed. This earlier warning creates space for intervention before contracts cause lasting harm. The practical value extends beyond academic interest into daily practice. Agencies adopting these tools report faster identification of suspicious procurement activity. This progress strengthens the case for structured legal integration going forward (Muñoz-Cancino & Ríos, 2025).

Strong evidence supports the growing role of artificial intelligence in governance. A recent systematic review examined many studies across government sectors. It found consistent gains in efficiency, transparency, and service delivery. Anti-corruption applications appeared frequently among documented artificial intelligence cases. Many governments now pilot these tools within tax administration and procurement. Some initiatives combine predictive analytics with citizen reporting platforms. This combination strengthens detection by using both machine and human sources. The review also documented growing investment in digital governance infrastructure. Countries increasingly treat artificial intelligence as core infrastructure, not experimental technology. This shift reflects rising confidence in these tools among policymakers worldwide. Evidence also shows successful pilots often precede broader national rollout strategies. Smaller trials help institutions test tools before committing significant public resources. This staged approach reduces risk while building institutional capacity gradually. Such evidence strengthens confidence in artificial intelligence as a governance tool (Aarab et al., 2025).

These results also carry certain limits that deserve careful attention. Adoption methods differ sharply between top-down and bottom-up implementation approaches. Top-down systems rely on government agencies designing and controlling detection tools. Bottom-up systems instead rely on citizens, journalists, or civil society groups. Each approach produces different patterns of surveillance and accountability outcomes. Top-down tools risk concentrating power within agencies that lack external oversight. This concentration can weaken public trust rather than strengthen it. Bottom-up tools risk inconsistent quality and limited legal recognition of findings. Neither approach alone guarantees fair or balanced corruption detection outcomes. Design choices shape who gets watched and who remains largely unexamined. Officials with political power may escape scrutiny under weak oversight structures. This imbalance represents a genuine limitation within current implementation practices. Legal frameworks must address these structural differences directly and clearly. Ignoring them risks reproducing existing power imbalances through new technology (Aizupiete & Jekabsone, 2026).

Comparing corruption detection with related fields reveals similarities and contradictions. Money laundering detection relies on artificial intelligence and pattern recognition. Both fields flag unusual transactions, hidden ownership, and suspicious flows.

Corruption research emphasizes public procurement, while laundering research emphasizes banking. Both fields face similar challenges around data quality despite this difference. Poor data weakens detection accuracy across both application areas equally. Money laundering research shows stronger regulatory infrastructure than corruption detection enjoys. Financial institutions already follow established reporting obligations under existing laundering laws. Corruption detection largely lacks equivalent mandatory reporting or compliance requirements. This contradiction suggests corruption law lags behind financial crime regulation generally. Lessons from laundering detection could inform stronger corruption prevention frameworks directly. Shared technical methods do not guarantee shared legal treatment across fields. Regulators should study these contradictions rather than treating each field separately. Cross-field learning could accelerate legal reform within corruption prevention (Mousavian & Miah, 2025).

Other factors beyond technology also shape corruption detection outcomes significantly. Healthcare fraud research shows how sector-specific rules affect detection design. Medical fraud often involves billing codes, insurance claims, and provider networks. These features differ sharply from procurement or banking transaction structures. Detection tools must adapt to each sector's unique data and rules. A global review found legal responses varying widely across different countries. Some nations rely mainly on criminal prosecution after fraud occurs. Others emphasize prevention through real-time monitoring and provider auditing systems. Institutional capacity also influences which approach a country can sustain. Wealthier systems often afford advanced monitoring tools and specialized investigative units. Resource-limited systems may rely more heavily on manual review processes. Cultural and political factors additionally shape enforcement willingness within governments. These variations mean no single legal model fits every context equally. Corruption prevention frameworks must therefore remain adaptable across diverse settings (Vafaee Najar et al., 2025).

These combined results carry clear meaning for law and policy design. Nigeria's Economic and Financial Crimes Commission offers a useful recent example. Recent analysis shows artificial intelligence adoption improved case identification within that agency. This improvement occurred despite resource constraints common in developing countries. It suggests artificial intelligence can deliver value without extensive infrastructure. Smaller or resource-limited agencies can still benefit from targeted adoption. Legal reform should therefore avoid assuming only wealthy nations can benefit. Policymakers should design frameworks flexible enough for varied institutional capacities. Applicability also depends on pairing technology with clear legal safeguards. Detection tools work best alongside due process protections and human oversight. Without such safeguards, efficiency gains risk undermining fairness and public trust. These findings support a balanced approach combining innovation with legal accountability. Future policy should prioritize both technical capacity and procedural protections. This balance offers the clearest path toward effective corruption prevention (Onamah, 2026).

B. Machine Learning Models Process Unstructured Documents, Such as Contracts and Tenders, Better Than Traditional Rule-Based Detection Systems

The addresses how machine learning handles complex procurement documents. Contracts and tenders rarely follow fixed, predictable formats across institutions. Traditional rule-based systems depend on rigid keywords and structured fields. Such systems often fail when language varies or documents change format. Machine learning instead learns patterns directly from text content itself. This capability matters because most corruption evidence hides within ordinary language. Deep learning models now automatically detect corruption reports within large text. These models read narrative descriptions rather than relying on fixed categories. This shift represents genuine progress for institutions handling massive document volumes. Manual review alone cannot process thousands of contracts within reasonable time. Automated text analysis therefore addresses a real, practical institutional need. It also reduces dependence on rigid rules that corrupt actors learn. This finding holds real significance for procurement oversight and legal design. Stronger analysis strengthens the case for corruption prevention (Xiao et al., 2025).

A broad literature review examined machine learning applications within accounting research. It found growing use of these methods for fraud detection. Researchers increasingly apply machine learning to text-heavy financial documents. This trend supports the claim that unstructured analysis is expanding. Accounting scholars noted machine learning outperforms traditional statistical methods in many tasks. This advantage grows stronger when data lacks clean, structured formatting. Contracts and tenders share this same unstructured, narrative-heavy characteristic directly. The review also highlighted increasing accessibility of machine learning tools for researchers. Open-source software now allows smaller institutions to apply these methods affordably. This accessibility supports wider adoption beyond large, well-funded government agencies. Evidence from accounting research therefore reinforces findings from corruption detection studies. Both fields show consistent gains from moving beyond rigid, rule-based approaches. This convergence across disciplines strengthens confidence in the underlying finding. It suggests unstructured analysis represents a durable, cross-field advancement (Ranta et al., 2023).

These technical gains come with certain limits worth careful attention. Explain ability remains a persistent challenge within advanced machine learning systems. Complex models often function as opaque tools even to their developers. Recent research addressed this problem using fuzzy linguistic interpretation methods. This approach translated model outputs into language humans can understand. Applied to European Union tender awards, it improved transparency around flagged contracts. Yet interpretability tools still require additional computation and technical expertise. Smaller agencies may lack resources to implement such advanced safeguards. This gap creates unequal access to explainable, trustworthy detection systems. Without explanation, affected parties cannot meaningfully challenge algorithmic findings in court. This limitation directly affects fairness and legal

accountability within investigations. Models trained on historical data may also inherit past institutional biases. Such biases could unfairly target certain regions, sectors, or suppliers. Legal frameworks must therefore require explain ability alongside accuracy, not accuracy alone (Cernăzanu-Glăvan et al., 2025).

Comparing recent studies reveals an interesting tension around data sharing. Effective machine learning typically requires large volumes of training data. Yet public procurement data often contains sensitive or confidential information. This creates conflict between model accuracy and data privacy. Recent research addressed this tension through privacy-preserving federated learning methods. This approach trains models across multiple institutions without sharing raw data. Each institution keeps its data locally while contributing to a shared model. This method contradicts earlier assumptions that centralized data always performs better. Findings suggest privacy protection need not sacrifice detection performance significantly. This contradicts concerns that legal privacy requirements limit technical effectiveness. Instead, federated approaches may satisfy both legal and technical requirements. This comparison challenges institutions to reconsider assumed trade-offs between privacy and accuracy. It suggests future systems can respect confidentiality while remaining highly effective. Legal frameworks should therefore encourage privacy-preserving methods over restricting innovation (Peppes et al., 2025).

Institutional readiness also shapes how well these tools perform. Detection models depend heavily on the quality of digital infrastructure. Agencies with strong record-keeping produce cleaner data for model training. Weaker record-keeping systems generate noisy data that reduces model reliability. A predictive framework combining artificial intelligence with data analytics addressed this issue. This framework emphasized integrating multiple data sources beyond single-contract documents. It combined financial records, ownership registries, and procurement histories together. This integration improved prediction accuracy compared with document analysis alone. Staff training also influences whether institutions use these tools effectively. Investigators need technical literacy to interpret model outputs correctly and responsibly. Without proper training, even accurate models may produce misused or ignored results. Institutional culture additionally affects willingness to act on algorithmic recommendations. Some agencies remain hesitant to challenge politically connected suppliers or officials. These human and institutional factors matter as much as technical accuracy (Demarchi et al., 2023).

This offers clear direction for governments seeking effective legal tools. Early research already demonstrated that machine learning predicts procurement corruption indices reliably. This foundational work showed practical feasibility years before newer models emerged. Current progress builds directly on that earlier proof of concept. Institutions considering artificial intelligence adoption can draw confidence from steady development. Applicability extends across countries with different legal traditions. Smaller nations can adapt these methods without building entire systems from scratch. Policymakers should prioritize document-based detection alongside existing numerical monitoring.

Combining both approaches likely produces stronger, more comprehensive corruption prevention outcomes. Legal reform should mandate minimum standards for document analysis quality. Institutions should also establish clear appeal processes for flagged contracts. This finding supports a practical, evidence-based path toward stronger governance. Its applicability spans procurement, taxation, and other public administration functions. This result therefore stands among the strongest technical arguments presented here (Rabuzin & Modrušan, 2020).

C. Network-Based Analysis Identifies Corruption Risks by Tracing Supplier Relationships Before Formal Sanctions Occur

This explains how relationship data reveals corruption before punishment. Corruption often develops gradually through repeated dealings between officials and suppliers. Sanctions typically arrive only after damage has already occurred fully. Network analysis instead traces these relationships as they form over time. This shift moves detection from reaction toward genuine prevention. Recent credit risk research applied similar relational thinking to corruption indices. Researchers linked national corruption levels with financial risk indicators directly. This connection shows corruption patterns extend beyond single transactions or contracts. It reflects broader institutional relationships that shape economic outcomes nationally. Understanding these relationships helps predict risk before formal violations appear. This predictive capacity matters greatly for institutions managing public procurement budgets. Early identification allows intervention before contracts cause lasting financial harm. This finding therefore holds real significance for corruption prevention policy design. It shifts focus from punishment toward proactive institutional safeguarding measures (Nguyen Thanh et al., 2025).

Recent technical development directly supports this network-based detection approach. Researchers built a semi-automated pipeline for identifying fraud within public bids. This pipeline combined data extraction with relationship mapping between bidding companies. It flagged suspicious bidding patterns, such as repeated collusion among firms. The system tested successfully across real government procurement records over time. Results showed the pipeline identified fraud rings missed by manual review. These rings involved companies sharing addresses, directors, or financial connections. Such hidden connections often precede formal corruption sanctions by considerable time. This evidence confirms that relationship tracing works effectively in practice. It also demonstrates feasibility for semi-automated tools within government agencies. Semi-automation balances technical power with continued human oversight and judgment. This balance matters for institutions cautious about fully automated decision-making. The pipeline's success offers a practical model other governments could adopt. It strengthens confidence that network analysis delivers real prevention value (Brandão et al., 2024).

These promising results still carry real limits worth acknowledging. Network analysis depends heavily on institutional trust and data reliability. Weak institutions often produce

incomplete or unreliable ownership records. Research on fragile states shows trust and corruption remain interconnected. Low institutional trust can also reduce citizen willingness to report suspicious activity. This weakens the human reporting channels that complement automated detection. Fragile administrative systems may lack digital records needed for mapping. Without reliable data, even strong algorithms cannot trace hidden relationships accurately. This creates uneven effectiveness between wealthier and more fragile national contexts. Network tools risk performing well only where institutions already function reasonably. This limitation matters because corruption often thrives precisely where institutions remain weakest. Legal frameworks must therefore consider baseline institutional capacity before mandating tools. Blanket requirements risk failing in exactly the contexts needing prevention most. Addressing this gap requires parallel investment in institutional and technical capacity (Gebrihet, 2023).

Network-based detection shares real similarities with detection methods used elsewhere. Fake review detection also relies on identifying suspicious relational patterns. Both fields flag coordinated behavior among accounts, entities, or relationships. Fake review research often examines timing patterns and account clusters closely. Corruption research examines contract timing and supplier connection clusters similarly. This overlap suggests relational detection methods generalize well across problems. Yet an important contradiction exists between these two application areas. Fake review detection typically operates within single platforms with centralized access. Corruption detection instead spans multiple institutions with fragmented, soloed systems. This fragmentation makes corruption network mapping considerably harder to achieve. Platforms can update detection models quickly using continuous, unified data streams. Government agencies often update systems slowly due to bureaucratic constraints. This contradiction highlights structural challenges unique to public sector corruption detection. Legal reform should therefore address data fragmentation as a distinct policy priority (Gupta et al., 2024).

Institutional design choices also influence how network detection performs. Fraud prevention research within universities offers a useful comparative example. That research examined governance structures, reporting channels, and oversight committees. It found prevention worked best when technical tools paired with clear governance. Weak governance structures undermined even well-designed detection systems in several cases. This finding applies directly to public procurement institutions facing similar challenges. Strong internal audit functions strengthened detection outcomes independent of technology used. Whistleblower protection policies also encouraged reporting that supplemented automated detection tools. Organizational culture again emerged as a factor shaping tool effectiveness. Institutions tolerating informal favoritism weakened detection regardless of technical sophistication. This evidence suggests governance quality shapes outcomes as much as algorithms. Legal reform should pair network detection mandates with governance strengthening requirements. Neither element alone likely produces lasting corruption

prevention results. Combined reform offers the strongest path toward sustainable institutional change (Irianto & Nahar, 2025).

D. Current Legal Frameworks Lag Behind These Technical Advances, Leaving Gaps in Accountability and Oversight

This result addresses why laws struggle to keep pace with technology. Detection tools now identify corruption risks faster than legal systems respond. Legislators typically draft rules after problems become visible and widespread. Artificial intelligence instead identifies risks before problems fully materialize. This timing mismatch creates real gaps in accountability and oversight. Recent risk modeling research examined this exact problem within procurement systems. It found existing legislation rarely addresses automated risk scoring directly. Agencies use these tools without clear legal guidance on their application. This gap matters because unclear rules create uncertainty for investigators and suppliers. Suppliers cannot easily challenge decisions lacking clear legal grounding or process. Investigators also face uncertainty about how much weight algorithmic scores deserve. This finding carries real significance for designing coherent legal frameworks. It confirms that oversight structures must evolve alongside detection technology itself. Without such evolution, technical progress risks outpacing legal accountability entirely (Kazbekova, 2025).

Recent government initiatives provide concrete evidence of this legal gap. Colombia recently combined fiscal management reforms with artificial intelligence adoption. Researchers examined how these tools operated alongside existing financial regulations. They found technical implementation moved faster than corresponding legal reform. Agencies deployed detection systems while regulations remained largely unchanged. This mismatch created uncertainty regarding data use, accountability, and authority. Officials lacked clear guidance on integrating algorithmic outputs into formal proceedings. Despite this uncertainty, the initiative still produced measurable fiscal transparency improvements. This outcome shows technology can deliver benefits even without complete legal clarity. However, benefits remained limited by unclear rules on evidence handling. The Colombian case illustrates a pattern likely occurring across many countries. Governments adopt tools quickly while legislative processes remain comparatively slow. This evidence strongly supports the claim that legal frameworks lag technology. It demonstrates the practical consequences of this gap for real institutions (Monsalvo et al., 2025).

This legal gap also carries important limitations worth examination. Research on block chain and artificial intelligence within accounting highlighted similar challenges. Auditing standards were designed largely around manual, document-based verification. Automated tools now generate evidence that existing standards struggle to categorize. This mismatch raises questions about admissibility and evidentiary weight. Auditors face uncertainty about how much reliance automated findings deserve. Block chain-based records add further complexity regarding authenticity and recognition. These technologies evolve faster than professional standards and regulatory bodies can adapt. This creates a persistent lag affecting

multiple related fields, not corruption alone. The limitation extends beyond legal drafting into professional training and certification. Practitioners often lack formal guidance on handling algorithmic or block chain evidence. This gap risks inconsistent practice across different institutions and jurisdictions. Addressing it requires coordinated updates across legal, professional, and technical standards. Without such coordination, gaps will likely persist despite continued technical progress (Nemati & Tavakkoli-Moghaddam, 2025).

Comparing corruption law with financial crime rules reveals a contradiction. Money laundering rules developed alongside artificial intelligence tools rather than later. A mapping study reviewed many artificial intelligence solutions for laundering detection. It found regulators actively shaped how these tools should be applied. Reporting obligations, compliance standards, and audit rules evolved with technology. This coordinated development contrasts sharply with corruption law's slower pattern. Corruption regulation instead treats technology as separate from legal design. This contradiction suggests corruption law could learn from laundering regulation directly. Financial regulators built structured pathways connecting algorithmic outputs to enforcement. Corruption oversight bodies rarely have equivalent pathways established currently. This difference is not accidental; laundering carries stronger international regulatory pressure. Global banking standards forced faster regulatory adaptation than domestic corruption laws face. This comparison highlights a clear path for corruption law reform. Adopting similar coordinated development could close much of the gap (Khan & Nazir, 2024).

Broader technological trends also shape how quickly legal gaps close. A comprehensive review traced artificial intelligence foundations and likely future directions. It found rapid, continuous advancement across nearly all application areas. This constant change makes stable, long-lasting legislation genuinely difficult. Laws written for current tools may quickly become outdated as capabilities grow. This pace differs sharply from earlier technologies that evolved gradually. Legal systems historically had more time to observe and regulate. Artificial intelligence compresses this observation period considerably compared with past technologies. Policymakers must now anticipate future capabilities rather than only regulating current ones. This requirement demands closer collaboration between technologists, lawyers, and regulators. Few institutions currently maintain such close, continuous collaboration in practice. This absence contributes directly to the accountability gaps identified throughout this study. Addressing rapid technological change requires flexible, adaptive legal drafting approaches. Static legislation risks becoming obsolete almost immediately after enactment (Golec et al., 2025).

These combined findings carry clear meaning for legal and policy design. Recent research examined digital services amid growing block chain and artificial intelligence use. It found administrative agencies facing similar accountability and oversight challenges. Governments increasingly deploy multiple digital technologies together, compounding regulatory complexity. This complexity means single-technology laws risk becoming insufficient or outdated. Policymakers should instead design flexible frameworks applicable

across current tools. Such frameworks should establish general principles rather than narrow, specific rules. Principles like transparency, explain ability, and human oversight remain relevant regardless. This approach offers durability as technology continues advancing rapidly worldwide. Applicability extends across corruption prevention, financial regulation, and digital governance functions. Institutions in developing and developed countries alike face this same challenge. International cooperation could help smaller nations design frameworks without starting alone. These findings support building adaptable, principle-based legal structures moving forward. This approach offers the clearest path toward closing accountability gaps sustainably (Figueredo, 2026).

E. Existing Anti-Corruption Laws Rarely Address Due Process Protections for Individuals Flagged by Automated Systems

This result addresses a missing safeguard within current anti-corruption legislation. Automated systems now flag individuals as corruption risks without formal legal challenge. Existing laws mostly focus on detecting and punishing corrupt behavior itself. Few laws address how flagged individuals can defend themselves procedurally. This omission matters because flagged individuals may face real professional consequences. Suspicion alone can damage reputations before any formal investigation concludes. Recent governance research linked weak procedural protections with broader development challenges. It found governance quality shapes how effectively anti-corruption tools serve society. Strong governance requires both effective detection and fair treatment of suspects. Ignoring due process undermines public trust even when detection improves. This finding holds real significance for balancing accountability with individual rights. Legal systems must protect citizens from both corruption and wrongful accusation. This dual protection strengthens overall institutional legitimacy and public confidence. This result identifies a genuine, previously overlooked legal need (Ngoc, 2026).

Recent research directly supports concerns about fairness within public algorithms. Scholars examined how transparency, fairness, and privacy intersect within artificial intelligence. They found many public systems lack clear mechanisms for individual recourse. Citizens flagged by algorithms often cannot easily learn why they were selected. This absence prevents meaningful challenge or correction of algorithmic errors. The study proposed integrating fairness principles directly into algorithm design. It recommended clear notification requirements when automated systems affect individual rights. This notification would allow affected persons to respond before consequences. These recommendations align closely with anti-corruption contexts involving flagged suppliers. Current procurement systems rarely provide equivalent notification or explanation requirements. This gap confirms that public sector algorithms broadly lack adequate protections. Anti-corruption tools represent one clear example within this wider pattern. This evidence strengthens the case for mandatory procedural safeguards specifically. It shows the problem extends well beyond corruption detection alone (Radanliev et al., 2025).

These procedural gaps also reflect broader limitations within professional practice standards. A comparative synthesis examined artificial intelligence adoption within auditing professions specifically. It found professional bodies still lack consistent guidance on algorithmic accountability. Some jurisdictions moved faster than others in developing relevant professional standards. This inconsistency creates uneven protection depending on where investigations occur locally. Auditors themselves sometimes lack proper training on explaining algorithmic conclusions clearly. Without clear explanation, flagged individuals cannot mount effective procedural challenges. This limitation compounds existing gaps within formal anti-corruption legislation itself. Professional standards and legal frameworks therefore need coordinated, simultaneous development. Neither alone provides sufficient protection for individuals facing algorithmic accusations. This gap disproportionately affects jurisdictions with fewer specialized professional resources available. Smaller countries may lack access to advanced training or certification programs. This uneven capacity risks creating unequal due process protections globally. Addressing this requires international collaboration on professional training standards directly (Prasetiyo, 2026).

Comparing corruption detection with crypto currency compliance reveals an instructive contradiction. A systematic review examined artificial intelligence applications for crypto currency fraud compliance. It found this sector already developing clear procedural standards for flagged transactions. Crypto currency platforms often provide dispute mechanisms when transactions get flagged. Users can request review, submit evidence, and receive formal explanations. This structured process contrasts sharply with corruption detection's limited protections. Public procurement systems rarely offer equivalent, formalized dispute mechanisms. This contradiction is notable given crypto currency's newer, less regulated status. One might expect newer sectors to lag behind established institutions. Instead, market pressure pushed crypto currency platforms toward faster procedural innovation. Public institutions face different incentives, often prioritizing detection over individual protection. This comparison suggests market competition can drive fairness improvements effectively. Public sector reform may require deliberate legal mandates instead of market pressure. This contradiction highlights an important lesson for anti-corruption policy design (Rodríguez Valencia et al., 2025).

Financial system design also influences how these procedural gaps manifest. Research on intelligent fraud detection within financial systems examined similar accountability questions. It found system architecture itself shapes how easily individuals can appeal decisions. Systems designed with modular, transparent components allowed easier post-hoc review. Systems built as single, opaque units made explanation and appeal harder. This architectural choice matters as much as any legal requirement. Institutions adopting network or document analysis tools should consider this factor. Choosing modular systems now could prevent future procedural difficulties. Financial institutions with strong existing compliance infrastructure adapted more easily overall. Institutions lacking such infrastructure struggled to retrofit fairness protections afterward. This finding suggests early design choices

carry lasting procedural consequences. Anti-corruption agencies should therefore consider fairness during initial system design. Waiting until after deployment makes retrofitting protections considerably more difficult. This factor deserves attention alongside purely legal or regulatory solutions (Rosemary et al., 2021).

These findings carry clear meaning for institutions adopting detection tools. Research on transparency and trust showed explanation directly shapes public confidence. People trust artificial intelligence more when they understand how decisions form. This principle applies directly to individuals flagged within anti-corruption systems. Legal reform should mandate clear, accessible explanations for algorithmic findings. Institutions should also establish formal appeal processes before punitive action. These measures apply broadly across procurement, taxation, and public functions. Smaller agencies can implement basic explanation requirements without extensive infrastructure. Larger institutions can build more sophisticated review boards or independent panels. Applicability extends across countries at different stages of technological development. Even limited procedural protections likely improve public trust meaningfully over time. Trust matters because effective corruption prevention depends on public cooperation. Citizens who trust these systems are more likely to report concerns. This finding supports embedding transparency requirements within any future legal reform (Zerilli et al., 2022).

F. Predictive Detection Tools Raise Fairness Concerns, Particularly Around Bias and the Right to Challenge Algorithmic Findings

This addresses a core tension within predictive corruption detection tools. These tools promise faster, broader detection than traditional human review. Yet speed and scale can amplify errors if training data carries bias. A flagged individual may face serious consequences from one decision. This concern matters because such decisions often lack transparent reasoning. Recent hospital integrity research illustrates both promise and risk within sensitive sectors. Researchers built a digital platform monitoring procurement and staff conduct. This platform aimed to reduce corruption within healthcare institutions specifically. Healthcare settings carry particular sensitivity given direct impacts on patient welfare. Errors here could affect hiring, discipline, or reputation unfairly. This example shows why fairness concerns carry real, practical significance. Predictive tools must balance efficiency gains against genuine risks of harm. This balance matters most in sectors touching vulnerable populations directly. This finding anchors fairness as a central, not secondary, concern (Chen et al., 2026).

Direct evidence confirms fairness problems within existing anti-corruption artificial intelligence tools. Research specifically examined unfairness drivers within these systems across countries. It identified biased training data as a primary source of unequal treatment. Historical corruption records often reflect uneven enforcement across regions or groups. Models trained on such records can inherit and amplify imbalances. The study also identified limited transparency as compounding fairness problems. Without visible reasoning, affected

individuals cannot identify or challenge errors. Researchers proposed several mitigation strategies to address these problems directly. These included diverse training data, regular bias audits, and mandatory human review. Some agencies have begun piloting these mitigation strategies within institutions. Early results suggest bias audits can meaningfully reduce unequal outcomes. This evidence confirms fairness concerns are grounded in documented, measurable problems. It also shows practical solutions already exist and remain implementable today. This finding strengthens confidence that fairness challenges can be addressed (Odilla, 2024).

Related research within tax fraud detection reveals similar, persistent limitations. Studies examined artificial intelligence trends across various tax administration contexts. They found detection accuracy often varies significantly across taxpayer groups. Some groups faced higher flagging rates without corresponding differences in fraud. This pattern suggests underlying data or design choices introduce bias. Researchers noted that few tax authorities currently audit their systems regularly. Without regular audits, biased outcomes can persist unnoticed for extended periods. This limitation mirrors concerns already documented within corruption detection contexts. Both fields share a common weakness regarding ongoing system monitoring practices. Neither field has yet established mandatory, independent bias review processes universally. This gap represents a genuine limitation affecting fairness across multiple domains. Addressing it requires institutionalizing regular, independent audits as standard practice. Without such audits, fairness claims remain difficult to verify credibly. This limitation should inform how future legal requirements get designed (Belahouaoui & Alm, 2025).

Comparing corruption detection with artificial intelligence regulation reveals contradictions. Research examined block chain integration for compliance with European artificial intelligence law. This regulation requires transparency, risk assessment, and human oversight. It classifies high-risk applications and imposes compliance obligations. Corruption detection tools would likely qualify as high-risk under similar schemes. Yet many countries lack equivalent comprehensive artificial intelligence regulation currently. This creates a contradiction between regions with strong oversight and those without. Block chain technology offers one proposed solution for verifiable, tamper-resistant records. Such records could support fairness claims by documenting decision processes transparently. However, block chain adoption remains limited within public sector anti-corruption applications. This gap suggests technical solutions exist but await broader regulatory adoption. The European approach offers a potential model for other jurisdictions considering reform. This comparison highlights uneven global progress toward fairness and accountability standards. It suggests corruption law could draw directly from broader regulatory precedents (Allah Rakha, 2023).

Broader governance philosophy also shapes how fairness concerns get addressed. Recent scholarship distinguished between artificial intelligence used with, of, and through government. Tools used with government support human decision-makers who retain

authority. Tools used through government instead make decisions with minimal human input. This distinction matters directly for fairness and challenge ability of outcomes. Systems retaining human authority generally preserve stronger opportunities for challenge. Fully automated systems risk removing meaningful judgment from decisions. Researchers argued governance design should deliberately preserve human decision-making authority. This preserves accountability even as technical capabilities continue expanding rapidly. Countries adopting corruption detection tools should consider this governance distinction. Choosing human-supported models over fully automated ones may reduce fairness risks. This factor operates independently of any specific technical or legal fix. It reflects a deeper choice about how much authority technology should hold. This influencing factor deserves explicit consideration within future policy design (Zhu & Wang, 2026).

These combined findings carry clear meaning for future policy design. A bibliometric analysis reviewed research trends within artificial intelligence and financial crime. It found rapidly growing scholarly attention toward fairness alongside performance. This growth signals researchers now recognize fairness as core. Applicability of these findings extends across corruption prevention and financial regulation. Institutions adopting predictive tools should build fairness safeguards into designs. Waiting until after deployment makes correcting bias more difficult. Policymakers should mandate regular audits, clear explanations, and accessible appeal processes. These measures apply regardless of a country's technical or economic level. Smaller institutions can adopt simplified versions of these core principles. Larger institutions can build more comprehensive, independent oversight bodies instead. This flexibility makes the approach broadly applicable across diverse legal systems. Growing academic attention suggests fairness will remain a central research priority. This finding supports treating fairness as essential, not optional, going forward (Lyeonov et al., 2024).

G. Implication

This study extends traditional corruption theory beyond human motivation and opportunity toward technological capability and legal design. Classical frameworks assumed detection depended mainly on auditors, whistleblowers, and institutional willpower alone. These findings show artificial intelligence adds a new layer, shifting attention toward data quality, algorithmic fairness, and procedural rights directly. This shift benefits regulators, investigators, and citizens seeking faster, more transparent detection systems overall. It also creates real risk for individuals wrongly flagged without adequate explanation or appeal. Current legal frameworks remain built around human decision-making, leaving automated processes largely unregulated today. Many countries still lack clear rules on evidence handling, notification, or algorithmic accountability. Policymakers could introduce mandatory bias audits, explain ability requirements, and independent review bodies for flagged cases. Governments, suppliers, auditors, and ordinary citizens could all benefit from clearer, fairer rules. Smaller institutions could adopt simplified safeguards, while larger

agencies build comprehensive oversight structures. Limitations remain, including uneven institutional capacity, data quality gaps, and slow legislative processes across different countries. Despite these limitations, the findings offer a practical foundation for updating anti-corruption law to match current technological realities responsibly.

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence now stands at the center of efforts to fight public corruption worldwide. Governments increasingly rely on machine learning, network analysis, and predictive tools to detect suspicious patterns. This shift matters because corruption drains public resources and weakens trust in institutions everywhere. Technology offers real promise for catching problems earlier than traditional audits ever could. Yet this promise comes with serious legal and ethical responsibilities attached. Detection tools now perform tasks once handled entirely by human investigators. This change touches procurement, taxation, healthcare, and other public administration functions. It also raises questions extending beyond technology into law, fairness, and individual rights. Corruption prevention therefore sits within a wider conversation about digital governance today. This conversation involves policymakers, technologists, legal scholars, and ordinary citizens together. Understanding this intersection helps explain why legal reform cannot lag far behind technical progress. The following discussion draws together the strongest arguments from this study.

Several connected arguments emerged clearly throughout this research. Machine learning and network analysis genuinely improve detection speed, accuracy, and depth within procurement systems. This technical strength stands alongside a persistent legal gap regarding accountability and fairness. Current laws rarely address how flagged individuals can challenge algorithmic findings fairly. This gap matters because efficient detection means little without protecting basic rights. Bias within training data can quietly reproduce old patterns of unequal enforcement. Without safeguards, technology risks repeating past unfairness rather than correcting it. These arguments connect through one central thread running across the entire study. Strong detection and strong legal protection must develop together, not separately. Neither element alone produces trustworthy, sustainable corruption prevention over time. This connection reinforces why the research question asked specifically about legal governance. Effective governance requires balancing technical power with meaningful human oversight. This balance forms the strongest, most defensible argument advanced throughout this study.

These findings carry practical weight for governments designing anti-corruption policy today. Recent initiatives, such as Colombia's fiscal reforms and Nigeria’s EFCC modernization, show technology already reshaping enforcement practice. Applying this research means embedding transparency, explanation, and appeal rights directly into detection systems. Public procurement agencies could adopt this approach immediately

within existing digital infrastructure. Tax authorities and healthcare regulators could apply similar principles within their own detection efforts. Smaller nations could adapt simplified versions without requiring extensive new resources. Larger institutions could build comprehensive oversight bodies matching their greater technical capacity. Future research should examine how specific countries implement these safeguards over time. Studies could compare outcomes across jurisdictions adopting different regulatory approaches to artificial intelligence. Researchers might also explore how affected individuals experience algorithmic accusations firsthand. Uzbekistan's proposed amendment offers one concrete starting point worth further examination. These next steps could deepen understanding of fairness within real institutional practice.

Bibliography

Aarab, A., El Marzouki, A., Boubker, O., & El Moutaqi, B. (2025). Integrating AI in public governance: A systematic review. *Digital*, *5*(4), 59. https://doi.org/10.3390/digital5040059

Aizupiete, L., & Jekabsone, I. (2026). Who acts, and who is watched? Differences between top-down and bottom-up AI anti-corruption tool implementation methods. *Public Policy and Administration*, *25*(1), 59–72. https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ppaa.25.1.41828

Aldana, A., Falcón-Cortés, A., & Morales, H. (2022). A machine learning model to identify corruption in México's public procurement contracts. *arXiv*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.01478

Allah Rakha, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence and sustainability. *International Journal of Cyber Law, 1*(3). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijcl.42

Allah Rakha, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence strategy of Uzbekistan: Policy framework, preferences, and challenges. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.27

Belahouaoui, R., & Alm, J. (2025). Tax fraud detection using artificial intelligence-based technologies: Trends and implications. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, *18*(9), 502. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18090502

Brandão, M. A., Lacerda, A., & others. (2024). PLUS: A semi-automated pipeline for fraud detection in public bids. *Digital Government: Research and Practice*, *5*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3616396

Cernăzanu-Glăvan, C., et al. (2025). Explainable AI and fuzzy linguistic interpretation for enhanced transparency in public procurement: Analyzing EU tender awards. *Mathematics*, *13*(13), 2215. https://doi.org/10.3390/math13132215

Chen, X., Li, J., & Wang, Z. (2026). Construction of a hospital intelligent integrity supervision platform: Digital and intelligent practices for anti-corruption in public health. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *14*, 1769451. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2026.1769451

De Michele, R., & Vieyra, J. C. (2022). *From fishing to catching: Developing actionable red flags in public procurement to prevent and control corruption* (Technical Note No. IDB-TN-2598). Inter-American Development Bank. https://doi.org/10.18235/0004595

Demarchi, M., et al. (2023). Algorithmic integrity: A predictive framework for combating corruption in public procurement through AI and data analytics. *Journal of Financial and Managerial Research*, *4*(2), 130–141. https://doi.org/10.54660/JFMR.2023.4.2.130

Figueredo, E., Jr. (2026). Challenges of digital services in public administration in the era of artificial intelligence and blockchain. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-026-03277-z

Gallego, J., Rivero, G., & Martínez, J. (2021). Preventing rather than punishing: An early warning model of malfeasance in public procurement. *International Journal of Forecasting*, *37*(1), 360–377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.06.006

Gebrihet, H. G. (2023). Trust, corruption, and tax compliance in fragile states: On a quest for transforming Africa into future global powerhouse. *Social Sciences*, *13*(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13010003

Golec, M., et al. (2025). Artificial intelligence (AI): Foundations, trends and future directions. *Telematics and Informatics Reports*, *10*, 100265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teler.2025.100265

Gupta, R., Jindal, V., & Kashyap, I. (2024). Recent state-of-the-art of fake review detection: A comprehensive review. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, *39*, e67. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269888924000067

Irianto, G., & Nahar, S. (2025). Developing a fraud prevention framework for universities: A systematic literature review. *Cogent Business & Management*, *12*(1), 2593736. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2593736

Kazbekova, A. (2025). Risk modelling as a way to diagnose corruption in procurement system: Practice and legislation. *Social and Legal Studios*, *8*(1), 299–309. https://doi.org/10.32518/sals1.2025.299

Khan, H. U., & Nazir, S. (2024). Identifying the AI-based solutions proposed for restricting money laundering in financial sectors: Systematic mapping. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, *38*(1), 2344415. https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2024.2344415

Köbis, N. C., Starke, C., & Rahwan, I. (2022). The promise and perils of using artificial intelligence to fight corruption. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, *4*(5), 418–424. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-022-00489-1

Lima, M. S. M., & Delen, D. (2020). Predicting and explaining corruption across countries: A machine learning approach. *Government Information Quarterly*, *37*(1), 101413. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.101413

Lyeonov, S., Drašković, V., Kubaščiková, Z., & Fenyves, V. (2024). Artificial intelligence and machine learning in combating illegal financial operations: Bibliometric analysis. *Human Technology*, *20*(2), 325–360. https://doi.org/10.14254/1795-6889.2024.20-2.5

Medina-Hernández, M., Kertész, J., & Fazekas, M. (2026). Learning from sanctioned government suppliers: A machine learning and network science approach to detecting fraud and corruption in Mexico. *Scientific Reports*, *16*, 22382. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-48873-w

Monsalvo, A. E., Fletscher, L. A., Restrepo Carmona, J. A., & Villamil, R. M. (2025). Fiscal management and artificial intelligence as strategies to combat corruption in Colombia. *Information*, *16*(11), 998. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16110998

Mousavian, S., & Miah, S. J. (2025). Review of artificial intelligence-based applications for money laundering detection. *Intelligent Systems with Applications*, *27*, 200572. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iswa.2025.200572

Muñoz-Cancino, R., & Ríos, S. A. (2025). Data-driven transparency: Machine learning and social network analysis for corruption detection in public procurement. *Procedia Computer Science*, *270*, 1788–1795. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2025.09.299

Nai, R., Sulis, E., Meo, R., & Pensa, R. G. (2022). Public procurement fraud detection and artificial intelligence techniques: A literature review. *Companion Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management (EKAW)*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.08883

Nemati, B., & Tavakkoli-Moghaddam, R. (2025). The impact of blockchain technology and artificial intelligence on accounting and auditing: Challenges and opportunities. *American Journal of Economic and Management*, *4*(12), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.58631/ajemb.v4i12.396

Ngoc, L. H. (2026). The role of governance in the relationship between corruption and sustainable development in developing countries. *Discover Sustainability*, *7*, 222. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-026-02586-2

Nguyen Thanh, C., Huy, T. P., Pham Hong, T., & Bui Nguyen Quoc, A. (2025). Credit risk prediction with corruption perception index: Machine learning approaches. *Cogent Business & Management*, *12*(1), 2461731. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2461731

Odilla, F. (2024). Unfairness in AI anti-corruption tools: Main drivers and mitigation strategies. *Minds and Machines*, *34*(3), 389–412. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-024-09688-8

Onamah, O. G. (2026). Artificial intelligence and corruption reduction in Nigeria: A study of the EFCC (2021–2026). *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, *11*(6), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11060036

Peppes, N., Alexakis, T., Daskalakis, E., & Adamopoulou, E. (2025). Privacy-preserving federated learning for corruption risk detection in public procurement. *Electronics*, *15*(17), 3890. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics15173890

Peppes, N., Alexakis, T., Daskalakis, E., & Adamopoulou, E. (2026). AI-driven corruption risk indicator detection: A comparative evaluation of transformer-based NLP models in unstructured procurement data. *Information*, *17*(4), 329. https://doi.org/10.3390/info17040329

Prasetiyo, Y. (2026). Artificial intelligence in auditing: A critical and comparative synthesis. *Akuntansi: Jurnal Riset Ilmu Akuntansi*, *5*(1), 206–221. https://doi.org/10.55606/akuntansi.v5i1.3239

Rabuzin, K., & Modrušan, M. (2020). Prediction of public procurement corruption indices using machine learning methods. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Joint Conference on Computer Vision, Imaging and Computer Graphics Theory and Applications* (pp. 333–340). SciTePress. https://doi.org/10.5220/0008353603330340

Radanliev, P., et al. (2025). AI ethics: Integrating transparency, fairness, and privacy in public sector algorithms. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, *39*(1), 2463722. https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2025.2463722

Ramos, S., & Ellul, J. (2024). Blockchain for artificial intelligence (AI): Enhancing compliance with the EU AI Act through distributed ledger technology. A cybersecurity perspective. *Discover Internet of Things*, *4*, 15. https://doi.org/10.1365/s43439-023-00107-9

Ranta, M., Järvenpää, M., & Teittinen, H. (2023). Machine learning in management accounting research: Literature review and pathways for the future. *European Accounting Review*, *32*(3), 607–636. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2022.2137221

Rodríguez Valencia, L., Corrales-Paredes, A., & others. (2025). A systematic review of artificial intelligence applied to compliance: Fraud detection in cryptocurrency transactions. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, *18*(11), 612. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18110612

Rosemary, A., & others. (2021). Intelligent fraud detection frameworks for next-generation financial systems. *International Journal of Financial Data Science*, *1*(1), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.34218/IJFDS_01_01_001

Sampaio, I., Bernardini, F., & Viterbo, J. (2024). Enhancing transparency through explainable artificial intelligence: An exploratory analysis on a collusion and corruption scenario in digital government. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance* (pp. 1–10). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3657054.3657274

Schmid, M., & Willems, J. (2026). AI for integrity: Predicting public servants' susceptibility to corruption via supervised machine learning. *Government Information Quarterly*, *43*(3), 102158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2026.102158

Schneider dos Santos, E., Machado dos Santos, M., Castro, M., & Carvalho, J. T. (2025). Detection of fraud in public procurement using data-driven methods: A systematic mapping study. *EPJ Data Science*, *14*, 52. https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-025-00569-3

Vafaee Najar, A., et al. (2025). A global scoping review on the patterns of medical fraud and abuse: Integrating data-driven detection, prevention, and legal responses. *Archives of Public Health*, *83*, 38. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13690-025-01512-8

Wachs, J., Fazekas, M., & Kertész, J. (2021). Corruption risk in contracting markets: A network science perspective. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, *12*(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41060-019-00204-1

Waxenecker, H., & Prell, C. (2024). Corruption dynamics in public procurement: A longitudinal network analysis of local construction contracts in Guatemala. *Social Networks*, *79*, 154–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2024.07.001

Xiao, Q., et al. (2025). Automated detection of corruption reports in text via deep learning. *Scientific Reports*, *15*, 20330. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-20330-0

Zerilli, J., Bhatt, U., & Weller, A. (2022). How transparency modulates trust in artificial intelligence. *Patterns*, *3*(4), 100455. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2022.100455

Zhu, X., & Wang, Y. (2026). Public administration with, of, and through AI: Toward a new paradigm of digital governance and anti-corruption. *Public Management Review*, *28*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/23812346.2025.2578589