



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Preventing disputes: preventive logic, law & technology

Stathis, G.

Citation

Stathis, G. (2024, November 27). *Preventing disputes: preventive logic, law & technology*. *SIKS Dissertation Series*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4169981>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4169981>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Propositions belonging to the thesis

Preventing Disputes

Preventive Logic, Law & Technology

by Georgios Stathis

27 November 2024

Proposition 1: Automating contracts is already possible for small use cases. The automation is based on *communications and risk data* at an analytical level. The goal is full automation, which will happen for most use cases in the next twenty years (See Chapter 2).

Proposition 2: The Bow-Tie Method provides an effective legal risk management framework for preventing hazardous legal events via *proactive controls* on the basis of specific risk sources (See Chapter 3 and 4).

Proposition 3: If proactive controls are understood as arguments, then it is possible to qualitatively and quantitatively improve them by applying argumentation theory to the Bow-Tie Method (See Chapter 5).

Proposition 4: *Explaining* intelligent systems decisions for preventive legal technology enhances end-user trustworthiness with improved transparency and accountability (See Chapter 6 and 7).

Proposition 5: Society suffers from the paradox of reactive legal services, meaning that most individuals lack the legal expertise to seek legal help at the right time.

Proposition 6: Visualising legal risks enhances end-user trustworthiness and improves the understanding of potential legal consequences.

Proposition 7: Explaining the decisions of intelligent systems will accelerate the adoption of technology in the market.

Proposition 8: The gap of LegalTech innovation between science and market is decades long; the legal market is not ready for wide-adoption of scientific innovations.

Proposition 9: Preventing disputes is better than resolving disputes. It helps avoid unnecessary consequential costs. The challenging part is knowing the right time to invest in prevention.

Proposition 10: AI will support lawyers in practice to a large extent. The prevailing question is what are adequate criteria to state that AI programs will have a better performance than lawyers? In my opinion they will be formulated within the next twenty years.