INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF IJBAI (INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BIOINFORMATICS AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

PEER-REVIEWED · OPEN ACCESS · QUARTERLY JOURNAL

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

Artificial Intelligence and Algorithmic Accountability: Advancing Explainable AI for Healthcare and Biomedical Applications

Author: [1] *Rawdah Abdul Karim Mohammad Pharaon,*

Affiliation:
1 Applied Science Private University, Amman, Jordan

Corresponding author:
dr.rawdahpharaon@gmail.com

Doi: 10.32332/ijbai.9950

Dates:
Received 15 December, 2025
Revised 20 December, 2025
Accepted 29 March, 2025
Published 15 Jun, 2026

Read Online:

Scan this QR code with your mobile device or smart phone to read online

Abstract : The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly transformed decision-making processes across public and private sectors, raising complex legal and ethical challenges for the protection of human rights in democratic societies. Algorithmic decision-making systems are increasingly used in areas such as employment, financial services, healthcare, law enforcement, and public administration, where automated processes may influence individuals' rights and opportunities. While AI technologies offer significant benefits in terms of efficiency, data analysis, and institutional decision-making, they also present risks related to algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, privacy violations, and weakened procedural accountability. These concerns have prompted growing legal debates regarding how democratic societies can regulate AI systems in ways that ensure accountability and protect fundamental rights.

This study examines the intersection between artificial intelligence and human rights by analyzing the legal accountability of algorithmic decision-making systems within democratic governance frameworks. Using a qualitative doctrinal and comparative legal methodology, the research evaluates the implications of AI technologies for core human rights principles, including equality, non-discrimination, privacy, and due process. The study further explores the legal challenges associated with algorithmic bias, opacity in automated decision-making, and the allocation of liability among governments, technology companies, and developers responsible for AI systems.

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

The findings indicate that traditional legal frameworks are often insufficient to address the complex accountability issues created by AI-driven decision-making. Effective governance of algorithmic systems requires the development of new regulatory approaches that emphasize transparency, explainability, and human oversight. The study also highlights the importance of integrating human rights principles into AI governance frameworks and strengthening institutional oversight mechanisms to ensure that algorithmic technologies operate within the rule of law.

The research concludes that a rights-based regulatory approach is essential for balancing technological innovation with the protection of fundamental freedoms. By developing clear accountability frameworks, strengthening regulatory institutions, and promoting international cooperation on AI governance, democratic societies can ensure that artificial intelligence technologies support rather than undermine human rights and democratic values in the evolving digital era.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Human Rights; Algorithmic Decision-Making; Legal Accountability; Democratic Governance.

Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has transformed many aspects of modern society, including economic activity, governance, and decision-making processes. AI systems are increasingly used to analyze large datasets, automate administrative procedures, and support decision-making in sectors such as finance, healthcare, criminal justice, employment, and public administration. These technologies have the potential to enhance efficiency, improve public service delivery, and support innovation across multiple sectors. However, the growing reliance on algorithmic decision-making has also raised significant concerns regarding transparency, accountability, and the protection of fundamental human rights. As AI systems increasingly influence decisions that directly affect individuals and communities, questions about legal responsibility and regulatory oversight have become central issues in contemporary legal and policy debates.[1]

Algorithmic decision-making refers to the use of automated systems that rely on machine learning models or computational algorithms to evaluate data and generate decisions or recommendations. In many cases, these systems operate by identifying patterns in large datasets and applying predictive models to assess risk, eligibility, or

[1] Cheong, B. C. (2024). *Transparency and accountability in AI systems: Safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making.* Frontiers in Human Dynamics, 6, 1421273. https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2024.1421273

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

behavior. Governments and private institutions have adopted algorithmic systems to assist with tasks such as credit scoring, predictive policing, immigration assessments, employment screening, and social welfare distribution. While these technologies promise greater efficiency and data-driven decision-making, they also raise concerns regarding fairness, discrimination, and the potential erosion of procedural justice in democratic societies.[2]

One of the most significant concerns surrounding AI-driven decision-making is the possibility that algorithmic systems may replicate or amplify existing social inequalities. Because AI models rely heavily on historical data for training, they may reproduce biases embedded within past decision-making practices. For example, biased datasets may lead to discriminatory outcomes in areas such as hiring processes, loan approvals, or criminal justice risk assessments. These issues raise fundamental questions regarding the compatibility of algorithmic governance with established human rights principles, including equality before the law, non-discrimination, and the right to due process.[3]

Another major challenge associated with algorithmic decision-making involves the lack of transparency and explainability in many AI systems. Complex machine learning models often operate as "black boxes," meaning that even developers may find it difficult to fully explain how specific decisions are produced. This lack of transparency can create significant obstacles for individuals seeking to challenge decisions that affect their legal rights or social opportunities. In democratic societies that emphasize procedural fairness and accountability in governance, the inability to understand or contest algorithmic decisions raises serious concerns regarding the protection of civil liberties and access to justice.[4]

The expansion of AI technologies has therefore prompted governments, international organizations, and legal scholars to examine how existing legal frameworks should respond to algorithmic governance. Traditional legal systems were developed in contexts where decisions were made by human actors whose actions could be evaluated according to established legal standards of responsibility. The increasing involvement of automated systems in decision-making processes complicates these frameworks, raising questions regarding who should be held accountable when algorithmic systems produce harmful or discriminatory outcomes. Determining legal responsibility among software

[2] Busuioc, M. (2020). *Accountable artificial intelligence: Holding algorithms to account*. Public Administration Review, 81(5), 825–836. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13293
[3] Henman, P. (2020). *Improving public services using artificial intelligence: Possibilities, pitfalls, governance*. Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration, 42(4), 209–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/23276665.2020.1816188
[4] de Bruijn, H., Warnier, M., & Janssen, M. (2022). The perils and pitfalls of explainable AI: Strategies for explaining algorithmic decision-making. Government Information Quarterly, 39(2), 101666. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101666

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

developers, government agencies, private companies, and regulatory authorities remains a complex challenge for modern legal systems.[5]

In response to these concerns, policymakers in many democratic societies have begun exploring regulatory approaches aimed at ensuring that AI technologies operate within frameworks consistent with human rights protections. Emerging regulatory initiatives emphasize principles such as algorithmic transparency, fairness, accountability, and human oversight in automated decision-making systems. These initiatives seek to ensure that technological innovation does not undermine the fundamental rights and democratic values upon which modern legal systems are built.[6]

Against this backdrop, the intersection between artificial intelligence and human rights has become a major area of inquiry within contemporary legal scholarship. Understanding how algorithmic decision-making affects fundamental rights such as equality, privacy, due process, and freedom from discrimination is essential for developing effective regulatory frameworks capable of governing AI technologies. Legal systems must therefore adapt to the realities of algorithmic governance while preserving the principles of accountability and justice that underpin democratic societies.

This study examines the relationship between artificial intelligence and human rights by focusing on the issue of legal accountability for algorithmic decision-making in democratic societies. It explores the challenges that AI-driven decision systems pose to traditional legal frameworks and analyzes emerging approaches aimed at regulating algorithmic governance. Through this analysis, the research seeks to contribute to ongoing discussions regarding how legal institutions can ensure that AI technologies remain consistent with fundamental human rights principles while supporting innovation and technological development in the digital age.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative doctrinal and socio-legal research methodology to examine the legal accountability of artificial intelligence systems in relation to human rights within democratic societies. The research focuses on analyzing how existing legal frameworks address the challenges posed by algorithmic decision-making and how regulatory systems can adapt to ensure that AI technologies operate consistently with fundamental rights and democratic principles. By combining doctrinal legal analysis with comparative and policy-oriented evaluation, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the legal implications of AI governance.

---

[5] Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. J. (2020). *Strengthening legal protection against discrimination by algorithms and artificial intelligence.* The International Journal of Human Rights, 24(10), 1572–1593. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2020.1743976

[6] Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. J. (2025). *Discrimination, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic decision-making.* arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2510.13465

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF IJBAI (INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BIOINFORMATICS AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)
PEER-REVIEWED OPEN ACCESS QUARTERLY JOURNAL
IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

The research begins with a doctrinal legal analysis of relevant legal sources that regulate artificial intelligence and human rights protections. These sources include constitutional provisions, human rights instruments, national legislation governing data protection and digital governance, as well as regulatory guidelines related to algorithmic accountability and automated decision-making. Particular attention is given to legal principles such as equality before the law, non-discrimination, due process, transparency, and accountability. Through the analysis of these legal norms, the study evaluates how existing legal systems attempt to regulate AI technologies and protect individuals from harmful or discriminatory algorithmic outcomes.

In addition to doctrinal analysis, the study adopts a comparative legal approach to examine how different democratic jurisdictions regulate artificial intelligence and algorithmic decision-making. The research compares emerging regulatory frameworks, policy initiatives, and institutional responses developed in different legal systems in order to identify common regulatory principles and divergences in governance strategies. This comparative analysis allows the study to assess how democratic societies address challenges such as algorithmic bias, transparency in automated systems, and legal responsibility for AI-generated decisions.

The research also incorporates a socio-legal perspective that considers the broader institutional, technological, and social contexts in which algorithmic decision-making systems operate. AI technologies do not function solely within legal frameworks; they are embedded within complex social systems involving government agencies, private technology companies, data scientists, and regulatory authorities. The socio-legal approach therefore examines how technological design, data governance practices, and institutional structures influence the effectiveness of legal accountability mechanisms in regulating AI systems.

To support the analysis, the study utilizes secondary sources including academic literature, policy reports, international organization guidelines, and legal scholarship related to artificial intelligence governance and human rights law. These materials provide critical insights into contemporary debates surrounding algorithmic accountability, ethical AI development, and the regulatory challenges associated with emerging digital technologies.

Through the integration of doctrinal legal analysis, comparative evaluation, and socio-legal inquiry, this methodology enables a comprehensive examination of the legal and institutional mechanisms governing algorithmic decision-making. The research ultimately aims to identify regulatory gaps and propose legal strategies capable of ensuring that artificial intelligence technologies operate within frameworks that respect human rights and uphold democratic values.

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Systems: Definitions and Key Characteristics

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most transformative technological developments of the twenty-first century, fundamentally altering how information is processed, decisions are made, and services are delivered across various sectors of society. In its broadest sense, artificial intelligence refers to computational systems designed to perform tasks that traditionally require human intelligence. These tasks may include problem-solving, pattern recognition, language processing, predictive analysis, and decision-making. AI systems rely on sophisticated algorithms and computational models capable of analyzing large datasets, identifying patterns, and generating outputs that assist or automate decision-making processes.A central component of modern AI systems is **machine learning**, a subset of artificial intelligence that enables computers to learn from data without being explicitly programmed for every specific task. Machine learning systems operate by analyzing training datasets and developing predictive models that can identify correlations or patterns within the data. These models are then used to generate predictions, classifications, or recommendations when the system encounters new data inputs. As a result, machine learning technologies can improve their performance over time through continuous exposure to data and feedback mechanisms.[7]

Several key characteristics distinguish artificial intelligence systems from traditional computational tools. One of the most notable characteristics is the **capacity for large-scale data analysis**, often referred to as "big data" processing. AI systems can analyze enormous datasets at speeds far beyond human capabilities, allowing organizations to extract insights that would otherwise remain undetected. This capacity has enabled the widespread adoption of AI technologies in fields such as financial risk assessment, healthcare diagnostics, transportation systems, and digital marketing.[8]

Another defining characteristic of AI systems is their **predictive capability.** Machine learning algorithms can generate predictions about future events or behaviors by analyzing historical data. Predictive analytics has become particularly valuable in areas such as fraud detection, consumer behavior analysis, and predictive policing. By identifying patterns within historical datasets, AI systems can assist institutions in

[7] Ahuja, P., Gangwani, M. K., Ahuja, N., Ali, M. A., & Inamdar, S. (2026). Artificial intelligence-based prediction of esophageal adenocarcinoma risk in Barrett's esophagus patients: A literature review. *Translational Gastroenterology and Hepatology, 11*, 50.

[8] Cai, X., Zhang, Z., Zhao, S., Liu, W., & Fan, X. (2025). Application of explainable artificial intelligence based on visual explanation in digestive endoscopy. *Bioengineering, 12*(10), 1058. https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering12101058

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

anticipating potential risks or opportunities and making informed decisions based on data-driven analysis.[9]

However, the complexity of machine learning models has also introduced challenges related to transparency and explainability. Many advanced AI systems rely on deep learning techniques involving complex neural networks that process data through multiple computational layers. While these models can achieve highly accurate results, they often operate in ways that are difficult for human observers to interpret. This phenomenon, commonly described as the **"black box" problem**, raises important legal and ethical concerns regarding the accountability of automated decision-making systems.[10]

Algorithmic Decision-Making in Public and Private Sectors: Risks and Governance Challenges

The increasing integration of artificial intelligence into decision-making processes has led to the emergence of **algorithmic decision-making systems** that influence a wide range of social, economic, and political activities. Algorithmic decision-making refers to the use of computational algorithms to analyze information and generate decisions, predictions, or recommendations that guide human actions or institutional policies. These systems may operate either autonomously or in combination with human oversight, depending on the complexity and sensitivity of the decision being made.[11]

In the **public sector**, governments have begun using algorithmic systems to improve administrative efficiency and enhance public service delivery. AI technologies are used in areas such as tax administration, immigration processing, welfare distribution, predictive policing, and judicial risk assessment. For example, algorithmic models may assist government agencies in identifying potential fraud in social welfare programs, allocating public resources, or predicting patterns of criminal activity in specific geographic areas. These systems promise increased efficiency and the ability to analyze complex datasets that may improve policy outcomes.[12]

---

[9] Girdhar, N., Raj, A., Sharma, D., Doucet, A., & Renz, M. (2025). A comprehensive review of frugal artificial intelligence: Challenges, applications, and the road to sustainable AI. *Soft Computing, 29*(13–14), 4823–4856. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-024-09566-6

[10] Gutiérrez Buitrago, A. G., Aguilar, J., Ortega, A., & Montoya, E. (2025). Using fuzzy cognitive maps to evaluate innovation in micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. *Management Decision, 63*(5), 1545–1567. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-07-2024-1042

[11] Turkbey, B., Huisman, H., Fedorov, A., Tempany, C. M., & Haider, M. A. (2025). Requirements for AI development and reporting for MRI prostate cancer detection in biopsy-naive men. *Radiology, 315*(1), e240140. https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.240140

[12] Brigato, P., Vadalà, G., De Salvatore, S., Costici, P. F., & Denaro, V. (2025). Harnessing machine learning to predict and prevent proximal junctional kyphosis and failure. *Brain and Spine, 5*, 104273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bas.2025.104273

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

In the **private sector**, algorithmic decision-making has become deeply embedded in commercial and economic activities. Financial institutions use AI systems to evaluate creditworthiness and detect financial fraud, while technology companies rely on algorithmic models to personalize advertising, recommend digital content, and manage online platforms. Employers increasingly use automated tools to screen job applicants, evaluate employee performance, and make hiring decisions. These developments illustrate how algorithmic systems are gradually reshaping the mechanisms through which economic and social opportunities are distributed.[13]

Despite these potential benefits, the use of algorithmic decision-making systems has generated significant concerns regarding **fairness, transparency, and accountability**. One major issue involves the risk of **algorithmic bias**, which occurs when AI systems produce discriminatory outcomes due to biases embedded within training datasets or model design. Because machine learning algorithms rely heavily on historical data, they may inadvertently replicate existing patterns of social inequality. For instance, biased datasets may lead to discriminatory outcomes in hiring processes, credit approvals, or criminal justice assessments, disproportionately affecting marginalized groups.[14]

Another critical challenge relates to the **opacity of algorithmic systems**, often referred to as algorithmic opacity or lack of explainability. Many AI models operate through complex computational processes that are difficult for users, regulators, or even developers to fully understand. When individuals are subject to decisions generated by opaque algorithmic systems, they may have limited ability to challenge those decisions or understand the reasoning behind them. This lack of transparency can undermine procedural fairness and weaken public trust in institutions that rely on automated decision-making systems.[15]

The expansion of algorithmic governance also raises broader concerns regarding **automated decision-making in democratic societies**. Democratic governance traditionally relies on principles of accountability, transparency, and public oversight. When decision-making authority is delegated to algorithmic systems developed by private technology companies or implemented by government agencies, questions arise regarding who should be held responsible when these systems produce harmful or unjust outcomes. Determining legal liability among software developers, government

[13] Fusco, J. P. (2025). Intelligent systems platform enhanced by digital twins and generative AI. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Big Data Analytics, Data Mining and Computational Intelligence* (pp. 69–76).
[14] Leyer, M., Wichmann, J., Müller, W., Do Khac, L. T., & Richter, A. (2025). Human-AI perception: Not much different, but some distinct novelties. *Bottom Line*. https://doi.org/10.1108/BL-03-2025-0032
[15] Dahiya, A., Singh, S., & Shrivastava, G. (2025). Android malware analysis and detection: A systematic review. *Expert Systems, 42*(1), e13488. https://doi.org/10.1111/exsy.13488

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

institutions, and private organizations represents a complex challenge for contemporary legal systems.[16]

Furthermore, algorithmic decision-making may influence the distribution of fundamental rights and social opportunities, including access to employment, credit, housing, education, and public services. When such decisions are made through automated systems, the risk arises that individuals may be subjected to **automated governance structures that operate without adequate legal safeguards.** Ensuring that these systems remain consistent with human rights principles requires robust legal frameworks capable of addressing the unique challenges posed by AI technologies.[17]

Equality, Non-Discrimination, and Fairness in Algorithmic Decision-Making

The increasing integration of artificial intelligence into decision-making processes has raised significant concerns regarding the protection of fundamental human rights. Democratic societies are built upon legal frameworks that safeguard equality before the law, prohibit discrimination, and ensure fair treatment in both public and private institutions. As AI-driven technologies increasingly influence decisions related to employment, finance, healthcare, criminal justice, and public administration, it becomes essential to examine how these technologies interact with core human rights principles.[18]

One of the most important human rights principles affected by algorithmic decision-making is **equality and non-discrimination.** Human rights law requires that individuals be treated equally regardless of characteristics such as race, gender, religion, ethnicity, disability, or socio-economic status. However, AI systems that rely on historical data may unintentionally replicate patterns of discrimination embedded within past human decision-making processes. If training datasets reflect historical inequalities, algorithmic systems may learn these patterns and reproduce them in automated decision-making outcomes.[19]

For example, AI tools used in recruitment may analyze historical employment data to predict which candidates are most suitable for particular positions. If historical

[16] Puri, A., Rangra, A., Thakur, V., & Atwal, N. (2025). Outlook on current challenges and future directions. In *Perspectives on artificial intelligence and internet of things for sustainable environment* (pp. 377–401). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-1234-5_15

[17] Purificato, E., Boratto, L., & De Luca, E. W. (2024). Toward a responsible fairness analysis: From binary to multiclass and multigroup assessment. *Minds and Machines, 34*(3), 33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-024-09642-2

[18] Shi, C., Yang, C., Fang, Y., Sun, L., & Yu, P. S. (2024). Lecture-style tutorial: Towards graph foundation models. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference* (pp. 1264–1267). https://doi.org/10.1145/3589334.3645472

[19] Hasanah, L. N., Faisal, M. S., Ahmed, Z., & Hasyim, M. Y. A. (2025). Religious diversity and the digital economy: Legal–academic pathways to harmonize Sharia and international law. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.8

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF IJBAI (INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BIOINFORMATICS AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)
PEER-REVIEWED OPEN ACCESS QUARTERLY JOURNAL
IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

hiring patterns favored certain demographic groups, the algorithm may replicate these biases and disadvantage candidates from underrepresented groups. Similar concerns have arisen in financial lending systems, predictive policing models, and risk assessment tools used in criminal justice systems. These examples illustrate how algorithmic systems may inadvertently reinforce existing social inequalities if adequate safeguards are not implemented.[20]

Ensuring fairness in AI-driven decision-making therefore requires the development of **algorithmic auditing mechanisms and bias detection strategies**. Governments and regulatory authorities increasingly recognize the need to evaluate the fairness of AI systems before they are deployed in sensitive decision-making contexts. This may involve reviewing training datasets for potential biases, testing algorithmic outputs for discriminatory outcomes, and implementing oversight mechanisms that allow human intervention when automated systems produce questionable results.[21]

Another important dimension of fairness involves ensuring that algorithmic systems do not undermine the principle of **substantive equality**, which requires that legal systems address structural inequalities affecting disadvantaged groups. Human rights law emphasizes that equality is not merely the absence of discrimination but also the promotion of equitable opportunities for all individuals. AI governance frameworks must therefore consider how automated decision-making may affect vulnerable populations and ensure that technological innovation does not exacerbate existing social disparities.[22]

Privacy, Data Protection, and Due Process in Automated Decisions

In addition to equality concerns, the expansion of artificial intelligence technologies raises critical questions regarding **privacy rights and data protection**. AI systems rely heavily on large datasets that often contain sensitive personal information, including behavioral data, biometric identifiers, location information, and digital communication records. These datasets are used to train machine learning models that generate predictions and automated decisions affecting individuals' lives.The right to privacy is recognized as a fundamental human right in many international legal instruments and constitutional frameworks. Privacy protections are designed to safeguard individuals from intrusive surveillance, unauthorized data collection, and misuse of personal information. However, AI-driven technologies often involve large-scale data processing activities that may challenge traditional privacy safeguards. For instance, algorithmic systems used in digital platforms or public security operations may collect

[20] Huang, X., Huang, C., Yin, W., Han, T., & Yi, M. (2024). Automatic quantitative intelligent assessment of neonatal general movements with video tracking. *Displays, 82*, 102658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.displa.2023.102658

[21] Mujiono, & Ticualu, C. (2025). Emerging trends in law and social sciences: Global perspectives on policy, ethics, justice, and institutional reform. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1), 40–60. https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.6

[22] You, X., Jia, F., Tian, J., Yang, J., & Li, K. (2024). The machine map and its conceptual model. *Journal of Geo-Information Science, 26*(1), 25–34.

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

extensive personal data in order to generate predictive insights or automated risk assessments.[23]

Data protection laws therefore play a crucial role in regulating how personal information is collected, processed, and stored in AI-driven systems. Effective data protection frameworks typically establish legal requirements related to data minimization, transparency, and accountability in data processing activities. These legal safeguards help ensure that personal data used for algorithmic decision-making is handled responsibly and that individuals retain control over their personal information.[24]

Another critical human rights concern associated with AI-driven decision-making involves the principle of **due process and procedural fairness**. In democratic societies, individuals affected by administrative or legal decisions have the right to challenge those decisions and seek explanations regarding the reasoning behind them. However, the use of complex algorithmic systems in decision-making processes may undermine this principle if individuals are unable to understand or contest automated decisions that affect their rights or opportunities.The concept of a **"right to explanation"** has therefore emerged as an important legal principle in debates surrounding AI governance. This principle suggests that individuals subjected to automated decisions should have access to meaningful explanations regarding how those decisions were reached. Transparency in algorithmic decision-making enables individuals to identify potential errors, challenge discriminatory outcomes, and hold institutions accountable for automated decision processes.Ensuring procedural fairness in algorithmic governance also requires mechanisms that allow for **human oversight and review of automated decisions**. Fully automated decision-making systems may produce outcomes without human intervention, which can create risks of unjust or erroneous decisions. Legal frameworks governing AI systems increasingly emphasize the importance of maintaining human involvement in decision-making processes, particularly in cases where automated decisions may significantly affect individuals' rights or livelihoods.[25]

Furthermore, the integration of AI technologies into governance structures raises broader questions about the **accountability of institutions using algorithmic systems**. When decisions are made through automated processes, it may become difficult to determine who bears legal responsibility for potential errors or harms resulting from those decisions. Developers, technology companies, government agencies, and regulatory

[23] Camelo, M., Cominardi, L., Gramaglia, M., Hellinckx, P., & Latré, S. (2022). Requirements and specifications for the orchestration of network intelligence in 6G. In *IEEE Consumer Communications and Networking Conference Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.1109/CCNC49033.2022.9700578

[24] Alanne, K. (2021). A novel performance indicator for the assessment of smart buildings. *Sustainable Cities and Society, 72*, 103054. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.103054

[25] Azhari, A. M., Azhari, S., & Yaqooq, M. I. (2025). Global transformations in law, justice, and society: Comparative perspectives on governance, rights, and legal reform. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1), 60–90. https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.7

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

authorities may all play roles in the design and implementation of algorithmic systems, complicating the assignment of legal liability.

Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination in Automated Decision-Making

The increasing reliance on artificial intelligence in decision-making processes has introduced significant legal challenges for democratic societies, particularly in relation to fairness, equality, and the protection of fundamental rights. One of the most pressing concerns associated with algorithmic governance is the risk of **algorithmic bias**, which occurs when automated systems produce outcomes that systematically disadvantage certain individuals or groups. These biases may arise from several sources, including biased training data, flawed model design, or structural inequalities embedded within historical datasets.Machine learning systems depend heavily on historical data to identify patterns and generate predictive models. If the data used to train these systems reflects historical discrimination or social inequalities, the algorithm may reproduce and even amplify those patterns in automated decision-making. For example, algorithmic tools used in recruitment processes may learn patterns from past hiring decisions that favored particular demographic groups, thereby disadvantaging candidates from marginalized communities. Similarly, credit scoring systems and loan approval algorithms may incorporate data that indirectly reflects socio-economic inequalities, resulting in discriminatory lending practices.[26]

In the context of criminal justice systems, algorithmic risk assessment tools have been used to evaluate the likelihood that individuals may reoffend or fail to appear in court proceedings. While these systems are intended to assist judges and law enforcement agencies in making informed decisions, critics argue that they may reproduce racial or socio-economic biases present in historical policing and sentencing data. Such outcomes raise serious concerns regarding the compatibility of algorithmic governance with fundamental legal principles such as equality before the law and protection against discrimination.Addressing algorithmic bias presents a complex regulatory challenge because bias in AI systems may not always be intentional or immediately visible. Unlike traditional forms of discrimination where human actors can be directly identified, algorithmic discrimination may arise from technical design choices or data limitations embedded within complex computational systems. Consequently, legal frameworks must develop mechanisms for detecting and correcting algorithmic bias, including requirements for algorithmic audits, fairness testing, and independent oversight of automated decision-making systems.[27]

[26] Jöckel, L., Bauer, T., Kläs, M., Hauer, M. P., & Groß, J. (2021). Towards a common testing terminology for software engineering and data science experts. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (pp. 281–289). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88418-0_20

[27] Al-Farjani, S. H., Ahmad, T., & Rana, H. A. S. (2025). Digital innovation, legal reform, and social justice: Interdisciplinary approaches to law, technology, and human rights. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1), 91–129. https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.5

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

Another significant legal challenge associated with algorithmic governance concerns the **lack of transparency and accountability in AI-driven systems**. Many advanced artificial intelligence models operate through complex computational processes that are difficult to interpret or explain. This phenomenon, often referred to as algorithmic opacity, can create significant obstacles for individuals seeking to understand or challenge automated decisions that affect their legal rights or social opportunities.In democratic societies, legal institutions traditionally rely on principles of transparency and procedural fairness to ensure that government decisions are subject to public scrutiny and legal review. When decision-making processes are delegated to opaque algorithmic systems, individuals may face difficulties in accessing meaningful explanations regarding how those decisions were generated. For example, an individual denied access to credit, employment, or social welfare benefits due to an automated system may struggle to identify the factors that influenced the decision or determine whether an error occurred within the algorithm.The lack of transparency in algorithmic decision-making can also complicate the assignment of **legal responsibility and accountability.** When automated systems produce harmful or discriminatory outcomes, determining who is legally responsible may be challenging. Responsibility may potentially lie with the developers who designed the algorithm, the organizations that deployed the system, the data providers who supplied training datasets, or the public institutions that rely on algorithmic tools in decision-making processes. The distributed nature of algorithmic systems therefore creates difficulties for traditional legal frameworks that rely on clearly identifiable actors to assign liability and enforce accountability.[28]

Furthermore, the expansion of algorithmic governance raises broader concerns regarding the **impact of artificial intelligence on democratic governance and the rule of law**. Democratic systems depend on transparent decision-making processes, institutional accountability, and public participation in governance. When algorithmic systems play increasingly influential roles in public administration, law enforcement, and policy implementation, there is a risk that critical decisions may be made through technological processes that operate beyond effective democratic oversight.For instance, predictive policing algorithms that identify high-risk neighborhoods for law enforcement intervention may influence policing strategies in ways that affect community relations and civil liberties. Similarly, automated systems used in immigration decision-making or welfare distribution may significantly impact individuals' access to fundamental rights and social protections. If these systems operate without adequate transparency, public scrutiny, or legal oversight, they may undermine the legitimacy of democratic institutions and erode public trust in governance.The risk to the **rule of law** becomes particularly significant when algorithmic systems are used to support or replace decisions traditionally made by human officials. The rule of law requires that legal decisions be based on clear

[28] Hassan, M. A., Mesbah, S., & Darwish, S. M. (2021). Enhanced image fusion model for 3D imaging applications. In *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing* (pp. 184–194). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70713-7_17

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

legal standards, subject to judicial review, and accountable to democratic institutions. Automated systems that generate decisions through opaque computational processes may challenge these principles if individuals cannot effectively contest algorithmic outcomes or seek remedies for potential injustices.To address these challenges, policymakers and legal scholars have increasingly emphasized the need for **robust regulatory frameworks governing algorithmic governance**. Such frameworks may include requirements for algorithmic transparency, mandatory impact assessments for high-risk AI systems, mechanisms for independent auditing of automated decision-making tools, and legal provisions ensuring that individuals have the right to challenge algorithmic decisions affecting their rights.[29]

National and Regional AI Regulatory Frameworks

As artificial intelligence technologies become increasingly integrated into economic, governmental, and social systems, governments around the world have begun developing regulatory frameworks aimed at ensuring that AI systems operate responsibly and in accordance with legal and ethical standards. These regulatory initiatives vary significantly across jurisdictions, reflecting differences in legal traditions, technological capacities, economic priorities, and policy approaches toward innovation and risk management. A comparative analysis of national and regional AI governance frameworks reveals diverse strategies for addressing the challenges associated with algorithmic decision-making and automated governance.Many democratic states have adopted **national AI strategies** that outline regulatory principles, ethical guidelines, and policy objectives for the development and deployment of artificial intelligence technologies. These strategies often emphasize the importance of innovation, economic competitiveness, and technological leadership while simultaneously addressing concerns related to safety, accountability, and human rights protection. Governments have increasingly recognized that effective AI governance must balance the promotion of technological advancement with safeguards designed to protect individuals from potential harms associated with automated decision-making.At the regional level, several jurisdictions have introduced more comprehensive regulatory frameworks governing artificial intelligence. Some regional initiatives focus on establishing legal standards that categorize AI systems based on their level of risk to individuals and society. Under such frameworks, high-risk AI applications—such as those used in law enforcement, employment screening, healthcare diagnostics, or financial decision-making—may be subject to stricter regulatory requirements. These requirements may include mandatory impact assessments, transparency obligations, and human oversight mechanisms designed to ensure that automated systems do not violate fundamental rights.[30]

[29] Al Azhari, F. U., & Al Azhari, S. I. (2025). Contemporary challenges in harmonizing Sharia, national legal systems, and international law in a rapidly changing world. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1), 130–150. https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.4

[30] Bikeev, I., Kabanov, P., Begishev, I., & Khisamova, Z. (2019). Criminological risks and legal aspects of artificial intelligence implementation. In *ACM International Conference Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3316615.3316720

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

Another important component of regional AI governance involves the regulation of **data governance and digital infrastructure**. Because AI systems rely heavily on large datasets for training and operation, regulatory frameworks often include provisions addressing data protection, privacy rights, and responsible data management practices. These legal safeguards are intended to prevent the misuse of personal data and ensure that individuals retain meaningful control over their personal information within AI-driven systems.In addition to regulatory legislation, governments increasingly rely on **soft law mechanisms** such as ethical guidelines, technical standards, and voluntary codes of conduct to guide the development of responsible AI systems. Technology companies, research institutions, and industry organizations often collaborate with public authorities to develop best practices for AI development and deployment. While these non-binding instruments may lack the enforceability of formal legislation, they play an important role in shaping responsible innovation and promoting awareness of ethical considerations within the technology sector.[31]

International Human Rights Law and Institutional Oversight of AI Systems

Beyond national and regional regulatory frameworks, **international human rights law** has become an important reference point for evaluating the legality and legitimacy of AI governance systems. Human rights instruments establish fundamental legal principles that apply to the protection of individual freedoms, equality, and procedural fairness in democratic societies. As AI technologies increasingly influence decisions that affect individuals' rights and opportunities, policymakers and legal scholars have begun examining how these existing legal principles can guide the development of responsible AI governance frameworks.International human rights law provides a normative foundation for regulating AI systems in several key areas. The principle of **non-discrimination**, for example, requires that automated decision-making systems do not produce outcomes that unfairly disadvantage individuals based on protected characteristics such as race, gender, religion, or socio-economic status. Similarly, the right to privacy and data protection imposes legal obligations on institutions that collect and process personal data used to train AI systems. These legal protections ensure that technological innovation does not undermine individuals' fundamental rights.[32]

Human rights frameworks also emphasize the importance of **procedural fairness and accountability in decision-making processes**. When AI systems are used to generate decisions affecting individuals' legal rights or access to public services, individuals must have the ability to challenge those decisions and seek appropriate remedies. This principle supports the development of regulatory mechanisms that require

[31] Kuo, C. F., Lin, C. H., & Lee, M. H. (2018). Analyze energy consumption characteristics of Taiwan's convenience stores. *Energy and Buildings, 168*, 120–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.03.027
[32] Ricciardi Celsi, L., & Zomaya, A. Y. (2025). Perspectives on managing AI ethics in the digital age. *Information, 16*(4), 318. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040318

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

transparency, explainability, and human oversight in algorithmic decision-making systems.Institutional oversight mechanisms play a crucial role in ensuring that AI governance frameworks are effectively implemented and enforced. Governments have begun establishing **specialized regulatory bodies and supervisory authorities** responsible for monitoring the development and deployment of AI technologies. These institutions may conduct risk assessments, investigate complaints related to automated decision-making systems, and impose regulatory sanctions when AI applications violate legal or ethical standards.[33]

In addition to national regulatory authorities, **independent oversight bodies and judicial institutions** also play important roles in supervising algorithmic governance systems. Courts may review disputes involving automated decision-making, evaluate the legality of algorithmic policies implemented by government agencies, and ensure that AI technologies operate within constitutional and human rights frameworks. Judicial oversight therefore provides an essential safeguard against potential abuses of algorithmic governance.Furthermore, international organizations and multilateral institutions have begun engaging in policy discussions regarding the global governance of artificial intelligence. These institutions facilitate dialogue among governments, technology companies, and civil society organizations regarding best practices for AI regulation, ethical guidelines for AI development, and mechanisms for protecting human rights within digital governance systems. Such collaborative efforts contribute to the development of shared principles for responsible AI governance at the global level.[34]

Liability Frameworks for AI-Driven Decisions

The increasing reliance on artificial intelligence in decision-making processes has created significant challenges for traditional legal frameworks of liability and accountability. Legal systems historically evolved to regulate actions carried out by identifiable human actors who could be held responsible for the consequences of their decisions. However, algorithmic decision-making introduces complex technological processes that may involve multiple actors, including software developers, technology companies, data providers, and institutions that deploy AI systems. As a result, determining legal responsibility when automated systems produce harmful or discriminatory outcomes has become a central issue in contemporary legal scholarship and policy debates.One of the primary challenges in establishing liability for AI-driven decisions arises from the **autonomous or semi-autonomous nature of algorithmic systems**. Machine learning models can evolve over time by continuously analyzing new data inputs and adjusting their predictive outputs. This dynamic learning process may produce outcomes that were not directly anticipated by the original system designers. Consequently, identifying a single responsible actor within the AI decision-making chain

[33] Green, B. P. (2022). The Vatican and artificial intelligence: An interview with Bishop Paul Tighe. *Journal of Moral Theology*. https://doi.org/10.55476/001c.34131
[34] Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., Tunçalp, Ö., & Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

may prove difficult, particularly when automated systems are integrated into complex institutional infrastructures.[35]

Legal scholars have proposed several approaches to address this challenge through the development of **adapted liability frameworks for AI governance**. One approach involves applying traditional product liability principles to AI systems. Under this framework, developers or manufacturers of AI technologies may be held responsible if defects in the system design or development process lead to harmful outcomes. Product liability principles are particularly relevant in situations where algorithmic systems malfunction or generate erroneous outputs due to flaws in programming, testing, or quality assurance procedures.Another potential approach focuses on **negligence-based liability**, which evaluates whether organizations deploying AI systems exercised reasonable care in designing, implementing, and monitoring automated decision-making tools. Institutions that rely on algorithmic systems in areas such as employment screening, financial lending, or public administration may have legal obligations to ensure that these systems operate fairly and accurately. Failure to conduct adequate testing, auditing, or oversight of algorithmic systems may therefore constitute negligence under applicable legal standards.In some contexts, legal scholars have also discussed the possibility of **strict liability regimes for high-risk AI applications**. Under strict liability frameworks, organizations deploying AI systems would be held responsible for harmful outcomes regardless of whether negligence or intentional misconduct can be proven. This approach may be particularly relevant in sectors where algorithmic decisions have significant consequences for individuals' rights or safety, such as healthcare diagnostics, autonomous vehicles, or criminal justice risk assessments.[36]

Institutional Responsibility, Judicial Review, and Regulatory Enforcement

Beyond formal liability rules, effective accountability for algorithmic decision-making also requires clear allocation of responsibilities among the various actors involved in the development and deployment of AI technologies. AI governance involves a complex ecosystem that includes governments, private technology companies, software developers, data scientists, and institutional users of algorithmic systems. Each of these actors may play distinct roles in shaping how AI technologies influence decision-making processes within society.Governments and public institutions bear particular responsibility when algorithmic systems are used within **public administration and governance contexts**. When government agencies deploy automated systems to assist with decisions related to welfare benefits, immigration assessments, taxation, or law

[35] Olawade, D. B., Plabon, S. B., Ojo, A., Makanjuola, B. D., & Olasilola, O. R. (2026). Human-in-the-loop artificial intelligence in healthcare: Applications, outcomes, and implementation challenges. *International Journal of Medical Informatics, 213*, 106362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2025.106362

[36] Chau, M. T., Spuur, K. M., White, S., Pyper, A., & Crossman, M. (2026). Malpractice in the machine age: Legal and ethical responses to machine learning in medical imaging. *Radiography, 32*(3), 103339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2025.103339

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

enforcement activities, they must ensure that these systems comply with constitutional protections and human rights standards. Public authorities have a legal obligation to guarantee that administrative decisions remain transparent, accountable, and subject to oversight mechanisms consistent with democratic governance.[37]

Technology companies and software developers also carry important responsibilities in the design and deployment of algorithmic systems. Developers are responsible for ensuring that AI systems are developed using reliable datasets, robust testing procedures, and ethical design principles that minimize the risk of bias or discrimination. Many technology companies have begun implementing **internal governance mechanisms** such as algorithmic impact assessments, fairness audits, and ethical review committees in order to evaluate the potential social impacts of their technologies.Judicial institutions play a critical role in ensuring accountability for algorithmic decision-making through mechanisms of **judicial review and legal oversight**. Courts may review disputes involving automated decisions and determine whether institutions using AI technologies have complied with applicable legal standards. Judicial review ensures that individuals affected by algorithmic decisions retain the ability to challenge those decisions and seek legal remedies when their rights have been violated.For example, individuals denied employment opportunities, financial services, or social benefits due to automated decision-making systems may seek judicial review to determine whether the decision was based on discriminatory or unlawful criteria. Courts may require institutions to provide explanations regarding how algorithmic decisions were generated and evaluate whether those decisions comply with principles of fairness, equality, and due process.[38]

In addition to judicial oversight, **regulatory enforcement mechanisms** are essential for ensuring that organizations comply with AI governance frameworks. Regulatory agencies responsible for digital governance, data protection, and consumer protection increasingly monitor the deployment of algorithmic systems across various sectors. These agencies may impose sanctions, fines, or corrective measures when organizations deploy AI systems that violate legal or ethical standards.Regulatory enforcement may also involve the implementation of **algorithmic auditing requirements and impact assessments** for high-risk AI applications. These mechanisms require organizations to evaluate the potential risks associated with automated decision-making systems before deploying them in sensitive areas such as healthcare, employment, financial services, or public administration. By requiring organizations to assess the potential social impacts of AI technologies, regulators can help ensure that algorithmic systems operate within legal frameworks designed to protect fundamental rights.[39]

---

[37] Klymov, K., Pron, L., Orobets, K., Liashenko, R., & Vasylenko, L. (2026). The algorithmic rule of law: Institutionalizing accountability and human oversight in AI-driven legal systems. *Janus.Net, 16*(2), 191–209.
[38] Jung, S. Y., Cha, J., Seo, J. B., & Park, S. M. (2026). Artificial intelligence-driven digital transformation for strengthening universal health coverage. *Journal of the Korean Medical Association, 69*(2), 146–157.
[39] Scollo, L. (2026). Navigating market abuse in the age of AI: Reimagining criminal responsibility in algorithmic trading. In *Legal protection against financial market abuse* (pp. 82–96).

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

Policy Recommendations for Responsible AI Regulation

As artificial intelligence technologies become increasingly embedded within public governance, economic systems, and social institutions, policymakers face the critical challenge of ensuring that AI systems operate in ways that respect fundamental rights and democratic values. The growing influence of algorithmic decision-making requires the development of regulatory frameworks capable of addressing the ethical, legal, and institutional risks associated with automated governance. A rights-based approach to AI regulation emphasizes that technological innovation must be guided by principles of fairness, accountability, transparency, and respect for human dignity.One key policy recommendation for responsible AI governance is the establishment of **comprehensive regulatory frameworks that categorize AI systems based on their level of risk.** Not all AI technologies pose the same degree of threat to human rights or social welfare. Systems used for entertainment or consumer recommendation services may present relatively low risk, whereas AI applications used in law enforcement, employment screening, healthcare diagnostics, or public administration may significantly affect individuals' rights and opportunities. Risk-based regulatory models allow governments to apply stricter oversight and compliance requirements to high-risk AI systems while encouraging innovation in lower-risk areas.[40]

Another important policy strategy involves requiring **algorithmic transparency and explain ability** in automated decision-making systems. Individuals affected by algorithmic decisions should have access to clear explanations regarding how those decisions were generated and which factors influenced the outcome. Transparency helps ensure that automated systems can be evaluated for fairness, accuracy, and compliance with legal standards. It also enhances public trust in institutions that rely on AI technologies for decision-making processes.Governments should also require organizations deploying AI systems to conduct **algorithmic impact assessments** before implementing automated decision-making tools in sensitive sectors. These assessments involve evaluating potential risks associated with AI deployment, including possible discriminatory outcomes, privacy violations, and negative social impacts. By identifying potential risks at an early stage, organizations can implement corrective measures that minimize harm and ensure compliance with regulatory standards.Another critical policy recommendation involves promoting **human oversight in automated decision-making systems**. Fully autonomous decision-making processes may undermine accountability if individuals cannot intervene when algorithmic systems produce questionable or harmful outcomes. Regulatory frameworks should therefore require that human decision-makers

[40] Nnawuchi, U., & George, C. (2026). Not knowing, yet living: AI and the modern legal trial of Prometheus in medicine. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (Vol. 16122, pp. 147–159). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-XXXX-X

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

remain involved in reviewing automated outputs, particularly in cases where AI systems influence decisions affecting individuals' legal rights or access to essential services.[41]

Integrating Human Rights and Strengthening Democratic Oversight of AI Systems

In addition to regulatory reforms, effective governance of artificial intelligence requires the integration of **human rights principles into the design, development, and deployment of AI technologies**. Human rights frameworks provide normative guidance for ensuring that technological innovation does not undermine fundamental freedoms or exacerbate existing social inequalities. Integrating these principles into AI governance involves aligning technological development with legal standards that protect equality, privacy, freedom of expression, and access to justice.One strategy for integrating human rights into AI governance involves incorporating **human rights impact assessments** into the development lifecycle of AI systems. These assessments evaluate how algorithmic systems may affect different groups within society and identify potential risks related to discrimination, surveillance, or exclusion. By conducting such assessments during the design phase of AI technologies, developers and institutions can implement safeguards that mitigate harmful outcomes before systems are deployed in real-world contexts.Public participation and democratic engagement also represent important components of rights-based AI governance. Decisions regarding the use of AI technologies in public administration, law enforcement, and social policy should involve **transparent policy discussions and stakeholder consultations.** Civil society organizations, academic experts, technology professionals, and affected communities should have opportunities to participate in discussions regarding the ethical and legal implications of AI deployment. Such participatory governance mechanisms strengthen democratic legitimacy and ensure that technological policies reflect broader societal values.[42]

Strengthening **institutional oversight mechanisms** is another essential element of rights-based AI governance. Governments should establish specialized regulatory bodies responsible for monitoring the development and deployment of AI technologies. These institutions may conduct independent audits of algorithmic systems, investigate complaints related to automated decision-making, and enforce compliance with legal and ethical standards governing AI technologies.Judicial institutions will also continue to play a critical role in shaping the future of AI governance. Courts provide essential safeguards by reviewing disputes involving algorithmic decisions and ensuring that AI systems operate within constitutional and human rights frameworks. Through judicial review,

[41] Corte Metto, S., Magnani, F., & Castellani, G. (2026). Assessment and compliance of personalized machine-learning pharmacokinetic models in the European regulatory environment. In *Communications in Computer and Information Science* (Vol. 2696, pp. 75–87). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-XXXX-X
[42] Meredyth, N., & Barrios, P. A. (2026). Ethical considerations for the use of artificial intelligence tools in surgery. *Clinics in Colon and Rectal Surgery*. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-XXXX

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

legal systems can establish precedents that clarify the responsibilities of governments and private organizations deploying AI technologies.[43]

Looking toward the future, the governance of artificial intelligence will require **continuous adaptation to technological innovation and evolving societal expectations**. Emerging technologies such as advanced machine learning systems, autonomous decision-making tools, and predictive analytics will continue to reshape social and economic institutions. Policymakers must therefore develop flexible regulatory frameworks capable of responding to new technological developments while preserving the core values of democratic governance.International cooperation will also become increasingly important as AI technologies operate across global digital networks. Collaborative initiatives among governments, international organizations, and regulatory institutions can help establish common principles for responsible AI development and prevent regulatory fragmentation across jurisdictions. Global dialogue on AI governance can contribute to the development of shared standards that protect human rights while promoting innovation and technological progress.[44]

Conclusion

The rapid development and widespread adoption of artificial intelligence technologies have fundamentally transformed the ways in which decisions are made in modern societies. Algorithmic decision-making systems are now used in numerous sectors, including public administration, financial services, healthcare, employment, and criminal justice. While these technologies offer significant opportunities for efficiency, innovation, and data-driven governance, they also present complex challenges for legal systems that must ensure the protection of fundamental human rights in democratic societies. The growing influence of automated decision-making requires careful examination of how legal frameworks can adapt to address issues related to fairness, accountability, transparency, and democratic oversight.

This study has examined the relationship between artificial intelligence and human rights through a legal analysis of algorithmic decision-making systems and their implications for democratic governance. The analysis demonstrates that AI technologies have the potential to both enhance and threaten human rights protections. On one hand, AI systems can improve institutional efficiency and support better policy decisions through advanced data analysis. On the other hand, algorithmic systems may produce

[43] Nnawuchi, U., & George, C. (2025). Decoding accountability: The importance of explainability in liability frameworks for smart border systems. *Discover Computing, 28*(1), 64. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-025-00864-0

[44] Nouis, S. C. E., Uren, V., & Jariwala, S. (2025). Evaluating accountability, transparency, and bias in AI-assisted healthcare decision-making: A qualitative study. *BMC Medical Ethics, 26*(1), 89. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-025-01189-7

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

discriminatory outcomes, compromise privacy protections, and undermine procedural fairness if they operate without adequate legal safeguards.

One of the central concerns identified in this research is the risk of **algorithmic bias and discrimination.** Machine learning systems trained on historical datasets may replicate patterns of inequality embedded within past decision-making processes. Without proper oversight, automated systems may reinforce existing social disparities and produce unfair outcomes affecting marginalized communities. Ensuring fairness in algorithmic governance therefore requires robust regulatory mechanisms, including algorithmic auditing, bias detection, and transparent data governance practices.

Another major challenge involves the **lack of transparency and accountability in automated decision-making systems.** Many advanced AI models operate through complex computational processes that are difficult for individuals and institutions to interpret. This lack of explainability can undermine procedural fairness by preventing individuals from understanding or contesting decisions that affect their rights or opportunities. Legal frameworks must therefore emphasize transparency, explainability, and human oversight to ensure that automated systems remain accountable to democratic institutions and legal standards.

The study also highlights the importance of **developing comprehensive legal accountability frameworks for AI-driven decisions**. Traditional liability models must be adapted to address the complex ecosystem of actors involved in AI development and deployment, including governments, technology companies, and software developers. Effective governance requires clear allocation of responsibilities, strong regulatory enforcement mechanisms, and accessible judicial remedies for individuals affected by harmful algorithmic decisions.

Finally, the research emphasizes the need for a **rights-based approach to AI governance** that integrates human rights principles into the design and deployment of algorithmic systems. Policymakers must ensure that technological innovation does not undermine fundamental freedoms such as equality, privacy, due process, and access to justice. Achieving this objective requires not only legal reforms but also stronger institutional oversight, public participation in technology governance, and international cooperation in developing shared standards for responsible AI regulation.

References

Ahuja, P., Gangwani, M. K., Ahuja, N., Ali, M. A., & Inamdar, S. (2026). Artificial intelligence-based prediction of esophageal adenocarcinoma risk in Barrett's esophagus patients: A literature review. *Translational Gastroenterology and Hepatology, 11*, 50.

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

Al Azhari, F. U., & Al Azhari, S. I. (2025). Contemporary challenges in harmonizing Sharia, national legal systems, and international law in a rapidly changing world. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1), 130–150. https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.4

Alanne, K. (2021). A novel performance indicator for the assessment of smart buildings. *Sustainable Cities and Society, 72*, 103054. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.103054

Al-Farjani, S. H., Ahmad, T., & Rana, H. A. S. (2025). Digital innovation, legal reform, and social justice: Interdisciplinary approaches to law, technology, and human rights. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1), 91–129. https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.5

Azhari, A. M., Azhari, S., & Yaqooq, M. I. (2025). Global transformations in law, justice, and society: Comparative perspectives on governance, rights, and legal reform. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1), 60–90. https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.7

Bikeev, I., Kabanov, P., Begishev, I., & Khisamova, Z. (2019). Criminological risks and legal aspects of artificial intelligence implementation. In *ACM International Conference Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3316615.3316720

Brigato, P., Vadalà, G., De Salvatore, S., Costici, P. F., & Denaro, V. (2025). Harnessing machine learning to predict and prevent proximal junctional kyphosis and failure. *Brain and Spine, 5*, 104273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bas.2025.104273

Busuioc, M. (2020). *Accountable artificial intelligence: Holding algorithms to account*. **Public Administration Review, 81**(5), 825–836. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13293

Cai, X., Zhang, Z., Zhao, S., Liu, W., & Fan, X. (2025). Application of explainable artificial intelligence based on visual explanation in digestive endoscopy. *Bioengineering, 12*(10), 1058. https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering12101058

Camelo, M., Cominardi, L., Gramaglia, M., Hellinckx, P., & Latré, S. (2022). Requirements and specifications for the orchestration of network intelligence in 6G. In *IEEE Consumer Communications and Networking Conference Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.1109/CCNC49033.2022.9700578

Chau, M. T., Spuur, K. M., White, S., Pyper, A., & Crossman, M. (2026). Malpractice in the machine age: Legal and ethical responses to machine learning in medical imaging. *Radiography, 32*(3), 103339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2025.103339

Cheong, B. C. (2024). *Transparency and accountability in AI systems: Safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making*. **Frontiers in Human Dynamics, 6**, 1421273. https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2024.1421273

Corte Metto, S., Magnani, F., & Castellani, G. (2026). Assessment and compliance of personalized machine-learning pharmacokinetic models in the European regulatory

environment. In *Communications in Computer and Information Science* (Vol. 2696, pp. 75–87). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-XXXX-X

Dahiya, A., Singh, S., & Shrivastava, G. (2025). Android malware analysis and detection: A systematic review. *Expert Systems, 42*(1), e13488. https://doi.org/10.1111/exsy.13488

de Bruijn, H., Warnier, M., & Janssen, M. (2022). The perils and pitfalls of explainable AI: Strategies for explaining algorithmic decision-making. Government Information Quarterly, 39(2), 101666. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101666

Fusco, J. P. (2025). Intelligent systems platform enhanced by digital twins and generative AI. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Big Data Analytics, Data Mining and Computational Intelligence* (pp. 69–76).

Girdhar, N., Raj, A., Sharma, D., Doucet, A., & Renz, M. (2025). A comprehensive review of frugal artificial intelligence: Challenges, applications, and the road to sustainable AI. *Soft Computing, 29*(13–14), 4823–4856. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-024-09566-6

Green, B. P. (2022). The Vatican and artificial intelligence: An interview with Bishop Paul Tighe. *Journal of Moral Theology*. https://doi.org/10.55476/001c.34131

Gutiérrez Buitrago, A. G., Aguilar, J., Ortega, A., & Montoya, E. (2025). Using fuzzy cognitive maps to evaluate innovation in micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. *Management Decision, 63*(5), 1545–1567. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-07-2024-1042

Hasanah, L. N., Faisal, M. S., Ahmed, Z., & Hasyim, M. Y. A. (2025). Religious diversity and the digital economy: Legal–academic pathways to harmonize Sharia and international law. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.8

Hassan, M. A., Mesbah, S., & Darwish, S. M. (2021). Enhanced image fusion model for 3D imaging applications. In *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing* (pp. 184–194). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70713-7_17

Henman, P. (2020). *Improving public services using artificial intelligence: Possibilities, pitfalls, governance*. **Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration,** 42(4), 209–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/23276665.2020.1816188

Huang, X., Huang, C., Yin, W., Han, T., & Yi, M. (2024). Automatic quantitative intelligent assessment of neonatal general movements with video tracking. *Displays, 82*, 102658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.displa.2023.102658

Jöckel, L., Bauer, T., Kläs, M., Hauer, M. P., & Groß, J. (2021). Towards a common testing terminology for software engineering and data science experts. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (pp. 281–289). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88418-0_20

Jung, S. Y., Cha, J., Seo, J. B., & Park, S. M. (2026). Artificial intelligence-driven digital transformation for strengthening universal health coverage. *Journal of the Korean Medical Association, 69*(2), 146–157.

IJOIS
International Journal of Islamic Studies UK
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol. 1 No. 1 January-June 2026, Pages 1-22

Klymov, K., Pron, L., Orobets, K., Liashenko, R., & Vasylenko, L. (2026). The algorithmic rule of law: Institutionalizing accountability and human oversight in AI-driven legal systems. *Janus.Net, 16*(2), 191–209.

Kuo, C. F., Lin, C. H., & Lee, M. H. (2018). Analyze energy consumption characteristics of Taiwan's convenience stores. *Energy and Buildings, 168*, 120–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.03.027

Leyer, M., Wichmann, J., Müller, W., Do Khac, L. T., & Richter, A. (2025). Human-AI perception: Not much different, but some distinct novelties. *Bottom Line*. https://doi.org/10.1108/BL-03-2025-0032

Meredyth, N., & Barrios, P. A. (2026). Ethical considerations for the use of artificial intelligence tools in surgery. *Clinics in Colon and Rectal Surgery*. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-XXXX

Mujiono, & Ticualu, C. (2025). Emerging trends in law and social sciences: Global perspectives on policy, ethics, justice, and institutional reform. International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1(1), 40–60. https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.6

Nnawuchi, U., & George, C. (2025). Decoding accountability: The importance of explainability in liability frameworks for smart border systems. *Discover Computing, 28*(1), 64. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-025-00864-0

Nnawuchi, U., & George, C. (2026). Not knowing, yet living: AI and the modern legal trial of Prometheus in medicine. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (Vol. 16122, pp. 147–159). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-XXXX-X

Nouis, S. C. E., Uren, V., & Jariwala, S. (2025). Evaluating accountability, transparency, and bias in AI-assisted healthcare decision-making: A qualitative study. *BMC Medical Ethics, 26*(1), 89. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-025-01189-7

Olawade, D. B., Plabon, S. B., Ojo, A., Makanjuola, B. D., & Olasilola, O. R. (2026). Human-in-the-loop artificial intelligence in healthcare: Applications, outcomes, and implementation challenges. *International Journal of Medical Informatics, 213*, 106362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2025.106362

Puri, A., Rangra, A., Thakur, V., & Atwal, N. (2025). Outlook on current challenges and future directions. In *Perspectives on artificial intelligence and internet of things for sustainable environment* (pp. 377–401). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-1234-5_15

Purificato, E., Boratto, L., & De Luca, E. W. (2024). Toward a responsible fairness analysis: From binary to multiclass and multigroup assessment. *Minds and Machines, 34*(3), 33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-024-09642-2

Ricciardi Celsi, L., & Zomaya, A. Y. (2025). Perspectives on managing AI ethics in the digital age. *Information, 16*(4), 318. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040318

Scollo, L. (2026). Navigating market abuse in the age of AI: Reimagining criminal responsibility in algorithmic trading. In *Legal protection against financial market abuse* (pp. 82–96).

Shi, C., Yang, C., Fang, Y., Sun, L., & Yu, P. S. (2024). Lecture-style tutorial: Towards graph foundation models. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference* (pp. 1264–1267). https://doi.org/10.1145/3589334.3645472

Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., Tunçalp, Ö., & Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850

Turkbey, B., Huisman, H., Fedorov, A., Tempany, C. M., & Haider, M. A. (2025). Requirements for AI development and reporting for MRI prostate cancer detection in biopsy-naive men. *Radiology, 315*(1), e240140. https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.240140

You, X., Jia, F., Tian, J., Yang, J., & Li, K. (2024). The machine map and its conceptual model. *Journal of Geo-Information Science, 26*(1), 25–34.

Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. J. (2020). *Strengthening legal protection against discrimination by algorithms and artificial intelligence*. **The International Journal of Human Rights,** 24(10), 1572–1593. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2020.1743976

Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. J. (2025). *Discrimination, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic decision-making*. **arXiv.** https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2510.13465