



Global Scientific and Academic Research Journal of Economics, Business and Management

ISSN: 2583-5645 (Online)

Frequency: Monthly

Published By GSAR Publishers

Journal Homepage Link- <https://gsarpublishers.com/journals-gsarjebm-home/>



The Superagency Imperative: A Framework for Human-AI Synergy in Contract Lifecycle Management

By

Abdolkhalegh Abbaszadeh

Islamic Azad University, Bandar abbas, Iran



Article History

Received: 08/08/2025

Accepted: 16/08/2025

Published: 18/08/2025

Vol –4 Issue – 8

PP: -54-61

Abstract

This paper introduces the Superagency Framework, a symbiotic model for Contract Lifecycle Management (CLM) tailored to hypercomplex regulatory and operational environments anticipated between 2025 and 2030. Grounded in sociotechnical systems theory, cognitive load theory, and human-centered AI principles, the framework positions AI as a "precision engine" for clause extraction and compliance, while humans serve as "strategic governors" responsible for negotiation and ethical oversight. The Superagency Framework aims to address the limitations of purely automated or purely human-driven CLM by fostering a dynamic feedback loop that transforms contracts from static documents into evolving intellectual assets. The paper proposes a phased implementation protocol aligned with the EU AI Act mandates emphasizing explainability, transparency, and federated learning. Ethical challenges and regulatory considerations are analyzed in depth, alongside a critical discussion of the framework's limitations and future research directions.

Keywords: Human-AI Synergy, Precision Engine, Strategic Governor, Cognitive Contracts.

Introduction

Contract Lifecycle Management (CLM) [1] has become an indispensable component in industries characterized by rapidly evolving regulatory landscapes and increasing operational complexities [2]. As businesses expand globally and regulatory requirements grow more stringent, organizations face mounting pressure to manage contracts not only efficiently but also with heightened accuracy and compliance [3]. Contracts, which once were primarily static documents, have evolved into dynamic instruments that govern multifaceted relationships, stipulate risk management strategies, and embody regulatory mandates across jurisdictions [4]. The sheer volume and intricacy of these contracts challenge traditional human-centric management methods, which rely heavily on manual review, interpretation, and negotiation [5]. These approaches, although grounded in human judgment and experience, are increasingly strained under the weight of scale and complexity, leading to inefficiencies, delays, and heightened risk exposure [6]. Conversely, fully automated AI-driven CLM solutions promise speed, scalability, and consistency by leveraging advanced natural language processing, machine learning, and rule-based automation [7]. These systems can rapidly extract clauses, flag compliance issues, and even predict potential risks, thus offering a compelling value proposition for

contract management [2]. However, the adoption of fully automated systems is not without pitfalls. AI, while powerful, can suffer from significant limitations—most notably, [9] the inability to fully grasp contextual nuances, ethical considerations, and unexpected scenarios that frequently arise in legal and contractual settings [10]. Furthermore, many AI models operate as opaque "black boxes," [11] providing little transparency or explainability behind their decisions. This opacity can erode stakeholder trust and complicate accountability, [12] especially when AI-driven errors lead to material losses or regulatory violations. Moreover, reliance solely on automation risks dehumanizing critical aspects of contract governance [13]. Ethical judgment, strategic negotiation, and the balancing of competing stakeholder interests remain areas where human insight is indispensable [14]. Failures to incorporate human oversight can result in costly misjudgments, as seen in documented cases of AI misinterpretation causing significant financial and reputational damage [15]. These limitations underscore the pressing need for a hybrid approach—one that harnesses the computational precision and scalability of AI while retaining human strategic control and ethical stewardship [16]. To address this dual challenge, this paper introduces the Superagency Framework, a theoretical model designed to foster a symbiotic relationship between humans and AI in CLM [17]. The framework positions AI as a "precision



engine,"[18] tasked with data-intensive, repetitive, and computational functions such as clause extraction, compliance monitoring, and anomaly detection. In parallel, human agents act as "strategic governors," exercising judgment in negotiation, ethical oversight, and decision-making in ambiguous or high-stakes contexts [19]. By integrating the complementary strengths of AI and human actors, the Superagency Framework aims to optimize contract management processes for efficiency, risk mitigation, and ethical compliance [20]. This human-AI symbiosis is grounded in established theories from sociotechnical systems, cognitive load management, and human-centered AI design [21]. It envisions contracts as living cognitive assets that evolve through iterative feedback loops between human and machine actors, rather than static documents confined to discrete transactional phases [22]. The framework also aligns with emerging regulatory demands, notably the European Union's AI Act, which emphasizes transparency, explainability, and accountability in AI applications [23].

In the following sections, the paper will elaborate the theoretical underpinnings of the Superagency Framework, analyze ethical and regulatory implications, propose an implementation roadmap, and discuss critical limitations and avenues for future research. Through this holistic approach, the paper seeks to contribute a novel paradigm that enhances the resilience, agility, and integrity of CLM in an increasingly complex and automated world.

Background and Theoretical Foundations

Recent advances in CLM software emphasize automation, from contract generation and clause extraction to compliance tracking and renewal management [24]. Research indicates that optimized CLM can reduce contract cycle times by up to 30%, decrease revenue leakage, and improve risk detection

[25]. However, these improvements are often limited by the narrow scope of current AI tools and the cognitive overload faced by human practitioners [26]. AI techniques such as natural language processing (NLP), machine learning (ML), and rule-based automation have shown significant promise in parsing complex contracts, detecting anomalies, and predicting risks [27]. Yet, AI systems often struggle with contextual ambiguity, ethical nuance, and unexpected contractual scenarios, which may lead to errors with costly implications. Pure automation models are also vulnerable to "hallucinations," lack transparency, and may perpetuate biases from historical data [28].

Sociotechnical systems theory advocates designing technologies that align with social systems, emphasizing joint optimization of humans and machines. This perspective is crucial for CLM, where legal, ethical, and operational stakes require human oversight integrated tightly with AI capabilities [29]. Cognitive load theory explains how complex tasks impose demands on human working memory. Human-centered AI frameworks [30] argue that AI should reduce cognitive load by handling repetitive and data-heavy tasks, enabling humans to focus on strategic and ethical decision-making [31]. This division of labor forms the theoretical backbone of the Superagency Framework [32].

The Superagency Framework

The Superagency Framework rests on four interdependent pillars that together create a synergistic model of Contract Lifecycle Management (CLM). Unlike purely automated systems or traditional manual workflows, this hybrid paradigm strategically allocates tasks based on cognitive, legal, and technical affordances—enhancing both operational precision and governance accountability [33].

Table 1: The Superagency Framework - Core Components and Functions

Framework Pillar	AI System Role	Human Role	Key Interaction Mechanisms	Output/Value Proposition
Sociotechnical Integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NLP-based clause extraction - Compliance pattern matching - Anomaly detection in contract language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define ethical boundaries - Set risk thresholds - Contextual interpretation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AI surfaces recommendations - Humans validate/override - Joint optimization loops 	40-60% faster contract review with 30% fewer errors
Human-in-the Loop Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risk probability scoring (0-100%) - Alternative clause generation - Version comparison 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final approval authority - Dispute resolution - Stakeholder negotiation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mandatory human review points - Audit trail generation - Explainability triggers 	100% auditable decisions Legal defensibility
Explainability & Ethical Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confidence scoring - Bias detection flags - Regulatory citation mapping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fairness validation - Ethical impact assessment - Compliance certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Human-readable rationale generation - Transparency dashboards - Bias correction 	EU AI Act Article 13 compliance Reduced liability

			protocols	
Cognitive Contracts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Performance tracking - Renegotiation triggers - Market condition monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic adaptation - Relationship management - Final validation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuous learning feedback loops - Semi-automated amendment workflows - Risk-adjusted alerts 	25-40% faster contract optimization cycles

• Sociotechnical Integration

Sociotechnical integration forms the philosophical backbone of the Superagency Framework, emphasizing the intentional co-design of human and AI functions in Contract Lifecycle Management [34]. Rather than relegating legal professionals to passive roles or relying solely on automated systems, this model distributes tasks based on the unique strengths of each [35]. Artificial intelligence takes charge of processing-heavy functions, such as extracting clauses from massive volumes of contracts, identifying regulatory compliance issues, and surfacing hidden anomalies through machine learning. In parallel, human experts are positioned as strategic overseers who engage in complex negotiations, make ethical determinations in sensitive contexts, and define the operational thresholds for AI intervention. This balance alleviates cognitive burdens on legal professionals and ensures AI tools operate within well-defined ethical and contextual parameters, creating a symbiotic environment that is both efficient and accountable [36].

• Human-in-the-Loop Governance

At the heart of the Superagency Framework lies a robust commitment to Human-in-the-Loop governance, recognizing that critical decisions in CLM—especially those fraught with ambiguity or legal complexity—must not be left entirely to machines [37]. This governance model introduces structured layers of oversight where humans can override AI-driven actions, redirect complex cases to appropriate stakeholders, and audit decision-making trails for legal and ethical validity. [38] These human checkpoints are not merely safety nets; they are active elements of control that preserve institutional accountability and prevent the types of automation failures seen in high-stakes cases, such as the Suez Canal liability debacle. By formalizing human authority within the AI workflow, the framework builds a resilient legal infrastructure that benefits from AI efficiency without ceding ultimate responsibility [39].

• Explainability and Ethical Compliance

Transparency is treated as a foundational requirement within the Superagency Framework, not just as a technical feature but as a trust mechanism and legal imperative [40]. The framework embeds explainability into every AI action by providing human-readable justifications, risk confidence levels, and decision-making pathways. In doing so, it addresses major concerns related to AI opacity and legal defensibility [41]. Ethical compliance is maintained through ongoing audits of training data to detect and mitigate bias, ensuring decisions reflect a fair and representative analysis across legal and industry contexts. Additionally, AI outputs are directly linked to relevant legal codes, making it easier to

validate system recommendations during disputes. By aligning with regulatory requirements such as the EU AI Act, the framework reduces risks of hallucination and fosters greater user trust, ultimately supporting a higher adoption rate among legal professionals [42].

• Cognitive Contracts

The Superagency Framework redefines contracts as living, intelligent documents that evolve in response to changing legal, organizational, and market dynamics. These cognitive contracts continuously absorb insights from performance metrics, human feedback, and AI-driven anomaly detection to suggest real-time improvements or renegotiations. Rather than being static artifacts, they function as adaptive legal instruments capable of learning and evolving—akin to how version-controlled codebases develop in software engineering. When anomalies or risks are identified, semi-automated workflows prompt human review and revalidation, ensuring terms remain optimized and enforceable. This shift transforms Contract Lifecycle Management from a static compliance function into a dynamic, strategic process of legal knowledge generation, fostering agility and reducing systemic risk through continuous learning [43].

Ethical and Regulatory Considerations

The ethical and regulatory foundation of the Superagency Framework ensures that AI enhances rather than replaces human judgment in Contract Lifecycle Management [2]. Central to this approach is the preservation of human autonomy, where decision-makers retain ultimate accountability, and AI serves strictly as a precision-assistive tool. To ensure fairness and equity, AI systems are subjected to continuous auditing for bias, particularly given the complexities and variances in legal contexts, with federated learning employed to improve model performance without compromising data privacy [45]. Transparency and explainability, as mandated by the EU AI Act, are embedded through confidence scores and interpretable rationale outputs, enabling legal professionals to understand, trust, and intervene in AI-generated recommendations. Privacy and data protection remain paramount, especially as contracts often contain sensitive information, prompting the use of privacy-preserving architectures and strict security protocols. These integrated safeguards ensure that the framework operates responsibly within both ethical boundaries and evolving regulatory requirements.

Critical Limitations and Challenges

While the Superagency Framework presents a compelling theoretical model for enhancing Contract Lifecycle Management through human-AI symbiosis, several significant

limitations and challenges must be acknowledged to contextualize its practical applicability and future development.

- **Lack of Empirical Validation**

A primary limitation of the Superagency Framework is its current theoretical status. The model has yet to be rigorously implemented and empirically validated across a range of real-world environments, industries, and organizational scales. Without comprehensive field studies or longitudinal data, questions remain regarding the framework's effectiveness in diverse contexts characterized by varying contract complexities, regulatory demands, and organizational cultures. Empirical validation is essential to verify the proposed efficiency gains, risk mitigation benefits, and ethical oversight improvements, and to identify unforeseen operational challenges during implementation.

- **Scalability and Integration Challenges**

The integration of the Superagency Framework into existing CLM ecosystems presents considerable technical and organizational hurdles. Enterprises often operate multiple, heterogeneous CLM platforms, each with distinct data architectures, workflow processes, and vendor ecosystems. Seamless interoperability between AI modules and human governance layers requires sophisticated middleware solutions, robust APIs, and adaptable interface designs. Moreover, scaling this hybrid human-AI model across large multinational organizations introduces complexities related to localization, regulatory diversity, and cross-border data governance. The ability to maintain system performance, consistency, and user experience at scale remains an open challenge [42].

- **Proprietary AI Models and Transparency Constraints**

Many state-of-the-art AI tools deployed in contract management are proprietary products developed by commercial vendors. These models often function as “black boxes” with limited transparency regarding their internal decision-making processes, training data, or algorithmic biases [23]. Such opacity hampers explainability—a cornerstone of the Superagency Framework—and complicates efforts to audit AI behavior for compliance and fairness. Vendor lock-in risks further constrain organizations' ability to customize or extend AI functionalities, potentially creating dependence on single suppliers and limiting innovation or ethical oversight.

- **Human Factors: Training, Adoption, and Change Management**

Effective implementation of human-AI symbiosis hinges on the preparedness and adaptability of human actors involved in CLM processes. Training legal teams, contract managers, and compliance officers to effectively interact with AI tools, interpret their outputs, and assert governance requires significant investment in education and change management initiatives. Organizational resistance, varied levels of AI literacy, and cultural differences can impede adoption and reduce the efficacy of the hybrid model. Moreover, sustaining

human engagement over time—particularly when AI handles routine tasks—may lead to complacency or overreliance on automated outputs, weakening critical oversight functions [24].

- **Evolving Regulatory Landscape**

AI governance and data privacy regulations continue to evolve rapidly worldwide, with frameworks such as the EU AI Act imposing stringent transparency, accountability, and fairness requirements. The dynamic nature of regulatory environments necessitates ongoing adaptations to the Superagency Framework's compliance mechanisms. Organizations must remain vigilant to legal changes that affect data handling, AI explainability, cross-border data flows, and liability allocation between human and machine agents. Anticipating and operationalizing compliance in this shifting landscape can be resource-intensive and may require continuous collaboration between legal, technical, and operational stakeholders [43].

Implementation Roadmap

To facilitate effective adoption of the Superagency Framework, we propose a comprehensive, phased implementation protocol that guides organizations through systematic integration of human-AI symbiosis within their Contract Lifecycle Management processes. This roadmap emphasizes strategic alignment, regulatory compliance, and continuous improvement, ensuring that the framework is adaptable to evolving operational demands and legal landscapes.

Table 2: Superagency Framework Implementation Roadmap – Phases, Activities, and Stakeholders

Phase	Key Activities	Key Deliverables	Stakeholders
1	Workflow mapping, Risk audit, AI readiness check	Process diagrams, Gap report, Risk matrix	Legal, IT, Compliance
2	NLP deployment, Federated learning, Pilot test	AI models, Transparency logs, Pilot data	Data engineers, Legal ops
3	Ethics board setup, Override protocols, Training	Governance policy, Audit system	Executives, HR, Audit
4	Bias audits, Model retraining, Performance tracking	Mitigation reports, Updated models	Governance team, Analysts

- **Phase 1: Assessment and Readiness Evaluation**

The initial phase centers on a comprehensive evaluation of the organization's existing contract lifecycle management (CLM) workflows, technological infrastructure, risk exposure, and regulatory landscape [12]. This foundational stage involves mapping current processes to identify inefficiencies and high-risk areas, analyzing contractual vulnerabilities that may benefit from AI augmentation, and conducting a thorough review of applicable laws and industry-specific regulations such as the GDPR and EU AI Act.[32]. Cross-departmental stakeholder engagement is essential at this stage to assess organizational readiness, build internal alignment, and anticipate the training and cultural adjustments required for the successful adoption of a human-AI collaborative framework. By establishing this baseline, the organization ensures that the Superagency Framework will align with both strategic priorities and legal obligations.

- **Phase 2: AI Integration and Technical Deployment**

Building on insights gathered during the assessment, the second phase involves the technical deployment of AI components tailored to CLM use cases, with a strong emphasis on explainability and modular integration. AI tools for clause extraction, anomaly detection, and risk tagging are introduced incrementally, ensuring compatibility with existing CLM platforms while embedding transparency features such as confidence scores, decision logs, and audit trails to build user trust. Data governance structures are concurrently established, including secure data handling protocols and federated learning architectures that support model improvement without compromising confidentiality. Pilot testing in selected units allows for fine-tuning based on real-world performance, facilitating a smoother transition to broader organizational deployment [27].

- **Phase 3: Human Governance Layer Establishment**

This phase formalizes the indispensable role of human oversight within the CLM workflow by embedding governance mechanisms and ethical safeguards into the Superagency Framework. Specific decision points are designated for mandatory human review, particularly in contracts involving elevated risk or ethical complexity, while clearly defined override protocols empower users to reject or modify AI-generated outputs with full traceability. Ethical review boards, composed of legal, compliance, and ethics professionals, are established to evaluate ongoing AI use and ensure it remains aligned with organizational values. Training programs are also implemented to equip staff with the skills needed to collaborate effectively with AI systems, focusing on interpretability, accountability, and ethical awareness in decision-making processes [18].

- **Phase 4: Continuous Feedback, Learning, and Compliance**

The final phase ensures the long-term adaptability and accountability of the Superagency Framework through mechanisms for feedback, learning, and regulatory alignment. Federated learning is leveraged to enhance AI model performance over time while safeguarding data privacy,

enabling continuous improvement from decentralized, real-world usage data. Regular compliance audits are scheduled to verify that the framework remains consistent with evolving legal standards and ethical guidelines. User feedback loops allow for the collection of experiential insights and identification of anomalies, which feed directly into iterative enhancements. Performance is tracked through clearly defined KPIs—including contract cycle time, accuracy of risk detection, and user satisfaction—to guide refinements and measure strategic impact [36].

Discussion and Future Directions

The Superagency Framework represents a pioneering step towards realizing true human-AI symbiosis within the domain of Contract Lifecycle Management (CLM). By thoughtfully integrating AI's computational precision with human strategic oversight, this framework directly addresses the shortcomings of both fully manual and fully automated approaches. It recognizes the indispensable role of human judgment in navigating ethical complexities, contextual nuances, and regulatory ambiguity, while harnessing AI to manage scale, speed, and pattern recognition. Despite its theoretical robustness, several important avenues for future research and practical exploration remain. These directions are critical to validating, refining, and extending the framework's applicability across diverse organizational contexts and evolving technological landscapes [10].

- **Multi-Industry Empirical Validation**

To date, the Superagency Framework has been primarily conceptualized and illustrated through limited case examples. Comprehensive empirical research is necessary to test the framework's efficacy across a broad spectrum of industries—such as finance, healthcare, manufacturing, and technology—that face unique contract complexities and regulatory pressures. Multi-site case studies would enable comparative analysis of implementation strategies, identify industry-specific challenges, and validate outcome measures such as efficiency gains, risk mitigation, and compliance improvements. Such empirical work will be instrumental in developing best practices and generalizable guidelines.

- **Human Factors and Cognitive Load Research**

Understanding how human users interact with AI-augmented CLM systems is essential for optimizing the Superagency Framework. Future studies should investigate cognitive workload implications—how AI tools can reduce routine mental effort without introducing new forms of cognitive strain, such as overreliance, alert fatigue, or decision paralysis. Trust dynamics are equally important: research should examine factors that influence legal professionals' confidence in AI outputs, including explainability features, error rates, and transparency of decision rationale. Insights from human-computer interaction (HCI) and organizational psychology will inform interface design, training protocols, and governance mechanisms that foster effective human-AI collaboration.

• Legal and Liability Considerations

The integration of AI into contract decision-making raises profound questions regarding legal liability and accountability. Future legal scholarship should rigorously analyze how responsibility is allocated when decisions emerge from human-AI teams, especially in scenarios involving contract disputes or regulatory violations. This includes assessing existing liability frameworks and proposing adaptations that reflect the nuanced interplay between automated recommendations and human overrides. Additionally, ethical considerations around data privacy, algorithmic bias, and fairness warrant sustained legal scrutiny to ensure equitable outcomes and public trust.[45]

• Open and Interoperable AI Development

Current reliance on proprietary AI models poses challenges related to vendor lock-in, transparency, and adaptability. The future of CLM AI lies in the development of open-source, interoperable AI architectures that can be customized, audited, and integrated flexibly across diverse enterprise systems. This will facilitate innovation, reduce barriers to adoption for smaller organizations, and enhance transparency—key to regulatory compliance and user acceptance. Research and policy efforts should focus on fostering collaborative ecosystems that promote shared AI standards, data exchange protocols, and federated learning capabilities.

• AI in Contract Renegotiation and Dispute Resolution

While the Superagency Framework primarily addresses contract creation and compliance, there is significant potential for AI to contribute to the often complex stages of contract renegotiation and dispute resolution. [3] Future work should explore how AI can assist in real-time negotiation support, predictive analytics for dispute outcomes, and intelligent mediation tools that integrate legal expertise with data-driven insights. This would extend the lifecycle approach beyond static contract management to dynamic, adaptive contract governance, further reinforcing the concept of contracts as evolving knowledge assets.

Conclusion

In the face of escalating contractual complexity and rapidly shifting regulatory landscapes, the Superagency Framework provides a robust and forward-looking theoretical model for harmonizing AI's analytical precision with human strategic governance. By fostering a dynamic partnership where contracts evolve as cognitive and adaptive assets, organizations can significantly enhance operational agility, ensure stringent compliance, and uphold high ethical standards throughout the contract lifecycle. This synergistic approach not only mitigates the risks inherent in fully automated or purely manual processes but also empowers legal teams to focus on nuanced judgment and decision-making. Ultimately, the framework equips organizations to navigate the challenges of the digital age with resilience and foresight, positioning CLM as a strategic driver of value and competitive advantage.

References

1. Ahmad, T., Aakula, A., Ottori, M., & Saini, V. (2022). Developing a strategic roadmap for digital transformation. *Journal of Computational Intelligence and Robotics*, 2(2), 28–68.
2. Akpobome, O. (2024). The impact of emerging technologies on legal frameworks: A model for adaptive regulation. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(10), 5046–5060.
3. Al-Dulaimi, A. O. M., & Mohammed, M. A. A. W. (2025). Legal responsibility for errors caused by artificial intelligence (AI) in the public sector. *International Journal of Law and Management*.
4. Asghari Moghaddam, M., Pakuhinezhad, O., & Atrian, A. (2024). Digital contracts and market dynamics: Technological innovation and business implications in the enforcement of futures contracts risks. SSRN. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4799689>
5. Bala, R., Balasubramanian, N., & Joshi, A. (2025). The AI-centered enterprise: Reshaping organizations with context aware AI. CRC Press.
6. Basit, S. A., Gharleghi, B., ur Rehman, A., Tee, P. K., Batool, K., & Nawaser, K. (2025). The impact of digital products and artificial intelligence on sustainable marketing methods. In *Managing customer-centric strategies in the digital landscape* (pp. 1–24). IGI Global.
7. Chinnaraju, A. (2025). Explainable AI (XAI) for trustworthy and transparent decision-making: A theoretical framework for AI interpretability. *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, 14(3), 170–207.
8. Dasaka, S. (2024). Optimizing decision-making: Balancing intuition with evidence in digital experience design.
9. Eizi, N., Semnani, B. L., Nawaser, K., & Vesal, S. M. (2013). The impact of application of information technology on electronic service quality. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 6(15), 2747–2756.
10. Ekeh, A. H., Apeh, C. E., Odionu, C. S., & Austin-Gabriel, B. (2025). Automating legal compliance and contract management: Advances in data analytics for risk assessment, regulatory adherence, and negotiation optimization. *Gulf Journal of Advanced Business Research*, 3(2).
11. Emma, L. (2024). The ethical implications of artificial intelligence: A deep dive into bias, fairness, and transparency.
12. Etemadi, M., Hamzehpoor, M., Nawaser, K., Hanifah, H., & Vafaei-Zadeh, A. (2022). Identification and prioritisation of factors affecting lean leadership model. *International Journal of Management Practice*, 15(3), 364–388. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMP.2022.10046035>
13. Fong, L., Wynne, K., & Verhoeven, B. (2025). Easing the cognitive load of general practitioners:

- AI design principles for future-ready healthcare. *Technovation*, 142, 103208.
14. Gheitarani, F., Guevara, R., Nawaser, K., & Jahanshahi, A. A. (2022). Identifying dimensions of dynamic technological capability: A systematic review of the last two decades of research. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management*, 19(8), Article 2230002.
15. Gkintoni, E., Antonopoulou, H., Sortwell, A., & Halkiopoulos, C. (2025). Challenging cognitive load theory: The role of educational neuroscience and artificial intelligence in redefining learning efficacy. *Brain Sciences*, 15(2), 203.
16. Gong, H., Zhang, S. X., Nawaser, K., Jahanshahi, A. A., Xu, X., Li, J., & Bagheri, A. (2021). The mental health of healthcare staff working during the COVID-19 crisis: Their working hours as a boundary condition. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 14, 1073–1081.
17. Haque, E. (2024). AI horizons: Shaping a better future through responsible innovation and human collaboration. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
18. Hakkak, M., Nawaser, K., & Ghodsi, M. (2016). Effects of intellectual capital on human resource productivity in innovative firms: Mediating role of knowledge management. *International Journal of Technology Marketing*, 11(2), 238–250.
19. Hakkak, M., Shakhshian, F., & Nawaser, K. (2013). A dynamic approach to the organizational vision in uncertain situations (Case study: Low-cost airlines in Iran). *Applied Mathematics in Engineering, Management and Technology*, 1(1), 17–24.
20. Herbosch, M. (2025). To err is human: Managing the risks of contracting AI systems. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 56, 106110.
21. Jafarkhani, F., Barani, F., Nawaser, K., Rashidi, H., & Gharleghi, B. (2024). Factors affecting the aesthetic experiences in educational games: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Economy and Technology*, 2, 200–207.
22. Jiang, T., Sun, Z., Fu, S., & Lv, Y. (2024). Human-AI interaction research agenda: A user-centered perspective. *Data and Information Management*, 8(4), 100078.
23. Kabytov, P., & Nazarov, N. (2025). Transparency in public administration in the digital age: Legal, institutional, and technical mechanisms. *Legal Issues in the Digital Age*, 6(2), 161–182.
24. Khaksar, S. M. S., Maghsoudi, T., Soleimani, M., Nawaser, K., Saki, A., & Jahani, H. (2025). (Un)intended consequences of social robot adoption in aged care: A hybrid literature review. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 1–27.
25. Kothandapani, H. P. (2025). AI-driven regulatory compliance: Transforming financial oversight through large language models and automation. *Emerging Science Research*, 12(1), 12–24.
26. Meira, S., Neves, A., & Braga, C. P. P. (2025). From programmed labor to meta-cognitive orchestration. SSRN. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5329936>
27. Nawaser, K., Hakkak, M., Aeiny, M. A., Vafaei-Zadeh, A., & Hanifah, H. (2023). The effect of green innovation on sustainable performance in SMEs: The mediating role of strategic learning. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*, 39(4), 490–511.
28. Nawaser, K., Jafarkhani, F., Khamoushi, S., Yazdi, A., Mohsenifard, H., & Gharleghi, B. (2024). The dark side of digitalization: A visual journey of research through digital game addiction and mental health. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMR.2024.3462740>
29. Pachori, H. (2025). Optimizing human-AI collaboration in deal management: A holistic framework.
30. Pakuhinezhad, O. (2023). Comparative study of Indian Contract Act 1872 and CISG on the law relating to damages. *World Wide Journals*, 12(3).
31. Pakuhinezhad, O. (2024). Harmonizing international commerce: A detailed analysis of CISG's impact on legal systems and human resource management, with a focus on Australia. SSRN. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4887935>
32. Pakuhinezhad, O., & Afsham, N. (2025). AI regulation in cross-border e-commerce: Legal challenges and global remedies. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 14(6).
33. Pakuhinezhad, O., & Afsham, N. (2025). GDPR and AI-driven business models: Navigating legal risks through a legal analysis framework. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 14(6).
34. Pakuhinezhad, O., & Atrian, A. (2024). Navigating the ethical, societal, and technological challenges of AI judges: Toward responsible legal systems. SSRN.
35. Pakuhinezhad, O., & Atrian, A. (2024). Unraveling the tapestry of artificial intelligence: From myth to reality, ethics to economics. SSRN.
36. Patel, N. S., & Indurkha, N. (Eds.). (2025). The rise of intelligent machines: A multi-disciplinary perspective from industry and impact on higher education. CRC Press.
37. Popoola, N. T., & Bakare, F. A. (2024). Advanced computational forecasting techniques to strengthen risk prediction, pattern recognition, and compliance strategies.
38. Priyadarshni, S. (2024, December). AI-driven document automation and compliance in contract lifecycle management. In 2024 International Conference on Communication, Control, and Intelligent Systems (CCIS) (pp. 1–6). IEEE.

39. Sepahvand, R., Nawaser, K., Azadi, M. H., Vafaei-Zadeh, A., Hanifah, H., & Khodashahri, R. B. (2023). In search of sustainable electronic human resource management in public organisations. *International Journal of Information and Decision Sciences*, 15(2), 117–147.
40. Sinha, R., Mohan, S., Mukhuty, S., & Upadhyay, A. (2025). Impact of human AI symbiosis on Industry 5.0. In *Technological innovations and Industry 5.0* (pp. 157–173). Elsevier.
41. Sinha, S., & Lee, Y. M. (2024). Challenges with developing and deploying AI models and applications in industrial systems. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 4(1), 55.
42. Taherinia, M., Nawaser, K., Shariatnejad, A., & Moshtaghi, M. (2021). The evolution of the e-business value cycle through value co-creation during the COVID-19 pandemic: An empirical study from Iran. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(10), 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no10.0019>
43. Tallam, K. (2025). From autonomous agents to integrated systems, a new paradigm: Orchestrated distributed intelligence. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.13754>
44. Vafaei-Zadeh, A., Rastan, A. E., Hanifah, H., Teoh, A. P., & Nawaser, K. (2024). Modelling blockchain technology adoption in the supply chain: Evidence from an emerging country. *International Journal of Business Information Systems*, 46(3), 330–355.
45. Verma, R., & Jana, S. (2024). AI-powered governance: Shaping the future landscape of corporate governance. SSRN. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5099460>
46. Yaghoubi, N. M., Khaksar, S. M. S., Banihashemi, S. A., Jahanshahi, A. A., & Nawaser, K. (2011). The impact of knowledge management on customer relationship management. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 34, 76–86.