An Overview of Legal Artificial Intelligence Assistants Landscape

Marjan Gusev, Ana Madevska Bogdanova,
Nevena Ackovska, Magdalena Kostoska
Ss Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje
Faculty of Comp. Science and Engineering
Skopje, North Macedonia
{marjan.gushev, ana.madevska, nevena.ackovska,
magdalena.kostoska}@finki.ukim.mk

Dimitar Mileski, Alen Kostov
Innovation Dooel
Skopje, North Macedonia
{dimitar.mileski, alen.kostov}@innovation.dooel

***Abstract*—This survey presents the current landscape of AI legal tools, serving both legal professionals and the general public. It compares existing solutions, while also addressing technological and business challenges that shape their development and use. The findings contribute to a clearer understanding of the role and potential of AI assistants in the legal domain, offering insights relevant to both practitioners and researchers.**

***Index Terms*—LLMs, Legal AI, AI Agents**

I. Introduction

Legal systems are structured around the principles of fairness, transparency, and equal access to justice. Yet in practice, navigating legal procedures often proves prohibitively complex for those without formal legal training or institutional support. Legal information is frequently locked behind paywalls, obscured by technical language, or distributed across fragmented and poorly indexed sources. As a result, both ordinary citizens and small legal practitioners face structural disadvantages when seeking, interpreting, or producing legally relevant information.

At the same time, the legal domain is experiencing a digital transformation. Courts are increasingly publishing decisions online, legal databases are becoming more interoperable, and Artificial Intelligence (AI)-assisted tools are emerging to support tasks such as contract review, legal search, document generation, case analysis, and consultation. Among these developments, large language models (LLMs) represent a particularly significant breakthrough. Their capacity for natural language understanding, summarization, translation, and knowledge synthesis presents a powerful opportunity to reimagine the delivery of legal services.

Several challenges arise when analyzing the European Legislative arena. Each country uses its own legislation and exercises different legal cases, with country- and language-specific nuances. Although these differences present a significant obstacle to realizing a unique system for navigating and searching the legal landscape, LLMs offer good potential to mitigate these issues by establishing a predefined procedure to be used across different countries.

Additional problems are the availability of relevant reference documents. The number of digitized legislative contents to be used for analysis is either inaccessible for older documents and cases, or is in scanned form. Older documents pose additional challenges, as most court cases were developed within legislation valid for the period when the document was produced. However, many legislative documents change over time, and it is a time-consuming task to search all relevant documents and extract the relevant information.

Although not in an indexed and structured organizational form, the good news is that most relevant documents are available from at least the last twenty-five years. The realization of agents utilizing Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) technology, which employs deep learning (DL), enables the generation of human-like text and other content based on the transformer architecture. This technology enables the analysis of these documents and the retrieval of useful information. This means that the legal AI agents will not just search and find relevant content, but also create new content. The requirement is to train the LLM on vast datasets and utilize an advanced neural network (NN) architecture to comprehend the context and relationships within the data. LLMs are enhanced by Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG). This AI technique enables the access and retrieval of relevant, up-to-date external data before generating a response, thereby making their answers more accurate, contextual, and trustworthy without requiring costly retraining. RAGs are specifically querying an external knowledge base to ground answers in specific, current facts.

AI agents are an upgrade of chatbot AI tools, capable of reasoning, planning, learning, and adapting by integrating with tools and accessing data from their environment, enabling them to solve complex, multi-step problems. They are autonomous software systems that use AI to perform tasks and achieve goals with minimal human intervention. Advancements in LLMs hold high potential for the realization of AI agents, particularly when employing sophisticated prompt engineering to produce desired, high-quality, and relevant outputs. These are excellent tools for designing, testing, and refining natural language instructions (prompts) to guide generative AI models, especially LLMs by a creative process of structuring input text, choosing the right words and

This is accepted version. Published version DOI: 10.1109/TELFOR67910.2025.11314289

formats, and often using techniques like providing context, specifying output formats, assigning a role (persona) to the AI, or breaking down complex tasks into smaller steps.

This survey provides an overview of existing tools for legal AI assistants, outlines the motivations and design considerations for the system, and highlights its limitations. Section II explains the background concepts and describes the existing tools. Related work is presented in Section III and use case analysis in Section IV. Section V describes the challenges and limitations. Conclusions and future work plans are lebaorated in Section VI.

II. Background and Existing Tools

A. Legal AI Tools for Professionals

Legal AI tools for professionals streamline workflows by automating document drafting, legal research, case analysis, and predictive insights. They exhibit natural language understanding tailored to legal texts, efficiently handle unstructured data, and provide transparent decision support. A 2025 survey reported that 74% of legal professionals expect to incorporate AI-driven tools within their practice over the next year, reflecting rapid adoption trends [1].

Leading tools include ChatLaw, integrating external knowledge bases [2], LexiLaw for specialized Q&A [3], Luminance AI for contract review [4], and Contract Mill for document revision [5]. These tools enhance efficiency, accuracy, and access to legal services.

Systems such as Westlaw Precision [6], Lexis+ AI [7], Casetext CoCounsel [8], and Harvey AI [9] offer case summarization, argument construction, and legal citation tools. However, these are often closed-source, jurisdiction-bound, and financially inaccessible to small practitioners.

B. Legal AI Tools for the Public

Public access legal AI tools aim to democratize legal information and services by providing easy, affordable, and understandable AI-driven assistance. Platforms like Cicerai [10] offer instant searches of millions of statutes and court opinions, grounding results in reliable legal data. AI Lawyer acts as a personal AI legal assistant, helping consumers with common legal questions and document drafting [11].

Platforms like DoNotPay [12] and JusticeBot [13] help laypeople with specific tasks like appealing tickets or handling rental disputes. These systems provide basic document generation and navigation but may fall into unauthorized practice of law and often lack legal depth.

C. Toward Dual-Use Systems

Few existing platforms attempt to serve both audiences with one architecture.

Dual-use AI systems in the legal domain are designed to serve both legal professionals and the public, balancing specialized legal needs with broad accessibility. These systems provide advanced analytical tools for professionals, such as contract analysis and case prediction, while offering simplified interfaces and guidance for public users seeking legal help. Regulatory frameworks like the EU AI Act emphasize transparency, risk management, and ethical use to ensure safe deployment [14]. Dual-use systems must mitigate risks associated with misuse while maximizing benefits, supported by governance standards addressing fairness, accountability, and compliance with privacy laws.

III. Related Work

JusticeBot [13] is a Canadian legal assistant creation methodology designed to build legal support tools for laypeople. It uses guided interviews and rule-based logic, but current implementations lack full retrieval capabilities and legal reasoning.

ChatLaw [2] is a Chinese AI-legal assistant designed to combat hallucinations typical in LLM technology in the context of Chinese Law. It uses a Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) model and a multi-agent system to enhance the reliability and accuracy of AI-driven legal services.

LawGPT [15] is an open-source legal knowledge-enhanced language model. It involves domain-specific fine-tuning of LLMs on legal corpora to improve performance on citation generation, statutory reasoning, and legal classification tasks.

The current landscape of AI legal assistants includes a range of tools targeted at both professional and consumer users. These platforms differ by pricing model, user scope, and supported use cases. Table I is a comparative overview of some leading offerings.

IV. Use Case Analysis

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools in the legal sector are applied to a range of specific use cases. Each type of task introduces unique requirements in terms of legal risk, output explainability, and interface design, depending on the target user group.

A. Legal Research and Precedent Search

Professionals increasingly use artificial intelligence (AI) to search for precedents and statutes using natural language. Tools such as Westlaw Precision and Lexis+ AI support case summarization, citation graphs, and semantic search. However, hallucinated results remain a major concern, with LLM-based systems producing fabricated responses in approximately 17% of cases using Lexis+AI and ASK practical law, while Westlaw's AI-Assisted Research hallucinated more than 34% of the time. [20].

B. Citation Verification

Citation checking tools such as Casetext CoCounsel help identify incorrect or missing references in legal briefs. These systems reduce clerical error; however, there is limited information available for their efficacy, and they may still suffer from hallucinations if citations are generated without structured retrieval integration. Other AI models such as GPT-3 and GPT-4 are known to include up to 55% in GPT-3 and 24% in GPT-4 errors in citations according to Walters et al. [21] [8].

TABLE I
AN OVERVIEW OF LEADING MARKET OFFERINGS OF AI ASSISTANT TOOLS .

Platform	Pricing	Users	Use Cases
Harvey AI [9]	$ ~1,000 per user per month	Large law firms, in-house counsel	Legal research, contract drafting, document review, internal compliance Q&A
Casetext CoCounsel [8]	$ ~500 per user per month	Small/mid-size firms	Cite checking, brief review, natural language legal search
Lexis+ AI [7]	Enterprise pricing	Law firms, academics, courts	Advanced search, litigation analytics, generative drafting
DoNotPay [12]	~12 per month (consumer)	Individuals, SMBs	Legal form generation, ticket appeals, refund automation
Luminance [16]	Enterprise pricing	Enterprises, legal teams	Contract analytics, due diligence, M&A compliance scanning
Adobe Acrobat AI Assistant [17]	4.99 per month add-on	General professionals	Contract summarization, clause-level change tracking
Ivo AI [18]	Custom enterprise	Fortune 500, corporate counsel	Contract review automation, redlining
Legora [19]	Enterprise (custom)	Law firms	Word-integrated drafting, clause management, model prompts

C. Contract Drafting and Clause Management

Clause-level drafting support is now a common feature in enterprise platforms, including Harvey AI, Ivo AI, and Luminance. These systems assist with redlining, suggesting fallback clauses, and classifying risk. According to BIICL [22], this is fairly common use case for modern legal AI assistants. It demands transparency and human review, especially in high-risk domains like M&A.

D. Document Generation for Laypeople

Systems such as DoNotPay [12] and JusticeBot guide users through document creation for tasks like traffic appeals, rental disputes, or refunds. These interfaces prioritize simplicity and avoid legal complexity. Research suggests that including clarification steps improves trust and factual accuracy [23].

V. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

There are a lot of challenges for developing Legal AI assistants, such as the legal risks, evaluation,

- **Legal Risk**: Output for laypeople must not constitute unauthorized practice of law. Clear disclaimers and guardrails are essential.
- **Model Hallucination**: LLMs can produce fabricated citations or interpretations, especially when retrieval fails.
- **Evaluation**: It is difficult to benchmark legal ”correctness” without human expert annotation.
- **Anonymization**: Personal data may appear in the output, or the system may search for the answer with personal data as input. Since GPT models are pre-trained on documents as they are, including personal information, they are susceptible to generating output that reveals relevant personal information.

The most significant challenge is hallucinations, which happen by generating plausible and false statements that appear to be real. These appear by nature, as they generate creative content from available resources and attempt to fill the gaps of missing content during training. Although RAGs provide a technology to mitigate these issues, confidence remains very low, and users always verify the output validity.

The limitations can be summarized by:

- **Legal Landscape** Legal AI tools likely fall under the “high-risk” category under the EU AI Act [24]. This imposes strict requirements on explainability, audit logging, and data governance.
- **Regulatory Landscape** Data privacy is central. The system must not store personally identifiable data unnecessarily and must allow users to request the deletion or review of their data in accordance with the GDPR [25].

The lack of transparency and explainability into how AI generates content creates vulnerabilities that can deeply harm businesses in profound ways, from losing customer confidence to encountering regulatory penalties or making costly strategic missteps [26]. Essential issues are biased outcomes that lead to discriminatory decisions and violate fairness standards or data privacy regulations.

VI. CONCLUSION

This analysis summarizes the following conclusions about AI assistants involving AI agents and available systems on the market:

- Consumer products (e.g., DoNotPay, Acrobat AI) offer entry-level legal help with intuitive UX and low cost.
- Professional platforms (Harvey, CoCounsel, Luminance) focus on workflow automation, document generation, and legal accuracy, priced accordingly.

- Enterprise integrations often involve fine-tuning with proprietary legal corpora and operate within strict compliance boundaries.
- Most tools are LLM-enhanced and increasingly integrated with Microsoft Word or document management systems.

This survey provides an overview of legal AI assistants that bridge the gap between expert legal research tools and guided, public-facing services. It provides a comparative analysis of existing tools in terms of pricing models, target user groups, and practical applications. Furthermore, the study examines the technological and business-related challenges inherent in their development and deployment, highlighting both the limitations of current approaches and the considerations necessary for their effective integration into the legal domain.

The legal AI assistant landscape integrates various legal AI agents and will continue to evolve into efficient tools for both practitioners and researchers. Since the legislation conforms to a structured organization with strictly defined rules, AI assistants will become highly reliable tools.

REFERENCES

[1] Legal Tech Steering Group. (2025) Ai adoption surges in the legal industry: Key findings from the 2025 secretariat and aceds global artificial intelligence report. Accessed: 2025-09-19. [Online]. Available: https://secretariat-intl.com/insights/ai-adoption-surges-in-the-legal-industry/

[2] J. Cui, M. Ning, Z. Li, B. Chen, Y. Yan, H. Li, B. Ling, Y. Tian, and L. Yuan, "Chatlaw: A multi-agent collaborative legal assistant with knowledge graph enhanced mixture-of-experts large language model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16092*, 2023.

[3] J. Lai, W. Gan, J. Wu, Z. Qi, and P. S. Yu, "Large language models in law: A survey," *AI Open*, vol. 5, pp. 181–196, 2024.

[4] Luminance Legal Group AI. (2025) Legal-grade™ ai - wherever computer meets contract. Accessed: 2025-09-19. [Online]. Available: https://www.luminance.com/

[5] Secretariat Advisors. (2025) Contract mill (no-code / document automation). Accessed: 2025-09-19. [Online]. Available: https://knowledge.lexmundi.com/en/knowledge/contract-mill-no-code-/-document-automation

[6] W. Precision. (2025) Westlaw precision - ai summarization, argument generation and citation tool. Accessed: 2025-06-08. [Online]. Available: https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/

[7] LexisNexis. (2025) Ai legal assistance, search, research and drafting tool. Accessed: 2025-06-08. [Online]. Available: https://www.lexisnexis.com/

[8] Casetext. (2025) Cocounsel - the first ai legal assistant. Accessed: 2025-03-08. [Online]. Available: https://casetext.com/cocounsel

[9] Harvey AI. (2025) Harvey - your ai legal copilot. Accessed: 2025-03-08. [Online]. Available: https://www.harvey.ai

[10] Cicerai. (2025) Ai tools for lawyers: A 2025 playbook for smarter, faster legal work. Accessed: 2025-09-19. [Online]. Available: https://www.cicerai.com/blogs/ai-tools-for-lawyers

[11] AILawyer. (2025) Ai lawyer: your personal legal ai assistant. Accessed: 2025-09-19. [Online]. Available: https://ailawyer.pro/

[12] DoNotPay. (2025) Donotpay - the world's first robot lawyer. Accessed: 2025-03-08. [Online]. Available: https://www.donotpay.com

[13] H. Westermann and K. Benyekhlef, "Justicebot: A methodology for building augmented intelligence tools for laypeople to increase access to justice," in *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 2023, pp. 351–360.

[14] Chambers and Partners. (2025) Artificial Intelligence 2025 - Netherlands. Accessed: 2025-09-19. [Online]. Available: https://practiceguides.chambers.com/practice-guides/artificial-intelligence-2025/netherlands/trends-and-developments/O21090)

[15] Z. Zhou, J.-X. Shi, P.-X. Song, X.-W. Yang, Y.-X. Jin, L.-Z. Guo, and Y.-F. Li, "Lawgpt: A chinese legal knowledge-enhanced large language model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04614*, 2024.

[16] L. T. Ltd. (2025) Luminance - the ai-powered legal document review platform. Accessed: 2025-04-08. [Online]. Available: https://www.luminance.com

[17] A. Inc. (2025) Adobe acrobat ai assistant for contracts. Accessed: 2025-04-08. [Online]. Available: https://www.adobe.com/acrobat/online/ai-assistant.html

[18] I. AI. (2025) Ivo ai - ai contract review and negotiation. Accessed: 2025-06-08. [Online]. Available: https://www.ivo.ai

[19] Legora. (2025) Legora - ai legal assistant and drafting tool. Accessed: 2025-06-08. [Online]. Available: https://www.legora.ai

[20] Stanford HAI. (2024) Ai on trial: Legal models hallucinate in 1 out of 6 (or more) benchmarking queries. Accessed: 2025-08-14. [Online]. Available: https://hai.stanford.edu/news/ai-trial-legal-models-hallucinate-1-out-6-or-more-benchmarking-queries

[21] W. Walters and B. Wilder, "Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by chatgpt," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 14045, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-41032-5

[22] BIICL, "Use of artificial intelligence in legal practice," 2024, british Institute of International and Comparative Law report. [Online]. Available: https://www.biicl.org/documents/170_use_of_artificial_intelligence_in_legal_practice_final.pdf

[23] R. Yao *et al.*, "Intelligent legal assistant: An interactive clarification system for legal question answering," *arXiv preprint*, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.07904

[24] European Parliament and Council, "Regulation (eu) 2024/1689 of 13 june 2024 on artificial intelligence (ai act)," 2024, official Journal of the EU L 2024/1689 of 12 July 2024. Accessed: 2025-08-06. [Online]. Available: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32024R1689

[25] ——, "Regulation (eu) 2016/679 of 27 april 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (general data protection regulation)," 2016, official Journal of the EU L 119/1. Accessed: 2025-08-06. [Online]. Available: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679

[26] Vectara. (2025) The importance of explainability in enterprise rag. Accessed: 2025-09-19. [Online]. Available: https://www.vectara.com/blog/the-importance-of-explainability-in-enterprise-rag