



**EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL**  
by European Scientific Institute



**Paper: “The EU AI Act, Lethal Autonomous Weapons, and the Imperative for Human-Centric AI”**

**Submitted: 24 February 2026**

**Accepted: 10 March 2026**

**Published: 31 March 2026**

Corresponding Author: Eirini Dellagrammatika Bizmpiki

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n8p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ricardo Furfaro  
University of Business & Social Sciences, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Elia Fiorenza  
University of Calabria, Italy

Reviewer 3: Shery Boushra Tamer Arsanious  
Helwan University, Egypt

Reviewer 4: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes, the title is clear and is aligned to the article.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.**

Yes, the abstract meets the guidelines. The abstract clearly introduces the topic and situates the paper within the legal and ethical debate surrounding Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems and the EU AI Act.

Minor elements for the author to consider.

"autonomous robotic systems face difficulty adhering to the principle of distinction." This is a normative assumption, not an established fact, the author may consider a more neutral phrasing.

The abstract frames the EU AI Act military exclusion as a "significant regulatory gap". That is defensible, but it is also a policy choice because military authority remains with member states (TEU Article 4(2)). The author may consider a more neutral phrasing.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Minor editorial improvements may strengthen clarity, including correction of a missing sentence break and simplification of citation formatting.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The analytical approach of the study appears to be primarily a legal and policy analysis of the EU AI Act and relevant International Humanitarian Law principles. While this approach is generally clear from the discussion, the article may benefit from briefly clarifying the methodological framework used to examine regulatory gaps and governance implications. Explicitly identifying the study as a doctrinal legal or policy analysis could improve transparency regarding how conclusions are derived.

**The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

The discussion of the EU AI Act, International Humanitarian Law principles, and the governance implications of Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems is coherent and internally consistent. The claims made are interpretive rather than empirical and fall within the scope of normative legal review.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion accurately summarizes the main arguments presented in the article and is consistent with the discussion throughout. The final section reiterates the key points regarding the regulatory gap created by the exclusion of military AI from the EU AI Act, the challenges autonomous systems pose to International Humanitarian Law principles such as distinction and proportionality, and the need for stronger governance mechanisms for Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems. These conclusions are supported by the legal and policy analysis developed in the earlier sections of the article.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references cited in the article are valid and relevant to the topic.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
4

*Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The author has created a well thought out and timely article. One final observation. The discussion of geopolitical competition and regulatory fragmentation provides a useful overview of the differing national approaches to military AI governance. Given that the article references the United States and China as major actors in the development of military AI, the analysis may benefit from briefly clarifying that regulatory divergence may also reflect differing governance philosophies rather than simply regulatory absence. For example, the European Union's human-centric regulatory tradition tends to emphasize precautionary governance, explainability, and the preservation of human judgment in decision-making processes. By contrast, the policy discourse in the United States has historically emphasized operational performance, testing, and accountability structures designed to validate system behavior under real-world conditions.

In this context, U.S. governance discussions often frame the challenge less as regulating the intelligence of autonomous systems and more as establishing operational constraints, authorization structures, and accountability mechanisms for their use. As a result, what may appear as regulatory fragmentation may also reflect differing institutional approaches to risk

management and technological governance. A brief acknowledgement of these differing regulatory traditions could strengthen the manuscript's geopolitical analysis and help explain why achieving international consensus on LAWS governance has proven difficult despite shared concerns regarding compliance with International Humanitarian Law. The following is an article that highlights the differences between the US and the EU.  
<https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/autonomous-weapons-and-operational-risk>

---

---

Reviewer B:  
Recommendation: Accept Submission

---

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

1. Title, Abstract, and KeywordsRating: ExcellentComments: The title is clear and effectively captures the three pillars of the research: the regulatory framework (EU AI Act), the technological subject (LAWS), and the ethical goal (Human-Centric AI). The abstract provides a concise summary of the regulatory gap in Article of the EU AI Act and the resulting challenges to International Humanitarian Law (IHL). Keywords are highly relevant and aligned with current academic and legal discourse.
2. IntroductionRating: GoodComments: The introduction successfully sets the stage by describing the "Fourth Industrial Revolution" and the dual-use nature of AI. It clearly identifies the central problem: that while AI offers strategic optimization, it simultaneously outpaces existing regulatory mechanisms. The author's thesis—arguing for an integrated governance framework to mitigate risks—is well-defined early on.
3. Theoretical Framework and Literature ReviewRating: GoodComments: The manuscript effectively integrates key legal doctrines, such as the Martens Clause and the Principle of Analogy in Public International Law. It also addresses the critical distinction between "automation" (fixed sequences) and "autonomy" (independent target selection). The inclusion of psychological concepts like "automation bias" adds a necessary multidisciplinary layer to the legal analysis.
4. Analysis of the EU AI Act and Military ExclusionRating: ExcellentComments: This section provides a strong legal critique of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689. The author correctly identifies that Article excludes military applications based on TEU Article , which protects national security as a Member State prerogative. The argument that this creates a "regulatory void" affecting collective security in an era of converging technologies is a compelling and timely observation.
5. Ethical and Legal Argumentation (IHL)Rating: ExcellentComments: The author provides a robust analysis of how LAWS challenge the "jus in bello" principles of distinction and proportionality. The argument that algorithms lack the empathy and moral reasoning required to differentiate between combatants and civilians is well-supported. Furthermore, the discussion on the "accountability gap" created by "human-off-the-loop" systems is handled with significant depth.
6. Geopolitical Context and Strategic RisksRating: GoodComments: The manuscript provides

necessary context regarding the AI arms race between major powers like the U.S. and China. By referencing ongoing conflicts in Ukraine and Gaza, the author demonstrates that the risks of autonomous force are no longer theoretical but are "urgent realities". This grounds the legal theory in contemporary global events.

7. Recommendations and ConclusionRating: GoodComments: The recommendations are concrete and actionable. Specifically, the call for meaningful human oversight, the prohibition of "black box" models in military contexts, and the creation of a permanent international governance body for LAWS provide a clear path forward. Mentioning Greece's potential role in balancing these regulations adds a specific regional perspective to the broader EU framework.

8. Language and FormatRating: ExcellentComments: The manuscript is written in sophisticated, academic prose. It adheres to a logical structure, moving from specific legislation to broad ethical concerns and ending with policy solutions. Citations are used appropriately to support complex legal claims.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.**

Objectives: The abstract clearly identifies the goal of investigating the regulatory gap created by the exclusion of military applications from the EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689). It also sets out to analyze how the shift to full autonomy challenges International Humanitarian Law (IHL).

Methods: The study utilizes a qualitative and analytical approach, examining the transition from automation to full algorithmic autonomy. It further evaluates strategic implications like automation bias and the erosion of human judgment.

Results/Findings: The abstract highlights that the current fragmentation and the "human-off-the-loop" capability transfer critical moral decisions to mathematical algorithms. It notes that this transition renders the attribution of responsibility for collateral damage exceptionally difficult.

Conclusions: The author concludes that there is an urgent need for a unified international governance body. This is presented as the necessary solution to ensure that rapid technological evolution does not supersede existing ethical and legal frameworks.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

No, Grammatical errors or spelling mistakes

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes, Methods explained clearly

**The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

Yes, Results are clear and do not contain errors

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Yes, The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes, The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
4

*Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please ensure that the Greek national oversight mechanism mentioned in the conclusion is clearly linked to the broader "unified European standard" to maximize the paper's appeal to an international readership.

The Impact of AI on Decision-Making and the Erosion of Human Judgment:

The impact of AI extends beyond the battlefield to fundamentally reshape decision-making processes, particularly in the critical pre-conflict phase. However, this integration introduces "structural risks," where AI systems both shape and are shaped by the competitive military environments in which they are deployed, potentially influencing national interests and strategic trajectories.

A significant concern is "automation bias," the human tendency to over-rely on or uncritically accept AI-generated outputs. This phenomenon can lead to misinterpretations of complex or ambiguous data, where unchecked algorithmic errors could escalate situations with widespread, unintended consequences. Furthermore, military AI models often suffer from inherent biases derived from flawed training data, opacity (the "black box" problem), and instability in changing data patterns.

These limitations can result in an inaccurate portrayal of reality, potentially leading decision-makers to resort to force rather than peaceful conflict resolution. The superior processing speed of AI may also blur the line between truly "optimal" strategies and those that merely "satisfice" based on quantifiable data, overlooking crucial non-quantifiable factors like cultural context or human psychology. This can be particularly dangerous in scenarios requiring the interpretation

of "dual signaling" from adversaries, where an AI's misinterpretation could lead to catastrophic escalation.

#### Algorithmic Impact on International Law:

This algorithmic shift profoundly impacts the dual pillars of international law: jus ad bellum and jus in bello.

**Jus ad bellum (The right to war):** The reliance on AI for strategic early-warning and threat assessments introduces structural risks where automation bias may lower the threshold for conflict. If AI models misinterpret "dual-signaling" from an adversary, they may provide recommendations favoring coercive measures over diplomacy, risking a violation of the prohibition on the threat or use of force under of the UN Charter.

**Jus in bello (The law in war):** The deployment of Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS) directly challenges adherence to principles such as distinction and proportionality. Algorithms, despite their data-processing speed, struggle with the evaluative judgment required to distinguish between combatants and civilians in complex human environments, and to conduct the context-dependent, value-based balancing act of proportionality.

#### Geopolitical Competition and the Fragmented Regulatory Landscape

The rapid advancement and integration of military AI are inextricably linked to intense global geopolitical competition. Major powers, notably the United States and China, are heavily investing in military AI, transforming technological superiority into a primary strategic advantage. This competitive drive accelerates the development and deployment of autonomous systems, often outpacing the establishment of comprehensive ethical and regulatory safeguards.

In this landscape, the EU's focus on human-centric AI governance for civilian applications contrasts starkly with the less regulated military AI development occurring elsewhere, creating a significant risk asymmetry. The ongoing conflicts in Ukraine and Gaza serve as stark reminders that the risks associated with autonomous force are no longer theoretical; they are urgent realities demonstrating how the unchecked use of AI can render the global environment more insecure and complicate the attribution of responsibility under international law.

#### Towards Integrated Governance: Recommendations for a Cohesive Framework:

Addressing the multifaceted challenges posed by military AI and LAWS necessitates a departure from fragmented regulatory approaches toward an integrated and cohesive governance framework:

**Reconsidering the EU AI Act's Scope:** The Act should be revised to bridge the critical regulatory void surrounding military applications. Future iterations should include clear mandates for meaningful human oversight and establish interpretability standards that ideally prohibit "black box" models in military contexts.

**Establishing International and National Oversight:** A permanent, specialized international governance body dedicated solely to LAWS should be established. Complementing this, national oversight bodies should be institutionalized within defense sectors to serve as vital links for

compliance with IHL.

The Role of Greece: Greece, for instance, aims to play a pivotal role in balancing European regulations with international law compliance through such national mechanisms, potentially acting as a conduit for harmonizing defense and security needs within a unified European standard.

#### Conclusion

The current exclusion of military AI from the EU AI Act, coupled with the ethical and legal ambiguities surrounding LAWS, creates a dangerous regulatory void. Without a binding, comprehensive, and human-centric governance framework, technological progress risks undermining the foundational principles of international law, eroding human accountability, and increasing the probability of unintended escalations.

-----

-----

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

#### **The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is clear, precise, and accurately reflects the core content of the manuscript. It effectively highlights the three central pillars of the study: the EU AI Act, Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS), and the concept of Human-Centric AI. It is fully aligned with the legal and ethical focus of the paper.

#### **The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.**

The abstract clearly outlines the context, objectives, and main argumentative direction of the article. However, given the predominantly legal-theoretical nature of the work, it would benefit from a more explicit reference to the methodology employed (e.g., normative legal analysis, doctrinal approach, comparative analysis). Overall, it is coherent and well-structured.

#### **There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

There are minor grammatical inaccuracies, occasional punctuation inconsistencies, and some overly long or syntactically dense sentences. A careful language revision would significantly improve clarity, precision, and overall academic fluency.

#### **The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The article adopts a legal-normative and theoretical analytical approach; however, the methodology is not presented in a clearly defined section. Explicitly stating the methodological framework (e.g., doctrinal legal analysis, interpretative approach, examination of international legal instruments) would strengthen the scientific rigor of the manuscript.

#### **The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

The argumentative conclusions are logically developed and coherent. The analysis of the regulatory gap resulting from the exclusion of military applications from Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 is well articulated. No substantive errors are evident, though certain claims could be further supported with additional scholarly references or illustrative examples.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion is consistent with the overall structure of the article and effectively synthesizes the key arguments. The call for a binding and integrated international governance framework is logically grounded in the preceding analysis.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references are relevant and appropriate to the topic. However:

Greater consistency in citation formatting is recommended.

Additional peer-reviewed academic sources (journal articles, monographs) could strengthen the theoretical foundation.

Some institutional references could be complemented by specialized legal commentary.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This manuscript addresses a highly relevant and timely topic within contemporary international legal and ethical discourse. The analysis of the regulatory gap created by the exclusion of military applications from Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 is particularly compelling and well-argued.

The following improvements are recommended:

Explicitly define the methodological framework adopted in the study.

Strengthen the theoretical foundation with additional academic references.

Conduct a thorough linguistic revision to enhance clarity and academic precision.

Consider incorporating concrete examples or brief case illustrations to reinforce the practical dimension of the analysis.

Overall, the article is suitable for publication following minor revisions.

-----