

The preventive role of legal technology (LegalTech) in monitoring anti-competitive behaviors

Yousif H. Ghadih^{*1}, Luay A. Ali², Mahdi A. Mahdi³

^{1,2,3} AL.Turath University, Baghdad, Iraq

Yousif.hassan@uoturath.edu.iq , Mahdi.ayad@uoturath.edu.iq

Article information:

Published: 25-04-2026

***Corresponding author:**

Yousif H. Ghadih

Yousif.hassan@uoturath.edu.iq



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract:

This study examines the preventive role of Legal Technology (LegalTech) in monitoring anti-competitive behaviors, with a particular focus on current challenges in Iraq. The problem arises from the limitations of traditional tools in detecting collusion and monopolistic practices, in contrast to the potential offered by LegalTech solutions such as artificial intelligence algorithms and digital reporting platforms. The research adopts a descriptive-analytical and comparative methodology, reviewing successful international experiences (the European Union, Singapore, and the United Kingdom), alongside an Iraqi case study in a key sector. The underlying hypothesis suggests that while LegalTech provides promising opportunities for regulatory oversight, its effectiveness in Iraq depends largely on the development of digital and legislative infrastructures. Preliminary findings indicate that LegalTech can play the role of an "early warning mechanism" against anti-competitive practices. However, Iraq faces structural and legislative challenges that require urgent addressing.

Accordingly, the research seeks to provide a cognitive and policy contribution that deepens understanding of the preventive role of LegalTech and supporting Iraqi decision-makers in addressing current challenges, thereby fostering a fairer and more competitive economic environment.

Keywords: LegalTech, anti-competitive behavior, artificial intelligence (AI), economic governance, digital economy.

1. Introduction

In the past two decades, the world has witnessed profound transformations brought about by the digital revolution. Its impact has extended beyond the economy and communications, encompassing legal and regulatory systems as well. The digital environment has spawned new forms of anti-competitive behavior, most notably algorithmic collusion, market dominance through online platforms, and the misuse of big data to restrict market entry. These phenomena have posed unprecedented challenges for legislators and regulators, as traditional tools are no longer sufficient for detecting violations or regulating markets. In this context, the concept of LegalTech has emerged as an innovative tool that combines law, artificial intelligence, and big data analytics. No longer limited to online legal services or digital contract management, LegalTech has become a strategic tool for enhancing competition policy, thanks to its ability to detect unusual market patterns and identify monopolistic practices early on. This research, therefore, aims to highlight the preventive role of LegalTech in monitoring anti-competitive behavior. The topic is particularly relevant in the Iraqi context, where the country suffers from weak digital infrastructure, legislative challenges stemming from an outdated legal framework, and widespread corruption in government procurement. However,

Iraq also possesses a large young population and opportunities for digital transformation, which can be leveraged through LegalTech to bring about a significant transformation in market regulation and promote transparency.

2. Research Problem

The digital revolution has introduced complex anti-competitive behaviors, such as algorithmic collusion and data exploitation, which traditional regulatory frameworks are increasingly unable to detect. In Iraq, these challenges are compounded by outdated legislation, weak digital infrastructure, and a lack of technological integration within oversight bodies, leading to unaddressed monopolistic practices in public procurement and local markets. Consequently, the central problem of this research is to determine how LegalTech can be implemented as a proactive mechanism to monitor and combat these behaviors in the Iraqi context, drawing on successful international experiences to enhance market transparency and fair competition.

3. Significance of the Study

The study's significance lies in exploring LegalTech as a strategic tool to safeguard competition in Iraq's digital economy. Academically, it fills a gap in Iraqi legal literature by identifying LegalTech as a preventive mechanism against algorithmic collusion and big data exploitation. Legislatively, it provides a diagnostic for modernizing Iraq's Competition Law No. 14 of 2010 to better monitor digital markets and public procurement. Operationally, the research offers a roadmap for regulators, leveraging international benchmarks to enhance transparency, attract investment, and protect the national economy from monopolistic practices.

4. Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

- To analyze the role of LegalTech in early detection of anti-competitive behaviors based on international experiences.
- To evaluate the digital and legislative infrastructure in Iraq and its readiness to adopt LegalTech.
- To explore the opportunities and potential for applying digital monitoring mechanisms in Iraqi markets and public procurement.
- To provide practical recommendations to enhance transparency and support fair competition using LegalTech.

5. Research Hypotheses

The first hypothesis posits that the integration of LegalTech and Artificial Intelligence into competition policy will facilitate a strategic shift from traditional reactive oversight to proactive market surveillance, thereby enhancing the detection of complex anti-competitive behaviors such as algorithmic collusion. Building on this, the second hypothesis suggests that the effectiveness of digital monitoring in the Iraqi market is strictly contingent upon legislative modernization, specifically requiring an amendment to Law No. 14 of 2010 to grant legal admissibility to digital evidence and automated analytical findings. Finally, the third hypothesis maintains that the implementation of LegalTech mechanisms within Iraq's public procurement sector will significantly reduce systemic corruption and bid-rigging by utilizing automated data analysis to uncover hidden links and non-competitive agreements between bidding entities.

6. Research Population and Sample

The research population and sample encompass the legal and institutional frameworks governing competition policy and market regulation, focusing on Iraqi oversight bodies such as the Competition and Antitrust Council and the Ministry of Trade. The study utilizes a comparative analytical sample of leading international models specifically the European Union, the United Kingdom, and Singapore to extract successful technical and legislative benchmarks for LegalTech integration. Furthermore, the sample extends to Iraqi public procurement contracts and government tenders as a practical model to

evaluate the effectiveness of digital tools in detecting bid-rigging and corruption, providing a realistic data-driven basis to assess the readiness of Iraq's infrastructure for smart regulatory oversight.

7. Methodology

This research adopts a mixed-methods approach combining comparative analysis and case study design, integrating both quantitative and qualitative methods, International Comparative Analysis: Examine EU, UK, and Singapore experiences, focusing on digital tools, supporting legislation, and practical outcomes Iraqi Case Study: Assess the current digital and legislative infrastructure, exploring the feasibility of LegalTech implementation in monitoring procurement and market activities.

Chapter One: Legal Technology (LegalTech) and its Preventive Mechanisms

Section One: The Concept of LegalTech and its Basic Tools

Today, it is impossible to study law in isolation from the rapid technological advancements occurring worldwide. Digital transformation has reshaped the practices of legal and regulatory professions. In this context, the concept of legal technology, or LegalTech, has emerged. This term refers to the use of advanced digital tools and technologies, such as artificial intelligence, block chain, and big data analytics, in providing legal services and assisting judicial and regulatory bodies. This concept has gone through several stages. Initially, it was limited to the electronic archiving of documents and file management in law firms. It later expanded to include specialized databases of legal texts and judicial rulings. Over the last decade, however, it has witnessed a qualitative leap, incorporating smarter tools capable of analyzing data and predicting legal risks before they occur.

Richard Susskind pointed out that Legal Technology does not merely mean introducing computers into the legal office; rather, it represents a comprehensive reconfiguration of the very nature of legal practice, making law faster, more efficient, and more transparent in its application(1). Other researchers, such as Katz and Rabinovich-Einy, have also emphasized that LegalTech constitutes a knowledge revolution that reshapes the relationship between individuals and the law through digital means (2). And if we look at the stages of the development of Legal

Technology, we find that it has gone through three fundamental levels:

1. The first level was administrative, focusing on the use of computers to store and archive documents and to organize legal correspondence.
2. The second level was characterized by the emergence of specialized legal databases, which enabled lawyers and judges to quickly access legislative texts and previous court rulings.
3. The third level represents the true revolution: the introduction of artificial intelligence, big data technologies, and block chain into the process of legal decision-making. At this particular stage, the preventive role of LegalTech began to emerge, as it became capable of detecting anti-competitive behaviors such as price collusion or abuse of dominant positions more quickly and accurately than traditional regulatory bodies.

It is of paramount importance to emphasize that competition policies are fundamentally built on three main objectives: protecting consumers from monopolistic practices, ensuring the fair entry and exit of economic actors into the market, and fostering innovation and productivity. However, these objectives face growing challenges in the era of digital globalization and the expansion of electronic transactions. Companies no longer operate within narrow national boundaries; instead, they are active in multiple, interconnected markets, which make it increasingly difficult for regulatory authorities to monitor all their activities using traditional means. Here, the role of LegalTech emerges as a strategic tool in the hands of these authorities. It provides digital

mechanisms to monitor markets in near real-time, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of competition policies.

For example, artificial intelligence can analyze millions of business transactions within a specific sector and detect recurring patterns that may indicate the existence of unlawful agreements between companies to fix prices. Likewise, smart contracts based on block chain technology can help prevent the enforcement of abusive or anti-competitive clauses, as such contracts are programmed to execute automatically in accordance with fair rules that leave no room for manipulation. In another dimension, LegalTech enables the creation of secure digital platforms for reporting unlawful practices confidentially, thereby encouraging the early detection of violations.

The role of LegalTech in competition policies does not stop at monitoring. It extends further to empowering policymakers to build policies grounded in accurate data, a practice known today as evidence-based policymaking. Instead of relying solely on complaints or lengthy investigations, competition authorities can draw upon comprehensive, continuously updated databases, granting them the ability to intervene preventively rather than being limited to remedial action after harm has already occurred.

In Iraq specifically, the integration of LegalTech into competition policies could bring about a qualitative shift in market regulation. The challenges facing the Iraqi economy such as the dominance of certain actors over key sectors and the absence of genuine competition can be addressed through predictive analytics tools and the digitization of oversight processes. However, this requires legislative reforms that recognize digital evidence before the courts, alongside investment in digital infrastructure and the capacity building of human resources in the field of legal technology.

What distinguishes LegalTech is that it is not limited to procedural aspects; rather, it extends to an important preventive role. Through it, early warning systems can be developed to

detect legal irregularities before they occur, whether by monitoring commercial contracts or tracking pricing patterns in markets. Hence, LegalTech should not be understood merely as a technical tool, but as a strategic shift toward smarter legal systems that are more capable of addressing the challenges of the modern economy (3).

Section Two: The Role of LegalTech in Preventing Anti-Competitive Behaviors

Competition is considered the cornerstone of a free economy and one of the most important drivers ensuring market development and increased consumer welfare. It is based on the principle of free interaction between the forces of supply and demand without unjustified restrictions, allowing economic actors to enter or exit the market on the basis of efficiency and innovation. Proper competition thus enhances productivity, drives innovation, and guarantees consumers fair prices and high-quality services. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has emphasized that the presence of strong competition is a fundamental condition for achieving sustainable economic growth, while its absence weakens investment and increases costs for consumers(4).

However, practical reality shows that markets are not always arenas of fair competition. Some companies resort to anti-competitive practices in order to increase their profits at the expense of competitors and consumers. These behaviors pose a real challenge to regulatory authorities, as they are often hidden and complex, making them difficult to detect through traditional means. For this reason, it has become necessary to develop advanced legal and regulatory mechanisms to confront them. Here, the importance of integrating LegalTech into competition policies becomes evident, as we explained in the first section. Anti-competitive behaviors can take many forms, the most common of which can be described as follows:

1. **Restrictive Agreements** :These refer to understandings or collusion among companies aimed at limiting competition, often carried out in secrecy and difficult to prove. Examples

include agreements to fix prices, divide markets geographically, or set production quotas. Such practices are considered among the most serious violations because they undermine the essence of competition and artificially inflate prices. International experience has shown that detecting cartels requires big data analysis tools capable of identifying abnormal behavioral patterns in pricing or production.

2. Abuse of Dominant Position: This occurs when a company with significant market power exploits its position to impose unfair conditions on consumers or competitors. The most prominent forms include predatory pricing to drive out rivals, tying the sale of one product to another, or preventing new firms from entering the market through the use of influence. These practices may not be immediately apparent, as they can be justified as ordinary business decisions; however, upon analysis, they reveal an underlying intention to exclude competition.

3. Mergers that harm competition: While mergers can sometimes be beneficial in increasing economic efficiency, they can also lead to excessive market dominance if they result in a single entity controlling the market. The challenge lies in distinguishing between legitimate mergers that benefit the economy and harmful mergers that reduce competition.

4. Complete Monopoly: This is the most severe form, where a single company controls the production or distribution of a particular good or service entirely, giving it absolute power over prices and quality. Such a situation effectively eliminates competition and places consumers in a weak position. Such a situation effectively eliminates competition and puts the consumer in a vulnerable position. If we examine the negative impacts of these practices in Iraq, we find that they manifest as:

- Prices rising beyond the purchasing power of consumers.
- Weakening of the quality of goods and services due to the absence of competition.
- Hindrance to foreign investment seeking a fair competitive environment.

- Spread of unemployment due to the exclusion of small and medium-sized enterprises from the market.
- Expansion of the informal economy and smuggling of goods.

These issues underscore that competition policies in Iraq require profound development. The legal framework exists through the Iraqi Competition Law No. 14 of 2010, but it suffers from weak implementation and inadequate regulatory tools. For example, the Iraqi Competition Council lacks the technical capabilities needed to detect price-fixing collusion or to perform predictive analyses of mergers (5). This highlights the need to introduce LegalTech to strengthen its regulatory capacity. LegalTech can contribute to addressing these behaviors through three main mechanisms:

1. **Smart Monitoring:** Using algorithms capable of analyzing millions of data points related to prices and production, detecting patterns of collusion.
2. **Predictive Analysis:** Enabling authorities to anticipate anti-competitive behaviors before they actually occur.
3. **Digital Transparency:** Through open and regularly updated databases, reducing opportunities for administrative corruption and helping to build trust in the market.

Wisch and Bailey have noted that the greatest challenge for competition policies today is the ability to keep pace with the digital development of large companies, and that the solution lies in developing parallel digital capabilities within regulatory authorities(6). This is particularly urgent in Iraq, where the market is vulnerable to control by powerful economic entities that may use their influence in ways detrimental to competition (7).

Chapter Two: International Experiences in Using LegalTech to Combat Anti-Competitive Practices

Section one: The European Union's experience

The European Union is considered one of the most advanced international models for integrating LegalTech into competition policies. The European Commission recognized early that the complexity of European markets and their cross-border interconnections render traditional tools insufficient for detecting violations. Consequently, the Commission developed the European Competition Data Hub, which relies on artificial intelligence to analyze massive amounts of data related to prices, distribution, and market shares.

A prominent example is the truck cartel case, in which the European Commission used data analysis tools to uncover a secret agreement among six major companies to fix prices. This resulted in fines exceeding €3.8 billion, an unprecedented figure in EU history. This success demonstrated that artificial intelligence can detect patterns that would be difficult for human investigators to perceive on their own (8). In addition, the European Union has relied on digital simulation tools to assess mergers. Thanks to these predictive models, it is possible to estimate the impact of any merger on prices and consumers before it actually takes place. For example, the European Commission rejected the proposed merger between Siemens and Alstom in 2019, as simulations showed that the merger would reduce competition in the high-speed train sector and lead to significantly higher prices. It is also noteworthy that the European Union has not limited itself to using technical tools but has adapted the legal framework to allow the use of digital evidence. The European Competition Guidelines have explicitly recognized algorithmic analyses as admissible evidence in investigations and have even required some companies to disclose the details of their pricing algorithms when under suspicion. This step was considered revolutionary, as it addressed the transparency issues associated with using artificial intelligence in markets (9).

However, challenges have also emerged that cannot be ignored. Civil society organizations have raised concerns about data protection, warning that the collection of big data could

infringe upon consumer freedom and privacy. Additionally, over-reliance on algorithms may lead to what is known as “algorithmic collusion,” where companies use AI tools to coordinate prices without an explicit agreement, posing a new dilemma for traditional law.

Section Two: The United Kingdom's experience

The United Kingdom's exit from the European Union marked a turning point in competition policies, as the UK had to rebuild its legislative and regulatory framework independently. In this context, the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) emerged as the central body responsible for market monitoring and enforcement of competition laws. Given that UK markets are highly open to technology and digital platforms, it became necessary to adopt LegalTech as an advanced means of detecting anti-competitive practices (10).

The CMA enforces the UK Competition Act 1998 and the Enterprise Act 2002, which constitute the main legal framework for protecting competition. However, with the expansion of the digital economy, it has become clear that traditional investigative tools are no longer sufficient, especially given the widespread use of smart algorithms that may coordinate prices or exploit consumer data.

The UK has focused on using artificial intelligence and machine learning to monitor digital behaviors in markets. The CMA has developed platforms capable of collecting and analyzing millions of data points daily, particularly in sectors experiencing rapid fluctuations, such as energy, transportation, and digital media.

- In the energy sector, the (CMA) used artificial intelligence systems to monitor the prices offered to consumers by gas and electricity companies. The system revealed recurring patterns suggesting that companies were relying on similar pricing algorithms, which could constitute unlawful tacit coordination. Based on these findings, the authority imposed new regulations on electronic pricing practices (11).

- In the field of digital booking platforms, such as (Booking.com, Expedia), the CMA employed contract mining tools to uncover unfair clauses, such as the Most Favored Nation (MFN) clause, which prevents hotels from offering lower prices on other platforms. The investigation concluded with requiring the platforms to amend their terms, thereby achieving greater contractual fairness.

The United Kingdom adopted a policy of collaborative innovation through the establishment of what is known as the Regulatory Sandbox a framework that allows startups to test LegalTech solutions under the supervision of the CMA without fear of violating the law. This approach encouraged the development of innovative tools capable of analyzing commercial data and monitoring algorithms more efficiently.

The CMA also collaborated with British universities such as Oxford and Cambridge on research projects aimed at developing digital economic models capable of simulating the effects of major mergers on the market before they occur (12). The UK's experience has demonstrated that LegalTech can uncover not only traditional monopolistic practices but also indirect algorithmic collusion, which is among the most difficult violations to prove using conventional methods (13). Moreover, the integration of artificial intelligence into oversight has helped save significant costs and efforts compared to manual investigative methods. Based on this experience, the CMA recommended the following:

1. Strengthening investment in AI tools for market monitoring.
2. Expanding the use of data mining to detect anti-competitive behaviors.
3. Intensifying international cooperation with EU and US authorities to combat cross-border collusion.

Section Three: The Singaporean Experience

Singapore is one of the leading Asian countries that adopted LegalTech early on to enhance competition, thanks to the nature of its economy, which is based on services and e-

commerce. This has created a constant need for flexible and rapid regulatory mechanisms. Competition policies in Singapore fall under the supervision of the Competition and Consumer Commission of Singapore (CCCS), established under the Competition Act of 2004(14). Singapore's strategy was founded on the principle that modern oversight must be entirely digital. For this reason, the CCCS established smart platforms capable of monitoring prices and commercial transactions in real time.

In 2018, the CCCS launched a platform based on artificial intelligence to monitor the prices of essential goods such as rice, oil, and imported food products. This tool enabled the government to intervene quickly during the COVID-19 pandemic, when prices raised unjustifiably, as digital data revealed attempts to exploit the crisis (15). In 2020, the CCCS initiated a project to monitor e-commerce using big data analytics. The project revealed that some major platforms were imposing hidden fees on small sellers or restricting the visibility of their products through opaque algorithms. As a result, the authority issued clear guidelines to prevent such exploitative practices (16). More importantly, Singaporean courts have recognized digital evidence derived from LegalTech tools as admissible in judicial proceedings, thereby strengthening the legal authority of these tools. Researchers have emphasized that this development has made Singapore a pioneer in integrating LegalTech into both economic regulation and judicial oversight (17). The Singaporean experience has shown that integrating LegalTech yields several benefits:

1. Price stability even during times of crisis, which has strengthened consumer confidence.
2. Reduction of monopolies in food, telecommunications, and digital services markets.
3. Improved efficiency of oversight, as the authority was able to significantly cut monitoring costs through automation.

4. Attraction of foreign investment by creating a fair and transparent competitive environment.

Chapter Three: The Iraqi Reality in Confronting Anti-Competitive Behaviors and the Role of LegalTech

Section One: The Current State Of Digital and Legislative Infrastructure in Iraq

The current situation in Iraq presents a complex model of intertwined digital and regulatory challenges in combating anti-competitive practices, particularly given its economy's heavy reliance on the oil sector, weak economic diversification, and low levels of investment in digital infrastructure. When discussing digital infrastructure, the stark disparity between Iraq and other countries in the region becomes evident in terms of internet quality and the speed of digital communications. According to World Bank reports, internet access in Iraq remains below the regional average. Moreover, communication networks lack stability and balanced coverage: reliable services are concentrated in the capital, Baghdad, and a few major cities, while other areas suffer from very weak network coverage. This reality makes it difficult for regulatory authorities to develop effective digital tools to monitor markets or oversee corporate activities.

On the legislative level, Iraq's Competition Law No. 14 of 2010 serves as the primary legal framework for combating anti-competitive practices. However, this law was drafted before the emergence of the digital economy and therefore does not contain explicit provisions or references to anti-competitive practices in the digital environment such as algorithmic collusion, abuse of big data, or monopolistic conduct through online platforms (19). Moreover, the law does not adequately address issues related to government procurement, which represents one of the most critical areas in the Iraqi economy. Public tenders are often managed through paper-based procedures or rudimentary electronic platforms that lack transparency, leaving the door open to monopolistic practices and pre-arranged price

coordination among bidding companies (20). Reports from the Iraqi Ministry of Trade indicate that cases of manipulation in public tenders are widespread, whether through companies agreeing to divide bids among themselves or by submitting closely matched offers to give regulatory authorities the impression of competition, while in reality, there is prearranged collusion. The absence of advanced digital systems to detect patterns of such practices such as algorithms capable of analyzing historical bid data and identifying abnormal repetitions makes combating this phenomenon extremely difficult.

Regarding digital data challenges, Iraq suffers from the lack of centralized and unified databases, with economic and financial data distributed across multiple ministries and agencies without a single platform for aggregation and analysis. This fragmentation not only limits the ability to monitor anti-competitive behaviors but also hampers overall government oversight. Most importantly, the lack of a culture of transparency and weak data protection makes it difficult to use this data as a basis for developing reliable LegalTech tools for analysis or decision-making. From another perspective, the level of technology use within regulatory authorities remains extremely limited. Regulatory bodies whether the Ministry of Trade, the Integrity Commission, or even the judiciary still lack the technological infrastructure required employing artificial intelligence tools or algorithmic analyses in their daily operations. Technology usage is often restricted to simple office applications or file-archiving systems (21). This technological deficiency renders Iraqi institutions incapable of keeping pace with emerging challenges in digital markets, where anti-competitive practices rely on advanced techniques beyond the detection capabilities of traditional methods. Consequently, the current situation demonstrates that Iraq remains far from the institutional adoption of LegalTech, highlighting an urgent need for both legislative reform and the development of robust digital infrastructure (22).

Section Two: The potential of LegalTech in the Iraqi market

Despite the significant challenges facing Iraq's environment, there are several important opportunities that could pave the way for the gradual integration of LegalTech in market monitoring and the combat of anti-competitive behaviors. Iraq has a large youth population, representing over 60% of the total population, which is highly receptive to modern technology. This demographic can serve as a crucial foundation for developing national cadres capable of managing and operating digital tools in regulatory oversight (23). Additionally, the Iraqi market has witnessed noticeable growth in the use of digital platforms for e-commerce and banking services in recent years. Although this adoption remains limited compared to other countries, it reflects an initial shift that can be leveraged to strengthen digital monitoring and oversight (24).

The potential of LegalTech in Iraq can manifest at several levels. The first is the application of digital oversight mechanisms in public procurement, where automated bid analysis programs could detect unjustified similarities between offers or recurring patterns in contract allocation, helping uncover collusion and monopolistic practices. Such tools have been successful in countries like South Korea and Singapore, saving billions of dollars by exposing complex corruption patterns that could not have been detected through traditional means (25). Artificial intelligence can also be employed to analyze market data and monitor price movements in critical sectors such as fuel, telecommunications, and essential goods. This type of digital oversight enables authorities to intervene quickly if there are indicators of price-fixing alliances or monopolies, thereby reducing potential harm to consumers. In

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Studying international experiences in the use of LegalTech to combat anti-competitive behaviors clearly shows that these tools are no

addition, Iraq could benefit from contract mining tools, which help review large contracts especially those concluded with multinational companies to detect clauses that may grant monopolistic advantages or undermine fair competition.

This tool is particularly important in Iraq, where major investments are concentrated in the oil and infrastructure sectors, and companies tend to impose strict conditions due to the limited negotiation experience of some local entities (26). However, these potentials face structural and legislative challenges that cannot be overlooked. Weak digital infrastructure is the primary obstacle to any LegalTech adoption, as the lack of high-speed internet and frequent network interruptions impede the operation of advanced systems that rely on real-time data flows. Moreover, Iraqi laws remain traditional and cover only conventional competition in physical markets, without addressing digital monopolistic practices or algorithmic collusion. Furthermore, a weak culture of transparency and poor coordination between government institutions complicate the unification of data required to operate LegalTech tools. Resistance to change within administrative bodies also represents a significant cultural challenge, as transitioning from manual methods to digital solutions requires a radical shift in administrative mindset and building trust in these digital tools a process that demands time and specialized training programs. Therefore, it can be said that integrating LegalTech in Iraq is feasible but contingent on the state's ability to address these structural and legislative challenges by reforming existing laws to cover digital practices, developing digital infrastructure, and building institutional and human capacities capable of effectively adopting and operating LegalTech solutions.

longer a regulatory luxury; they have become an essential condition for ensuring the integrity of both digital and traditional markets. While Europe has successfully employed artificial intelligence through its legislative and

regulatory models to monitor price-fixing, the United Kingdom has developed advanced partnerships between its regulatory authorities and technology innovation centers, and Singapore has integrated digital oversight into the core of its economic infrastructure, Iraq now stands at a historic crossroads.

On one hand, Iraq faces numerous challenges: fragile digital infrastructure, outdated legislation, weak centralized data, and a lack of trust between citizens and institutions. On the other hand, it possesses significant opportunities: a youthful, technology-savvy population, an urgent need to regulate public procurement, and a growing desire to catch up with digital transformation amid regional and global shifts. This balance makes the integration of LegalTech into Iraqi policies not a secondary option but a national necessity to combat corruption, achieve transparency, and ensure fair competition.

Finally, it can be said that LegalTech is not merely a technical tool; it is a comprehensive national project that contributes to reshaping the state's relationship with the economy and provides Iraq with a historic opportunity to overcome past obstacles and move toward a more transparent and just future.

Recommendations

1. **Legislative Reform for Digitalization:** Amend Iraq's Competition Law No. 14 of 2010 to include clear provisions addressing digital monopolistic practices, such as algorithmic collusion and manipulation of big data.
2. **Development of Digital Procurement Platforms:** Establish a unified national platform for managing public tenders, utilizing algorithms to detect collusion, thereby enhancing transparency and preventing monopolistic practices.
3. **Strengthening Institutional Cooperation:** Create a joint digital oversight unit comprising the Ministry of Trade, the Integrity Commission, and the Central Bank, tasked with developing and deploying LegalTech tools for market monitoring.

4. **Human Capacity Development:** Launch specialized training programs in collaboration with Iraqi and international universities to prepare cadres capable of operating artificial intelligence tools and conducting digital legal analysis.
5. **International Partnerships:** Leverage the expertise of the European Union, United Kingdom, and Singapore through technical and legislative partnerships, enabling Iraq to import best practices while adapting them to its economic and social context.
6. **Culture of Transparency:** Promote a culture of relying on Open Data, enhancing public trust and enabling researchers and experts to analyze markets independently, alongside regulatory authorities.

Data Availability:

The data used to support the results of this study has been included in the article.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Funding Sources:

No financial support was received.

Acknowledgments:

None.

References:

1. Susskind, R. (2021). *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future*. Oxford University Press.
2. Katsh, E., & Rabinovich-Einy, O. (2017). *Digital Justice: Technology and the Internet of Disputes*. Oxford University Press.
3. Nizar Mahmoud, *Legal Technology and Digital Transformation in the Legal Profession*, Journal of Legal Sciences, Baghdad, 2022.
4. OECD (2020) *Competition Policy in the Digital Era*.
5. The Iraqi Competition Law No. 14 of 2010.

6. Whish, R., & Bailey, D. (2021). *Competition Law*. Oxford University Press
7. Khaled Al-Jumaili, *Anti-competitive practices in Iraqi law*, University of Baghdad, 2019.
8. European Commission. (2016). *Truck Cartel Case*
9. European Commission. (2019). *Siemens/Alstom Merger Decision*.
10. Competition and Markets Authority (CMA).(2023). *Annual report and accounts 2022/23*. UK Government.
11. House of Lords. (2019). *Regulating In a Digital World: Report of the Communications Committee*. UK Parliament.
12. Whish, R., & Bailey, D. (2021). *Competition law (10th Ed.)* Oxford University Press.
13. Saied, M.M. (2022). *The legal framework for combating anti-competitive practices in digital markets*. Egyptian Journal of Law and Economics.
14. Competition and Consumer Commission of Singapore (CCCS). (2020). *Annual report 2019–2020* Government of Singapore.
15. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2021). *Competition policy in Asia-Pacific: Developments and challenges*. OECD Publishing.
16. Low, G. (2020). *Digital evidence and competition law in Singapore*. Singapore Journal of Legal Studies, 2020(2), 145–168.
17. Abdullah, B. Y. (2022). *Legal technology and digital transformation in Asian legal systems: A case study of the Singaporean experience*. Qatar Journal of Comparative Law, Qatar University, (15).
18. Abdullah, Maryam. (2020). *Legal challenges of digital transformation in Iraq*. Journal of Legal and Economic Studies, 12, (1).
19. Republic of Iraq. (2010). *Iraqi Competition Law No. 14 of 2010*. Baghdad: Official Gazette of Iraq.
20. Federal Integrity Authority. (2022). *Report on Corruption and Transparency Indicators in Public Procurement*. Baghdad.
21. UNDP. (2020). *Iraq's Digital Readiness Assessment*. Baghdad: UNDP.
22. Communications and Media Authority. (2021). *Telecommunications Infrastructure Report for Iraq*. Baghdad.
23. ESCWA. (2021). *Digital Transformation in the Arab Region: Iraq Country Profile*. Beirut: UN-ESCWA.
24. Deloitte. (2021). *Digital Procurement in Emerging Markets: Iraq's Path Forward*. London: Deloitte Insights.
25. Federal Integrity Authority. (2022). *Report on Corruption and Transparency Indicators in Public Procurement*. Baghdad.
26. Al-Hadithi, A., & Al-Mashhadani, H. (2021). *E-Governance and Digital Transformation in Iraq: Challenges and Opportunities*. Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 55, (4).