

# GLOBAL ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE GOVERNANCE: A SCOPING REVIEW

APANDI, L. S. A.<sup>1\*</sup> – SHARIFUDDIN, M. D. K.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *School of International Studies, Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), Kedah, Malaysia.*

*\*Corresponding author  
e-mail: laila[at]uum.edu.my*

(Received 13<sup>th</sup> October 2025; revised 17<sup>th</sup> January 2026; accepted 24<sup>th</sup> January 2026)

**Abstract.** Global AI governance is an eminent matter that needs to be addressed in the AI era. AI not only resulted to some benefits, but also drawbacks. This resulted government to govern AI as to contain these drawbacks of AI. However, different governments govern AI differently. This further situates the paper to examine global artificial intelligence governance using scoping review. It questions: What global AI governance ought to be? The paper found that global AI governance ought to be developed by an international collaboration that prioritizes accountable AI and adopts human centered approach. International collaboration within global AI governance, argued in this paper, should be inclusive. Various key stakeholders in AI governance should participate in the international collaboration. Only by having such inclusivity in international collaboration, global AI governance can benefits users, producers, regulators, etc. In addition, global AI governance should ensure that AI, supplied by industrial firms, remain accountable for their outcomes and impacts. Similarly, users are also accountable, at all times, when using AI. This element of accountable AI should prioritize human matters at all stages of AI policy making, be it the phases of draft, implementation, or review. Thus, the paper also contributes to a better understanding of what AI global governance ought to be.

**Keywords:** *global AI governance, international collaboration, accountable AI, human centered approach, scoping review*

## Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly changed the ways of world used to be. According to NASA (2024), artificial intelligence is defined as “any artificial system that performs tasks under varying and unpredictable circumstances without significant human oversight, or can learn from experience and improved performance when exposed to data sets, an artificial system developed in computer software, physical hardware, or other context that solves tasks requiring human-like perception, cognition, planning, learning, communication or physical action, an artificial system designed to think and act like a human, including cognitive architectures and neural networks, a set of techniques, including machine learning that is designed to approximate a cognitive task, and an artificial system designed to act rationally, including an intelligent software agent or embodied robot that achieves goals using perception, planning, reasoning, learning, communicating, decision-making, and acting”. Such big scopes of AI definition denote many ways of how AI could assist humans at workplace and day-to-day activities. With AI assistance, humans could complete numerous tasks faster. This enables humans to be more efficient and productive through automated tasks. Furthermore, AI is affordable. Users could use AI for free with limited usage and paid via subscription plan(s). In decision making process, humans could consult data-driven supplied by AI before finalizing such decision(s). Consequently, humans have shown tendency to rely more on AI in daily life.

However, AI could be threats to humans. Some fear of losing job to AI due to automated routine tasks by AI. Vulnerability of human labours has become social security concerns when some companies would prefer to invest on AI while reducing number of hired human labour. For instance, TikTok laid off “fewer than 500 employees” in Malaysia because of its increased reliance on AI for content moderation (The Straits Times, 2024). In addition, there are several reported incidents of AI hallucination. Deloitte, for example, agreed to refund substantial amount to Australian government after acknowledging multiple errors of AI hallucination in commissioned report (Paoli, 2025). Another incident of AI hallucination is depicted in the forms of non-existent references published as a journal article. It was reported: “In the paper, titled ‘Forty years of fertility transition in Hong Kong’ and published in China Population and Development Studies on October 17, at least 20 out of 61 references appear to be non-existent” (The Star, 2025). Omar et al. (2025), in an examination of using AI chatbots in health care, caution that AI could produce data errors should there be no human intervention. Thus, government should govern AI as to contain these drawbacks of AI, not limiting to the ones highlighted in this paper.

Different governments govern AI differently. The United States of America, for example, came up with a national strategy titled ‘Winning the Race: America’s AI Action Plan’ in 2025 to guide the nation in terms of innovation, infrastructure, and becoming global leader in diplomacy and security. Likewise, China came up with its own national strategy, AI+ Action, in 2025 with an aim to be an intelligence-based economy and society (CSET, 2025). Meanwhile, the European Union governs AI by legal regulation via the European Union AI Act (CEU, 2024). The differences of national governments governing AI have situated the interest of this paper to examine global AI governance through scoping review AI. It questions: What global AI governance ought to be? The following section critically reviews some literature pertaining to AI governance. Next, it discusses methodology of study. This will be followed by sections of findings and discussion. Lastly, the paper concludes with the gist of study.

### ***Literature review***

AI governance has become the focus of policy makers who are increasing concerned about the widespread use of AI in daily lives. This posits the importance of scholars to further examine AI governance. Camilleri (2023) conducted a systematic literature review on AI governance based on twelve articles indexed by Scopus and WOS from 2019 to 2023. The paper extends the understanding of AI governance based on selected literature indexed by Scopus and WOS from 2023 to March 2025. The starting examined year of 2023 was chosen because ChatGPT, generative AI (GenAI), was released in November 2022. Principles of AI governance that were identified by Camilleri (2023) are “accountability and transparency, explainability and interpretability, fairness and inclusiveness, privacy and safety for consumers, security and robustness of AI systems”. Likewise, the paper also examines principles of AI governance based on much later publications. AI governance has become the focus of policy makers who are increasing concerned about the widespread use of AI in daily lives. This posits the importance of scholars to further examine AI governance. Likewise, the paper also examines principles of AI governance based on much later publications. In this respect, principles of AI governance argued by Camilleri (2023) shall be revisited in the latter section of this paper.

Hisham et al. (2024) conducted a systematic literature review on another topic related to AI governance, AI application in policy making. Their findings, based on twenty-two articles sourced from Emerald Insight, IEE, PubMed, WOS, and Scopus, also stress on the importance of ethics and regulation when applying AI in policy making. These two areas of interest also situate the interest of paper when examining global AI governance. Another systematic literature review was conducted by Batool et al. (2025) whose data ranged from 2013 till 2023. By focusing on actor, context, and ways of governance as well as the best time to govern AI, they found that challenges of AI governance are neglecting the principles of ethical AI and responsible AI, human centred approach, and comprehensive approach to match rapid advancement of AI when governing AI (Batool et al., 2025). Such challenges will be examined in this paper when reviewing literature indexed by Scopus and WOS from 2023 to March 2025. This also infers such challenges highlighted by Batool et al. (2025) shall be revisited in the latter section of this paper. Papagiannidis et al. (2025) also conducted systematic literature review concerning AI governance with reference to responsible AI governance. They found that responsible AI governance encompasses “accountability, diversity, non-discrimination and fairness, human agency and oversight, privacy and data governance, technical robustness and safety, transparency, and social and environmental well-being” (Papagiannidis et al., 2025). However, much of reviewed literature in the work of Papagiannidis et al. (2025) were largely from Europe and the United States of America. This situates the necessity of this paper to examine literature related to AI governance that offers non-Western perspective. In summary, the paper extends the understanding of global AI governance by conducting scoping review based on literature published from 2023 till March 2025. It also reviewed some literature which offers non-Western perspective on AI governance, notably Global South and developing countries. The following section explains methodology of this paper.

## Materials and Methods

The study adopted scoping review method of Arksey and O’Malley (2005). The first stage of scoping review entail author to identify research question(s) of the study. In this regard, the scoping question is What global AI governance ought to be? Then, authors conducted literature researching using Scopus and WOS data base. By doing this, authors were able to find peer-reviewed article with quality assured by Scopus and WOS. The keyword for this activity is global “AI governance”. Digital library research was conducted on 24th and 25th March 2025. Literature was filtered based on: (a) open accessed publications, (b) English medium, and (c) published between 2003 and 2025. Then, literature was filtered for categories of publication. As a result, authors found forty-one articles meant for scoping review. However, only twenty-seven reviewed articles were used in the study due to another two additional criteria: (1) literature published in journal, not conference proceeding, book or a chapter in book, and (2) context related to global AI governance, not placing emphasis on attribute(s) of national AI policy and/or governance. The following stage argued by Arksey and O’Malley (2005) is to chart data extracted from reviewed literature. This led authors to extract and convert data into the discussions found in the findings and discussion section of this paper.

## Results and Discussion

This section discusses the findings found in the twenty-six reviewed articles. Out of these twenty-six reviewed articles, four were published in 2025, fourteen in 2024, and eight in 2023. Six articles are empirical papers and twenty are discussion papers. Details are as shown in the following *Table 1* and *Table 2* respectively. There are three articles shown in *Table 1* examined the perspective of China on AI. For instance, Mao and Shi-Kupter (2023) examined the online discussions on ethical and societal implications of AI. Data was extracted from online posts in WeChat and Zhihu, the social media platforms in China based on occurrences and context (Mao and Shi-Kupter, 2023). In regard of global AI governance ought to be, the paper found that the work of Mao and Shi-Kupter (2023) contributes to international collaboration, multi-stake approach, data privacy, accountable AI as well as digital divide and inequality. Another article written by Ji et al. (2024) examined AI from the angle of Chinese journalists based on their respective media coverage with reference to algorithmic accountability. It highlights the importance of accountable AI as part of AI governance. Hung (2025), on the other hand, analysed China’s AI governance which has placed emphasis on cyber sovereignty. Like Ji et al. (2024), the work of Hung (2025) also highlights the importance of AI accountable when governing AI.

**Table 1.** Summary of reviewed articles (empirical papers).

No.	Author(s) (Year)	Global AI Governance Ought to be
1	Mao and Shi-Kupter (2023)	International collaboration Multi-stake approach Data privacy Accountable AI Digital divide and inequality
2	Ji et al. (2024)	Accountable AI
3	Feldstein (2024)	International collaboration
4	Siomalas-Christodoulou and Tympas (2025)	Global AI metrics that aligned with national and international AI policies
5	Vecchietti et al. (2025)	Data integrity Privacy risk management
6	Hung (2025)	Accountable AI International collaboration

**Table 2.** Summary of reviewed articles (discussion papers).

No.	Author(s) (Year)	Global AI Governance Ought to be
1	Robles and Mallinson (2023)	Accountable AI Transparent AI Policy learning Data privacy security of AI AI fairness
2	Roberts et al. (2023)	Sector-Led Approach Ethical AI
3	Jones (2023)	International collaboration Ethical AI Accountable AI Competitive digital market
4	Fontes et al. (2023)	Data privacy Ethical AI Trustworthy AI
5	Cheng and Zeng (2023)	Risk based assessment model as in EU AI Act International collaboration Human-centered AI
6	Tallberg et al. (2023)	Guided by normative ideals of democracy and justice based on procedural and outcome aspects
7	Mügge (2023)	Regulatory security governance – balanced security needs with broader societal and ethical considerations
8	Montagnani et al. (2024)	Ethical AI Accountable AI

9	Wakunuma and Eke (2024)	Human-centered AI Balancing innovation and regulation Protecting human interests International collaboration
10	Kaufman (2024)	Complement AI governance with industry-related standards and quality assurance
11	Roberts et al. (2024)	Coordination and procedural legitimacy of AI global governance
12	Trigui et al. (2024)	Balancing innovation and regulation Protecting human interests
13	Ayana et al. (2024)	Empowering Global South Mitigating AI bias
14	Erman and Furendal (2024)	Political legitimacy normative ideals of democracy Transparency in decision making process of AI governance
15	Segun (2024)	Afro-communitarianism Human dignity Human centered approach
16	Joshi (2024)	Balancing innovation and regulation Protecting human interests
17	Xu et al. (2024)	Balancing innovation and regulation Environmental & human dimensions of AI Digital inclusivity Digital inequalities Institutional capacity building
18	Zaidan and Ibrahim (2024)	Multi-Stakeholder collaboration
19	Gwagwa and Mollema (2024)	Multi-Stake consensus Adhering to international law
20	Rebolledo (2025)	Transparent AI Accountable AI Respect for human rights Harmonized approach of legal and culture

In addition, Feldstein (2014) examined the initiatives of the European Union to govern AI via legislation. It also supports international collaboration that should be participated by developing countries, representing the Global South. Sioumalas-Christodoulou and Tympas (2025) argue that AI metrics should be aligned with national and international AI policies. By doing this, AI metrics could assist national government to devise effective AI policies. Vecchietti et al. (2025) has developed business calculus based on the perceptions of global bank managers on addressing deepfake generated by AI as business threats. The work of Vecchietti et al. (2025) places emphasis on data integrity and privacy risk management as crucial components of AI governance. Drawn from this basis, some reviewed articles shown in *Table 1* have discussed national perspectives of state actors in the forms of China (Hung, 2025; Ji et al., 2024; Mao and Shi-Kupter, 2023), and the European Union (Feldstein, 2024) as well as bankers as industrial players (Vecchietti et al., 2025). *Table 2* contains discussion papers published in SCOPUS and/or WOS that examined various aspects of global AI governance. For instance, Kaufman (2024) argues that addressing AI challenges should not be limited to regulation. Rather, a comprehensive framework is needed. This means regulation should be integrated with “standards, ownership structures, unwritten codes of compliance and arbitration procedures, AI governance, international agreements, compliance with current local and global standards and laws” (Kaufman, 2024). The work of Tallberg et al. (2023) argues for the normative needs of democracy and justice in global AI governance. Meanwhile, Robles and Mallinson (2023) argues that AI governance should include components of “accountability, transparency, policy learning, privacy and data protection, civil rights, non-discrimination, fairness and, safety based on their examination of some national AI strategies and AI policies in private sector. Balancing industrial innovation and human needs has captured the interests of some reviewed papers (Montagnani et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2024). As argued by Montagnani et al.

(2024) based on their examination on framework of the European Union’s AI liability, such balance enables society to reap benefits of AI.

The following word cloud analysis was developed based on data extracted with some modified terms (shortened to one word) from *Table 1* and *Table 2* respectively. The paper found that global AI governance ought to be developed by an (1) international collaboration that prioritizes (2) accountable AI and adopts (3) human centered approach (*Figure 1*).



*Figure 1. Word Cloud Analysis.*

### ***International collaboration***

The paper found that international collaboration should be the one that develops global AI governance (Cheng and Zhen, 2023; Jones 2023). The ‘missing’ inclusive collaboration among stakeholders in AI industry may resulted to AI governance becoming a platform for superpower competition, notably the European Union (EU), the United States of America, and China. This resulted to fragmented governance of AI. Each government, not limiting to the EU, the United States of America, and China, will impose own approach with different scopes and priorities concerning AI governance. For instance, Fontes et. al (2023) argue that the EU act does not only mean for governing AI, but the EU Act also enables the EU as aspiring global standard-setter, sharing the framework with non-EU countries and/or organizations, and promoting values-based governance. The United Kingdom (UK), on the other hand, seeks to cooperate with existing global powers in terms of collaborate with other governments and focus on shared leadership via its sector-led approach of AI governance (Roberts et al., 2023). However, this may not be welcomed by developing countries. China, for example, perceives AI governance as an instrument to “protect national security, promote sovereign equality, and ensure non-interference” (Hung, 2025). This is reflected in China’s preference to collaborate in international cooperation that involves both Western and non-Western countries as argued by Mao and Shi-Kupter (2023).

Some Global South countries are concerned of decolonization via AI governance. Ayana et al. (2024) argues that current governance structures are not neutral but reflect historically produced power asymmetries. This entails the importance of having developing countries as representatives when establishing AI global governance. On the same note, international collaboration should also harmonize “national strategies and global AI metrics” (Sioumalas-Christodoulou and Tympas, 2025). Gwagwa and Mollema (2024) further assert that international collaboration to be based on “a multi

stakeholder consensus [to be] adherence to international law and not the rules-based global order often propagated by the US and its allies” (Gwagwa and Mollema, 2024). In addition to that, international collaboration should also be represented by other stakeholders apart from state-centred actors. Non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations and industrial players (not limiting to AI-related business firms) should also participate in the international collaboration that construct global AI governance (Zaidan and Ibrahim, 2024). However, Erman and Furendal (2024) argues that political legitimacy remains as an important principle in AI-related international collaboration. In this sense, political legitimacy referred by Erman and Furendal (2024) is “a virtue of political arrangements and the rules (laws) that are made within them”. Rebolledo (2025) further asserts that harmonized approach matters most in global AI governance as to accommodate diverse needs of stake-holders. In summary, international collaboration within global AI governance, argued in this paper, should be inclusive. Various key stakeholders in AI governance should participate in the international collaboration. Only by having such inclusivity in international collaboration, global AI governance can benefit users, producers, regulators, etc.

### ***Accountable AI and human centered approach***

The paper found that global AI governance should ensure that accountable AI to be resulted from human-centered approach. In other words, global AI governance should ensure that artificial intelligence, supplied by industrial firms, remain accountable for their outcomes and impacts. Similarly, users should also be accountable, at all times, when using AI. This element of accountable AI should prioritize human matters at all stages of AI policy making, be it the phases of draft, implementation, or review. Rebolledo (2025) argues that “global AI governance is essential to ensure that AI development and deployment align with ethical values and social standards”. Such responsibility should be taken by all stakeholders in AI: users, producers, and regulators (Mao and Shi-Kupter, 2023). The diverse backgrounds of stakeholders resulted to inadequate “opportunities and risks associated with AI” as argued by Mao and Shi-Kupter (2023) when examined the public perception of AI in China. Like wise, Joshi (2024) raised his concerns over the manipulation of AI governance that may benefit capitalists at the disadvantage of the others. Should this issue not being addressed, it might jeopardize “democratic values, social interests, and individual rights” (Joshi, 2024). In addition, accountable AI should support and complement innovation of technology (Xu et al., 2024). In addition, global AI governance should address “how to preserve the superiority of humankind to other forms of life in the age of AI which is anticipated to be superior to humans in intelligence and perhaps morality eventually” (Cheng and Zhen, 2023). Segun (2024) argues that “AI must be developed to support humans carrying out their duty and not replace those very critical aspects of human interaction that foster our relational capacity to commune with others”. In this respect, global AI governance should prioritize human dignity in any policy related to AI.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the paper has discussed the ideal global AI governance using scoping review. That is, global AI governance ought to be developed by an (1) international collaboration that prioritizes; (2) accountable AI and adopts; (3) human centered approach. This further signifies the three important principles of governing AI at

international level: international collaboration, accountable AI, and human centered approach. A further study could conduct empirical research testing these three ideal principles in global AI governance. Data presented in this paper, however, is limited to selected literature indexed in Scopus and WOS database. Future research may also consider other elements of AI global governance that discussed by other literature listed in Google Scholar. This paper also contributes to a better understanding of what AI global governance ought to be.

### **Acknowledgement**

Some components of this paper were presented at the 4th International Conference on Government and Public Affairs 2025 (ICOGPA 2025) held in May 2025. The author wishes to thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive and insightful feedback, which greatly contributed to improving this manuscript. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for profit sectors.

### **Conflict of interest**

The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest involve with any parties in this research study.

### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Arksey, H., O'Malley, L. (2005): Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. – *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 8(1): 19-32.
- [2] Ayana, G., Dese, K., Nemomssa, H.D., Bontu, H., Mellado, B., Badu, K., Yamba, E., Faye, S.L., Ondua, M., Nsagha, D., NKweteyim, D., Kong, J.D. (2024): Decolonizing global AI governance: assessment of the state of decolonized AI governance in Sub-Saharan Africa. – *Royal Society Open Science* 11(8): 16p.
- [3] Batool, A., Zowghi, D., Bano, M. (2025): AI governance: a systematic literature review. – *AI and Ethics* 5: 3265-3279.
- [4] Camilleri, M.A. (2023): Artificial intelligence governance: Ethical considerations and implications for social responsibility. – *Expert Systems* 41(7): 15p.
- [5] Cheng, J., Zeng, J. (2023): Shaping AI's future? China in global AI governance. – *Journal of Contemporary China* 32(143): 794-810.
- [6] Council of the European Union (CEU) (2024): Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act). – *Council of the European Union Web Portal* 5p.
- [7] Erman E., Furendal, M. (2024): Artificial intelligence and the political legitimacy of global governance. – *Political Studies* 72(2): 421-441.
- [8] Feldstein, S. (2024): Evaluating Europe's push to enact AI regulations: how will this influence global norms? – *Democratization* 31(5): 1049-1066.
- [9] Fontes, C., Corrigan, C., Lütge, C. (2023): Governing AI during a pandemic crisis: Initiatives at the EU level. – *Technology in Society* 72: 11p.
- [10] Gwagwa, A., Mollema, W.J.T. (2024): How could the United Nations Global Digital Compact prevent cultural imposition and hermeneutical injustice? – *Patterns* 5(11): 16p.

- [11] Hisham, A.A.B., Yusof, N.A.M., Salleh, S.H., Abas, H. (2024): Transforming governance: A systematic review of AI applications in policymaking. – *Journal of Science, Technology and Innovation Policy* 10(1): 7-15.
- [12] Hung, H.T. (2025): Exploring China's cyber sovereignty concept and artificial intelligence governance model: a machine learning approach. – *Journal of Computational Social Science* 8(1): 31p.
- [13] Ji, X., Kuai, J., Zamith, R. (2024): Scrutinizing Algorithms: Assessing Journalistic Role Performance in Chinese News Media's Coverage of Artificial Intelligence. – *Journalism Practice* 18(9): 2396-2413.
- [14] Jones, E. (2023): Digital disruption: artificial intelligence and international trade policy. – *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 39(1): 70-84.
- [15] Joshi, D. (2024): AI governance in India—law, policy and political economy. – *Communication Research and Practice* 10(3): 328-339.
- [16] Kaufman, D. (2024): Logic and foundations of artificial intelligence and society's reactions to maximize benefits and mitigate harm. – *Filosofia Unisinos* 25(1): 13p.
- [17] Mao, Y., Shi-Kupfer, K. (2023): Online public discourse on artificial intelligence and ethics in China: context, content, and implications. – *AI & Society* 38: 373-389.
- [18] Montagnani, M.L., Najjar, M., Davola, A. (2024): The EU Regulatory approach (es) to AI liability, and its application to the financial services market. – *Computer Law & Security Review* 53: 19p.
- [19] Mügge, D. (2023): The securitization of the EU's digital tech regulation. – *Journal of European Public Policy* 30(7): 1431-1446.
- [20] National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) (2024): What is Artificial Intelligence? – *NASA Web Portal* 4p.
- [21] Omar, M., Sorin, V., Collins, J.D., Reich, D., Freeman, R., Gavin, N., Charney, A., Stump, L., Bragazzi, N.L., Nadkarni, G. N., Klang, E. (2025): Multi-model assurance analysis showing large language models are highly vulnerable to adversarial hallucination attacks during clinical decision support. – *Communications Medicine* 5(1): 7p.
- [22] Paoli, N. (2025): Deloitte was caught using AI in \$290,000 report to help the Australian government crack on welfare after a researcher flagged hallucinations. – *Fortune Web Portal* 17p.
- [23] Papagiannidis, E., Mikalef, P., & Conboy, K. (2025): Responsible artificial intelligence governance: A review and research framework. – *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 34(2): 18p.
- [24] Rebolledo, V.G. (2025): Impact of Artificial Intelligence on International Relations: Towards a Global Algorithms Governance. – *Revista UNISCI* 43p.
- [25] Robles, P., Mallinson, D.J. (2023): Catching up with AI: Pushing toward a cohesive governance framework. – *Politics & Policy* 51(3): 355-372.
- [26] Roberts, H., Babuta, A., Morley, J., Thomas, C., Taddeo, M., Floridi, L. (2023): Artificial intelligence regulation in the United Kingdom: a path to good governance and global leadership? – *Internet Policy Review* 12(2): 1-31.
- [27] Roberts, H., Hine, E., Taddeo, M., Floridi, L. (2024): Global AI governance: barriers and pathways forward. – *International Affairs* 100(3): 1275-1286.
- [28] Center for Security and Emerging Technology (CSET) (2025): Opinions of the State Council on deepening the implementation of the “Artificial Intelligence+” action. – *CSET Web Portal* 5p.
- [29] Segun, S. (2024): Are certain African ethical values at risk from artificial intelligence? – *Data & Policy* 6: 14p.
- [30] Sioumalas-Christodoulou, K., Tympas, A. (2025): AI metrics and policymaking: assumptions and challenges in the shaping of AI. – *AI & Society* 16p.
- [31] Tallberg, J., Erman, E., Furendal, M., Geith, J., Klamberg, M., Lundgren, M. (2023): The global governance of artificial intelligence: Next steps for empirical and normative research. – *International Studies Review* 25(3): 23p.

- [32] The Star (2025): Journal defends work with fake AI citations amid Hong Kong university probe. – The Star Web Portal 8p.
- [33] The Straits Times (2024): ByteDance’s TikTok cuts hundreds of jobs in shift towards AI content moderation. – The Straits Times Web Portal 4p.
- [34] Trigui, H., Guerfali, F., Harigua-Souiai, E., Qasrawi, R., Atri, C., Sokhn, E. S., Morr, C.E., Hammami, K., Souiai, O., Wu, J., Kong, J.D., Rousseau, J.J., Znaidi, S. (2024): Exploring AI governance in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region: gaps, efforts, and initiatives. – Data & Policy 6: 13p.
- [35] Vecchietti, G., Liyanaarachchi, G., Viglia, G. (2025): Managing deepfakes with AI: Introducing the business calculus. – Journal of Business Research 186: 10p.
- [36] Wakunuma, K., Eke, D. (2024): Africa, ChatGPT, and generative AI systems: Ethical benefits, concerns, and the need for governance. – Philosophies 9(3): 19p.
- [37] Xu, J., Lee, T., Goggin, G. (2024): AI governance in Asia: policies, praxis and approaches. – Communication Research and Practice 10(3): 275-287.
- [38] Zaidan, E., Ibrahim, I.A. (2024): AI governance in a complex and rapidly changing regulatory landscape: A global perspective. – Humanities and Social Sciences Communications 11(1):1-18.