

AI Critique Review Checklist

Start here: verification gate

!

Use this checklist after asking an AI tool to critique a legal memo, brief section, client email, or other legal writing. An AI critique is not a supervising attorney; it may identify useful revision opportunities, but it may also misunderstand the assignment, invent problems, or suggest changes that make the work less accurate, less strategic, or less professional.

After using AI for any review, you need to be able to say: I verified all legal and factual claims contained in the material. Otherwise, it is not work product you can stand behind.

1

The Critique Matches the Assignment

First ask whether the AI understood the task.

- Did the AI know what kind of document it was reviewing?
- Did it understand the audience: court, client, partner, professor, or internal team?
- Did it apply the correct jurisdiction, procedural posture, and legal standard?
- Did it evaluate the memo against the actual assignment instructions?
- Did it critique the work you gave it, or drift into generic advice?
- Did it suggest changes that would violate length, format, tone, or source limits?

2

Legal and Factual Claims Are Verified

Treat legal comments as claims to be checked.

- Did the AI say the memo misstated the law?
- Did it identify a missing rule, element, exception, defense, or standard?
- Did it claim authority is weak, outdated, distinguishable, or incomplete?
- Did it suggest adding a case, statute, regulation, rule, or secondary source?
- Can each legal claim be verified in a reliable legal research source?
- Are factual comments traceable to the record, assignment materials, or provided facts?

3

Hallucinations and False Problems Are Flagged

AI can invent errors just as easily as answers.

- Did the AI refer to a case, rule, quotation, element, or doctrine that may not exist?
- Did it misread the memo and criticize something that is not actually there?
- Did it claim a required section is missing when the memo already covers it?
- Did it invent a better rule statement without source support?
- Did it recommend adding facts that were not provided?
- Did it treat a stylistic preference as a legal requirement?

4

Reasoning and Analysis Are Strengthened

A good critique improves reasoning, not just prose.

- Did the critique identify where the analysis is too conclusory?
- Did it point out missing connections between rule, facts, and conclusion?
- Did it identify counterarguments or adverse facts to address?
- Did it distinguish major analytical gaps from minor writing issues?
- Did it explain why a revision would improve the legal analysis?
- Did it clarify what matters most for the client, court, or supervisor?

AI Critique Review Checklist (continued)

5

Structure and Organization Are Improved

Use the critique to test whether the document flows.

- Did the AI identify unclear headings, misplaced paragraphs, or weak transitions?
- Did it recognize whether the memo uses an expected structure, such as CREAC or IRAC?
- Did it suggest moving material for a reason, not just for variety?
- Did it preserve the logical order of the analysis?
- Did it identify repetition, gaps, or unsupported jumps?
- Would the proposed structure help the reader reach the conclusion more easily?

6

Prose Feedback Is Useful, Not Generic

AI often gives confident but shallow writing advice.

- Did the critique identify specific sentences or paragraphs to revise?
- Did it explain the problem: clarity, concision, tone, precision, organization, or support?
- Did it preserve legally necessary nuance?
- Did it avoid making writing more polished but less accurate?
- Did it avoid replacing analysis with vague professional-sounding prose?
- Did it distinguish plain language, persuasive language, and oversimplification?

7

Tone and Audience Fit Are Preserved

A revision may be grammatically better but worse.

- Would the suggested tone fit the intended audience?
- Would the revision be credible to a judge?
- Would it be understandable to a client?
- Would it be useful to a supervising attorney?
- Did the AI make the memo too aggressive, too casual, too certain, or too hedged?
- Did it remove necessary caution, uncertainty, or professional judgment?

8

Final Revision Decisions Are Yours

Do not accept AI critique wholesale.

- Which suggestions should be adopted?
- Which suggestions should be rejected?
- Which suggestions require additional research or verification?
- Which suggestions improve prose but not analysis?
- Which suggestions change the legal meaning?
- What should be documented about how the critique was used?

Bottom line + practice note

Bottom line: Do not treat an AI critique as a grade, an answer key, or a supervising attorney review. Use it as a diagnostic tool. Verify all legal claims, test prose suggestions against the assignment and audience, and decide which revisions actually improve the work product.

Note: This checklist is not exhaustive. It is meant to help you slow down and evaluate AI-generated critique, not to identify every possible issue. The questions you should ask will vary depending on the assignment, document, audience, tool, and professional setting. In practice, firm policies, court rules, client instructions, confidentiality obligations, supervisor expectations, and internal risk-management decisions should ultimately control whether and how AI tools are used.