

CERIDAP

RIVISTA INTERDISCIPLINARE SUL
DIRITTO DELLE
AMMINISTRAZIONI PUBBLICHE

Estratto

FASCICOLO
1 / 2025

GENNAIO - MARZO

Anti-Corruption Expertise in Ukrainian Public Administration: Conceptual Framework, Challenges, and Innovative Approaches

Ihor Diorditsa, Yuriy Onishchuk, Anatolii Matviichuk, Nazar Maliarchuk, Viktor Dasiuk

DOI: 10.13130/2723-9195/2025-1-72

Lo studio ha l'obiettivo di esaminare il quadro concettuale e procedurale relativo alle expertise in tema di anticorruzione in Ucraina, con particolare attenzione all'efficacia e alla difficoltà di applicare tali misure nella pubblica amministrazione. Le principali conclusioni rivelano che, nonostante i progressi significativi, quali l'attuazione di dichiarazioni elettroniche e sistemi automatizzati di monitoraggio, permangono lacune nel quadro giuridico, impedendo la completa realizzazione degli obiettivi anticorruzione. Lo studio esamina anche gli approcci anticorruzione e le caratteristiche della corruzione in altre nazioni, attingendo all'esperienza del sistema ucraino. Vengono esaminati i moderni approcci all'attuazione delle procedure amministrative e identificato il ruolo della tecnologia nell'accrescimento della competenza in tema di anticorruzione. Sulla base dei risultati dello studio, le raccomandazioni per future azioni anticorruzione includono il miglioramento del quadro giuridico e l'integrazione di tecnologie innovative basate su norme e standard internazionali.

The study's goal is to examine the conceptual and procedural framework for anti-corruption expertise in Ukraine, with an emphasis on the effectiveness and difficulty of applying such measures in public administration. The key findings reveal that, despite significant progress, such as the implementation of e-declarations and automated monitoring systems, loopholes in the legal framework remain, preventing the complete realisation of anti-corruption goals. The study also examines anti-corruption approaches and corruption-prone characteristics in other nations, drawing on the Ukrainian system's experience. Modern approaches to the implementation of administrative procedures are examined, and the role of technology in increasing

anti-corruption competence is established. Based on the study's findings, recommendations for future anti-corruption actions include improving the legal framework and integrating innovative technologies based on international norms and standards.

Summary: 1. Introduction.- 2. Materials and methods.- 3. Results.- 4. Discussion.- 5. Conclusions.

1. Introduction

Corruption remains one of the most serious threats to sustainable development and the functioning of democratic institutions in any country, and this is especially true for Ukraine. The issue of conducting anti-corruption expertise in public administration is important, as corruption undermines trust in state institutions, and negatively impacts economic development, social stability and the international image of the state^[1]. In the context of ongoing public administration reform in Ukraine, the issue of systemic anti-corruption is of relevance. Anti-corruption expertise of regulatory acts and their drafts is a keyway to prevent corruption risks^[2]. This process requires constant improvement and a scientifically based approach to increase its effectiveness^[3].

The research relevance is determined by several factors. Firstly, according to Transparency International^[4], Ukraine improved its ranking by three positions in 2023, ranking 104th among 180 countries with a total score of 36 out of 100. Although this shows some positive changes, the indicator still indicates a high level of corruption in the country. One of the reasons for this is the shortcomings in the existing anti-corruption mechanisms due to the lack of a systematic approach to anti-corruption expertise.

Secondly, the legal framework for conducting anti-corruption expertise needs to be significantly improved and adapted to current challenges. Thirdly, there is a need to identify effective actors, methods and procedures for conducting anti-corruption expertise that would be in line with the best international practices and standards^[5].

The scientific literature devoted significant attention to anti-corruption

expertise. For instance, Zaiats^[6], in a systematic analysis of the role of civil society institutions in combating corruption in state and local governments of Ukraine, emphasised the importance of active participation of civil society organisations in the process of anti-corruption expertise. The author notes that the involvement of civil society is a key element for effectively reducing the corrupt influence on public administration.

Ivanov^[7] addressed the administrative status of the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption (NAPC) and proposed new approaches to addressing theoretical and practical challenges in the field of combating corruption. The NAPC, as a public administration entity with a special status, plays an important role in the implementation of anti-corruption norms, but both the legislative and administrative frameworks need to be improved to achieve this goal.

E-governance is a significant part of the fight against corruption, which can significantly reduce corruption if there is an effective legal system^[8]. Park and Kim^[9] emphasised that in countries with more developed legal systems, the introduction of open government reduces corruption, although e-government alone is not always sufficiently effective. Corruption factors in the administrative culture also have a significant impact on the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures. Onyango^[10] demonstrated how cultural characteristics, such as centralised decision-making and weak legal frameworks, can make anti-corruption strategies ineffective, especially in the context of whistleblowers who often face professional and social risks.

Equally important is the impact of educational activities on the fight against corruption. Cochrane^[11] noted that anti-corruption commissions often lack adequate mechanisms to evaluate the effectiveness of educational measures, which casts doubt on their impact on real behavioural change. In the context of international experience, it is necessary to address examples of countries where anti-corruption measures have been successfully implemented. Maggio^[12] analysed the new anti-corruption legislation in Italy, highlighting that while legislative innovation is important, its effectiveness depends on integration with international standards and ensuring respect for human rights. In Africa, corruption remains one of the main obstacles to sustainable development. Senu^[13] analysed in detail how failed attempts to implement anti-corruption strategies have hindered economic development in the region, emphasising the

need to address systemic corruption factors. In addition, a study by Falisse and Leszczynska^[14], and Sadiq^[15] demonstrate that professional ethics among public officials can be improved through anti-corruption messages, but this does not always lead to a reduction in bribery, which points to the difficulty of implementing effective anti-corruption measures.

A study by Oliynyk and Onishchuk^[16] emphasised the relevance of anti-corruption expertise in the context of a full-scale war in Ukraine. The authors emphasised the need to improve legal norms and approaches, which will allow for a quick and effective response to new challenges related to corruption risks in wartime. Onishchuk^[17] provided a detailed analysis of international acts and legislation of other countries in the field of anti-corruption expertise. The article emphasised the importance of addressing international experience when developing national anti-corruption strategies, which will help to create an effective system of corruption prevention in Ukraine.

Despite the vast number of studies on various aspects of anti-corruption expertise, this issue remains insufficiently analysed. Most studies focus on specific aspects, such as legal regulation, methods and tools of expertise, but there is still a lack of a comprehensive approach to a systematic analysis of anti-corruption expertise in Ukraine, which would consider the specifics of the national legal environment and international experience. The absence of a deep analysis of the practical aspects of the examination, its effectiveness and its impact on reducing corruption risks in public administration indicates the need for further research in this area.

The study aims to develop and substantiate scientific and methodological approaches to conducting anti-corruption expertise of legal acts in Ukraine, focusing on the analysis of existing legal norms, the study of international experience and practical examples.

The main problematic issue of this study is the definition and improvement of a conceptual framework for conducting anti-corruption expertise in the public administration of Ukraine, especially in the context of instability and constant changes in the legal environment.

2. Materials and methods

During the study, the documents of various national and international organisations that have a significant impact on the development and improvement of anti-corruption policy were reviewed. Reports and recommendations of Transparency International^[18], which provide an in-depth analysis of corruption risks and suggest specific measures to reduce them, were analysed.

The formal logical approach was used to analyse the issues of legal regulation of anti-corruption expertise as a special type of activity in public administration. This approach structured the conceptual and categorical apparatus used in the theory of the State's anti-corruption policy. In particular, based on the materials of The Great Ukrainian Legal Encyclopaedia^[19], such key concepts as "administrative procedure" and "legal procedure", as well as their role in ensuring the legality and efficiency of public administration, were analysed in detail.

A dialectical approach was used to determine the legal nature, features and types of anti-corruption expertise in public administration. This approach revealed the internal contradictions and evolution of the concepts related to anti-corruption expertise, as well as to clarify the peculiarities of conducting anti-corruption expertise in the current environment. The article analysed how changes in legislation, in particular the Law of Ukraine No. 1700-VII "On Prevention of Corruption"^[20], affect the procedures and effectiveness of anti-corruption expertise.

The structural and functional approach was used to determine the peculiarities of legal regulation of the subjects of anti-corruption expertise in public administration. This approach identified the main elements that make up the anti-corruption expertise procedure and analysed their interaction in the context of preventing corruption risks. The study also addressed the Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 1395/5 "On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise"^[21].

The comparative legal approach was used to analyse the powers of anti-corruption expertise in public administration in different countries, such as Ukraine (Order of the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption No. 109/23 "On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption

Expertise by the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption”^[22], Order of the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption No. 325/20 “On Approval of the Procedure for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise by the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption”^[23], Poland (Act of Poland No. 104 “On the Central Anti-Corruption Bureau”^[24]), Georgia (Law of Georgia No. 1157 “On the Fight Against Corruption”^[25]) and Germany (Anti-Corruption Act of Germany^[26]). This approach identified both general trends and specific features of anti-corruption expertise in each of these countries. The approaches of modelling, analysis and synthesis were used to develop directions for improving the legal regulation of anti-corruption expertise in the public administration of Ukraine. In addition, the analysis and synthesis of the research results formulated proposals for the integration of international standards of anti-corruption expertise into Ukrainian legislation.

3. Results

In the legal literature, the category of “procedure” is of particular importance. It is interpreted as an independent legal entity regulated by legal norms, which determines the procedure for performing socially and legally significant actions by the subjects of specific legal relations and ensures normatively ordered regulation of social relations. The peculiarity of a legal procedure is its focus on achieving a specific legal result, which forms not only a sequence of actions but also important tools in the implementation of legal relations.

The Great Ukrainian Legal Encyclopaedia^[27] defines the term “legal procedure” as a set of interrelated actions performed by the subjects of legal relations following the procedure established by law to achieve a certain legal result. A legal procedure includes various procedural actions that regulate the procedure for exercising the rights and obligations of parties to legal relations in a particular legal area. This concept is a mechanism for ensuring legality, reasonableness and fairness in resolving legal issues, guaranteeing compliance with legal norms in administrative activities and other legal processes.

The procedure for conducting an anti-corruption expertise in the field of public administration is a component of administrative law, since it is related to public law relations, and one of the mandatory participants in such an expertise is the

subject of administrative relations. The modern science of administrative law offers different approaches to understanding the concept of “administrative procedure”: functional – a tool for the effective functioning of the administrative apparatus aimed at achieving specific administrative goals and objectives; legal – a formalised sequence of actions that regulates the activities of public authorities and ensures the legality of administrative decisions; procedural – a mechanism that protects the rights and interests of citizens in relations with administrative authorities^[28].

In the context of anti-corruption expertise, it is necessary to define administrative procedure as a specific procedure enshrined in regulations aimed at preventing corruption risks in public administration. Administrative procedure, therefore, plays a key role in ensuring transparency and efficiency of actions of public administration entities.

The procedure for conducting anti-corruption expertise is reflected in several regulatory acts, in particular in the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 950 “On Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine”^[29], Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 383/5 “Some Issues of Anti-Corruption Expertise”^[30], Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 1395/5 “On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise”^[31], as well as Order of the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption No. 109/23 “On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise by the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption”^[32] and Order of the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption No. 325/20 “On Approval of the Procedure for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise by the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption”^[33]. Notably, current legislation does not always fully cover the procedures for conducting anti-corruption assessments, especially concerning the participation of the public and independent organisations.

In particular, the analysis of current legislation shows that there are gaps in the regulation of anti-corruption expertise procedures. Particularly, Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 383/5 “Some Issues of Anti-Corruption Expertise”^[34] only generally outlines the procedure for conducting anti-corruption expertise, without providing detailed instructions on the specific steps to be taken. A similar situation is notable with the Order of the Ministry of

Justice of Ukraine No. 1395/5 “On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise”^[35], which defines the criteria and methods for assessing corruption risks but does not regulate the procedure itself in detail.

At present, there is a need to improve the legal framework governing anti-corruption expertise in Ukraine. This may include the development of clearer guidelines for conducting the assessment at various stages, as well as expanding legal opportunities for public participation in anti-corruption assessments. This will not only increase the transparency and efficiency of the process but will also help reduce corruption risks in public administration.

Recent changes in Ukrainian legislation, in Law of Ukraine No. 1700-VII “On Prevention of Corruption”^[36] are essential for improving anti-corruption expertise. In 2023, this legal act was supplemented with several concepts regulating corruption risks, by including new categories of declaration subjects and increasing requirements for openness of information. Other innovations include increased liability for failure to declare or false declaration of property, as well as the introduction of procedures for analysing declarations for their compliance with real income.

In addition, the procedures for anti-corruption expertise in regulatory acts were updated, detailing methodological approaches to identifying corruption-prone factors in legal acts and projects. The amendments include an updated methodology for identifying and assessing corruption risks developed by the National Agency on Corruption Prevention (NACP), which includes tools such as analysing provisions of laws for the possibility of manipulation and abuse, as well as assessing the compliance of regulations with international standards of transparency and accountability.

The study of the conceptual framework of anti-corruption expertise should account for new approaches that have emerged both in Ukraine and internationally. In the Ukrainian context, this refers to the introduction of electronic tools for monitoring and controlling compliance with legal norms, such as the e-declaration system, which provides quick access to data and its automatic processing. At the international level, the introduction of artificial intelligence systems to detect anomalies in financial and property declarations is gaining importance, which helps to automate the anti-corruption expertise

process and increase its efficiency (Table 1).

Table 1. Comparison of anti-corruption approaches and corruption-prone factors in different countries^[37].

Country	New anti-corruption approaches	Corruption risk factors
Ukraine	Electronic declaration of property; analysis of declarations for compliance with income; automated monitoring and anomaly detection; use of electronic tools for control.	Discretionary powers without proper control; ambiguity of wording in the legislation; lack of clear mechanisms for exercising rights and obligations.
Poland	Extended declaration of income and property; stricter sanctions for concealing information; increasing the transparency of tender procedures.	Incomplete anti-corruption reform; discretion in public procurement; insufficient public control.
Georgia	E-procurement system; transparency of political party funding; a simplified reporting procedure for officials.	Excessive concentration of power; insufficient transparency of party funding; lack of systematic verification of declarations.
Germany	Regular audits of public finances; implementation of whistleblowing mechanisms; establishment of independent anti-corruption agencies.	The complexity of lobbying legislation; high bureaucracy; insufficient number of independent inspections.

Describing the content of Table 1, it is worth noting that changes in Ukrainian legislation include the introduction of e-declarations and automated monitoring of declarations, which allows for quick detection of violations. However, there are still corruption-prone factors such as discretionary powers and ambiguities in the legislation. The Polish system was improved to enhance transparency and

accountability through expanded declaration and increased sanctions. However, the completion of anti-corruption reform and control over public procurement remains problematic. Georgia has transparent e-procurement and a simplified reporting procedure. However, excessive concentration of power and insufficient control over party financing remains the main corruption factors. In turn, Germany is developing anti-corruption control mechanisms, including regular audits and support for whistleblowing^[38]. However, the complexity of the legislation and the high level of bureaucracy create opportunities for corruption risks.

The comparison demonstrates that each country has its unique approaches to fighting corruption, as well as specific corruption-prone factors that require special attention. Corruption-prone factors in Ukraine remain a serious challenge for the development of an effective anti-corruption policy: broad discretionary powers of officials' ambiguity and complexity of the wording of legislation lack of transparency and accountability in the activities of public authorities^[39].

It is worth noting that the lack of clear procedures for monitoring and reviewing decisions made at the discretion of officials creates preconditions for abuse of power. Discretionary powers in Ukraine are often found in the context of public procurement, issuance of licences, permits and other administrative procedures. A significant number of laws and regulations are written in a way that allows for different interpretations, which creates opportunities for circumvention of the law and evasion of responsibility. This contributes to legal uncertainty, which in turn increases the risk of corruption.

Ukraine still has significant problems with access to public information and the possibility of public control over the actions of the authorities. Despite the introduction of the e-declaration system and other monitoring tools, these measures are not always effective due to insufficient integration with other databases and low levels of accountability for providing false information. Thus, anti-corruption expertise in modern conditions requires a comprehensive approach that combines legal, technological and methodological innovations. This not only identifies potential corruption risks but also minimises their impact by improving the regulatory framework and increasing the transparency and accountability of public authorities.

The procedure for conducting an anti-corruption assessment consists of several

successive stages, each of which has its specifics and importance for ensuring transparency and efficiency of public administration. Monitoring of draft legal acts and existing acts for signs indicating the need for anti-corruption expertise includes analysis of draft acts submitted to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (VRU) or the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (CMU) to identify potential corruption-prone provisions. The NACP experts carry out this monitoring based on the Methodology for conducting anti-corruption expertise^[40]. If the monitoring reveals signs of corruption-prone provisions, the NACP decides to conduct an anti-corruption expert review of the relevant project. The beginning of the examination is recorded the day after the relevant notification is sent to the VRU or the CMU. The NACP experts analyse in detail the provisions of the draft act for their compliance with anti-corruption requirements and risks of corruption.

The results of the anti-corruption expertise are set out in a conclusion containing a list of corruption-prone factors, justification for their existence and recommendations for their elimination. The conclusion is sent to the relevant committee of the VRU or the CMU and published on the official website of the NACP. The examination must be completed within 10 calendar days from the date of its commencement. Anti-corruption expertise is conducted by a group of qualified NACP experts, which may include specialists from various fields of law, economics, public administration and other areas. To ensure independence and objectivity, independent experts, representatives of non-governmental organisations, as well as international organisations may be involved in the evaluation process. Public involvement is carried out through the Public Council at the NACP, which can submit substantiated proposals and recommendations during the examination. This interaction between government agencies, civil society and international partners contributes to the transparency of the process and ensures that different points of view are taken into account when assessing regulations. Public involvement also creates an additional mechanism of control and accountability for the NACP.

The assessment of the effectiveness of anti-corruption expertise is based on several criteria, among which the main ones are addressing the NACP's recommendations in the final adoption of acts, reducing the number of corruption-prone provisions in legal acts and increasing the level of transparency

and accountability of public authorities. The success of anti-corruption expertise is also determined by how effectively the level of corruption in specific areas of public administration has been reduced after the implementation of the expertise's findings.

One of the main drawbacks is that some of the NACP's recommendations remain unaddressed, which leads to the preservation of corruption-prone provisions in the current legislation. This concerns, in particular, the failure to eliminate unclear or ambiguous wording that allows for different interpretations and opportunities for abuse, as well as the lack of effective mechanisms to prevent conflicts of interest and proper control over public procurement, which leaves room for corrupt practices and avoidance of responsibility. Thus, anti-corruption expertise is relevant for preventing corruption in Ukraine, but its effectiveness depends on the proper implementation of recommendations and the active participation of all stakeholders.

The activities of civic experts described in this methodology include several key stages that ensure a systematic approach to analysing regulatory acts. At each of these stages, a detailed analysis of the formal features of the acts, the procedures for their development, and the identification of corruption-prone factors in the provisions is carried out, which makes it possible to identify and eliminate corruption risks in a timely manner. One of the indicators of the effectiveness of civic anti-corruption expertise is the ability to identify corruption-prone factors at the stage of drafting and discussing legal acts. For example, the identification of incorrectly defined functions and powers of actors, broad discretionary powers, regulatory gaps, and conflicts in legislation allows civic experts to provide recommendations aimed at eliminating or reducing these factors.

The criteria for assessing the effectiveness of anti-corruption expertise include not only the number of corruption-prone factors identified but also the extent to which these recommendations are considered when adopting regulatory acts. Thus, anti-corruption expertise becomes a tool not only for assessing existing regulations but also for actively influencing the process of their development, ensuring that the acts comply with anti-corruption standards. Another important aspect is the involvement of the public in the review process. The participation of civil society organisations and experts allows for a wider range of opinions to be considered and reduces the likelihood of acts that facilitate

corrupt practices. For example, consultations with sectoral experts help to identify potential corruption threats more accurately and develop effective recommendations for their elimination. In general, the effectiveness of anti-corruption expertise, especially in the context of public engagement, is determined by how well it manages to reduce corruption risks in public administration and increase the transparency of the legal framework. This activity also contributes to the formation of a more responsible and accountable state apparatus, which is the basis for the successful development of a democratic society.

An important area of development of anti-corruption expertise is the creation of new and adaptation of existing tools and methodologies to more effectively identify corruption risks in legal acts (Table 2).

Table 2. Possible ways and methodologies, as well as recommendations for their implementation and adaptation in Ukraine^[41].

Tool/Method	Description	Recommendations for implementation and adaptation in Ukraine
Automated text analysis	Use of artificial intelligence to automatically analyse the texts of legal acts to identify corruption factors.	Development of algorithms for analysing the specific legal language of Ukrainian legislative acts.
Big Data Analytics	Analysing large amounts of data from various sources to identify anomalies and patterns that may indicate corruption.	Integrate Big Data with government databases to create a comprehensive system for monitoring corruption risks.
Blockchain for process transparency	Use of blockchain technologies to ensure the immutability and transparency of records related to the adoption of regulatory acts.	Implementation of blockchain solutions to track the history of changes in regulations and their development processes.

Public platforms for expertise	Electronic platforms for engaging the public in the anti-corruption expertise of regulatory acts.	Creating and promoting online platforms where non-government organisations and experts can submit their comments and suggestions.
International standards of anti-corruption expertise	Adaptation of international standards and methodologies to Ukrainian realities to increase the effectiveness of anti-corruption expertise.	Engage international experts to adapt and implement best practices in the field of anti-corruption expertise.

One of the modern tools that optimise anti-corruption expertise is automated text analysis, which significantly reduces the time for its conduct and increases the accuracy of the results. In Ukraine, the implementation of this tool requires adaptation to the specifics of the legal language and national legislation. The use of big data technologies opens new opportunities for identifying complex corruption schemes, which makes their integration with national information systems and databases an important step in the adaptation process^[42].

Blockchain technologies, due to their ability to ensure the immutability of records, contribute to increasing the transparency of decision-making and the creation of regulations, which can significantly increase the level of accountability in the public administration of Ukraine. In addition, the creation of electronic platforms for the public opens new opportunities for civil society to be involved in the anti-corruption review process, which increases the effectiveness of control over the activities of state bodies.

The adaptation of international standards to national conditions allows Ukraine to implement best practices in the fight against corruption, considering national peculiarities. The implementation of these tools and techniques can significantly increase the effectiveness of anti-corruption expertise in Ukraine, making it more modern, transparent and efficient.

In the context of global trends and Ukrainian national needs, the prospects for the development of the anti-corruption expertise system include several key areas. First, further digitalisation of anti-corruption expertise processes is necessary to

increase the efficiency of this activity. The development of electronic platforms for conducting expert assessments, their integration with other state information systems, as well as the use of technologies such as artificial intelligence and big data will significantly strengthen the ability of state authorities to identify and prevent corruption risks^[43].

Expanding international cooperation in the field of anti-corruption expertise will allow Ukraine to implement best practices and standards that have already proven effective in other countries. Joint projects with international organisations and the exchange of experience and knowledge will help to raise the professional level of Ukrainian experts and improve the methodology of expert evaluation.

Ensuring active participation of civil society in the anti-corruption assessment process is also an important area of development. Creating conditions for public involvement, including through electronic platforms for submitting proposals and comments on draft legal acts, will help to increase transparency and accountability of the authorities.

Therefore, the development of the anti-corruption expertise system in Ukraine should account for both global innovation trends and specific national needs. The introduction of new technologies, deeper international cooperation and increased participation of civil society are key elements that will contribute to the effective fight against corruption in public administration^[44].

The analysis of anti-corruption expertise in Ukraine reveals that procedural and legislative measures alone cannot fully address the complex issue of corruption in public administration. While efforts to reduce legislative ambiguity and limit discretionary powers of public officials are undoubtedly essential, they fall short of addressing the latent uncertainties inherent in administrative systems. These uncertainties, arising from the structural incompleteness of legal frameworks and the bounded rationality of actors, create a margin of unpredictability in public administration. This unpredictability, in turn, provides opportunities for opportunistic behaviors, including corruption. Even advanced monitoring systems and automated oversight mechanisms, while valuable, are not immune to the risks posed by collusion between monitors and the individuals they are meant to oversee.

To tackle these challenges, it is imperative to consider the role of cultural and

ethical factors in shaping the behavior of public officials. Ethical norms, societal values, and the cultivation of a strong sense of public duty and integrity are pivotal in mitigating corruption risks. A procedural approach, focusing solely on stricter regulations and enhanced monitoring, neglects the human and cultural dimensions of governance. Public officials' commitment to ethical behavior, driven by a sense of accountability and a culture of transparency, is indispensable for the success of anti-corruption initiatives.

Therefore, fostering a culture of integrity within the bureaucratic body emerges as a crucial complement to procedural reforms. This requires targeted educational initiatives, public awareness campaigns, and the promotion of ethical standards within the civil service. Such cultural shifts are not immediate but are necessary to reinforce the procedural mechanisms and ensure their effectiveness in the long term. In this way, the fight against corruption becomes a multidimensional effort, balancing procedural rigor with the cultivation of an ethical public administration culture that resists opportunistic behaviors at its core.

4. Discussion

The findings of the study confirm the importance of anti-corruption expertise as the main tool for ensuring transparency and efficiency of public administration in the current environment. An in-depth analysis of Ukraine's legislative framework has revealed several significant shortcomings that need to be addressed. In particular, the procedures for conducting anti-corruption expertise are not sufficiently detailed, which makes it difficult to apply them in practice. The absence of clear regulatory requirements for the involvement of the public and independent experts during the assessment limits the possibilities of civilian control, which is important for preventing corruption risks. The need to improve these aspects is obvious and is confirmed by the results of the study, which emphasises the importance of involving a wide range of participants, including civil society organisations and independent experts, in the anti-corruption review process. This, in turn, will significantly reduce corruption risks in public authorities and increase public trust in state institutions.

The study determined that insufficient detailing of anti-corruption expertise

procedures in the legislative framework of Ukraine complicates their practical application. This aspect is confirmed by Jiang et al.^[45], who emphasised that the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures is significantly increased when they are combined with active public monitoring, which compensates for the shortcomings in legislative procedures. It is impossible not to agree that active public engagement can significantly compensate for the shortcomings in the details of procedures, as public monitoring provides an additional level of control and transparency, which is extremely important for a successful anti-corruption assessment.

Another relevant aspect is the lack of set regulatory requirements for the involvement of the public and independent experts in anti-corruption assessments, which limits the possibilities of civilian control. This aspect is confirmed by Del Sarto et al.^[46], who emphasise the importance of adapting anti-corruption strategies to local conditions, through the involvement of local experts and the public, which can reduce corruption risks. Indeed, the involvement of the public and independent experts should be a mandatory part of anti-corruption expertise, as it ensures a diversity of approaches and reduces the risk of decisions being made in favour of corrupt individuals.

The study also determined that anti-corruption measures can have a broad positive impact on other areas, including environmental innovation. This aspect is supported by the results of a study by Zhou et al.^[47], which showed that after the introduction of anti-corruption measures, the level of environmental innovation in firms increased significantly. This suggests that the fight against corruption has a complex effect that goes beyond the governance process itself and has a positive impact on the development of innovation, especially in environmentally important sectors.

An important conclusion is that deficiencies in the justice system and the influence of corrupt politicians can reduce public trust in the judiciary. This is supported by a study by Zhang^[48], which demonstrates that anti-corruption measures significantly reduce the influence of corrupt politicians on court decisions, which contributes to increased trust in justice. Effective anti-corruption measures in the judiciary are critical to ensuring justice and restoring public trust in state institutions.

The study also determined that fighting corruption can reduce tax evasion. This

aspect is confirmed by Banerjee et al.^[49], who emphasised the close relationship between corruption and tax offences. Integrating anti-corruption measures into broader financial reforms is essential to increase transparency and strengthen the tax base.

Current research determined that anti-corruption measures can also have a positive impact on the health and efficiency of civil servants. This thesis is supported by Li et al.^[50], who found that anti-corruption measures improve the health and productivity of civil servants. Anti-corruption policy is relevant not only for governance but also for improving the efficiency of human resources in the public sector.

This study also showed that socioeconomic factors influence the level of corruption among officials. This thesis is confirmed by Yang et al.^[51], who found a significant impact of education and socioeconomic status on corruption. This indicates the need to consider socio-economic factors when developing anti-corruption strategies, as they can significantly affect the success or failure of such initiatives. At the same time, transparency of anti-corruption bodies is an important aspect of the fight against corruption. This thesis is confirmed by Monnery and Chirat^[52], who show that increased transparency of anti-corruption bodies significantly increases public trust in the government. Transparency in the activities of anti-corruption agencies is a key factor for the success of anti-corruption expertise, as it increases accountability and reduces opportunities for corrupt practices^[53].

Educational programmes aimed at developing ethical values play a key role in shaping anti-corruption behaviour, as confirmed by Kwarteng and Servoh^[54]. They emphasise the importance of introducing ethical standards in the training of civil servants, which helps to strengthen anti-corruption measures and increase their sustainability. A similar approach to the formation of ethical standards proved to be effective by Wahyono and Narmaditya^[55], who addressed the need for high ethical standards for the successful fight against corruption, especially among local bureaucrats who interact directly with the population. Thus, the formation of ethical standards in the training of civil servants is an important component of a successful anti-corruption strategy.

Another conclusion of this study was that transparency in public procurement is primary in reducing corruption risks. This thesis is supported by Owusu et al.^[56],

who emphasise the importance of transparency in public procurement. This confirms the importance of reforming the public procurement system to reduce corruption risks and increase the efficiency of budget spending.

The use of information technology, such as blockchain and big data, is an effective tool for fighting corruption^[57]. This aspect is supported by Thommandru et al.^[58], which shows the effectiveness of these technologies in increasing transparency and efficiency of public administration. The introduction of new technologies should be a priority in the fight against corruption, as they provide modern solutions for monitoring and identifying corruption risks. Anti-corruption measures also contribute to increasing corporate responsibility, especially in the environmental sphere. This thesis is confirmed by Boubaker et al.^[59], which shows that anti-corruption measures increase corporate responsibility. This suggests that fighting corruption not only reduces risks but also stimulates responsible business conduct, which is important for sustainable development. A comprehensive approach to fighting corruption has a positive impact on economic development^[60]. This thesis is supported by Lu et al.^[61], which demonstrates that fighting corruption contributes to economic development. Economic development is closely linked to the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures, so a comprehensive approach to fighting corruption is essential to ensure sustainable economic growth^[62]. Effective regulation and support of state-owned enterprises help to reduce corruption risks, as confirmed by Zhang et al.^[63]. This confirms the need for a systematic approach to the management of state-owned enterprises to minimise corruption risks.

As indicated by these research findings, transparency in financial transactions reduces corruption risks and increases the efficiency of market processes, as noted in the current study. This is confirmed by Yan et al.^[64], who show that anti-corruption measures affect IPO pricing. Transparency in financial management at the local level also contributes to reducing corruption risks and improving the use of budget funds^[65]. For example, studies by Paranata^[66] and Smetanina and Maaluli^[67] demonstrate that effective anti-corruption measures can significantly reduce expenditures in local budgets. Thus, ensuring transparency in financial processes is important both at the national and local levels to reduce corruption risks and improve the efficiency of budgetary resource management.

Systemic reforms and improvement of legislation are necessary to increase the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures. This thesis is supported by Guo,^[68] who shows that anti-corruption mechanisms in China after the adoption of the National Supervision Law have significantly improved the effectiveness of the fight against corruption. This underscores the need to improve legislation and carry out systemic reforms to ensure the successful implementation of anti-corruption measures and reduce corruption risks.

Thus, the results of the study confirm the need to improve the regulatory framework for anti-corruption expertise, engage the public and independent experts, and use the latest technologies to increase the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures. This will help reduce corruption and increase transparency and accountability of public administration, which is a key factor for ensuring the sustainable development of society and the economy. Implementation of the recommendations and findings of the study will help to strengthen the legal framework and build trust in state institutions, which is a prerequisite for effective anti-corruption efforts at all levels. Thus, the research findings confirm the importance of improving the legal framework for anti-corruption expertise, engaging the public and independent experts, and using the latest technologies to increase the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures. This will help reduce corruption and increase transparency and accountability of public administration, which is a key factor in ensuring the sustainable development of society and the economy. Implementation of the recommendations and findings of the study will help to strengthen the legal framework and build trust in state institutions, which is a prerequisite for effective anti-corruption efforts at all levels.

5. Conclusions

The study of anti-corruption expertise in the public administration of Ukraine has identified key aspects that affect its effectiveness. The study determined that anti-corruption expertise is an important tool for ensuring transparency and accountability of public administration, helping to identify and prevent corruption risks arising from the discretionary powers of officials and ambiguity in the wording of legislative acts. The analysis of the legal framework has shown

that the current legislation needs to be improved, especially in terms of clear procedures and public involvement in the review.

The findings also point to the importance of introducing modern technologies, such as automated text analysis using artificial intelligence and the use of blockchain technologies to ensure transparency of processes. However, the study was not without its limitations. First, the integration of electronic tools with other state databases remains insufficient, which limits their effectiveness. Secondly, there are certain problems with access to up-to-date data and sources regarding the application of international standards of anti-corruption expertise in the Ukrainian context. These limitations have affected the completeness of the analysis and the ability to identify complex corruption schemes.

Further research prospects in this area include several key areas. It is necessary to deepen the integration of electronic systems and develop methodologies that consider the specifics of Ukrainian legislation. Research in this area may include the development of new algorithms for analysing corruption-prone factors, the use of big data to identify complex corruption schemes, and the study of the effectiveness of implementing blockchain technologies in public administration. The prospect of further research includes the expansion of international cooperation, including the adaptation of the best international practices and standards to Ukrainian conditions, as well as joint projects with international organisations. This approach will help to raise the professional level of Ukrainian experts and improve the methodology of anti-corruption expertise.

Another area worth addressing is the improvement of the participation of civil society in the anti-corruption review process. Further research could focus on developing new models of interaction between the public and government agencies, as well as on studying the effectiveness of electronic platforms for engaging the public in the review process.

Therefore, the development of the anti-corruption expertise system in Ukraine should consider global innovation trends and national needs, which will contribute to the effective fight against corruption in public administration and strengthen trust in state institutions.

1. B. Aitzhanova, Zh. Oralbayeva, A. Zhanibekov, S. Sabit, N. Apakhayev, *Corruption prevention as a public administration improvement factor*, in *Social and Legal Studies*, vol.

- 7, no. 4, 2024, pp. 28-37, <https://doi.org/10.32518/sals4.2024.28>; R. Subačienė, A. Krutova, O. Nesterenko, *Determinants of sustainable development in the post-war recovery of Ukraine*, in *Economics of Development*, vol. 22, no. 4, 2023, pp. 23-33, <https://doi.org/10.57111/econ/4.2023.23>.
2. M. Galikhanov, K. Lakbayev, A. Aituarova, G. Rysmagambetova, *Problems of crime prevention by operational-investigative units in Kazakhstan*, in *Scientific Herald of Uzhhorod University. Series Physics*, vol. 55, 2024, pp. 257-265, <https://doi.org/10.54919/physics/55.2024.25pf7>.
3. O. Oliinychuk, Y. Muravska, A. Kolesnikov, N. Savka, R. Oliinychuk, N. Moskaliuk, *Fighting counterfeit as a threat to the economic security of the state on the basis of criminology research*, in *Law, Policy and Security*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2023, pp. 26-40.
4. Transparency International, *Corruption Perceptions Index*, 2023, https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2023?gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjww5u2BhDeARIsALBuLnPVGOj594fvIU6sBWx903gdb1FDQ1Ej9N-2n1-Nu6Mq630-c0Arxy0aAk7GEALw_wcB.
5. Yu. Nikolchuk, O. Lopatovska, *Investment attractiveness of Ukraine: Trends, problems and solution key vectors*, in *Innovation and Sustainability*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2023, pp. 164-175, <https://doi.org/10.31649/ins.2023.1.164.175>.
6. B.R. Zaiats, *The role of civil society institutions in the prevention of corruption in public and municipal bodies of Ukraine: Administrative-legal dimension*, in *Lviv State University of Internal Affairs*, 2021, <https://dspace.lvduvs.edu.ua/handle/1234567890/3678>.
7. O. Ivanov, *Administrative and legal status of the National Agency on Corruption Prevention*, National Academy of Internal Affairs, Kyiv, 2019, <https://uacademic.info/en/document/0420U100228#!>.
8. N. Musayeva, N. Atakishiyeva, M. Mammadova, U. Mammadova, *Innovations in the Azerbaijan Auditing Activity*, in *Review of Economics and Finance*, vol. 20, 2022, pp. 1286-1294, <https://doi.org/10.55365/1923.x2022.20.141>.
9. C.H. Park, K. Kim, *E-government as an anti-corruption tool: Panel data analysis across countries*, in *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, vol. 86, no. 4, 2020, pp. 691-707, <https://doi.org/10.1177/002085231882205>.
10. G. Onyango, *Whistleblowing behaviours and anti-corruption approaches in public administration in Kenya*, in *Economic and Political Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2020, pp. 230-254, <https://doi.org/10.1080/20954816.2020.1800263>.
11. C. Cochrane, *Teaching integrity in the public sector: Evaluating and reporting anti-corruption commissions' education function*, in *Teaching Public Administration*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2020, pp. 78-94, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0144739419851147>.
12. P. Maggio, *A critical analysis of corruption and anti-corruption policies in Italy*, in *Journal of Financial Crime*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2021, pp. 513-530, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-12-2019-0168>.
13. O. Senu, *A critical assessment of anti-corruption strategies for economic development in sub-Saharan Africa*, in *Development Policy Review*, vol. 38, no. 5, 2019, pp. 664-681,

- <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12442>.
14. J.B. Falisse, N. Leszczynska, *Do anti-corruption messages improve public service delivery? Insights from a lab-in-the-field experiment in Burundi*, in *Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 58, no. 1, 2021, pp. 96-114, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2021.1969010>.
 15. E. Sadiq, *Anti-corruption investigation agencies in Pakistan: An appraisal*, in *ISSRA Papers*, vol. 12, 2020, pp. 47-73, <https://issrapapers.ndu.edu.pk/site/article/view/51>.
 16. A. Oliynyk, Y. Onishchuk, *Concepts and types of anti-corruption examination of regulatory and legal acts*, in *Legal Scientific Electronic Journal*, vol. 8, 2023, pp. 148-151, <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0374/2023-8/32>.
 17. Y. Onishchuk, *Legal regulation of anti-corruption expertise: International standards and experience of foreign countries*, in *Current Issues in Modern Science*, vol. 9, no. 15, 2023, pp. 520-530, [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6300-2023-9\(15\)-520-530](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6300-2023-9(15)-520-530).
 18. Transparency International, *Corruption Perceptions Index*, 2023, https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2023?gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjww5u2BhDeARIsALBuLnPVG0j594fvIU6sBWX903gdb1FDQ1Ej9N-2n1-Nu6Mq630-c0Arxy0aAk7GEALw_wcB.
 19. The Great Ukrainian Legal Encyclopaedia, 2017, <https://library.nlu.edu.ua/novi-nadkhodzhennia/item/2017-velyka-ukrainska-iurydychna-entsyklopediia.html>.
 20. Law of Ukraine No. 1700-VII, *On Prevention of Corruption*, 2014 <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1700-18#Text>.
 21. Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 1395/5, *On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise*, 2017, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v1395323-17#Text>.
 22. Order of the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption No. 109/23, *On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise by the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption*, 2023, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/rada/show/v0109884-23#Text>.
 23. Order of the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption No. 325/20, *On Approval of the Procedure for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise by the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption*, 2020, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0787-20#Text>.
 24. Act of Poland No. 104 “On the Central Anti-Corruption Bureau”, 2006, <https://isap.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WDU20061040708/U/D20060708Lj.pdf>.
 25. Law of Georgia No. 1157, *On the Fight Against Corruption*, 2009, <https://matsne.gov.ge/ka/document/download/33550/83/en/pdf>.
 26. *Anti-Corruption Act of Germany*, 2004, https://recht.nrw.de/lmi/owa/br_text_anzeigen?v_id=2820131014143952768.
 27. The Great Ukrainian Legal Encyclopaedia, 2017, <https://library.nlu.edu.ua/novi-nadkhodzhennia/item/2017-velyka-ukrainska-iurydychna>.

- entsyklopediia.html.
28. N.T. Sydor, *Legal regulation of measures of procedural coercion in administrative process*, Lviv Polytechnic National University, 2021, <https://lpnu.ua/sites/default/files/2021/dissertation/16516/disertaciyna-robota-na-zdobuttya-naukovogo-stupenya-kandidata-yuridichnikh-nauk-sidor-nt.pdf>.
 29. Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 950, On Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, 2017, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/950-2007-п>.
 30. Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 383/5, Some Issues of Anti-Corruption Expertise, 2015, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0303-15#Text>.
 31. Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 1395/5, On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise, 2017, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v1395323-17#Text>.
 32. Order of the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption No. 109/23, On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise by the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption, 2023, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/rada/show/v0109884-23#Text>.
 33. Order of the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption No. 325/20, On Approval of the Procedure for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise by the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption, 2020, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0787-20#Text>.
 34. Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 383/5, Some Issues of Anti-Corruption Expertise, 2015, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0303-15#Text>.
 35. Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 1395/5, On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise, 2017, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v1395323-17#Text>.
 36. Law of Ukraine No. 1700-VII, On Prevention of Corruption, 2014, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1700-18#Text>.
 37. Source: compiled by the authors.
 38. Germany Anti-corruption Guide 2022, <https://www.theworldlawgroup.com/membership/news/germany-anti-corruption-guide-2022>.
 39. Transparency International, Corruption Perceptions Index, 2023, https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2023?gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjww5u2BhDeARIsALBuLnPVGOj594fvIU6sBWX903gdb1FDQ1Ej9N-2n1-Nu6Mq630-c0Arxy0aAk7GEALw_wcB.
 40. Order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine No. 1395/5, On Approval of the Methodology for Conducting Anti-Corruption Expertise, 2017, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v1395323-17#Text>.
 41. Source: compiled by the authors.
 42. O. Miliienko, *Public-Private Partnership as a Paradigm for Building Socially Responsible*

- Business: Successful Implementation and Plotting of Corruption Schemes and Related Criminal Liability*, in *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2023, pp. 337-354, <https://doi.org/10.34132/pard2019.04.09>.
43. S. Gashi, T. Imaraliev, S. Abdykadyrov, E. Lailieva, F. Babayev, *Research on the impact of artificial intelligence on financial security in the context of modern technological challenges*, in *Revista Interdisciplinar de Ciencia Aplicada*, vol. 8, no. 13, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.18226/25253824.v8.n13.08>.
 44. B.B. Esenalieva, A.K. Karabekova, R.S.-A. Makkaeva, *Advanced Development of Economies Based on the Digital Competitiveness: Consequences for the Balance and Financial Sustainability of the World Economic System*, in *Advances in Science, Technology and Innovation*, vol. 1, 2023, pp. 355-358, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-29364-1_70.
 45. S. Jiang, Q. Wei, L. Zhao, *Synergizing anti-corruption strategies: Group monitoring and endogenous crackdown – An experimental investigation*, in *China Economic Review*, vol. 85, 102158, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2024.102158>.
 46. S. Del Sarto, M. Gnaldi, N. Salvini, *Sustainability and high-level corruption in healthcare procurement: Profiles of Italian contracting authorities*, in *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, vol. 95, 101988, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2024.101988>.
 47. K. Zhou, H. Luo, D. Ye, Y. Tao, *The power of anti-corruption in environmental innovation: Evidence from a quasi-natural experiment in China*, in *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, vol. 182, 121831, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.121831>.
 48. P. Zhang, *Anti-corruption campaign, political connections, and court bias: Evidence from Chinese corporate lawsuits*, in *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 222, 104861, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2023.104861>.
 49. R. Banerjee, A. Boly, R. Gillanders, *Anti-tax evasion, anti-corruption and public good provision: An experimental analysis of policy spillovers*, in *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, vol. 197, pp. 179-194, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2022.03.006>.
 50. X. Li, W. Pan, G. Xu, *A “leaner” government? The effect of China’s anti-corruption campaign on the body weight and health of public sector employees*, in *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, vol. 217, pp. 141-169, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2023.11.002>.
 51. L. Yang, B. Milanovic, Y. Lin, *Anti-corruption campaign in China: An empirical investigation*, in *European Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 85, 102559, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2024.102559>.
 52. B. Monnery, A. Chirat, *Trust in a national anti-corruption agency: A survey experiment among citizens and experts*, in *European Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 85, 102592, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2024.102592>.
 53. I. Aviv, M. Levy, I. Hadar, *Knowledge-intensive business process audit: The practical aspect*, in K. Tochtermann, A. Paschke (Ed.), *Proceedings of I-KNOW 2009 - 9th International Conference on Knowledge Management and Knowledge Technologies*, Graz, 2009, pp. 397-404,

- https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Meira-Levy-2/publication/228982873_Knowledge_Intensive_Business_Process_Audit_The_Practical_Aspect/links/00b7d529068b4089f3000000/Knowledge-Intensive-Business-Process-Audit-The-Practical-Aspect.pdf.
54. J.T. Kwarteng, M.W. Servoh, *A reasoned action approach to understanding anti-corruption intentions among MBA (accounting) students in Ghana*, in *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 5, e26752, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e26752>.
 55. H. Wahyono, B.S. Narmaditya, *Structural model of the application of anti-corruption values to local government bureaucrats*, in *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, vol. 6, no. 1, 100346, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2022.100346>.
 56. E.K. Owusu, A.P. Chan, T. Wang, *Tackling corruption in urban infrastructure procurement: Dynamic evaluation of the critical constructs and the anti-corruption measures*, in *Cities*, vol. 119, 103379, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103379>.
 57. M. Gulaliyev, S. Abasova, S. Guliyeva, E. Samedova, M. Orucova, *The Main Problems of Building the Digital Economy of Azerbaijan*, in *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, vol. 20, pp. 1383-1395, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.37394/23207.2023.20.123>.
 58. A. Thommandru, F.F. Maratovich, N.S. Saparovna, *Fortifying Uzbekistan's integrity landscape: Harnessing India's tech-driven anti-corruption strategies*, in *Sustainable Futures*, vol. 7, 100206, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2024.100206>.
 59. S. Boubaker, P.-Z. Liu, Y.-S. Ren, C.-Q. Ma, *Do anti-corruption campaigns affect corporate environmental responsibility? Evidence from China*, in *International Review of Financial Analysis*, vol. 91, 102961, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2023.102961>.
 60. K. Ketners, *Developing potential budget reform for Latvia: Shifting from conventional to contemporary budgeting*, in *Social and Legal Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 55-63, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.32518/sals2.2024.55>.
 61. M. Lu, H. Bai, Y. Wu, *Anti-corruption, credit supply, and agricultural economic development*, in *Finance Research Letters*, vol. 65, 105515, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2024.105515>.
 62. S. Kerimkhulle, N. Baizakov, A. Slanbekova, Z. Alimova, G. Azieva, M. Koishybayeva, *The Kazakhstan Republic Economy Three Sectoral Model Inter-sectoral Linkages Resource Assessment*, in *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, vol. 502, pp. 542-550, 2022, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-09076-9_49.
 63. H. Zhang, R. An, Q. Zhong, *Anti-corruption, government subsidies, and investment efficiency*, in *China Journal of Accounting Research*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 113-133, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjar.2018.12.001>.
 64. C. Yan, Z. Li, J. Wang, *Do anti-corruption campaigns affect IPO underpricing? Evidence from a central discipline inspection of the CSRC in China*, in *China Journal of Accounting Research*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 80-99, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjar.2022.100281>.
 65. I. Novykova, R. Chorny, N. Chorna, M. Malik, A. Rybak, *Ensuring of Financial Stability of the Enterprise by Financial Management Tools*, in *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, vol. 487, pp. 783-792, 2023,

- https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08084-5_56.
66. A. Paranata, *The miracle of anti-corruption efforts and regional fiscal independence in plugging budget leakage: Evidence from western and eastern Indonesia*, in *Heliyon*, vol. 8, no. 10, e11153, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11153>.
 67. N. Smetanina, O. Maaluli, *Anti-corruption expertise as a direction of corruption prevention*, in *Law Review of Kyiv University of Law*, vol. 1, pp. 237-241, 2019, <https://chasprava.com.ua/index.php/journal/article/view/230>.
 68. Z. Guo, *Anti-corruption mechanisms in China after the supervision law*, in *Journal of Economic Criminology*, vol. 1, 100002, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconc.2023.100002>.