Pinnacle in Social Sciences

July-December 2026, Vol. 01, No. 02, [19–30]
Published: 31 August 2026
Publisher: Pinnacle Research Company
https://ojs.pinnacleresearchcompany.com/index.php/PSS

RESEARCH PAPER

Commercial Law: Foundations, Harmonization, and Digital Transformation in Global Trade

Shanfa Maryam[1*]

ABSTRACT

Commercial law is the body of rules that governs the making, performance, financing, and enforcement of business transactions. This article examines commercial law as a system rather than a collection of statutes. It traces the historical emergence of merchant custom, identifies the principal sources of modern commercial regulation, and analyzes core doctrinal areas: contract and sale of goods, business organizations and agency, negotiable instruments, and secured transactions. It then considers international harmonization efforts, including the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG), the UNIDROIT Principles, and the New York Convention on arbitral awards, before turning to dispute resolution and the pressures created by digital commerce, electronic records, and smart contracts. The article argues that commercial law succeeds when it combines predictability, flexibility, and enforceability, and that its future depends on balancing uniformity with local legal tradition while adapting to technological change.

Keywords: commercial law, sale of goods, CISG, lex mercatoria, international arbitration, electronic commerce, smart contracts.

*© 2026 The Authors, Published by **(PSS)**. This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Common Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0*

INTRODUCTION

Every market depends on trust between parties who often cannot verify each other's reliability. A buyer in one country orders machinery from a seller in another; a lender advances funds against inventory; a company issues shares to investors it has never met. Each of these transactions carries risk, and each is made tolerable by a legal framework that defines promises, allocates risk, and offers a credible remedy when promises fail. That framework is commercial law. Commercial law is not a single code or a single discipline. Goode et al. (2015) describe transnational commercial law as a layered system in which national legislation, international conventions, trade usages, standard-form contracts, and private dispute resolution interact. In common-law jurisdictions, commercial law has developed through judicial decisions supplemented by statutes such as the Sale of Goods Act 1979 in the United Kingdom and Article

[1] LLM Scholar, Chengdu University of Technology, China; maryam.khan.3343@gmail.com (**Corresponding)**

2 of the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) in the United States (American Law Institute & Uniform Law Commission, n.d.; Sale of Goods Act 1979). In civil-law jurisdictions, commercial rules are frequently collected in commercial codes alongside general civil codes. Many developing economies draw on both traditions; the Indian Contract Act 1872, for example, codified English common-law principles for a different social and economic setting and continues to influence several South Asian legal systems (Khan, 2027). The importance of commercial law extends beyond private convenience. Economic historians and institutional economists have argued that secure property rights and reliable contract enforcement are among the strongest determinants of long-run economic performance (North, 1990). Comparative studies of corporate and financial law further suggest that the quality of legal protection for investors and creditors influences the depth of capital markets and the cost of finance (La Porta et al., 1998). Commercial law therefore sits at the intersection of law, economics, and public policy.

This article pursues four objectives. First, it explains how commercial law evolved from merchant custom into state-backed legal systems. Second, it identifies the main sources and institutions of the field. Third, it analyzes core doctrinal areas and the policy choices embedded in them. Fourth, it evaluates contemporary challenges, including cross-border fragmentation and the legal treatment of digital transactions. The discussion is doctrinal and comparative; it relies on primary legal instruments and established scholarship, and it does not purport to state the law of any single jurisdiction as applied to a particular dispute (Haider et al., 2026).

HISTORICAL FOUNDATIONS OF COMMERCIAL LAW

The Law Merchant: The modern discipline traces its roots to the medieval lex mercatoria, or law merchant, a body of customs developed by traveling traders who needed fast, informal, and internationally intelligible rules. Berman (1983) argues that the law merchant emerged in the eleventh and twelfth centuries alongside the revival of long-distance trade in Europe and formed one of the distinct streams of Western legal tradition, together with canon, feudal, royal, and urban law. Merchants at fairs and ports resolved disputes before merchant judges who applied custom rather than technical local rules, valuing speed, informality, and reputation. Institutional economists have offered an influential explanation for how such a system could function without a central state. Milgrom et al. (1990) analyzed the medieval Champagne fairs and argued that private judges and information-sharing mechanisms allowed merchants to enforce commitments through collective reputation. A trader who defaulted on a judgment risked exclusion from future dealings. Law and economic incentive thus reinforced one another. Bernstein (1992) found a modern parallel in the diamond industry, where trade associations maintain private rules and tribunals that largely bypass the formal court system, relying on expulsion and loss of reputation as sanctions (Khan et al., 2026).

Absorption into National Law: From the seventeenth century onward, states increasingly absorbed merchant custom into national law. In England, judges such as Lord Mansfield integrated mercantile usage into the common law, particularly in relation to bills of exchange, insurance, and carriage of goods. On the Continent, the French Commercial Code of 1807 and later the German Commercial Code treated commercial activity as a distinct sphere with its own rules. This process of nationalization gave merchants state enforcement but reduced the cross-border uniformity that

the medieval law merchant had provided. The twentieth century's harmonization projects, discussed in Section 7, can be understood partly as an attempt to recover that uniformity through treaties and model laws rather than custom alone (Haider et al., 2026).

Modern Codification: Codification followed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Sale of Goods Act 1893 in England consolidated common-law rules on sale and later became the model for similar legislation across the Commonwealth, including the Sale of Goods Act 1930 in British India. In the United States, the UCC, drafted in the mid-twentieth century and adopted with variations by state legislatures, unified commercial rules on sales, negotiable instruments, secured transactions, and related subjects (American Law Institute & Uniform Law Commission, n.d.). Its drafting philosophy, which emphasized commercial reasonableness, course of dealing, and trade usage, deliberately imported the flexibility of merchant custom into statutory form (Khan, 2025).

SOURCES AND STRUCTURE OF COMMERCIAL LAW

Primary Sources: Modern commercial law draws on several layers of authority. At the national level, the primary sources are statutes, codes, and judicial precedent. Statutes typically supply default rules: terms that apply unless the parties agree otherwise. This is a defining feature of commercial law. Because sophisticated parties can often allocate risk more efficiently than a legislature, most commercial legislation is facilitative rather than mandatory, and freedom of contract remains a central organizing principle. At the international level, sources include treaties and conventions (such as the CISG and the New York Convention), model laws prepared by bodies like the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), and non-binding restatements such as the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts (UNIDROIT, 2016). Model laws and principles do not bind states or parties automatically, but they shape legislation, guide tribunals, and are frequently incorporated by reference into contracts (Lu et al., 2025).

Private Ordering: A third layer consists of private ordering: standard-form contracts, trade association rules, and widely used commercial terms. The International Chamber of Commerce's Incoterms rules, for instance, allocate responsibility for transport, insurance, and risk of loss between buyer and seller and are among the most widely used contractual tools in international trade. Standard forms reduce transaction costs but also raise concerns about unequal bargaining power, especially where one party presents terms on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Courts and legislatures in many systems respond through doctrines of unconscionability, statutory controls over unfair contract terms, or interpretive rules that read ambiguous terms against the drafter (Mathlouthi et al., 2025).

Institutions: Commercial law is enforced and shaped by an ecosystem of institutions: ordinary courts, specialized commercial courts, arbitral institutions, registries for companies and security interests, and regulatory agencies. Many jurisdictions have created dedicated commercial divisions or courts to improve the speed and expertise of business litigation. The quality of these institutions is often as important as the content of the written rules, since a well-drafted statute offers little value if enforcement is slow or unpredictable (Khan et al., 2025).

CONTRACT LAW AND THE SALE OF GOODS

Formation: Contract law is the core of commercial law. Under common-law principles, a contract generally requires offer, acceptance, consideration, and an intention to create legal relations. The classic case of Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Co [1893] 1 QB 256 illustrates how a unilateral offer made to the public can be accepted by performance. In commercial settings, courts tend to presume that parties intend to be legally bound, in contrast to domestic or social arrangements. Empirical work has nonetheless shown that businesses often rely on relationships and informal norms rather than formal contract terms in practice. Macaulay (1963), in a seminal study of Wisconsin manufacturers, found that many firms avoided detailed planning and legal sanctions, preferring to resolve problems through continuing relationships. This finding reminds us that law supplies a backstop and that commercial behavior is shaped by many forces. Civil-law systems approach formation differently, often placing greater emphasis on good faith in negotiation and on the substance of agreement rather than the doctrine of consideration. The CISG reflects a compromise: it does not require consideration and treats an offer as capable of acceptance by assent or conduct, while setting its own rules on the timing and effect of acceptance (United Nations, 1980).

Terms, Performance, and Risk: Sale-of-goods statutes imply terms that protect buyers and allocate risk. Under English law, for example, goods must correspond with their description and be of satisfactory quality and fit for purpose where sold in the course of a business (Sale of Goods Act 1979). Article 2 of the UCC provides comparable implied warranties of merchantability and fitness (American Law Institute & Uniform Law Commission, n.d.). Rules on passing of property and risk determine who bears loss if goods are damaged in transit, a question of obvious importance in commercial logistics. Parties commonly displace the default allocation through express contractual terms. Performance obligations also raise questions about the degree of strictness the law demands. Some systems permit rejection of goods for any breach of a condition, while others, including the CISG, restrict termination to a "fundamental" breach that substantially deprives the other party of what it was entitled to expect (United Nations, 1980, art. 25). This difference reflects a policy choice: the CISG's approach favors preserving the contract and avoiding wasteful rejection of goods in international sales, where return shipment is costly (Hui et al., 2025).

Remedies: The remedial framework determines whether promises are credible. Damages are the primary remedy for breach in common-law systems, and they are usually compensatory. The rule in Hadley v Baxendale (1854) 9 Exch 341 limits recovery to losses that arise naturally from the breach or that were within the reasonable contemplation of both parties at the time of contracting. This foreseeability limit helps parties price risk. Specific performance, by contrast, is generally exceptional in common-law systems and available mainly where damages are inadequate, whereas civil-law systems more readily treat performance as the primary remedy. The CISG attempts a middle position, permitting a buyer to require performance but allowing a court to decline to order it where its own domestic law would not do so for similar contracts (United Nations, 1980, art. 28). Liquidated damages and penalty clauses also illustrate the balance between freedom of contract and fairness. Many systems enforce agreed damages if they represent a

genuine pre-estimate of loss or protect a legitimate interest, but refuse to enforce clauses that are punitive. Schwenzer et al. (2012) note that comparative differences in these doctrines can create significant uncertainty in cross-border contracts, which is one reason sophisticated parties negotiate governing law and forum provisions with care (Khan & Ullah, 2024).

BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS AND AGENCY

Corporate Personality and Limited Liability: Commerce is conducted largely through organizations, and the law of business entities forms a second pillar of commercial law. The principle of separate legal personality, affirmed in Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd [1897] AC 22, holds that a registered company is a legal person distinct from its members. Limited liability, the corollary, protects investors from personal responsibility for corporate debts beyond their capital commitment. These features encourage investment by allowing risk to be pooled and priced, and they make it possible for enterprises to outlive their founders. The same features create risks of abuse. Courts and legislatures have therefore developed mechanisms to hold individuals accountable in cases of fraud, wrongful trading, or improper use of the corporate form, often described as piercing or lifting the corporate veil. Directors' duties, disclosure obligations, and rules on capital maintenance are further tools that balance entrepreneurial freedom with creditor and shareholder protection. La Porta et al. (1998) found that countries differ significantly in the strength of shareholder and creditor rights, and linked these differences to legal origin and financial development (Khan, 2024).

Partnerships and Other Forms: Beyond companies, commercial systems typically recognize partnerships, limited liability partnerships, sole proprietorships, and cooperative or hybrid forms. Partnership law traditionally imposes unlimited joint liability on partners, reflecting the personal nature of the enterprise, while modern limited-liability variants combine flexibility with liability protection. The choice among forms involves trade-offs among tax treatment, governance flexibility, regulatory burden, and exposure to risk (Khan, 2024).

Agency: Agency law allows one person to act on behalf of another and bind them to third parties. It is indispensable to commercial life, since companies can act only through human agents. Doctrines of actual and apparent authority protect third parties who reasonably rely on an agent's apparent powers, and they place the risk of unauthorized conduct on the principal who created the appearance of authority. This allocation promotes certainty in dealings: a counterparty need not investigate internal arrangements before contracting with a company representative acting within customary limits (Khan & Jiliani, 2023).

NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS AND SECURED TRANSACTIONS

Negotiable Instruments: Bills of exchange, promissory notes, and cheques are historically among the most important commercial devices. They are valuable because they are transferable and, subject to conditions, allow a holder in due course to take free of certain defenses between earlier parties. This feature promotes liquidity: a person who accepts an instrument in good faith and for value can rely on it as a near-substitute for money. Legislation such as the Negotiable Instruments Act 1881, still in force in several South Asian jurisdictions, and Article 3 of the UCC codifies these rules (American Law Institute & Uniform Law Commission, n.d.). The rise of

electronic payments has reduced reliance on paper instruments in many economies, but the underlying principles of negotiability continue to inform the law of documents of title and, increasingly, the debate over electronic transferable records (UNCITRAL, 2017).

Secured Transactions: Secured transactions law concerns the use of property as collateral for credit. Access to affordable credit depends in part on whether lenders can obtain, perfect, and enforce security interests with confidence. Modern reform has favored functional approaches, exemplified by UCC Article 9, which treat diverse security devices (pledges, chattel mortgages, conditional sales, and others) under a unified framework and rely on a public notice-filing system to establish priority (American Law Institute & Uniform Law Commission, n.d.). Public registries reduce information costs: a prospective lender can search the register to determine whether assets are already encumbered. In many developing economies, secured credit remains constrained because movable assets such as inventory and receivables cannot easily be used as collateral, or because enforcement is slow. Reforms that create modern registries and streamline enforcement can expand access to finance, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises that lack real estate collateral. Insolvency law completes this picture by determining how competing claims are ranked and whether viable businesses can be rehabilitated rather than liquidated (Khan et al., 2023).

INTERNATIONAL HARMONIZATION OF COMMERCIAL LAW

The Problem of Fragmentation: When trade crosses borders, parties face uncertainty about which law governs, how it will be interpreted, and where disputes will be resolved. Divergent national rules raise transaction costs and may discourage trade, particularly for small enterprises that cannot afford extensive legal advice. Harmonization seeks to reduce this friction by offering uniform or compatible rules.

The CISG: The most ambitious harmonization instrument in the field of sales is the CISG, adopted in Vienna in 1980 and in force since 1988 (United Nations, 1980). It applies to contracts for the sale of goods between parties whose places of business are in different Contracting States, unless the parties exclude it. According to the Pace University Institute of International Commercial Law (n.d.), 97 states have adopted the Convention. The CISG addresses contract formation, the obligations of seller and buyer, remedies, and the passing of risk, but it deliberately leaves out matters such as validity, the effect of the contract on property, and consumer sales. The CISG's success rests partly on its text, which was drafted to bridge common-law and civil-law traditions, and partly on its flexibility, since parties may opt out entirely or vary its provisions. Scholars have noted that its interpretation is meant to take account of its international character and the need to promote uniformity and good faith in international trade (United Nations, 1980, art. 7; Schwenzer et al., 2012). In practice, uniformity depends on courts and arbitral tribunals consulting foreign decisions and commentary, and databases of case law have been important in supporting this cross-border dialogue. The CISG is not without difficulties. Some states have made declarations that limit its application, and some major trading economies have chosen not to adopt it. Practitioners frequently exclude the Convention out of unfamiliarity or preference for a known domestic law, even though doing so may forgo a neutral and balanced default regime. Training

and awareness among lawyers and judges remain uneven, a factor that can affect its consistent application (Khan et al., 2023).

UNIDROIT Principles and Model Laws: The UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts, most recently revised in 2016, offer a comprehensive, non-binding statement of general contract law for international commerce. They may be chosen by parties as the governing rules, used to interpret or supplement uniform law, or referred to by arbitrators as evidence of general principles (UNIDROIT, 2016). Their value lies in providing a neutral, carefully reasoned text that does not belong to any single national system, and they can function as a modern articulation of the lex mercatoria. UNCITRAL has produced a series of model laws and conventions addressing arbitration, insolvency, secured transactions, electronic commerce, and other subjects. Model laws serve as templates that states may adapt to local conditions, producing harmonization without requiring identical text. This approach respects legislative sovereignty while promoting convergence (Khan, 2023).

Regional Integration: Regional organizations have also promoted commercial harmonization. The European Union, for example, has adopted directives and regulations covering areas such as electronic commerce, late payment, consumer protection, and data protection (Directive 2000/31/EC; Regulation 2016/679). Other regional blocs have created business-law harmonization programs aimed at reducing legal barriers within their markets. Regional approaches can reach deeper integration than global treaties because they rest on shared institutions, but they also raise questions about coherence with global instruments (Khan & Ximei, 2022).

COMMERCIAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Litigation and Its Limits: A right without a remedy is of little commercial value. Court litigation is the default route for enforcing commercial claims, but in cross-border disputes it presents difficulties: uncertainty about jurisdiction, concerns about neutrality, and the problem that a judgment may not be readily enforced abroad. Enforcement of foreign judgments depends on a patchwork of treaties and national rules, and it remains less predictable than enforcement of arbitral awards.

International Commercial Arbitration: Arbitration has become the preferred mechanism for resolving international commercial disputes. Its attractions include party autonomy in choosing arbitrators, procedure, and seat; confidentiality; and, above all, the enforceability of awards under the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, known as the New York Convention (United Nations, 1958). With well over 170 states party, the Convention requires courts to recognize and enforce foreign arbitral awards subject to limited grounds for refusal, such as invalidity of the agreement, violation of due process, or conflict with public policy. Born (2021) characterizes it as the cornerstone of the international arbitration system. Arbitration has attracted criticism. Costs and delays can be considerable in complex cases; the limited right of appeal means that errors may be difficult to correct; and in the investor-state setting, concerns about transparency and legitimacy have prompted reform debates. These critiques have led

institutions to introduce expedited procedures, rules for emergency relief, and greater transparency measures, while preserving the core advantages of the process (Khan, 2022).

Mediation and Hybrid Mechanisms: Mediation and other consensual methods have grown in importance, particularly where parties wish to preserve business relationships. The United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation, concluded in 2018, aims to provide cross-border enforceability for mediated settlements in a way comparable to the New York Convention for awards (United Nations, 2018). Multi-tier dispute clauses, which require negotiation or mediation before arbitration or litigation, are increasingly common, reflecting a preference for graduated, cost-conscious resolution (Khan & Wu, 2021).

DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION AND EMERGING CHALLENGES

Electronic Commerce and Records: The digitization of trade challenges assumptions built into traditional commercial law, which often presume paper documents, handwritten signatures, and physical delivery. The UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce, adopted in 1996, addressed this through the principles of functional equivalence and technological neutrality: an electronic record or signature should be treated as satisfying a legal requirement for writing or signature if it serves the same function, without privileging a particular technology (UNCITRAL, 1996). Many jurisdictions have enacted electronic transactions legislation modeled on or influenced by this text. Documents of title, such as bills of lading and negotiable instruments, present a harder problem because they confer rights through possession. The UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Transferable Records, adopted in 2017, seeks to enable electronic equivalents by establishing conditions under which a record can be controlled and transferred in a manner that replicates possession (UNCITRAL, 2017). Adoption of such frameworks can reduce costs and delays in trade finance and logistics, but their effect depends on legislative uptake and the willingness of commercial actors and platforms to rely on them (Abdelrehim, 2021).

Smart Contracts and Distributed Ledgers: Smart contracts, self-executing code stored on distributed ledgers, raise novel questions for commercial law. De Filippi and Wright (2018) argue that blockchain-based systems create a form of regulation by code that can operate alongside, and sometimes in tension with, legal rules. Werbach and Cornell (2017) contend that smart contracts do not eliminate the need for contract law; rather, they shift the focus to questions of interpretation, mistake, and remedies when code behaves unexpectedly or fails to capture the parties' intentions. Key issues include whether code can constitute an enforceable agreement or merely performs one, how to treat errors and exploits, who bears liability when automated execution produces unintended results, and how to reconcile irreversible execution with legal remedies such as rescission. Most existing legal systems can accommodate smart contracts through general principles. A contract may be formed electronically, and automated performance may implement its terms. However, uncertainty remains about the treatment of decentralized actors, cross-border enforcement, and the interaction with consumer protection, anti-money-laundering, and securities regulation. Regulators in many jurisdictions have responded through targeted guidance or legislation, and the area continues to evolve rapidly (Usman et al., 2021).

Data, Platforms, and Artificial Intelligence: The growth of digital platforms has produced new commercial relationships in which data is itself a commercial asset. Data protection laws such as the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation impose obligations on businesses that collect and process personal information, with extraterritorial effect that influences commercial practice worldwide (Regulation 2016/679). Platform business models raise questions about intermediary liability, standard terms imposed on users and merchants, and competition. The use of artificial intelligence in pricing, credit decisions, and contract drafting adds further layers of complexity, including questions about accountability, transparency, and bias. These developments are likely to remain central to commercial-law reform debates (Khan & Wu, 2021).

PERSISTENT CHALLENGES AND DIRECTIONS FOR REFORM

Several challenges cut across the topics discussed above. The first is the tension between uniformity and diversity. Harmonized rules promote predictability, but they must operate within legal systems that differ in doctrine, institutions, and culture. A uniform text can be applied inconsistently if courts lack training or access to comparative sources, and a rigid unification effort may ignore legitimate local policy choices. Flexible instruments such as model laws and optional principles reflect an effort to manage this tension (Khan, 2021).

The second is enforcement capacity. Substantive law reform alone seldom improves commercial outcomes if courts are overburdened, registries are incomplete, or enforcement procedures are slow. Investment in judicial training, commercial courts, case management, and electronic filing systems can have an impact comparable to legislative change. Alternative dispute resolution can reduce pressure on courts, but it depends on a baseline of reliable court enforcement of agreements and awards.

The third is the inclusion of small and informal enterprises. Much commercial law was designed with large, formal, well-advised firms in mind. Micro and small businesses often lack access to credit, legal advice, and dispute resolution, and many operate wholly or partly outside formal registration. Simplified registration, accessible secured-lending frameworks, and low-cost dispute procedures can extend the benefits of commercial law more widely.

The fourth is the integration of sustainability and responsible business conduct. Contemporary commercial practice increasingly involves due-diligence and reporting obligations relating to labor standards, environmental impact, and corruption. These requirements blur the boundary between private commercial law and public regulation and raise questions about how contractual allocation of risk should interact with mandatory standards. Finally, the digital transformation discussed in Section 9 requires continuous adaptation of legal concepts, including writing, signature, possession, and delivery, to new forms of commercial practice (Khan et al., 2020).

CONCLUSION

Commercial law has evolved from the customs of medieval merchants into a sophisticated, multilayered system of national statutes, international conventions, model laws, and private rules. Its core functions have remained constant: to make promises credible, to allocate risk efficiently,

to facilitate credit and investment, and to provide effective means of resolving disputes. The doctrinal areas surveyed in this article, namely contract and sale, business organizations, negotiable instruments, and secured transactions, illustrate how these functions are carried out through a combination of default rules, mandatory protections, and institutional support. International harmonization instruments such as the CISG, the UNIDROIT Principles, and the New York Convention show that substantial convergence is achievable where rules are carefully drafted, flexible, and supported by shared interpretive practice. At the same time, uneven adoption, local variation, and limited judicial capacity demonstrate that harmonization is a continuing process rather than a completed task. The digital economy adds further pressure by challenging traditional assumptions about documents, signatures, and performance, though the principles of functional equivalence and technological neutrality offer a workable foundation for adaptation. The central lesson is that effective commercial law depends on balance: between certainty and flexibility, between freedom of contract and protection of weaker parties, and between global uniformity and respect for local legal traditions. Future reform should focus not only on drafting better rules but also on strengthening the institutions that apply them, widening access for smaller enterprises, and ensuring that legal frameworks keep pace with technological change. Further empirical research on how businesses actually use and experience commercial law would be valuable in guiding these efforts.

REFERENCES

Abdelrehim, A. A. (2021). Digital Economy Barriers to Trade Regulation Status, Challenges, and China's Response. *International Journal of Social Sciences Perspectives*, *8*(2), 41-49.

American Law Institute, & Uniform Law Commission. (n.d.). *Uniform Commercial Code*.

Berman, H. J. (1983). Law and revolution: The formation of the Western legal tradition. Harvard University Press.

Bernstein, L. (1992). Opting out of the legal system: Extralegal contractual relations in the diamond industry. *Journal of Legal Studies*, *21*(1), 115–157.

Born, G. B. (2021). *International commercial arbitration* (3rd ed.). Kluwer Law International.

Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Co [1893] 1 QB 256 (CA).

De Filippi, P., & Wright, A. (2018). *Blockchain and the law: The rule of code*. Harvard University Press.

Directive 2000/31/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2000 on certain legal aspects of information society services, in particular electronic commerce, in the Internal Market. (2000). *Official Journal of the European Communities, L 178*, 1–16.

Goode, R., Kronke, H., & McKendrick, E. (2015). *Transnational commercial law: Text, cases, and materials* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Hadley v Baxendale (1854) 9 Exch 341.

Haider, A., Khan, A., Salameh, M. H., Almelhem, M. A., Almethen, W., & Rahman, S. U. (2026). When we are gone, but our data is not: the cultural and Jurisdictional Crisis of post-mortem data governance in the age of AI. *Cogent Social Sciences*, *12*(1), 2698290.

Haider, A., Mathlouthi, N., Nor, M. Z. M., Asmara, M., & Khan, A. (2026). From stewardship to sustainability: A comparative analysis of Islamic ecological jurisprudence and western anthropocentric regimes. *JURIS (Jurnal Ilmiah Syariah)*, *25*(1), 41-60.

Hui, Z., Haider, A., & Khan, A. (2025). International trade and plastic waste in oceans: legal and policy challenges. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *12*, 1627829.

Institute of International Commercial Law, Pace University. (n.d.). *CISG: Table of contracting states*. https://iicl.law.pace.edu/cisg/page/cisg-table-contracting-states

Khan, A. (2021). Plurilateral negotiation of WTO E-commerce in the context of digital economy: Recent issues and developments. *Journal of Law and Political Sciences Vol. No. 26, 01, 2021*.

Khan, A. (2022). E-commerce Regulations in Emerging Era: The Role of WTO for Resolving the Complexities of Electronic Trade. *ASR Chiang Mai University Journal Of Social Sciences And Humanities*.

Khan, A. (2023). Rules on digital trade in the light of WTO agreements. *PhD law dissertation, school of law, Zhengzhou University China*.

Khan, A. (2024). The emergence of the Fourth Industrial Revolution and its impact on international trade. *ASR: CMU Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (2024) Vol, 11*.

Khan, A. (2024). The intersection of artificial intelligence and international trade laws: Challenges and opportunities. *IIUMLJ, 32*, 103.

Khan, A. (2025). Study On Legal Issues Of Pakistan And China Free Trade Agreement (FTA). *Available at SSRN 6574278*.

Khan, A. (2027). Ecocide and Human Rights: Emerging Legal Frontiers in Global Environmental Accountability. In *The Evolution of Global Environmental Accountability* (pp. 143-170). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

Khan, A., & Jiliani, M. A. H. S. (2023). Expanding the boundaries of jurisprudence in the era of technological advancements. *IIUMLJ, 31*, 393.

Khan, A., & Ullah, M. (2024). The Pakistan-China FTA: legal challenges and solutions for marine environmental protection. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *11*, 1478669.

Khan, A., & Wu, X. (2021). Bridging the digital divide in the digital economy with reference to intellectual property. *Journal of Law and Political Sciences*, *28*(03), 256-263.

Khan, A., & Wu, X. (2021). Reforms for culmination of the deadlock in appellate body of WTO: An agenda of saving the multilateral trading system. *Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS-Asia)*, *2*(1), 50-62.

Khan, A., & Ximei, W. (2022). Digital economy and environmental sustainability: do information communication and technology (ICT) and economic complexity matter?. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *19*(19), 12301.

Khan, A., Amjad, S., & Usman, M. (2020). The Role of Customary International Law in Contemporary International Relations. *International Review of Social Sciences*, *8*(08), 259-265.

Khan, A., Haider, A., & Salim, A. (2026). Justice by humans, assisted by AI: What should the future of adjudication look like?. *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*.

Khan, A., Jillani, M. A. H. S., Ullah, M., & Khan, M. (2025). Regulatory strategies for combatting money laundering in the era of digital trade. *Journal of Money Laundering Control*, *28*(2), 408-423.

Khan, A., Usman, M., & Amjad, S. (2023). The digital age legal revolution: taped's trailblazing influence. *International journal of contemporary issues in social sciences*, *2*(4), 524-535.

Khan, A., Usman, M., & Amjad, S. (2023). The effectiveness of international law: a comparative analysis. *International Journal of Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences*, *2*(3), 780-786.

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (1998). Law and finance. Journal *of Political Economy, 106*(6), 1113–1155.

Lu, Y., Ahmad, I., Haider, A., & Khan, A. (2025). Legal and Economic Implications of Travel Restrictions in the China-US Trade Dispute. *China and WTO Review*, *11*(2), 66-94.

Macaulay, S. (1963). Non-contractual relations in business: A preliminary study. *American Sociological Review*, *28*(1), 55–67.

Mathlouthi, N., Haider, A., Khan, A., & Ahmad, N. (2025). The role of Hainan Free Trade Port in shaping China's WTO commitments and international trade policies. *China and WTO Review*, *11*(1), 71-82.

Milgrom, P. R., North, D. C., & Weingast, B. R. (1990). The role of institutions in the revival of trade: The law merchant, private judges, and the Champagne fairs. *Economics & Politics, 2*(1), 1–23.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data (General Data Protection Regulation). (2016). *Official Journal of the European Union, L 119*, 1–88.

Sale of Goods Act 1979, c. 54 (UK).

Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd [1897] AC 22 (HL).

Schwenzer, I., Hachem, P., & Kee, C. (2012). *Global sales and contract law*. Oxford University Press.

UNCITRAL. (1996). *Model Law on Electronic Commerce with Guide to Enactment*. United Nations.

UNCITRAL. (2017). *Model Law on Electronic Transferable Records*. United Nations.

UNIDROIT. (2016). *UNIDROIT principles of international commercial contracts 2016*. International Institute for the Unification of Private Law.

United Nations. (1958). *Convention on the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards* (330 U.N.T.S. 3).

United Nations. (1980). *United Nations Convention on contracts for the international sale of goods* (1489 U.N.T.S. 3).

United Nations. (2018). *United Nations Convention on international settlement agreements resulting from mediation*.

Usman, M. U. H. A. M. M. A. D., Khan, A. S. I. F., & Amjad, S. O. H. A. I. L. (2021). State Responsibility and International Law: Bridging the Gap.

Werbach, K., & Cornell, N. (2017). Contracts ex machina. *Duke Law Journal, 67*(2), 313–382.