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Abstract

Judges frequently rely their reasoning on precedents. Courts must preserve uniformity in decisions while, depending on the legal system, previous cases compel rulings. The search for methods to accurately identify similar previous cases is not new and has been a vital input, for example, to case-based reasoning (CBR) methodologies. This literature review offers a comprehensive analysis of the advancements in automating the identification of legal precedents, primarily focusing on the paradigm shift from Manual Knowledge Engineering to the incorporation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies such as Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Machine Learning (ML). While multiple approaches harnessing NLP and ML show promise, none has emerged as definitively superior, and further validation through statistically significant samples and expert-provided ground truth is imperative. Additionally, this review employs text-mining techniques to streamline the survey process, providing an accurate and holistic view of the current research landscape. By delineating extant research gaps and suggesting avenues for future exploration, this review serves as both a summation and a call for more targeted, empirical investigations.

1 Introduction

Civil, criminal, and administrative courts are challenged by the increasing need for justice systems' intervention in private and public affairs. Their actions must result in prompt and consistent judgments (Gomez, 2021; Rhode, 2004). Although the decision-making process of justice courts affects many facets of citizens' lives, these institutions have limited resources and strive to keep up with the rising caseload (Popova et al., 2021; Susskind, 2020).

The basis of the rationale of judges in national legal systems is precedent. Judges often follow precedent closely for legal certainty. Otherwise, their rulings could be appealed to higher instances (Guillaume, 2011).

In the same way, the Common Law system considers similar past cases to be precedents, implying that a result in a current issue is compelled by past issues (Rigoni, 2014). Even in places that adopt Civil law, courts are required to regard former rulings when there is enough uniformity in case law. Typically, when consistent jurisprudence is formed, precedents become "soft" law, and courts consider them when making decisions (Fon & Parisi, 2006).

Precedents are also fundamental to case-based reasoning (CBR). CBR considers similar previous cases to employ prior knowledge in answering new questions. CBR can clarify new situations by reasoning from precedents (Kolodner, 1992). Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Law, a branch of AI, extensively utilize CBR to explore legal case-based reasoning (Roth, 2003).

Although research in CBR has been utilized in legal practice since the 1980s, techniques for identifying precedents are reasonably young and understudied in AI and Law. While methods for mining textual data...
and natural language processing (NLP) have evolved and provide promising opportunities, the number of papers that studied strategies for detecting similarity and recognizing such past cases is scant.

To our knowledge, no prior work has described the methodologies used to retrieve legal precedents[1]. In the same way, the research state on this subject needs clarification so researchers and courts can consider such AI-based assistants. This paper identifies the most promising findings and the knowledge gaps about how legal practitioners can employ AI to retrieve similar cases. Moreover, we investigate the effectiveness of text mining (TM) and NLP in this semi-automated systematic review of the literature. An earlier version of this paper has been presented as a preprint (Mentzingen et al., 2022).

Mainly, we concentrate on these research questions:

- **RQ1**: How did researchers address the challenge of automatically identifying prior relevant cases, and what methods have been used in the screened studies?
- **RQ2**: What are the most promising methods for the automated search of legal precedents, and what research gaps exist?
- **RQ3**: What is the taxonomy of existing methods, and what is their mainstream?
- **RQ4**: What are the research domain’s most influential journals and authors?
- **RQ5**: What data has been used in existing research?
- **RQ6**: Are there real-world applications of this topic?

[1] The present paper is an extended and updated version of our paper [omitted for anonymity reasons], presented at [omitted for anonymity reasons][reference omitted]. This paper incorporates feedback received, increases the search period, includes a new research question, and offers significantly more detailed results and discussion sections.

## 2 Theoretical Background

### Systematic Literature Reviews

We intend to present an unbiased literature assessment on automating legal precedent identification. To this purpose, we conducted a systematic literature review (SLR). An SLR is a method of synthesizing scientific data from explicitly defined research questions. It follows rigorous procedures to locate, select, and assess relevant scientific research. SLRs collect and critically analyze data from selected studies. (Moher et al., 2009).

The systematic review process is based on predefined criteria and protocol (Jahan et al., 2016), constituting evidence syntheses of high value used to inform decisions. However, it frequently takes one to two years to complete the process under the methodological rigor that renders SLR evidence reliable (Bero et al., 2012; Ganann et al., 2010; Khangura et al., 2012; Tsafnat et al., 2014). Garrity et al. (2021)
mention that this aspect reduces the usefulness of SLRs for not tackling the time constraints of stakeholders.

Rapid Literature Reviews

Various strategies exist to make reviews more time-efficient. These strategies can be employed separately or simultaneously. Review shortcuts are among these mechanisms, through which one or more steps in a systematic review can be simplified or omitted. Moreover, the typical systematic review approach is accelerated by automating review steps (Tricco et al., 2017). In this sense, Rapid Reviews (RRs) became an alternative method to save time and resources on literature reviews. At the same time, the core principles of knowledge synthesis are present (Tricco et al., 2017).

Despite a surge in RR production, their process is still underdeveloped. The definition of an RR is still not universally recognized (Khangura et al., 2012). An extension is in progress to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) for RRs (Stevens et al., 2018). However, until it is formally finalized, authors are encouraged to follow the generic PRISMA criteria as much as possible and adapt them appropriately (Garritty et al., 2021).

PRISMA’s four stages (identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion) are used in this study to guide the critical components of an SLR.

Automating Systematic Literature Reviews

Numerous academics studied methods for automating the SLR procedure (van Dinter et al., 2021). Conducting an SLR according to the best standards and with the required level of rigor is complex, developed in multiple stages, and considerably time-consuming (Feng et al., 2018). While preserving the rigor expected from SLRs, text analytics and machine learning techniques could solve this scaling issue (Zimmerman et al., 2021). For this reason, automated literature reviews have been utilized for numerous subjects, including tourism and hospitality (António et al., 2019), climate change (Schweizer et al., 2022), and healthcare (Golinelli et al., 2022).

A recent review screened 41 articles focused on automating SLRs. It concluded that the primary election of studies was the most automated step. Even though various studies have proposed automation techniques for SLRs, none have automated the planning and reporting phases (van Dinter et al., 2021).

Four groups of applications were identified based on the SLR automation solutions proposed in 32 studies: automated document/text categorization, text mining based on visual methods (VTM) such as word clouds, federated search strategy, i.e., searching on multiple data sources at once, and document summarizing (Feng et al., 2018). In this study, we used Python (Van Rossum & Drake, 2009) and a combination of TM methods to identify primary studies for human screening.

VTM enabled the determination of the most pertinent terms and authors employing keywords and word clouds produced from the most frequent terms. Also, we used the vectorial representation of the studies
to automate their classification. Documents were deduplicated based on their similarity and filtered based on keywords.

Lastly, Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) was utilized to determine document admissibility. It was made by associating a Topics' distribution to each paper, each Topic with its corresponding probability. This way, documents were *softly* clustered according to the Topic with the most significant likelihood. The number of records still present following each phase is shown in Fig. 1.

### 3 Materials And Methods

#### Keyword Identification

Precedents are influential in resolving any legal question (Fon & Parisi, 2006). According to the Legal Information Institute, based at Cornell Law School, a precedent is a decision that serves as a starting point for resolving later cases. These cases should involve similar facts or legal matters. However, a case cannot serve as a precedent if its facts or issues differ from the current case (Cornell University Law School, 2020).

In this sense, the identification of legal precedents is antecedced by finding previous similar cases. In this sense, we derived central expressions from the research questions to allude to detecting similar cases. Also, we used 'precedent' as the corresponding legal term and consulted the study from Mandal et al. (2021) as a seminal reference on identifying precedents in justice courts. The resulting set was 'precedents identification', 'precedent retrieval', and 'case similarity'. Since CBR models are used in many disciplines, including engineering and medicine, we added the term 'case-based reasoning' as a potential alternative. We made the keyword 'legal' a required component to focus the search on the legal segment.

#### Electronic Databases and Eligibility Criteria

We used Scopus, a publication of Elsevier, and Web of Science (WoS), a database managed by Thomson Reuters, as sources because of their extensive publications' coverage. Besides that, these are the most used electronic databases for bibliometric analyses (Mongeon & Paul-Hus, 2016).

Given that English is the language of most relevant research, the search was limited to English to reduce obstacles with text mining (António et al., 2019). Additionally, to appraise the most recent methodologies, in line with advancements in TM and NLP, we restricted the search to research published from the 2000s onward ('Year'> 1999). We did not limit the publication categories provided by the search because precedent identification is still a relatively unexplored topic.

*Fig. 2* and *Fig. 3* show the queries on Scopus and WoS, respectively.

The results from the search queries were combined into a single dataset that underwent preprocessing, including deduplication and feature engineering, before they could be employed for further studies’
screening. The details about the extraction and preprocessing of the sources list are presented in Appendix A.

Screening using the Keyword Frequency

The queries for searching the electronic databases could retrieve any studies related to legal precedents, even those not involving computational methods. Thus, we wanted to apply a screening process so that the publications not mentioning computational techniques for identifying similar cases could be disregarded. We then chose to semi-automate the screening process of the remaining 160 documents.

This process started with tokenizing and stemming the abstracts, from which unique tokens (3256 unigrams and 14675 bigrams) were found. The number of occurrences of these tokens is shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5.

Stemmed words (tokens) might be indicative of computer-aided precedent retrieval applications. We used word clouds for this purpose. The words appear more prominent in this visual representation the more frequently they occur in the corpus. The tokens shown in Fig. 6 have been removed to prevent non-discriminatory words from crowding word clouds.

When building the word cloud using unigrams, the tokens 'reasoning', 'cas', and 'casebased' were discarded because they appeared in over half of the texts. Similarly, 'casebased reasoning' exceeded 30% of the samples and was removed when the word cloud was built from bigrams. The word clouds were created using the WordCloud library (Oesper et al., 2011) and are shown in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8.

The terms' syst' ('support syst' included), 'artific intelligenc', 'machine learning,' 'natur language,' and 'computat model' pointed to the most promising literature segment. Following this, the only records kept were those containing such tokens in the title, abstract, or keywords, yielding 101 samples.

Eligibility Screening based on Topic Modelling

During the eligibility assessment stage of the SLR, the publications are assessed for eligibility based on pre-specified methods. Therefore, the review team must meet the criteria for inclusion and excluding publications. The result of this stage is the reduction of the studies under evaluation, keeping the evidence set that can provide answers to the research questions. (Frampton et al., 2017).

We used topic modeling to cluster the papers and choose the studies with a higher probability of effectively responding to the research questions. Although Topic Modeling is not a recent concept, it is remarkable that just a few publications use this method to cluster research papers (Asmussen & Møller, 2019). We decided to employ LDA (Blei et al., 2003). It is usually the preferred approach for topic modeling and is considered state-of-the-art (Asmussen & Møller, 2019), using the Gensim (Rehurek & Sojka, 2011) library. LDA is a topic model that uses a generative statistics approach to unveil semantic Topics in extensive text collections and classifies documents into these Topics. The documents are categorized according to their distance from a given Topic (António et al., 2019; Hu, 2009).
We classified the documents according to four Topics. The one with the most explicit link to the research subject was chosen as the eligibility criterion for including a document in the literature review. It resulted in forty eligible documents. The procedure for obtaining the optimal number of Topics and the Topics’ description is presented in Appendix B.

Full-text Screening for Inclusion

After clustering the documents according to their most relevant topics and selecting the set of publications mainly related to Topic 2, the remaining forty studies had their full texts examined to eliminate those irrelevant to the automation of similar case identification or precedent retrieval. The nineteen publications that focus on subjects unrelated to the research questions are synthesized in Appendix C. It contains the excluded document titles and respective research topics. In Appendix D, we included the method used for validating the clustering through topic modeling as an effective method to assess document eligibility.

In conclusion, the ultimate analysis included the twenty-one papers in Table 1.

Table 1. Documents contained in the final selection (A = Article, CP = Conference Paper, PP = Proceedings Paper).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cited</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Mandal et al., 2021)</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J. Arora et al., 2020)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Di Nunzio, 2020)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(More et al., 2019)</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Amin et al., 2019)</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bhattacharya et al., 2019)</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nair &amp; Wagh, 2018)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kulkarni et al., 2017)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Thuma &amp; Motlogelwa, 2017)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oconitrillo &amp; De La Ossa Oseugeda, 2017)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Zhang et al., 2017)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eyorokon et al., 2016)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(McLaren &amp; Ashley, 2011)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Raman &amp; Palanissamy, 2009)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Raman &amp; Palanissamy, 2008)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nouaouria et al., 2006)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wang &amp; Zeng, 2005)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C.-L. Liu et al., 2004)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(McLaren, 2003)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Elhadi, 2001)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Elhadi, 2000)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Results

Descriptive Analytics
Examining Fig. 9 demonstrates that the studies' publications were dispersed in numerous sources, including conference proceedings. The peer-reviewed articles were found in six journals, one per journal.

When we examine the number of publications per year and geographical origin (Fig. 10), we observe a few studies, approximately one per year, in the first decade of the 2000s. After the initial studies, there was a long period in which there were virtually no publications in the field. After 2016, a growing interest in this field is observable, with Indian researchers contributing the most to this subject. This growth is possibly a result of the developments observed in TM and NLP in the latter half of the 2010s: word embeddings and neural network (NN) applications to NLP (Mikolov et al., 2013), recurrent neural networks (RNN) (Cho et al., 2014) and Long Short-Term Memory networks (LSTM) (Yao et al., 2019), Attention Mechanisms and Transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017), and language models pre-trained through Transfer Learning (Howard & Ruder, 2018; Qiu et al., 2020).

Content Analysis

The two first relevant studies (Elhadi, 2000, 2001) presented a simplified model to store and retrieve information in the legal context. The model approximated the human cognitive process and combined keywords with related scenarios to facilitate understanding. The scheme matched individual cases to story patterns, clustering cases with some similarity. However, the patterns, keywords, and importance were manually crafted according to the specific domain, e.g., bankruptcy legislation.

The following paper proposed a model using content vectors to recover principles and previous cases. In this work, the author assessed similarities in each case's actions and events (McLaren, 2003). Content vectors summarize the information included in intricate relational structures. A case description's content vector identifies the functors[2] that were used in that description and how frequently they occurred, including connectives, relations, object properties, and functions (Forbus et al., 1994).

A 2004 paper presented an algorithm for obtaining valuable legal information, constructing case examples from prior lawsuits, recognizing comparable samples, and refining them by combining cases and deleting irrelevant data. It required encoding the texts as ordered sets of keywords and evaluating the similarity between pairs of case scenarios. To measure similarity, the authors applied word count-based metrics. Using predetermined crime types, the nearest neighbors created clusters (C.-L. Liu et al., 2004).

The subsequent research introduced a function based on Nonlinear Nearest-Neighbor (NNN) for finding similar accident compensation cases. This method used "dimensions" to compare cases. The dimensions can be interpreted as factors representing, analogizing, and differentiating legal cases. From data observation, groupings of variables were set to represent clusters of cases. The authors employed four groupings of variables (Wang & Zeng, 2005).

Nouaouria et al. (2006) presented a prototype of a tool for applying interpretative case-based reasoning to verdicts involving alcohol consumption and smoking under Islamic legislation. The representation of
cases was based on attributes inferred as relevant to historical decisions, such as the type of fact and the product used. The similarity was addressed by grouping cases with similar attributes.

Between 2008 and 2009, a methodology inspired by CBR for retrieving legal precedents depicted lawsuits as pairs of attributes and their respective values. Knowledge from experts and critical legal circumstances were the sources for attributes and values. After, the process involved a case-similarity calculation, and cases with strong similarities were selected according to the value distribution of each attribute (Raman & Palanissamy, 2008, 2009).

In all previously analyzed studies, cases were represented using a predetermined set of dimensions corresponding to the attributes of each sample. Consequently, the factors or dimensions describing each case were subject-specific. Indeed, there were two broad approaches to applying information retrieval (IR): methods built on manual knowledge engineering (KE) and other methods based on NLP. The existing technology and scientific knowledge limited the former methods. So far, the studies have emphasized KE-based retrieval, even though these methods were not viable in the long run (Maxwell & Schafer, 2008).

McLaren and Ashley (2011) evaluated the influence of temporal orderings of facts in distinguishing among cases in ethical case issues. Each case was represented by a predefined set of actors, objects, actions, and events that appeared in the narrative. Also, temporal knowledge was expressed through a time qualifier: an association between time and how a fact relates to other facts. The study did not detail the logic employed to obtain the time qualifier for each case. The authors could not confirm the hypothesis that introducing temporal knowledge into a computational model would increase the accuracy of the model's predictions.

Eyorokon et al. (2016) presented Kyudo, a system that used conversational CBR to support knowledge discovery. Cases were represented in Kyudo as sequences of questions or knowledge goals represented by TF-IDF vectors. The similarity between answers or new goals with the existing knowledge base was calculated as a dialogue between the user and the system. By expressing knowledge goals as multidimensional vectors of semantic attributes, the system could recognize similarities with other knowledge goals and alert the user to other pertinent goals as the number of examples increased.

Later, a Business Intelligence (BI) solution was proposed by Oconitrillo and De La Ossa Osegueda (2017) to support judges' decision-making. The authors advocated a new formal representation of legal cases, depending on facts and attributes. It considered how the law is applied during a judge's reasoning process to decide on each case and the relations that a judge develops among such regulations. Nevertheless, the authors did not incorporate a solution for automating the retrieval of attributes and their values.

With a study authored by Kulkarni et al. (2017) proposing the detection of precedents using Regular Expressions rules, cosine similarity between Doc2Vec embeddings (Le & Mikolov, 2014), and topic modeling (Blei et al., 2003), we notice a move toward TM and NLP. Another research published in 2017
detected precedents integrating genetic algorithms (GAs) with k-nearest neighbors (KNNs) (Zhang et al., 2017).

Additionally, the performance of legal catchphrases for precedent retrieval was studied. Thuma and Motlogelwa (2017) isolated legal catchphrases from new cases, primarily bigrams and trigrams represented by TF-IDF vectors, and compared them to gold standard catchphrases extracted from previous cases. The results indicated that the technique needed improvements.

In a 2018 article, the citations of a document were used to perform association-rule mining as an alternative method of identifying similarities. This time, cases with matching citations were considered comparable (Nair & Wagh, 2018).

To identify similar cases from unstructured text, an unsupervised Autoencoder (Baldi, 2012) was used as a substitute for word embeddings based on neural networks, such as Word2Vec (Mikolov et al., 2013). The Autoencoder was utilized with LSTM to retrieve similar cases from unstructured text. It reportedly led to quicker training and more accurate results (Amin et al., 2019).

Using Named Entity Recognition (NER) (Mansouri et al., 2008) to preprocess documents and the input query, More et al. (2019) reported the extraction of data from legal texts. First, the vectorization used TF-IDF, while the comparison of documents used BM25 (Robertson & Zaragoza, 2009). This algorithm also won the Artificial Intelligence for Legal Assistance (AILA) track at the 2019 FIRE Conference (Bhattacharya et al., 2019), in which the task involved identifying legal precedents. In the subsequent edition of the FIRE Conference, Di Nunzio (2020) explored techniques to reduce the dimensionality of vectorized texts by employing lemmatization and stemming. The author compared the techniques for retrieving precedents with no outstanding results for any method.

Recently, the novel text embedding technique Top2Vec (Angelov, 2020) was used to retrieve precedents in combination with BM25 in a paper published by Arora et al. (2020). The authors evaluated the similarity obtained from Top2Vec embeddings with BM25, outperforming BM25-only measures.

The most recent publication in this rapid literature review was released in 2021. Mandal et al. (2021) presented a comprehensive study of fifty-six distinct combinations of document representation techniques (eight) and similarity measures (seven) to identify similarities between case report texts. Their methods included author-designed methodologies, BERT, and Law2Vec (Chalkidis, 2018), a set of Word2Vec embeddings trained on legal corpora.

When comparing the various methods for similarity measurement, the authors noticed a similar performance between neural network-based embeddings (Word2Vec, Doc2Vec, and Law2Vec) and conventional embeddings, whereas BERT produced unsatisfactory results. They also noted that the conventional vectorization techniques that represent text using bag-of-words, for instance, TF-IDF, outperformed the more sophisticated methods that consider the context (such as Law2Vec and BERT).

As identified in the content analysis, in eight papers published in 2009 and before, cases were represented using a predetermined set of dimensions corresponding to the attributes of each sample that may be grouped as methods built on manual knowledge engineering (KE). Early computational models, like Elhadi’s (2000, 2001) studies, aimed to store and retrieve information by manually matching cases to story patterns. The efforts during this period primarily relied on predetermined sets of attributes derived from keywords and factual aspects, which were crafted to the specifics of the domain, such as bankruptcy legislation. Such dimensions were handcrafted from intricate cognitive structures like content vectors (McLaren, 2003) or text encoding as ordered sets of keywords (C.-L. Liu et al., 2004).

The commonality in all these methods was their reliance on domain expertise and manual screening of cases to create such attributes. Such methods made scalability a persistent challenge, proving them unfeasible when dealing with vast numbers of legal documents. Even as computational power grew, the emphasis remained on KE-based retrieval methods (Raman & Palanissamy, 2008, 2009).

The Wave of Artificial Intelligence (2016 – Onwards)

The next significant evolution in the domain came almost a decade later. A renewed interest in legal precedent retrieval was marked by a notable shift towards utilizing NLP and ML techniques to identify precedents through textual similarity. Studies like Eyorokon et al. (2016) and Kulkarni et al. (2017) marked the beginning of this transition. The authors of the first study used TF-IDF to represent documents as vectors of important words. The approach of Kulkarni et al. (2017) combined Regular Expression rules with sophisticated techniques like Doc2Vec embeddings (Le & Mikolov, 2014) and topic modeling (Blei et al., 2003).

More contemporary methods, like the unsupervised Autoencoder paired with LSTM (Amin et al., 2019) and Named Entity Recognition (More et al., 2019), were employed as research evolved. The latter part of this era saw researchers evaluating many algorithms and representations to optimize precedent retrieval. Techniques like Top2Vec (Angelov, 2020) combined with BM25, a ranking function, began outperforming legacy methods. A comprehensive assessment by Mandal et al. (2021) encompassed fifty-six unique document representation techniques and similarity measure combinations. Their observations testify to the potential of conventional vectorization techniques in identifying legal precedents while also indicating areas of improvement for methods that heavily rely on context.

The Pipeline of Legal Precedents Retrieval

In the scholarly landscape focused on automating the identification of legal precedents, a noticeable structure has emerged, as depicted in Fig. 11. The initial phase of this process, here termed "representation", involves encoding each legal case based on a predefined set of attributes, thereby preparing it for subsequent "similarity assessment." Following this second step, most studies incorporate "evaluation" as the final stage. This phase is dedicated to assessing the effectiveness of the proposed techniques for legal precedent retrieval.
Concerning the representation of legal cases, the existing body of research can be categorized based on the specific attributes employed to characterize each document. It is noteworthy that a singular study may incorporate methodologies from multiple categories. The delineated groups are as follows:

**Keywords:** In this approach, legal cases were characterized through the utilization of specific keywords or sets of keywords.

**Facts:** This category concentrated on representing cases based on factual elements, encompassing scenarios, actions, events, and the content of judicial decisions.

**Time:** This group of studies considered the temporal sequencing of the cases or the facts within each case.

**Text-based vectors:** Here, vectorial representations of text are employed. These may be generated through various means, such as regular expressions or vectorization techniques, and may or may not incorporate semantic considerations.

**References:** This category pertains to representations that account for the statutes cited in each case or cross-references to other legal cases.

The similarity assessment phase constitutes a critical component of the legal precedents’ retrieval pipeline, serving as the linchpin that connects the representation of legal cases with the subsequent evaluation of a methodology's efficacy. Following the encoding of cases based on specific attributes as previously described — from keywords and factual elements to text-based vectors and references — the similarity assessment phase employs computational techniques to determine the resemblance between cases. The methods of similarity assessment identified among the studies are multifaceted, encompassing clustering, pairwise-distance calculations, attribute matching, association rules, and ranking functions. These techniques measure how closely a target case aligns with one or more source cases, thereby enabling the accurate retrieval of relevant legal precedents. Therefore, the efficacy of similarity assessment methodologies plays an instrumental role in enhancing the precision and utility of automated legal precedent retrieval systems. The studies can be classified into the following categories according to the type of similarity assessment:

**Clustering:** This method for identifying similar cases involves retrieving sets of documents based on document clustering.

**Pairwise distance:** The potential precedents were identified by calculating a distance measure, mainly cosine similarity, to all other cases in the dataset.

**Attribute matching:** In such studies, cases sharing one or more attributes or facts were considered similar.

**Association rules:** Similar cases were identified by mining frequent itemsets and calculating association rules metrics such as Support and Confidence.
**Ranking function:** These studies used a ranking function to compare documents to a given query or another document. Most studies in this category employed BM25 to score documents, while Divergence from Randomness (DFR)\[3\] (Amati & Van Rijsbergen, 2002) was also observed.

We designated the terminal phase of the legal precedents’ retrieval pipeline as the "evaluation" stage, which substantiates the employed methodologies’ utility and precision. This section gauges the effectiveness of the techniques demonstrated in the studies in automating the identification of relevant similar cases. A well-constructed evaluation, therefore, not only confirms the validity of the similarity assessment techniques but also serves as a benchmark for future studies seeking to contribute to this growing field of research. Notably, the evaluative methods employed by researchers in this domain can be broadly classified into three categories:

**Document citation:** This approach entails juxtaposing the results produced by the computational model against the cases cited in the target document. Such a comparison provides an empirical assessment of the model's ability to identify precedents already recognized and cited in legal literature.

**Expert evaluation:** Some studies opt for a more comprehensive approach by comparing the model's results with cases appraised similarly by legal experts. This method adds a layer of professional scrutiny, offering insights into how well the computational methods align with human expertise in the field. The comparison of a target document is made with all the documents included in the corpus and is not limited to the documents cited by the target document.

**Authors' appraisal:** A subset of studies adopts a somewhat subjective methodology, wherein the authors manually compare the results generated by their model against a small set of case pairs. Typically, this involves examining one to three pairs of cases. Although less rigorous, this evaluation form is an initial test for the model's performance.

Ultimately, a handful of studies forego the evaluation phase entirely, either due to the exploratory nature of the research or other constraints. In these instances, the absence of an evaluative component leaves the model's effectiveness untested, limiting the findings' generalizability.

**The Taxonomy of Legal Precedents Retrieval**

Based on our review of the existing literature and findings detailed in sections 4.2.1 to 4.2.3, we propose a taxonomy to systematize the field of legal precedents retrieval in **Fig. 12**. The aim is to provide a structured framework that categorizes the studies according to the technological context and techniques employed, facilitating a more comprehensive understanding of the field's evolution and current trends.

We also classified the existing studies under this taxonomy according to the characteristics described in **Table 2**.

**Table 2.** Studies are classified according to the proposed taxonomy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Similarity Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Mandal et al., 2021)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>Text-based vectors</td>
<td>Pairwise distance</td>
<td>Expert evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J. Arora et al., 2020)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>Text-based vectors</td>
<td>Ranking function</td>
<td>Document citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Di Nunzio, 2020)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>Text-based vectors</td>
<td>Ranking function</td>
<td>Document citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(More et al., 2019)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>Text-based vectors</td>
<td>Ranking function</td>
<td>Document citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Amin et al., 2019)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>Text-based vectors</td>
<td>Attribute matching</td>
<td>No evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nair &amp; Wagh, 2018)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Association rules</td>
<td>No evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kulkarni et al., 2017)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>Text-based vectors</td>
<td>Pairwise distance</td>
<td>No evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Thuma &amp; Motlogelwa, 2017)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>Text-based vectors</td>
<td>Ranking function</td>
<td>Authors’ appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Zhang et al., 2017)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>Facts, Time, References</td>
<td>Clustering</td>
<td>Expert evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eyorkon et al., 2016)</td>
<td>AI Wave</td>
<td>Facts, Text-based vectors</td>
<td>Clustering</td>
<td>No evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Raman &amp; Palanissamy, 2009)</td>
<td>Manual KE</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Raman &amp; Palanissamy, 2008)</td>
<td>Manual KE</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Attribute matching</td>
<td>Authors’ appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nouaouria et al., 2006)</td>
<td>Manual KE</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Clustering</td>
<td>No evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wang &amp; Zeng, 2005)</td>
<td>Manual KE</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Clustering</td>
<td>Authors’ appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C.-L. Liu et al., 2004)</td>
<td>Manual KE</td>
<td>Keywords</td>
<td>Clustering</td>
<td>Expert evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Elhadi, 2001)</td>
<td>Manual KE</td>
<td>Keywords, Facts</td>
<td>Clustering</td>
<td>Authors’ appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Elhadi, 2000)</td>
<td>Manual KE</td>
<td>Keywords, Facts</td>
<td>Clustering</td>
<td>Authors’ appraisal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Sources**

In the topic of legal precedent retrieval, academic research has utilized a diversity of data sources from varied geographical and legal contexts. An observation that stands out is the wide-ranging geographical representation of data sources, lending a global perspective to the research. Early studies, such as those by Elhadi (2000, 2001) and McLaren (2003), mainly used U.S.-based data focusing on bankruptcy law and professional ethics cases. These were followed by research that expanded the geographical scope to include criminal summary judgments from Taiwan (C.-L. Liu et al., 2004) and Islamic legislation (Nouaouria et al., 2006). There were also more focused datasets, such as those involving the Law of Negligence (Raman & Palanissamy, 2008) and judicial declarations of abandonment in Costa Rican Juvenile Courts (Oconitrillo & De La Ossa Osegueda, 2017).
Notably, there has been a prominent utilization of Indian court data in recent studies. Beginning with Thuma & Motlogelwa (2017), who used case documents from the Indian Supreme Court, subsequent research such as that by Kulkarni et al. (2017) and Nair & Wagh (2018) further delved into various facets of the Indian justice system. Kulkarni et al. (2017) analyzed a broad dataset comprising both court cases and statutes. Nair & Wagh (2018) used cases under the Information Technology Act 2000 conducted in different high courts in India. This trend continued in recent years with work by More et al. (2019), Bhattacharya et al. (2019), Di Nunzio (2020), J. Arora et al. (2020), and Mandal et al. (2021), all of whom engaged with case documents adjudicated by the Supreme Court of India. The emphasis on Indian court data enriches the field by incorporating the complexities and idiosyncrasies of a legal system influenced by a rich tapestry of cultural, historical, and social factors.

Adding another layer of complexity are studies like that of Amin et al. (2019), which employed a mixed-language customer support tickets dataset from an automotive company in Germany, and Zhang et al. (2017), who investigated Chinese statutes and judicial cases. These data types, though unusual, pave the way for exploring the adaptability of legal precedent retrieval algorithms to varied data formats and languages. The diversity in data sources and geographical settings reveals the demand from multiple justice systems and jurisdictions for legal precedent retrieval methods. It also embeds a challenge for the adaptability of such models and raises questions about their universal applicability, thereby serving as a compelling avenue for future research.

---

[2] A Functor is defined as a function that converts items of one set into those of another set.

[3] The DFR framework aims to rank documents based on the idea that terms that diverge significantly from their expected random distribution in a corpus are informative and thus useful for determining the relevance of a document to a query. Essentially, the more a term's distribution in the document set deviates from a random distribution, the more "useful" or "informative" that term is for distinguishing relevant from non-relevant documents.

[4] This study describes the Artificial Intelligence for Legal Assistance (AILA) track at the 2019 FIRE Conference and did not include representation or similarity assessment stages.

[5] The authors did not describe the similarity assessment method in detail.

5 Discussion

RQ1: How did researchers address the challenge of automatically identifying prior relevant cases, and what methods have been used in the screened studies?

Researchers have employed various approaches to identify relevant prior cases automatically. Such methodologies were extensively described in Section 4.2. Two major paradigms emerge:
**Manual Knowledge Engineering (2000-2009):** Initially, the research relied on domain expertise to create manually defined attributes and dimensions representing each case. The first techniques included matching individual cases to story patterns (Elhadi, 2000, 2001) and content vectors (McLaren, 2003). Keywords, facts, and other elements were manually chosen, which made these methods less scalable.

**Artificial Intelligence Wave (2016-Onwards):** The subsequent wave saw the use of ML and NLP techniques to handle the task. Methods like TF-IDF vectors (Eyorkon et al., 2016), Regular Expressions combined with Doc2Vec embeddings (Kulkami et al., 2017), Named Entity Recognition (More et al., 2019), and Autoencoders (Amin et al., 2019) were employed. These methods significantly improved scalability and accuracy.

RQ2: What are the most promising methods for the automated search of legal precedents, and what research gaps exist?

Based on the review, the most promising automated legal precedent retrieval techniques seem to lie within NLP and ML. While early efforts were primarily built on manual knowledge engineering, the shift towards NLP and ML has heralded promising advances. Document embeddings such as Doc2Vec and topic modeling (Kulkami et al., 2017; Mandal et al., 2021) have effectively represented textual data. Additionally, methods such as Top2Vec combined with BM25 ranking functions have been highlighted as outperforming approaches in a recent precedent retrieval challenge (J. Arora et al., 2020; Bhattacharya et al., 2019).

Autoencoders, especially when coupled with LSTMs, have been claimed to be effective for training on unstructured text, offering both speed and accuracy (Amin et al., 2019). NER has also been employed as a preprocessing step to extract meaningful data from legal documents (More et al., 2019). Conventional vectorization techniques, such as TF-IDF, still maintain robust performance in similarity measurements, as evidenced by the findings of Mandal et al. (2021).

Despite the progress, there are some glaring research gaps in the field. One significant gap is the continuation of studies employing AI to retrieve similar cases. The lack of consensus about the most effective methodology is evident. No definitive technique stands out as the best for all types of legal documents and jurisdictions, indicating room for more comparative studies. Additionally, no work has analyzed the effect of text preprocessing on the results, which may prove to be decisive considering that, so far, no methodology presents superior performance.

Moreover, there is a lack of uniform benchmarks for comparing different methodologies. While Mandal et al. (2021) conducted a comprehensive study on various document representation techniques and similarity measures, such exhaustive evaluations are not commonly found in the existing literature, and some studies did not evaluate the proposed methods. Larger corpora and expert-supplied ground truth should be incorporated into new studies, preferably in new legal contexts. It is crucial to notice that the mentioned works were conducted on very small corpora, with the most comprehensive study comparing similarity measurement methods using only 50 pairs of documents as the gold standard.
Temporal elements in cases, although explored, have not been comprehensively studied or incorporated into existing models, leaving a gap in our understanding of how temporal relationships between events might affect the relevance of legal precedents. Another aspect that has not yet been thoroughly evaluated is the applicability of models across different legal domains and jurisdictions, considering studies focused only on a single corpus each.

Moreover, while there has been a move toward utilizing sophisticated techniques like NLP and ML, it is worth noting that conventional methods like TF-IDF are still highly effective. This effectiveness leaves an open question about the actual incremental benefits of using more complex methods, which remains underexplored.

Finally, there is plenty of room for assessing the effects of contextual understanding on this topic. While techniques considering semantics have been effective, there is still a gap in understanding the deep context of legal language, which neural embeddings like BERT and other Transformers may fulfill.

In summary, the field has seen a promising shift toward automation using AI techniques, but many questions and gaps remain, suggesting avenues for further research.

RQ3: What is the taxonomy of existing methods, and what is their mainstream?

The taxonomy of methods for automating the identification of legal precedents has evolved significantly over the years, with two distinct eras emerging, as described in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2. In terms of operational pipeline, the taxonomy can be broadly divided into three main phases: Representation, which involves encoding legal cases based on predefined attributes; Similarity Assessment, the techniques employed to measure the resemblance between cases; and Evaluation, the final stage of measuring the effectiveness of the retrieval techniques.

As per the existing literature, there has been a mainstream shift towards AI-based methods in recent years, with a particular emphasis on vectorial text representations and advanced similarity assessment techniques like ranking functions and pairwise distance measures. The comprehensive assessment by Mandal et al. (2021) stood out as a seminal work that spanned over fifty-six unique combinations of document representation techniques and similarity measures, validating the efficacy of conventional vectorization techniques while indicating areas for improvement.

In terms of evaluation, the most rigorous methods involve either document citation or expert evaluation, with a less rigorous yet prevalent approach involving authors' appraisal of a handful of case pairs. However, it is noteworthy that some studies have foregone the evaluation phase entirely, possibly due to the lack of an annotated corpus or other constraints, which leaves a gap in validating the effectiveness of the proposed methods.

The trend has moved towards more automated, scalable, and data-driven approaches, leaving behind the past's cumbersome, manual, and less scalable methods. Nevertheless, there remains considerable
diversity in both representation and similarity assessment techniques, suggesting the field is still in a 
state of active exploration and development.

RQ4: What are the research domain's most influential journals and authors?

As described in Table 1, the most cited paper had sixty-seven citations. It was published in Artificial 
Intelligence. The following two papers with more citations were published in the Journal of Information 
Science and Engineering and Experts Systems with Applications. This set of publications is concentrated 
between the years 2000 and 2004. In line with the time gap we observe in the literature associated with 
this field, the following three most cited papers were published between 2017 and 2021 on IEEE Access, 
Artificial Intelligence and Law, and ACM International Conference Proceeding Series.

Exception made for CEUR Workshop Proceedings, all sources had only one paper considered relevant to 
this literature review (Fig. 9). Consequently, it is still not possible to say that there is a source considered 
more influential than the others in the field of automation of identification of legal precedents.

Bruce M. McLaren (sixty-seven citations) is the author with the most citations. However, this author 
cannot be considered influential in this field as the paper to which the citations correspond was published 
in 2003. The same applies to Chao L. Liu, Cheng T. Chang, and Jim H. Ho, with forty citations, and 
Mohamed T. Elhadi, cited thirty times. The authors who published papers more recently and that obtained 
the most citations are Kripabandhu Ghosh (seventeen citations), Saptarshi Ghosh (seventeen citations), 
and Arpan Mandal (eleven citations). The literature in this field is also very sparse regarding influential 
authors, with no author with more than two relevant publications.

RQ5: What data has been used in existing research?

In the academic research included in this literature review, a wide variety of data sources have been 
utilized, spanning multiple geographical and legal contexts. The diversity in data is indicative of the field's 
global scope and its attempts to adapt to various legal systems. Below is a breakdown of the 
geographical scopes and corresponding legal contexts used:

United States: Early studies primarily used U.S.-based data (Elhadi, 2000, 2001; McLaren, 2003). These 
studies focused on areas such as bankruptcy law and professional ethics cases.

Taiwan: The research includes Taiwanese data in criminal summary judgments (C.-L. Liu et al., 2004).

Algeria: One study has delved into Islamic legislation (Nouaouria et al., 2006).

Costa Rica: Research has been conducted on judicial declarations of abandonment in Costa Rican 
Juvenile Courts (Oconitrillo & De La Ossa Osegueda, 2017).

India: A significant emphasis has been placed on Indian court data in recent studies. Research in this 
context includes various aspects of the Indian justice system, including the Supreme Court and different
high courts (J. Arora et al., 2020; Bhattacharya et al., 2019; Di Nunzio, 2020; Kulkarni et al., 2017; Mandal et al., 2021; More et al., 2019; Nair & Wagh, 2018; Thuma & Motlogelwa, 2017).

**China**: One study has also investigated Chinese statutes and judicial cases (Zhang et al., 2017).

**Germany**: One unusual dataset employed was a mixed-language customer support tickets dataset from an automotive company in Germany (Amin et al., 2019).

Finally, multiple types of documents have been employed by researchers. Most studies used case documents from courts, while some research incorporated statutes (Kulkarni et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2017) or even customer support tickets (Amin et al., 2019), a non-traditional source for this field.

Using data from multiple justice systems and jurisdictions embeds a challenge for the adaptability of legal precedent retrieval models and raises questions about their universal applicability. This diversity serves as a compelling avenue for future research.

RQ6: Are there real-world applications of this topic?

In synthesizing the range of research approaches discussed in Section 4.2, it is notable that none of the studies in this literature review report real-world implementations of models designed for legal precedents retrieval. This gap presents a central direction for future research. While various models have been proposed, tested, and evolved to tackle different aspects of precedent retrieval—from early KE systems to more recent systems based on neural network embeddings—their applications have remained mainly theoretical. The absence of real-world case studies in applying these models to actual legal systems raises pertinent questions: Why have these models not yet been adopted in judicial settings? Are there inherent limitations in the current models that deter their application, or are there external factors such as ethical, legal, or operational constraints?

This situation underscores the need for the following research phase to focus on refining algorithms and methods and transitioning from theoretical frameworks to applied solutions. Implementing these models in real-world scenarios could provide insights into their efficacy, scalability, and limitations. Similarly, in-depth investigations into the challenges preventing the implementation can yield valuable lessons. Both avenues would significantly contribute to the field's maturity, ensuring that future advancements are theoretically robust and practically applicable.

6 Conclusions

This literature review aimed to synthesize the state of research on automating the identification of legal precedents, focusing on the techniques employed, influential journals, and authors while assessing the effectiveness of these techniques and existing research gaps. Using textual mining methods for semi-automating the review process, this study identified 70% of relevant publications, thereby reducing the number of studies that required in-depth analysis by 82.5%. This highlights the transformative potential
of automation in expediting the creation of literature reviews, particularly in a field as intricate as legal studies.

The findings suggest that the automation of legal precedent retrieval is increasingly leveraging text processing and machine learning techniques. However, the field is nascent, with techniques often tested in isolated studies and specific contexts. Most alarmingly, the limited validation samples used in these studies and the lack of a noteworthy advantage from advanced text embeddings underscore the challenges in establishing universally applicable models. This leads to the realization that automating legal precedent retrieval is not a one-size-fits-all proposition but requires nuanced approaches tested across different legal contexts and datasets.

Given these complexities, there is an urgent call for more comprehensive research. Future work should focus on employing more extensive and diverse corpora, including expert-provided ground truths, to accurately evaluate the efficacy and adaptability of various strategies accurately. The application of emerging technologies, such as LSTM networks and Transformers, also merits rigorous exploration to understand their potential in legal precedent retrieval.

However, the limitations of this literature review must be acknowledged. The insights were drawn from a relatively small set of 21 papers, and the human cognition involved in selecting databases, queries, and eligibility criteria could have influenced the findings. Notably, the lack of snowballing in related work identification due to varied citation structures could also be a limitation. As such, future research could benefit from investigating citation networks or employing automated methods for selecting studies based on objective criteria for literature reviews.

In summary, while this review marks a significant step in understanding the possibilities and limitations of automating legal precedent retrieval, it also serves as a clarion call for further, more expansive research to grasp the opportunities and challenges that lie ahead fully.
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Figure 1
Documents chosen from each electronic database after the sources' selection stages.

(TITLE-ABS-KEY {{precedents identification} OR {precedent identification} OR {precedent retrieval} OR {precedents retrieval} OR {case similarity} OR {cases similarity} OR {case-based reasoning}} AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (legal)) AND (LIMIT-TO(LANGUAGE, "English")) AND (PUBYEAR > 1999)

Figure 2
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Figure 3
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