LawyerGen: Judgment Generation and Proficiency Assessment for Trial Lawyers

Anonymous Author(s)




Figure 1: The distribution statistics of average lawyer scores.




Figure 2: The distribution statistics of average lawyer scores.




Figure 3: The distribution statistics of average lawyer scores.

Abstract

A clear and well-documented LaTeX document is presented as an article formatted for publication by ACM in a conference proceedings or journal publication. Based on the "acmart" document class, this article presents and explains many of the common variations, as well as many of the formatting elements an author may use in the preparation of the documentation of their work.

CCS Concepts

• **Do Not Use This Code → Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper**; *Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper*; Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper; Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper.

Keywords

Do, Not, Use, This, Code, Put, the, Correct, Terms, for, Your, Paper

ACM Reference Format:

Anonymous Author(s). 2018. LawyerGen: Judgment Generation and Proficiency Assessment for Trial Lawyers . In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2 pages. https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX

1 Introduction

an [1] Below are examples of sectioning commands.

When assessing capabilities, it was found that, under the same metrics, each assessment showed an improvement on the previous one; this has led to the current capabilities being close to the requirements, whilst there is a gap between past capabilities and the current ones. Figure 1 illustrates the process of capability assessment and quantification, whilst Figure 2 shows the trend of capability scores increasing over time; the framework we propose is illustrated in Figure 3.

2 Experiments

References

[1] Yanqing An, Qi Liu, Han Wu, Kai Zhang, Linan Yue, Mingyue Cheng, Hongke Zhao, and Enhong Chen. 2021. LawyerPAN: A proficiency assessment network for trial lawyers. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 5–13.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference acronym 'XX, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06
https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX

Table 1: Predictions of lawyers' winning rate and judgment generation on cases. The values in brackets of LawyerGen indicate relative increase over NeuralCDM-BERT. The values in brackets of variants of LawyerGen indicate relative decrease compared to LawyerPAN. The bold values represent the optimal results.

Methods	WRP		JG
	MSE↓	RMSE↓	Accuracy↑
MF	0.723	0.416	0.763
SVD	0.723	0.416	0.763
LR	0.723	0.416	0.763
NeuralCD	0.723	0.416	0.763
LawyerGen	0.723	0.416	0.763
w/o history	0.867 (-0.01)	0.313 (+0.01)	0.918 (-0.01)