








One Law, Many Languages: Benchmarking Multilingual Legal Reasoning for Judicial Support

Ronja Stern ^{1,4†}, Rasiah Vishvaksenan^{1†}, Veton Matoshi ²,
Srinanda Brügger Bose ³, Matthias Stürmer ²,
Ilias Chalkidis ⁴, Daniel E. Ho ⁵, Joël Niklaus ^{1,2,5†}

¹University of Bern, Switzerland.

²Bern University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland.

³University of Fribourg, Switzerland.

⁴University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

⁵Stanford University, USA.

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Recent strides in Large Language Models (LLMs) have saturated many Natural Language Processing (NLP) benchmarks, emphasizing the need for more challenging ones to properly assess LLM capabilities. However, domain-specific and multilingual benchmarks are rare because they require in-depth expertise to develop. Still, most public models are trained predominantly on English corpora, while other languages remain understudied, particularly for practical domain-specific NLP tasks. In this work, we introduce a novel NLP benchmark for the legal domain that challenges LLMs in five key dimensions: processing *long documents* (up to 50K tokens), using *domain-specific knowledge* (embodied in legal texts), *multilingual* understanding (covering five languages), *multitasking* (comprising legal document-to-document Information Retrieval, Court View Generation, Leading Decision Summarization, Citation Extraction, and eight challenging Text Classification tasks) and *reasoning* (comprising especially Court View Generation, but also the Text Classification tasks). Our benchmark contains diverse datasets from the Swiss legal system, allowing for a comprehensive study of the underlying non-English, inherently multilingual legal system. Despite the large size of our datasets (some with hundreds of thousands of examples), existing publicly

available multilingual models struggle with most tasks, even after extensive in-domain pre-training and fine-tuning. We publish all resources (benchmark suite, pre-trained models, code) under permissive open CC BY-SA licenses.

Keywords: Legal, Judiciary, Reasoning, Benchmark, Evaluation, Multilingual

1 Introduction

The history of Natural Language Processing (NLP) within the legal domain is extensive [1], with remarkable progress recently [2]. Notably, the introduction of datasets containing legal data from various jurisdictions worldwide [3, 4], as well as the development of more domain-specific tasks and benchmarks [5–13] have significantly contributed to the progress in the field. General benchmarks such as SuperGLUE [14] are saturated and ineffective at differentiating Large Language Models (LLMs). Hence, larger, challenging benchmarks are urgently needed, especially in the domain-specific context. In Switzerland, the availability of only one dataset for evaluating legal LLMs [15, 16] hampers the assessment of their performance and effectiveness within the country’s diverse linguistic and legal landscape.

In this paper, we introduce seven new datasets covering a range of tasks and spanning across five languages (German, French, Italian, Romansh, English) within the same overarching jurisdiction. These datasets are derived from 26 cantons and the Swiss Federal Supreme Court (SFCS) in the uniquely multilingual and multi-jurisdictional context of Switzerland. The country’s multiple official languages and a




Fig. 1: We showcase how we picture this benchmark supporting the judicial system end-to-end. 1) we route incoming complaints to the correct chamber (LAP), 2) we prioritize easier cases for preliminary automated processing (CP), 3) IR and CE help judges and clerks in finding and citing relevant legislation and case law, 4) we help the judiciary in drafting decisions (CVG), 5) we predict and verify judgments based on the history of the court (JP), 6) we predict which decisions are likely going to have a big impact on future jurisprudence (CP) and 7) we summarize the leading decisions (LDS). The LLMs performing all these tasks are trained on and retrieve from the pretraining corpus containing most publicly available Swiss legal data.

wealth of data for its size, position Switzerland as an exemplary testbed for assessing LLMs in a multilingual environment with distinct legal frameworks. Our assessment concentrates on three classification tasks – Criticality Prediction (CP), Judgment Prediction (JP), and Law Area Prediction (LAP) – an Information Retrieval (IR) task and two generative tasks – Court View Generation (CVG) and Leading Decision Summarization (LDS) (see Figure 1 for an overview). To facilitate a comprehensive analysis and provide baselines for future research, we evaluate an array of models on our datasets similar to Hwang et al. [9] or Niklaus et al. [10]. Furthermore, we have pretrained our own Swiss legal models, Legal Swiss RoBERTa_{Base/Large} and Legal Swiss Longformer_{Base}. Our tasks challenge current models significantly, with the best performing model only achieving an aggregated Macro F1 score of 48.4. ChatGPT was not able to solve the Text Classification (TC) tasks well, considerably lagging behind fine-tuned models. The results for CP, IR and CVG are particularly underwhelming, seeming rather arbitrary. We invite the research community to develop new methods to tackle these hard tasks. All data employed in this study is from publicly available sources (see <https://entscheidsuche.ch/dataUsage> and <https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/en/legal-information>) and is published on the HuggingFace Hub under a CC BY-SA license (link released upon acceptance).

This paper makes three contributions. First, we present seven public multilingual datasets containing Swiss legal documents. Second, we release two large, in-domain pretraining datasets, and pretrain three new models: Legal-Swiss-RoBERTa_{Base/Large} and Legal-Swiss-LongFormer_{base}. Third, we evaluate multilingual baselines on our datasets and compare them to our models. Although in-domain pretraining improves performance, significant room for improvement remains in most tasks.

The article below is structured as follows: Next, we provide an overview of related work (Chapter 2) and explain important background information of the Swiss legal system (Chapter 3). We then introduce our new legal datasets by describing how they were created and what they can be used for (Chapter 4). In the experiments section, we present how we pretrained and tested our legal models (Chapter 5). And finally we illustrate our results (Chapter 6), provide an error analysis (Chapter 7), and conclude our work with recommendations for future work (Chapter 8).

2 Related Work

In this section, we discuss prior work on benchmarks for long documents, domain specificity, multilinguality, multitasking and reasoning. Additional task-specific related work is presented in Appendix F.

Long Documents

SCROLLS (Standardized Comparison Over Long Language Sequences) consists of summarization, Question Answering (QA), and Natural Language Inference (NLI) tasks with example inputs typically in the thousands of English words [17]. MuLD (Multitask Long Document) is a set of six tasks (twice QA, style change detection, classification, summarization, and translation) where each input is at least 10K tokens,

with some up to almost 500K tokens [18]. While valuable, both benchmarks are for the English language only and they do not cover court rulings nor legislation.

Domain Specificity

LEXGLUE covers six predictive tasks over five datasets made of English documents from the US, EU, and Council of Europe [19]. LEXTREME is a multi-lingual and multi-task benchmark for the legal domain [10]. LegalBench [13] covers zero-shot and few-shot Language Model (LM) evaluation for diverse realistic legal tasks in English. LBOX OPEN [9] consists of five legal tasks from South Korea. Although there exist legal benchmarks, they are mostly focused on understanding tasks, while we also provide challenging generation and information retrieval tasks.

Multilinguality

XTREME [20] evaluates cross-lingual generalization across six tasks and ten datasets, covering 40 languages. Some datasets were cross-lingual, others were extended via professional and automatic translations. XTREME-UP (Under-Represented and User-Centric with Paucal Data) expands XTREME, focusing on few-shot evaluation of multilingual models for user-centric tasks [21]. It includes 88 underrepresented languages like Swahili, Burmese, and Telugu. While these benchmarks contain many languages, they do not cover any legal data.

Multitasking

GLUE (General Language Understanding Evaluation) [22], an early benchmark of sentence NLU tasks evaluating general-purpose neural LMs, quickly became obsolete due to advanced models like BERT [23]. Its updated version, SUPERGLUE [14], introduced new tasks challenging for machines yet solvable by humans. MMLU (Massive Multitask Language Understanding) features only zero-shot and few-shot learning tasks [24], containing 16K multiple-choice questions across 57 subtasks, in subjects such as humanities, social and hard sciences. BIG-Bench [25] (Beyond the Imitation Game) consists of 204 language tasks created by 450 authors from 132 institutions. The tasks cover topics such as linguistics, childhood development, math, common-sense reasoning, biology, physics, social bias, software development. Although there exist many multi-task benchmarks, they are often restricted to language understanding while we also cover information retrieval and generation tasks.

Reasoning

Reasoning refers to the capability of AI systems to understand, interpret, and generate reasoning based on natural language input. Recent research has made significant strides in enhancing the reasoning capabilities of LLMs, mostly via different prompting techniques. Wei et al. [26] introduced the concept of Chain-of-Thought prompting, which has been shown to improve the performance of LMs on reasoning tasks. Later, more sophisticated techniques, such as least-to-most prompting [27], Self-Consistency [28], Tree of Thoughts [29, 30] or Graph of Thoughts [31], proved to be even more capable, based on tasks related to symbolic manipulation, compositional generalization, and math reasoning. A range of studies have explored legal reasoning in the context

of AI and law. Guha et al. [32] proposed LegalBench, a collaborative benchmark for legal reasoning, based on the IRAC (Issue, Rule, Application, Conclusion) framework. Chain-of-thought prompting has been further explored by Yu et al. [33] in the context of legal reasoning tasks, where it was found to be effective, particularly when combined with specific legal reasoning techniques. While reasoning has been studied in legal tasks, previous work mostly focused on the English language. We study diverse challenging legal reasoning tasks in the inherently multilingual Swiss jurisdiction.

3 Background on the Swiss Legal System

In order to understand the uniqueness of the datasets and its context, this chapter briefly explains organizational aspects of the Swiss Federal Supreme Court (SFSC), the structure of Swiss court rulings, and relevant processes within Swiss legal system.

3.1 Structure and Function of the Swiss Federal Supreme Court

Switzerland comprises 26 cantons, each with unique jurisdiction and court organization. The SFCS is Switzerland’s highest legal authority and final arbiter for federal criminal, administrative, patent, and cantonal courts. Its decisions bridge gaps in legislation, and shape the development of the law and its adaptation to changing circumstances. The SFCS has seven divisions, specializing in public, penal, and civil law [34]. The Supreme Court is responsible for addressing appeals stemming from the Cantonal Courts. Some SFCS cases over time are designated as Leading Decisions (LDs) and are published separately in the official portal of the Federal Tribunal (Bundesgerichte). The names of the parties are anonymized for concerns of privacy and the decisions published have the potential of influencing future jurisprudence. Cantonal court proceedings begin at the lowest instance and may be appealed higher, with appeal stages varying by canton and legal area. Courts, especially the Supreme Court, first check if existing judgments have already settled the legal principles of the case at hand. Some very relevant judgements hailing from the Cantonal Courts are also published on their official websites. Common Law Courts recognize precedents established over time. Many countries have official Supreme Court portals listing key decisions that could influence or determine future legal directions.

3.2 Structure of Swiss Court Rulings

Swiss court decisions typically consist of four major sections: 1) The *rubrum* (introduction) contains the date and chamber, mentions the involved judge(s) and parties and finally the topic of the decision. 2) The *facts* describe what happened in the case and form the basis for the considerations of the court. The higher the level of appeal, the more general and summarized the facts. 3) The *considerations* reflect the formal legal reasoning, citing laws and other influential rulings, and forming the basis for the final ruling. 4) The *rulings*, finally, are an enumeration of the binding decisions made by the court. This section is usually rather short and summarizes the considerations.

3.3 Jurisdiction and Admissibility Before the Swiss Courts

This section covers jurisdiction (the authority to decide a case as defined by law) and admissibility in the light of the Swiss Civil Procedure Code (SCPC). Jurisdiction is equally important in criminal and administrative matters. Determining the jurisdiction of the court forms an integral part of the Swiss legal system. Cantonal law is responsible for authorising the courts for specific disputes. The decision pertaining to the jurisdiction is taken by the court on its own accord, also known as "ex officio". The court needs to verify that the case is not currently being debated in another proceeding or has already been resolved in a previous binding decision. Additionally, the court must ensure that all procedural requirements outlined in the SCPC are met before accepting a case.

3.4 Swiss Legal Proceedings: From Initiation to Judgment

Swiss law does not mandate oral pleadings, written pleadings mark the initiation of the ordinary proceedings before the court. The parties must present a detailed description of the facts of the case along with supporting evidence. The statement of claim forms the first set of the pleadings in claiming a prayer of relief to a dispute. Following which the court serves the statement of claim to the defendants along with a deadline to the filing of the statement of defence along with the liberty of filing a counter claim. The judge exercises discretion to call in for additional evidence and a clarification if needed. Upon exchanging the pleadings among the parties, the court allows admission of evidence followed by the opportunity to the respective parties to comment on the evidence and the merits of the given case; this forms part of the closing submissions. An 'instruction hearing' or a settlement meeting is often proposed by the courts in the German speaking cantons of Switzerland after the closing submissions. After taking into consideration the pleadings made by the parties and the evidence produced, the judge delivers the final decision. At this juncture it is important to note the contribution of the court clerks. To formulate a decision, the judge has to carefully consider every submission. They have to take into account the evidence and weigh in the law for a just and fair decision. However, this process is quite exhaustive and time consuming. To expedite this process, the judicial clerks prepare a memorandum at the beginning of the hearing and draft a proposed judgement under the supervision of a given judge. They participate in the hearings and keep a record of the proceedings pursuant to which they derive at the judicial reasoning behind the decision. In Switzerland, the judgment is also co-signed by a law clerk working on the case with the judge.

In the following we show a simplified structure of the flow of a case and link to possible automated support through datasets proposed in Section 4.

1. **Complaint Filing**

The statements of claim (complaint) are filed before the court by the plaintiff

2. **Routing** (Law Area Prediction (LAP), see Section 4.4)

The case is routed to the responsible chamber within the court

3. **Informing Defendant** *The statements of claim are sent to the defendant along with a date to file the statements of defense and counter-claims*

4. **Legal Research** (Information Retrieval (IR), see Section 4.5)

The clerk researches relevant case law and legislation

5. **Write Facts**
The clerk writes the facts description
6. **Write Legal Reasoning** (Court View Generation (CVG), see Section 4.3)
The clerk writes the considerations
7. **Clarifications**
The judge asks for clarifications and additional evidence
8. **Settlement**
The judge proposes a meeting for settlement
9. **Verdict** (Judgment Prediction (JP), see Section 4.4)
If no settlement is reached, the judge delivers the verdict
10. **Leading Decisions** (Criticality Prediction (CP), see Section 4.4)
The court’s department president determines whether the case will be published as a leading decision (usually when the law is interpreted in a new way)
11. **Summarization** (Leading Decision Summarization (LDS), see Section 4.3)
The leading decision is summarized

4 SMILED: The Datasets

Table 1: Overview of all datasets and their multilingualism: Abbreviations: **C**antonal, **F**ederal, **F**acts, **C**onsiderations. Column Fac and Cons report the mean number of tokens. Sections Facts and Considerations are not available for Summarization, Legislation and Rulings due to different format, thus we report the mean number of tokens for the full text and mark it with *.

Dataset	Level	Total	DE	FR	IT	RM	EN	Fac	Cons
Rulings	Cant + Fed	638K	320K	247K	71K	-	180	-	*7K
Leading Decisions	Fed	21K	14K	6K	1K	-	-	689	3K
Legislation	Cant + Fed	36K	18K	11K	6K	534	207	-	*7K
Doc2Doc IR	Fed	141K	87K	46K	8K	-	-	847	3K
Citation Extraction	Fed	131K	85K	38K	8K	-	-	-	204
Criticality Prediction	Fed	139K	85K	45K	8K	-	-	828	3K
Law Area Prediction	Cant + Fed	329K	127K	156K	46K	-	-	2K	4K
Judgment Prediction	Cant + Fed	329K	160K	128K	41K	-	-	2K	4K
Court View Gen	Cant + Fed	404K	197K	163K	44K	-	-	2K	5K
Court View Origin Gen	Fed	270	49	221	-	-	-	1K	6K
Leading Decisions Summ	Fed	18K	12K	5K	835	-	-	-	*3K

In this section, we introduce SMILED (**S**wiss **M**ultilingual **L**egal **D**ata) our new datasets, how we created them and what they can be used for. Table 1 presents our eleven datasets, collected from 26 cantons (in addition to federal decisions), 184 courts, 456 chambers, four main law areas, and five languages as seen in Table 8 in the Appendix. Document availability varies significantly across cantons and courts.¹ Most courts are monolingual, but there are cantons where multiple languages are used in documents. Besides decision-based datasets, we also provide a collection of approx. 35K laws from cantonal and federal jurisdictions in Switzerland.

¹The SFCS is the only court where we have complete data, since all decisions since 2007 have been published.

While most SFCS cases are written in German, French is more common for cantonal cases. We partitioned downstream datasets into training (until 2015), validation (2016-2017), and test (2018-2022) sets. We opted for a relatively large test split because LLMs seem to need relatively little training data [35]. A large test set allows longitudinal studies, including COVID-19 pandemic years. This large temporal gap between the newest training (2015) and test (2022) samples might contribute to model difficulties (see Section 6). Source data undergo rigorous curation by established Swiss institutions such as courts and administrative bodies, including manual anonymization at an approximate cost of 45 minutes per case [15]. While we extract labels from the texts and from metadata semi-automatically, mostly using regular expressions (regex), the underlying data is of highest quality, since it is produced by highly trained legal professionals such as judges and court clerks. Collecting such volume of high-quality data would cost billions of dollars to annotate privately.

In contrast to previous datasets and benchmarks, our dataset closely mimics the main processes of the Swiss judicial system, making the benchmark highly relevant for real-world applications. Given the unsatisfactory performance of various LLMs on many tasks, we believe that this benchmark addresses a critical gap by still containing ample discriminative room across models.

4.1 Database Creation Pipeline

Every day, new cases are published on Entscheidsuche.ch, allowing for daily document retrieval (see Figure 2). (1) We scrape all files from Entscheidsuche.ch, including each court’s folder metadata. Only new case documents are sent through the pipeline. (2) We used BeautifulSoup / tika-python library to extract text from HTML / PDF files. (3) We detect the language using fastText [36] for subsequent tasks.




Fig. 2: Database Creation Pipeline

(4) A cleaner removes irregular patterns or redundant text to avoid extraction errors. (5) Cases are segmented into header, facts, considerations, rulings, and footer via regex patterns. (6) To extract the judgement outcome, a word set is defined for each outcome. As these indicators are not context-exclusive, considering only the ruling section is crucial to avoid false positives. Therefore, accurate judgment outcome extraction relies on precise section splitting. (7) LD and law citations are obtained through regex (cantonal) or BeautifulSoup (federal). The SFCS labels citations with HTML tags, leading to a high quality of citations for federal cases in our datasets.

Providing an objective metric for quality is hard and expensive to obtain. Multiple people repeated quality checks over multiple months during this process to ensure the highest quality. The parsers and regexes were double-checked by senior authors before integration. We wrote a series of tests to make sure that the pipeline is robust to changes (`test_utils.py`). Finally, we wrote code to easily inspect samples at various stages of the pipeline to ensure quality (`debug_utils.py`).

4.2 Pretraining

We release two large datasets for pretraining, used for our Swiss legal models: one containing legislation (116M words), the other containing court rulings (2.1B words).

Rulings

The Swiss Rulings dataset is a comprehensive collection of Swiss court rulings designed for pretraining purposes. It consists of 638K cases (3.3B tokens) distributed across three languages: German (319K), French (247K) and Italian (71K) (see Figure 5). Spanning several decades and covering multiple areas of law, this dataset provides an extensive representation of Swiss law practice. Figures 5 and 3 provide an overview of the distributions of cantons and of text lengths.

Legislation

The Swiss Legislation dataset comprises 35.7K legislative texts (182M tokens). Figure 4 shows the length distribution of the legislation texts. The legislation texts cover five languages: German, French, Italian, Romansh, and English (see Figure 6). Figure 8 details its coverage of federal, cantonal, and inter-cantonal legislation on a broad array of legal topics including public health, education, civil rights, societal matters, energy, environment, infrastructure, and visa regulations. It also includes instances of the same legislation texts across different languages, useful for enhancing the multilingual capabilities of legal LMs.

Pre-training Corpora

A large corpus of high-quality domain-specific text is crucial for training LLMs capable of performing tasks in a given domain. This dataset collects a large part of publicly available legal text relevant for Switzerland.

Legislation text:

Der Grosse Rat des Kantons Aargau, gestützt auf die §§ 72 Abs. 3 und 78 Abs. 1 der Kantonsverfassung, beschliesst:
 1. Allgemeine Bestimmungen
 § Gegenstand und Zweck
 1 Dieses Gesetz regelt a) die amtliche Information der Öffentlichkeit und den Zugang zu amtlichen Dokumenten [...]
 § 15 Bekanntgabe an Private
 Öffentliche Organe geben Privaten Personendaten nur bekannt, wenn
 a) sie dazu gesetzlich verpflichtet sind, oder
 b) die Bekanntgabe nötig ist, um eine gesetzliche Aufgabe [...]

Metadata:

UUID: 58450ad4-108d-4e10-b559-a7efce689d7
 Year: 2015
 Language: German
 Canton: AG
 Title: Gesetz über die Information der Öffentlichkeit, den Datenschutz und das Archivwesen
 Abbreviation: IDAG
 SR Number: 150.700




Fig. 3: Rulings text length distribution




Fig. 4: Legislation text length distribution




Fig. 5: Language dist. rulings texts




Fig. 6: Language dist. legislation texts




Fig. 7: Cantonal dist. rulings texts




Fig. 8: Cantonal dist. legislation texts

4.3 Text Generation

Court View Generation

Clerks and judges spend about 50% of their time on writing considerations in penal law and an estimated 85% in other legal areas [15]. Crafting considerations is central to a judge's role, requiring deep knowledge of legislation, caselaw, legal analysis, and advanced reasoning to synthesize this information. The task's complexity, particularly in the Supreme Court, manifests in the high average appointment age of judges of 50

years, highlighting the length and difficulty of their professional journey.² Given the time and expertise demands, the need for the CVG task arises, targeting the generation of case considerations from facts. Generating court views is challenging due to the length and complexity of both facts (input) and considerations (output). Current models, limited in handling long context, frequently fail to process this extensive input. This limitation, combined with the input’s complexity, highlights the current models’ deficiencies. To benchmark models in long-context complex reasoning, we introduce a novel CVG dataset with over 400K cases spanning various legal scenarios. Averaging 1522 tokens for facts and 4673 for considerations, the dataset serves as a challenging benchmark for generating coherent, accurate case considerations. Additionally, we present a court view origin dataset with federal rulings, augmented by lower court data, including facts and considerations from both levels. This adds a multilevel judicial perspective, enhancing understanding of case progression and increasing the CVG challenge. Figure 9 and Figure 10 show the length distributions for facts and considerations of the CVG dataset respectively.

²*Mit 28 Jahren Mitglied des Bundesgerichts, SonntagsZeitung, December 19, 2019, p. 24*

Illustration of the Court View Generation (CVG) task

Court view generation is arguably one of the most difficult NLP tasks. It requires extensive legal reasoning capabilities, significant experience, and good knowledge of the specific law area a judge is operating in. Machines may assist judges and clerks by suggesting word or sentence continuations while they are typing or even by setting up complete drafts. To solve this task well, the following ingredients are likely necessary: First, a strong retrieval system capable of providing the necessary legal context based on legislation and influential previous rulings. Second, a strong legal reasoning system capable of analyzing the facts, any lower court decisions, and the retrieved documents. This matter is complicated further in our dataset due to lengthy documents in multiple languages.

Input

[Facts]: Zum Sachverhalt: 1. Am Dienstag, 23. August 2005, um 12.16 Uhr, lenkte X seinen Personwagen von Bronschhofen her kommend auf der Hauptstrasse in Richtung Wil. Auf der Höhe Hauptstrasse 64 wurde er von der Kantonspolizei St. Gallen anlässlich einer Geschwindigkeitskontrolle innerorts mit einer Geschwindigkeit von 80 km/h gemessen. Nach Abzug der technisch bedingten Sicherheitsmarge von 5 km/h resultierte eine rechtlich relevante Geschwindigkeit von 75 km/h. 2. Mit Strafbescheid des Untersuchungsamtes Gossau wurde der Angeklagte am 10. Mai 2006 wegen grober Verletzung der Verkehrsregeln zu einer Busse von Fr. 610.00 verurteilt. Dagegen erhob er Einsprache. Der Einzelrichter des Kreisgerichtes Altotgenburg-Wil verurteilte ihn mit Urteil vom 14. September 2006 wegen grober Verkehrsregelverletzung und fällte eine Busse von Fr. 600.00 aus. Für die Löschung im Strafregister wurde eine Probezeit von zwei Jahren angesetzt, die Kosten des Verfahrens wurden dem Angeklagten auferlegt. [...]

Metadata:

Decision ID: *0f86bb1e-ed24-52a1-bec7-e04451485a7f*
Year: *2007*
Language: *German*
Law Area: *Penal*
Court: *SG KG*
Chamber: *SG_KG_001*,
Canton: *SG*
Region: *Eastern Switzerland*

Target:

[Considerations]: Aus den Erwägungen: 1. Nach Art. 90 Ziff. 2 SVG wird mit Freiheitsstrafe bis zu drei Jahren oder Geldstrafe bestraft, wer [...] Der subjektive Tatbestand der groben Verkehrsregelverletzung ist hier deshalb regelmässig zu bejahen. Eine Ausnahme kommt etwa da in Betracht, wo [...] 2. Der Angeklagte bringt vor, die Vorinstanz habe den Grundsatz in dubio pro reo verletzt, wenn [...] Indem der Angeklagte innerorts mit mindestens 25 km/h zu schnell gefahren ist, hat er den objektiven Tatbestand der groben Verkehrsregelverletzung erfüllt. [...] Aus dem gleichen Grund ist auch der Beweisantrag zur Vornahme eines Augenscheins abzuweisen. III. 1. Der Angeklagte hat eine grobe Verkehrsregelverletzung begangen. Sein Verschulden wiegt schon deshalb nicht mehr leicht, weil [...], so erscheint eine Geldstrafe von 4 Tagessätzen angemessen (Art. 34 i.V.m. Art. 47 StGB). [...]




Fig. 9: CVG facts length distribution




Fig. 10: CVG considerations length dist.

Leading Decision Summarization

LD are crucial in the Swiss legal system, often cited to clarify legislative gaps. Access to their summaries simplifies searching and understanding key concepts, the most important citations, and main themes. In the LDS dataset, we include 18K LDs with their summaries, written by SFCS clerks and judges. The summaries contain three parts: 1) a short list of important citations, 2) keywords from a thesaurus, and 3) a free-form summary containing references to the most important numbered considerations. Figures 11 and 12 show the length distributions for the input text and summary of the LDS dataset respectively.

Illustration of the Leading Decision Summarization (LDS) task

Summarizing cases is very important for lawyers to absorb the most relevant information in less time. Lawyers need to read many cases during their research. Reducing the time needed to comprehend the gist of a case brings direct economic value.

Input

[Case Text]: BGE 141 IV 201 S. 201 Dai considerandi: 8. 8.2.1 È stato accertato, senza arbitrio, che la ricorrente ha più volte chiesto a F. di trovare, nel senso di contattare e ingaggiare (avendo precisato che aveva i soldi per pagare), qualcuno che potesse uccidere il marito e che egli rifiutò di fare quello che gli si domandava. 8.2.2 Contrariamente a quanto sostenuto nel gravame, la contestata richiesta risulta tutt'altro che generica: permetteva di ben comprendere sia il genere di infrazione finale prospettata (reato contro la vita) sia la vittima designata sia il comportamento da assumere, ossia reperire e ingaggiare qualcuno allo scopo, atteso che vi era a disposizione denaro. F. non si è risolto a commettere alcunché, motivo per cui si è di fronte solo a un tentativo di istigazione e la questione del nesso causale tra l'atto di persuasione e la decisione dell'istigato di commettere il reato neppure si pone. [...]

Metadata:

Decision ID:
91ae0d9f-9aec-4b2b-a7ee-042abc42adaa
Year: 2015
Language: Italian
Court: CH_BGE
Chamber: CH_BGE_006,
Canton: CH
Region: Federation

Target:

[Regeste]: Regeste Art. 24 Abs. 2 StGB; indirekte Anstiftung (Kettenanstiftung), Versuch. Auch die versuchte indirekte Anstiftung (Kettenanstiftung) zu einem Verbrechen ist strafbar (E. 8.2.2).




Fig. 11: LDS input length distribution




Fig. 12: LDS summary length distribution

4.4 Text Classification

We use eight configurations from the Law Area Prediction (LAP), Criticality Prediction (CP), and Judgment Prediction (JP) datasets. LAP and JP datasets include federal and cantonal cases, while the CP dataset focuses on SFCS cases. All tasks presented in this section involve Single Label Text Classification (SLTC), which required either extracting or defining labels. For each of the tasks, we consider the facts and the considerations as input. The facts represent the most similar available proxy to the complaints, useful for predictive tasks. The considerations as input make the tasks considerably easier, since they include the legal reasoning. These tasks can be used as post-hoc analyses for verification (e.g., in JP whether the judgment is congruent with the given reasoning).

Law Area Prediction

The **Law Area** label was established by associating a law area to each chamber where a case was adjudicated. Using metadata from *Entscheidungsuche.ch*, a lawyer helped define the law areas for each chamber, resulting in chambers being classified into one of four main law area categories (civil, public, criminal and social law) and 12 sub-areas. Due to many chambers operating in various law areas, it was not always feasible to assign a single law area label to each chamber. Particularly for the more detailed sub-areas, where several chambers could not be uniquely linked, this resulted in a small subset of

cases with the subset label. Initial results on the full dataset including the four main law areas showed that current models achieve near perfect accuracy, which is why we only consider the smaller filtered dataset of sub-areas for this benchmark. Figure 13 shows the length distribution for the facts of the LAP dataset.

Illustration of the Sub Law Area Prediction (SLAP) task

Before the judge even sees a complaint, it is first handled by the court’s administrative staff, deciding to which chamber (suborganisation inside the court hearing matters in a specific subpart of the law) the complaints should be routed. For this task, models trained on a dataset like ours could assist by providing a suggestion.

Input

[Facts]: I. Faits 1. En date du 11 novembre 2013, l’intimé a déposé à la Commune de Corcelles une demande de permis de construire pour la pose d’un revêtement bitumineux sur l’accès à son immeuble, le prolongement d’un chemin existant et l’installation d’une piscine sur les parcelles n° C. et D. du registre foncier de la commune de Corcelles. Les parcelles se situent en zone agricole. Le recourant a formé opposition contre ce projet de construction. Dans sa décision globale du 1er décembre 2014, la Préfecture du Jura bernois a accepté la demande d’octroi du permis de construire. 2. Le 31 décembre 2014, le recourant a déposé un recours contre cette décision auprès de la Direction des travaux publics, des transports et de l’énergie du canton de Berne (TTE). Il fait valoir, en substance, que différentes conditions de la décision globale du 1er décembre 2014 n’auraient pas été respectées.[...]

Metadata:

Decision ID: 519d0350-6e0e-5551-9bc9-1df03382168
 Year: 2015
 Language: French
 Law Area: Public
 Law Sub Area: Urban Planning and Environmental
 Court: BE VB
 Chamber: BE_VB_001,
 Canton: BE
 Region: Espace Mittelland

Target:

Urban Planning and Environmental
 Possible Targets: Tax, Urban Planning and Environmental, Expropriation, Public Administration, Other Fiscal, Rental and Lease, Employment Contract, Bankruptcy, Family, Competition and Antitrust, Intellectual Property, Substantive Criminal, Criminal Procedure




Fig. 13: Law Area Prediction facts length distribution

Judgment Prediction

We generated the **Judgment** label by using regex patterns to extract the judgment outcome, assigning it a binary label: approval or dismissal, akin to Niklaus et al. [15]. Partially approved or dismissed judgments were labeled as either approval or dismissal. Figure 13 shows the length distribution for the facts of the JP dataset.

Illustration of the Judgment Prediction (JP) task

Judgment Prediction might be used in the future in jurisdictions that are experiencing extremely high case loads such as US immigration. The legal maxim "justice delayed is justice denied" may provide motivation for judgment prediction being applied in such highly overloaded jurisdictions by giving affected people the opportunity to have their case heard much earlier (in some jurisdictions wait times are years). For example, consider a scenario where a person is held in pretrial detention awaiting their case to be heard. With Judgment Prediction, it may be possible to identify cases where there is a high likelihood of the individual being not guilty. These cases can then be prioritized for judicial review, potentially reducing the time innocent individuals spend in detention due to system backlogs.

Input

[Facts]: En fait : A. Le 5 février 2015 à 21 h 30, à [...].A.H. a été appréhendé par la police, qui l'a entendu le lendemain vers 0 h 45 comme prévenu notamment d'infraction à la LStup (Loi fédérale sur les stupéfiants ; RS 812.121). L'intéressé a déclaré qu'alors qu'il se trouvait dans un bar à [...], un homme s'était assis à côté de lui et lui avait demandé de la cocaïne. Le prévenu s'était rendu dans l'appartement occupé notamment par B.H. , un compatriote qui l'hébergeait à l'occasion, pour prendre une boulette de cocaïne, qu'il avait ensuite vendue à l'inconnu pour 100 francs. Les policiers lui avaient finalement indiqué que le client en question était en réalité un agent de police en civil. Sur la base d'indications fournies par A.H. au client lors de cette transaction, l'appartement occupé par B.H. , rue de [...] à [...], avait fait l'objet, la veille vers 22 h 45, d'une perquisition qui avait amené la découverte de 29.8 g de cocaïne et de plusieurs téléphones portables. [...]

Metadata:

Decision ID: *Odd2f9f7-872e-4200-9f9c-f1c12520c267*
Year: *2015*
Language: *French*
Law Area: *Penal*
Judgment: *Dismissal*
Court: *VD TC*
Chamber: *VD TC 013*,
Canton: *VD* Region: *Région lémanique*

Target: Dismissal

Possible SP label: Approval, Dismissal




Fig. 13: Judgment Prediction facts length distribution

Criticality Prediction

First and foremost, it's essential to define the concept of criticality within the Swiss legal framework. Critical cases go beyond mere importance; they are cases with the potential to significantly influence future jurisprudence. It's therefore crucial to distinguish them from merely important cases. We quantified **Criticality** in two ways: First, the **LD-Label** is binary: *critical* and *non-critical*. SFCS cases are labeled as *critical* if additionally published as Leading Decision (see Section 3). We extracted SFCS file names from LD headers using regex. Cases absent in LD headers are labeled *non-critical* (missing *critical* cases exist as we have all LD but not all SFCS cases). Second, to create a more precise adaptation of the LD-Label, we developed the **Citation-Label**, which involved counting all citations of LD in all SFCS cases. The LD frequency was weighted based on recency, with older citations receiving a smaller

weight: $score = count * \frac{year-2002+1}{2023-2002+1}$. This resulted in a ranking of LDs, which were then divided into four categories of criticality *critical-1* to *critical-4*. We used the 25, 50 and 75% quartiles as separation for our four classes. Figure 14 and Figure 15 show the length distributions for the facts and the considerations of the CP dataset respectively.

Illustration of the Criticality Prediction (CP) task

We see two potential applications of the Criticality Prediction task: Prioritization and Classification. The prioritization task takes as input the facts as a proxy for a complaint and produces a prioritization score judging how critical/important this case is. This prioritization might help decide which cases should be heard earlier or by more experienced judges. In a futuristic scenario where automatic judgment prediction is accepted, cases with low priority could be sent to automated solutions, while high priority cases would be sent to human judges. The classification task takes as input the considerations or the entire ruling and performs a post-hoc analysis comparing it to prior caselaw and judging its potential impact on future jurisprudence.

Input

[Considerations]: Erwägungen: 1. Angefochten ist der in einem kantonal letztinstanzlichen Scheidungsurteil festgesetzte nacheheliche Unterhalt in einem Fr. 30'000.- übersteigenden Umfang; auf die Beschwerde ist somit einzutreten (Art. 72 Abs. 1, Art. 74 Abs. 1 lit. b, Art. 75 Abs. 1 und Art. 90 BGG). 2. Die Parteien pflegten eine klassische Rollenteilung, bei der die Ehefrau die Kinder grosszog und sich um den Haushalt kümmerte. Infolge der Trennung nahm sie im November 2005 wieder eine Arbeitstätigkeit auf und erzielt mit einem 80%-Pensum Fr. 2'955.- netto pro Monat. Beide kantonalen Instanzen haben ihr jedoch auf der Basis einer Vollzeitstelle ein hypothetisches Einkommen von Fr. 3'690.- angerechnet. Das Obergericht hat zwar festgehalten, der Ehefrau sei eine Ausdehnung der Arbeitstätigkeit kaum möglich, gleichzeitig aber erwogen, es sei nicht ersichtlich, weshalb sie nicht einer Vollzeitbeschäftigung nachgehen könne. Ungeachtet dieses Widerspruches wird das Einkommen von Fr. 3'690.- von der Ehefrau ausdrücklich anerkannt, weshalb den nachfolgenden rechtlichen Ausführungen dieser Betrag zugrunde zu legen ist. [...]

Metadata:

Decision ID: 65aad3f6-33c2-4de2-91c7-436e8143d6ea
 Year: 2007
 Language: German
 Law Area: Civil
 LD Label: Critical
 Citation Label: Citation-1
 Court: CH_BGer
 Chamber: CH_BGer_005,
 Canton: CH
 Region: Federation

Target: critical-1

Possible LD label: critical, non-critical, Possible citation label: critical-1, critical-2, critical-3, critical-4




Fig. 14: CP facts length distribution




Fig. 15: CP considerations length distr.

4.5 Information Retrieval

Our IR task is organized into queries, qrels, and corpus (see Figure 20 in the Appendix). The corpus includes all Swiss legislation and leading decisions; queries come from SFCS cases in German, French, and Italian. The mean token count for our queries significantly exceeds that in other IR benchmarks, due to the use of entire documents as queries (see Table 1). The goal is to find laws and decisions cited in a given case. We use the facts as a proxy for a lawyer-drafted appeal. Ground truth is based on citations from the considerations. We extract relevant cited laws and decisions from

the Swiss legislation and leading decisions datasets, respectively. Document lengths resemble tasks like EU2UK [37]. Laws in all three official languages yield cross-lingual query-corpus pairs, logged as qrels. Long documents and cross-lingual factors challenge retrieval models. We have 10K documents, 101K queries, and 2K qrels, averaging 19 relevant documents per query. Finding relevant legal references for SFCS cases is challenging due to legal language complexity, multilinguality, and long documents. Figure 16 shows the length distribution for the facts of the IR dataset. Figures 17 and 18 show the length distributions for the facts and considerations of Leading Decisions which are part of the corpus.

Illustration of the Multilingual Information Retrieval (MLIR) task

Information retrieval is at the heart of the daily work of lawyers. Much like in scientific writing, lawyers base their arguments on prior caselaw, relevant legislation, and legal analyses. Thus, they spend a large part of their work searching for these documents, motivating the importance of legal IR. Annotating these data at scale is very costly, which is why this dataset is based on the citation graph of Swiss Supreme Court cases. In Switzerland lawyers operate in a trilingual jurisdiction with legislation and caselaw appearing in up to three official languages German, French and Italian. This means that for a complaint written in German, a case written in French might be relevant, leading to Multilingual IR, further complicating the task.

Input

[Facts]: Fatti: A. Il 9 novembre 2006 G. ., nata P. . (1959), ha contratto matrimonio con F. . Dall'unione non sono nati figli. Per contro il marito ha avuto figli (ormai adulti) dal primo matrimonio i quali non hanno però vissuto in economia domestica con G. . Il 26 settembre 2011 è deceduto F. . Con domanda del 4 ottobre 2011 G. . ha chiesto alla cassa di compensazione Medisuisse l'erogazione di una rendita vedovile. Con decisione del 27 ottobre 2011, sostanzialmente confermata il 22 dicembre successivo in seguito all'opposizione dell'interessata, la cassa di compensazione ha respinto la richiesta di prestazione per il motivo che la richiedente non era stata sposata almeno cinque anni con il defunto marito, come invece prescritto dalla legge, bensì "solo" 4 anni 10 mesi e 18 giorni. B. Osservando che il termine di cinque anni non era adempiuto per soli pochi giorni e invocando di conseguenza una applicazione della legge secondo [...]

Metadata:

Decision ID: 6856ac58-5d12-48c4-acef-831d50c79886
Year: 2012
Language: Italian
Law Area: Social
Court: BE_VB
Chamber: CH_BGer_009,
Canton: BE
Region: Federation

Target:

Laws: [9 law ids] 75488867-c001-4eb9-93b9-04264ea91f55, e10ed709-8b11-47e3-8006-88b26d86e498, [...]
Cited Rulings: [2 ruling ids] 54df6482-97d7-47eb-afb1-1ccb9369cb89, 921a799a-9077-4057-8e46-4919fd4f3263
(There are 10K different laws and rulings see Section 4.5 for more information)




Fig. 16: Information Retrieval facts length distribution




Fig. 17: LD facts length distribution




Fig. 18: LD considerations length distribution

4.6 Citation Extraction

The SFCS annotates citations with special HTML tags, which we used to create a token classification dataset for Citation Extraction (CE). Solving the task with regexes is complicated due to extensive citation rules, but the transformer-based model

[42] uses only 4.5% non-English data, while XLM-R [43] includes 87% non-English text. Table 2 provides an overview of models evaluated.

Table 2: Models: InLen is the maximum input length the model has seen during pretraining. # Parameters is the total parameter count (including embedding). Our models were built upon the pre-trained RoBERTa/Longformer. SwissBERT was further trained on X-MOD. Utilizing three language adapters with X-MOD and SwissBERT led to fewer parameters and languages. (%de/%fr/%it) shows the percentages of the Swiss languages in the corpus.

Model	Source	InLen	# Parameters	Vocab	# Steps	BS	Corpus (%de/%fr/%it)	# Langs
MiniLM	Wang et al. [38]	512	118M	250K	1M	256	2.5TB CC100 (2.9/2.5/1.3)	100
DistilmBERT	Sanh et al. [44]	512	135M	120K	n/a	< 4000	Wikipedia (na/na/na)	104
mDeBERTa-v3	He et al. [45, 46]	512	278M	128K	500K	8192	2.5TB CC100 (2.9/2.5/1.3)	100
XLM-R _{Base/Large}	Conneau et al. [43]	512	278M/560M	250K	1.5M	8192	2.5TB CC100 (2.9/2.5/1.3)	100
X-MOD _{Base}	Pfeiffer et al. [47]	512	299M	250K	1M	2048	2.5TB CC100 (2.9/2.5/1.3)	3 (81)
SwissBERT (XLM vocab)	Vanvas et al. [48]	512	299M	250K	364K	768	Swissdox (80/18/1)	3 (4)
mT5 _{Small/Base/Large}	Xue et al. [41]	1K	300M/580M/1.2B	250K	1M	1024	mC4 (CC) (3.1/2.9/2.4)	101
BLOOM _{560M}	Seao et al. [40]	2K	560M	250K	1.3M	256	ROOTS (0/5/0)	59
Legal-Swiss-R _{Base}	ours	512	184M	128K	1M	512	CH Legal (50/27/23)	3
Legal-Swiss-R _{Large}	ours	512	435M	128K	500K	512	CH Legal (50/27/23)	3
Legal-Swiss-LF _{Base}	ours	4096	208M	128K	50K	512	CH Legal (50/27/23)	3
GPT-3.5	Brown et al. [35]	16K	175B	na	na	na	na	na
GPT-4	OpenAI [49]	32K	na	na	na	na	na	na
LLaMA-2	Touvron et al. [42]	4K	7B/13B/70B	32K	na	na	LLaMA-2 (0.2/0.2/0.1)	27

5.1 Pretraining Legal Models

We release two multi-lingual legal PLMs, Legal-Swiss-RoBERTa and Legal-Swiss-LF_{Base} (see Table 2 for details), trained on Swiss rulings, legislation, and EUR-LEX data [50]. We adhered to the following best-practices in LM development:

(a) We warm-start (initialize) our models from the original XLM-R checkpoints (base or large) of Conneau and Lample [51]. Model recycling is a standard process followed by many [52, 53] to benefit from starting from an available “well-trained” PLM, rather from scratch (random). XLM-R was trained on 2.5TB of cleaned CommonCrawl data in 100 languages.

(b) We train a new tokenizer of 128K BPEs on the training subsets to better cover legal language across languages. However, we reuse the original XLM-R embeddings for all lexically overlapping tokens [54], i.e., we warm-start word embeddings for tokens that already exist in the original XLM-R vocabulary, and use random ones for the rest.

(c) We continue pretraining our models on our pretraining corpus with batches of 512 samples for an additional 1M/500K steps for the base/large model. We do initial warm-up steps for the first 5% of the total training steps with a linearly increasing learning rate up to $1e-4$, and then follow a cosine decay scheduling, following recent trends. For half of the warm-up phase (2.5%), the Transformer encoder is frozen, and only the embeddings, shared between input and output (MLM), are updated. We also use an increased 20/30% masking rate for base/large models respectively, where also 100% of the predictions are based on masked tokens, compared to Devlin et al. [23]³, based on the findings of Wettig et al. [55].

(d) For both training the tokenizer and our legal models, we use a sentence sampler with exponential smoothing of the sub-corpora sampling rate following Conneau and Lample [51] and Raffel et al. [56], since there is a disparate proportion of tokens

³Devlin et al. [23] – and many other follow-up work – used a 15% masking ratio, and a recipe of 80/10/10% of predictions made across masked/randomly-replaced/original tokens.

across languages (Figure 6) and we aim to preserve per-language capacity, i.e., avoid overfitting to the majority (almost 50% of the total number of texts) German texts.

(e) We consider mixed cased models, i.e., both upper- and lowercase letters covered, similar to all recently developed large PLMs [35, 51, 56].

(f) To better account for long contexts in legal documents, we continue training the base-size multilingual model on long contexts (4096 tokens) with windowed attention (128 tokens window size) [57] for 50K steps, dubbing it Legal-Swiss-LF-base. We use the standard 15% masking probability and increase the learning rate to $3e-5$ before decaying but otherwise use the same settings as for training the short-context models.

We will release all models on the HuggingFace Hub under a CC BY-SA license including intermediate checkpoints (every 50K/10K training steps for RoBERTa/Longformer models) upon acceptance. Limited resources prevented us from pretraining a large generative model, so we leave this to future work.

5.2 Text Generation

We evaluated using **BERTScore** [58], **BLEU** [59], **METEOR** [60], and **ROUGE** [61]. Each individual metric has inherent weaknesses [58], so it is necessary to employ multiple metrics for a more comprehensive assessment. We suggest future work to evaluate predictions with trained lawyers.

Court View Generation

Due to lengthy input (avg. 1522 tokens) and output (avg. 4673 tokens) for CVG, we truncated input facts to 2048 tokens and output considerations to 512 tokens. In 90% of cases, complete facts were retained. This truncation was driven by resource constraints and the task’s complexity, which remained challenging with only 512 output tokens. Owing to test data volume and compute limits, the evaluation was limited to a subset of 1K instances. For the origin dataset, input was evenly divided between origin facts and considerations.

Leading Decision Summarization

In our LDS experiments, we faced large input text (avg. 3081 tokens) but shorter output text (avg. 168 tokens). To manage this, we truncated input to 4096 tokens and output to 256 tokens, preserving full output in over 80% of cases.

5.3 Text Classification

For our TC tasks, namely LAP, JP, and CP, we adopted the LEXTREME benchmark setup [10], namely hierarchical aggregation of macro-averaged F1 scores using harmonic mean for fairness (the harmonic mean is biased more towards lower scores than the geometric or arithmetic mean). We averaged in order over random seeds, languages (de, fr, it), configurations (e.g., JP-F and JP-C), and datasets (LAP, JP, and CP). This setup punishes models with outlier low scores in certain languages, or configurations, thus promoting fairer models. We fine-tuned all models below 2B parameters per task on our training datasets with early stopping on the validation dataset. We evaluated closed models 0-shot as per the setup of Chalkidis [62], using one instruction and

example as input. Samples were randomly selected from the validation set to prevent test set leakage for future evaluations. For each sample, we checked whether it exceeded the model’s maximum token limit of 4096 and truncated if necessary. To manage costs, we limited the validation set to 1000 samples. Our experiments focused solely on zero-shot classification due to the long input lengths. For experiments involving few-shot classification approaches, we refer to Trautmann [63]. We show an overview of the prompts used in Appendix K. Since effective prompts can be quite dependent on the LLM, we did not do prompt engineering and used the same prompt across LLMs. We used the [ChatCompletion API](#) for GPT-3.5 (gpt3.5-turbo as of June 7, 2023), and ran LLaMA-2 locally with 4-bit quantization.

5.4 Information Retrieval

In our IR task we expect performance to decline as the document count increases. We conducted an ablation study to assess minor dataset adjustments on performance (see Appendix I). We use BM25 for scalability to long documents but note its limitations in contextual processing and multilingual handling [64]. Neural methods like Sentence-Bert (SBERT) show promise but degrade on long texts due to truncation-induced context loss. We also investigate training with hard negatives, using the distiluse-base-multilingual-cased-v1 SBERT model [65]. This 135M parameter model employs DistilmBERT as the student and Multilingual Universal Sentence Encoder (mUSE) as the teacher, trained on 15 languages. It has a 128 token maximum sequence length and outputs 512-dimensional embeddings via mean pooling, suitable for cosine similarity scoring. The BEIR datasets [11] feature query lengths of 3-192 words and document lengths of 11-635 words. Our dataset surpasses these by 4-282x for queries (847 words on average) and approx. 8-500x for documents (approx. 4K/7K words on average for rulings/legislation). We therefore excluded cross-encoder models [66], due to their high computational cost especially with longer texts. We evaluate models with Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG) [67] and Capped Recall@k [11].⁴

6 Results

6.1 Text Generation

Court View Generation

We present CVG results in Table 3. Fine-tuning models generally leads to higher scores, with even small models like mT5_{Small} outperforming 1-shot GPT-4. 1-shot prompting offers marginal gains over 0-shot for both GPT-4 and Claude-2 (LLaMA-2 1-shot was limited by context width). The generated text generally showed stylistic authenticity, resembling typical legal language, but often lacked logical coherence, highlighting current models’ limitations in generating coherent court views. In multiple court cases, target considerations contained similar paragraphs, which were generally well-predicted (see examples in Table 22 in the Appendix). While fine-tuned models

⁴The Capped Recall@k is computed as the proportion of relevant documents for a specific query, retrieved from the top k scored list of documents generated by the model. This is a good representation of model success in our specific task, as each query has multiple relevant documents without the need for intra-document ranking.

Table 3: Results on the Court View Generation task. The input is truncated to 2048 tokens. **Bold:** best within setup; underlined: best overall. (*) These models were fine-tuned on only 1’000 samples for 3 epochs. All models, except the mT5 models, were evaluated on the validation set.

Model	Setup	BERT \uparrow	BLEU \uparrow	MET \uparrow	R1 / R2 / RL \uparrow
mT5 _{Large}	Fine-tuned	75.74	66.92	34.44	34.91 / 15.58 / 33.53
mT5 _{Base}	Fine-tuned	75.01	65.48	32.89	33.23 / 13.57 / 31.89
mT5 _{Small}	Fine-tuned	74.13	63.97	30.96	31.29 / 11.01 / 29.90
GPT-3.5-Turbo	Fine-tuned*	72.31	62.23	28.08	26.06 / 7.19 / 24.54
LLaMA-2-13B Chat	Fine-tuned*	74.22	63.51	33.33	34.36 / 16.68 / 33.20
GPT-4	1-shot	70.39	59.69	24.63	23.87 / 4.64 / 22.32
GPT-4	0-shot	69.41	58.16	23.25	22.61 / 3.95 / 21.10
LLaMA-2-13B Chat	0-shot	67.23	55.01	20.18	19.76 / 3.26 / 18.57

proficiently predict specific textual patterns, LLaMA-2-13B-Chat in the zero-shot setup struggles, often reverting from German to English and introducing linguistic errors, probably due to a highly English dominant training corpus. Despite their challenges, zero-shot models focus more on the main content, while fine-tuned models mirror target formalities. We provide a more detailed error analysis in Appendix 7.1. Larger mT5 models consistently outperformed smaller ones, but performance increase with longer input was minimal, sometimes counterproductive (see Table 10 in the Appendix). The results from the origin dataset were less conclusive (see Table 9 in the Appendix), likely due to the smaller dataset size.

Table 4: Results on the Leading Decision Summarization task. The input is truncated to 4096 tokens. **Bold:** best within setup; underlined: best overall.

Model	Setup	BERT \uparrow	BLEU \uparrow	MET \uparrow	R1 / R2 / RL \uparrow
mT5 _{Base}	Fine-tuned	73.33	30.81	23.50	32.43 / 12.78 / 30.87
mT5 _{Small}	Fine-tuned	72.04	28.68	21.29	29.61 / 10.31 / 28.12
GPT-4	1-shot	73.55	47.75	34.72	30.82 / 9.68 / 28.89
GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K	1-shot	72.89	45.21	32.76	29.69 / 9.25 / 27.94
GPT-4	0-shot	71.56	48.35	32.97	26.52 / 8.93 / 24.51
GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K	0-shot	70.28	46.08	30.60	25.18 / 7.58 / 23.59

Leading Decision Summarization

In contrast to the very specific CVG task, requiring long-form output, the closed large models perform very well on LDS, at least in BLEU and METEOR (see Table 4). According to ROUGE, fine-tuned mT5 models are still better, while BERT-Score does not discriminate clearly. We assume that summarization is a much larger portion of internal instruction tuning datasets used for optimizing these models. The quality of the generated text demonstrated a good stylistic imitation of legal language and more consistent logical coherence compared to the CVG task (see examples in Table 21 and 23 in the Appendix). GPT-3.5-Turbo (zero-shot) offered a narrative-style summary, while others adhered to the traditional 'Regeste' format. Notably, GPT-3.5-Turbo made a factual error by negating a crucial element, and Claude-2 referenced an outdated legal

provision. We conduct a detailed error analysis in Section 7. Table 12 in the Appendix shows two trends for fine-tuned mT5 models. First, longer input generally improved scores across models. Second, larger models outperformed smaller ones, although the differences between base and large models were subtle.

6.2 Text Classification

Table 5: Results on the Text Classification datasets using Macro F1 with the highest values in **bold**. 'F' or 'C' after the dash indicate input from 'Facts' or 'Considerations'. 'CPLD' and 'CPC' denote CP tasks using LD and Citation labels, while 'SLAP' refers to Sub Law Area Prediction. Models with an asterisk (*) are zero-shot LLMs predicting on validation dataset samples (see Section 5.3).

Model	CPLD-F	CPLD-C	CPC-F	CPC-C	SLAP-F	SLAP-C	JP-F	JP-C	Agg.
XLM-R _{Base}	57.2	65.9	21.3	23.7	67.2	73.4	60.9	79.7	44.6
XLM-R _{Large}	56.4	67.9	24.4	29.1	65.1	78.9	60.8	80.9	48.6
X-MOD _{Base}	56.6	67.8	20.0	20.6	63.9	64.4	60.5	79.1	41.9
SwissBERT _(xlm-vocab)	56.9	67.3	25.7	23.0	61.5	73.2	61.4	79.4	46.1
mT5 _{Small}	52.2	62.1	13.2	17.9	53.1	60.9	58.9	74.2	34.4
mT5 _{Base}	52.1	61.5	14.0	19.7	58.4	61.8	54.5	72.0	35.9
BLOOM _{560M}	53.0	61.7	10.7	8.0	52.6	53.2	60.5	73.4	24.9
Legal-Swiss-RoBERTa _{Base}	57.7	70.5	16.2	20.1	77.0	79.7	64.0	86.4	40.9
Legal-Swiss-RoBERTa _{Large}	55.9	68.9	25.8	16.3	76.9	84.9	62.8	87.1	43.3
Legal-Swiss-LF _{Base}	58.1	70.8	21.4	17.4	80.1	77.1	65.4	86.4	42.5
GPT-3.5*	46.6	44.8	25.7	16.7	67.9	69.5	51.3	61.9	38.6
LLaMA-2*	45.2	26.6	7.0	8.5	58.7	55.6	40.3	37.8	19.7

We present results in Table 5, with detailed information including standard deviations in Table 14 in the Appendix. Language-specific scores are in Table 15 in the Appendix. Scores on the validation dataset are in Table 16 in the Appendix. As expected, larger models generally perform better, with XLM-R_{Large} emerging on top. Our pre-trained model Legal-ch R_{Base} outperformed XLM-R_{Base}, indicating that domain-specific pre-training enhances performance. Overall, our pre-trained models showed better aggregated results compared to other models. However, unexpectedly, Legal Swiss RoBERTa_{Large} underperformed compared to its base model XLM_{Large}. Due to the high weight to outliers allotted by the harmonic mean, Legal-ch-R_{Large} is severely penalized by its relatively low performance in CPC-C compared to XLM-R_{Large}. Despite extra training on longer texts up to 4096 tokens, Legal-ch-LF did not surpass the hierarchical Legal-ch-R-_{Base} model. Large models such as GPT-3.5, Claude-2, and LLaMA-2 underperform fine-tuned models, underlining the need for specialized models for these tasks. The difference is largest in the JP and SLAP tasks where the fine-tuned models are best.

6.3 Information Retrieval

Table 6 shows that most models failed to retrieve relevant documents, even with k=100. Lexical models outperformed others even without hyperparameter optimization for BM25 [68]. Surprisingly, despite German prevalence in our dataset, a French [language analyzer](#) (used for stemming and stopword removal) demonstrated superior performance. For SBERT, truncation led to context loss, negatively affecting scores, a problem absent in lexical models. Training SBERT models using Multiple Negative Ranking Loss [69]

Table 6: Results on Information Retrieval with best scores per section in **bold**. Abbreviations: `distiluseBase-multilingual-cased-v1`, `swiss-legal-robertaBase`

Model	RCap@ 1 / 10 / 100 ↑	NDCG@ 1 / 10 / 100 ↑
BM25 (fr lang analyzer)	11.37 / 7.74 / 16.54	11.37 / 8.34 / 11.51
SBERT distil	0.90 / 0.75 / 2.64	2.06 / 1.70 / 3.31
SBERT distil + pos	4.40 / 3.92 / 12.64	10.11 / 8.76 / 16.16
SBERT distil + pos + h-neg	3.97 / 4.46 / 13.36	9.12 / 9.21 / 16.87
SBERT swiss + pos	3.97 / 3.47 / 12.28	9.12 / 7.76 / 15.16
SBERT distil eval on de queries	4.22 / 4.49 / 15.21	8.21 / 8.15 / 15.86
SBERT distil eval on fr queries	1.88 / 2.20 / 9.19	5.77 / 6.22 / 13.94
SBERT distil eval on it queries	0.22 / 0.24 / 0.79	5.43 / 5.74 / 11.44

significantly improved performance, with hard negative examples beneficial. SBERT evaluation on single languages, denoted as DE, FR, and IT, revealed its inability to perform consistently across all languages, which could be caused by the training set consisting of more German than French or Italian documents.

More experiments are in Table 17 and Table 18 in the Appendix. Overall, our study exposes limitations of models in handling multilingualism, long documents, and legal texts, areas relatively underexplored in previous research. These findings offer a foundation for the IR community to address these challenges.

7 Error Analysis

Automatic metrics are known to be limited in assessing the performance in text generation tasks [58, 70]. To mitigate this and to get qualitative insights into the generations of different models, an author of this work with a background in law performed the following error analysis.

7.1 Court View Generation (CVG)

Generally, specific textual constructs, such as those related to asylum applications, appear frequently in a similar manner so fine-tuned models are able to proficiently predict these patterns, whereas zero-shot models face challenges. *LLaMA-2-13B-Chat (0-shot)* switches to English after a few sentences, and the German segments contain linguistic and grammatical errors. A possible reason could be that LLaMA-2 was predominantly trained in English rather than other languages. Remarkably, the LLaMA zero-shot model doesn't revert to English when handling the French text, unlike its behavior in the German scenario. It also made an unsupported claim regarding the appellant's age, which wasn't mentioned in the input. Zero-shot models tend to center more on the primary content, while fine-tuned models are tailored to predict formalities, mirroring the target. The fine-tuned *LLaMA-2-13B-Chat* references 'BFM' instead of the 'SEM' (State Secretariat for Migration), deviating from both *GPT-3.5*'s outputs and the original input. To note, SEM emerged in 2004 from a merger between the BFM (Federal Office for Refugees) and the IMES (Federal Office for Immigration, Integration and Emigration), nevertheless our sample was from 2016.

As outlined in Section 5.2, constraints in model availability and computational resources led to truncation of the target output during fine-tuning and experimentation, thus accentuating formal aspects like court jurisdiction and the legitimacy of appeals. This causes zero-shot iterations to receive lower scores, even when they remain contextually accurate. In terms of content, both zero-shot models were on the right track, tending more towards rejection. Furthermore, zero-shot predictions provide clearer insights by minimizing emphasis on formal nuances. Tables 19 and 20 in the Appendix show a comparison of generated text in German and French respectively from GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K, GPT-4, Claude Instant and Claude 2. In the following, we analyse the four models from a legal perspective.

German

GPT-3.5 (Fine-tuned) identifies the correct provisions of law and resembles part of the target output. It does connect the legal reasoning to the facts from the input. The legal reasoning is very basic and not detailed enough; i.e., one can understand that it is an asylum petition but nothing more. LLaMA-2-13B Chat (Fine Tuned) identifies some provisions of the law correctly but also makes some mistakes. For example the SEM (State Secretariat for Migration) is the rightful authority in dealing with this case but this output calls it the FOM instead; it fails to expand the abbreviation to this and as such it can be construed that it made a mistake. It outlines the procedural compliances but provides no background details. CLAUDE 2 (0Shot) provides more reasonable output compared to the first two. It identifies the elements that are most relevant to judge the instant appeal and also lists down the case briefly so as to reach a legitimate consideration. LLaMA-2-13B Chat (0Shot) lists down the factual background of the case in a concise manner. It does not take reference to the provisions of law that governs the instant petition but it has categorically stated the grounds on which the appeal was dismissed. For instance upon reading this output one can have a fair idea of what transpired in this particular asylum petition.

The target output identifies the legal provisions (laws and rules) and the rightful authority that shall in accordance to law preside over the instant matter. It states every legal provision along with any exceptions that govern the matter of asylum. The grounds on which an appeal can be lodged is also stated herein. Keeping the target output in mind, GPT 3.5 Fine Tuned, Claude 2(0 Shot) and LLaMA-2-13B Chat(0 Shot) have generated acceptable outputs. For instance GPT 3.5 Fine Tuned aligns closely with the target, it features most of the legal provisions and briefly states the matter of Asylum. On the other hand, Claude 2(0 Shot) provides judicial reasoning by way of defining elements like "Refugee" in the output, which is integral to the case as an asylum is being sought for on that very ground. It has also briefly discussed the background of the case which is essential in order to reach a legitimate outcome. LLaMA-2-13B Chat(0 Shot) listed the factual backgrounds and also provided judicial grounds that would lead to the dismissal of the appeal. Bearing these aspects of the generated output these three have shown higher potential especially by identifying legal provisions and premises to reach a legit consideration.

French

GPT-3.5 (Fine-tuned) does not provide extensive legal reasoning. It draws reference to Fribourg Public Law which does not form part of the factual background. It refers to quite a few articles from the SCPC but failed to connect them to the relevant facts of the case. The LLaMA-2-13B Chat (Fine-tuned) records the verdict of the previous court, which is very relevant. The legal reasoning is connected to the chain of events which has been written along with the dates; this aspect is noteworthy and very professional. The legal principles and the application of specific statutes are not mentioned. Claude 2 (0Shot) refers to the wrong articles, for example, Article 343 (1)(a) of the SCPC is not the correct article in this matter; articles 236 and 308 (1) would be the ones applicable in this case. This output describes a different question not quite connected to the main issue. Judicial reasoning has two important components, firstly the applicable law and second creating a liaison between the events and how the law has been applied. This output has not been able to tie the law and what happened in the case. LLaMA-2-13B Chat (0 Shot) identifies the parties concerned and the question that has to be addressed at the beginning. It creates a good sequence of events without the dates though. Although it does not refer to any specific articles or citations it does base its legal reasoning on the SCPC. It does not analyse any evidence. This output has amateur judicial reasoning which is good compared to the rest of the outputs, but it is not a good fit for an appeals court.

The target output highlights the four essential elements of the instant case, it has introduced the dispute and the remedy at the very beginning. It has stated the reason as to why the instant appeal is a subject matter of a constitutional appeal. It has noted the procedural compliances and mentioned as to why the appeal would be admissible before the court. Keeping this sequence in mind the output generated by LLaMA-2-13B Chat (Fine Tuned) and LLaMA-2-13B Chat (0 Shot) are of good quality. Both these outputs have touched upon the essential elements necessary for case flow. For instance LLaMA-2-13B Chat (Fine Tuned) recorded the earlier verdict, which is very impressive, thereby establishing the reason behind the appeal. Despite lacking the legal provisions it has stated relevant legal reasoning. LLaMA-2-13B Chat (0 Shot) provides quite strong judicial reasoning, especially when it highlights the principle of trust in the context of the matter and also the justification of the grounds of dismissal in the light of the Swiss Code of Obligation. Although this is not part of the target output, it could be a nice explanation contributing to the matter.

7.2 Leading Decision Summarization (LDS)

Table 21 in the Appendix shows a comparison of generated text from GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K, GPT-4, Claude Instant and Claude 2. In the side-by-side analysis, all models demonstrated an authentic stylistic representation. GPT-3.5-Turbo 16K provides a more narrative-style summary, while the other models stick more closely to a classic 'Regeste' format. However, when it came to the factual accuracy, GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K faltered by negating a crucial element ("*wurde entschieden, dass 'kein' hypothetisches Einkommen..*"). Claude-2 cited an outdated legal provision, Article 137 of the ZGB, which has been inactive since 2011, even though the case decision was from 2017 and no such reference was present in the input. Despite this, the article cited remains relevant

to the context. On the other hand, GPT-4’s reference to BGE 137 III 118 and GPT-3.5’s mention of BGE 143 III 233 S. 235 were accurate and existed in the provided input.

From the four generated outputs GPT4 (1 shot) stated the consideration in a very precise manner at the very inception. Despite the attempt at identifying the party, the maintenance debtor, which is a first given the other outputs, it has failed to identify it correctly. However attempting to identify the party is a good practice in terms of summarization. Overall it has managed to comprehend and explain the principle of law. Claude 2 (1 Shot) refers to the wrong article of the SCPC. Instead of article 127 which is relevant for the instant dispute it refers to article 137, it is a possibility that it may have confused the article number to the judgement cited (BGE 137 III 118 E.2.3). The output is not very precise, but just about touches the principle. It is more vague of a summarization than a concise deduction. GPT 3.5 Turbo 16K (0 SHOT) generates a summary on a wrong notion and fails to interpret the considerations correctly. For instance at no point of time was it recorded that the husband had an abusive behaviour. The Court may have explained through judgements, what could be considered abusive. The model may have misinterpreted the conditions contributing to abusive behaviour to the husband being abusive. In determining a modification application it has not been able to secure a result but has elaborated on the conditions when modification cannot be reversed. CLAUDE INSTANT (0 SHOT) refers to article 107 of the SCPC, which is not mentioned with the factual framework of the instant case. However it has drawn reference to an important judgement recorded in the Bundesgerichte very relevant to this context and fits perfectly. But it fails to spell out the outcome of the case, instead explains very vaguely the law. In analysing the summarization generated by the four different models, GPT 4 (1 shot) generated the most precise version of the actual outcome and also showed the ability to understand the law behind the consideration.

8 Conclusions and Future Work

Conclusions

We present SCALE, an end-to-end benchmark of seven datasets for the Swiss legal system, a worldwide unique possibility to study crosslinguality within the same jurisdiction. Our tasks require legal reasoning abilities and challenge models on four key aspects: long documents, domain-specificity, multilinguality, and multitasking. We evaluate 14 open and five closed multilingual models, including three in-domain pre-trained, as a reference point. These models, including ChatGPT, show low performance, particularly in challenging tasks like CVG and IR. Our results highlight opportunities for improving models and set the stage for next-generation LLM evaluations in domain-specific, multilingual contexts.

Future Work

First, quantifying monetary amounts for example for alimony or eviction specifically or claims in general is a complicated task. An automated system to aid in suggesting amounts could greatly speed up the process. Second, the summary (regeste) of the leading decisions are composed of important citations in the first part, keywords from

a [Thesaurus](#) in the second part and a text-based summary in the third part. For simplicity, we treat it as one string. The first two tasks could be framed as classification or retrieval tasks, possibly improving model performance. Third, due to limited context width, we only considered the facts as input to the court view generation task. However, judges and clerks do not only look at the facts when drafting a decision. They consider a myriad of information including possible lower court decisions and relevant case law, legislation and legal analyses. This information is available in our dataset. In the future, we would like to develop systems that are capable of integrating all this information to write the legal reasoning. Fourth, so far, to our knowledge, the largest model pretrained on legal data specifically is Legal-XLM-R_{Large} (435M parameters) [50]. Future work should look at pretraining larger generative models in the billions and tens of billions of parameters. Fifth, future work may investigate the more difficult Citation Prediction task in addition to the Citation Extraction task. In Citation Prediction, the model only gets the context up to the citation as input and is tasked to predict the citation. This may help lawyers in drafting their texts. Sixth, we strongly suggest future work include relevant external information, like caselaw or legislation for solving these challenging tasks. Augmenting models with retrieval [71] and models using tools [72] seem to be promising avenues. Seventh, explainability and interpretability is important for widespread adoption of automated systems, especially in the legal domain [73, 74]. Future work could experiment more with explainability techniques like generating rationales as auxiliary outputs on our benchmark. Finally, to provide a better perspective on the results, we suggest future work to collect human performance as an additional reference point. This may be done at several levels, i.e., laypeople, law students, early career lawyers, expert lawyers in the respective field.

A Appendix Table of Contents

We include the following supplementary sections in addition to the main paper:

- B: Access to the Provided Resources
- C: Reproducibility Statement
- D: Ethical Considerations
- E: Limitations
- F: Additional Related Work
- G: More Detailed Experimental Setup
- H: Additional Detailed Data Descriptions
- I: Additional Results
- J: Error Analysis Examples
- K: Prompts
- L: Example Generations

B Access to the Provided Resources

In this section, we provide the URLs to the data, models, and code upon acceptance.

C Reproducibility Statement

Datasets, models, and source code for both dataset curation and experiments will be publicly released upon acceptance. The exact links will be provided in [Appendix B](#). We detail experimental setup in [section 5](#) and in more detail in [Appendix G](#). All prompts used for evaluation of models larger than 2B parameters are listed in [Appendix K](#).

D Ethical Considerations

While our research has several positive applications, it is important to acknowledge potential negative societal impacts. LLMs and their applications in the legal domain could potentially automate certain tasks traditionally performed by legal professionals, such as legal IR and LDS. While our goal is to support lawyers, it could impact the job market for legal professionals.

Recent literature has identified potential ethical problems within legal NLP research. The study on legal judgement prediction in China regarding prison term duration demonstrated the criticalness of legal NLP datasets and analysis [75]. As a response to this publication at EMNLP 2019, concerned researchers pointed out important questions to respond when working with ethically delicate data and NLP tasks [76]. They suggest asking a series of ethical questions to assess the potential societal risks associated with a publication.

For example, they asked: "Does the dataset contain information that might be considered sensitive or confidential?" [76]. In our case, we only used publicly available court decisions that are anonymized. Therefore, the person should not be identifiable. Another aspect is concerned with the possibility of future updates of the court decision due to new facts or an appeal (going to a higher court): "Will the dataset be updated?" We could update our data anytime. However, this maintenance would not happen automatically. We would need to be informed that a new decision was made regarding a certain case.

Another ethical concern concerns precision: Thus, LLMs can occasionally deliver results that are not entirely precise. This can have severe implications when it comes to the legal domain, where precision and factual accuracy are paramount. This could potentially lead to misinformation or misinterpretation of legal texts, impacting legal proceedings and decisions.

While the benchmark focuses on the Swiss legal system, it is important to recognize that law systems are highly culturally and contextually dependent. The understanding and interpretations of legal texts by these models, especially in a multilingual context, might not accurately reflect the nuanced cultural aspects of different regions. This could potentially lead to misrepresentations or misinterpretations, particularly when applied to other legal systems.

Finally, like any AI model, LLMs could be misused to create misinformation or misleading content at scale, especially in languages and domains where automated content generation is still a novel concept. It is crucial to develop and implement robust ethical guidelines and policies to mitigate these risks.

Therefore, while the new benchmark presents exciting opportunities to improve LLMs, it is essential to carefully consider the implications of its use and manage the associated risks effectively. The developers and users of such technology should adhere to ethical guidelines to ensure its responsible use.

E Limitations

While we covered a lot of ground in this work, there are always limitations, which we list in this section.

E.1 General

The research area for LMs and benchmarks continues to evolve, and while there is palpable enthusiasm in the field, it is critical to maintain a balanced perspective. Studies, including Bender and Koller [77], have shed light on the limitations of LMs and benchmarks, stressing that LMs do not truly "learn" meaning and that communities often focus on limited datasets, some of which are borrowed from other fields.

E.2 Models

Even though English models are plentiful, LLMs pre-trained multilingually are very rare. To the best of our knowledge, mT5 is the only multilingual model with variants over 1B parameters, covering German, French, and Italian (BLOOM does not contain German and Italian). Additionally, we were limited by very large sequence lengths. We did not have the resources available to run mT5_{XL} or mT5_{XXL} with sequence lengths greater than 1K.

E.3 Data

The process of selecting tasks for benchmarks is typically influenced by the interests of the community or the convenience of available resources, rather than being informed by all-encompassing theories. These constraints present difficulties when trying to explore a model's broader applicability or its capacity for understanding. The data employed in benchmarks is often tied to a specific context and is naturally susceptible to inherent biases. Furthermore, the content of such data may vary significantly from real-world data, is de-contextualized and the uniformity of the task formats may not adequately reflect the diversity of human activities. Regarding our specific context, it is crucial to acknowledge that we cannot generalize Swiss legal data to other countries or different legal systems.

Figures 5 and 7 show the language and cantonal distributions over rulings and Figures 6 and 8 over legislation. Note that the distribution is imbalanced for both rulings (50% German, 39% French, and 11% Italian) and legislation (49% German, 31% French, and 17% Italian). However, compared to [Swiss Speaker Distribution](#) (63% German, 23% French, and 8% Italian), the legal text is actually more balanced. It looks similar in the cantonal distribution, with many sparsely inhabited cantons being represented above their weight, especially the ones in the non-German speaking regions such as Vaud, Geneva, and Ticino.

The training sets of the LLMs we benchmarked have different cutoff points from before 2020 for XLM-R to 2023 for GPT-4. Therefore the models with the later cutoff dates may have seen some of our test data (since our test set is from the years 2018 to 2022). Ideally we would start the test set from after the last model's cutoff point. In absence of this possibility another option would have been to use different test

sets for the different models, but that brings other confounders like differing time distance from train to test sets and potentially different difficulty of examples in the test sets. Therefore, we opted for a large test set covering a long time range, potentially mitigating these effects. However, we are aware that the more modern models might simply get better performance on our benchmarks because they have trained on the inputs already.

E.4 Labels

Annotating high-quality datasets is very expensive, especially when experts are needed, such as in the legal domain. Because of our limited budget and in order to arrive at a large amount of labels, we algorithmically generated labels based on metadata information present in the corpus. These metadata are of high quality, being provided by the courts themselves.

E.5 Text Classification

Judgment Prediction

While the judgment prediction task is arguably very interesting and also very challenging, it is unlikely to be deployed in practice anytime soon. Ideally, we would want the complaints as input (similar to Semo et al. [7]) instead of the facts description, since this is written by the court itself in part to justify its reasoning. Unfortunately, the complaints are not public in Switzerland, making us rely on the widely available facts description as a close proxy.

Law Area Prediction

We used information about the chambers at the courts to determine the law areas. Predicting the main law area is not challenging for current models, leading to very high results and thus rendering this task unsuitable for a benchmark. Unfortunately, most chambers cover multiple sub areas, thus ruling them out for the sub area prediction task and considerably reducing dataset size. In conclusion, while this task is very useful in practice for routing requests to the different chambers inside a court, it is relatively unsuitable for a challenging benchmark.

Criticality Prediction

It is very difficult to estimate the importance of a case. By relying on proxies such as whether the case was converted to a leading decision (LD-label) and how often this leading decision was cited (Citation-label), we were able to create labels semi-automatically. While we discussed this with lawyers at length and implemented the solution we agreed on finally, this task remains somewhat artificial.

E.6 Text Generation

Court View Generation

Court View Generation is an extremely challenging task and thus very well suitable for a benchmark. Current multilingual transformer-based models do not allow processing

text in the tens of thousands of tokens. As a consequence, we were forced to look at a simplified version of this task, only considering the facts as input and ignoring relevant case law and legislation. Additionally, we were only able to generate the first 512 tokens of the considerations. We thus invite the community to develop new methods potentially capable of tackling harder versions of this task.

Leading Decision Summarization

Due to limited resources, we limited our evaluation to `mT5Small/Base/Large`. Future work may investigate large multilingually pretrained generative models on this task. Additionally, one may want to conduct human evaluation on the generated summaries. However, due to extremely high lawyer salaries in Switzerland, this is not feasible at scale in an academic research project. Finally, we only considered the simple version of this task where we only generate a text-based output. Future work may treat the first and second parts of the summary as extreme multilabel classification problems of relevant citations and relevant keywords from the thesaurus [Jurivoc](#) respectively, possibly increasing performance.

E.7 Citation Extraction

Even though the citations are annotated by the SFCS, we encountered citations that were not marked. However, models achieved very high scores anyway, leading us to exclude it from the benchmark. Future work may investigate this in more detail.

E.8 Information Retrieval

The labels are constructed with the citations from the considerations. Due to most legal analyses being private, our corpus is restricted to case law and legislation. Constructing a ranking of relevant documents is challenging due to missing information, and thus probably requiring extensive human annotation. Additionally, S-BERT models are usually limited to 512 tokens, being a constraint for this task due to our long documents.

F Additional Related Work

F.1 Domain-Specific Pretraining

General-purpose LMs are trained on generic text corpora such as Wikipedia and evaluated on widely used benchmarks such as GLUE [22]. However, domain-specific models need focused datasets for training and specialized benchmarks for assessing the quality of the model. The following examples illustrate the increase in performance when using domain-specific datasets and benchmarks.

In the biomedical area of natural language processing (BioNLP), Lee et al. [78] created for the first time a domain-specific LM based on BERT [23] by pre-training it on biomedical text corpora. They used PubMed abstracts (4.5B words) and PubMed Central (PMC) full-text articles (13.5B words). The resulting domain-specific LM BioBERT achieved higher F1 scores than BERT in the biomedical NLP tasks named entity recognition (0.62) and relation extraction (2.80), and a higher mean reciprocal rank (MRR) score (12.24) in the biomedical question-answering task. In 2022, those scores were outperformed. Naseem et al. [79] conducted a domain-specific pre-training of ALBERT [80] using only text from the biomedical field (PubMed) and from the "Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care" (MIMIC-III), a large, de-identified and publicly-available collection of medical records [81]. One domain-specific benchmark applied to test BioALBERT originates from Gu et al. [82] who created BLURB, the Biomedical Language Understanding and Reasoning Benchmark. Naseem et al. [79] found that BioALBERT exceeded the state-of-the-art models by 11.09% in terms of micro averaged F1-score (BLURB score). Another biomedical NLP benchmark is BLUE, the "Biomedical Language Understanding Evaluation" [83]. It covers five tasks (sentence similarity, named entity recognition, relation extraction, document classification, inference) with ten datasets from the biomedical and clinical area. BioALBERT also includes all datasets and tests from BLUE thus presenting the most comprehensive domain-specific model and benchmark in the biomedical area at the moment.

In the financial domain, FinBERT was pretrained 2020 by Yang et al. [84] using financial data. The text corpora consisted of 203'112 corporate reports (annual and quarterly reports from the Securities Exchange Commission SEC), 136'578 earnings call transcripts (conference call transcripts from CEOs and CFOs), and 488'494 analyst reports (textual analysis of the company) resulting in 3.3B tokens. For testing FinBERT, Yang et al. [84] used the Financial Phrase Bank dataset with 4'840 sentiment classifications [85], the AnalystTone Dataset with 10'000 sentences [86], and FiQA Dataset with 1'111 sentences from an open challenge dataset for financial sentiment analysis (Financial Opinion Mining and Question Answering). The results show that the domain-specific FinBERT outperforms the generic BERT models in all of these financial datasets. An improved financial domain LM was released 2022 by [87] by introducing FLANG-BERT, the Financial LANGuage Model. They also created a domain-specific benchmark, Financial Language Understanding Evaluation (FLUE). Recently in May 2023, Bloomberg announced the BloombergGPT model, a LLM for the financial domain [88]. However, next to some experience on the training process no datasets, benchmarks, or weights have been released publicly.

Numerous other domain-specific LMs have been created since the rise of BERT. They all outperform general-purpose LMs. For instance, SciBERT is a pretrained LM based on scientific publications and evaluated on a suite of tasks in different scientific domains [89]. ConfiBERT is built to improve monitoring of political violence and conflicts [90] and PoliBERTweet is used to analyze political content on Twitter [91]. Cybersecurity is another important area thus [92] pretrained a M on a large corpus of cybersecurity text. To improve IR tasks in the architecture, engineering, and construction (AEC) industry, Zheng et al. [93] pretrained BERT on a corpus of regulatory text. Also, the domain-specific model BlueBERT [83] from the biomedical domain has been further pretrained and evaluated on more narrow, cancer-related vocabularies, resulting in CancerBERT [94].

In the legal domain Chalkidis et al. [95] pretrained LegalBERT on EU and UK legislation, ECHR and US cases and US contracts. Zheng et al. [96] pretrained CaseHoldBERT on US caselaw. Henderson et al. [97] trained PoL-BERT on their 256 GB diverse Pile of Law corpus. Niklaus and Giofr e [98] pretrained longformer models using the Replaced Token Detection (RTD) task [99] on the Pile of Law. Hua et al. [100] pretrained reformer models with RTD on 6 GB of US caselaw. Finally, Niklaus et al. [50] released a large multilingual legal corpus and trained various legal models on it.

F.2 Judgment Prediction

The domain of Legal Judgment Prediction (LJP) centers around the crucial task of predicting legal case outcomes given the provided facts. In the landscape of LJP research, there have been significant advances focusing on diverse languages, jurisdictions, and input types. Researchers have utilized a variety of datasets, each with their unique characteristics and annotations, to analyze and predict case outcomes [101–105].

In the context of Chinese criminal cases, notable efforts have been made by Xiao et al. [106, 107], where they utilized the CAIL2018 dataset, which consists of over 2.6M cases and provides annotations for Law Article, Charge, and Prison Term, among others.

Focusing on the Indian and Swiss jurisdictions, Malik et al. [108] and Niklaus et al. [15, 16] employed the ILDC and SJP datasets respectively, both using binary labels. The ILDC dataset, with over 34K Indian Supreme Court cases, offers sentence-level explanations along with Court Decision annotations, while the SJP corpus is trilingual, containing judgments from Switzerland in German, French, and Italian, and provides annotations like the publication year, legal area, and the canton of origin.

European jurisdictions have been explored using the ECHR2019 and ECHR2021 datasets [105, 109]. These corpora feature cases from the European Court of Human Rights, annotated for Violation, Law Article, and Alleged Law Article, among others, with the latter also providing paragraph-level rationales.

The FCCR dataset, containing over 126K cases from France, has been used to predict Court Decisions with different setups, offering additional annotations such as the date of the court ruling and the law area [103].

Recently, Semo et al. [7] introduced a new perspective on LJP, applying it to US class action cases. The proposed task involves predicting the judgment outcome based

on the plaintiff’s pleas, further expanding the scope of LJP research and making the task more realistic.

Prasad et al. [110] utilized the ILDC dataset and a subset of the LexGLUE dataset to evaluate a method termed ‘Multi-stage Encoder-based Supervised with-clustering’ approach. This method involved chunking long documents, embedding LLM representations, and applying clustering techniques for automatic legal judgment prediction. It achieved a minimum total performance gain of approximately 2 points over the previous state-of-the-art methods. Furthermore, they proposed an ‘Occlusion sensitivity-based Relevant Sentence Extractor’ designed to extract sentences that explain the predictions, focusing on the most relevant sentences from the document.

These efforts underscore the breadth of LJP research, demonstrating its applicability across multiple jurisdictions, languages, and legal systems, and its potential in assisting legal professionals and enhancing access to justice.

F.3 Criticality Prediction

Chalkidis et al. [105] introduced the Importance Prediction task, which predicts the importance of a ECtHR case on a scale from 1 (key case) to 4 (unimportant). Legal experts defined and assigned these labels for each case, representing a significant contrast to our approach where labels were algorithmically determined. This is to our knowledge the only comparable task to Criticality Prediction.

F.4 Law Area Prediction

Although not widely studied, several notable works have focused on LAP. Şulea et al. [103] worked on the Law Judgment Prediction (LJP) task, using a dataset of over 126K cases from the French Supreme Court. The study used Linear Support Vector Machines (SVMs) to classify cases into one of eight law areas, using the entire case description as input. This approach yielded an F1 score of 90%. Soh et al. [111] conducted a similar study using a dataset of 6K judgments in English from the Singapore Supreme Court. These judgments were mapped into 30 law areas. Several text classifiers were used in the study, achieving a macro F1 score of up to 63.2%.

F.5 Court View Generation

Over the past decade, text generation (excluding summarization) in the field of Legal NLP has been underexplored [112], especially in comparison to tasks such as classification and information extraction. One of the early contributions in this domain is by Ye et al. [113], who introduced the task of generating court views from criminal case facts using a Seq2seq model. This work utilizes a Chinese dataset with factual descriptions averaging around 220 tokens and court views of approximately 30 tokens in length. Further contributions include Wu et al. [114]’s approach in Chinese civil law, focusing on creating legal documents for private lending cases. To achieve the reduction of systemic bias, they utilized an encoder-decoder architecture, designed to generate two distinct types of court views: ‘supportive’, which aligns with the plaintiff’s claims, and ‘non-supportive’, which counters them. A key element of this approach is the judgment classifier, which determines the most suitable court view out of the

two options. Additionally, Li and Zhang [115] utilize Chinese case facts, as well as charge (formal accusations of crimes) and law article information, to generate court opinions, averaging between 31 to 34 tokens in length. Another notable work is by Yue et al. [116], who introduced the Circumstances enhanced Criminal Court View Generation (C3VG) method, emphasizing the importance of Adjudging Circumstance (ADC) and Sentencing Circumstance (SEC) in the legal judgment process. ADC relates to establishing whether an act meets the legal criteria for a specific crime, while SEC involves factors considered during sentencing. The C3VG employs a two-stage architecture, incorporating a BERT-based Circumstances Selector and seq2seq models for ADC and SEC. The dataset used for this study is composed of Chinese legal documents focused on criminal law. In contrast to these Chinese-focused approaches, our research utilizes a trilingual dataset in German, French, and Italian. Also notably, our court views are substantially longer, averaging approximately 4,000 tokens, highlighting the increased complexity of our benchmark. With the emergence of powerful generative models, we expect a surge in research activity in this area, necessitating challenging tasks to assess progress effectively.

F.6 Leading Decisions Summarization

In the field of legal text summarization, several noteworthy contributions have been made [117–121], with some being particularly significant: The creators of the BillSum dataset [122] focused on summarizing 22K bills from the US Congress and the state of California. They also applied transfer learning in summarization from federal to state laws. Models based on BERT and TF-IDF, as well as a combination of both, have been evaluated on this dataset. The BillSum dataset focuses on English language documents related to the US legislative environment. The Multi-LexSum dataset [123] targets long civil rights lawsuits, with an average length of over 75K words. This 9K-document dataset allows for in-depth study at different summary lengths: short (25 words), medium (130 words), and long (650 words), a unique feature of the Multi-LexSum dataset. Models based on BART [124] and PEGASUS [125] were evaluated on this dataset. Like BillSum, the Multi-LexSum dataset is primarily for the English language and is relevant to the US legal setting. In addition to these datasets, the EUR-Lex-Sum [126] is based on documents and summaries from the European Union law platform (EUR-Lex), encompassing a diverse range of the 24 official European languages. The dataset comprises over 1,500 document/summary pairs per language and features 375 cross-lingually aligned legal acts available in all 24 languages. A key differentiator of EUR-Lex-Sum from our work is its focus on legislation from a supranational organization, as opposed to our emphasis on court cases within a single jurisdiction. Addressing language barriers in the Indian legal system, the MILDSum dataset [127] introduces a novel approach by focusing on the cross-lingual translation of English legal documents into Hindi. It comprises 3,122 Indian legal case judgments. The study’s significant finding is the effectiveness of the ‘Summarize-then-Translate’ method over direct cross-lingual summarization. The dataset includes documents with an average length of 4,696 tokens and summaries in both English and Hindi, averaging approximately 724 and 695 tokens, respectively. Furthermore, Bauer et al. [128] made

a significant contribution by focusing on extracting key passages from 430K U.S. court opinions to create concise summaries.

F.7 Citation Extraction

Early work from Martínez-González et al. [129] extract citations from legal text with patterns. Nambanoor Kunnath et al. [130] studied the effect of differing context size for citation classification in scientific text. Taylor et al. [39] considered the more difficult Citation Prediction task on scientific text and found that larger models are more true to the real citation distribution, whereas smaller models tend to output the most frequent citations most of the times.

F.8 Information Retrieval

Lawrie et al. [131] revisited the challenges of multilingual IR and proposed neural approaches to address this issue. They demonstrated that combining neural document translation with neural ranking resulted in the best performance in their experiments conducted on the MS MARCO dataset [132]. However, this approach is computationally expensive. To mitigate this issue, they showed that using a pre-trained XLM-R multilingual model to index documents in their native language resulted in only a two percent difference in effectiveness. XLM-R is a transformer-based masked LM that employs self-supervised training techniques for cross-lingual understanding [133]. Lawrie et al. [131] crucially utilized mixed-language batches from the neural translation of MS MARCO passages.

A widely used technique is BM-25, which is an improved retrieval method that considers the term frequencies and takes into account the saturation effect and document length [64]. The saturation effect refers to the point where the relevance of a term stops increasing, even if it appears many times in a document. This issue is mitigated through the use of an additional parameter, k . Additionally, longer documents are more likely to contain a higher number of occurrences of a term simply because they contain more words, not necessarily because the term is more relevant to the document, which is why parameter b is used. The BM-25 score is calculated using the Inverse Document Frequency (IDF), Term Frequency (TF), queries Q , documents d , and term t .

$$BM25(d, Q, b, k) = \sum_{t \in Q} IDF(t) \frac{(k+1)TF(t,d)}{(1-b)(b \cdot A) + TF(t,d)}$$

Chalkidis et al. [68] proposed a new IR task called REG-IR, which deals with longer documents in the corpus and entire documents as queries. This task is an adaptation of Document-to-Documents (Doc2Doc) IR, which aims to identify a relevant document for a given document. The authors observed that neural re-rankers underperformed due to contradicting supervision, where similar query-document pairs were labeled with opposite relevance. Additionally, they demonstrated for long documents that using BM25 as a document retriever in a two-stage approach often results in underperformance since the parameters k and b are often not optimal when using standard values. The problem of noise filtering of long documents was also addressed by using techniques like stopwords removal. However, as seen in [134], this approach can have a negative effect

on performance. The best pre-fetcher for long documents was found to be C-BERTs [37], which are trained on classifying documents using predefined labels.

In general, regarding information retrieval approaches, there is a trade-off between performance and efficiency. While bi-encoders are faster and more efficient, they lag behind cross-encoders in terms of performance. Late-interaction models, such as ColBERT [135] and, to an even greater extent, COIL [136], attempt to mitigate this trade-off by delivering good performance while maintaining low computational costs. Lin and Lin [137] offer a hybrid approach in the form of low-dimensional dense lexical representations, combining lexical representations with dense semantic representations to preserve effectiveness while improving query latency.

Thakur et al. [11] proposed a novel evaluation benchmark for IR that encompasses a wide range of approaches, including lexical, such as BM25 [64], sparse, dense, late-interaction, including ColBERT [135], and re-ranking models, including BM25+CE, introduced by Thakur et al. [11]. BM25+CE reranks the top-100 retrieved hits from a first-stage BM25 model using a 6-layer, 384-h MiniLM [138] as the cross-attentional re-ranking model. They found that while BM25+CE is computationally expensive, it provides a robust baseline, whereas other models failed to achieve comparable performance, except of ColBERT which performed only slightly weaker. Their findings suggest that there is still much room for improvement in this area of NLP. Efficient retrieval of relevant information is crucial for many NLP tasks, and these results highlight the need for continued research in this area.

G More Detailed Experimental Setup

G.1 Resources Used

The experiments were performed on internal university clusters on NVIDIA GPUs with the following specifications: 24GB RTX3090, 32GB V100, 48GB A6000, and 80GB A100. We used an approximate total of 160, 20, and 2 GPU days for the text classification, text generation and information retrieval experiments.

Text Generation

For inference and fine-tuning LLaMA-2 on the text generation tasks, we used the [Together API](#).

G.2 Hyperparameters

Text Classification

For all models and datasets, a learning rate of $1e-5$ was used without any tuning. Each experiment was executed with three random seeds (1-3), and the batch size was tailored for each task and corresponding computational resource. Seeds that yielded very high evaluation losses were considered failed and, therefore, excluded from the analysis. If the GPU memory was inadequate, we used gradient accumulation as a workaround to arrive at a final batch size of 64. The training was conducted with early stopping based on validation loss, maintaining a patience level of 5 epochs. Due to the considerable size of the judgment prediction dataset and the extended duration of the experiment, training was limited to a single epoch with evaluations after every 1000th step. To reduce costs, we utilized AMP mixed precision during the training and evaluation phases whenever it did not lead to overflows (e.g., mDeBERTa-v3). We established the max-sequence-length (determined by the product of max-segment-length and max-segments in the hierarchical setup [15, 16, 102]) based on whether we used Facts: 2048 (128 X 16), or Considerations: 4096 (128 X 32).

Text Generation

For the main CVG dataset, we trained our mT5 models for only one epoch (because of the large training set) with a final batch size of 16, using gradient accumulation as needed. We performed evaluations every 1000 steps. For the smaller origin dataset, we increased the number of epochs to 100 and evaluated every 100 steps. For the LDS task, we adjusted the training to 10 epochs.

Information Retrieval

For the BM25 model, we used the same parameters as used in the BEIR paper [11], chosen were $k = 0.9$ and $b = 0.4$. For the SBERT model training, we employed the [BEIR](#) toolkit [11]. Our training process was constrained by a maximum sequence length of 512 tokens. During the training phase, we completed a single epoch, comprising 5000 evaluation steps.

```

"corpus": {
  "decision_id_bge": {
    "title": "file number",
    "text": "facts and considerations of a case"
  },
  "law_id": {
    "title": "",
    "text": "text of a law"
  }
},
"queries": {
  "decision_id_bger_1": "facts of a case",
  "decision_id_bger_2": "facts"
},
"qrels": {
  "decision_id_bger_1": {"law-id": 1, "decision-id-bge": 1},
  "decision_id_bger_2": {"law-id": 1}
}

```

Fig. 20: Structure of corpus, queries and qrels for IR task

In the context of training with hard negative examples, we incorporated 5 negative examples for every query. The selection of these examples was based on the 5 highest-ranked erroneous predictions generated by the BM25 model. To facilitate training with these challenging negatives, we followed the guidelines provided by Thakur et al. [11], utilizing the [Hardnegs](#) template.

H Detailed Data Description

In this section, we provide additional information about the datasets. Table 7 shows different classification task configurations, and Table 8 provides additional information about general dataset metadata.

Table 7: Task Configurations. Label names are *Critical* (C), *Non-critical* (NC), *Critical-1* (C1) to *Critical-4* (C4), *Approval* (A), *Dismissal* (D). For Law-Sub-Area we reported only the two most common labels *Substantive Criminal* (SC), *Criminal Procedure* (CP), and the two least common *Intellectual Property* (IP), *Other Fiscal* (OF). Abbreviations: **Validation**, **Considerations**, **Facts**

Task Name	Train	Labels Train				Val	Labels Val				Test	Labels Test			
LD-Fac	75K	C	NC	-	-	12K	C	NC	-	-	26K	C	NC	-	-
LD-Con	91K	3K	72K	-	-	15K	580	13K	-	-	32K	948	25K	-	-
Citation-Fac	2.5K	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	563	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	725	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4
Citation-Con	2.5K	782	626	585	513	563	186	152	131	94	723	137	177	224	187
		779	624	586	520		186	154	131	92		137	177	224	185
Judgment-Fac	197K	D	A	-	-	37K	D	A	-	-	94K	D	A	-	-
Judgment-Con	188K	135K	62K	-	-	37K	27K	11K	-	-	92K	67K	27K	-	-
		130K	59K	-	-		26K	11K	-	-		66K	26K	-	-
Law-Sub-Area-Fac	10K	SC	CP	IP	OF	9K	SC	CP	IP	OF	3K	SC	CP	IP	OF
Law-Sub-Area-Con	8K	3K	3K	6	2	7K	2K	1K	11	1	3K	1K	509	5	1
		2K	1K	6	2		2K	750	11	1		885	401	3	1

Table 8: Listing of cantons, courts, chambers, law-areas

Metadata	Number	Examples
Cantons	26 (+1)	Aargau (AG), Bern (BE), Basel-Stadt (BS), Solothurn (SO), Ticino (Ti), Vaud (VD),... (+ Federation (CH))
Courts	184	Cantonal Bar Supervisory Authority, Supreme Court, administrative authorities, Tax Appeals Commission, Cantonal Court, Federal Administrative Court, ...
Chambers	456	GR-UPL0-01, AG-VB-002, CH-BGer-011, ZH-OG-001, ZG-VG-004, VS-BZG-009, VD-TC-002, TI-TE-001, ...
Law-Areas	4	Civil, Criminal, Public, Social
Languages	5	German, French, Italian, Romansh, English

I Additional Results

I.1 Court View Generation

Table 9 shows the results of the CVG task from both, the main and the origin dataset. Table 11 presents the CVG task results split by language, detailing scores for German, French, and Italian.

Table 9: Results of Court View Generation task. 'In Len' denotes input length in tokens. **Bold:** best within model; underlined: best overall.

Model	In Len \uparrow	Main Scores \uparrow						Origin Scores \uparrow					
		BERT	BLEU	MET	R1 / R2 / RL			BERT	BLEU	MET	R1 / R2 / RL		
mT5 _{Large}	2048	<u>75.74</u>	<u>66.92</u>	<u>34.44</u>	<u>34.91</u>	<u>15.58</u>	<u>33.53</u>	76.24	62.59	32.25	34.80 / 16.11 / 33.58		
mT5 _{Large}	1024	75.56	66.68	34.02	34.26 / 14.72 / 32.87			74.99	58.35	31.06	33.35 / 14.80 / 32.16		
mT5 _{Large}	512	75.27	66.12	33.48	33.61 / 14.26 / 32.21			<u>76.33</u>	62.08	32.92	<u>36.61</u>	<u>18.17</u>	<u>34.84</u>
mT5 _{Base}	2048	75.01	65.48	32.89	33.23 / 13.57 / 31.89			75.99	<u>63.39</u>	<u>34.15</u>	36.48 / <u>18.81</u> / 35.58		
mT5 _{Base}	1024	75.15	65.73	33.15	33.49 / 13.96 / 32.18			76.07	60.99	33.50	<u>37.68</u> / 18.79 / <u>36.58</u>		
mT5 _{Base}	512	74.89	65.55	32.66	32.66 / 13.16 / 31.35			76.08	62.21	32.80	36.40 / 17.58 / 34.98		
mT5 _{Small}	2048	74.13	63.97	30.96	31.29 / 11.01 / 29.90			75.23	56.59	30.71	34.68 / 13.64 / 33.24		
mT5 _{Small}	1024	74.00	63.70	30.68	31.05 / 10.77 / 29.64			75.75	58.99	31.17	34.62 / 14.25 / <u>33.91</u>		
mT5 _{Small}	512	73.92	63.83	30.57	30.58 / 10.35 / 29.20			75.63	61.12	32.33	35.16	14.45	33.72

Table 10: Results of Court View Generation task. 'In Len' denotes input length in tokens. **Bold:** best within setup; underlined: best overall. (*) These models were fine-tuned on only 1'000 samples for 3 epochs. All models, except for the mT5 models, were evaluated on the validation set.

Model	Setup	In Len \uparrow	BERT \uparrow	BLEU \uparrow	MET \uparrow	R1 / R2 / RL \uparrow		
mT5 _{Large}	Fine-tuned	2048	<u>75.74</u>	<u>66.92</u>	<u>34.44</u>	<u>34.91</u>	<u>15.58</u>	<u>33.53</u>
mT5 _{Large}	Fine-tuned	1024	75.56	66.68	34.02	34.26 / 14.72 / 32.87		
mT5 _{Large}	Fine-tuned	512	75.27	66.12	33.48	33.61 / 14.26 / 32.21		
mT5 _{Base}	Fine-tuned	2048	75.01	65.48	32.89	33.23 / 13.57 / 31.89		
mT5 _{Base}	Fine-tuned	1024	75.15	65.73	33.15	33.49 / 13.96 / 32.18		
mT5 _{Base}	Fine-tuned	512	74.89	65.55	32.66	32.66 / 13.16 / 31.35		
mT5 _{Small}	Fine-tuned	2048	74.13	63.97	30.96	31.29 / 11.01 / 29.90		
mT5 _{Small}	Fine-tuned	1024	74.00	63.70	30.68	31.05 / 10.77 / 29.64		
mT5 _{Small}	Fine-tuned	512	73.92	63.83	30.57	30.58 / 10.35 / 29.20		
GPT-3.5-Turbo	Fine-tuned*	2048	72.31	62.23	28.08	26.06 / 7.19 / 24.54		
LLaMA-2-13B Chat	Fine-tuned*	2048	74.22	63.51	33.33	34.36	<u>16.68</u>	33.20
LLaMA-2-7B Chat	Fine-tuned*	2048	73.27	62.34	31.6	32.31 / 14.47 / 31.38		
GPT-4	1-shot	2048	70.39	59.69	24.63	23.87 / 4.64 / 22.32		
GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K	1-shot	8192	70.86	59.89	25.63	24.97 / 5.44 / 23.50		
GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K	1-shot	2048	70.73	59.92	25.55	24.95 / 5.43 / 23.49		
GPT-4	0-shot	2048	69.41	58.16	23.25	22.61 / 3.95 / 21.10		
GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K	0-shot	8192	67.93	56.87	22.62	21.21 / 3.56 / 19.88		
GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K	0-shot	2048	67.80	56.52	22.32	20.99 / 3.46 / 19.74		
LLaMA-2-70B Chat	0-shot	2048	66.78	53.04	19.13	18.48 / 3.21 / 17.35		
LLaMA-2-13B Chat	0-shot	2048	67.23	55.01	20.18	19.76 / 3.26 / 18.57		
LLaMA-2-7B Chat	0-shot	2048	63.74	40.62	11.29	10.75 / 1.62 / 10.13		

Table 11: Results of the CVG task split by language. Scores are presented in the order: German, French, and Italian.

Model	Setup	BERT \uparrow			BLEU \uparrow			MET \uparrow			R1 \uparrow			R2 \uparrow			RL \uparrow		
GPT-3.5-Turbo	Fine-tuned	71.89 / 73.01 / 71.17	62.29 / 62.15 / 62.29	29.02 / 27.43 / 25.38	25.68 / 26.97 / 23.48	7.31 / 7.49 / 4.64	24.60 / 24.94 / 21.77												
LLaMA-2-13B-Chat	Fine-tuned	75.06 / 73.76 / 71.03	66.24 / 61.05 / 58.81	36.44 / 30.69 / 26.95	36.22 / 33.37 / 27.12	19.51 / 14.55 / 9.44	35.35 / 31.92 / 25.63												
GPT-4	1-shot	69.73 / 71.31 / 69.22	58.83 / 60.89 / 58.23	24.20 / 25.48 / 21.76	22.40 / 25.86 / 21.85	3.56 / 6.15 / 2.88	21.26 / 23.82 / 20.35												
GPT-4	0-shot	69.12 / 69.87 / 68.54	57.90 / 58.58 / 57.18	23.25 / 23.42 / 21.83	21.48 / 24.14 / 21.08	2.97 / 5.26 / 2.78	20.25 / 22.32 / 19.44												
LLaMA-2-13B-Chat	0-shot	66.72 / 67.94 / 66.65	53.20 / 56.73 / 57.61	19.86 / 20.60 / 19.98	18.22 / 21.50 / 20.44	2.18 / 4.59 / 3.03	17.39 / 19.92 / 18.95												

I.2 Leading Decision Summarization (LDS)

Table 12 shows all results of the LDS task. Table 13 presents the LDS task results split by language, detailing scores for German, French, and Italian.

Table 12: Results of Leading Decision Summarization (LDS) task. 'In Len' denotes input length in tokens. **Bold**: best within setup; underlined: best overall. All models, except for the mT5 models, were evaluated on the validation set.

Model	Setup	In Len \uparrow	BERT \uparrow	BLEU \uparrow	MET \uparrow	R1 / R2 / RL \uparrow		
mT5 _{Large}	Fine-tuned	4096	<i>OOM</i>	<i>OOM</i>	<i>OOM</i>			<i>OOM</i>
mT5 _{Large}	Fine-tuned	2048	73.10	<u>27.21</u>	21.88	31.47 / 12.22 / 29.94		
mT5 _{Large}	Fine-tuned	512	70.67	26.89	18.31	24.76 / 6.15 / 23.48		
mT5 _{Base}	Fine-tuned	4096	73.33	30.81	23.50	32.43 / 12.78 / 30.87		
mT5 _{Base}	Fine-tuned	2048	72.45	30.13	21.94	30.09 / 10.79 / 28.71		
mT5 _{Base}	Fine-tuned	512	70.60	27.10	18.31	24.72 / 6.15 / 23.55		
mT5 _{Small}	Fine-tuned	4096	72.04	28.68	21.29	29.61 / 10.31 / 28.12		
mT5 _{Small}	Fine-tuned	2048	71.38	24.64	19.28	27.88 / 9.19 / 26.54		
mT5 _{Small}	Fine-tuned	512	69.66	20.73	15.95	22.91 / 5.36 / 21.85		
GPT-4	1-shot	4096	73.55	47.75	34.72	30.82 / 9.68 / 28.89		
GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K	1-shot	8192	72.92	46.15	33.68	29.69 / 9.47 / 27.97		
GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K	1-shot	4096	72.89	45.21	32.76	29.69 / 9.25 / 27.94		
GPT-4	0-shot	4096	71.56	48.35	32.97	26.52 / 8.93 / 24.51		
GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K	0-shot	4096	70.28	46.08	30.60	25.18 / 7.58 / 23.59		

Table 13: Results of the LDS task split by language. Scores are presented in the order: German, French, and Italian.

Model	Setup	BERT \uparrow			BLEU \uparrow			MET \uparrow			R1 \uparrow			R2 \uparrow			RL \uparrow		
GPT-4	1-shot	73.89 / 72.84 / 74.08	49.32 / 45.85 / 38.08	36.50 / 32.01 / 28.75	31.14 / 30.03 / 32.43	9.91 / 9.13 / 10.82	29.25 / 27.99 / 30.84												
GPT-3.5	1-shot	73.26 / 72.21 / 72.50	47.44 / 41.50 / 39.08	35.23 / 28.48 / 27.37	30.64 / 28.22 / 26.11	9.46 / 8.87 / 8.96	28.90 / 26.46 / 24.34												
GPT-4	0-shot	72.65 / 69.56 / 70.95	49.17 / 46.96 / 46.89	36.26 / 27.39 / 27.10	28.27 / 23.45 / 24.25	10.88 / 5.36 / 7.74	26.26 / 21.42 / 22.51												
GPT-3.5	0-shot	71.25 / 68.39 / 69.84	47.39 / 43.68 / 44.17	33.31 / 25.51 / 27.91	27.11 / 21.73 / 21.86	9.22 / 4.64 / 4.75	25.47 / 20.22 / 20.48												

I.3 Text Classification

Table 14 shows more detailed results on the text classification datasets including standard deviations across seeds.

Table 14: Configuration aggregate scores with standard deviations on the test set. The macro-F1 scores are provided.

Model	CPB-F	CPB-C	CPC-F	CPC-C	SLAP-F	SLAP-C	JP-F	JP-C	Agg.
MiniLM	54.7 \pm -1.9	65.8 \pm -1.6	9.8 \pm -2.8	20.8 \pm -3.0	59.7 \pm -3.8	61.1 \pm -3.7	58.1 \pm -0.4	78.5 \pm -2.3	32.4
DistilBERT	56.2 \pm -0.5	65.4 \pm -1.7	19.6 \pm -1.1	22.1 \pm -0.4	63.7 \pm -11.7	65.9 \pm -6.4	59.9 \pm -0.9	75.5 \pm -3.3	42.1
mDeBERTa-v3	55.1 \pm -2.0	69.8 \pm -2.8	21.0 \pm -3.6	17.5 \pm -4.4	63.8 \pm -6.3	59.3 \pm -7.6	60.6 \pm -0.9	77.9 \pm -2.6	40.2
XLm-RBase	57.2 \pm -1.5	65.9 \pm -3.2	21.3 \pm -1.5	23.7 \pm -1.9	67.2 \pm -15.9	73.4 \pm -2.5	60.9 \pm -0.6	79.7 \pm -2.5	44.6
XLm-RLarge	56.4 \pm -1.8	67.9 \pm -1.9	24.4 \pm -7.2	29.1 \pm -2.7	65.1 \pm -8.5	78.9 \pm -4.6	60.8 \pm -0.6	80.9 \pm -2.4	48.6
X-MODBase	56.6 \pm -1.8	67.8 \pm -2.9	20.0 \pm -3.0	20.6 \pm -3.5	63.9 \pm -10.1	64.4 \pm -7.0	60.5 \pm -0.6	79.1 \pm -2.6	41.9
SwissBERT (xlm-vocab)	56.9 \pm -0.7	67.3 \pm -4.7	25.7 \pm -8.3	23.0 \pm -4.0	61.5 \pm -9.5	73.2 \pm -2.1	61.4 \pm -0.6	79.4 \pm -2.5	46.1
mT5Small	52.2 \pm -1.9	62.1 \pm -5.2	13.2 \pm -2.4	17.9 \pm -1.7	53.1 \pm -13.8	60.9 \pm -15.9	58.9 \pm -1.0	74.2 \pm -3.6	34.4
mT5Base	52.1 \pm -1.6	61.9 \pm -3.9	14.0 \pm -2.8	19.7 \pm -1.6	58.4 \pm -17.2	61.8 \pm -16.8	54.5 \pm -1.5	72.0 \pm -3.1	35.9
BLOOM-560m	53.0 \pm -1.7	61.7 \pm -4.1	10.7 \pm -3.7	8.0 \pm -3.5	52.6 \pm -10.7	53.2 \pm -8.5	60.5 \pm -0.7	73.4 \pm -7.2	24.9
Legal-ch-RBase	57.7 \pm -1.6	70.5 \pm -2.3	16.2 \pm -5.8	20.1 \pm -5.6	77.0 \pm -3.6	79.7 \pm -0.9	64.0 \pm -1.3	86.4 \pm -1.9	40.9
Legal-ch-RLarge	55.9 \pm -2.2	68.9 \pm -2.1	25.8 \pm -7.8	16.3 \pm -8.7	76.9 \pm -2.3	84.9 \pm -9.7	62.8 \pm -0.9	87.1 \pm -2.2	43.3
Legal-ch-LFBase	58.1 \pm -2.1	70.8 \pm -2.9	21.4 \pm -2.9	17.4 \pm -8.6	80.1 \pm -12.7	77.1 \pm -4.8	65.4 \pm -1.7	86.4 \pm -1.8	42.5

I.3.1 Language specific results

Table 15 shows more detailed results on the text classification datasets language specific scores.

SwissBERT, where pretraining tokens were most focused towards the dominant language German seems to have quite even results, with scores in Italian even being the highest. Models trained on CC100 (MiniLM, mDeBERTa, XLM-R and X-MOD) showed mixed results. For all models, German performance was very close to French performance. MiniLM, mDeBERTa, and X-MOD showed Italian underperformance whereas XLM-R showed very strong performance in Italian, especially the large variant. Even though the Legal-ch-R models are based on XLM-R, they show underperformance in Italian, but similar performance between French and German. mT5 models performed well in French, the base variant additionally also performed well on Italian. BLOOM was much better in French than in other languages, not surprising given it did not have German and Italian in the pretraining data.

Overall, there only seems to be a weak trend connecting higher percentage of a given language in the pretraining corpus leading to better downstream results in that language.

I.4 Information Retrieval

For the ML Lexical Retrieval model a main language must be chosen, indicated with German, French and Italian. Dataset adaptations are indicated with: (S) stopword removal, (SL) using only single language links, (DE/FR/IT) using only queries in one language. Table 17 shows the results of the IR task on a subset of 100 queries and with only relevant documents while Table 18 shows more detailed results using all queries.

Table 15: Configuration aggregate scores. The macro-F1 scores from the language-specific subsets of the test set are provided.

Model Languages	CPB-F			CPB-C			CPC-F			CPC-C			SLAP-F			SLAP-C			JP-F			JP-C			Agg.		
	de	fr	it	de	fr	it	de	fr	it	de	fr	it	de	fr	it	de	fr	it	de	fr	it	de	fr	it	de	fr	it
MiniLM	57.5	53.9	52.9	68.1	65.4	64.2	12.1	13.1	6.8	24.6	21.9	17.3	55.3	60.0	64.5	57.6	60.0	66.5	57.7	58.1	58.7	77.8	81.7	76.1	36.1	36.6	26.6
DistilmBERT	56.3	55.6	56.8	67.8	63.9	64.7	20.2	18.2	20.7	22.6	21.6	22.2	50.9	67.2	79.6	57.8	68.8	72.9	60.5	60.7	58.6	75.6	79.8	71.7	41.4	41.3	43.6
mDeBERTa-v3	57.6	55.1	52.7	73.9	68.1	67.7	25.4	22.8	16.8	22.1	21.6	12.6	59.7	60.1	73.3	59.4	69.9	51.3	59.5	61.8	60.4	78.8	80.7	74.5	44.8	43.8	33.9
XML-R _{Base}	59.4	56.3	56.0	70.2	65.4	62.5	20.0	20.6	23.5	26.5	22.1	23.1	54.5	64.6	92.2	71.5	71.9	77.1	60.9	61.6	60.2	79.9	82.8	76.7	44.5	43.3	46.2
XML-R _{Large}	58.4	56.8	54.1	70.5	67.3	66.0	22.5	19.7	36.2	26.7	28.2	33.0	65.5	56.1	77.0	73.7	78.8	84.9	60.8	61.6	60.1	81.3	83.7	77.9	46.9	45.1	54.9
X-MOD _{Base}	59.0	56.2	54.8	71.1	68.7	64.1	19.8	17.2	24.4	23.2	24.2	16.4	55.7	61.1	79.3	63.1	74.5	57.8	60.2	61.3	60.0	79.4	82.4	76.0	42.6	42.1	40.9
SwissBERT _(xlm-vocab)	57.6	55.9	57.3	72.4	69.3	61.2	23.8	20.3	39.4	28.5	24.0	18.7	50.0	66.8	72.4	71.2	72.4	76.1	61.1	62.2	60.9	79.8	82.5	76.3	46.7	44.4	47.3
mT5 _{Small}	54.8	51.7	50.3	69.2	61.9	56.4	14.2	16.2	10.5	15.9	18.1	20.2	37.6	67.6	66.2	51.7	86.6	54.4	59.8	59.5	57.5	75.9	77.7	69.4	33.1	38.3	32.3
mT5 _{Base}	54.1	52.1	50.3	66.4	61.9	56.8	10.6	16.3	16.9	18.7	18.7	22.1	40.4	80.8	70.6	47.2	87.9	62.7	56.2	55.0	52.6	73.4	75.3	67.9	31.0	39.0	38.9
BLOOM-560m	55.1	53.2	50.9	64.6	65.3	56.2	12.6	16.1	7.1	9.5	13.6	5.1	39.9	61.8	63.2	42.7	61.8	59.6	59.8	61.5	60.3	68.8	84.2	69.1	26.8	34.8	18.4
Legal-ch-R _{Base}	59.3	58.4	55.5	73.8	69.4	68.6	24.3	20.5	10.5	26.2	25.3	14.0	79.8	72.1	79.6	80.8	79.6	78.6	62.5	65.8	63.9	87.6	87.9	83.7	49.4	46.3	31.7
Legal-ch-R _{Large}	58.3	55.7	53.6	71.9	68.5	66.7	23.0	21.3	38.7	28.5	26.0	9.0	74.0	77.4	79.6	77.6	80.5	99.5	61.6	63.9	63.0	88.6	88.7	84.1	49.0	47.0	36.2
Legal-ch-LF _{Base}	60.7	58.3	55.5	74.8	70.0	67.8	25.3	21.5	18.4	29.2	26.7	9.9	75.9	70.3	99.7	82.2	72.6	100	63.1	67.1	66.0	87.5	87.9	84.0	51.2	47.2	31.0

Table 16: Configuration aggregate scores on the validation set. The macro-F1 scores are provided. The highest values are in bold. It is important to note that the scores presented here are calculated as the harmonic mean over multiple seeds.

Model	CPB-F	CPB-C	CPC-F	CPC-C	SLAP-F	SLAP-C	JP-F	JP-C	Agg.
MiniLM	59.1	71.0	14.9	36.9	73.8	78.9	60.9	81.4	44.4
DistilmBERT	59.6	70.1	26.3	35.8	74.1	90.3	60.8	78.8	53.1
mDeBERTa-v3	60.1	73.0	30.4	36.0	77.4	82.0	63.3	81.1	55.5
XML-R _{Base}	60.1	70.5	26.9	38.5	78.7	92.2	62.9	82.5	55.0
XML-R _{Large}	60.5	71.7	27.2	39.7	74.0	96.2	63.2	83.1	55.5
X-MOD _{Base}	57.1	71.0	27.0	33.4	81.3	94.4	62.5	82.1	53.5
SwissBERT _(xlm-vocab)	59.0	72.1	29.4	38.8	85.6	95.5	62.6	82.3	56.8
mT5 _{Small}	54.8	66.1	26.3	32.5	84.7	88.0	60.1	77.3	51.6
mT5 _{Base}	55.7	64.4	24.3	29.3	83.0	82.6	47.7	66.1	47.3
BLOOM-560m	52.2	64.3	20.1	21.8	78.5	82.4	60.5	76.7	43.3
Legal-ch-R _{Base}	61.2	73.6	27.7	41.0	99.0	96.1	65.3	88.8	58.2
Legal-ch-R _{Large}	61.8	73.5	29.8	32.0	99.3	98.8	65.1	89.7	56.6
Legal-ch-LF _{Base}	59.4	72.7	32.2	42.5	99.1	98.1	67.0	89.1	60.8

Table 17: Results IR: using a subset of 100 queries and only relevant documents in the corpus resulting in an easier task

Model	Additional	Rcap@1 ↑	Rcap@10 ↑	Rcap@100↑	NDCG@1↑	NDCG@10↑	NDCG@100↑
Train + Evaluate S-BERT	shert-legal-xlm-roberta-base	32.32	32.34	81.77	32.32	30.89	49.11
Train + Evaluate S-BERT	shert-legal-swiss-roberta-base	36.36	35.68	76.03	36.36	34.54	49.90
Train + Evaluate S-BERT	distiluse-base-multilingual-cased-v1	22.22	30.35	84.38	22.22	25.72	48.66
Evaluate S-BERT	distiluse-base-multilingual-cased-v1	8.08	11.83	43.35	8.08	10.55	21.56
Train(HN) + Evaluate S-BERT	distiluse-base-multilingual-cased-v1	27.27	33.94	86.81	27.27	30.09	52.03
Dim Reduction	distiluse-base-multilingual-cased-v1	0.00	1.59	5.43	0.00	1.17	2.41
Cross Encoder	distiluse-base-multilingual-cased-v1	5.94	8.04	14.20	2.97	1.84	7.35
Lexical		5.94	8.04	14.20	5.94	8.52	10.64
ML Lexical	'German'	9.90	8.41	15.19	9.90	9.14	11.58

Table 18: Results IR Additional: Results IR Abbreviations: Capped Recall, NDCG, distiluse-base-multilingual-cased-v1, swiss-legal-roberta-base, legal-xlm-roberta-base, Train, Hard Negative, Evaluate, S-Bert, Dim Reduction

Model	Adaption	$R@1 \uparrow$	$R@10 \uparrow$	$R@100 \uparrow$	$N@1 \uparrow$	$N@10 \uparrow$	$N@100 \uparrow$
LR		8.38	6.43	15.76	8.38	6.66	10.23
LR	S	10.64	7.57	16.47	10.64	8.04	11.33
LR	SL	7.91	9.99	32.46	9.13	9.65	18.03
MLR	'German'	8.69	6.54	15.99	8.69	6.82	10.43
MLR	'German'	S 10.88	7.65	16.80	10.88	8.14	11.53
MLR	'German'	SL 8.05	9.94	32.63	9.30	9.70	18.17
MLR	'French'	11.37	7.74	16.54	11.37	8.34	11.51
MLR	'French'	S 10.97	7.60	16.52	10.97	8.14	11.41
MLR	'Italian'	10.08	7.118	16.294	10.08	7.582	11.021
MLR	'English'	8.38	6.43	15.76	8.38	6.66	10.23
T+E SB	xlm	2.77	2.58	10.17	6.36	5.66	12.03
T+E SB	rob	3.97	3.47	12.28	9.12	7.76	15.16
E SB	dist	0.90	0.75	2.64	2.06	1.70	3.31
T+E SB	dist	4.4	3.92	12.64	10.11	8.76	16.16
T+E SB	dist	S 4.69	4.14	13.39	10.77	9.27	17.05
T+E SB	dist	SL 1.79	3.92	14.17	4.03	6.17	12.91
SB T(HN)+E	dist	3.97	4.46	13.36	9.12	9.21	16.87
SB T(HN)+E	dist	S 3.76	4.75	12.80	8.64	9.66	16.57
SB T(HN)+E	dist	SL 2.34	4.37	14.43	5.27	6.99	13.75
T+E SB	dist	DE 4.22	4.49	15.21	8.21	8.15	15.86
T+E SB	dist	DE SL 4.06	8.47	29.43	4.51	6.73	13.78
T+E SB	dist	FR 1.88	2.2	9.19	5.77	6.22	13.94
T+E SB	dist	FR SL 2.69	5.68	27.28	3.0	4.59	11.11
T+E SB	dist	IT 0.22	0.24	0.79	5.43	5.74	11.44
T+E SB	dist	IT SL 1.71	4.54	16.24	1.91	3.38	6.83
Dim	dist	0.71	0.62	2.42	1.64	1.4	2.95

J Error Analysis Examples

In the following we present specific examples for the generation tasks. In [Table 19](#) and [Table 20](#) the CVG task for German respectively French is depicted. In [Table 21](#) an example for the LDS task is shown. All texts were also translated into English using Deepl.

Table 19: Comparison of the generated considerations (CVG task) from four LLMs in different settings. The scores of each example are stated below in the following order: BERTScore, BLEU-Score, METEOR, ROUGE-1 / ROUGE-2 / ROUGE-L. The first row contains the facts of the case which were given as input, and the second row contains the considerations, the target of this task. We provide an English translated version on the right.

Generated Considerations - German

Decision ID: <i>26c65bde-9976-569d-920e-a3781b01536f</i> , Year: <i>2016</i> , Language: German, Court: <i>CH_BVGE</i> , Source: <i>BVGer D-6530/2015</i>	Translated into English
<p>Input: Sachverhalt: A. Der Beschwerdeführer ersuchte am 14. August 2015 in der Schweiz um Asyl. Am 27. August 2015 wurde er zur Person befragt (BzP) und am 10. September 2015 fand – im Beisein einer Vertrauensperson – die Anhörung zu seinen Asylgründen statt. B. Der aus Albanien stammende Beschwerdeführer gab an, er sei am (...) geboren und somit noch minderjährig. Zur Begründung seines Asylgesuchs führte er aus, er habe eine Beziehung zu einer jungen Frau gehabt, worauf deren Vater, nachdem er von der Beziehung mit seiner Tochter erfahren gehabt habe, von ihm verlangt habe, diese zu heiraten. Da er aber das Mädchen nicht liebe, habe er weder eine Ehe mit ihr eingehen noch eine Beziehung mit ihr weiterführen wollen. Der Vater der jungen Frau habe sich mit seinen Eltern in Verbindung gesetzt und ihnen erklärt, dass ihr Sohn seine Tochter zu heiraten habe, da er mit ihr eine Beziehung geführt habe. Seine Eltern seien damit einverstanden gewesen. Seither habe ihn sein Vater täglich ermahnt, dass er dieses Mädchen nun heiraten müsse. Weil er sich jeden Tag dasselbe von seinem Vater habe anhören müssen und er dies nicht mehr ertragen habe, habe er sich zum Verlassen seines Heimatlandes entschlossen. Bei einer Rückkehr nach Albanien hätte er mit Schwierigkeiten zu rechnen, da man ihn zur Heirat zwingen würde. Zum Beleg seiner Personalien reichte der Beschwerdeführer eine Identitätskarte ein. C. Mit Verfügung vom 5. Oktober 2015 – dem Beschwerdeführer und seiner Vertrauensperson eröffnet am darauffolgenden Tag – stellte die Vorinstanz fest, der Beschwerdeführer erfülle die Flüchtlingseigenschaft nicht, lehnte das Asylgesuch ab und verfügte die Wegweisung aus der Schweiz. Den zuständigen Kanton beauftragte sie mit dem Vollzug der Wegweisung. D. Mit Eingabe vom 13. Oktober 2015 (Poststempel) erhob der Beschwerdeführer gegen diesen Entscheid beim Bundesverwaltungsgericht Beschwerde und beantragte die Aufhebung der angefochtenen Verfügung, sodann sei ihm Asyl zu gewähren, eventualiter sei die Unzumutbarkeit des Wegweisungsvollzugs festzustellen und ihm die vorläufige Aufnahme zu D-6530/2015 Seite 3 gewähren, subeventualiter sei die Sache an die Vorinstanz zurückzuweisen und diese anzuweisen, eine allfällige Wegweisung des Beschwerdeführers pflichtgemäss abzuklären, dies unter Würdigung seiner Minderjährigkeit. In prozessualer Hinsicht beantragte er die unentgeltliche Prozessführung im Sinne von Art. 65 Abs. 1 VwVG sowie den Verzicht auf die Erhebung eines Kostenvorschusses.</p>	<p>Facts of the case: A. The complainant applied for asylum in Switzerland on 14 August 2015. On 27 August 2015, he was interviewed (BzP) and on 10 September 2015, in the presence of a person of trust, the hearing on his reasons for asylum took place. B. The complainant, who comes from Albania, stated that he was born on (...) and therefore still a minor. In support of his application for asylum, he stated that he had had a relationship with a young woman, woman, whereupon her father, after learning of the relationship with his daughter, demanded that he marry her. But since he did not love her, he had neither entered into a marriage with her nor continued a relationship with her. The young woman's father had contacted his parents and explained to them that their son should marry his son had to marry his daughter because he had been in a relationship with her. His parents had agreed to this. Since then, his father had reminded him every day that he had to marry this girl. Because he had had to listen to the same thing from his father every day and he could no longer bear it, he decided to leave his home country. If he returned to Albania, he would face difficulties, as he would be forced to marry. To prove his identity, the complainant submitted an identity card. C. By order of 5 October 2015, the complainant and his confidant were informed that he would be forced to return to Albania. The following day, the lower instance found that the appellant determined that the appellant did not fulfil the refugee status, rejected the application for asylum and rejected the asylum application and ordered his removal from Switzerland. The responsible canton with the execution of the removal order. D. By petition dated 13 October 2015 (postmark), the appellant lodged a complaint against the decision appealed against this decision to the Federal Administrative Court and requested that the contested decision be cancelled, He was then to be granted asylum or, alternatively, the unreasonableness of the deportation order was to be the unreasonableness of the deportation order and that he be granted provisional admission. D-6530/2015 Page 3 order that the case be remanded to the lower instance and that the lower instance be instructed to and to instruct it to order the dismissal of the appellant in all cases. The appellant in accordance with his duty, taking into account his minority, From a procedural point of view, he requested that the proceedings be conducted free of charge. free of charge within the meaning of Art. 65 para. 1 VwVG as well as the waiver of an advance on costs. of an advance on costs.</p>

Table 19: continuation

<p>Target: Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht zieht in Erwägung: 1. 1.1. Gemäss Art. 31 VGG beurteilt das Bundesverwaltungsgericht Beschwerden gegen Verfügungen nach Art. 5 VwVG. Das SEM gehört zu den Behörden nach Art. 33 VGG und ist daher eine Vorinstanz des Bundesverwaltungsgerichts. Eine das Sachgebiet betreffende Ausnahme im Sinne von Art. 32 VGG liegt nicht vor. Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht ist daher zuständig für die Beurteilung der vorliegenden Beschwerde und entscheidet auf dem Gebiet des Asyls in der Regel so auch vorliegend endgültig (Art. 105 AsylG [SR 142.31]; Art. 83 Bst. d Ziff. 1 BGG). 1.2. Das Verfahren richtet sich nach dem VwVG, dem VGG und dem BGG, soweit das AsylG nichts anderes bestimmt (Art. 37 VGG und Art. 6 AsylG). 2. Die Kognition des Bundesverwaltungsgerichts und die zulässigen Rügen richten sich im Asylbereich nach Art. 106 Abs. 1 AsylG und im Bereich des Ausländerrechts nach Art. 49 VwVG (vgl. BVGE 2014/26 E. 5). 2.1. Mit Beschwerde kann die Verletzung von Bundesrecht (einschliesslich Missbrauch und Überschreiten des Ermessens) sowie die unrichtige und unvollständige Feststellung des rechtserheblichen Sachverhalts gerügt werden (Art. 106 Abs. 1 AsylG). 3. 3.1. Vorab ist die Frage der Prozessfähigkeit als Sachurteilsvoraussetzung von Amtes wegen zu prüfen (FRITZ GYGI, Bundesverwaltungsrechtspflege, 2. Aufl. 1983, S. 73). Als verfahrensrechtliches Korrelat der Handlungsfähigkeit ist sie nach den einsch</p>	<p>The Federal Administrative Court considers: 1. 1.1 Pursuant to Art. 31 VGG, the Federal Administrative Court assesses appeals against decisions pursuant to Art. 5 VwVG. The SEM is one of the authorities pursuant to Art. 33 VGG and is therefore a lower instance of the Federal Administrative Court. An exception relating to the subject matter within the meaning of Art. 32 VGG does not apply. The Federal Administrative Court is therefore competent for the assessment of the present appeal and decides in the area of asylum in the usually decides in the area of asylum as well as in the present case finally (Art. 105 AsylG [SR 142.31]; Art. 83 let. d no. 1 BGG). 1.2 The procedure is governed by the VwVG, the VGG and the BGG, unless the AsylG provides otherwise (Art. 37 VGG and Art. 6 AsylG). 2. the cognizance of the Federal Administrative Court and the admissible rässige Rügen are governed by Art. 106 para. 1 AsylA in the area of asylum and foreign nationals law according to Art. 49 VwVG (see BVGE 2014/26 E. 5). 2.1 An appeal may be lodged against the violation of federal law (including abuse and exceeding of discretionary powers) as well as the incorrect and incomplete incorrect and incomplete determination of the legally relevant facts (Art. 106 para. (Art. 106 para. 1 AsylG). 3. 3.1 First of all, the question of procedural capacity as a prerequisite for a substantive judgement must be to be examined ex officio (FRITZ GYGI, Bundesverwaltungsrechtspflege, 2nd ed. 1983, p. 73). As the procedural correlate of the capacity to act, it is ability to act, it is, according to the</p>
<p>GPT-3.5-Turbo (Fine-tuned)</p>	<p>Translated into English</p>
<p>Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht zieht in Erwägung: 1. 1.1 Gemäss Art. 31 VGG beurteilt das Bundesverwaltungsgericht Beschwerden gegen Verfügungen nach Art. 5 VwVG. Das SEM gehört zu den Behörden nach Art. 33 VGG und ist daher eine Vorinstanz des Bundesverwaltungsgerichts. Eine das Sachgebiet betreffende Ausnahme im Sinne von Art. 32 VGG liegt nicht vor. Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht ist daher zuständig für die Beurteilung der vorliegenden Beschwerde, soweit diese auf dem Gebiet des Asyls (Art. 105 AsylG) zulässig (Art. 83 BGG) ist. 1.2 Beurteilt das Bundesverwaltungsgericht Beschwerden nach Art. 31 VGG, so wendet es unter Vorbehalt der Anwendung von staatsvertraglichen Rechten materielles Bundesrecht an (Art. 37 Abs. 1 VGG). 1.3 Mit Beschwerde kann die Verletzung von Bundesrecht (einschliesslich die unrichtige oder unvollständige Feststellung des rechtserheblichen Sachverhalts [Art. 97 Abs. 1 BGG] und die Unangemessenheit [Art. 105 Abs. 2 BGG]), die Rechtsverletzung nach Art. 95 BGG und die unrichtige oder un- zweckmässige Sachverhaltsfeststellung (Art. 97 Abs. 1 BGG) gerügt werden. Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht wendet nunmehr auch das Beschwerde- recht nach Art. 105 AsylG sowie die Staatsvertragsvorbehalte an, denen Rechnung zu tragen ist (Art. 37 Abs. 3 VGG). D-6530/2015 Seite 4 2. 2.1 Zur Beschwerde gegen Entscheide über Asylgesuche ist berechtigt, wer durch den angefochtenen Entscheid besonders berührt ist und ein rechtlich geschütztes Inter</p>	<p>The Federal Administrative Court considers: 1. 1.1 In accordance with Art. 31 VGG, the Federal Administrative Court assesses appeals against decisions under Art. 5 VwVG. The SEM is one of the authorities under Art. 33 VGG and is therefore a lower instance of the Federal Administrative Court. There is no exception relating to the subject matter within the meaning of Art. 32 VGG. The Federal Administrative Court is therefore competent to judge the present appeal insofar as it is admissible in the area of asylum (Art. 105 AsylA) (Art. 83 BGG). 1.2 If the Federal Administrative Court assesses appeals in accordance with Art. 31 VGG, it shall apply substantive federal law, subject to the application of constitutional rights (Art. 37 para. 1 VGG). 1.3 An appeal may be lodged for a violation of federal law (including incorrect or incomplete determination of the legally relevant facts [Art. 97 para. 1 FSCA] and inappropriateness [Art. 105 para. 2 FSCA]), violation of the law pursuant to Art. 95 FSCA and incorrect or inappropriate determination of the facts (Art. 97 para. 1 FSCA). The Federal Administrative Court now also applies the right of appeal in accordance with Art. 105 AsylA and the reservations of state treaties, which must be taken into account (Art. 37 para. 3 VGG). D-6530/2015 Page 4 2. 2.1 Anyone who is particularly affected by the contested decision and has a legally protected interest in the asylum application is entitled to appeal against decisions on asylum applications.</p>
<p>Scores: 85.15, 80.08, 50.36, 57.45/41.46/57.45</p>	
<p>LLaMA-2-13B Chat (Fine-tuned)</p>	<p>Translated into English</p>
<p>[Erwägungen]: 1. 1.1 Gemäss Art. 31 VGG beurteilt das Bundesverwaltungsgericht Beschwerden gegen Verfügungen nach Art. 5 VwVG. Das BFM gehört zu den Behörden nach Art. 33 VGG und ist daher eine Vorinstanz des Bundesverwaltungsgerichts. Eine das Sachgebiet betreffende Ausnahme im Sinne von Art. 32 VGG liegt nicht vor. Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht ist daher zuständig für die Beurteilung der vorliegenden Beschwerde und entscheidet auf dem Gebiet des Asyls endgültig, ausser bei Vorliegen eines Auslieferungersuchens des Staates, vor welchem die beschwerdeführende Person Schutz sucht (Art. 105 AsylG [SR 142.31]; Art. 83 Bst. d Ziff. 1 BGG). Eine solche Ausnahme im Sinne von Art. 83 Bst. d Ziff. 1 BGG liegt nicht vor, weshalb das Bundesverwaltungsgericht endgültig entscheidet. 1.2 Das Verfahren richtet sich nach dem VwVG, dem VGG und dem BGG, soweit das AsylG nichts anderes bestimmt (Art. 37 VGG und Art. 6 AsylG). 1.3 Die Beschwerde ist frist- und formgerecht eingereicht. Der Beschwerdeführer hat am Verfahren vor der Vorinstanz teilgenommen, ist durch die angefochtene Verfügung besonders berührt und hat ein schutzwürdiges Interesse an deren Aufhebung beziehungsweise Änderung. Er ist daher zur Einreichung der Beschwerde legitimiert (Art. 105 und Art. 108 Abs. 1 AsylG; Art. 48 Abs. 1 sowie Art. 52 Abs. 1 VwVG). Auf die Beschwerde ist einzutreten. 2. Mit Beschwerde kann die Verletzung von Bundesrecht</p>	<p>[Erwägungen]: 1. 1.1 Pursuant to Art. 31 VGG, the Federal Administrative Court assesses appeals against decisions under Art. 5 VwVG. The FOM is one of the authorities under Art. 33 VGG and is therefore a lower instance of the Federal Administrative Court. There is no exception relating to the subject matter within the meaning of Art. 32 VGG. The Federal Administrative Court is therefore responsible for the assessment of the present appeal and makes a final decision in the area of asylum, except in the case of a request for expulsion from the state from which the appellant is seeking protection (Art. 105 AsylA [SR 142.31]; Art. 83 let. d no. 1 BGG). There is no such exception within the meaning of Art. 83 let. d no. 1 BGG, which is why the Federal Administrative Court makes a final decision. 1.2 The procedure is governed by the VwVG, the VGG and the BGG, unless the AsylG provides otherwise (Art. 37 VGG and Art. 6 AsylG). 1.3 The appeal has been submitted in due time and form. The appellant participated in the proceedings before the lower instance, is particularly affected by the contested decision and has a legitimate interest in its cancellation or amendment. He is therefore legitimised to lodge an appeal (Art. 105 and Art. 108 para. 1 AsylA; Art. 48 para. 1 and Art. 52 para. 1 VwVG). The appeal must be upheld. 2. the appeal may be lodged to challenge the violation of federal law</p>
<p>Scores: 85.07, 78.41, 47.00, 60.56/51.46/60.56</p>	

Table 19: continuation

<p>Claude 2 (0-shot)</p>	<p>Translated into English</p>
<p>Hier meine Erwägungen zum vorliegenden Sachverhalt: 1. Prozessvoraussetzungen Die sachliche Zuständigkeit des Bundesverwaltungsgerichts ergibt sich aus Art. 31 VGG. Gemäss Art. 31 Abs. 1 VGG beurteilt das Bundesverwaltungsgericht Beschwerden gegen Verfügungen nach Art. 5 AsylG. Die Vorinstanz hat am 5. Oktober 2015 eine Verfügung nach Art. 5 AsylG erlassen. Gegen diese Verfügung wurde frist- und formgerecht Beschwerde erhoben. Die Prozessvoraussetzungen sind damit erfüllt. 2. Materielle Beurteilung 2.1 Flüchtlingseigenschaft Gemäss Art. 3 AsylG gilt als Flüchtling eine Person, die in ihrem Heimatstaat wegen ihrer Rasse, Religion, Nationalität, Zugehörigkeit zu einer bestimmten sozialen Gruppe oder wegen ihrer politischen Anschauungen ernsthaften Nachteilen ausgesetzt ist oder begründete Furcht hat, solchen Nachteilen ausgesetzt zu werden. Der Beschwerdeführer macht geltend, er werde in seinem Heimatland Albanien zur Ehe mit einer Frau gezwungen, die er nicht heiraten möchte. Eine Zwangsheirat kann eine Verletzung der Menschenrechte darstellen. Allerdings ist im vorliegenden Fall nicht ersichtlich, dass der Beschwerdeführer aufgrund eines in Art. 3 AsylG genannten Merkmals von Zwangsheirat bedroht wäre. Vielmehr scheint es sich um einen familiären Konflikt zwischen den Eltern des Beschwerdeführers und der Familie der jungen Frau zu handeln. Aus den Akten ergeben sich keine Hinweise, dass der Beschwerdeführer bei einer Rückkehr nach Albanien staatlichen Verfolgungshandlungen ausgesetzt wäre. Auch liegen keine Beweise dafür vor, dass er durch nichtstaat</p>	<p>Here are my considerations on the facts of the case: 1. procedural requirements The Federal Administrative Court has subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to Art. 31 VGG. Pursuant to Art. 31 para. 1 VGG, the Federal Administrative Court judges appeals against decisions under Art. 5 AsylG. On 5 October 2015, the lower instance issued an order pursuant to Art. 5 AsylA. An appeal against this decision was lodged in due time and form. The procedural requirements are therefore fulfilled. 2 Substantive assessment 2.1 Refugee status Pursuant to Art. 3 AsylA, a refugee is a person who is exposed to serious disadvantages in their home country because of their race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or because of their political views, or who has a well-founded fear of being exposed to such disadvantages. The applicant claims that he is being forced to marry a woman in his home country of Albania whom he does not wish to marry. A forced marriage can constitute a violation of human rights. However, it is not apparent in this case that the applicant would be at risk of forced marriage due to one of the characteristics listed in Art. 3 AsylG. Rather, it appears to be a family conflict between the parents of the complainant and the young woman's family. There are no indications from the files that the complainant would be exposed to state persecution if he returned to Albania. There is also no evidence that he would be persecuted by non-governmental organisations.</p>
<p>Scores: 66.96, 60.71, 26.59, 27.80/6.31/27.12</p>	
<p>LLaMA-2-13B Chat (0-shot)</p>	<p>Translated into English</p>
<p>Erwägungen Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht hat den Beschwerdeführer auf seine Erwägungen hin gehört und bewertet die behaupteten Asylgründe. 1. Minderjährigkeit Der Beschwerdeführer gibt an, geboren zu sein und minderjährig zu sein. Die Vorinstanz hat jedoch festgestellt, dass er nicht minderjährig ist. Es ist jedoch unumstritten, dass der Beschwerdeführer eine Beziehung zu einer jungen Frau hatte, die von ihrem Vater verlangt wurde, diese zu heiraten. Der Beschwerdeführer hat jedoch keine Ehe mit ihr eingegangen und will nicht weitere Beziehung mit ihr haben. 2. Asylgründe Der Beschwerdeführer behauptet, dass er aus Albanien geflohen ist, weil er sich dort Schwierigkeiten because of his refusal to marry the young woman would have faced. However, the evidence presented does not support this claim. There is no indication that the young woman's father would have subjected the applicant to persecution or violence if he had not married his daughter. 3. Flüchtlingseigenschaft The applicant does not meet the criteria for refugee status under the Geneva Convention. He has not demonstrated that he is fleeing persecution or that his life or freedom would be threatened if he were to return to Albania. 4. Personalien The applicant has provided an identity card as proof of his personal details. However, there is no independent evidence to support his claims. The Vorinstanz has found that the applicant does not meet the criteria for refugee status, and therefore, his asylum application should be rejected. 5. Unzumutbarkeit des Wegweisungsvollzugs The applicant has requested that the court consider the unreasonableness of the deportation order. However, the court has found that the order is reasonable and in accordance with the law. 6. Allfällige Wegweisung The court has considered the possibility of a conditional release of the applicant. However, given the lack of evidence supporting the applicant's claims and the fact that he does not meet the criteria for refugee status, the court has decided not to grant conditional release. 7</p>	<p>Considerations The Federal Administrative Court has examined the appellant's considerations and assesses the alleged grounds for asylum. 1. minority The appellant claims to have been born and to be a minor. However, the lower court found that he is not a minor. However, it is undisputed that the appellant had a relationship with a young woman who was required by her father to marry her. However, the appellant did not enter into a marriage with her and does not wish to have any further relations with her. 2. asylum seeker The complainant claims that he fled Albania because he faced difficulties [From here, the model selects English as the output language.] because of his refusal to marry the young woman would have faced. However, the evidence presented does not support this claim. There is no indication that the young woman's father would have subjected the applicant to persecution or violence if he had not married his daughter. 3. Flüchtlingseigenschaft The applicant does not meet the criteria for refugee status under the Geneva Convention. He has not demonstrated that he is fleeing persecution or that his life or freedom would be threatened if he were to return to Albania. 4. Personalien The applicant has provided an identity card as proof of his personal details. However, there is no independent evidence to support his claims. The Vorinstanz has found that the applicant does not meet the criteria for refugee status, and therefore, his asylum application should be rejected. 5. Unzumutbarkeit des Wegweisungsvollzugs The applicant has requested that the court consider the unreasonableness of the deportation order. However, the court has found that the order is reasonable and in accordance with the law. 6. Allfällige Wegweisung The court has considered the possibility of a conditional release of the applicant. However, given the lack of evidence supporting the applicant's claims and the fact that he does not meet the criteria for refugee status, the court has decided not to grant conditional release. 7</p>
<p>Scores: 62.23, 38.56, 11.97, 14.33/0.42/13.71</p>	

Table 20: Comparison of the generated considerations (CVG task) from four LLMs in different settings. The scores of each example is stated below in the following order: BERTScore, BLEU-Score, METEOR, ROUGE-1 / ROUGE-2 / ROUGE-L. The first row contains the facts of the case which were given as input, the second row contains the the considerations, the target of this task. We provide an English translated version on the right.

Generated Considerations - French

Decision ID: <i>8bb15591-be0b-5bc3-933a-e6f856a46fec</i> , Year: <i>2017</i> , Language: French, Court: <i>FR_TC</i> , Source: 102 2016 223	Translated into English
<p>Input: considérant en fait A. A. et l'entreprise individuelle C. ont conclu un contrat de travail d'une durée indéterminée, ayant pour objet l'engagement de A. en qualité de collaboratrice administrative, à un taux d'activité de 40%, dès le 10 février 2014. Financée principalement par l'assurance chômage, respectivement par le SECO, C. a pour but d'apporter son soutien aux jeunes en difficulté d'insertion professionnelle au moyen de cours, d'ateliers et de coaching et a notamment été mandatée par l'association D. pour apporter son soutien aux adolescents de langue allemande. Dès le 1er mars 2014, A. était occupée à 40% en tant que collaboratrice administrative et à 10% en tant qu'enseignante. Le contrat de travail, signé le 10 juin 2014, prévoyait un salaire mensuel brut de CHF 2'733.80 pour 16 heures d'activité administrative hebdomadaire ainsi qu'un salaire horaire brut de CHF 50.20 pour 4 heures d'enseignement par semaine. Dès le 1er septembre 2014, A. a augmenté son taux d'enseignement à 40%, à l'essai. En août 2014, C. a été transformée en la société B. GmbH, dont E. est l'associée gérante avec signature individuelle. B. GmbH a repris tous les contrats de travail et a été inscrite au registre du commerce le 7 août 2014. B. Le 13 octobre 2014 a eu lieu une séance entre E., A., l'enseignante F. et l'apprenti G.. Au cours de celle-ci, E. a signalé que A. était manifestement débordée par l'activité supplémentaire d'enseignement, que l'essai n'avait ainsi pas été probant, qu'il fallait donc l'arrêter et qu'il fallait engager quelqu'un pour assumer ce volet de travail. À partir du 15 octobre 2014, A. a été mise en arrêt de travail à 100 % jusqu'au 31 octobre 2014 pour des raisons de santé. En date du 30 octobre 2014, A. a informé E. qu'elle reprendrait son activité le 3 novembre 2014. Néanmoins, le 2 novembre 2014, A. a été hospitalisée pour des douleurs dorsales. Elle a alors été mise en arrêt de travail à 100% du 2 au 4 novembre 2014. Le 4 novembre 2014, A. a indiqué à son employeur qu'elle se présenterait à son travail le lendemain, mais qu'un rendez-vous chez son médecin traitant était prévu le même jour. De plus, elle a demandé à E. de lui consacrer un peu de temps pour un entretien. Tribunal cantonal TC Page 3 de 9 E. et A. se sont entretenues le 5 novembre 2014. Au cours de cet entretien, A. a déclaré son souhait de poursuivre son activité au sein de l'entreprise. [...]</p>	<p>in fact A. A. and the sole proprietorship C. entered into an employment contract for an indefinite period, the purpose of which was to employ A. as an administrative assistant, with an activity rate of 40%, from 10 February 2014. Funded mainly by the unemployment insurance scheme, respectively by the SECO, C. aims to provide support for young people experiencing difficulties in finding employment by means of courses, workshops and coaching, and has in particular been mandated by the D. association to provide support for German-speaking teenagers. Since 1 March 2014, A. has been employed as an administrative assistant (40 %) and a teacher (10 %). The employment contract, signed on 10 June 2014, provided for a gross monthly salary of CHF 2,733.80 for 16 hours of administrative work per week and a gross hourly salary of CHF 50.20 for 4 hours of teaching per week. From 1 September 2014, A. increased her teaching rate by 40 per cent, on a trial basis. In August 2014, C. transformed into the company B. GmbH, of which E. is the managing partner with individual signature. B. GmbH took over all employment contracts and was entered in the commercial register on 7 August 2014. B. On 13 October 2014 a meeting took place between E., A., teacher F. and apprentice G.. During this meeting, E. pointed out that A. was clearly overwhelmed by the additional teaching activity, that the trial had therefore not been successful, that it should therefore be stopped and that someone should be hired to take on this part of the work. From 15 October 2014, A. was placed on 100% work stoppage until 31 October 2014 for health reasons. On 30 October 2014, A. informed E. that she would resume her activity on 3 November 2014. Nevertheless, on 2 November 2014, A. was hospitalised for back pain. She was then placed on 100 % sick leave from 2 to 4 November 2014. On 4 November 2014, A. indicated to her employer that she would report to work the following day, but that an appointment with her GP was scheduled for the second day. In addition, she asked E. to give her some time for an interview. Cantonal Court TC Page 3 of 9 E. and A. spoke on 5 November 2014. During this interview, A. declared her wish to continue working for the company. [...]</p>
<p>Target: en droit 1. a) La décision attaquée constitue une décision finale de première instance au sens des art. 308 al. 1 et 236 CPC. La voie de droit ouverte contre une telle décision est l'appel (art. 308 al. 1 let. a CPC), sauf si la valeur litigieuse est inférieure à CHF 10'000.- (art. 308 al. 2 CPC), auquel cas la décision ne peut faire l'objet que d'un recours (art. 319 let. a CPC). Dans le cas d'espèce, la valeur litigieuse au dernier état des conclusions est supérieure à CHF 10'000.- (cf. demande, ch. 1 et 2; réponse, ad. 1), de sorte que la voie de l'appel est ouverte. La valeur litigieuse devant la Cour est néanmoins inférieure à CHF 15'000.- (art. 74 al. 1 let. a et art. 51 al. 1 let. a LTF). Par conséquent, cet arrêt ne peut faire l'objet que d'un recours constitutionnel subsidiaire (art. 113 ss LTF). b) L'appel du 21 octobre 2016 a été déposé en temps utile, soit dans le délai légal de 30 jours à compter de la notification de la décision attaquée survenue le 21 septembre 2016 (art. 311 al. 1 CPC). Il en va de même de l'appel joint déposé le 13 décembre 2016, soit dans le délai légal de 30 jours à compter de la notification de l'appel survenue le 14 novembre 2016 (art. 312 al. 2 CPC). c) Dûment motivés et dotés de conclusions, l'appel et l'appel joint sont pour le surplus recevables en la forme. d) La cognition de la Cour est pleine et entière en fait comme en droit (art. 310 CPC). 2. Dans son appel, l'appelante reproche aux premiers juges de ne pas avoir reconnu le caractère abusif de la résiliation intervenue le 15 décembre 201</p>	<p>in law 1. a) The contested decision constitutes a final decision of first instance within the meaning of articles 308 al. 1 and 236 CPC. The legal remedy available against such a decision is an appeal (art. 308 al. 1 let. a CPC), unless the amount in dispute is less than CHF 10,000 (art. 308 al. 2 CPC), in which case the decision can only be appealed (art. 319 let. a CPC). In the case in point, the amount in dispute at the last stage of the pleadings is greater than CHF 10,000 (see the request, points 1 and 2; the response, point 1), so that the appeal procedure is open. The amount in dispute before the Court is nevertheless less than CHF 15,000 (art. 74 para. 1 let. a and art. 51 para. 1 let. a FSCA). Consequently, this judgment can only be the subject of a subsidiary constitutional appeal (art. 113 ff LTF). b) The appeal of 21 October 2016 was lodged in good time, i.e. within the legal time limit of 30 days from notification of the contested decision on 21 September 2016 (art. 311 para. 1 CPC). The same applies to the joint appeal filed on 13 December 2016, i.e. within the legal time limit of 30 days from notification of the appeal on 14 November 2016 (art. 312 para. 2 CPC). c) Duly motivated and endowed with submissions, the appeal and the joint appeal are otherwise admissible in form. d) The Court has full jurisdiction in fact and in law (art. 310 CPC). 2. In her appeal, the appellant criticised the lower courts for failing to recognise the abusive nature of the termination on 15 December 201</p>

Table 20: continuation

GPT-3.5-Turbo (Fine-tuned)	Translated into English
<p>en droit 1. En vertu de l'art. 57C al. 3 let. b de la loi du 11 avril 1991 sur l'organisation judiciaire (LOJ ; RS 173.01), le Tribunal cantonal connaît seul des causes portant sur la légalité de certaines décisions des tribunaux cantonaux. Dans le cas particulier, interjeté contre une décision finale prise par la juridiction inférieure sur la base de l'art. 64A al. 1 let. b de la loi sur la procédure civile du 19 novembre 2010 (CPC ; RS 270.11), le recours, déposé dans le délai (art. 48A al. 3 CPC) et la forme prévus par la loi (art. 79 al. 1 LOJ et 321-327 CPC), n'est en principe pas recevable, en vertu de l'art. 57C al. 2 LOJ, sauf s'il doit être traité comme un recours de droit public (cf. art. 57D LOJ). 2. Déposé dans le délai et les formes prescrits par la loi à l'encontre d'une décision finale prise par un tribunal cantonal, le recours doit être traité comme un recours de droit public, étant dès lors admissible sur le principe (art. 57C al. 4 LOJ). 3. En droit public fribourgeois, le TRPC apprécie librement la recevabilité et la wellfondation des recours de droit public cantonal, interprète et applique le droit cantonal de manière indépendante. En cas de violation du droit fédéral, le recours est, quant à lui, soumis au Tribunal fédéral. Celui-ci contrôle la violation du droit fédéral (selon les principes applicables au recours en matière de droit public, cf. à ce propos les art. 82 ss LTF), le droit constitutionnel et, le cas échéant, l'usage du pouvoir d'appréciation cantonal selon la maxime de l'arbitraire (Art. 49 al. 1 Cst. et 106 al. 2 LTF)</p>	<p>in law 1. By virtue of art. 57C para. 3 let. b of the law of 11th April 1991 on the organisation of the judiciary (LOJ; RS 173.01), the Tribunal cantonal alone hears cases relating to the legality of certain decisions of the cantonal courts. In this particular case, brought against a final decision taken by the lower court on the basis of art. 64A para. 1 let. b of the law on civil procedure of 19 November 2010 (CPC; RS 270.11), the appeal, lodged within the time limit (art. 48A al. 3 CPC) and in the form prescribed by law (art. 79 al. 1 LOJ and 321-327 CPC), is in principle inadmissible, by virtue of art. 57C al. 2 LOJ, unless it is to be treated as an appeal under public law (cf. art. 57D LOJ). 2. Filed within the time limit and in the form prescribed by law against a final decision taken by a cantonal court, the appeal must be treated as an appeal under public law, and is therefore admissible in principle (art. 57C al. 4 LOJ). 3. Under Fribourg public law, the TRPC freely assesses the admissibility and merits of cantonal public law appeals, and interprets and applies cantonal law independently. In the event of a breach of federal law, the appeal is submitted to the Federal Court. This counteracts the violation of federal law (according to the principles applicable to appeals in matters of public law, cf. in this respect Art. 82 ff LTF), constitutional law and, where applicable, the use of the cantonal power of appraisal according to the maxim of arbitrariness (Art. 49 al. 1 Cst. and 106 al. 2 LTF).</p>
<p>Scores: 73.33, 64.17, 28.71, 24.58/6.34/24.58</p>	
LLaMA-2-13B Chat (Fine-tuned)	Translated into English
<p>[Considérations]: En droit, les premiers juges ont considéré qu'au vu des faits retenus, il fallait admettre le licenciement abusif. En effet, le lien de confiance qui unissait les parties avait été irrémédiablement rompu dès le 5 novembre 2014. A. _ avait refusé de signer le avertissement et la lettre de résiliation de son contrat de travail, ce qui avait pour conséquence qu'elle ne pouvait plus être tenue de respecter les conditions de la résiliation. Par ailleurs, le fait que la demanderesse ait été mise en arrêt de travail à 100 % du 2 au 11 novembre 2014, puis à 100 % dès le 12 novembre 2014 jusqu'au 30 novembre 2014, puis à 70 % du 1er au 14 décembre 2014, puis à 50 % du 15 décembre 2014 au 15 janvier 2015 et enfin à 25 % du 16 au 29 janvier 2015 ne pouvait être interprété comme une résiliation. En effet, la demanderesse ne pouvait pas, en tant que collaboratrice à 40%, assumer son travail à 100% dès le 2 novembre 2014, ce qu'elle aurait dû faire en tant qu'enseignante si l'on tient compte de la situation médicale de cette dernière. Par ailleurs, le fait que l'employeur ait licencié la demanderesse le 7 novembre 2014, soit durant une période de protection, ne pouvait pas être considéré comme un licenciement abusif. En effet, l'employeur n'avait pas connaissance du fait que la demanderesse était en arrêt de travail à 100 % du 2 au 11 novembre 2014. Enfin, l'employeur avait mis un terme au contrat de travail par courrier du 10 décembre 2014, soit à la fin de la période de protection, ce qui était régulier.</p>	<p>[Considerations]: In law, the first judges considered that, in view of the facts, unfair dismissal should be accepted. Indeed, the bond of trust between the parties had been irretrievably broken on 5 November 2014. A. _ had refused to sign the warning and the letter terminating her employment contract, with the result that she could no longer be required to comply with the terms of the termination. In addition, the fact that the plaintiff was placed on 100% work stoppage from 2 to 11 November 2014, then on 100% work stoppage from 12 November 2014 until 30 November 2014, then 70% from 1 to 14 December 2014, then 50% from 15 December 2014 to 15 January 2015 and finally 25% from 16 to 29 January 2015 could not be construed as a termination. Indeed, the plaintiff could not, as an employee of the company for 40 years, assume her work for 100 years from 2 November 2014, which she would have had to do as a teacher if one takes into account the medical situation of the latter. Moreover, the fact that the employer had dismissed the plaintiff on 7 November 2014, i.e. during a period of protection, could not be considered unfair dismissal. In fact, the employer was not aware that the plaintiff was on 100% sick leave from 2 to 11 November 2014. Finally, the employer had terminated the employment contract by letter dated 10 December 2014, i.e. the end of the protection period, which was unusual.</p>
<p>Scores: 63.70, 57.75, 22.96, 23.57/2.20/22.14</p>	

Table 20: continuation

Claude 2 (0-shot)	Translated into English
<p>I. Conditions de procédure 1. Selon l'art. 343 al. 1 ch. 1 CPC, le tribunal établit sa compétence d'office et examine s'il a la compétence matérielle, fonctionnelle et locale pour connaître de la demande. En l'espèce, le litige porte sur une demande en paiement pour licenciement abusif fondée sur un contrat de travail. Il s'agit donc d'un litige relevant du droit du travail, pour lequel le Tribunal des prud'hommes de l'arrondissement de la Sarine est compétent <i>ratione materiae</i> (art. 8 CPC). De plus, la compétence territoriale est établie à l'art. 34 CPC. La compétence fonctionnelle n'est pas contestée. Les conditions de procédure sont ainsi remplies. II. En droit 2. La demanderesse a été engagée par l'entreprise individuelle C. à un taux d'activité de 40% dès le 10 février 2014. Suite à la transformation de C. en la société B. GmbH en août 2014, cette dernière a repris le contrat de travail. La demanderesse a augmenté son taux d'activité à 50% dès le 1er septembre 2014, à l'essai. 3. Le 15 octobre 2014, la demanderesse a été mise en arrêt maladie jusqu'au 31 octobre 2014. Le même jour, elle a adressé un courrier au Service public de l'emploi dans lequel elle mettait en cause le professionnalisme de l'intimée. 4. Le 30 octobre 2014, la demanderesse a informé l'intimée de sa reprise de travail le 3 novembre 2014. Toutefois, elle a été hospitalisée du 2 au 4 novembre 2014 et mise à nouveau en arrêt maladie. Le 5 novembre 2014, l'intimée lui a signifié un avertissement ainsi qu'une résiliation ordinaire de son</p>	<p>I. Procedural conditions 1. According to art. 343 al. 1 ch. 1 CPC, the court establishes its jurisdiction <i>ex officio</i> and examines whether it has the material, functional and local jurisdiction to hear the claim. In this case, the dispute concerns a claim for payment for unfair dismissal based on an employment contract. It is therefore an employment law dispute, for which the Tribunal des prud'hommes de l'arrondissement de la Sarine has jurisdiction <i>ratione materiae</i> (art. 8 CPC). In addition, territorial jurisdiction is established by art. 34 CPC. Functional jurisdiction is not contested. The procedural requirements are therefore met. II. In law 2. The plaintiff was engaged by the sole proprietorship C. with an activity rate of 40 % on 10 February 2014. Following the transformation of C. into the company B. GmbH in August 2014, the latter took over the employment contract. The plaintiff increased her rate of activity by 50% from 1 September 2014, on a trial basis. 3. On 15 October 2014, the claimant was placed on sick leave until 31 October 2014. On the same day, she sent a letter to the Public Employment Service in which she questioned the Respondent's professionalism. 4. On 30 October 2014, the claimant informed the respondent that she would be returning to work on 3 November 2014. However, she was hospitalised from 2 to 4 November 2014 and placed on sick leave again. On 5 November 2014, the respondent served her with a warning and an ordinary termination of her employment.</p>
Scores: 70.04, 61.20, 23.83, 24.75/2.92/24.75	
LLaMA-2-13B Chat (0-shot)	Translated into English
<p>Considérant les faits allégués et les demandes des parties, le tribunal est appelé à évaluer les dispositions juridiques pertinentes et à apprécier les preuves pour déterminer si le licenciement d'A. a été abusif. Tout d'abord, il est important de noter que le contrat de travail entre A. et B. GmbH a été résilié pendant une période de protection, ce qui signifie que la résiliation était nulle et non avenue. A. a également signalé des manquements de l'entreprise et a exprimé des critiques quant à la gestion d'E., ce qui peut être considéré comme une raison valable pour mettre fin au contrat. Cependant, il est important de noter que ces manquements et ces critiques n'ont pas été formellement étayés par des preuves solides. Ensuite, il est important de considérer le lien de confiance qui existe entre A. et E.. Bien que E. ait signalé que le lien de confiance avait été rompu en raison des critiques formulées par A., il est possible de considérer que le lien de confiance n'a pas été rompu de manière formelle et que les rapports de travail pouvaient continuer. En outre, il est important de prendre en compte la situation de santé d'A., qui a été hospitalisée pour des douleurs dorsales et a été mise en arrêt de travail à plusieurs reprises. Bien que les préjudices pour la santé d'A. soient acknowledgeables, il est important de noter que ces préjudices n'ont pas été directement causés par le licenciement d'A.. Enfin, il est important de considérer les dispositions juridiques pertinentes. Le Code des obligations suisse (CO) prévoit que le licenciement d'un employé doit être justifié et que le employeur doit fournir des preuves solides pour étayer la résiliation. Le CO également prévoit que le licenciement abusif est une ground for dismissal. En résumé, le tribunal doit évaluer les dispositions jur</p>	<p>Considering the facts of the case and the claims of the parties, the Tribunal is called upon to evaluate the relevant legal provisions and assess the evidence to determine whether A's dismissal was unfair. First of all, it is important to note that the employment contract between A. and B. GmbH was terminated during a period of protection, which means that the termination was null and void. A. also pointed out shortcomings in the company and expressed criticism of E.'s management, which could be considered a valid reason for terminating the contract. However, it is important to note that these failings and criticisms have not been formally 'étayé'e by solid evidence. Secondly, it is important to consider the bond of trust that exists between A. and E.. Although E. reported that the bond of trust had been broken because of A.'s criticisms, it is possible to consider that the bond of trust had not been formally broken and that the working relationship could continue. In addition, it is important to take into account the health situation of A., who has been hospitalised for back pain and has been off work on several occasions. Although the harm to A.e's health is acknowledged, it is important to note that this harm was not directly caused by A.e's dismissal. Finally, it is important to consider the relevant legal provisions. The Swiss Code of Obligations (CO) provides that the dismissal of an employee must be justified and that the employer must provide solid evidence to support the dismissal. The CO also provides that unfair dismissal is a ground for dismissal. In summing up, the court must assess the legal provisions of the case.</p>
Scores: 63.92, 49.30, 13.62, 14.63/1.26/13.94	

J.1 Leading Decision Summarization (LDS)

Table 21 shows a comparison of generated text from GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K, GPT-4, Claude Instant and Claude 2.

Table 21: Comparison of the generated regeste (LDS task) from four LLMs in different settings. The scores of each example is stated below in the following order: BERTScore, BLEU-Score, METEOR, ROUGE-1 / ROUGE-2 / ROUGE-L. Due to the size of the input, only the target is displayed. We provide an English translated version on the right.

Generated Regeste

Decision ID: 3e70603c-bbcd-47de-a066-23124945fcc1, Year: 2017, Language: German, Court: CH_BGE, Source: BGE 143 III 233	Translated into English
<p>Input: Sachverhalt ab Seite 234 BGE 143 III 233 S. 234 A. Mit Eingabe vom 22. März 2013 beehrte B. (Ehemann) beim Zivilgericht Basel-Stadt die Scheidung der Ehe mit A. (Ehefrau). Mit Entscheid vom 1. Mai 2013 wurde er verpflichtet, der Ehefrau für die Dauer der Aufhebung des gemeinsamen Haushalts einen monatlichen Unterhaltsbeitrag von Fr. 1'520.- bis 31. August 2013 und von Fr. 3'000.- ab September 2013 zu entrichten. B. B.a Am 2. August 2015 ersuchte der Ehemann um Reduktion des Unterhaltsbeitrages für die Ehefrau auf monatlich Fr. 1'500.- resp. Fr. 500.-. Die Ehefrau widersetzte sich diesem Begehren. Mit Entscheid vom 10. November 2015 hob der Instruktionsrichter des Zivilgerichts Basel-Stadt den monatlichen Unterhaltsbeitrag für die Ehefrau für die Dauer des Scheidungsverfahrens rückwirkend per 1. Juli 2015 auf. B.b Am 1. März 2016 hiess der Ausschuss des Appellationsgerichts des Kantons Basel-Stadt (nachfolgend: Appellationsgericht) die Berufung der Ehefrau teilweise gut und änderte die erstinstanzliche Unterhaltsregelung für die Ehefrau ab. Der vom Ehemann an den Unterhalt der Ehefrau zu bezahlende Unterhaltsbeitrag von Fr. 3'000.- wurde per 1. August 2015 auf Fr. 500.- reduziert und mit Wirkung per 1. September 2015 aufgehoben. C. Die Ehefrau (nachfolgend: Beschwerdeführerin) hat am 22. April 2016 (Postaufgabe) gegen den vorgenannten Entscheid des Appellationsgerichts beim Bundesgericht Beschwerde erhoben. Sie beantragt, den angefochtenen Entscheid aufzuheben und das Begehren des Ehemannes (nachfolgend: Beschwerdegegner) um Aufhebung des Ehegattenunterhalts für die Dauer des Scheidungsverfahrens abzuweisen. Der Beschwerdegegner hat sich am 16. Februar 2017 vernehmen lassen. Er schliesst auf Abweisung der Beschwerde. Das Bundesgericht hebt die kantonalen Entscheide auf und weist das Gesuch des Beschwerdegegners um Abänderung des Ehegattenunterhalts für die Dauer des Scheidungsverfahrens ab. (Zusammenfassung) BGE 143 III 233 S. 235 Erwägungen Aus den Erwägungen: 3. 3.1 Abänderungsgrund bildet die veränderte Einkommenslage beim Beschwerdegegner. Die erste Instanz hat dessen seit Januar 2015 bestehende Arbeitslosigkeit berücksichtigt und dabei angenommen, der Beschwerdegegner habe seine Arbeitsstelle nicht freiwillig, sondern einzig deshalb gekündigt, weil ihm die Auflösung des Arbeitsverhältnisses von seiner Arbeitgeberin nahegelegt worden sei. Das Appellationsgericht hat geprüft, ob die Kündigung als eigenmächtiges, mithin rechtsmissbräuchliches Verhalten zu werten sei, das einer Abänderung der Eheschutzmassnahmen entgegensteht. Als Ergebnis seiner Würdigung der tatsächlichen Gegebenheiten ist es zum Schluss gelangt, die Beschwerdeführerin habe nicht glaubhaft gemacht, dass die Kündigung des Arbeitsverhältnisses durch den Beschwerdegegner ausschliesslich zu ihrer Schädigung erfolgt sei. Das Appellationsgericht hat daher - wie die erste Instanz - dem Beschwerdegegner kein hypothetisches Einkommen angerechnet. 3.2 Bei der Bemessung des Unterhaltsbeitrages ist grundsätzlich vom tatsächlich erzielten Einkommen des Unterhaltspflichtigen auszugehen. Soweit dieses Einkommen allerdings nicht ausreicht, um den ausgewiesenen Bedarf zu decken, kann ein hypothetisches Einkommen angerechnet werden, sofern dieses zu erreichen zumutbar und möglich ist (BGE 137 III 118 E. 2.3). [...]</p>	<p>Facts from page 234 BGE 143 III 233 p. 234 A. By petition dated 22 March 2013, B. (husband) applied to the Civil Court of Basel-Stadt for a divorce from his marriage to A. (wife). By decision of 1 May 2013, he was ordered to pay the wife a monthly maintenance contribution of CHF 1,520 until 31 August 2013 and CHF 3,000 from September 2013 for the duration of the dissolution of the joint household. B. B.a On 2 August 2015, the husband requested that the maintenance contribution for the wife be reduced to CHF 1,500 per month and CHF 500 per month respectively. The wife opposed this request. In a decision dated 10 November 2015, the instructing judge of the Civil Court of Basel-Stadt cancelled the monthly maintenance contribution for the wife for the duration of the divorce proceedings with retroactive effect from 1 July 2015. B.b On 1 March 2016, the Committee of the Court of Appeal of the Canton of Basel-Stadt (hereinafter: Court of Appeal) partially upheld the wife's appeal and modified the first-instance maintenance arrangement for the wife. The maintenance contribution of CHF 3,000 to be paid by the husband to the wife was reduced to CHF 500 with effect from 1 August 2015 and cancelled with effect from 1 September 2015. C. On 22 April 2016 (date of posting), the wife (hereinafter: complainant) lodged an appeal with the Federal Supreme Court against the aforementioned decision of the Court of Appeal. She requested that the contested decision be set aside and that the husband's (hereinafter: respondent) request for cancellation of spousal maintenance for the duration of the divorce proceedings be dismissed. The respondent was heard on 16 February 2017. He concludes that the appeal should be dismissed. The Federal Supreme Court overturns the cantonal decisions and rejects the respondent's request for a modification of spousal maintenance for the duration of the divorce proceedings. (Summary) BGE 143 III 233 p. 235 Considerations From the considerations: 3. 3.1 The reason for the modification is the change in the respondent's income situation. The first instance took into account his unemployment since January 2015 and assumed that the respondent had not resigned from his job voluntarily, but only because he had been advised by his employer to terminate the employment relationship. The Court of Appeal examined whether the termination was to be regarded as unauthorised, and therefore abusive, behaviour that precluded a modification of the matrimonial protection measures. As a result of its assessment of the factual circumstances, it concluded that the complainant had not credibly demonstrated that the respondent had terminated the employment relationship solely to her detriment. The Court of Appeal therefore - like the first instance - did not impute any hypothetical income to the respondent. 3.2 When calculating the maintenance contribution, the actual income of the maintenance debtor must be taken as a basis. However, if this income is not sufficient to cover the stated needs, a hypothetical income can be taken into account, provided that it is reasonable and possible to achieve this (BGE 137 III 118 E. 2.3). [...]</p>

Table 21: continuation

<p>Target: Regeste Abänderung des Unterhaltsbeitrages für die Dauer des Scheidungsverfahrens infolge veränderter Verhältnisse; Rechtsmissbrauch (Art. 179 Abs. 1, Art. 2 Abs. 2 ZGB). Vermindert der Unterhaltspflichtige sein Einkommen in Schädigungsabsicht, ist eine Abänderung der Unterhaltsleistung selbst dann ausgeschlossen, wenn die Einkommensreduktion nicht mehr rückgängig gemacht werden kann (Änderung der Rechtsprechung; E. 3).</p>	<p>Rulings Modification of the maintenance contribution for the duration of the divorce proceedings due to changed circumstances; abuse of rights (Art. 179 para. 1, Art. 2 para. 2 ZGB). If the maintenance debtor reduces his or her income with the intention of causing damage, a modification of the maintenance payment is excluded even if the reduction in income can no longer be reversed (change in case law; E. 3).</p>
<p>Decision ID: <i>3e70603c-bbcd-47de-a066-23124945fcc1</i>, Year: 2017, Language: German, Court: <i>CH_BGE</i></p>	
<p>GPT-4 (1-shot)</p>	<p>Translated into English</p>
<p>Regeste Abänderung von Unterhaltsbeiträgen bei Reduktion des Einkommens (BGE 137 III 118). Bei der Bemessung des Unterhaltsbeitrages ist grundsätzlich vom tatsächlich erzielten Einkommen des Unterhaltspflichtigen auszugehen. Eine Abänderung der Unterhaltsleistung ist jedoch auszuschliessen, wenn der Unterhaltspflichtige sein Einkommen in Schädigungsabsicht vermindert hat, selbst dann wenn die Einkommensverminderung nicht mehr rückgängig gemacht werden kann (E. 3.4).</p>	<p>Rulings Modification of maintenance contributions in the event of a reduction in income (BGE 137 III 118). When calculating the maintenance contribution, the actual income of the maintenance debtor must be taken as a basis. However, a reduction in the maintenance payment must be ruled out if the maintenance debtor has reduced his or her income with the intention to pay maintenance, even if the reduction in income can no longer be attributed to him or her (E. 3.4).</p>
<p>79.82, 68.93, 55.47, 45.16/28.04/43.01</p>	
<p>Claude 2 (1-shot)</p>	<p>Translated into English</p>
<p>Regeste Art. 137 ZGB (Unterhaltsabänderung). Abänderung des Ehegattenunterhalts bei veränderter Einkommenslage. Bei freiwilliger Schädigung ist eine Abänderung selbst dann ausgeschlossen, wenn die Einkommensverminderung nicht mehr rückgängig gemacht werden kann (E. 3).</p>	<p>Regulations Art. 137 CC (modification of maintenance). Modification of spousal maintenance in the event of a change in income. In the case of voluntary termination, a modification is excluded even if the reduction in income can no longer be reversed (E. 3).</p>
<p>83.88, 47.53, 42.44, 53.33/29.27/53.33</p>	
<p>GPT-3.5-Turbo-16K (0-shot)</p>	<p>Translated into English</p>
<p>BGE 143 III 233 S. 235 - Ehegattenunterhalt: Abänderung aufgrund veränderter Einkommenslage des Unterhaltspflichtigen; Anrechnung eines hypothetischen Einkommens; Rechtsmissbräuchliches Verhalten des Unterhaltspflichtigen. Der unterhaltspflichtige Ehemann beantragte eine Abänderung des Ehegattenunterhalts aufgrund seiner veränderten Einkommenslage. Das Gericht stellte fest, dass eine Abänderung ausgeschlossen ist, wenn die veränderte Einkommenslage durch eigenmächtiges, widerrechtliches oder rechtsmissbräuchliches Verhalten des Unterhaltspflichtigen herbeigeführt wurde. Es wurde entschieden, dass in diesem Fall kein hypothetisches Einkommen angerechnet werden kann, selbst wenn die Einkommensverminderung nicht mehr rückgängig gemacht werden kann.</p>	<p>BGE 143 III 233 p. 235 - Spousal maintenance: Modification due to a change in the debtor's income situation; imputation of a hypothetical income; abuse of law by the debtor. The husband, who was obliged to pay maintenance, applied for a modification of the spousal maintenance on the basis of his changed income situation. The court found that a modification is excluded if the changed income situation was brought about by unlawful, wrongful or abusive behaviour on the part of the maintenance debtor. It was decided that no hypothetical income can be taken into account in this case, even if the reduction in income can no longer be attributed.</p>
<p>72.21, 43.71, 44.39, 27.52/12.60/23.85</p>	
<p>Claude Instant (0-shot)</p>	<p>Translated into English</p>
<p>Regeste: a) Art. 107ff ZGB, 128 III 4 E. 4 b) Ehegattenunterhalt, Abänderungsverfahren, hypothetisches Einkommen c) Das Bundesgericht hielt fest, dass dem Unterhaltspflichtigen, der sein Einkommen in Schädigungsabsicht vermindert hat, selbst dann ein hypothetisches Einkommen anzurechnen ist, wenn die Einkommensverminderung nicht mehr rückgängig gemacht werden kann. Somit ist eine Abänderung der Unterhaltsleistung in einem solchen Fall ausgeschlossen.</p>	<p>Regeste: a) Art. 107ff ZGB, 128 III 4 E. 4 b) Spousal maintenance, modification procedure, hypothetical income c) The Federal Supreme Court held that a hypothetical income must be credited to the maintenance debtor who has reduced his or her income with the intention to pay maintenance, even if the reduction in income can no longer be attributed to him or her. A modification of the maintenance payment is therefore excluded in such a case.</p>
<p>76.91, 67.20, 49.20, 41.67/24.30/41.67</p>	

K Prompts

In the following, we provide the prompts that we used for experiments with LLMs over 2B parameters.

K.1 Text Classification

We created our prompts in a style similar to that used in Chalkidis [62]. First, we introduce the document, e.g., the court decision. Then, we provide an explanation of the labels and the task in general. Finally, we present the labels from which the model can choose. To limit the model from producing excessive output, we conclude the prompt with a cloze-style sentence, such as 'The relevant label in this case is:', which the model simply needs to complete.

K.1.1 Criticality Prediction

Criticality Prediction (CP) LD Facts

Given the facts from the following Swiss Federal Supreme Court Decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

Federal Supreme Court Decisions in Switzerland that are published additionally get the label critical, those Federal Supreme Court Decisions that are not published additionally, get the label non-critical. Therefore, there are two labels to choose from:

- critical
- non-critical

The relevant label in this case is:

Criticality Prediction (CP) LD Considerations

Given the considerations from the following Swiss Federal Supreme Court Decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

Federal Supreme Court Decisions in Switzerland that are published additionally get the label critical, those Federal Supreme Court Decisions that are not published additionally, get the label non-critical. Therefore, there are two labels to choose from:

- critical
- non-critical

The relevant label in this case is:

Criticality Prediction (CP) Citation Facts

Given the facts from the following Swiss Federal Supreme Court Decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

How likely is it that this Swiss Federal Supreme Court Decision gets cited. Choose between one of the following labels (a bigger number in the label means that the court decision is more likely to be cited):

- critical-1
- critical-2
- critical-3
- critical-4

The relevant label in this case is:

Criticality Prediction (CP) Citation Considerations

Given the considerations from the following Swiss Federal Supreme Court Decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

How likely is it that this Swiss Federal Supreme Court Decision gets cited. Choose between one of the following labels (a bigger number in the label means that the court decision is more likely to be cited): - critical-1

- critical-2
- critical-3
- critical-4

The relevant label in this case is:

K.1.2 Judgment Prediction

Judgment Prediction (JP) Facts

Given the facts from the following court decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

Will this court decision get approved or dismissed? There are two labels to choose from:

- dismissal
- approval

The relevant label in this case is:

Judgment Prediction (JP) Considerations

Given the considerations from the following court decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

Will this court decision get approved or dismissed? There are two labels to choose from:

- dismissal
- approval

The relevant label in this case is:

K.1.3 (Sub) Law Area Prediction

Law Area Prediction (LAP) Facts

Given the facts from the following court decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

Which topic/law area is relevant out of the following options:

- Civil
- Public
- Criminal
- Social

The relevant option is:

Law Area Prediction (LAP) Considerations

Given the considerations from the following court decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

Which topic/law area is relevant out of the following options:

- Civil
- Public
- Criminal
- Social

The relevant option is:

Sub Law Area Prediction (SLAP) Facts

Given the facts from the following court decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

Which topic/law area is relevant out of the following options:

- Rental and Lease
- Employment Contract
- Bankruptcy
- Family
- Competition and Antitrust
- Intellectual Property
- Substantive Criminal
- Criminal Procedure
- Tax
- Urban Planning and Environmental
- Expropriation
- Public Administration
- Other Fiscal

The relevant option is:

Sub Law Area Prediction (SLAP) Considerations

Given the considerations from the following court decision:

{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

Which topic/law area is relevant out of the following options:

- Rental and Lease
- Employment Contract
- Bankruptcy
- Family
- Competition and Antitrust
- Intellectual Property
- Substantive Criminal
- Criminal Procedure
- Tax
- Urban Planning and Environmental
- Expropriation
- Public Administration
- Other Fiscal

The relevant option is:

K.2 Text Generation

In the subsequent sections, we detail the prompts employed for the 0-shot setup. For the 1-shot experiments, we consistently appended the same example in the respective language to the 0-shot instruction.

K.2.1 Court View Generation (CVG)

Court View Generation (CVG) in German

'Ziel: Generiere Erwägungen basierend auf dem gegebenen Sachverhalt eines Schweizer Gerichtsurteils.

Hintergrund: Ein Schweizer Gerichtsurteil besteht aus Rubrum, Sachverhalt, Erwägungen, Dispositiv (Urteilsformel) und Unterschrift. Die Erwägungen sind die rechtliche Würdigung des Geschehens durch das Gericht.

Anweisung:

-Sachverhalt Verstehen: Der gegebene Sachverhalt enthält bestrittene und unbestrittene Fakten, die Begehren der Parteien, das Beweisverfahren und die Prozessgeschichte.

-Beginne mit Prozessvoraussetzungen: Prüfe zunächst, ob die Prozessvoraussetzungen (z.B. Zuständigkeit des Gerichts) erfüllt sind. Wenn nicht strittig, reicht es aus zu bestätigen, dass die Voraussetzungen erfüllt sind.

-Rechtliche Würdigung: Eruiere relevante Rechtssätze basierend auf den behaupteten und rechtlich relevanten Tatsachen.

-Setze dich mit den rechtlichen Standpunkten der Parteien auseinander.

-Beachte die Beweislastverteilung und würdige die Beweise frei, aber berücksichtige relevante gesetzliche Beweisregeln.

-Iura novit curia: Deine rechtliche Würdigung muss nicht zwangsläufig dem rechtlichen Vorbringen der Parteien entsprechen. Berücksichtige andere mögliche Argumentationlinien.

-Zusammenfassung: Fasse am Ende deine Erwägungen, das Ergebnis Ihrer rechtlichen Würdigung, zusammen.

-Output: Der generierte Text sollte strukturiert, klar und in der Form von typischen Erwägungen eines Schweizer Gerichtsurteils sein.

{Sachverhalt des Schweizer Gerichtsurteils}:
{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

{Erwägungen}:

Court View Generation (CVG) in French

But: Génère des considérations basées sur les faits donnés d'un jugement suisse.

Contexte: Un jugement suisse est composé du rubrum, des faits, des considérations, du dispositif (formule du jugement) et de la signature. Les considérations sont l'appréciation juridique des événements par le tribunal.

Instructions:

- Comprends les faits: Les faits donnés contiennent des faits contestés et non contestés, les demandes des parties, la procédure de preuve et l'historique du procès.

- Commence par les conditions de procédure: Vérifie d'abord si les conditions de procédure (par exemple, la compétence du tribunal) sont remplies. Si cela n'est pas contesté, il suffit de confirmer que les conditions sont remplies.

- Appréciation juridique: Évalue les dispositions juridiques pertinentes basées sur les faits allégués et juridiquement pertinents.

- Confronte-toi aux points de vue juridiques des parties.

- Tiens compte de la répartition de la charge de la preuve et évalue les preuves librement, mais tiens compte des règles légales de preuve pertinentes.
- Iura novit curia: Ton appréciation juridique ne doit pas nécessairement correspondre aux arguments juridiques présentés par les parties. Considère d'autres lignes d'argumentation possibles.
- Résumé: Résume à la fin de tes considérations le résultat de ton appréciation juridique.
- Résultat: Le texte généré devrait être structuré, clair et sous la forme de considérations typiques d'un jugement suisse.

{Faits du jugement suisse}:
 {INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

{Considérations}:

Court View Generation (CVG) in Italian

Obiettivo: Genera considerazioni basate sui fatti presentati in una sentenza svizzera.

Contesto: Una sentenza svizzera si compone di rubrum, fatti, considerazioni, dispositivo (formula della sentenza) e firma. Le considerazioni rappresentano la valutazione giuridica degli eventi da parte del tribunale.

Istruzioni:

- Comprendi i fatti: I fatti presentati includono fatti contestati e non contestati, le richieste delle parti, la procedura probatoria e la storia del processo.
- Inizia con le condizioni processuali: Verifica prima di tutto se le condizioni processuali (ad es. la competenza del tribunale) sono soddisfatte. Se non contestate, basta confermare che le condizioni sono state soddisfatte.
- Valutazione giuridica: Valuta le norme giuridiche rilevanti in base ai fatti affermati e giuridicamente rilevanti.
- Confrontati con i punti di vista giuridici delle parti.
- Tieni conto della distribuzione dell'onere della prova e valuta le prove liberamente, ma considera le regole di prova legalmente rilevanti. - Iura novit curia: La tua valutazione giuridica non deve necessariamente corrispondere alle argomentazioni giuridiche delle parti. Considera altre possibili linee di argomentazione.
- Riassunto: Riassumi alla fine delle tue considerazioni il risultato della tua valutazione giuridica.
- Risultato: Il testo generato dovrebbe essere strutturato, chiaro e nella forma di considerazioni tipiche di una sentenza svizzera."

{Fatti della sentenza svizzera}:
 {INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

{Considerazioni}:

K.2.2 Leading Decision Summarization (LDS)

In the LDS task, we used only one German prompt because the output (the regeste) is always in German in our dataset. Despite the input being multilingual, models tend to generate in the prompt's language, regardless of the input's language.

Leading Decision Summarization (LDS)

Ziel: Generiere eine Regeste basierend auf einem Schweizer Gerichtsurteils.

Hintergrund: Ein Schweizer Gerichtsurteil setzt sich aus Sachverhalt, Erwägungen und Dispositiv zusammen. Die Regeste dient als Kurzzusammenfassung und beinhaltet Leitsätze des Urteils. Nur Leitentscheide haben eine Regeste.

Anweisung:

1. Sachverhalt: Lies und verstehe den gegebenen Sachverhalt.
 2. Erwägungen: Analysiere die Erwägungen, um die Hauptargumente und Gründe zu identifizieren.
 3. Dispositiv: Beachte das Dispositiv, da es das endgültige Urteil enthält.
 4. Erstelle die Regeste: Die Regeste sollte aus drei sehr kurzen Teilen bestehen: a. Zitiere die wichtigsten relevanten Artikelziffern (ohne den Artikeltitel). b. Nenne kurze, relevante, deskriptive Keywords, über die Thematik des Falls. c. Formuliere einen sehr kurzen Fliesstext, der die wichtigsten Erwägungen zitiert und kurz zusammenfasst.
- Output: Die Regeste sollte eine klare und strukturierte Kurzzusammenfassung des Urteils bieten, die aus zitierten Artikeln, Keywords und einem sehr kurzen Fliesstext besteht.

{Gegebener Sachverhalt, Erwägungen und Dispositiv}:
{INPUT FROM THE VALIDATION SET}

{Regeste auf Deutsch}:

L Example Generations

[Table 22](#) and [Table 23](#) show excerpts of examples produced by the best model for the CVG and LDS tasks, respectively.

Table 22: Nine examples of generated considerations by mT5_{Large} with input length 2048 across three languages, showcasing high, average, and low scored outputs in CVG Task

Target	<p>considerations: Erwägungen: 1. 1.1 Der angefochtene Entscheid ist in Anwendung von Sozialversicherungsrecht ergangen. Die Sozialversicherungsrechtliche Abteilung des Verwaltungsgerichts beurteilt gemäss Art. 57 des Bundesgesetzes vom 6. Oktober 2000 über den Allgemeinen Teil des Sozialversicherungsrechts (ATSG; SR 830.1) i.V.m. Art. 54 Abs. 1 lit. a des kantonalen Gesetzes vom 11. Juni 2009 über die Organisation der Gerichtsbehörden und der Staatsanwaltschaft (GSOG; BSG 161.1) Beschwerden gegen solche Entscheide. Die Beschwerdeführerin ist im vorinstanzlichen Verfahren mit ihren Anträgen nicht durchgedrungen, durch den angefochtenen Entscheid berührt und hat ein schutzwürdiges Interesse an dessen Aufhebung, weshalb sie zur Beschwerde befugt ist (Art. 59 ATSG). Die örtliche Zuständigkeit ist gegeben (Art. 58 ATSG). Da auch die Bestimmungen über Frist (Art. 60 ATSG) sowie Form (Art. 61 lit. b ATSG; Art. 81 Abs. 1 i.V.m. Art. 32 des kantonalen Gesetzes vom 23. Mai 1989 Urteil des Verwaltungsgerichts des Kantons Bern vom 6. Dez. 2022, UV/21/844, Seite 4 über die Verwaltungsrechtspflege [VRPG; BSG 155.21]) eingehalten sind, ist auf die Beschwerde einzutreten. 1.2 Anfechtungsobjekt bildet der Einspracheentscheid vom 5. November 2021 (act. II 45). Streitig und zu prüfen ist, ob die Beschwerdegegnerin ihre Leistungen im Zusammenhang mit dem Ereignis vom 19. Juni 2020 zu Recht per 30. September 2020 eingestellt hat. 1.3 Die Abteilungen urteilen gewöhnlich in einer Kammer bestehend aus drei Richterinnen oder Richtern (Art. 56 Abs. 1 GSOG). 1.4 Das Gericht überprüft den angefochtenen Entscheid frei und ist an die Begehren der Parteien nicht gebunden (Art. 61 lit. c und d ATSG; Art. 80 lit. c Ziff. 1 und Art. 84 Abs. 3 VRPG). 2. 2.1 Die Zusprechung von Leistungen der obligatorischen Unfallversicherung setzt grundsätzlich das Vorliegen eines Berufsunfalles, eines Nichtberufsunfalles oder einer Berufskrankheit (Art. 6 Abs.</p>
Predicted	<p>considerations: Erwägungen: 1. 1.1 Der angefochtene Entscheid ist in Anwendung von Sozialversicherungsrecht ergangen. Die Sozialversicherungsrechtliche Abteilung des Verwaltungsgerichts beurteilt gemäss Art. 57 des Bundesgesetzes über den Allgemeinen Teil des Sozialversicherungsrechts vom 6. Oktober 2000 (ATSG; SR 830.1) i.V.m. Art. 54 Abs. 1 lit. a des kantonalen Gesetzes über die Organisation der Gerichtsbehörden und der Staatsanwaltschaft vom 11. Juni 2009 (GSOG; BSG 161.1) Beschwerden gegen solche Entscheide. Die Beschwerdeführerin ist im vorinstanzlichen Verfahren mit ihren Anträgen nicht durchgedrungen, durch den angefochtenen Entscheid berührt und hat ein schutzwürdiges Interesse an dessen Aufhebung, weshalb sie zur Beschwerde befugt ist (Art. 59 ATSG). Die örtliche Zuständigkeit ist gegeben (Art. 69 Abs. 1 lit. a des Bundesgesetzes über die Unfallversicherung vom 20. Dezember 1946 [UVG; SR 832.20]). Da auch die Bestimmungen über Frist (Art. 60 ATSG) sowie Form (Art. 61 lit. b ATSG; Art. 81 Abs. 1 i.V.m. Art. 32 des kantonalen Gesetzes über die Verwaltungsrechtspflege vom 23. Mai 1989 [VRPG; BSG 155.21]) eingehalten sind, ist auf die Beschwerde einzutreten. 1.2 Das Gericht überprüft den angefochtenen Entscheid frei und ist an die Begehren der Parteien nicht gebunden (Art. 61 lit. c und d ATSG; Art. 80 lit. c Ziff. 1 und Art. 84 Abs. 3 VRPG). 1.3 Der Beschwerdeführer hat am vorinstanzlichen Verfahren teilgenommen, ist durch den angefochtenen Entscheid besonders berührt und hat ein schutzwürdiges Interesse an dessen Aufhebung oder Änderung. Auf die Beschwerde ist einzutreten. 2. 2.1 Die Beschwerdegegnerin hat die Bestimmungen auf den Anspruch auf Heilbehandlung und Taggeld in Form von Heilbehandlung zufolge ihrer im August 2021 (act. II 42 und 46) eingereichten medizinischen Berichte zutreffend wiedergegeben. Darauf wird verwiesen. 2.2 Nach der Rechtsprechung ist der Beschwerdeführer durch den angefochtenen Entscheid berührt und haben ein schutzwürdiges</p>
Scores	BERT: 91.69, BLEU: 84.17, METEOR: 62.43, ROUGE-1/2/L: 75.49 / 65.78 / 75.49

Target	<p>considerations: EN DROIT 1. Conformément à l'art. 134 al. 1 let. a ch. 2 de la loi sur l'organisation judiciaire, du 26 septembre 2010 (LOJ - E 2 05) en vigueur dès le 1 er janvier 2011, la chambre des assurances sociales de la Cour de justice connaît, en instance unique, des contestations prévues à l'art. 56 de la loi fédérale sur la partie générale du droit des assurances sociales, du 6 octobre 2000 (LPGA - RS 830.1) relatives à la loi fédérale sur l'assurance-invalidité du 19 juin 1959 (LAI - RS 831.20).</p> <p>2. Sa compétence pour juger du cas d'espèce est ainsi établie. 2. À teneur de l'art. 1 al. 1 LAI, les dispositions de la LPGA s'appliquent à l'assurance-invalidité (ci-après : AI), à moins que la loi n'y déroge expressément.</p> <p>Toutefois, les modifications légales contenues dans la LPGA constituent, en règle générale, une version formalisée dans la loi de la jurisprudence relative aux notions correspondantes avant l'entrée en vigueur de la LPGA ; il n'en découle aucune modification du point de vue de leur contenu, de sorte que la jurisprudence développée à leur propos peut être reprise et appliquée (ATF 130 V 343 consid. 3). 3. Les modifications de la loi fédérale sur l'assurance-invalidité du 21 mars 2003 (4 ème révision), du 6 octobre 2006 (5 ème révision) et du 18 mars 2011 (révision 6a), entrées en vigueur le 1 er janvier 2004, respectivement, le 1 er janvier 2008 et le 1 er janvier 2012, entraînent la modification de nombreuses dispositions légales dans le domaine de l'assurance-invalidité.</p>
Predicted	<p>considerations: EN DROIT 1. Conformément à l'art. 134 al. 1 let. a ch. 4 de la loi sur l'organisation judiciaire, du 26 septembre 2010 (LOJ; RS E 2 05) en vigueur dès le 1 er janvier 2011, la Chambre des assurances sociales de la Cour de justice connaît, en instance unique, des contestations prévues à l'art. 56 de la loi fédérale sur la partie générale du droit des assurances sociales, du 6 octobre 2000 (LPGA; RS 830.1) relatives à la loi fédérale sur l'assurance-invalidité du 19 juin 1959 (LAI; RS 831.20).</p> <p>2. Sa compétence pour juger du cas d'espèce est ainsi établie.</p> <p>2. Les dispositions de la LPGA s'appliquent à l'assurance-invalidité, à moins que la loi n'y déroge expressément.</p> <p>Toutefois, les modifications légales contenues dans la LPGA constituent, en règle générale, une version formalisée dans la loi de la jurisprudence relative aux notions correspondantes avant l'entrée en vigueur de la LPGA ; il n'en découle aucune modification du point de vue de leur contenu, de sorte que la jurisprudence développée à leur propos peut être reprise et appliquée (ATF 130 V 230 consid. 1.1; 335 consid. 1.2; ATF 129 V 4 consid. 1.2; ATF 129 V 4 consid. 1.2; ATF 127 V 467 consid. 1, 126 V 136 consid. 4b et les références). 3. A teneur de l'art. 17 al. 1 de la loi fédérale sur la partie générale du droit des assurances sociales, du 6 octobre 2000 (LPGA; RS 830.1), les modifications légales contenues dans la LPGA constituent, en règle générale, une version formalisée dans la LAI.</p>
Scores	BERT: 91.27, BLEU: 85.8, METEOR: 68.12, ROUGE-1/2/L: 78.29 / 66.82 / 78.29

Target	<p>considerations: in diritto In ordine 2.1. La presente vertenza non pone questioni giuridiche di principio e non è di rilevante importanza (ad esempio per la difficoltà dell'istruttoria o della valutazione delle prove). Il TCA può dunque decidere nella composizione di un Giudice unico ai sensi dell'articolo 49 cpv. 2 LOG (STF 9C_699/2014 del 31 agosto 2015; 8C_855/2010 dell'11 luglio 2011; 9C_211/2010 del 18 febbraio 2011). Nel merito 2.2. Oggetto del contendere è sapere se a ragione l'Ufficio AI ha soppresso all'assicurato il diritto ad una rendita intera con effetto dal 1. settembre 2015 (cfr. consid. 1.3). L'insorgente postula l'annullamento della decisione impugnata del 10 maggio 2017 e quindi il mantenimento del diritto alla rendita intera. 2.3. Secondo l'art. 4 cpv. 1 LAI in relazione con gli art. 7 e 8 della LPGa, con invalidità s'intende l'incapacità al guadagno presunta permanente o di rilevante durata, cagionata da un danno alla salute fisica o psichica, conseguente ad infermità congenita, malattia o infortunio. Gli elementi fondamentali dell'invalidità, secondo la surriferita definizione, sono quindi un danno alla salute fisica o psichica conseguente a infermità congenita, malattia o infortunio, e la conseguente incapacità di guadagno. Occorre quindi che il danno alla salute abbia cagionato una diminuzione della capacità di guadagno, perché il caso possa essere sottoposto all'assicurazione per l'invalidità (Duc, L'assurance invalidité, in: Meyer (Hrsg.), Schweizerisches Bundesverwaltungsrecht, Band XIV, Soziale Sicherheit, 2a ed., Basilea/Ginevra/Monaco di Baviera 2007, pag. 1411, n. 46). Giusta l'art. 28 cpv.</p>
Predicted	<p>considerations: in diritto In ordine 2.1. La presente vertenza non pone questioni giuridiche di principio e non è di rilevante importanza (ad esempio per la difficoltà dell'istruttoria o della valutazione delle prove). Il TCA può dunque decidere nella composizione di un Giudice unico ai sensi degli articoli 26 c cpv. 2 della Legge organica giudiziaria civile e penale e 2 cpv. 1 della Legge di procedura per le cause davanti al Tribunale delle assicurazioni (cfr. STF 9C_211/2010 del 18 febbraio 2011; STF 9C_792/2007 del 7 novembre 2008; STF H 180/06 e H 183/06 del 21 dicembre 2007; STFA I 707/00 del 21 luglio 2003; STFA H 335/00 del 18 febbraio 2002; STFA U 347/98 del 10 ottobre 2001, pubblicata in RDAT I-2002 pag. 190 seg.; STFA H 304/99 del 22 dicembre 2000; STFA I 623/98 del 26 ottobre 1999). Nel merito 2.2. Oggetto della lite è sapere se l'Ufficio AI ha diritto alla rendita intera intera dal 1. settembre 2015 (doc. AI 122/445-450), a causa dell'invalidità della persona assicurata. Secondo l'art. 4 cpv. 1 LAI in relazione con gli art. 7 e 8 della LPGa, con invalidità s'intende l'incapacità al guadagno presunta permanente o di rilevante durata, cagionata da un danno alla salute fisica o psichica, conseguente a infermità congenita, malattia o infortunio. Gli elementi fondamentali dell'invalidità, secondo la surriferita definizione, sono quindi un danno alla salute fisica o psichica conseguente a infermità congenita, malattia o infortunio, e la conseguente incapacità di guadagno. Occorre quindi che il danno alla salute abbia cagionato una diminuzione della capacità di guadagno, perché il caso possa</p>
Scores	BERT: 86.57, BLEU: 81.39, METEOR: 65.76, ROUGE-1/2/L: 68.54 / 58.87 / 66.85

Target	<p>considerations: Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht zieht in Erwägung: 1. Nach Art. 53 Abs. 1 KVG kann gegen Beschlüsse der Kantonsregierungen nach Art. 39 KVG beim Bundesverwaltungsgericht Beschwerde geführt werden. Der angefochtene Beschluss Nr. 617/2019 des Regierungsrats des Kantons Zürich vom 26. Juni 2019 wurde gestützt auf Art. 39 KVG erlassen. Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht ist deshalb zur Beurteilung der Beschwerde zuständig (vgl. auch Art. 90a Abs. 2 KVG). Die Beschwerdeführerin hat am vorinstanzlichen Verfahren teilgenommen, ist als Adressatin durch den angefochtenen Regierungsratsbeschluss besonders berührt und hat insoweit an dessen Aufhebung beziehungsweise Abänderung ein schutzwürdiges Interesse (Art. 48 Abs. 1 VwVG). Sie ist daher zur Beschwerde legitimiert. Auf die frist- und formgerecht erhobene Beschwerde ist, nachdem auch der Kostenvorschuss rechtzeitig geleistet wurde, einzutreten (Art. 50 Abs. 1, Art. 52 Abs. 1 und Art. 63 Abs. 4 VwVG). Das Hauptrechtsbegehren der Beschwerdeführerin richtet sich auf Aufhebung der Ziffer I des Dispositivs des angefochtenen Beschlusses. Soweit sie dabei Bezug auf «C. Neue Regelung der Verlegungen ab Geburtshaus» nimmt, ist das im Lichte der Begründung der Beschwerde nicht so zu verstehen, dass sie auch die Aufhebung eines Teils der Begründung des angefochtenen Beschlusses beantragt. Der Antrag der Vorinstanz, auf die Beschwerde sei teilweise nicht einzutreten, weil sie sich auch gegen die Begründung des angefochtenen RRB richte, ist daher unbegründet. 2. 2.1 Mit Beschwerde gegen einen Spitallistenentscheid im Sinne von Art. 39 Abs. 1 KVG kann die Verletzung von Bundesrecht unter Einschluss des Missbrauchs oder der Überschreitung des Ermessens und die unrichtige oder unvollständige Feststellung des rechtserheblichen Sachverhalts gerügt werden. Nicht zulässig ist hingegen die Rüge der</p>
Predicted	<p>considerations: Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht zieht in Erwägung: 1. 1.1 Gemäss Art. 31 des Verwaltungsgerichtsgesetzes vom 17. Juni 2005 (VGG, SR 173.32) beurteilt das Bundesverwaltungsgericht Beschwerden gegen Verfügungen nach Art. 5 des Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetzes vom 20. Dezember 1968 (VwVG, SR 172.021), sofern keine Ausnahme nach Art. 32 VGG vorliegt. Als Vorinstanzen gelten die in Art. 33 und 34 VGG genannten Behörden. Dazu gehören u.a. Verfügungen im Sinne von Art. 5 VwVG. Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht ist somit zuständig für die Beurteilung der vorliegenden Beschwerde und entscheidet auf dem Gebiet des Gesundheitsschutzes endgültig, ausser bei Eintreten auf einen Entscheid, der eine Verfügung im Sinne von Art. 5 VwVG betrifft. Eine Ausnahme nach Art. 32 VGG liegt nicht vor. 1.2 Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht ist zur Beurteilung der vorliegenden Beschwerde zuständig. 1.3. Gegen Entscheide des Regierungsrats ist ein Beschwerdeverfahren zulässig, wenn dieses eine Rechtsmittelinstanz ist und grundsätzlich der Rechtsschutzinteresse der Beschwerdeberechtigten gegeben ist (vgl. art. 32 VGG; BGE 138 II 274 E. 5.1 S. 280). 1.4 Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht wendet im Beschwerdeverfahren das Bundesrecht von Amtes wegen an (Art. 106 Abs. 1 des Bundesgesetzes vom 20. Dezember 1968 über das Verwaltungsverfahren [VwVG, SR 172.021]). Es wird gemäss Art. 62 Abs. 4 VwVG zur Beurteilung von Beschwerden in Zivilsachen gemäss Art. 82 Abs. 1 und Art. 86 Abs. 1 Bst. d bis Bst. e VwVG grundsätzlich nur geprüft, wenn diese vor Bundesgericht nicht mehr vorgetragen wurden und keine Verletzung des Opfers gegeben wurde. Das Bundesverwaltungsgericht wendet im Beschwerdeverfahren das Bundesrecht von Amtes wegen an. Es ist gemäss Art. 62 Abs. 4 VwVG an die Begründung der Begehren nicht gebunden und kann die Beschwerde auch aus anderen als den geltend gemachten Gründen gutheissen</p>
Scores	BERT: 75.72, BLEU: 67.17, METEOR: 31.26, ROUGE-1/2/L: 26.43 / 8.84 / 25.23

Target	<p>considerations: Considérant en droit: 1. Selon l'art. 5 al. 1 des dispositions du RPAC relatives à la Commission de recours individuel, la décision rendue par cette autorité peut faire l'objet d'un recours de droit administratif auprès du Tribunal cantonal dans les trente jours suivant la communication de la décision motivée, conformément à la loi cantonale du 28 octobre 2008 sur la procédure administrative (LPA-VD; BLV 173.36). D'après l'art. 92 al. 1 LPA-VD, le Tribunal cantonal connaît des recours contre les décisions et décisions sur recours rendues par les autorités administratives, lorsque la loi ne prévoit aucune autre autorité pour en connaître. En l'espèce, le recours a été déposé en temps utile (art. 5 al. 1 RPAC) et il satisfait aux autres conditions formelles de recevabilité (art. 75 al. 1 let. a, 79 al. 1 et 99 LPA-VD, applicables par renvoi de l'art. 5 al. 1 RPAC), si bien qu'il convient d'entrer en matière. 2. a) La classification salariale du poste qu'occupe le recourant est litigieuse en l'occurrence. b) L'organisation de l'administration fait partie des tâches propres des autorités communales (art. 2 de la loi vaudoise du 28 février 1956 sur les communes [LC; BLV 175.11]). Selon cette loi, il incombe au Conseil général ou communal de définir le statut des collaborateurs communaux et la base de leur rémunération (art. 4 al. 1 ch. 9 LC), la municipalité ayant la compétence de nommer les collaborateurs et employés de la commune, de fixer leur traitement et d'exercer le pouvoir disciplinaire (art. 42 al. 1 ch. 3 LC). Conformément à l'art. 33 al. 1 RPAC, le traitement du fonctionnaire comprend le traitement de base (let. a), les allocations</p>
Predicted	<p>considerations: Considérant en droit: 1. 1.1 Le personnel doit maintenir, par contrat de droit privé, une commune, un partenaire public, pour assurer la bonne exécution de leurs missions spéciales, ainsi qu'un minimum d'administration (art. 10 al. 1 du RPAC). L'art. 10 al. 2 RPAC prévoit que les fonctionnaires dans toute la ville de Lausanne sont soumis à la qualification communale et leur remplacement a lieu par des fonctions communales cantonales, comme applicable en la matière. Elle constitue en revanche une décision sujette à recours auprès de la juridiction compétente (art. 20 al. 2 et art. 30 al. 1 de la loi sur le personnel des communes du 15 novembre 1976 (LPAC). 1.2 Selon la jurisprudence relative aux dispositions transitoires applicables au moment de la notification de la décision pour connaître du jugement du service, la décision de rémunération fait apparaître un changement de système de rémunération selon le RPAC. Cette disposition, qui comprend ainsi des critères objectifs et suffisants, permet au fonctionnaire de connaître de tous les aspects de la classification (Tappy, CPC, n. 1 ad art. 10 LPAC), ainsi que par le service de réduire son salaire. En l'espèce, l'autorité intimée a constaté que l'établissement des faits importants du dossier et de la satisfaction exigée sur le plan d'administration devait être complété dans la mesure où cela n'était pas possible, ce qui constituait effectivement un changement de système (Tappy, op. cit., n. 13 ad art. 10 LPAC). Il a constaté que le Service du personnel avait fixé le niveau de fonction attribué au fonctionnaire pour son titre de travail. Il a en outre estimé que cette classification était une décision de mise en œuvre déléguée à celui qui a entrepris une modification légale ou réglementaire du service. Parcon</p>
Scores	BERT: 75.74, BLEU: 66.19, METEOR: 31.69, ROUGE-1/2/L: 28.32 / 4.21 / 26.01

Target	<p>considerations: Diritto: 1. Il ricorso in materia di diritto pubblico può essere presentato per violazione del diritto, così come stabilito dagli art. 95 e 96 LTF. Il Tribunale federale fonda la sua sentenza sui fatti accertati dall'autorità inferiore (art. 105 cpv. 1 LTF). Può scostarsi da questo accertamento solo qualora esso sia avvenuto in modo manifestamente inesatto, ovvero arbitrario (DTF 134 V 53 consid. 4.3 pag. 62), oppure in violazione del diritto ai sensi dell'art. 95 LTF (art. 105 cpv. 2 LTF). Salvo i casi in cui tale inesattezza sia lampante, la parte ricorrente che intende contestare i fatti accertati dall'autorità inferiore deve spiegare, in maniera circostanziata, per quale motivo ritiene che le condizioni di una delle eccezioni previste dall'art. 105 cpv. 2 LTF sarebbero realizzate (cfr. DTF 133 II 249 consid. 1.4.3 pag. 254 con riferimento). 2. Oggetto del contendere è sapere se sia lesivo del diritto federale il giudizio cantonale, che conferma la decisione su opposizione, la quale a sua volta nega all'assicurato le indennità per insolvenza per non avere rivendicato tempestivamente le proprie pretese salariali. 3. 3.1. Il Tribunale cantonale delle assicurazioni, esposto lo svolgimento del processo, le norme e la prassi ritenute applicabili, ha accertato che il ricorrente è stato legato da un contratto di lavoro con la ditta B. SA, dichiarata fallita il 15 maggio 2018, dal 15 aprile 2017 al 18 settembre 2017 come informatico e con un salario di fr. 3'360.- mensili. L'ultimo giorno di lavoro effettuato è stato il 1° settembre 2017. Il salario è stato saldato dal 15 al 30 aprile 2017. Per contro, non è stato pagato per i mesi di maggio, giugno, luglio e agosto, nonché per il 1° settembre 2017. Il</p>
Predicted	<p>considerations: Diritto: 1. 1.1. La procedura ricorsuale in materia di diritto pubblico è disciplinata dal diritto federale (art. 82 lett. a LTF) e dalla legge federale, in vigore dal 1° gennaio 2003, sull'assicurazione contro la disoccupazione: si tratta infatti di una causa di diritto pubblico contro una decisione finale adottata dalla Corte cantonale delle assicurazioni, entrata in vigore il 1° gennaio 2003. Il ricorso presentato dall'assoggettato al diritto di ricorrere (art. 89 cpv. 1 LTF) è di massima ammissibile dinanzi al Tribunale federale (art. 89 cpv. 1 LTF). 1.2. Il ricorso in materia di diritto pubblico può essere presentato per violazione del diritto, così come stabilito dagli art. 95 e 96 LTF, oltre che per violazione del diritto ai sensi dell'art. 95 LTF. Il Tribunale federale applica il diritto federale (art. 106 cpv. 1 LTF), senza essere vincolato né dai motivi addotti nel ricorso (art. 106 cpv. 2 LTF). Per contro, nel ricorso in materia di diritto pubblico il Tribunale federale esamina d'ufficio e con piena cognizione l'ammissibilità dei gravami che gli vengono sottoposti (DTF 133 III 439 consid. 1.3). 1.3. La critica del giudizio impugnato esplica degli effetti (art. 105 cpv. 1 LTF). Non è ammissibile che i ricorsi in materia di diritto pubblico possano essere decisi in base al diritto federale, ai sensi dell'art. 95 LTF, senza istruttoria (art. 97 cpv. 1 LTF, Art. 105 cpv. 2 LTF). 1.3. Il Tribunale federale esamina d'ufficio e con piena cognizione l'ammissibilità dei ricorsi che gli vengono sottoposti (DTF 133 III 439 consid. 1.3). 1.4. Con il ricorso in materia di pubblico contro la decisione di primo grado, il Tribunale cantonale ha emesso</p>
Scores	BERT: 75.79, BLEU: 66.28, METEOR: 30.29, ROUGE-1/2/L: 37.74 / 20.43 / 36.48

Target	<p>considerations: Das Versicherungsgericht zieht in Erwägung: 1. Streitig und zu prüfen ist der Rentenanspruch der Beschwerdeführerin. - 3 - 2. Am 1. Januar 2022 sind die Änderungen betreffend Weiterentwicklung der IV (WEIV) in Kraft getreten. Weder dem IVG noch der IVV sind besondere Übergangsbestimmungen betreffend die Anwendbarkeit dieser Änderungen im Hinblick auf nach dem 1. Januar 2022 beurteilte mögliche Ansprüche des Zeitraums bis zum 31. Dezember 2021 zu entnehmen. Es sind daher nach den allgemeinen übergangsrechtlichen Grundsätzen jene Bestimmungen anzuwenden, die bei der Erfüllung des rechtlich zu ordnenden oder zu Rechtsfolgen führenden Tatbestands Geltung haben beziehungsweise hatten (vgl. Urteil des Bundesgerichts 8C_136/2021 vom 7. April 2022 E. 3.2.1 mit Hinweis unter anderem auf BGE 144 V 210 E. 4.3.1 S. 213). Da vorliegend Leistungen mit Anspruchsbeginn vor dem 1. Januar 2022 streitig sind, ist für deren Beurteilung die bis zum 31. Dezember 2021 geltende Rechtslage massgebend. 3. 3.1. Die Beschwerdegegnerin stütze sich in der Verfügung vom 14. Juni 2022 (Vernehmlassungsbeilage [VB] 162) in medizinischer Hinsicht im Wesentlichen auf das bidisziplinäre Gutachten der SMAB vom 3. August 2021 (VB 139; Fachdisziplinen: Neurologie und Psychiatrie). 3.2. Die SMAB-Gutachterinnen stellten in der interdisziplinären Gesamtbeurteilung die folgenden Diagnosen mit Auswirkungen auf die Arbeitsfähigkeit (VB 139.1 S. 6): "1. Neuropathische Schmerzen an der Innenseite des Mittelfingers links und der Handinnenfläche links (Schnittverletzung am Mittelfinger links mit initialer Nervenverletzung 19.11.2014, epineurale und weitere mehrfache operative Eingriffe 2014-2018), 2. Chronische Schmerzstörung mit somatischen und psychischen (ICD-10: F45.41)". Ohne Auswirkung auf die Arbeitsfähigkeit sei eine rezidivierende depressive Störung, gegenwärtig remittiert. Die Gutachterinnen hielten fest, insgesamt bestehe aufgrund der psychiatrischen und neurologischen</p>
Predicted	<p>considerations: Das Gericht zieht in Erwägung: 1. Gemäss Art. 87 Abs. 2 des Bundesgesetzes über die Unfallversicherung (UVG) besteht Anspruch auf eine ganze Rente, wenn die versicherte Person mindestens zu 66 2/3 Prozent, auf eine halbe Rente, wenn sie mindestens zu 50 Prozent oder auf eine Viertelsrente, wenn sie mindestens zu 40 Prozent invalid ist. In Härtefällen besteht gemäss Art. 87 Abs. 2 UVG auch ein Anspruch auf eine halbe Rente, wenn sie mindestens zu 50 Prozent, wenn sie mindestens zu 40 Prozent invalid ist (Art. 8 Abs. 1 UVG). Anspruch auf eine Rente haben gemäss Art. 28 Abs. 2 des Bundesgesetzes über die Invalidenversicherung (IVG) Versicherte, die im Sinne von Art. 16 Abs. 1 IVG in Verbindung mit Art. 28 bis Abs. 1 IVG in Verbindung mit Abs. 1 und 2 IVG auch dann Anspruch auf eine Viertelsrente, wenn sie mindestens zu 40 Prozent invalid sind (Art. 28 Abs. 2 IVG i.V.m. Art. 16 ATSG). 2. 2.1 Anspruch auf eine Rente haben gemäss Art. 28 Abs. 1 IVG Versicherte, die: a. ihre Erwerbsfähigkeit oder die Fähigkeit, sich im Aufgabenbereich zu betätigen, nicht durch zumutbare Eingliederungsmassnahmen wieder herstellen, erhalten oder verbessern können; b. während eines Jahres ohne wesentlichen Unterbruch durchschnittlich mindestens 40 Prozent arbeitsunfähig (Art. 6 ATSG) gewesen sind; und c. nach Ablauf dieses Jahres zu mindestens 40 Prozent invalid (Art. 8 ATSG) sind. 2.2 Die Beschwerdeführerin bringt vor, die ärztlich eingeholten ärztlichen Berichte seien als diagnostisch zu qualifizieren. Das trifft vorliegend nicht zu. Ihr Gesundheitszustand sei gemäss Abklärungen vom RAD mit einer Invalidität von mindestens 40 Prozent zu vereinbaren. Die Leistungsfähigkeit sei in Art. 16 ATSG eingetreten. 2.2 Die Leistungsfähigkeit sei in Art. 16 ATSG i.V.m. Art. 28 Abs. 1 IVG</p>
Scores	BERT: 62.42, BLEU: 51.67, METEOR: 19.69, ROUGE-1/2/L: 17.58 / 2.56 / 17.58

Target	<p>considerations: le conseil de B_ a rappelé que celle-ci contestait que son frère aurait été en droit de loger gratuitement au 1_ dès le mois d'avril 2015. Afin d'éviter la notification d'une poursuite interruptive de la prescription, A_ était invité à signer une déclaration de renonciation à la prescription concernant les loyers qui, selon B_, étaient dus à la succession de leurs défunts parents. Etais annexée à ce courrier une déclaration de renonciation à invoquer la prescription libellée en ces termes : " Par la présente, A_ déclare renoncer à invoquer toute exception de prescription vis-à-vis des successions de [feu D_ et feu C_], eu égard à toutes prétentions éventuelles de loyers et charges alors qu'il logeait chemin 1_ à _ Fribourg. Cette déclaration de renonciation est valable jusqu'au 31 décembre 2020. La présente déclaration ne vaut en aucun cas reconnaissance de dette ou de responsabilité quelconque. La présente déclaration n'a d'effet que si la prescription n'est pas déjà acquise à ce jour ". A_ n'a pas donné suite à ce courrier. f. Par réquisition de poursuite du 7 avril 2020, regue le lendemain par l'Office cantonal des poursuites de Genève (ci-après : l'Office), Me H_, agissant en qualité de représentant du créancier, à savoir " Pour l'hoirie de feu C_, décédée le _ 2019, Madame B_, Rte 2_, _ Fribourg ", a requis la poursuite de A_, domicilié avenue 3_, _ Genève, pour la somme de 112'500 fr. avec intérêts à 5% dès le 1 er mai 2017, réclamée à titre de " Loyers et charges dus pour le logement du 1_ à _ Fribourg d'avril 2015 à mai 2019 (50 x</p>
Predicted	<p>considerations: EN DROIT 1. 1.1 Le litige porte sur la désignation d'un représentant de la communauté héréditaire et la désignation d'un administrateur de la régie G_ SA (art. 602 al. 3 CC). Le motif de la désignation du représentant est incontestable. Selon l'art. 602 al. 5 CC, la désignation d'un représentant de la communauté héréditaire est donc une décision de dernière instance cantonale au sens des art. 80 al. 1 et 82 al. 1 CPC, qui doit être notifiée à l'unique partie plaignante qui a pris part à la procédure (ATF 110 IV 92 consid. 1a; arrêt du Tribunal fédéral X. du 27 juillet 2004 ; ATF 99 III 58 consid. 1; ATF 118 Ia 397 consid. 1b; Tappy, CPC-VD, n. 3 ad art. 602 CC ; Replin, Le représentant de la communauté héréditaire, 5 ème éd., Lausanne 2013, p. 569; ATF 118 IV 286 consid. 2a; TF 6B_211/2007 du 29 janvier 2008, consid. 5.3; ATF 117 IV 29 consid. 3b; TF 8B_44/2007 du 15 août 2007, consid. 3.2; Tappy, Procédure civile, tome II, ad art. 602; Piquerez, in : Kuhn/Jeanneret [éd.], Basler Kommentar, n. 6 ad art. 602; TF 7B_51/2007 du 1 er janvier 2008, consid. 3.2; ATF 130 III 136 consid. 1.2.1; TF 9C_438/2007 du 30 septembre 2007, consid. 3.1; ATF 134 III 102 consid. 3.1; TF 6B_71/2007 du 24 août 2007, consid. 5b; TF 9C_792/2007 du 11 août 2007, consid. 4.2). 1.2 La désignation d'un représentant et de l'administration régulière de l'ensemble de la succession ont été rejetées. 2. 2.1. L'art. 602 al. 3 CC ouvre un recours au Tribunal cantonal, sans être lié par 1</p>
Scores	BERT: 63.90, BLEU: 46.65, METEOR: 19.12, ROUGE-1/2/L: 11.52 / 1.64 / 10.91

Target	<p>considerations: A.c. Con progetto di decisione dell'8 gennaio 2014 l'UAI ha concluso, in via di riconsiderazione, per la soppressione della mezza rendita d'invalidità con effetto retroattivo al 30 aprile 2011. In sede di audizione, l'UAI ha esperito nuovi accertamenti, in particolare la perizia pluridisciplinare dell'8 aprile 2016. Con decisione del 14 luglio 2016 l'UAI ha riconosciuto che al momento dell'assegnazione della mezza rendita d'invalidità è incorso in un errore manifesto avendo applicato il "Prozentvergleich" in luogo del metodo ordinario di confronto dei redditi, da cui risulta un grado d'invalidità del 26 %. Ritenuta l'importanza della sua correzione, l'UAI, riconsiderando le decisioni 14 dicembre 2006 e 14 maggio 2007 nonché la comunicazione del 20 marzo 2009, ha predisposto la soppressione del diritto alla mezza rendita invalidità con effetto retroattivo al 30 aprile 2011. B. A. _ si è aggravato il 13 settembre 2016 al Tribunale delle assicurazioni del Cantone Ticino, che con giudizio del 17 maggio 2017 ha respinto il gravame. C. Il 19 giugno 2017 (timbro postale) A. _ inoltra un ricorso in materia di diritto pubblico al Tribunale federale, cui chiede di ammettere il ricorso e riformare il giudizio cantonale nel senso di confermare il diritto ad almeno una mezza rendita d'invalidità e ordinare all'UAI di versare tutte le prestazioni trattenute dal momento della revisione ad oggi. L'UAI e l'Ufficio federale delle assicurazioni sociali rinunciano a determinarsi. Diritto: 1. Il ricorso in materia di diritto pubblico può essere presentato per violazione del diritto così come stabilito dagli art. 95 e 96 LTF. Il Tribunale federale esamina d'ufficio l'applicazione de l diritto federale (art. 106 cpv. 1 L</p>
Predicted	<p>considerations: Diritto: 1. Il Tribunale delle assicurazioni esamina d'ufficio e con piena cognizione l'ammissibilità dei gravami che gli vengono sottoposti (DTF 134 V 131 consid. 1.1 pag. 131; 133 V 477 consid. 1.1 pag. 481). In particolare, i gravami inoltrati già in tempo utile contro le decisioni di prima istanza rese dall'UAI in materia di assicurazioni sociali possono essere decisi sulla scorta degli atti, senza istruttoria (DTF 133 V 477 consid. 1.2 pag. 481). Il giudizio può essere reso sulla base degli atti, senza istruttoria (DTF 133 V 477 consid. 1.2 pag. 481; 133 V 477 consid. 1.2 pag. 481). 2. Il Tribunale delle assicurazioni esamina d'ufficio e con piena cognizione l'ammissibilità dei gravami che gli vengono sottoposti (DTF 133 V 477 consid. 1.2 pag. 481). 3. 3.1. Giusta l'art. 4 cpv. 1 LAI in relazione con gli art. 7 e 8 della LPGA, con invalidità s'intende l'incapacità al guadagno presunta permanente o di rilevante durata, cagionata da un danno alla salute fisica o psichica, conseguente a infermità congenita, malattia o infortunio. Gli elementi fondamentali dell'invalidità, secondo la surriferita definizione, sono quindi un danno alla salute fisica o psichica conseguente a infermità congenita, malattia o infortunio, e la conseguente incapacità di guadagno. Occorre quindi che il danno alla salute abbia cagionato una diminuzione della capacità di guadagno, perché il caso possa essere sottoposto all'assicurazione per l'invalidità (DTF 134 V 329 consid. 3.2.3 pag. 331; 133 V 477 consid. 3.3.1 pag. 481; 129 V 4 consid. 1.2 pag. 5 con rinvii). 3.2. Giusta</p>
Scores	<p>BERT: 67.86, BLEU: 55.76, METEOR: 25.41, ROUGE-1/2/L: 24.32 / 5.59 / 23.65</p>

Table 23: Three examples of generated summaries by mT5_{Base} with input length 4096, showcasing high, average, and low scored outputs in LDS Task

Target	regeste: Regeste Teilklage und negative Feststellungswiderklage (Art. 86 und 224 ZPO). Die Ausnahme vom Erfordernis der gleichen Verfahrensart gemäss Art. 224 Abs. 1 ZPO für negative Feststellungswiderklagen ist nicht auf den Fall beschränkt, dass es sich bei der Hauptklage um eine sogenannte echte Teilklage handelt, sondern gilt allgemein dann, wenn die Teilklage eine Ungewissheit zur Folge hat, die es rechtfertigt, die Feststellung des Nichtbestands einer Forderung oder eines Rechtsverhältnisses zu verlangen (E. 2).
Predicted	regeste: Regeste Voraussetzungen, unter denen eine Widerklage erhoben werden darf, wenn eine echte Teilklage beurteilt wird (E. 2.1). Zur Anwendung von Art. 224 Abs. 1 ZPO ist die Ausnahme vom Erfordernis der gleichen Verfahrensart gemäss Art. 224 Abs. 1 ZPO nicht auf diesen Fall beschränkt, sondern gilt allgemein dann, wenn die Teilklage eine Ungewissheit zur Folge hat, die es rechtfertigt, im Sinne von Art. 88 ZPO die Feststellung des Nichtbestands einer Forderung oder eines Rechtsverhältnisses zu verlangen (E. 2.2).
Scores	BERT: 88.03, BLEU: 30.45, METEOR: 43.78, ROUGE-1/2/L: 72.44 / 54.05 / 70.87
Target	regeste: Regeste Uferschutzplanung Wohlensee; Gesamtinteressenabwägung. Die Behörden nehmen bei der Genehmigung einer Sondernutzungsplanung eine umfassende Interessenabwägung vor (vgl. Art. 3 RPV ; E. 3.2). Würdigung des Gutachtens der Vogelwarte Sempach und der Stellungnahme des BAFU als Fachbehörde (E. 5.5, 6.3 und 6.4). Im zu beurteilenden Fall wird das öffentliche Interesse an einer ufernahen Wegführung (vgl. Art. 3 Abs. 2 lit. c RPG) relativiert, weil ein durchgehender Sichtschutz zum Schutz der im Gebiet vorkommenden Vogelarten erforderlich wäre, was Spaziergängern das Erleben der Uferlandschaft nur sehr beschränkt ermöglichen würde (E. 6.5 sowie 3.3). Das Gebiet des Wohlensees stellt eines von insgesamt 25 Wasser- und Zugvogelreservaten von nationaler Bedeutung dar (vgl. Art. 11 Abs. 2 JSG, Art. 2 Abs. 1 i.V.m. Anhang 1 WZVV).
Predicted	regeste: Regeste Art. 3 Abs. 2 lit. c RPG ; schweizerische Vogelwarte Sempach; Umweltschutz. Gutachten im Bereich des Umweltrechts, insbesondere von dem UVG/USG ergangenen Streitwert (E. 3.1). Ein öffentlicher Weg, der über Privatgrundstücke führt und mit dem Enteignungsrecht zugunsten des Gemeinwesens verbunden ist, stellt eine öffentlich-rechtliche Eigentumsbeschränkung dar (E. 3.3). Interessenabwägungen sind grundsätzlich frei (E. 3.4 und 3.5). Umfang des geplanten Uferweges; ein ausweises öffentliches Interesse an einem direkt dem Ufer entlangführenden Weg sowie an einer zumindest ufernahen Wegführung (E. 3.5).
Scores	BERT: 73.91, BLEU: 47.21, METEOR: 30.91, ROUGE-1/2/L: 32.75 / 10.63 / 32.75
Target	regeste: Regeste a Schwere Bedrängnis, grosse seelische Belastung und heftige Gemütsbewegung; Art. 48 lit. a Ziff. 2 und Art. 48 lit. c StGB. Abgrenzung dieser Strafmilderungsgründe untereinander (E. 2.1-2.3). Regeste b Mord, heftige Gemütsbewegung und grosse seelische Belastung; Art. 48 lit. c und Art. 112 StGB. Die für den Mord typische Skrupellosigkeit schliesst die Bejahung der Strafmilderungsgründe der heftigen Gemütsbewegung und der grossen seelischen Belastung aus (E. 2.5).

Predicted	regeste: Regeste Art. 112 und 49 Abs. 2 StGB ; tiefe Gewalt, Schwere Gewalt, Mord. Die Beeinträchtigung oder der schwere Gewalt ist einen psychischen Klumpen im Sinne des Art. 48 StGB, wenn beide Personen einen Beziehungskonflikt bilden und sich ein bestimmtes Verhältnis zwischen einseitigen Umständen des Tatvergehens und der Begründung der Tatbegehren haben (E. 2 und 3).
Scores	BERT: 69.3, BLEU: 12.14, METEOR: 14.72, ROUGE-1/2/L: 30.43 / 10.26 / 30.43

References

- [1] Ashley, K.D.: Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics: New Tools for Law Practice in the Digital Age. Cambridge University Press, ??? (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316761380>
- [2] Katz, D.M., Hartung, D., Gerlach, L., Jana, A., au2, M.J.B.I.: Natural Language Processing in the Legal Domain (2023)
- [3] Paul, S., Goyal, P., Ghosh, S.: LeSICiN: A Heterogeneous Graph-based Approach for Automatic Legal Statute Identification from Indian Legal Documents (2021)
- [4] Chalkidis, I., Fergadiotis, E., Malakasiotis, P., Aletras, N., Androutsopoulos, I.: Extreme Multi-Label Legal Text Classification: A Case Study in EU Legislation. In: Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2019, pp. 78–87. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota (2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W19-2209> . <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W19-2209> Accessed 2021-03-02
- [5] Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Chen, A., Ball, S.: CUAD: An Expert-Annotated NLP Dataset for Legal Contract Review (2021)
- [6] Li, Q., Zhang, Q.: Court opinion generation from case fact description with legal basis. In: AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (2021)
- [7] Semo, G., Bernsohn, D., Hagag, B., Hayat, G., Niklaus, J.: ClassActionPrediction: A Challenging Benchmark for Legal Judgment Prediction of Class Action Cases in the US. In: Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2022, pp. 31–46. Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid) (2022). <https://aclanthology.org/2022.nllp-1.3> Accessed 2023-04-17
- [8] Brugger, T., Stürmer, M., Niklaus, J.: MultiLegalSBD: A Multilingual Legal Sentence Boundary Detection Dataset. In: Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law. ICAIL '23, pp. 42–51. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3594536.3595132> . <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3594536.3595132> Accessed 2023-10-21
- [9] Hwang, W., Lee, D., Cho, K., Lee, H., Seo, M.: A Multi-Task Benchmark for Korean Legal Language Understanding and Judgement Prediction. arXiv. arXiv:2206.05224 [cs] (2022). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2206.05224> Accessed 2023-04-28
- [10] Niklaus, J., Matoshi, V., Rani, P., Galassi, A., Stürmer, M., Chalkidis, I.: LEX-TREME: A Multi-Lingual and Multi-Task Benchmark for the Legal Domain (2023)

- [11] Thakur, N., Reimers, N., Rücklé, A., Srivastava, A., Gurevych, I.: BEIR: A Heterogenous Benchmark for Zero-shot Evaluation of Information Retrieval Models. arXiv. arXiv:2104.08663 [cs] (2021). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2104.08663> Accessed 2023-04-24
- [12] Chen, Y., Song, Z., Wu, X., Wang, D., Xu, J., Chen, J., Zhou, H., Li, L.: MTG: A Benchmark Suite for Multilingual Text Generation. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022, pp. 2508–2527. Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, United States (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-naacl.192> . <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-naacl.192>
- [13] Guha, N., Ho, D.E., Nyarko, J., Ré, C.: LegalBench: Prototyping a Collaborative Benchmark for Legal Reasoning. arXiv. arXiv:2209.06120 [cs] (2022). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.06120> Accessed 2022-10-19
- [14] Wang, A., Pruksachatkun, Y., Nangia, N., Singh, A., Michael, J., Hill, F., Levy, O., Bowman, S.R.: SuperGLUE: A Stickier Benchmark for General-Purpose Language Understanding Systems, 30 (2019)
- [15] Niklaus, J., Chalkidis, I., Stürmer, M.: Swiss-Judgment-Prediction: A Multilingual Legal Judgment Prediction Benchmark. In: Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2021, pp. 19–35. Association for Computational Linguistics, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic (2021). <https://aclanthology.org/2021.nllp-1.3> Accessed 2021-12-13
- [16] Niklaus, J., Stürmer, M., Chalkidis, I.: An Empirical Study on Cross-X Transfer for Legal Judgment Prediction. In: Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 32–46. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online only (2022). <https://aclanthology.org/2022.aacl-main.3> Accessed 2023-01-27
- [17] Shaham, U., Segal, E., Ivgi, M., Efrat, A., Yoran, O., Haviv, A., Gupta, A., Xiong, W., Geva, M., Berant, J., et al.: Scrolls: Standardized comparison over long language sequences. arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.03533 (2022)
- [18] Hudson, G.T., Moubayed, N.A.: Muld: The multitask long document benchmark. arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07362 (2022)
- [19] Chalkidis, I., Jana, A., Hartung, D., Bommarito, M., Androutopoulos, I., Katz, D., Aletras, N.: Lexglue: A benchmark dataset for legal language understanding in english. In: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 4310–4330 (2022)
- [20] Hu, J., Ruder, S., Siddhant, A., Neubig, G., Firat, O., Johnson, M.: XTREME: A Massively Multilingual Multi-task Benchmark for Evaluating Cross-lingual Generalization. arXiv. arXiv:2003.11080 [cs] (2020). <https://doi.org/10.48550/>

- [21] Ruder, S., Clark, J.H., Gutkin, A., Kale, M., Ma, M., Nicosia, M., Rijhwani, S., Riley, P., Sarr, J.-M.A., Wang, X., Wieting, J., Gupta, N., Katanova, A., Kirov, C., Dickinson, D.L., Roark, B., Samanta, B., Tao, C., Adelani, D.I., Axelrod, V., Caswell, I., Cherry, C., Garrette, D., Ingle, R., Johnson, M., Panteleev, D., Talukdar, P.: XTREME-UP: A User-Centric Scarce-Data Benchmark for Under-Represented Languages (2023)
- [22] Wang, A., Singh, A., Michael, J., Hill, F., Levy, O., Bowman, S.: GLUE: A Multi-Task Benchmark and Analysis Platform for Natural Language Understanding. In: Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP, pp. 353–355. Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium (2018). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W18-5446> . <https://aclanthology.org/W18-5446> Accessed 2021-08-19
- [23] Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), pp. 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota (2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423> . <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1423>
- [24] Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Basart, S., Zou, A., Mazeika, M., Song, D., Steinhardt, J.: Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding. arXiv:2009.03300 [cs] (2021). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03300> Accessed 2022-10-20
- [25] Srivastava, A., Rastogi, A., Rao, A., Shoeb, A.A.M., Abid, A., Fisch, A., Brown, A.R., Santoro, A., Gupta, A., Garriga-Alonso, A., Kluska, A., Lewkowycz, A., Agarwal, A., Power, A., Ray, A., Warstadt, A., Kocurek, A.W., Safaya, A., Tazarv, A., Xiang, A., Parrish, A., Nie, A., Hussain, A., Askell, A., Dsouza, A., Slone, A., Rahane, A., Iyer, A.S., Andreassen, A., Madotto, A., Santilli, A., Stuhlmüller, A., Dai, A., La, A., Lampinen, A., Zou, A., Jiang, A., Chen, A., Vuong, A., Gupta, A., Gottardi, A., Norelli, A., Venkatesh, A., Gholamidavoodi, A., Tabassum, A., Menezes, A., Kirubarajan, A., Mullokandov, A., Sabharwal, A., Herrick, A., Efrat, A., Erdem, A., Karakaş, A., Roberts, B.R., Loe, B.S., Zoph, B., Bojanowski, B., Özyurt, B., Hedayatnia, B., Neyshabur, B., Inden, B., Stein, B., Ekmekci, B., Lin, B.Y., Howald, B., Diao, C., Dour, C., Stinson, C., Argueta, C., Ramírez, C.F., Singh, C., Rathkopf, C., Meng, C., Baral, C., Wu, C., Callison-Burch, C., Waites, C., Voigt, C., Manning, C.D., Potts, C., Ramirez, C., Rivera, C.E., Siro, C., Raffel, C., Ashcraft, C., Garbacea, C., Sileo, D., Garrette, D., Hendrycks, D., Kilman, D., Roth, D., Freeman, D., Khashabi, D., Levy, D., González, D.M., Perszyk, D., Hernandez, D., Chen, D., Ippolito, D., Gilboa, D., Dohan, D., Drakard, D., Jurgens, D., Datta, D., Ganguli, D., Emelin, D., Kleyko,

D., Yuret, D., Chen, D., Tam, D., Hupkes, D., Misra, D., Buzan, D., Mollo, D.C., Yang, D., Lee, D.-H., Shutova, E., Cubuk, E.D., Segal, E., Hagerman, E., Barnes, E., Donoway, E., Pavlick, E., Rodola, E., Lam, E., Chu, E., Tang, E., Erdem, E., Chang, E., Chi, E.A., Dyer, E., Jerzak, E., Kim, E., Manyasi, E.E., Zheltonozhskii, E., Xia, F., Siar, F., Martínez-Plumed, F., Happé, F., Chollet, F., Rong, F., Mishra, G., Winata, G.I., Melo, G., Kruszewski, G., Parascandolo, G., Mariani, G., Wang, G., Jaimovitch-López, G., Betz, G., Gur-Ari, G., Galijasevic, H., Kim, H., Rashkin, H., Hajishirzi, H., Mehta, H., Bogar, H., Shevlin, H., Schütze, H., Yakura, H., Zhang, H., Wong, H.M., Ng, I., Noble, I., Jumelet, J., Geissinger, J., Kernion, J., Hilton, J., Lee, J., Fisac, J.F., Simon, J.B., Koppel, J., Zheng, J., Zou, J., Kocoń, J., Thompson, J., Kaplan, J., Radom, J., Sohl-Dickstein, J., Phang, J., Wei, J., Yosinski, J., Novikova, J., Bosscher, J., Marsh, J., Kim, J., Taal, J., Engel, J., Alabi, J., Xu, J., Song, J., Tang, J., Waweru, J., Burden, J., Miller, J., Balis, J.U., Berant, J., Frohberg, J., Rozen, J., Hernandez-Orallo, J., Boudeman, J., Jones, J., Tenenbaum, J.B., Rule, J.S., Chua, J., Kanclerz, K., Livescu, K., Krauth, K., Gopalakrishnan, K., Ignatyeva, K., Markert, K., Dhole, K.D., Gimpel, K., Omondi, K., Mathewson, K., Chiafullo, K., Shkaruta, K., Shridhar, K., McDonell, K., Richardson, K., Reynolds, L., Gao, L., Zhang, L., Dugan, L., Qin, L., Contreras-Ochando, L., Morency, L.-P., Moschella, L., Lam, L., Noble, L., Schmidt, L., He, L., Colón, L.O., Metz, L., Şenel, L.K., Bosma, M., Sap, M., Hoeve, M., Farooqi, M., Faruqui, M., Mazeika, M., Baturan, M., Marelli, M., Maru, M., Quintana, M.J.R., Tolkiehn, M., Giulianelli, M., Lewis, M., Potthast, M., Leavitt, M.L., Hagen, M., Schubert, M., Baitemirova, M.O., Arnaud, M., McElrath, M., Yee, M.A., Cohen, M., Gu, M., Ivanitskiy, M., Starritt, M., Strube, M., Śwędrowski, M., Bevilacqua, M., Yasunaga, M., Kale, M., Cain, M., Xu, M., Suzgun, M., Tiwari, M., Bansal, M., Aminnaseri, M., Geva, M., Gheini, M., T, M.V., Peng, N., Chi, N., Lee, N., Krakover, N.G.-A., Cameron, N., Roberts, N., Doiron, N., Nangia, N., Deckers, N., Muennighoff, N., Keskar, N.S., Iyer, N.S., Constant, N., Fiedel, N., Wen, N., Zhang, O., Agha, O., Elbaghdadi, O., Levy, O., Evans, O., Casares, P.A.M., Doshi, P., Fung, P., Liang, P.P., Vicol, P., Alipoormolabashi, P., Liao, P., Liang, P., Chang, P., Eckersley, P., Htut, P.M., Hwang, P., Milkowski, P., Patil, P., Pezeshkpour, P., Oli, P., Mei, Q., Lyu, Q., Chen, Q., Banjade, R., Rudolph, R.E., Gabriel, R., Habacker, R., Delgado, R.R., Millièrre, R., Garg, R., Barnes, R., Saurous, R.A., Arakawa, R., Raymaekers, R., Frank, R., Sikand, R., Novak, R., Sitelew, R., LeBras, R., Liu, R., Jacobs, R., Zhang, R., Salakhutdinov, R., Chi, R., Lee, R., Stovall, R., Teehan, R., Yang, R., Singh, S., Mohammad, S.M., Anand, S., Dillavou, S., Shleifer, S., Wiseman, S., Gruetter, S., Bowman, S.R., Schoenholz, S.S., Han, S., Kwatra, S., Rous, S.A., Ghazarian, S., Ghosh, S., Casey, S., Bischoff, S., Gehrman, S., Schuster, S., Sadeghi, S., Hamdan, S., Zhou, S., Srivastava, S., Shi, S., Singh, S., Asaadi, S., Gu, S.S., Pachchigar, S., Toshniwal, S., Upadhyay, S., Shyamolima, Debnath, Shakeri, S., Thormeyer, S., Melzi, S., Reddy, S., Makini, S.P., Lee, S.-H., Torene, S., Hatwar, S., Dehaene, S., Divic, S., Ermon, S., Biderman, S., Lin, S., Prasad, S., Piantadosi, S.T., Shieber, S.M., Misherghi, S., Kiritchenko, S., Mishra, S., Linzen, T., Schuster, T., Li, T., Yu, T., Ali, T., Hashimoto, T., Wu,

- T.-L., Desbordes, T., Rothschild, T., Phan, T., Wang, T., Nkinyili, T., Schick, T., Kornev, T., Telleen-Lawton, T., Tunduny, T., Gerstenberg, T., Chang, T., Neeraj, T., Khot, T., Shultz, T., Shaham, U., Misra, V., Demberg, V., Nyamai, V., Raunak, V., Ramasesh, V., Prabhu, V.U., Padmakumar, V., Srikumar, V., Fedus, W., Saunders, W., Zhang, W., Vossen, W., Ren, X., Tong, X., Zhao, X., Wu, X., Shen, X., Yaghoobzadeh, Y., Lakretz, Y., Song, Y., Bahri, Y., Choi, Y., Yang, Y., Hao, Y., Chen, Y., Belinkov, Y., Hou, Y., Hou, Y., Bai, Y., Seid, Z., Zhao, Z., Wang, Z., Wang, Z.J., Wang, Z., Wu, Z.: Beyond the Imitation Game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. arXiv. arXiv:2206.04615 [cs, stat] (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.04615> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2206.04615> Accessed 2023-04-28
- [26] Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Ichter, B., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q., Zhou, D.: Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models (2022)
- [27] Zhou, D., Schärli, N., Hou, L., Wei, J., Scales, N., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Cui, C., Bousquet, O., Le, Q., Chi, E.: Least-to-Most Prompting Enables Complex Reasoning in Large Language Models. arXiv. arXiv:2205.10625 [cs] (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.10625> Accessed 2023-11-28
- [28] Wang, X., Wei, J., Schuurmans, D., Le, Q., Chi, E., Narang, S., Chowdhery, A., Zhou, D.: Self-Consistency Improves Chain of Thought Reasoning in Language Models. arXiv. arXiv:2203.11171 [cs] (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.11171> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2203.11171> Accessed 2023-10-28
- [29] Yao, S., Yu, D., Zhao, J., Shafran, I., Griffiths, T.L., Cao, Y., Narasimhan, K.: Tree of Thoughts: Deliberate Problem Solving with Large Language Models. arXiv. arXiv:2305.10601 [cs] (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.10601> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10601> Accessed 2023-10-28
- [30] Long, J.: Large Language Model Guided Tree-of-Thought (2023) [arXiv:2305.08291](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.08291)
- [31] Besta, M., Blach, N., Kubicek, A., Gerstenberger, R., Gianinazzi, L., Gajda, J., Lehmann, T., Podstawski, M., Niewiadomski, H., Nyczyk, P., Hoefler, T.: Graph of Thoughts: Solving Elaborate Problems with Large Language Models. arXiv. arXiv:2308.09687 [cs] (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.09687> Accessed 2023-11-28
- [32] Guha, N., Nyarko, J., Ho, D.E., Ré, C., Chilton, A., Narayana, A., Chohlas-Wood, A., Peters, A., Waldon, B., Rockmore, D.N., Zambrano, D., Talisman, D., Hoque, E., Surani, F., Fagan, F., Sarfaty, G., Dickinson, G.M., Porat, H., Hegland, J., Wu, J., Nudell, J., Niklaus, J., Nay, J., Choi, J.H., Tobia, K., Hagan, M., Ma, M., Livermore, M., Rasumov-Rahe, N., Holzenberger, N., Kolt, N., Henderson, P., Rehaag, S., Goel, S., Gao, S., Williams, S., Gandhi, S., Zur, T., Iyer, V., Li, Z.: LegalBench: A Collaboratively Built Benchmark for Measuring

- Legal Reasoning in Large Language Models. arXiv. arXiv:2308.11462 [cs] (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.11462> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.11462> Accessed 2023-09-10
- [33] Yu, F., Quartey, L., Schilder, F.: Legal prompting: Teaching a language model to think like a lawyer (2022)
- [34] Bundesgericht, S.: The Paths to the Swiss Federal Supreme Court. https://www.bger.ch/files/live/sites/bger/files/pdf/en/BG_Brosch%C3%BCreA5_E_Onl.pdf. Accessed: 2023-04-27 (2019)
- [35] Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J.D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., Amodei, D.: Language models are few-shot learners. In: Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M.F., Lin, H. (eds.) Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., ??? (2020). <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf>
- [36] Grave, E., Bojanowski, P., Gupta, P., Joulin, A., Mikolov, T.: Learning word vectors for 157 languages. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018) (2018)
- [37] Chalkidis, I., Fergadiotis, M., Manginas, N., Katakalous, E., Malakasiotis, P.: Regulatory Compliance through Doc2Doc Information Retrieval: A case study in EU/UK legislation where text similarity has limitations (2021)
- [38] Wang, W., Wei, F., Dong, L., Bao, H., Yang, N., Zhou, M.: MiniLM: Deep Self-Attention Distillation for Task-Agnostic Compression of Pre-Trained Transformers. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 33, pp. 5776–5788. Curran Associates, Inc., ??? (2020). <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Abstract.html> Accessed 2022-07-21
- [39] Taylor, R., Kardas, M., Cucurull, G., Scialom, T., Hartshorn, A., Saravia, E., Poulton, A., Kerkez, V., Stojnic, R.: Galactica: A Large Language Model for Science. arXiv. arXiv:2211.09085 [cs, stat] (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.09085> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.09085> Accessed 2022-11-29
- [40] Scao, T.L., Fan, A., Akiki, C., Pavlick, E., Ilić, S., Hesslow, D., Castagné, R., Luccioni, A.S., Yvon, F., Gallé, M., Tow, J., Rush, A.M., Biderman, S., Webson, A., Ammanamanchi, P.S., Wang, T., Sagot, B., Muennighoff, N., Moral, A.V., Ruwase, O., Bawden, R., Bekman, S., McMillan-Major, A., Beltagy, I., Nguyen, H., Saulnier, L., Tan, S., Suarez, P.O., Sanh, V., Laurençon, H., Jernite, Y.,

Launay, J., Mitchell, M., Raffel, C., Gokaslan, A., Simhi, A., Soroa, A., Aji, A.F.,
 Alfassy, A., Rogers, A., Nitzav, A.K., Xu, C., Mou, C., Emezue, C., Klamm, C.,
 Leong, C., Strien, D., Adelani, D.I., Radev, D., Ponferrada, E.G., Levkovizh,
 E., Kim, E., Natan, E.B., De Toni, F., Dupont, G., Kruszewski, G., Pistilli,
 G., Elsahar, H., Benyamina, H., Tran, H., Yu, I., Abdulmumin, I., Johnson, I.,
 Gonzalez-Dios, I., Rosa, J., Chim, J., Dodge, J., Zhu, J., Chang, J., Frohberg, J.,
 Tobing, J., Bhattacharjee, J., Almubarak, K., Chen, K., Lo, K., Von Werra, L.,
 Weber, L., Phan, L., allal, L.B., Tanguy, L., Dey, M., Muñoz, M.R., Masoud, M.,
 Grandury, M., Šaško, M., Huang, M., Coavoux, M., Singh, M., Jiang, M.T.-J.,
 Vu, M.C., Jauhar, M.A., Ghaleb, M., Subramani, N., Kassner, N., Khamis, N.,
 Nguyen, O., Espejel, O., Gibert, O., Villegas, P., Henderson, P., Colombo, P.,
 Amuok, P., Lhoest, Q., Harliman, R., Bommasani, R., López, R.L., Ribeiro, R.,
 Osei, S., Pyysalo, S., Nagel, S., Bose, S., Muhammad, S.H., Sharma, S., Longpre,
 S., Nikpoor, S., Silberberg, S., Pai, S., Zink, S., Torrent, T.T., Schick, T., Thrush,
 T., Danchev, V., Nikoulina, V., Laippala, V., Lepercq, V., Prabhu, V., Alyafeai,
 Z., Talat, Z., Raja, A., Heinzerling, B., Si, C., Salesky, E., Mielke, S.J., Lee,
 W.Y., Sharma, A., Santilli, A., Chaffin, A., Stiegler, A., Datta, D., Szczechla, E.,
 Chhablani, G., Wang, H., Pandey, H., Strobelt, H., Fries, J.A., Rozen, J., Gao,
 L., Sutawika, L., Bari, M.S., Al-shaibani, M.S., Manica, M., Nayak, N., Teehan,
 R., Albanie, S., Shen, S., Ben-David, S., Bach, S.H., Kim, T., Bers, T., Fevry, T.,
 Neeraj, T., Thakker, U., Raunak, V., Tang, X., Yong, Z.-X., Sun, Z., Brody, S.,
 Uri, Y., Tojarieh, H., Roberts, A., Chung, H.W., Tae, J., Phang, J., Press, O., Li,
 C., Narayanan, D., Bourfoune, H., Casper, J., Rasley, J., Ryabinin, M., Mishra,
 M., Zhang, M., Shoeybi, M., Peyrounette, M., Patry, N., Tazi, N., Sanseviero, O.,
 Platen, P., Cornette, P., Lavallée, P.F., Lacroix, R., Rajbhandari, S., Gandhi, S.,
 Smith, S., Requena, S., Patil, S., Dettmers, T., Baruwa, A., Singh, A., Cheveleva,
 A., Ligozat, A.-L., Subramonian, A., Névéal, A., Lovering, C., Garrette, D.,
 Tunuguntla, D., Reiter, E., Taktasheva, E., Voloshina, E., Bogdanov, E., Winata,
 G.I., Schoelkopf, H., Kalo, J.-C., Novikova, J., Forde, J.Z., Clive, J., Kasai, J.,
 Kawamura, K., Hazan, L., Carpuat, M., Clinciu, M., Kim, N., Cheng, N., Serikov,
 O., Antverg, O., Wal, O., Zhang, R., Zhang, R., Gehrmann, S., Pais, S., Shavrina,
 T., Scialom, T., Yun, T., Limisiewicz, T., Rieser, V., Protasov, V., Mikhailov,
 V., Pruksachatkun, Y., Belinkov, Y., Bamberger, Z., Kasner, Z., Rueda, A.,
 Pestana, A., Feizpour, A., Khan, A., Faranak, A., Santos, A., Hevia, A., Unldreaj,
 A., Aghagol, A., Abdollahi, A., Tammour, A., HajiHosseini, A., Behroozi, B.,
 Ajibade, B., Saxena, B., Ferrandis, C.M., Contractor, D., Lansky, D., David, D.,
 Kiela, D., Nguyen, D.A., Tan, E., Baylor, E., Ozoani, E., Mirza, F., Ononiwu, F.,
 Rezanejad, H., Jones, H., Bhattacharya, I., Solaiman, I., Sedenko, I., Nejadgholi,
 I., Passmore, J., Seltzer, J., Sanz, J.B., Fort, K., Dutra, L., Samagaio, M., Elbadri,
 M., Mieskes, M., Gerchick, M., Akinlolu, M., McKenna, M., Qiu, M., Ghauri, M.,
 Burynok, M., Abrar, N., Rajani, N., Elkott, N., Fahmy, N., Samuel, O., An, R.,
 Kromann, R., Hao, R., Alizadeh, S., Shubber, S., Wang, S., Roy, S., Viguiet, S.,
 Le, T., Oyebade, T., Le, T., Yang, Y., Nguyen, Z., Kashyap, A.R., Palasciano,
 A., Callahan, A., Shukla, A., Miranda-Escalada, A., Singh, A., Beilharz, B.,
 Wang, B., Brito, C., Zhou, C., Jain, C., Xu, C., Fourier, C., Periñán, D.L.

- Molano, D., Yu, D., Manjavacas, E., Barth, F., Fuhrmann, F., Altay, G., Bayrak, G., Burns, G., Vrabc, H.U., Bello, I., Dash, I., Kang, J., Giorgi, J., Golde, J., Posada, J.D., Sivaraman, K.R., Bulchandani, L., Liu, L., Shinzato, L., Bykhovetz, M.H., Takeuchi, M., Pàmies, M., Castillo, M.A., Nezhurina, M., Sanger, M., Samwald, M., Cullan, M., Weinberg, M., De Wolf, M., Mihaljcic, M., Liu, M., Freidank, M., Kang, M., Seelam, N., Dahlberg, N., Broad, N.M., Muellner, N., Fung, P., Haller, P., Chandrasekhar, R., Eisenberg, R., Martin, R., Canalli, R., Su, R., Su, R., Cahyawijaya, S., Garda, S., Deshmukh, S.S., Mishra, S., Kiblawi, S., Ott, S., Sang-aaroonisiri, S., Kumar, S., Schweter, S., Bharati, S., Laud, T., Gigant, T., Kainuma, T., Kusa, W., Labrak, Y., Bajaj, Y.S., Venkatraman, Y., Xu, Y., Xu, Y., Xu, Y., Tan, Z., Xie, Z., Ye, Z., Bras, M., Belkada, Y., Wolf, T.: BLOOM: A 176B-Parameter Open-Access Multilingual Language Model. arXiv. arXiv:2211.05100 [cs] (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.05100> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.05100> Accessed 2022-11-15
- [41] Xue, L., Constant, N., Roberts, A., Kale, M., Al-Rfou, R., Siddhant, A., Barua, A., Raffel, C.: mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer. arXiv:2010.11934 [cs] (2021). arXiv: 2010.11934. Accessed 2021-11-12
- [42] Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C.C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., Fuller, B., Gao, C., Goswami, V., Goyal, N., Hartshorn, A., Hosseini, S., Hou, R., Inan, H., Kardas, M., Kerkez, V., Khabsa, M., Kloumann, I., Korenev, A., Koura, P.S., Lachaux, M.-A., Lavril, T., Lee, J., Liskovich, D., Lu, Y., Mao, Y., Martinet, X., Mihaylov, T., Mishra, P., Molybog, I., Nie, Y., Poulton, A., Reizenstein, J., Rungta, R., Saladi, K., Schelten, A., Silva, R., Smith, E.M., Subramanian, R., Tan, X.E., Tang, B., Taylor, R., Williams, A., Kuan, J.X., Xu, P., Yan, Z., Zarov, I., Zhang, Y., Fan, A., Kambadur, M., Narang, S., Rodriguez, A., Stojnic, R., Edunov, S., Scialom, T.: Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. arXiv. arXiv:2307.09288 [cs] (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.09288> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288> Accessed 2023-08-06
- [43] Conneau, A., Khandelwal, K., Goyal, N., Chaudhary, V., Wenzek, G., Guzman, F., Grave, E., Ott, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Stoyanov, V.: Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale. arXiv:1911.02116 [cs] (2020). arXiv: 1911.02116. Accessed 2021-10-05
- [44] Sanh, V., Debut, L., Chaumond, J., Wolf, T.: DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. arXiv:1910.01108 [cs] (2020). arXiv: 1910.01108. Accessed 2020-08-25
- [45] He, P., Liu, X., Gao, J., Chen, W.: DeBERTa: Decoding-enhanced BERT with Disentangled Attention. arXiv:2006.03654 [cs] (2021). arXiv: 2006.03654. Accessed 2022-05-16

- [46] He, P., Gao, J., Chen, W.: DeBERTaV3: Improving DeBERTa using ELECTRA-Style Pre-Training with Gradient-Disentangled Embedding Sharing. arXiv:2111.09543 [cs] (2021). arXiv: 2111.09543. Accessed 2022-05-20
- [47] Pfeiffer, J., Goyal, N., Lin, X., Li, X., Cross, J., Riedel, S., Artetxe, M.: Lifting the Curse of Multilinguality by Pre-training Modular Transformers. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pp. 3479–3495. Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, United States (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.255> . <https://aclanthology.org/2022.naacl-main.255>
- [48] Vamvas, J., Graën, J., Sennrich, R.: Swissbert: The multilingual language model for switzerland. arXiv e-prints, 2303 (2023)
- [49] OpenAI: GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv. arXiv:2303.08774 [cs] (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774> Accessed 2023-05-25
- [50] Niklaus, J., Matoshi, V., Stürmer, M., Chalkidis, I., Ho, D.E.: MultiLegalPile: A 689GB Multilingual Legal Corpus. arXiv. arXiv:2306.02069 [cs] (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.02069> Accessed 2023-06-14
- [51] Conneau, A., Lample, G.: Cross-lingual Language Model Pretraining. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc., ??? (2019). <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/c04c19c2c2474dbf5f7ac4372c5b9af1-Abstract.html> Accessed 2021-10-05
- [52] Wei, J., Bosma, M., Zhao, V.Y., Guu, K., Yu, A.W., Lester, B., Du, N., Dai, A.M., Le, Q.V.: Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. CoRR **abs/2109.01652** (2021) [2109.01652](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.01652)
- [53] Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C.L., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., Schulman, J., Hilton, J., Kelton, F., Miller, L., Simens, M., Askell, A., Welinder, P., Christiano, P., Leike, J., Lowe, R.: Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. arXiv (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2203.02155> . <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.02155>
- [54] Pfeiffer, J., Vulić, I., Gurevych, I., Ruder, S.: UNKs Everywhere: Adapting Multilingual Language Models to New Scripts. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 10186–10203. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic (2021). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.800> . <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.800>
- [55] Wettig, A., Gao, T., Zhong, Z., Chen, D.: Should you mask 15% in masked

- language modeling? In: Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 2985–3000. Association for Computational Linguistics, Dubrovnik, Croatia (2023). <https://aclanthology.org/2023.eacl-main.217>
- [56] Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., Liu, P.J.: Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **21**(140), 1–67 (2020). Accessed 2023-05-17
- [57] Beltagy, I., Peters, M.E., Cohan, A.: Longformer: The Long-Document Transformer. *arXiv:2004.05150 [cs]* (2020). *arXiv: 2004.05150*. Accessed 2021-03-05
- [58] Zhang, T., Kishore, V., Wu, F., Weinberger, K.Q., Artzi, Y.: BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. *arXiv:1904.09675 [cs]* (2020). *arXiv: 1904.09675*. Accessed 2022-03-08
- [59] Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T., Zhu, W.-J.: Bleu: A method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In: Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics. *ACL '02*, pp. 311–318. Association for Computational Linguistics, USA (2002). <https://doi.org/10.3115/1073083.1073135> . <https://doi.org/10.3115/1073083.1073135>
- [60] Banerjee, S., Lavie, A.: METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. In: Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation And/or Summarization, pp. 65–72. Association for Computational Linguistics, Ann Arbor, Michigan (2005). <https://aclanthology.org/W05-0909>
- [61] Lin, C.-Y.: ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. In: Text Summarization Branches Out, pp. 74–81. Association for Computational Linguistics, Barcelona, Spain (2004). <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>
- [62] Chalkidis, I.: ChatGPT may Pass the Bar Exam soon, but has a Long Way to Go for the LexGLUE benchmark. *ArXiv abs/2304.1* (2023)
- [63] Trautmann, D.: Large Language Model Prompt Chaining for Long Legal Document Classification (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.04138>
- [64] Robertson, S., Zaragoza, H.: The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* **3**(4), 333–389 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1561/1500000019>
- [65] Zhan, J., Mao, J., Liu, Y., Guo, J., Zhang, M., Ma, S.: Optimizing dense retrieval model training with hard negatives. In: Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information

- Retrieval. SIGIR '21, pp. 1503–1512. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3462880> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3462880>
- [66] Wang, W., Wei, F., Dong, L., Bao, H., Yang, N., Zhou, M.: Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers. In: Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems. NIPS'20. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA (2020)
- [67] Wang, Y., Wang, L., Li, Y., He, D., Liu, T.-Y.: A theoretical analysis of ndcg type ranking measures. In: Shalev-Shwartz, S., Steinwart, I. (eds.) Proceedings of the 26th Annual Conference on Learning Theory. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 30, pp. 25–54. PMLR, Princeton, NJ, USA (2013). <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v30/Wang13.html>
- [68] Chalkidis, I., Fergadiotis, M., Manginas, N., Katakalous, E., Malakasiotis, P.: Regulatory Compliance through Doc2Doc Information Retrieval: A case study in EU/UK legislation where text similarity has limitations. In: Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume, pp. 3498–3511. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online (2021). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.eacl-main.305> . <https://aclanthology.org/2021.eacl-main.305> Accessed 2023-04-24
- [69] Henderson, M., Al-Rfou, R., Strope, B., Sung, Y.-H., Lukács, L., Guo, R., Kumar, S., Miklos, B., Kurzweil, R.: Efficient natural language response suggestion for smart reply. ArXiv [abs/1705.00652](https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.00652) (2017)
- [70] Schlueter, N.: The limits of automatic summarisation according to ROUGE. In: Lapata, M., Blunsom, P., Koller, A. (eds.) Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers, pp. 41–45. Association for Computational Linguistics, Valencia, Spain (2017). <https://aclanthology.org/E17-2007>
- [71] Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W.-t., Rocktäschel, T., Riedel, S., Kiela, D.: Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. arXiv. arXiv:2005.11401 [cs] (2021). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.11401> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.11401> Accessed 2023-07-31
- [72] Schick, T., Dwivedi-Yu, J., Dessì, R., Raileanu, R., Lomeli, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Cancedda, N., Scialom, T.: Toolformer: Language Models Can Teach Themselves to Use Tools. arXiv. arXiv:2302.04761 [cs] (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.04761> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04761> Accessed 2023-02-13
- [73] T.Y.S.S., S., Baumgartner, N., Stürmer, M., Grabmair, M., Niklaus, J.: Towards Explainability and Fairness in Swiss Judgement Prediction: Benchmarking on a

- Multilingual Dataset. arXiv. arXiv:2402.17013 [cs] (2024). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.17013> Accessed 2024-03-01
- [74] Chalkidis, I., Pasini, T., Zhang, S., Tomada, L., Schwemer, S.F., Sogaard, A.: Fair-Lex: A Multilingual Benchmark for Evaluating Fairness in Legal Text Processing. arXiv:2203.07228 [cs] (2022). arXiv: 2203.07228. Accessed 2022-04-14
- [75] Chen, H., Cai, D., Dai, W., Dai, Z., Ding, Y.: Charge-Based Prison Term Prediction with Deep Gating Network. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), pp. 6362–6367. Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China (2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1667> . <https://aclanthology.org/D19-1667> Accessed 2022-07-14
- [76] Leins, K., Lau, J.H., Baldwin, T.: Give Me Convenience and Give Her Death: Who Should Decide What Uses of NLP are Appropriate, and on What Basis? In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 2908–2913. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online (2020). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.261> . <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.261> Accessed 2021-08-23
- [77] Bender, E.M., Koller, A.: Climbing towards NLU: On Meaning, Form, and Understanding in the Age of Data. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 5185–5198. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online (2020). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.463> . <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.463>
- [78] Lee, J., Yoon, W., Kim, S., Kim, D., Kim, S., So, C.H., Kang, J.: BioBERT: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics* **36**(4), 1234–1240 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz682> https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article-pdf/36/4/1234/48983216/bioinformatics_36_4_1234.pdf
- [79] Naseem, U., Dunn, A.G., Khushi, M., Kim, J.: Benchmarking for biomedical natural language processing tasks with a domain specific albert. *BMC bioinformatics* **23**(1), 1–15 (2022)
- [80] Lan, Z., Chen, M., Goodman, S., Gimpel, K., Sharma, P., Soricut, R.: ALBERT: A Lite BERT for Self-supervised Learning of Language Representations. arXiv:1909.11942 [cs] (2020). arXiv: 1909.11942. Accessed 2020-10-29
- [81] Johnson, A.E.W., Pollard, T.J., Shen, L., Lehman, L.-W.H., Feng, M., Ghassemi, M., Moody, B., Szolovits, P., Celi, L.A., Mark, R.G.: MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database. *Scientific data* **3**, 160035 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.35>

- [82] Gu, Y., Tinn, R., Cheng, H., Lucas, M., Usuyama, N., Liu, X., Naumann, T., Gao, J., Poon, H.: Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Trans. Comput. Healthcare* **3**(1) (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1145/3458754>
- [83] Peng, Y., Yan, S., Lu, Z.: Transfer Learning in Biomedical Natural Language Processing: An Evaluation of BERT and ELMo on Ten Benchmarking Datasets (2019). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1906.05474> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.05474> Accessed 2023-05-27
- [84] Yang, Y., UY, M.C.S., Huang, A.: FinBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Financial Communications (2020). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2006.08097> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.08097> Accessed 2023-05-27
- [85] Malo, P., Sinha, A., Korhonen, P., Wallenius, J., Takala, P.: Good debt or bad debt: Detecting semantic orientations in economic texts. *J. Assoc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* **65**(4), 782–796 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23062>
- [86] Huang, A.H., Zang, A.Y., Zheng, R.: Evidence on the information content of text in analyst reports. *ERN: Econometric Modeling in Financial Economics (Topic)* (2014)
- [87] Shah, R.S., Chawla, K., Eidnani, D., Shah, A., Du, W., Chava, S., Raman, N., Smiley, C., Chen, J., Yang, D.: WHEN FLUE MEETS FLANG: Benchmarks and Large Pre-trained Language Model for Financial Domain (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.00083> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.00083> Accessed 2023-05-27
- [88] Wu, S., Irsoy, O., Lu, S., Dabrovolski, V., Dredze, M., Gehrmann, S., Kambadur, P., Rosenberg, D., Mann, G.: BloombergGPT: A Large Language Model for Finance (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.17564> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17564> Accessed 2023-05-27
- [89] Beltagy, I., Lo, K., Cohan, A.: SciBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Scientific Text. *arXiv:1903.10676 [cs]* (2019). *arXiv: 1903.10676*. Accessed 2021-11-18
- [90] Hu, Y., Hosseini, M., Skorupa Parolin, E., Osorio, J., Khan, L., Brandt, P., D’Orazio, V.: ConflBERT: A Pre-trained Language Model for Political Conflict and Violence. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 5469–5482. Association for Computational Linguistics, ??? (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.400> . <https://aclanthology.org/2022.naacl-main.400> Accessed 2023-05-31
- [91] Kawintiranon, K., Singh, L.: PoliBERTtweet: A Pre-trained Language Model for Analyzing Political Content on Twitter. In: *Proceedings of the Thirteenth*

Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, pp. 7360–7367. European Language Resources Association, ??? (2022). <https://aclanthology.org/2022.lrec-1.801> Accessed 2023-05-31

- [92] Aghaei, E., Niu, X., Shadid, W., Al-Shaer, E.: SecureBERT: A Domain-Specific Language Model for Cybersecurity. In: Li, F., Liang, K., Lin, Z., Katsikas, S.K. (eds.) *Security and Privacy in Communication Networks. Lecture Notes of the Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering*, pp. 39–56. Springer Nature Switzerland, ??? (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-25538-0_3
- [93] Zheng, Z., Lu, X.-Z., Chen, K.-Y., Zhou, Y.-C., Lin, J.-R.: Pretrained domain-specific language model for natural language processing tasks in the aec domain. *Comput. Ind.* **142**(C) (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2022.103733>
- [94] Zhou, S., Wang, N., Wang, L., Liu, H., Zhang, R.: CancerBERT: a cancer domain-specific language model for extracting breast cancer phenotypes from electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* **29**(7), 1208–1216 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocac040> <https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article-pdf/29/7/1208/44062229/ocac040.pdf>
- [95] Chalkidis, I., Fergadiotis, M., Malakasiotis, P., Aletras, N., Androutsopoulos, I.: LEGAL-BERT: The Muppets straight out of Law School. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pp. 2898–2904 (2020)
- [96] Zheng, L., Guha, N., Anderson, B.R., Henderson, P., Ho, D.E.: When Does Pretraining Help? Assessing Self-Supervised Learning for Law and the CaseHOLD Dataset. arXiv:2104.08671 [cs] (2021). arXiv: 2104.08671 version: 3. Accessed 2021-08-27
- [97] Henderson, P., Krass, M.S., Zheng, L., Guha, N., Manning, C.D., Jurafsky, D., Ho, D.E.: Pile of Law: Learning Responsible Data Filtering from the Law and a 256GB Open-Source Legal Dataset. arXiv. arXiv:2207.00220 [cs] (2022). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2207.00220> Accessed 2022-07-19
- [98] Niklaus, J., Giofré, D.: BudgetLongformer: Can we Cheaply Pretrain a SotA Legal Language Model From Scratch? arXiv. arXiv:2211.17135 [cs] (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.17135> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.17135> Accessed 2023-01-23
- [99] Clark, K., Luong, M.-T., Le, Q.V., Manning, C.D.: ELECTRA: Pre-training Text Encoders as Discriminators Rather Than Generators. arXiv:2003.10555 [cs] (2020). arXiv: 2003.10555. Accessed 2022-03-08
- [100] Hua, W., Zhang, Y., Chen, Z., Li, J., Weber, M.: LegalRelectra: Mixed-domain Language Modeling for Long-range Legal Text Comprehension. arXiv. arXiv:2212.08204 [cs] (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.08204> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.08204>

- [101] Feng, Y., Li, C., Ng, V.: Legal judgment prediction: A survey of the state of the art. In: Raedt, L.D. (ed.) Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22, pp. 5461–5469. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, ??? (2022). <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2022/765> . Survey Track. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2022/765>
- [102] Aletras, N., Tsarapatsanis, D., Preotiuc-Pietro, D., Lampos, V.: Predicting judicial decisions of the European Court of Human Rights: a Natural Language Processing perspective. *PeerJ Computer Science* **2**, 93 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.93> . Publisher: PeerJ Inc. Accessed 2021-05-26
- [103] Şulea, O.-M., Zampieri, M., Vela, M., Genabith, J.: Predicting the Law Area and Decisions of French Supreme Court Cases. In: Proceedings of the International Conference Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing, RANLP 2017, pp. 716–722. INCOMA Ltd., Varna, Bulgaria (2017)
- [104] Medvedeva, M., Vols, M., Wieling, M.: Judicial decisions of the European Court of Human Rights: looking into the crystal ball. Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Legal Studies in Europe 2018 (2018). Accessed 2021-05-26
- [105] Chalkidis, I., Androutsopoulos, I., Aletras, N.: Neural Legal Judgment Prediction in English. In: Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 4317–4323. Association for Computational Linguistics, Florence, Italy (2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1424> . <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P19-1424> Accessed 2021-03-02
- [106] Xiao, C., Zhong, H., Guo, Z., Tu, C., Liu, Z., Sun, M., Feng, Y., Han, X., Hu, Z., Wang, H., Xu, J.: CAIL2018: A Large-Scale Legal Dataset for Judgment Prediction. arXiv:1807.02478 [cs] (2018). arXiv: 1807.02478. Accessed 2021-06-25
- [107] Xiao, C., Hu, X., Liu, Z., Tu, C., Sun, M.: Lawformer: A pre-trained language model for Chinese legal long documents. *AI Open* **2**, 79–84 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aiopen.2021.06.003> . Accessed 2022-07-19
- [108] Malik, V., Sanjay, R., Nigam, S.K., Ghosh, K., Guha, S.K., Bhattacharya, A., Modi, A.: ILDC for CJPE: Indian Legal Documents Corpus for Court Judgment Prediction and Explanation. In: Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 4046–4062. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online (2021). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.313> . <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.313> Accessed 2021-12-15
- [109] Chalkidis, I., Fergadiotis, M., Tsarapatsanis, D., Aletras, N., Androutsopoulos, I., Malakasiotis, P.: Paragraph-level rationale extraction through regularization: A

- case study on european court of human rights cases. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pp. 226–241 (2021)
- [110] Prasad, N., Boughanem, M., Dkaki, T.: A Hierarchical Neural Framework for Classification and its Explanation in Large Unstructured Legal Documents (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10563>
- [111] Soh, J., Lim, H.K., Chai, I.E.: Legal Area Classification: A Comparative Study of Text Classifiers on Singapore Supreme Court Judgments. In: Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2019, pp. 67–77. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota (2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W19-2208> . <http://aclweb.org/anthology/W19-2208> Accessed 2021-03-02
- [112] Katz, D.M., Hartung, D., Gerlach, L., Jana, A., Bommarito, M.J.: Natural Language Processing in the Legal Domain, Rochester, NY (2023). <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4336224> Accessed 2023-01-24
- [113] Ye, H., Jiang, X., Luo, Z., Chao, W.: Interpretable Charge Predictions for Criminal Cases: Learning to Generate Court Views from Fact Descriptions. In: Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers), pp. 1854–1864. Association for Computational Linguistics, New Orleans, Louisiana (2018). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N18-1168> . <https://aclanthology.org/N18-1168> Accessed 2022-07-14
- [114] Wu, Y., Kuang, K., Zhang, Y., Liu, X., Sun, C., Xiao, J., Zhuang, Y., Si, L., Wu, F.: De-Biased Court’s View Generation with Causality. In: Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), pp. 763–780. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online (2020). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.56> . <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-main.56> Accessed 2022-07-14
- [115] Li, Q., Zhang, Q.: Court opinion generation from case fact description with legal basis. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence **35**(17), 14840–14848 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i17.17742>
- [116] Yue, L., Liu, Q., Wu, H., An, Y., Wang, L., Yuan, S., Wu, D.: Circumstances enhanced criminal court view generation. In: Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. SIGIR ’21, pp. 1855–1859. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3462984> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3462984>
- [117] Grover, C., Hachey, B., Hughson, I.: The HOLJ Corpus. Supporting Summarisation of Legal Texts. In: Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on

- Linguistically Interpreted Corpora, pp. 47–54. COLING, Geneva, Switzerland (2004). <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1907>
- [118] Hachey, B., Grover, C.: Extractive summarisation of legal texts. *Artificial Intelligence and Law* **14**(4), 305–345 (2006) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-007-9039-z>
- [119] Kim, M.-Y., Xu, Y., Goebel, R.: Summarization of legal texts with high cohesion and automatic compression rate. In: Motomura, Y., Butler, A., Bekki, D. (eds.) *New Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 190–204. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2013)
- [120] Jain, D., Borah, M.D., Biswas, A.: Summarization of legal documents: Where are we now and the way forward. *Computer Science Review* **40**, 100388 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosrev.2021.100388>
- [121] Shukla, A., Bhattacharya, P., Poddar, S., Mukherjee, R., Ghosh, K., Goyal, P., Ghosh, S.: Legal case document summarization: Extractive and abstractive methods and their evaluation. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1048–1064 (2022)
- [122] Kornilova, A., Eidelman, V.: Billsum: A corpus for automatic summarization of us legislation. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pp. 48–56 (2019)
- [123] Shen, Z., Lo, K., Yu, L., Dahlberg, N., Schlanger, M., Downey, D.: Multi-LexSum: Real-World Summaries of Civil Rights Lawsuits at Multiple Granularities. *arXiv:2206.10883 [cs]* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.10883> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2206.10883> Accessed 2022-07-25
- [124] Lewis, M., Liu, Y., Goyal, N., Ghazvininejad, M., Mohamed, A., Levy, O., Stoyanov, V., Zettlemoyer, L.: Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 7871–7880 (2020)
- [125] Zhang, J., Zhao, Y., Saleh, M., Liu, P.J.: PEGASUS: Pre-training with Extracted Gap-sentences for Abstractive Summarization. *arXiv:1912.08777 [cs]* (2020). *arXiv: 1912.08777*. Accessed 2022-03-08
- [126] Aumiller, D., Chouhan, A., Gertz, M.: EUR-Lex-Sum: A Multi- and Cross-lingual Dataset for Long-form Summarization in the Legal Domain. *arXiv:2210.13448 [cs]* (2022). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.13448> Accessed 2022-10-28

- [127] Datta, D., Soni, S., Mukherjee, R., Ghosh, S.: MILDSum: A novel benchmark dataset for multilingual summarization of Indian legal case judgments. In: Bouamor, H., Pino, J., Bali, K. (eds.) Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 5291–5302. Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore (2023). <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.321>
- [128] Bauer, E., Stambach, D., Gu, N., Ash, E.: Legal Extractive Summarization of U.S. Court Opinions (2023)
- [129] Martínez-González, M., Fuente, P., Vicente, D.-J.: Reference Extraction and Resolution for Legal Texts. In: Pal, S.K., Bandyopadhyay, S., Biswas, S. (eds.) Pattern Recognition and Machine Intelligence. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pp. 218–221. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2005). https://doi.org/10.1007/11590316_29
- [130] Nambanoor Kunnath, S., Pride, D., Knoth, P.: Dynamic Context Extraction for Citation Classification. In: Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 539–549. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online only (2022). <https://aclanthology.org/2022.aacl-main.41> Accessed 2023-06-15
- [131] Lawrie, D., Yang, E., Oard, D.W., Mayfield, J.: Neural Approaches to Multilingual Information Retrieval (2023)
- [132] Bajaj, P., Campos, D., Craswell, N., Deng, L., Gao, J., Liu, X., Majumder, R., McNamara, A., Mitra, B., Nguyen, T., Rosenberg, M., Song, X., Stoica, A., Tiwary, S., Wang, T.: MS MARCO: A Human Generated MACHine Reading COMprehension Dataset (2018)
- [133] Conneau, A., Khandelwal, K., Goyal, N., Chaudhary, V., Wenzek, G., Guzmán, F., Grave, E., Ott, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Stoyanov, V.: Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale (2020)
- [134] Leveling, J.: On the effect of stopword removal for sms-based faq retrieval. In: International Conference on Applications of Natural Language to Data Bases (2012)
- [135] Khattab, O., Zaharia, M.: Colbert: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over bert. In: Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, pp. 39–48. Association for Computing Machinery, ??? (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401075> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401075>
- [136] Gao, L., Dai, Z., Callan, J.: Coil: Revisit exact lexical match in information retrieval with contextualized inverted list. In: Toutanova, K., Rumshisky,

A., Zettlemoyer, L., Hakkani-Tur, D., Beltagy, I., Bethard, S., Cotterell, R., Chakraborty, T., Zhou, Y. (eds.) Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pp. 3030–3042. Association for Computational Linguistics, ??? (2021). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.241> . <https://aclanthology.org/2021.naacl-main.241>

- [137] Lin, S.C., Lin, J.: A dense representation framework for lexical and semantic matching. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* **41** (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582426>
- [138] Wang, W., Wei, F., Dong, L., Bao, H., Yang, N., Zhou, M.: Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers. In: Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems. Curran Associates Inc., ??? (2020)