

Bibliography

- A2J. 2012. *A2J Author*. www.kentlaw.iit.edu/institutes-centers/center-for-access-to-justice-and-technology/a2j-author (accessed January 30, 2015).
- ACL-AMW. 2016. *3d Workshop on Argument Mining at the Association of Computational Linguistics (ACL 2016)*. <http://argmining2016.arg.tech/> (accessed May 12, 2016).
- Aharoni, Ehud, Alzate, Carlos, Bar-Haim, Roy, Bilu, Yonatan, Dankin, Lena, Eiron, Iris, Hershovich, Daniel, and Hummel, Shay. 2014b. Claims on demand – an initial demonstration of a system for automatic detection and polarity identification of context dependent claims in massive corpora. *COLING 2014*, 6.
- Aharoni, Ehud, Polnarov, Anatoly, Lavee, Tamar, Hershovich, Daniel, Levy, Ran, Rinott, Ruty, Gutfreund, Dan, and Slonim, Noam. 2014a. A benchmark dataset for automatic detection of claims and evidence in the context of controversial topics. *ACL 2014*, 64–8.
- Al-Kofahi, Khalid, Tyrrell, Alex, Vachher, Arun, and Jackson, Peter. 2001. A machine learning approach to prior case retrieval. Pages 88–93 of: *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. ICAIL '01. New York, NY: ACM.
- Aleven, Vincent. 1997. *Teaching Case-based Argumentation through a Model and Examples*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Aleven, Vincent. 2003. Using background knowledge in case-based legal reasoning: a computational model and an intelligent learning environment. *Artificial Intelligence*, 150(1–2), 183–237.
- Alias-i. 2008. *Alias-i. Lingpipe 4.1.0*. <http://alias-i.com/lingpipe> (accessed July 22, 2015).
- Allen, Layman E. and Engholm, C. Rudy. 1978. Normalized legal drafting and the query method. *Journal of Legal Education*, 29, 380–412.
- Allen, Layman E. and Saxon, Charles. 1987. Some problems in designing expert systems to aid legal reasoning. Pages 94–103 of: *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Araszkiwicz, Michał, Łopatkiewicz, Agata, and Zienkiewicz, Adam. 2013. Factor-based parent plan support system. Pages 171–5 of: *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Ashley, Kevin D. 1990. *Modeling Legal Arguments: Reasoning with Cases and Hypotheticals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ashley, Kevin D. 1991. Reasoning with cases and hypotheticals in HYPO. *International Journal of Man–Machine Studies*, 34(6), 753–96.

- Ashley, Kevin D. 2000. Designing electronic casebooks that talk back: the cato program. *Jurimetrics*, 40, 275–319.
- Ashley, Kevin D. 2009a. Ontological requirements for analogical, teleological, and hypothetical legal reasoning. Pages 1–10 of: *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Ashley, Kevin D. 2009b. Teaching a process model of legal argument with hypotheticals. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 17(4), 321–70.
- Ashley, Kevin D. 2011. The case-based reasoning approach: ontologies for analogical legal argument. Pages 99–115 of: *Approaches to Legal Ontologies*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Ashley, Kevin D. 2012. Teaching law and digital age legal practice with an AI and Law seminar. *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, 88, 783.
- Ashley, Kevin D., Bjerke Ferrell, Elizabeth, Potter et al. 2014. Statutory network analysis plus information retrieval. Pages 1–7 of: *Second Workshop on Network Analysis in Law, 27th Annual Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems (JURIX 2014)*. Krakow, December 2014.
- Ashley, Kevin D. and Bridewell, Will. 2010. Emerging AI & Law approaches to automating analysis and retrieval of electronically stored information in discovery proceedings. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 18(4), 311–20.
- Ashley, Kevin D. and Brüninghaus, Stefanie. 2006. Computer models for legal prediction. *Jurimetrics*, 46(3), 309–52.
- Ashley, Kevin D. and Brüninghaus, Stefanie. 2009. Automatically classifying case texts and predicting outcomes. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 17(2), 125–65.
- Ashley, Kevin D. and Rissland, Edwina L. 2003. Law, learning and representation. *Artificial Intelligence*, 150(1–2), 17–58.
- Ashley, Kevin D. and Walker, Vern. 2013. From information retrieval (IR) to argument retrieval (AR) for legal cases: report on a baseline study. Pages 29–38 of: *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems (JURIX 2013)*. IOS Press: Amsterdam.
- Ashworth, Earline Jennifer. 1968. Propositional logic in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 9(2), 179–92.
- Atkinson, Katie and Bench-Capon, Trevor. 2007. Argumentation and standards of proof. Pages 107–16 of: *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Attaran, Mohsen. 2004. Exploring the relationship between information technology and business process reengineering. *Information and Management*, 41(5) 585–96.
- Bach, Ngo Xuan, Minh, Nguyen Le, Oanh, Tran Thi, and Shimazu, Akira. 2013. A two-phase framework for learning logical structures of paragraphs in legal articles. *ACM Transactions on Asian Language Information Processing (TALIP)*, 12(1), 3:1–3:32.
- Bansal, Apoorva, Bu, Zheyuan, Mishra, Biswajeet, Wang, Silun, Ashley, Kevin, and Grabmair, Matthias. 2016. Document Ranking with Citation Information and Oversampling Sentence Classification in the LUIMA Framework. Pages 33–42 of: Floris Bex and Serena Villata (eds.), *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems: JURIX 2016: The Twenty-Ninth Annual Conference*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Bauer, Robert S., Jade, Teresa, Hedin, Bruce, and Hogan, Chris. 2008. Automated legal sense-making: the centrality of relevance and intentionality. In: *Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Supporting Search and Sensemaking for Electronically Stored Information in Discovery Proceedings (DESI II)*. <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/9131/> (accessed June 12, 2016).

- Beck, S. 2014. *Emerging Technology Shapes Future of Law*. www.americanlawyer.com/id=1202664266769/Emerging-Technology-Shapes-Future-of-Law (accessed September 9, 2014).
- Bench-Capon, Trevor. 1991. Exploiting isomorphism: development of a KBS to support British coal insurance claims. Pages 62–68 of: *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Bench-Capon, Trevor. 2003. Persuasion in practical argument using value-based argumentation frameworks. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 13(3), 429–48.
- Bench-Capon, Trevor and Sartor, Giovanni. 2003. A model of legal reasoning with cases incorporating theories and values. *Artificial Intelligence*, 150(1), 97–143.
- Bench-Capon, Trevor and Visser, Pepijn. 1997. Ontologies in legal information systems: the need for explicit specifications of domain conceptualisations. Pages 132–41 of: *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. ICAIL '97. New York, NY: ACM.
- Berkman Center for Internet and Society, Harvard Law School Library, and Harvard Library Lab. 2016. *H2O Guide: Overview*. https://h2o.law.harvard.edu/p/overview_help (accessed February 18, 2016).
- Berman, Donald H. and Hafner, Carole D. 1988. Obstacles to the development of logic-based models of legal reasoning. Pages 183–214 of: Walter, Charles (ed.), *Computer Power and Legal Language*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Berman, Donald H. and Hafner, Carole D. 1993. Representing teleological structure in case-based legal reasoning: the missing link. Pages 50–9 of: *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Bex, Floris J. 2011. *Arguments, Stories and Criminal Evidence: A Formal Hybrid Theory*, vol. 92. Dordrecht: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Biagioli, Carlo, Francesconi, Enrico, Passerini, Andrea, Montemagni, Simonetta, and Soria, Claudia. 2005. Automatic semantics extraction in law documents. In: *ICAIL '05: 7th International Conference on AI and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Bialecki, Andrzej, Muir, Robert, and Ingersoll, Grant. 2012. Apache lucene 4. Pages 17–24 of: *SIGIR 2012 Workshop on Open Source Information Retrieval*.
- Bing, Jon. 1987. Designing text retrieval systems for conceptual searching. Pages 43–51 of: *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. ICAIL '87. New York, NY: ACM.
- Bishop, Christopher M. 2006. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. New York: Springer.
- Blair, David C. and Maron, M. E. 1985. An evaluation of retrieval effectiveness for a full-text document-retrieval system. *Communications of the ACM*, 28(3), 289–99.
- Blecking, Anja. 2014. Classroom salon – an innovative method for investigating student learning. In: Kendhammer, Lisa K. and Murphy, Kristen L. (eds.), *Innovative Uses of Assessments for Teaching and Research*. Washington, DC: American Chemical Society.
- Boella, Guido, Di Caro, Luigi, Lesmo, Leonardo, Rispoli, Daniele, and Robaldo, Livio. 2012. Multi-label classification of legislative text into EuroVoc. In: Schäfer, Burkhard (ed.), *JURIX 2012*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Boella, Guido, Di Caro, Luigi, Humphreys et al. 2016. Eunomos, a legal document and knowledge management system for the web to provide relevant, reliable and up-to-date information on the law. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 24(3), 245–83.
- Brachman, Ronald and Levesque, Hector. 2004. *Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

- Branting, L. Karl. 1991. Building explanations from rules and structured cases. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 34(6), 797-837.
- Branting, L. Karl. 1999. *Reasoning with Rules and Precedents*. Dordrecht, Holland: Kluwer, pp. 8-28.
- Breaux, Travis D. 2009. *Legal Requirements Acquisition for the Specification of Legally Compliant Information Systems*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest.
- Breaux, Travis D. and Gordon, David G. 2011. Regulatory requirements as open systems: structures, patterns and metrics for the design of formal requirements specifications. *Carnegie Mellon University Technical Report CMU-ISR-11-100*.
- Breaux, Travis D. and Gordon, David G. 2013. Regulatory requirements traceability and analysis using semi-formal specifications. Pages 141-57 of: *Requirements Engineering Foundation for Software Quality*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Breaux, Travis D., Hibshi, Hanan, and Rao, Ashwini. 2014. Eddy, a formal language for specifying and analyzing data flow specifications for conflicting privacy requirements. *Requirements Engineering*, 19(3), 281-307.
- Breaux, Travis D. and Schaub, Florian. 2014. Scaling requirements extraction to the crowd: experiments with privacy policies. Pages 163-72 of: *Requirements Engineering Conference (RE), 2014 IEEE 22nd International*. IEEE.
- Breaux, Travis D., Smullen, Daniel, and Hibshi, Hanan. 2015. Detecting repurposing and over-collection in multi-party privacy requirements specifications. Pages 166-75 of: *Requirements Engineering Conference (RE), 2015 IEEE 23rd International*. New York, NY: IEEE.
- Breaux, Travis D., Vail, Matthew, and Anton, Annie. 2006. Towards regulatory compliance: extracting rights and obligations to align requirements with regulations. Pages 46-55 of: *Proceedings of RE06*. Washington, DC: IEEE Computer Society.
- Breuker, Joost, Elhag, Abdullatif, Petkov, Emil, and Winkels, Radboud. 2002. Ontologies for legal information serving and knowledge management. Pages 1-10 of: *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems, Jurix 2002: The Fifteenth Annual Conference*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Breuker, Joost and Hoekstra, Rinke. 2004. Epistemology and Ontology in Core Ontologies: FOLaw and LRI-Core, two core ontologies for law. Pages 15-27 of: *Proceedings of the EKAW04 Workshop on Core Ontologies in Ontology Engineering*. Northamptonshire, UK.
- Breuker, Joost, Valente, André, and Winkels, Radboud. 2004. Legal ontologies in knowledge engineering and information management. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 12(4), 241-77.
- Brewka, Gerhard and Gordon, Thomas F. 2010. Carneades and abstract dialectical frameworks: a reconstruction. Pages 3-12 of: *Proceedings of the 2010 Conference on Computational Models of Argument: Proceedings of COMMA 2010*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Buckland, Michael K. and Gey, Fredric C. 1994. The relationship between recall and precision. *JASIS*, 45(1), 12-19.
- Burges, Chris, Shaked, Tal, Renshaw, Erin et al. 2005. Learning to rank using gradient descent. Pages 89-96 of: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Machine Learning*. ICML '05. New York, NY: ACM.
- Büttcher, Stefan, Clarke, Charles L. A., and Cormack, Gordon V. 2010. *Information Retrieval: Implementing and Evaluating Search Engines*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Callan, James, Croft, Bruce W., and Harding, Stephen M. 1992. The INQUERY retrieval system. Pages 78-83 of: *In Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Database and Expert Systems Applications*. Dordrecht: Springer-Verlag.

- Carnielli, Walter A. and Marcos, Joao. 2001. Ex contradictione non sequitur quodlibet. Pages 89–109 of: *Proceedings of the Advanced Reasoning Forum Conference*, vol. 1. Berkeley and Monte Rio, California, USA.
- Casemaker. 2015. *Casemaker*. www.casemaker.us/ProductsStateBarConsortium.aspx (accessed August 12, 2015).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2015. *Vaccine Acronyms & Abbreviations*. www.cdc.gov/vaccines/about/terms/vacc-abbrev.htm (accessed July 22, 2015).
- Cervone, Luca, Di Iorio, Angelo, Palmirani, Monica, and Vitali, Fabio. 2015. *Akoma Ntoso*. www.akomantoso.org/akoma-ntoso-in-detail/what-is-it/ (accessed October 8, 2015).
- Charniak, Eugene. 1991. Bayesian networks without tears. *AI Magazine*, 12(4), 50–63.
- Che, Bingqing, Qiang, Meng, and Yichi, Yepeng. 2015. *Capstone Project Report: LUIMA*.
- Chorley, Alison and Bench-Capon, Trevor. 2005a. AGATHA: automated construction of case law theories through heuristic search. Pages 45–54 of: *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Chorley, Alison and Bench-Capon, Trevor. 2005b. AGATHA: using heuristic search to automate the construction of case law theories. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 13(1), 9–51.
- Chorley, Alison and Bench-Capon, Trevor. 2005c. An empirical investigation of reasoning with legal cases through theory construction and application. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 13(3–4), 323–71.
- Chu-Carroll, Jennifer, Brown, Eric W., Lally, Adam, and Murdock, J. William. 2012. Identifying implicit relationships. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 56(3.4), 12:1–12:10.
- Clement, Kevin. 2016. Propositional logic. In: *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. IEP. www.iep.utm.edu/ (accessed August 4, 2016).
- Cohen, Jacob 1960. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1), 37–46.
- Cutler, Kim-Mai. 2015. *YC's ROSS Intelligence Leverages IBM's Watson to Make Sense of Legal Knowledge*. <http://techcrunch.com/2015/07/27/ross-intelligence/> (accessed December 31, 2015).
- Dabney, Daniel P. 1993. *Statistical Modeling of Relevance Judgments for Probabilistic Retrieval of American Case Law*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Daelemans, Walter, Zavrel, Jakub, van der Sloot, Ko, and van den Bosch, Anton. 2004. *TiMBL: Tilburg Memory based Learner, Version 5.02 (now 6.3)*. <http://ilk.uvt.nl/timbl/> (accessed July 19, 2015).
- Daniels, Jody J. and Rissland, Edwina L. 1997a. Finding legally relevant passages in case opinions. Pages 39–46 of: *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. ICAIL '97. New York, NY: ACM.
- Daniels, Jody J. and Rissland, Edwina L. 1997b. What you saw is what you want: using cases to seed information retrieval. Pages 325–36 of: *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Case-Based Reasoning*. Providence, RI: Springer.
- Daudaravicius, Vidas. 2012. Automatic multilingual annotation of EU legislation with EuroVoc descriptors. Pp. 14–20 of: *EEOP2012: Exploring and Exploiting Official Publications Workshop Programme*. Istanbul, Turkey.
- de Maat, Emile, Krabben, Kai, and Winkels, Radboud. 2010. Machine learning versus knowledge based classification of legal texts. In: Winkels, R. (ed.), *JURIX 2010*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- de Maat, Emile and Winkels, Radboud. 2007. Categorisation of norms. Pages 79–88 of: *JURIX 2007*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

- de Maat, Emile and Winkels, Radboud. 2009. A next step towards automated modelling of sources of law. Pages 31–9 of: *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. ICAIL '09. New York, NY: ACM.
- Deisher-Edwards, Julie. 2015. *TILABuddy: An Automated Approach to Corporate Compliance*. Unpublished student course paper on file with author.
- Desatnik, Eric. 2016. *The IBM Watson AI XPRIZE, a Cognitive Computing Competition*. www.xprize.org/AI (accessed May 21, 2016).
- Dick, Judith and Hirst, Graeme. 1991. A case-based representation of legal text for conceptual retrieval. In: *Workshop on Language and Information Processing, American Society for Information Science*. Washington, DC.
- Dietrich, Antje, Lockemann, Peter C., and Raabe, Oliver. 2007. Agent approach to online legal trade. Pages 177–94 of: *Conceptual Modelling in Information Systems Engineering*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Dowden, Bradley. 2016. Liar's paradox. In: *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. IEP. www.iep.utm.edu/ (accessed August 4, 2016).
- Dukeminier, Jesse, Krier, James, Alexander, Gregory, and Shill, Michael. 2010. *Property*. New York: Aspen.
- Dung, Phan Minh. 1995. On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in non-monotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *Artificial Intelligence*, 77(2), 321–57.
- Dvorsky, George. 2014. *IBM's Watson Can Now Debate Its Opponents (Demo at 45.47 Minute Mark)*. <http://io9.com/ibms-watson-can-now-debate-its-opponents-1571837847> (accessed February 1, 2015).
- Eckholm, Erik. 2015. *Harvard Law Library Readies Trove of Decisions for Digital Age*. www.nytimes.com/2015/10/29/us/harvard-law-library-sacrifices-a-trove-for-the-sake-of-a-free-database.html?_r=0 (accessed December 30, 2015).
- Epstein, Edward, Schor, Marshall, Iyer, Bhavani, et al. 2012. Making Watson fast. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 56(3.4), 15:1–15:12.
- EuroVoc. 2014. *EuroVoc*. <http://eurovoc.europa.eu/drupal/> (accessed August 27, 2014).
- Fagan, Frank. 2016. Big data legal scholarship: toward a research program and practitioners guide. *Virginia Journal of Law and Technology*, 20, 1–81.
- Falakmasir, Mohammad. 2016. *Comprehensive Exam Answer: Argument Mining (Revised)*. University of Pittsburgh Intelligent Systems Program.
- Feller, Robert. 2015. Judicial review of administrative decisions and procedure. In: Philip Weinberg and William R. Ginsberg (eds.), *Environmental Law and Regulation in New York 3:48* (2nd edn.). 9 N.Y.Prac.: New York Practice Series – Environmental Law and Regulation in New York.
- Feng, Vanessa Wei and Hirst, Graeme. 2011. Classifying arguments by scheme. Pages 987–96 of: *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies – Volume 1*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ferrucci, David A. 2012. Introduction to “This is Watson.” *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 56(3/4), 1:1–1:15.
- Ferrucci, David A., Brown, Eric W., Chu-Carroll, Jennifer et al. 2010. Building Watson: an overview of the DeepQA Project. *AI Magazine*, 31(3), 59–79.
- Finkel, Jenny, Rafferty, Anna, Kleeman, Alex, and Manning, Christopher. 2003–14. *Stanford Classifier*. <http://nlp.stanford.edu/software/classifier.shtml> (accessed July 22, 2015).
- Flood, Mark D. and Goodenough, Oliver R. 2015. Contract as automation: the computational representation of financial agreements. Office of Financial Research Working Paper,

- 15-04. https://financialresearch.gov/working-papers/files/OFRwp-2015-04_Contract-as-Automaton-The-Computational-Representation-of-Financial-Agreements.pdf (accessed July 29, 2016).
- Francesconi, Enrico. 2009. An approach to legal rules modelling and automatic learning. Pages 59–68 of: *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems: JURIX 2009: The Twenty-Second Annual Conference*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands : IOS Press.
- Francesconi, Enrico, Montemagni, Simonetta, Peters, Wim, and Tiscornia, Daniela. 2010. Integrating a bottom-up and top-down methodology for building semantic resources for the multilingual legal domain. Pages 95–121 of: Francesconi, Enrico, Montemagni, Simonetta, Peters, Wim, and Tiscornia, Daniela (eds.), *Semantic Processing of Legal Texts*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Francesconi, Enrico and Passerini, Andrea. 2007. Automatic classification of provisions in legislative texts. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 15, 1–17.
- Francesconi, Enrico and Peruginelli, Ginevra. 2008. Integrated access to legal literature through automated semantic classification. *AI and Law*, 17, 31–49.
- Freitag, Dayne. 2000. Machine learning for information extraction in informal domains. *Machine learning*, 39(2–3), 169–202.
- Fuller, Lon L. 1958. Positivism and fidelity to law: a reply to Professor Hart. *Harvard Law Review*, 630–72.
- Gangemi, Aldo, Guarino, Nicola, Masolo, Claudio, Oltramari, Alessandro, and Schneider, Luc. 2002. Sweetening ontologies with DOLCE. Pages 166–81 of: *Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management: Ontologies and the Semantic Web*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Gardner, Anne vdL. 1985. Overview of an artificial intelligence approach to legal reasoning. Pages 247–74 of: *Computer Power and Legal Reasoning*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co.
- Gardner, Anne vdL. 1987. *An Artificial Intelligence Approach to Legal Reasoning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gonçalves, Teresa and Quaresma, Paulo. 2005. Is linguistic information relevant for the classification of legal texts? Pages 168–76 of: *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Gordon, David G. and Breaux, Travis D. 2013. A cross-domain empirical study and legal evaluation of the requirements water marking method. *Requirements Engineering*, 18(2), 147–73.
- Gordon, Thomas F. 1987. Some problems with prolog as a knowledge representation language for legal expert systems. *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 3(1), 52–67.
- Gordon, Thomas F. 2008a. The legal knowledge interchange format (LKIF). *Estrella deliverable d4*, 1–28 (accessed March 22, 2017).
- Gordon, Thomas F. 2008b. Constructing legal arguments with rules in the legal knowledge interchange format (LKIF). Pages 162–84 of: *Computable Models of the Law*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Gordon, Thomas F. 2008c. Hybrid reasoning with argumentation schemes. Pages 543 of: *Proceedings of the 2008 Conference on Knowledge-based Software Engineering: Proceedings of the Eighth Joint Conference on Knowledge-based Software Engineering*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Gordon, Thomas F. 2014. Software engineering for research on legal argumentation. In: *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop for Methodologies for Research on Legal Argumentation (MET-ARG)*. (On file with author.)

- Gordon, Thomas F. 2015a. *Carneades 3.7 User Manual*. <https://carneades.github.io/manuals/Carneades3.7/carneades-3.7-manual.pdf> (accessed November 16, 2015).
- Gordon, Thomas F. 2015b. *Carneades Tools for Argument (Re)construction, Evaluation, Mapping and Interchange*. <http://carneades.github.io/Carneades/> (accessed November 23, 2015).
- Gordon, Thomas F., Governatori, Guido, and Rotolo, Antonino. 2009. Rules and norms: requirements for rule interchange languages in the legal domain. Pages 282–96 of: *Rule Interchange and Applications*. Dordrecht; Springer.
- Gordon, Thomas F., Prakken, Henry, and Walton, Douglas. 2007. The Carneades model of argument and burden of proof. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171(10–5), 875–96. *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*.
- Gordon, Thomas F. and Walton, Douglas. 2006. The Carneades argumentation framework using presumptions and exceptions to model critical questions. Pages 5–13 of: *6th Computational Models of Natural Argument Workshop (CMNA), European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)*, Italy.
- Gordon, Thomas F. and Walton, Douglas. 2009. Legal reasoning with argumentation schemes. Pages 137–46 of: *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Governatori, Guido and Shek, Sidney. 2012 (August). Rule based business process compliance. Pages 1–8 of: *6th International Rule Challenge @ RuleML 2012. CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. Volume 874. Paper 5.
- Grabmair, Matthias. 2016. *Modeling Purposive Legal Argumentation and Case Outcome Prediction using Argument Schemes in the Value Judgment Formalism*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Grabmair, Matthias and Ashley, Kevin D. 2010. Argumentation with value judgments: an example of hypothetical reasoning. Pages 67–76 of: *Proceedings of the 2010 Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems: JURIX 2010: The Twenty-Third Annual Conference*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Grabmair, Matthias and Ashley, Kevin D. 2011. Facilitating case comparison using value judgments and intermediate legal concepts. Pages 161–70 of: *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Artificial intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Grabmair, Matthias, Ashley, Kevin, Chen, Ran. et al. 2015. Introducing LUIMA: an experiment in legal conceptual retrieval of vaccine injury decisions using a UIMA type system and tools. Pages 1–10 of: *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. ICAIL 2015. New York, NY: ACM.
- Grabmair, Matthias, Ashley, Kevin D., Hwa, Rebecca, and Sweeney, P. M. 2011. Towards extracting information from public health statutes using text classification and machine learning. In: Atkinson, Katie M. (ed.), *JURIX 2011: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Grabmair, Matthias, Gordon, Thomas F., and Walton, Douglas. 2010. Probabilistic semantics for the Carneades argument model using Bayesian networks. Pages 255–66 of: *Proceedings of the 2010 Conference on Computational Models of Argument: Proceedings of COMMA 2010*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Granat, Richard and Lauritsen, Marc. 2014. Teaching the technology of practice: the 10 top schools. *Law Practice Magazine*, 40(4) www.americanbar.org/publications/law_practice_magazine/2014/july-august/teaching-the-technology-of-practice-the-10-top-schools.html (accessed February 2, 2015).

- Gray, Grayfred B. 1985. Statutes enacted in normalized form: the legislative experience in Tennessee. Pages 467–93 of: *Computer Power and Legal Reasoning*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.
- Gray, Jeff. 2014. University of Toronto's next lawyer: a computer program named Ross. *The Globe and Mail* www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/the-law-page/university-of-torontos-next-lawyer-a-computer-program-named-ross/article22054688/ (accessed February 3, 2015).
- Grossman, Maura R. and Cormack, Gordon V. 2010. Technology-assisted review in e-discovery can be more effective and more efficient than exhaustive manual review. *Richmond Journal of Law & Technology*, 17, 1–48.
- Grossman, Maura R. and Cormack, Gordon V. 2014. Grossman–Cormack glossary of technology-assisted review. *Federal Courts Law Review*, 7, 85–112.
- Gultemen, Dincer and van Engers, Thomas. 2014. Graph-based linking and visualization for legislation documents (GLVD). Pages 67–80 of: Winkels, Radboud, Lettieri, Nicola, and Faro, Sebastiano. (eds.), *Network Analysis in Law*. Collana: Diritto Scienza Tecnologia/Law Science Technology Temi, 3. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Hachey, Ben and Grover, Claire. 2006. Extractive summarisation of legal texts. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 14(4), 305–45.
- Hafner, Carole. 1978. An information retrieval system based on a computer model of legal knowledge. Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI. AAI7807057.
- Hart, Herbert Lionel Adolphus. 1958. Positivism and the separation of law and morals. *Harvard Law Review*, 71, 593–629.
- Hashmi, Mustafa, Governatori, Guido, and Wynn, Moe Thandar. 2014. Normative requirements for business process compliance. Pages 100–16 of: *Service Research and Innovation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Henderson, William D. 2013. A blueprint for change. *Pepperdine Law Review*, 40(2), 461–507.
- Henseler, Hans. 2010. Network-based filtering for large email collections in e-discovery. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 18(4), 413–30.
- Herring, David J. and Lynch, Collin. 2014. Measuring law student learning outcomes: 2013 lawyering class. UNM School of Law Research Paper.
- Hoekstra, Rinke. 2010. The knowledge reengineering bottleneck. *Semantic Web*, 1(1,2), 111–15.
- Hoekstra, Rinke and Boer, Alexander. 2014. A network analysis of Dutch regulations – using the MetaLex Document Server. Pages 47–58 of: Winkels, Radboud, Lettieri, Nicola, and Faro, Sebastiano (eds.), *Network Analysis in Law*. Collana: Diritto Scienza Tecnologia/Law Science Technology Temi, 3. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Hogan, Christopher, Bauer, Robert, and Brassil, Dan. 2009. Human-aided computer cognition for e-discovery. Pages 194–201 of: *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Hogan, Christopher, Bauer, Robert S., and Brassil, Dan. 2010. Automation of legal sensemaking in e-discovery. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 18(4), 431–57.
- Hu, Xia and Liu, Huan. 2012. *Mining Text Data*. Boston, MA: Springer US.
- IBM Watson Developer Cloud Watson Services. 2015. *IBM Watson Developer Cloud Watson Services*. www.ibm.com/smarterplanet/us/en/ibmwatson/developercloud/services-catalog.html (accessed February 1, 2015).
- IBM Watson Developer Cloud Watson Services. 2016. *Alchemy Language*. www.ibm.com/smarterplanet/us/en/ibmwatson/developercloud/alchemy-language.html (accessed May 22, 2016).

- Iron Tech Lawyer. 2015. *The Program in Legal Technologies*, Georgetown Law, Iron Tech Lawyer. Georgetown Law School. www.law.georgetown.edu/academics/centers-institutes/legal-profession/legal-technologies/iron-tech/index.cfm (accessed February 3, 2015).
- Jackson, Brian. 2015. *Meet Ross, the Watson-Powered "Super Intelligent" Attorney*. www.itbusiness.ca/news/meet-ross-the-watson-powered-super-intelligent-attorney/53376 (accessed December 31, 2015).
- Jackson, Peter, Al-Kofahi, Khalid, Tyrrell, Alex, and Vachher, Arun. 2003. Information extraction from case law and retrieval of prior cases. *Artificial Intelligence*, 150(1-2), 239-90. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*.
- Jurafsky, Daniel and Martin, James. 2015. Classification: naive Bayes, logistic regression, sentiment. Chapter 7, pages 1-28 of: Jurafsky, Daniel and Martin, James (eds.), *Speech and Language Processing*. Stanford University. Draft of August 24, 2015, <https://web.stanford.edu/~jurafsky/slp3/7.pdf> (accessed September 29, 2016).
- Kafura, Dennis. 2011. *Notes on Petri Nets*. <http://people.cs.vt.edu/~kafura/ComputationalThinking/Class-Notes/Petri-Net-Notes-Expanded.pdf> (accessed August 9, 2016).
- Kakwani, Nanak. 1980. On a class of poverty measures. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 437-46.
- Katz, Daniel M. and Bommarito, Michael. 2014. *Legal Analytics – Introduction to the Course*. www.slideshare.net/Danielkatz/legal-analytics-introduction-to-the-course-professor-daniel-martin-katz-professor-michael-j-bommartio-ii-31350591 (accessed May 12, 2016).
- Katz, Daniel M., Bommarito, Michael, and Blackman, Josh. 2014. *Predicting the Behavior of the United States Supreme Court: A General Approach* (July 21, 2014). <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2463244> (accessed May 26, 2015).
- Kelly, John E. and Hamm, Steve. 2013. *Smart Machines: IBM's Watson and the Era of Cognitive Computing*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Kiyavitskaya, Nadzeya, Zeni, Nicola, Breaux, Travis D. et al. 2008. Automating the extraction of rights and obligations for regulatory compliance. Pages 154-68 of: *Conceptual Modeling – ER 2008*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Koetter, Falko, Kochanowski, Monika, Weisbecker, Anette, Fehling, Christoph, and Leymann, Frank. 2014. Integrating compliance requirements across business and IT. Pages 218-25 of: *Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference (EDOC), 2014 IEEE 18th International*. New York, NY: IEEE.
- Kohavi, Ron. 1995. A study of cross-validation and bootstrap for accuracy estimation and model selection. Pages 1137-43 of: *Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence – Volume 2*. IJCAI'95. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Kohavi, Ron and Provost, Foster. 1998. Glossary of terms. *Machine Learning*, 30(2-3), 271-4.
- Kritzer, Albert H. 2015. *CISG Database*. Institute of International Commercial Law, Pace Law School. www.cisg.law.pace.edu/ (accessed February 4, 2015).
- Landauer, Thomas K, Foltz, Peter W., and Laham, Darrell. 1998. An introduction to latent semantic analysis. *Discourse Processes*, 25(2-3), 259-84.
- Legal OnRamp. 2015. *Legal OnRamp*. www.legalonramp.com/ (accessed February 1, 2015).
- LegalSifter. 2016. *LegalSifter Use Cases*. www.legalsifter.com/use-cases (accessed May 3, 2016).
- Legaltech News. 2016. *Legaltech News*. www.legaltechnews.com/ (accessed September 19, 2016).
- Levi, Edward H. 2013. *An Introduction to Legal Reasoning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levy, Ran, Bilu, Yonatan, Hershovich, Daniel, Aharoni, Ehud, and Slonim, Noam. 2014. Context dependent claim detection. Pages 1489-500 of: *Proceedings of COLING 2014*,

- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. 2015. *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster. <http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/mwcollegiate/explanation/o> (accessed February 5, 2015).
- Mimouni, Nada, Fernandez, Meritxell, Nazarenko, Adeline, Bourcier, Daniele, and Salotti, Sylvie. 2014. A relational approach for information retrieval on XML legal sources. Pages 169–92 of: Winkels, Radboud, Lettieri, Nicola, and Faro, Sebastiano (eds.) *Network Analysis in Law*. Collana: Diritto Scienza Tecnologia/Law Science Technology Temi, 3. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Mitchell, Thomas. 2015. *Generative and Discriminative Classifiers: Naive Bayes and Logistic Regression* www.cs.cmu.edu/~tom/mlbook/NBayesLogReg.pdf (accessed July 14, 2015).
- Mochales, Raquel and Moens, Marie-Francine. 2011. Argumentation mining. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 19(1), 1–22.
- Modgil, Sanjay and Prakken, Henry. 2014. The ASPIC+ framework for structured argumentation: a tutorial. *Argument & Computation*, 5(1), 31–62.
- Moens, Marie-Francine, Boiy, Erik, Palau, Raquel Mochales, and Reed, Chris. 2007. Automatic detection of arguments in legal texts. Pages 225–30 of: *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law. ICAIL '07*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Mohri, Mehryar, Rostamizadeh, Afshin, and Talwalkar, Ameet. 2012. *Foundations of Machine Learning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Morelock, John T., Wiltshire, James S., Ahmed, Salahuddin, Humphrey, Timothy L., and Lu, X. Allen. 2004 (August 3). System and method for identifying facts and legal discussion in court case law documents. US Patent 6,772,149.
- Neota Logic. 2016. *Neota Logic*. www.neotalogic.com/ (accessed August 9, 2016).
- Newman, Rick. 2014. *IBM Unveils a Computer that can Argue*. The Exchange. <http://finance.yahoo.com/blogs/the-exchange/ibm-unveils-a-computer-than-can-argue-181228620.htm> (accessed February 1, 2015).
- Nigam, Kamal, Lafferty, John, and McCallum, Andrew. 1999. Using maximum entropy for text classification. Pages 61–7 of: *IJCAI-99 Workshop on Machine Learning for Information Filtering*, vol. 1. Stockholm, Sweden.
- NIST/SEMATECH. 2016. *NIST/SEMATECH e-Handbook of Statistical Methods* www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/ (accessed May 30, 2016).
- Noble, William S. 2006. What is a support vector machine? *Nature Biotechnology*, 24(12), 1565–7.
- Oard, Douglas W. and Webber, William. 2013. Information retrieval for e-discovery. *Information Retrieval*, 7(2–3), 99–237.
- Oasis. 2016. *Akoma Ntoso Naming Convention Version 1.0, Committee Specification Draft 02/Public Review Draft 02*, 04 May 2016 www.akomantoso.org/akoma-ntoso-in-detail/what-is-it/ (accessed June 12, 2016).
- Oberle, Daniel, Drefs, Felix, Wacker, Richard, Baumann, Christian, and Raabe, Oliver. 2012. Engineering compliant software: advising developers by automating legal reasoning. *SCRIPTed*, 9(2), 280–313.
- Oh, Peter B. 2010. Veil-piercing. *Texas Law Review*, 89, 81–145.
- Opsomer, Rob, Meyer, Geert De, Cornelis, Chris, and van Eetvelde, Greet. 2009. Exploiting properties of legislative texts to improve classification accuracy. In: Governatori, Guido (ed.), *JURIX 2009: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Palanque, Philippe A. and Bastide, Remi. 1995. Petri net based design of user-driven interfaces using the interactive cooperative objects formalism. Pages 383–400 of: *Interactive Systems: Design, Specification, and Verification*. Dordrecht: Springer.

- Palmirani, Monica. 2011. Legislative change management with Akoma-Ntoso. Pages 101–30 of: Sartor, Giovanni, Palmirani, Monica, Francesconi, Enrico, and Biasiotti, Maria Angela (eds.), *Legislative XML for the Semantic Web*. Law, Governance and Technology Series, vol. 4. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pouliquen, Bruno, Steinberger, Raif, and Ignat, Camelia. 2006. *Automatic Annotation of Multi-lingual Text Collections with a Conceptual Thesaurus*. arXiv preprint cs/0609059.
- Prager, John, Brown, Eric, Coden, Anni, and Radev, Dragomir. 2000. Question-answering by predictive annotation. Pages 184–91 of: *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Prakken, Henry. 1995. From logic to dialectics in legal argument. Pages 165–74 of: *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Prakken, Henry. 2005. AI & Law, logic and argument schemes. *Argumentation*, 19(3), 303–20.
- Prakken, Henry and Sartor, Giovanni. 1998. Modelling reasoning with precedents in a formal dialogue game. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 6, 231–87.
- Privault, Caroline, O'Neill, Jacki, Ciriza, Victor, and Renders, Jean-Michel. 2010. A new tangible user interface for machine learning document review. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 18(4), 459–79.
- Putman, William H. 2008 *Legal Analysis and Writing for Paralegals*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Quinlan, J. Ross. 1986. Induction of decision trees. *Machine Learning*, 1(1), 81–106.
- Quinlan, J. Ross. 2004. *C4.5 Release 8* www.rulequest.com/Personal/ (accessed July 19, 2015).
- Rahwan, Iyad, Simari, Guillermo R., and van Benthem, Johan. 2009. *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 47. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Ravel Law. 2015a. *Ravel: Data Driven Research* www.ravellaw.com (accessed December 30, 2015).
- Ravel Law. 2015b. *Ravel Judge Analytics* (accessed December 31, 2015).
- Ravel Law. 2015c. *Ravel QuickStart Guide*. https://d2xkpk2ofm9wy8.cloudfront.net/downloads/Ravel_QuickStart_Guide.pdf (accessed December 31, 2015).
- Ravel Law. 2015d. *What Determines Relevance*. <https://ravellaw.zendesk.com/hc/en-us/articles/213290777-What-determines-Relevance-> (accessed December 31, 2015).
- Reed, Chris and Rowe, Glenn. 2004. Araucaria: software for argument analysis, diagramming and representation. *International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools*, 13(04), 961–79.
- Remus, Dana and Levy, Frank S. 2015. *Can Robots be Lawyers? Computers, Lawyers, and the Practice of Law* (December 30, 2015) <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2701092> (accessed July 24, 2016).
- Rissland, Edwina L. 1990. Artificial intelligence and law: stepping stones to a model of legal reasoning. *Yale Law Journal*, 1957–81.
- Rissland, Edwina L. and Friedman, M. Timur. 1995. Detecting change in legal concepts. Pages 127–36 of: *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Rissland, Edwina L. and Skalak, David B. 1991. CABARET: statutory interpretation in a hybrid architecture. *International Journal of Man–Machine Studies*, 34, 839–87.
- Rissland, Edwina L., Skalak, David B., and Friedman M. Timur. 1996. BankXX: supporting legal arguments through heuristic retrieval. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 4(1), 1–71.

- Robaldo, Livio, Humphreys, Llio, Sun, Xin et al. 2015. Combining input/output logic and reification for representing real-world obligations. In: *Proceedings of the Ninth International Workshop on Juris-Informatics*. JURISIN 2015. Kanagawa, Japan.
- Rose, Daniel E. and Belew, Richard K. 1991. A connectionist and symbolic hybrid for improving legal research. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 35(1), 1–33.
- Ross Intelligence. 2015. *Ross: Your Brand New Super Intelligent Attorney* www.rossintelligence.com/ (accessed December 30, 2015).
- Saravanan, Manimaran and Ravindran, Balaraman. 2010. Identification of rhetorical roles for segmentation and summarization of a legal judgment. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 18(1), 45–76.
- Saravanan, Manimaran, Ravindran, Balaraman, and Raman, Subramanian. 2009. Improving legal information retrieval using an ontological framework. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 17(2), 101–24.
- Sartor, Giovanni, Walton, Doug, Macagno, Fabrizio, and Rotolo, Antonino. 2014. Argumentation schemes for statutory interpretation: a logical analysis. Page 11 of: *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems: JURIX 2014: The Twenty-Seventh Annual Conference*, vol. 271. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Savelka, Jaromír and Ashley, Kevin D. 2015. Transfer of predictive models for classification of statutory texts in multi-jurisdictional settings. Pages 216–20 of: *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Savelka, Jaromir, Ashley, Kevin, and Grabmair, Matthias. 2014. Mining information from statutory texts in multi-jurisdictional settings. Pages 133–42 of: *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems: JURIX 2014: The Twenty-Seventh Annual Conference*, vol. 271. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Savelka, Jaromir and Grabmair, Matthias. 2015. (Brief) Introduction to (Selected Aspects of) Natural Language Processing and Machine Learning, Tutorial at Workshop on Automated Detection, Extraction and Analysis of Semantic Information in Legal Texts. <http://people.cs.pitt.edu/~jsavelka/docs/20150612ASAILTutorial.pdf> (accessed July 1, 2016).
- Savelka, Jaromir, Trivedi, Gaurav, and Ashley, Kevin D. 2015. Applying an interactive machine learning approach to statutory analysis. Pages 101–10 of: *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems: JURIX 2015: The Twenty-Eighth Annual Conference*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Schank, Roger C. 1996. Goal-based scenarios: Case-based reasoning meets learning by doing. Pp. 295–347 of: David Leake (ed.), *Case-based Reasoning: Experiences, Lessons & Future Directions*. Menlo Park, CA: AAAI Press/The MIT Press.
- Schank, Roger C., Kolodner, Janet L., and DeJong, Gerald. 1981. Conceptual information retrieval. Pages 94–116 of: *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual ACM Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. SIGIR '80. Kent, UK: Butterworth & Co.
- Schauer, Frederick. 1995. Giving reasons. *Stanford Law Review*, 47, 633–59.
- Scheer, August-Wilhelm, Kruppke, Helmut, Jost, Wolfram, and Kindermann, Herbert. 2006. *Agility by ARIS Business Process Management: Yearbook Business Process Excellence 2006/2007*, vol. 243. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Schwartz, Ariel. 2011. *Why Watson Wagered \$947, and Other Intel on the Jeopardy Supercomputer* www.fastcompany.com/1728740/why-watson-wagered-947-and-other-intel-jeopardy-supercompute (accessed February 1, 2015).
- Sebastiani, Fabrizio. 2002. Machine learning in automated text categorization. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 34(1), 1–47.

- Sergot, Marek J., Sadri, Fariba, Kowalski, Robert A. et al. 1986. The British Nationality Act as a logic program. *Communications of the ACM*, 29(5), 370–86.
- Shrivathsan, Michael. 2009. *Use Cases Definition (Requirements Management Basics)*. <http://pmblog.accompa.com/2009/09/19/use-cases-definition-requirements-management-basics/> (accessed July 1, 2016).
- Sklar, Howard. 2011. Using built-in sampling to overcome defensibility concerns with computer-expedited review. Pages 155–61 of: *Proceedings of the Fourth DESI Workshop on Setting Standards for Electronically Stored Information in Discovery Proceedings*. Pittsburgh, PA.
- Slonim, Noam. 2014. *IBM Debating Technologies How Persuasive Can a Computer Be?* Presentation at Frontiers and Connections between Argumentation Theory and Natural Language Processing Workshop (July 22, 2014). Bertinoro, Italy.
- Sohn, Edward. 2013. *Top Ten Concepts to Understand about Predictive Coding*. www.aac.com/legalresources/publications/topten/ttctuapc.cfm (accessed May 27, 2015).
- Sowa, John F. 1984. *Conceptual Structures: Information Processing in Mind and Machine*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc.
- Sowizral, Henry A. and Kipps, James R. 1985. *Rosie: A Programming Environment for Expert Systems*. Technical Report. DTIC Document.
- Spaeth, Harold J., Benesh, Sara, Epstein, Lee et al. 2013. *Supreme Court Database, Version 2013 Release 01* <http://supremecourtdatabase.org> (accessed August 30, 2015).
- Staudt, Ronald and Lauritsen, Marc. 2013. Symposium on justice, lawyering, and legal education in the digital age. *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, 88(3) <http://studentorgs.kentlaw.iit.edu/cklawreview/issues/vol-88-issue-3/> (accessed February 3, 2015).
- Steinberger, Raif, Ebrahim, Mohamed, and Ignat, Camelia. 2013. *JRC EuroVoc Indexer JEX-A Freely Available Multi-label Categorisation Tool*. arXiv preprint.
- Strötgen, Jannik and Gertz, Michael. 2013. Multilingual and cross-domain temporal tagging. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 47(2), 269–98.
- Surdeanu, Mihai, Nallapati, Ramesh, Gregory, George, Walker, Joshua, and Manning, Christopher D. 2011. Risk analysis for intellectual property litigation. Pages 116–20 of: *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Susskind, Richard. 2010. *The End of Lawyers?: Rethinking the Nature of Legal Services*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sweeney, Patricia M., Bjerke, Elisabeth E., Potter, Margaret A. et al. 2014. Network analysis of manually-encoded state laws and prospects for automation. In: Winkels, Radboud (ed.), *Network Analysis in Law*. Diritto Scienza Tecnologia.
- Szoke, Akos, Macsar, Krisztian, and Strausz, Gyorgy. 2014. A text analysis framework for automatic semantic knowledge representation of legal documents. Pages 59–66 of: Winkels, Radboud, Lettieri, Nicola, and Faro, Sebastiano (eds.), *Network Analysis in Law*. Collana: Diritto Scienza Tecnologia/Law Science Technology Temi, 3. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Takano, Kenji, Nakamura, Makoto, Oyama, Yoshiko, and Shimazu, Akira. 2010. Semantic analysis of paragraphs consisting of multiple sentences: towards development of a logical formulation system. Pages 117–26 of: *Proceedings of the 2010 Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems: JURIX 2010: The Twenty-Third Annual Conference*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands : IOS Press.
- Teufel, Simone, Siddharthan, Advaith, and Batchelor, Colin. 2009. Towards discipline-independent argumentative zoning: evidence from chemistry and computational linguistics. Pages 1493–502 of: *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Empirical Methods*

- in *Natural Language Processing: Volume 3*. EMNLP '09. Stroudsburg, PA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thielscher, Michael. 2011. A unifying action calculus. *Artificial Intelligence*, 175(1), 120–41.
- Thompson, Paul. 2001. Automatic categorization of case law. Pages 70–7 of: *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Tredennick, John. 2014a. *Measuring Recall in E-Discovery Review: A Tougher Problem than You might Realize, Part 1* www.catalystsecure.com/blog/2014/10/measuring-recall-in-e-discovery-review-a-tougher-problem-than-you-might-realize-part-1/ (accessed September 1, 2016).
- Tredennick, John. 2014b. *Measuring Recall in E-Discovery Review: A Tougher Problem than You might Realize, Part 2* <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4465/8cefo355aa63279f6dc2657eb1326dac8229.pdf> (accessed September 1, 2016).
- Turney, Peter D. and Pantel, Patrick. 2010. From frequency to meaning: vector space models of semantics. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 37(1), 141–88.
- Turtle, Howard. 1995. Text retrieval in the legal world. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 3(1–2), 5–54.
- Turtle, Howard and Croft, W. Bruce. 1990. Inference networks for document retrieval. Pages 1–24 of: *Proceedings of the 13th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. SIGIR '90. New York, NY: ACM.
- Uyttendaele, Caroline, Moens, Marie-Francine, and Dumortier, Jos. 1998. SALOMON: automatic abstracting of legal cases for effective access to court decisions. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 6(1), 59–79.
- van der Pol, Jorke. 2011. *Rules-Driven Business Services: Flexibility with the Boundaries of the Law*. Invited talk of Jorke van der Pol, Senior advisor, Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, Immigration and Naturalisation Service, The Netherlands at the *Thirteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*, University of Pittsburgh School of Law.
- Van Engers, Tom, Boer, Alexander, Breuker, Joost, Valente, André, and Winkels, Radboud. 2008. Ontologies in the legal domain. Pages 233–61 of: *Digital Government*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Van Kralingen, Robert W., Visser, Pepijn R. S., Bench-Capon, Trevor J. M., and Van Den Herik, H. Jaap. 1999. A principled approach to developing legal knowledge systems. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 51(6), 1127–54.
- Verheij, Bart. 2009. The Toulmin argument model in artificial intelligence. Pages 219–38 of: *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Verheij, Bart, Bex, Floris, Timmer, Sjoerd T. et al. 2015. Arguments, scenarios and probabilities: connections between three normative frameworks for evidential reasoning. *Law, Probability and Risk*, 15, 35–70.
- Wagner, Karl and Klueckmann, Joerg. 2006. Business process design as the basis for compliance management, enterprise architecture and business rules. Pages 117–27 of: Scheer, August-Wilhelm, Kruppke, Helmut, Jost, Wolfram, and Kindermann, Herbert (eds.), *AGILITY by ARIS Business Process Management*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer.
- Walker, Vern R. 2007. A default-logic paradigm for legal fact-finding. *Jurimetrics*, 47, 193–243.
- Walker, Vern R. 2011. Empirically quantifying evidence assessment in legal decisions. Presentation at the *Second International Conference on Quantitative Aspects of Justice and Fairness* (February 25–6, 2011). Fiesole, Italy.
- Walker, Vern R. 2016. The need for annotated corpora from legal documents, and for (human) protocols for creating them: the attribution problem. In: Cabrio, Elena, Hirst, Graeme, Villata, Serena, and Wyner, Adam (eds.), *Natural Language Argumentation:*

- Mining, Processing, and Reasoning over Textual Arguments* (Dagstuhl Seminar 16161). http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2016/6692/pdf/dagrep_v006_i004_p080_s16161.pdf (accessed March 2, 2017).
- Walker, Vern R., Bagheri, Parisa, and Lauria, Andrew J. 2015a. *Argumentation Mining from Judicial Decisions: The Attribution Problem and the Need for Legal Discourse Models*. ICAIL 2015 Workshop on Automated Detection, Extraction and Analysis of Semantic Information in Legal Texts (June 12, 2015). San Diego, CA.
- Walker, Vern R., Carie, Nathaniel, DeWitt, Courtney C., and Lesh, Eric. 2011. A framework for the extraction and modeling of fact-finding reasoning from legal decisions: lessons from the Vaccine/Injury Project Corpus. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 19(4), 291–331.
- Walker, Vern R., Lopez, Bernadette C., Rutchik, Matthew T., and Agris, Julie L. 2015b. Representing the logic of statutory rules in the United States. Pages 357–81 of: *Logic in the Theory and Practice of Lawmaking*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Walker, Vern R. and Vazirova, Karina. 2014. Annotating patterns of reasoning about medical theories of causation in vaccine cases: toward a type system for arguments. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Argumentation Mining, at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2014*, vol. 1. Baltimore, MD.
- Walton, Doug and Gordon, Thomas F. 2009. *Legal Reasoning with Argumentation Schemes*. www.dougwalton.ca/talks/09GordonWaltonICAIL.pdf (accessed June 6, 2015).
- Walton, Douglas and Gordon, Thomas F. 2005. Critical questions in computational models of legal argument. Pages 103–11 of: Dunne, Paul and Bench-Capon, Trevor (eds.), *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence and Law*. IAAIL Workshop Series. Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Wolf Legal Publishers.
- Wang, Yining, Wang, Liwei, Li, Yuanzhi et al. 2013. A theoretical analysis of NDCG ranking measures. In: *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Conference on Learning Theory (COLT 2013)*. Princeton, NJ.
- Waterman, Donald A. and Peterson, Mark A. 1981. *Models of Legal Decision Making: Research Design and Methods*. Rand Corporation, The Institute for Civil Justice.
- Weber, Robert C. 2011. Why “Watson” matters to lawyers. *The National Law Journal*. www.nationallawjournal.com/id=1202481662966/Why-Watson-matters-to-lawyers?slreturn=20150424173345 (accessed May 24, 2015).
- Weiss, Charles. 2003. Expressing scientific uncertainty. *Law, Probability and Risk*, 2(1), 25–46.
- Winkels, Radboud and Boer, Alexander. 2014. Finding and visualizing context in Dutch legislation. Pages 23–9 of: Winkels, Radboud, Lettieri, Nicola, and Faro, Sebastiano (eds.), *Network Analysis in Law*. Collana: Diritto Scienza Tecnologia/Law Science Technology Temi, 3. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Winkels, Radboud, Bosscher, Doeko, Boer, Alexander, and Hoekstra, Rinke. 2000. Extended conceptual retrieval. Pages 85–97 of: *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems: JURIX 2000: The Thirteenth Annual Conference*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Winkels, Radboud and Hoekstra, Rinke. 2012. Automatic extraction of legal concepts and definitions. In: *JURIX 2012: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- WIPO. 2015. *Index of WIPO UDRP Panel Decisions*. www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/search/legalindex.jsp (accessed February 4, 2015).
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1958. *Philosophical Investigations* (3rd edn.). New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Wu, Stephen Tze-Inn, Kaggal, Vinod, Dligach, Dmitriy et al. 2013. A common type system for clinical natural language processing. *Journal of Biomedical Semantics*, 4, 1–12.

- Wyner, Adam. 2008. An ontology in OWL for legal case-based reasoning. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 16(4), 361–87.
- Wyner, Adam and Governatori, Guido. 2013. A study on translating regulatory rules from natural language to defeasible logic. In: *Proceedings of RuleML*. Seattle, WA.
- Wyner, Adam and Peters, Wim. 2010. Towards annotating and extracting textual legal case factors. Pages 36–45 of: *Proceedings of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC 2010), Workshop on Semantic Processing of Legal Texts (SPLeT 2010)*. Valletta, Malta.
- Wyner, Adam and Peters, Wim. 2011. On rule extraction from regulations. In: *JURIX 2011: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Wyner, Adam and Peters, Wim. 2012. Semantic annotations for legal text processing using GATE teamware. Pages 34–6 of: *LREC 2012 Conference Proceedings: Semantic Processing of Legal Texts (SPLeT-2012) Workshop*. Istanbul, Turkey.
- Yimam, Seid Muhie, Gurevych, Iryna, de Castilho, Richard Eckart, and Biemann, Chris. 2013. WebAnno: a flexible, web-based and visually supported system for distributed annotations. Pages 1–6 of: *ACL (Conference System Demonstrations)*. Sofia, Bulgaria.
- Yoshida, Yutaka, Honda, Kozo, Sei, Yuichi et al. 2013. Towards semi-automatic identification of functional requirements in legal texts for public administration. Pages 175–84 of: *JURIX. Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Yoshino, Hajime. 1995. The systematization of legal meta-inference. Pages 266–75 of: *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Yoshino, Hajime. 1998. Logical structure of contract law system – for constructing a knowledge base of the United Nations Convention on contracts for the international sale of goods. *Journal of Advanced Computational Intelligence*, 2(1), 2–11.
- Zeni, Nicola, Kiyavitskaya, Nadzeya, Mich, Luisa, Cordy, James R., and Mylopoulos, John. 2013. GaiusT: supporting the extraction of rights and obligations for regulatory compliance. *Requirements Engineering*, 20, 1–22.
- Zhang, Jiansong and El-Gohary, Nora M. 2015. Automated information transformation for automated regulatory compliance checking in construction. *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering*, 29, B4015001.
- Zhang, Paul. 2015. *Semantic Annotation of Legal Texts*. Invited Talk, ICAIL 2015 Workshop on Automated Detection, Extraction and Analysis of Semantic Information in Legal Texts.
- Zhang, Paul, Silver, Harry, Wasson, Mark, Steiner, David, and Sharma, Sanjay. 2014. Knowledge network based on legal issues. Pages 21–49 of: Winkels, Radboud, Lettieri, Nicola, and Faro, Sebastiano (eds.), *Network Analysis in Law*. Collana: Diritto Scienza Tecnologia/Law Science Technology Temi, 3. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Zhou, Li and Hripcsak, George. 2007. Temporal reasoning with medical data: a review with emphasis on medical natural language processing. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 40(2), 183–202.
- Zywica, Jolene and Gomez, Kimberley. 2008. Annotating to support learning in the content areas: teaching and learning science. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 155–65.