TAR for Smart People

How Technology Assisted Review Works and Why It Matters for Legal Professionals

By John Tredennick

with Mark Noel, Jeremy Pickens & Robert Ambrogi
© 2015 Catalyst. All Rights Reserved.


To download the digital edition of this book, please visit: www.catalystsecure.com/TARforSmartPeople

John has been widely honored for his achievements. In 2013, he was named by *The American Lawyer* as one of the top six “E-Discovery Trailblazers” in their special issue on the “Top Fifty Big Law Innovators” in the past fifty years. In 2012, he was named to the FastCase 50, which recognizes the smartest, most courageous innovators, techies, visionaries and leaders in the law. London’s *CityTech* magazine named him one of the “Top 100 Global Technology Leaders.” In 2009, he was named the Ernst & Young Entrepreneur of the Year for Technology in the Rocky Mountain Region. Also in 2009, he was named the Top Technology Entrepreneur by the Colorado Software and Internet Association.

John is the former chair of the ABA’s Law Practice Management Section. For many years, he was editor-in-chief of the ABA’s *Law Practice Management* magazine. Over two decades, John has written scores of articles on legal technology and spoken on legal technology to audiences on four of the five continents.
**Mark Noel, Esq.**

Mark Noel is a managing director of professional services at Catalyst, where he specializes in helping clients use technology assisted review, advanced analytics, and custom workflows to handle complex and large-scale litigations. Before joining Catalyst, Mark was a member of the Acuity team at FTI Consulting, co-founded an e-discovery software startup, and was an intellectual property litigator with Latham & Watkins LLP.

Mr. Noel graduated with honors from the University of Wisconsin Law School, and from the Georgia Institute of Technology with a degree in physics and minors in social and organizational psychology. Prior to law school, Mr. Noel was a researcher at Dartmouth College's Interactive Media Laboratory and Institute for Security Technology Studies, where his work focused on how people use technology to learn complex professional tasks.

**Jeremy Pickens, Ph.D.**

Jeremy Pickens is one of the world’s leading information retrieval scientists and a pioneer in the field of collaborative exploratory search, a form of information seeking in which a group of people who share a common information need actively collaborate to achieve it. Dr. Pickens has seven patents and patents pending in the field of search and information retrieval.

As senior applied research scientist at Catalyst, Dr. Pickens has spearheaded the development of Insight Predict. His ongoing research and development focuses on methods for continuous learning, and the variety of real world technology assisted review workflows that are only possible with this approach.

Dr. Pickens earned his doctoral degree at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Center for Intelligent Information Retrieval. He conducted his post-doctoral work at King's College, London. Before joining Catalyst, he spent five years as a research scientist at FX Palo Alto Lab, Inc. In addition to his Catalyst responsibilities, he continues to organize research workshops and speak at scientific conferences around the world.

**Robert Ambrogi, Esq.**

A lawyer and veteran legal journalist, Bob serves as Catalyst’s director of communications. He is also a practicing lawyer in Massachusetts and is the former editor-in-chief of *The National Law Journal, Lawyers USA* and *Massachusetts Lawyers Weekly*. A fellow of the College of Law Practice Management, he writes the award-winning blog *LawSites* and co-hosts the legal-affairs podcast *Lawyer2Lawyer*. He is a regular contributor to the ABA’s *Law Practice Journal* and is vice chair of the editorial board of the ABA’s *Law Practice* magazine.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword by Ralph Losey ................................. 6  
Introduction by John Tredennick ....................... 8  

**Introduction to TAR**

1. Introduction to Technology Assisted Review .......... 11  
2. Continuous Active Learning for Technology Assisted Review  
   *How It Works and Why It Matters for E-Discovery* .......... 22  
3. How Much Can CAL Save?  
   *A Closer Look at the Grossman/Cormack Research Results* .......... 35  
4. TAR 2.0 Capabilities Allow Use in Even More E-Discovery Tasks .......... 42  
5. Measuring Recall for E-Discovery Review  
   *An Introduction to Recall Sampling* .......... 49  

**The Five Myths of TAR**

6. Five Myths About Technology Assisted Review  
   *How TAR 2.0 Overcomes the Limits of Earlier Systems* .......... 58  
7. TAR 2.0: Continuous Ranking  
   *Is One Bite at the Apple Really Enough?* .......... 63  
8. Subject Matter Experts  
   *What Role Should They Play in TAR 2.0 Training?* .......... 76  
9. Comparing Active Learning to Random Sampling  
   *Using Zipf’s Law to Evaluate Which is More Effective for TAR* .......... 86  
10. Using TAR in International Litigation  
    *Does Predictive Coding Work for Non-English Languages?* .......... 97  

**Case Studies**

11. Using TAR to Find Hot Docs for Depositions  
    *How Insight Predict Succeeded Where Keywords Failed* .......... 104  
12. Using TAR to Expedite Multi-Language Review  
    *How Insight Predict’s Unique Capabilities Cut Review by Two Thirds* .......... 108  
    *Insight Predict Finds 75% of Hot Docs While Cutting Review 92%* .......... 112  
14. TAR Does Double Duty in a Government Probe  
    *Insight Predict Reduces Review and Rescues Privileged Documents* .......... 116  

Suggested Reading on TAR .................................. 119  
APPENDIX A: TAR in the Courts ......................... 121
Foreword

By Ralph Losey

The “eLeet” technology lawyers of the world all know John Tredennick and Catalyst, the company he started as a spin-off from his law firm. But they may not know, as I do, how focused John and Catalyst are on creating the smartest artificial intelligence-based predictive coding type search software possible. Adding TAR to your software is the right thing to do, the smart thing. Moreover, John is going about this in the right way. He is using a multi-disciplinary team approach to create this new predictive coding software. That is the kind of approach that I advocate in my e-Discovery Team blog. He has information scientists, computer engineers and tech savvy lawyers from his company all working together.

Although John uses a multi-disciplinary team approach, he knows that this is a product designed for lawyers, not scientists. This book follows the same approach. Although scientific and engineering knowledge went into this book, it is written for lawyers and advanced paralegals. It avoids most of the over-technical jargon and scientific complexities. I am happy to recommend John’s book to all legal professionals who want to learn more about predictive coding, and so to take their search for evidence to the next level.

The Continuous Active Learning (CAL) approach described in this book is definitively the way to go, and closely matches my latest writings on the subject, and current scientific research. One of the best things about this book is all of the science that has gone into it. The book is informed by scientists, but written by a lawyer, a former trial lawyer at that, who is adept at explaining complex issues in a simple manner. That makes the science much more accessible to the legal community.

Sometimes simplifications of science can go too far and create distortions. That is another strength of this book; it was checked by a team of scientists and engineers at Catalyst for technical errors. Although I do not always agree with the conclusions made
by Catalyst’s research team, most notably their experiments on doing predictive coding without SMEs, I do respect the integrity of the scientists on the team. This is not bogus science engineered to make a particular piece of software look good, it is real research. The programmers at Catalyst try to follow the scientific research, not the other way around. That is the way it should be.

I found this to be an informative, current book on predictive coding. Although it is indeed written for smart people, not dummies, and has plenty of depth to it, the book avoids going into too many technical details. It is a good book for legal professionals who want to go beyond the simple introductions to predictive coding they may find elsewhere. As a lawyer himself, John understands the kind of knowledge that lawyers want and need to know about TAR. They will find it here. The smartest of the smart will be inspired to go further, and study the original source materials that John cites.

Ralph Losey is one of the world’s leading experts on e-discovery law and practice. He is a shareholder in the national law firm Jackson Lewis P.C., where he leads the firm's Electronic Discovery practice group. He is also the author of the e-Discovery Team blog (www.e-discoveryteam.com) and publisher of the leading information resource, LegalSearchScience.com.

Since 2006, Ralph has limited his legal practice to electronic discovery and technology law. He has a special interest in software and the search and review of electronic evidence using artificial intelligence, and cybersecurity. Ralph has been involved with computers, software, legal hacking, and the law since 1980. He has presented at hundreds of legal conferences worldwide, written more than 500 articles, and published five books on electronic discovery. He is also the founder of Electronic Discovery Best Practices and founder and CEO of e-Discovery TeamTraining.
Introduction:

*TAR for Smart People*

We’ve all seen those “For Dummies” series of explanatory books. But in the e-discovery field, I haven’t run into any dummies. To the contrary, the lawyers and other professionals I meet are pretty darn smart. For that reason, when we conceived of producing this book about technology assisted review (TAR), we decided to write it for all the smart people working in this field.

Of course, just because someone is smart doesn’t mean he or she fully understands TAR. TAR is a sophisticated and highly developed process that draws on science, technology and law. There are many different approaches to it and they go by different names.

Even so, all TAR systems share two common characteristics. One is that, at bottom, they all leverage human knowledge through technology to find relevant documents more quickly and with less effort. The other is that they all produce savings in review time and costs, although some do this much better than others.

**How Does it Work?**

The simple way to understand how TAR works is to think of it like the Pandora Internet radio service. Pandora has millions of songs in its archive but no idea what kind of music you like. Its goal is to play music from your favorite artists but also to present new songs you might like.
How does Pandora do this? For those who haven’t tried it, you start by giving Pandora the name of one or more artists you like, thus creating a “station.” Pandora begins by playing a song or two by the artists you have selected. Then, it chooses a similar song or artist you didn’t select to see if you like it. You answer by clicking a “thumbs up” or “thumbs down” button. Information retrieval (IR) scientists call this “relevance feedback.”

Pandora analyzes the songs you like, as well as the songs you don’t, to make its suggestions. It looks at factors such as melody, harmony, rhythm, form, composition and lyrics to find similar songs. As you give it feedback on its suggestions, it uses that information to make better selections the next time. The IR people would call this “training.”

The process continues as you listen to your radio station. The more feedback you provide, the smarter the system gets. The end result is Pandora plays a lot of music you like and, occasionally, something you don’t like.

TAR works in a similar way, only you work with documents rather than songs. As you train the system, it gets smarter about which
documents are relevant to your inquiry and which are not. It is as simple as that.

**Not for Dummies**

To date, every court that has considered TAR has approved it as a reasonable approach to find relevant documents and determine which documents do not require review. Although there is debate over differing TAR protocols and how much information about the process has to be shared, there has never been a question about the efficacy and reasonableness of TAR itself. TAR is here to stay and is well worth learning about.

In the chapters that follow, we will provide an introduction to TAR and then dig deeper into some of the key issues surrounding the process. We'll look at different TAR protocols, especially the newest and most-promising protocol, Continuous Active Learning.

We'll explore the different schools of thought about important TAR issues such as the best use of subject matter experts and the need for random sampling. We'll also cover various uses of TAR you may not know about, and conclude with some actual case studies showing TAR's effectiveness in practice.

This isn't a book for dummies. This book confronts some difficult questions surrounding TAR and explores them in some depth. Not everyone will agree with everything we say here. At the very least, however, we hope this book will help you refine your understanding of the process and make even smarter decisions about it going forward.

*John Tredennick, Esq.*

Founder and CEO, Catalyst
Introduction to Technology Assisted Review

Technology Assisted Review (TAR), aka Predictive Coding, Predictive Ranking, or Computer Assisted Review, is a process whereby humans interact with a computer to find relevant documents. Just as there are many names for the process, there are many different approaches to it. At bottom, however, all of these systems leverage human knowledge about relevant documents to find more potentially relevant documents.

The process is interactive. A human reviews and tags a document as relevant or non-relevant. The computer takes the human input and uses it to draw inferences about other documents. Ultimately, the computer orders the documents by relevance to guide the review process. Humans then decide how many documents need to be reviewed.

Savings are what make TAR interesting, if not revolutionary. Review teams can work faster using prioritized (ordered) review because they are reviewing documents with similar content. Clients save on review costs because TAR provides a reasonable basis to “cut off” review once most of the relevant documents have been found.
The savings in review time and costs for a successful TAR project are substantial, which is why the topic is important. (In some cases TAR allows you to remove 95% or even more documents from the review.) You defend the decision to cut off review through relatively simple sampling techniques, which show your success in promoting relevant documents to the top of the stack and prove that the documents left behind are mostly non-relevant.

**Understanding How TAR Works**

As we said in the introduction, TAR works in a similar way to Pandora, only you work with documents rather than songs. As you train the system, it gets smarter about which documents are relevant to your inquiry and which are not. It is as simple as that.

Of course, TAR involves more serious matters than simple music choice, so there are a few more options and strategies to consider. Also, different vendors approach the process in different ways, which can cause some confusion. But here is a start toward explaining the process.

1. **Collect the documents you want to review and feed them to the computer.**

   To start, the computer has to analyze the documents you want to review (or not review), just like Pandora needs to analyze all the music it maintains. While approaches vary, most systems analyze the words in your documents in terms of frequency in the document and across the population.

   Some systems require that you collect all of the documents before you begin training. Others, like Insight Predict, allow you to add documents during the training process. Different approaches can work but some are more efficient and easy to administer than others.

2. **Start training/review.**

   You have two choices here. You can start by presenting documents you know are relevant (or non-relevant) to the
computer or you can let the computer select documents randomly for your consideration. With Pandora, you start by identifying an artist you like. This gives the computer a head start on your preferences. In theory, you could let Pandora select music randomly to see if you liked it but this would be pretty inefficient.

Either way, you begin by giving the computer examples of which documents you like (relevant) and which you don't like (non-relevant). From these examples, the system learns more about your preferences—which terms tend to occur in relevant documents and which in non-relevant ones. It then develops a mathematical formula to help it predict the relevance of other documents in the population.

There is an ongoing debate about whether training requires the examples to be provided by subject matter experts (SMEs) to be effective. Our research (and that of others) suggests that review teams assisted by SMEs are just as effective as SMEs alone. Others disagree. You can read more about this issue later in this book.

3. **Rank the documents by relevance.**

   This is the heart of the process. Based on the training you have provided, the system creates a formula that it uses to rank (order) your documents by estimated relevance.

4. **Continue training/review (rinse and repeat).**

   Continue training using your SME or review team. Many systems will suggest additional documents for training, which will help the algorithm get better at understanding your document population. This is called “Active” learning. For the most part, the more training/review you do, the better the system will be at ranking the unseen documents.

5. **Test the ranking.**

   How good a job did the system do on the ranking? If the ranking is “good enough,” move forward and finish your review. If it is not, continue your training.
Some systems view training as a process separate from review. Following this approach, your SMEs would handle the training until they were satisfied that the algorithm was fully trained. They would then let the review teams look at the higher-ranked documents, possibly discarding those below a certain threshold as non-relevant.

Our research suggests that a continuous learning process is more effective. We therefore recommend that you feed reviewer judgments back to the system for a process of continuous learning. As a result, the algorithm continues to get smarter, which can mean even fewer documents need to be reviewed. You can read more about this issue later in this book.

6. Finish the review.

The end goal is to finish the review as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible. In a linear review, you typically review all of the documents in the population. In a predictive review, you can stop well before then because the important documents have been moved to the front of the queue. You save on both review costs and the time it takes to complete the review.

Ultimately, “finishing” means reviewing down the ranking until you have found enough relevant documents, with the concept of proportionality taking center stage. Thus, you may stop after reviewing the first 20% of the ranking because you have found 80% of the relevant documents. Your argument is that the cost to review the remaining 80% of the document population just to find the remaining 20% of the relevant documents is unduly burdensome.3

That’s all there is to it. While there are innumerable choices in applying the process to a real case, the rest is just strategy and execution.

How Do I Know if the Process is Successful?

That, of course, is the million-dollar question. Fortunately, the answer is relatively easy.

The process succeeds to the extent that the document ranking places
more relevant documents at the front of the pack than you might get when the documents are ordered by other means (e.g. by date or Bates number). How successful you are depends on the degree to which the Predictive Ranking is better than what you might get using your traditional approach.

Let me offer an example. Imagine your documents are represented by a series of cells, as in the below diagram. The shaded cells represent relevant documents and the white cells non-relevant.

![Diagram of relevant and non-relevant documents](image)

What we have is essentially a random distribution, or at least there is no discernable pattern between relevant and non-relevant. In that regard, this might be similar to a review case where you ordered documents by Bates number or date. In most cases, there is no reason to expect that relevant documents would appear at the front of the order.

This is typical of a linear review. If you review 10% of the documents, you likely will find 10% of the relevant documents. If you review 50%, you will likely find 50% of the relevant documents.

Take a look at this next diagram. It represents the outcome of a perfect ordering. The relevant documents come first followed by non-relevant documents.

![Diagram of perfect ordering](image)

If you could be confident that the ranking worked perfectly, as in this example, it is easy to see the benefit of ordering by rank. Rather than review all of the documents to find relevant ones, you could simply review the first 20% and be done. You could confidently ignore the remaining 80% (perhaps after sampling them) or, at least, direct them to a lower-priced review team.

**Yes, but What Is the Ranking Really Like?**

Since this is directed at smart people, I am sure you realize that computer rankings are never that good. At the same time, they are rarely (if ever) as bad as you might see in a linear review.
Following our earlier examples, here is how the actual ranking might look using Predictive Ranking:

We see that the algorithm certainly improved on the random distribution, although it is far from perfect. We have 30% of the relevant documents at the top of the order, followed by an increasing mix of non-relevant documents. At about a third of the way into the review, you would start to run out of relevant documents.

This would be a success by almost any measure. If you stopped your review at the midway point, you would have seen all but one relevant document. By cutting out half the document population, you would save substantially on review costs.

**How Do I Measure Success?**

If the goal of TAR is to arrange a set of documents in order of likely relevance to a particular issue, the measure of success is the extent to which you meet that goal. Put as a question: “Am I getting more relevant documents at the start of my review than I might with my typical approach (often a linear review).” If the answer is yes, then how much better?

To answer these questions, we need to take two additional steps. First, for comparison purposes, we will want to measure the “richness” of the overall document population. Second, we need to determine how effective our ranking system turned out to be against the entire document population.

1. **Estimating richness:** Richness is a measure of how many relevant documents are in your total document population. Some people call this “prevalence,” as a reference to how prevalent relevant documents are in the total population. For example, we might estimate that 15% or the documents are relevant, with 85% non-relevant. Or we might say document prevalence is 15%.

   How do we estimate richness? Once the documents are assembled, we can use random sampling for this purpose. In general, a random sample allows us to look at a small subset
of the document population, and make predictions about the nature of the larger set. Thus, from the example above, if our sample found 15 documents out of a hundred to be relevant, we would project a richness of 15%. Extrapolating that to the larger population (100,000 for example), we might estimate that there were about 15,000 relevant documents to be found.

For those really smart people who understand statistics, I am skipping a discussion about confidence intervals and margins of error. Let me just say that the larger the sample size, the more confident you can be in your estimate. But, surprisingly, the sample size does not have to be that large to provide a high degree of confidence. You can read more about this topic later in this book.

2. **Evaluating the ranking:** Once the documents are ranked, we can then sample the ranking to determine how well our algorithm did in pushing relevant documents to the top of the stack. We do this through a systematic random sample.

   In a systematic random sample, we sample the documents in their ranked order, tagging them as relevant or non-relevant as we go. Specifically, we sample every Nth document from the top to the bottom of the ranking (e.g. every 100th document). Using this method helps ensure that we are looking at documents across the ranking spectrum, from highest to lowest.
As an aside, you can actually use a systematic random sample to determine overall richness/prevalence and to evaluate the ranking. Unless you need an initial richness estimate, say for review planning purposes, we recommend you do both steps at the same time.

Comparing the Results

We can compare the results of the systematic random sample to the richness of our population by plotting what scientists call a “yield curve.” While this may sound daunting, it is really rather simple. It is the one diagram you should know about if you are going to use TAR.

A yield curve can be used to show the progress of a review and the results it yields, at least in number of relevant documents found. The X-axis shows the percentage of documents to be reviewed (or reviewed). The Y-axis shows the percentage of relevant documents found (or you would expect to find) at any given point in the review.

**Linear Review:** Knowing that the document population is 15% rich (give or take) provides a useful baseline against which we can measure the success of our Predictive Ranking effort. We plot richness as a diagonal line going from zero to 100%. It reflects the fact that, in a linear review, we expect the percentage of relevant documents to correlate to the percentage of total documents reviewed.
Following that notion, we can estimate that if the team were to review 10% of the document population, they would likely see 10% of the relevant documents. If they were to look at 50% of the documents, we would expect them to find 50% of the relevant documents, give or take. If they wanted to find 80% of the relevant documents, they would have to look at 80% of the entire population.

**Predictive Review:** Now let's plot the results of our systematic random sample. The purpose is to show how the review might progress if we reviewed documents in a ranked order, from likely relevant to likely non-relevant. We can easily compare it to a linear review to measure the success of the Predictive Ranking process.

![Yield Curve](image)

You can quickly see that the line for the Predictive Review goes up more steeply than the one for linear review. This reflects the fact that in a Predictive Review the team starts with the most likely relevant documents. The line continues to rise until you hit the 80% relevant mark, which happens after a review of about 10-12% of the entire document population. The slope then flattens, particularly as you cross the 90% relevant line. That reflects the fact that you won't find as many relevant documents from that point onward. Put another way, you will have to look through a lot more documents before you find your next relevant one.
We now have what we need to measure the success of our Predictive Ranking project. To recap, we needed:

1. A richness estimate so we have an idea of how many relevant documents are in the population.

2. A systematic random sample so we can estimate how many relevant documents got pushed to the front of the ordering.

It is now relatively easy to quantify success. As the yield curve illustrates, if I engage in a Predictive Review, I will find about 80% of the relevant documents after only reviewing about 12% of total documents. If I wanted to review 90% of the relevant documents, I could stop after reviewing just over 20% of the population. My measure of success would be the savings achieved over a linear review.

At this point we move into proportionality arguments. What is the right stopping point for our case? The answer depends on the needs of your case, the nature of the documents and any stipulated protocols among the parties. At the least, the yield curve helps you frame the argument in a meaningful way.

Footnotes

1. IR specialists call these documents “relevant” but they do not mean relevant in a legal sense. They mean important to your inquiry even though you may not plan on introducing them at trial. You could substitute “hot,” “responsive,” “privileged” or some other criterion depending on the nature of your review.

2. We could use “irrelevant” but that has a different shade of meaning for the IR people so I bow to their use of non-relevant here. Either word works for this discussion.

3. Sometimes at the meet-and-confer, the parties agree on Predictive
Ranking protocols, including the percentage of relevant documents that need to be found in the review.

4. We will use a linear review (essentially a random relevance ordering) as a baseline because that is the way most reviews are done. If you review based on conceptual clusters or some other method, your baseline for comparison would be different.

5. Note that an estimate based on a random sample is not valid unless you are sampling against the entire population. If you get new documents, you have to redo your sample.
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Continuous Active Learning for Technology Assisted Review

How It Works and Why It Matters for E-Discovery

Recently, two of the leading experts on e-discovery, Maura R. Grossman and Gordon V. Cormack, presented a peer-reviewed study on continuous active learning to the annual conference of the Special Interest Group on Information Retrieval, a part of the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), “Evaluation of Machine-Learning Protocols for Technology-Assisted Review in Electronic Discovery.”

In the study, they compared three TAR protocols, testing them across eight different cases. Two of the three protocols, Simple Passive Learning (SPL) and Simple Active Learning (SAL), are typically associated with early approaches to predictive coding, which we call TAR 1.0. The third, continuous active learning (CAL), is a central part of a newer approach to predictive coding, which we call TAR 2.0.
Based on their testing, Grossman and Cormack concluded that CAL demonstrated superior performance over SPL and SAL, while avoiding certain other problems associated with these traditional TAR 1.0 protocols. Specifically, in each of the eight case studies, CAL reached higher levels of recall (finding relevant documents) more quickly and with less effort than the TAR 1.0 protocols.

Not surprisingly, their research caused quite a stir in the TAR community. Supporters heralded its common-sense findings, particularly the conclusion that random training was the least efficient method for selecting training seeds. (See, e.g., “Latest Grossman and Cormack Study Proves Folly of Using Random Search for Machine Training”, by Ralph Losey on his e-Discovery Team blog) Detractors challenged their results, arguing that using random seeds for training worked fine with their TAR 1.0 software and eliminated bias. (See, e.g., “Random Sampling as an Effective Predictive Coding Training Strategy”, by Herbert L. Roitblat on OrcaBlog). We were pleased that it confirmed our earlier research and legitimized what for many is still a novel approach to TAR review.

So why does this matter? The answer is simple. CAL matters because saving time and money on review is important to our clients. The more the savings, the more it matters.

**TAR 1.0: Predictive Coding Protocols**

To better understand how CAL works and why it produces better results, let’s start by taking a look at TAR 1.0 protocols and their limitations.

Most are built around the following steps:

1. A subject matter expert (SME), often a senior lawyer, reviews and tags a random sample (500+ documents) to use as a control set for training.

2. The SME then begins a training process using Simple Passive Learning or Simple Active Learning. In either case, the SME reviews documents and tags them relevant or non-relevant.
3. The TAR engine uses these judgments to train a classification/ranking algorithm to identify other relevant documents. It compares its results against the already-tagged control set to gauge its accuracy in identifying relevant documents.

4. Depending on the testing results, the SME may need to do more training to improve performance of a particular classification/ranking project (often referred to as a “classifier”).

5. This training and testing process continues until the classifier is “stable.” That means its search algorithm is no longer getting better at identifying relevant documents in the control set. There is no point in further training relative to the control set.

The next step is for the TAR engine to run its classification/ranking algorithm against the entire document population. The SME can then review a random sample of ranked documents to determine how well the algorithm did in pushing relevant documents to the top of the ranking. The sample will help tell the review administrator how many documents will need to be reviewed to reach different recall rates.

The review team can then be directed to look at documents with relevance scores higher than the cutoff point. Documents below the cutoff point can be discarded.

Even though training is initially iterative, it is a finite process. Once your classifier has learned all it can about the 500+ documents in the control set, that’s it. You simply turn it loose to rank the larger population (which can take hours to complete) and then divide the documents into categories to review or not review.
The goal, to be sure, is for the review population to be smaller than the remainder. Savings come from not having to review all of the documents.

**SPL and SAL: Simple TAR 1.0 Training Protocols**

Grossman and Cormack tested two training protocols used in the TAR 1.0 methodology: Simple Passive Learning and Simple Active Learning.

**Simple Passive Learning** uses random documents for training. Grossman and Cormack did not find this approach to be particularly effective:

> The results show that entirely non-random training methods, in which the initial training documents are selected using a simple keyword search, and subsequent training documents are selected by active learning, require substantially and significantly less human review effort to achieve any given level of recall, than passive learning, in which the machine-learning algorithm plays no role in the selection of training documents.

Common sense supports their conclusion. The quicker you can present relevant documents to the system, the faster it should learn about your documents.

**Simple Active Learning** does not rely on random documents. Instead, it suggests starting with whatever relevant documents you can find, often through keyword search, to initiate the training. From there, the computer presents additional documents designed to help train the algorithm. Typically the system selects documents it is least sure about, often from the boundary between relevance and non-relevance. In effect, the machine learning algorithm is trying to figure out where to draw the line between the two based on the documents in the control set you created to start the process.

As Grossman and Cormack point out, this means that the SME spends a lot of time looking at marginal documents in order to train the classifier. And keep in mind that the classifier is training against a relatively small number of documents chosen by your initial random
sample. There is no statistical reason to think these are in fact representative of the larger population and likely are not.

Grossman and Cormack concluded that Simple Active Learning performed better than Simple Passive Learning. However, Simple Active Learning was found to be less effective than continuous active learning.

Among active-learning methods, continuous active learning with relevance feedback yields generally superior results to simple active learning with uncertainty sampling, while avoiding the vexing issue of “stabilization” – determining when training is adequate, and therefore may stop.

Thus, both of the TAR 1.0 protocols, SPL and SAL, were found to be less effective at finding relevant documents than CAL.

**Practical Problems with TAR 1.0 Protocols**

Whether you use either the SPL or SAL protocol, the TAR 1.0 process comes with a number of practical problems when applied to “real world” discovery.

**One Bite at the Apple:** The first, and most relevant to a discussion of continuous active learning, is that you get only “one bite at the apple.” Once the team gets going on the review set, there is no opportunity to feed back their judgments on review documents and improve the classification/ranking algorithm. Improving the algorithm means the review team will have to review less documents to reach any desired recall level.

**SMEs Required:** A second problem is that TAR 1.0 generally requires a senior lawyer or subject-matter expert (SME) for training. Expert training requires the lawyer to review thousands of documents to build a control set, to train and then test the results. Not only is this expensive, but it delays the review until you can convince your busy senior attorney to sit still and get through the training.

**Rolling Uploads:** Going further, the TAR 1.0 approach does not handle rolling uploads well and does not work well for low richness
collections, both of which are common in e-discovery. New documents render the control set invalid because they were not part of the random selection process. That typically means going through new training rounds.

**Low Richness:** The problem with low richness collections is that it can be hard to find good training examples based on random sampling. If richness is below 1%, you may have to review several thousand documents just to find enough relevant ones to train the system. Indeed, this issue is sufficiently difficult that some TAR 1.0 vendors suggest their products shouldn’t be used for low richness collections.

**TAR 2.0: Continuous Active Learning Protocols**

With TAR 2.0, these real-world problems go away, partly due to the nature of continuous learning and partly due to the continuous ranking process required to support continuous learning. Taken together, continuous learning and continuous ranking form the basis of the TAR 2.0 approach, not only saving on review time and costs but making the process more fluid and flexible in the bargain.

**Continuous Ranking**

Our TAR 2.0 engine is designed to rank millions of documents in minutes. As a result, we rank every document in the collection each time we run a ranking. That means we can continuously integrate new judgments by the review team into the algorithm as their work progresses.

Because the engine ranks all of the documents all of the time, there is no need to use a control set for training. Training success is based on ranking fluctuations across the entire set, rather than a limited set of randomly selected documents. When document rankings stop changing, the classification/ranking algorithm has settled, at least until new documents arrive.

This solves the problem of rolling uploads. Because we don’t use a control set for training, we can integrate rolling document uploads into the review process. When you add new documents to the mix, they simply join in the ranking process and become part of the review.
Depending on whether the new documents are different or similar to documents already in the population, they may integrate into the rankings immediately or instead fall to the bottom. In the latter case, we pull samples from the new documents through our contextual diversity algorithm for review. As the new documents are reviewed, they integrate further into the ranking.

You can see an illustration of the initial fluctuation of new documents in this example from Insight Predict. The initial review moved forward until the classification/ranking algorithm was pretty well trained.

New documents were added to the collection midway through the review process. Initially the population rankings fluctuated to accommodate the new documents. Then, as representative samples were identified and reviewed, the population settled down to stability.

**Continuous Active Learning**

There are two aspects to continuous active learning. The first is that the process is “continuous.” Training doesn’t stop until the review finishes. The second is that the training is “active.” That means the computer feeds documents to the review team with the goal of making the review as efficient as possible (minimizing the total cost of review).

Although our software will support a TAR 1.0 process, we have long advocated continuous active learning as the better protocol. Simply put, as the reviewers progress through documents in our system,
we feed their judgments back to the system to be used as seeds in the next ranking process. Then, when the reviewers ask for a new batch, the documents are presented based on the latest completed ranking. To the extent the ranking has improved by virtue of the additional review judgments, they receive better documents than they otherwise would had the learning stopped after “one bite at the apple.”

In effect, the reviewers become the trainers and the trainers become reviewers. Training is review, we say. And review is training.

Indeed, review team training is all but required for a continuous learning process. It makes little sense to expect a senior attorney do the entire review, which may involve hundreds of thousands of documents. Rather, SMEs should focus on finding (through search or otherwise) relevant documents to help move the training forward as quickly as possible. They can also be used to monitor the review team, using our quality control (“QC”) algorithm designed to surface documents likely to have been improperly tagged. We have shown that this process is as effective as using senior lawyers to do the training and can be done at a lower cost. And, like CAL itself, our QC algorithm also continues to learn as the review progresses.

What are the Savings?

Grossman and Cormack quantified the differences between the TAR 1.0 and 2.0 protocols by measuring the number of documents a team
would need to review to get to a specific recall rate. Here, for example, is a chart showing the difference in the number of documents a team would have to review to achieve a 75% level of recall comparing continuous active learning and simple passive learning.

The test results showed that the review team would have to look at substantially more documents using the SPL (random seeds) protocol than CAL. For matter 201, the difference would be 50,000 documents. At $2 a document for review and QC, that would be a savings of $100,000. For matter 203, which is the extreme case here, the difference would be 93,000 documents. The savings from using CAL based on $2 a document would be $186,000.

Here is another chart that compares all three protocols over the same test set. In this case Grossman and Cormack varied the size of the training sets for SAL and SPL to see what impact it might have on the review numbers. You can see that the results for both of the TAR 1.0 protocols improve with additional training but at the cost of requiring the SME to look at as many as 8,000 documents before beginning training. And, even using what Grossman and Cormack call an “ideal” training set for SAL and SPL (which cannot be identified in advance), SAL beat or matched the results in every case, often by a substantial margin.
What About Review Bias?

Grossman and Cormack constructed their CAL protocol by starting with seeds found through keyword search. They then presented documents to reviewers based on “relevance feedback.”

Relevance feedback simply means that the system feeds the highest-ranked documents to the reviewers for their judgment. Of course, what is highly ranked depends on what you tagged before.

Some argue that this approach opens the door to bias. If your ranking is based on documents you found through keyword search, what about other relevant documents you didn’t find? “You don’t know what you don’t know,” they say.

Random selection of training seeds raises the chance of finding relevant documents that are different from the ones you have already found. Right?

Actually, everyone seems to agree on this point. Grossman and Cormack point out that they used relevance feedback because they wanted to keep their testing methods simple and reproducible. As they note in their conclusion:

*There is no reason to presume that the CAL results described here represent the best that can be achieved. Any number of feature engineering methods, learning algorithms, training protocols, and search strategies might yield substantive improvements in the future.*

In an excellent four-part series on his blog *e-Discovery Team*, Ralph Losey suggested using a multi-modal approach to combat fears of bias in the training process. From private discussions with the authors, we know that Grossman and Cormack also use added techniques to improve the learning process for their system as well.

We combat bias in our active learning process by including contextual diversity samples as part of our active training protocol. Contextual diversity uses an algorithm we developed to present the reviewer with documents that are very different from what the review team has already seen. We wrote about it extensively in a recent blog post.
Our ability to do contextual diversity sampling comes from the fact that our engine ranks all of the documents every time. Because we rank all the documents, we know something about the nature of the documents already seen by the reviewers and the documents not yet reviewed. The contextual diversity algorithm essentially clusters unseen documents and then presents a representative sample of each group as the review progresses. And, like our relevance and QC algorithms, contextual diversity also keeps learning and improving as the review progresses.

**The Continuous Learning Process**

Backed by our continuous ranking engine and contextual diversity, we can support a simple and flexible TAR 2.0 process for training and review. Here are the basic steps:

1. Start by finding as many relevant documents as possible. Feed them to the system for initial ranking. (Actually, you could start with no relevant documents and build off of the review team’s work. Or, start with contextual diversity sampling to get a feel for different types of documents in the population.)

2. Let the review team begin review. They get an automated mix including highly relevant documents and others selected by the computer based on contextual diversity and randomness to avoid bias. Our mix is a trade secret but most are highly ranked documents to maximize review-team efficiency over the course of the entire review.

3. As the review progresses, QC a small percentage of the documents at the senior attorney’s leisure. Our QC algorithm will present documents that are most likely tagged incorrectly.

4. Continue until you reach the desired recall rate. Track your progress through our progress chart (shown above) and an occasional systematic sample, which will generate a yield curve.

The process is flexible and can progress in almost any way you desire. You can start with tens of thousands of tagged documents if you have them, or start with just a few or none at all. Just let the review
team get going either way and let the system balance the mix of documents included in the dynamic, continuously iterative review queue. As they finish batches, the ranking engine keeps getting smarter. If you later find relevant documents through whatever means, simply add them. It just doesn't matter when your goal is to find relevant documents for review rather than train a classifier.

This TAR 2.0 process works well with low richness collections because you are encouraged to start the training with any relevant documents you can find. As review progresses, more relevant documents rise to the top of the rankings, which means your trial team can get up to speed more quickly. It also works well for ECA and third-party productions where you need to get up to speed quickly.

**Key Differences Between TAR 1.0 and 2.0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAR 1.0</th>
<th>TAR 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. One Time Training</strong> before assigning documents for review. Does not allow for training or learning past the initial training phase.</td>
<td><strong>1. Continuous Active Learning</strong> allows the algorithm to keep improving over the course of review, improving savings and speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Trains Against Small Reference Set</strong>, limiting its ability to handle rolling uploads. Assumes all documents are received before ranking. Stability is based on comparison with reference set.</td>
<td><strong>2. Analyzes and Ranks Entire Collection Every Time</strong>, which allows rolling uploads. Does not use a reference set, but rather evaluates performance using multiple measures across the entire population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Subject Matter Expert</strong> handles all training. Review team judgments are not used to further train the system.</td>
<td><strong>3. Review Teams Train</strong> as they review, working alongside SME for maximum effectiveness. SME can focus on finding relevant documents and performing QC on review team judgments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Uses Random Seeds</strong> to train the system and avoid bias, precluding or limiting the use of key documents found by the trial team.</td>
<td><strong>4. Uses Judgmental Seeds</strong> so that training can immediately use every relevant document available. Supplements training with active learning to avoid bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Doesn’t Work Well</strong> with low richness collections, where target documents are rare. Impractical for smaller cases because of stilted workflow.</td>
<td><strong>5. Works Great</strong> in low richness situations. Ideal for any size case from small to huge because of flexible workflow with no separate, burdensome training phases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

As Grossman and Cormack point out:

This study highlights an alternative approach – continuous active learning with relevance feedback—that demonstrates superior performance, while avoiding certain problems associated with uncertainty sampling and passive learning. CAL also offers the reviewer the opportunity to quickly identify legally significant documents that can guide litigation strategy, and can readily adapt when new documents are added to the collection, or new issues or interpretations of relevance arise.

If your TAR product is integrated into your review engine and supports continuous ranking, there is little doubt they are right. Keep learning, get smarter and save more. That is a winning combination.
How Much Can CAL Save?

A Closer Look at the Grossman/Cormack Research Results

As we explained in the last chapter, two leading experts in technology assisted review, Maura R. Grossman and Gordon V. Cormack, recently presented the first peer-reviewed scientific study on the effectiveness of several TAR protocols, “Evaluation of Machine-Learning Protocols for Technology-Assisted Review in Electronic Discovery”.

Perhaps the most important conclusion of the study was that an advanced TAR 2.0 protocol, continuous active learning (CAL), proved to be far more effective than the two standard TAR 1.0 protocols used by most of the early products on the market today—simple passive learning (SPL) and simple active learning (SAL).

To quote Grossman and Cormack:

“The results show that entirely non-random training methods, in which the initial training documents are selected using a simple keyword search, and subsequent training documents are selected by active learning [CAL], require substantially and
significantly less human review effort . . . to achieve any given level of recall, than passive learning, in which the machine-learning algorithm plays no role in the selection of training documents [SPL]. ...

Among active-learning methods, continuous active learning with relevance feedback yields generally superior results to simple active learning with uncertainty sampling [SAL], while avoiding the vexing issue of “stabilization”—determining when training is adequate, and therefore may stop.”

But how much can you expect to save using CAL over the simple passive and active learning methods used by TAR 1.0 programs? While every case is different, as are the algorithms that different vendors employ, we can draw some interesting conclusions from the Grossman/Cormack study that will help answer this question.

**Comparing CAL with SPL and SAL**

Grossman and Cormack compared the three TAR protocols against eight different matters. Four were from an earlier Text REtrieval Conference (TREC) program and four were from actually litigated cases.

After charting the results from each matter, they offered summary information about their results. In this case I will show them for a typical TAR 1.0 project with 2,000 training seeds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Collection Size</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>SPL</th>
<th>SAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>284,000</td>
<td>237,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>521,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,118,116</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>502,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>409,277</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>293,549</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>405,796</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quick visual inspection confirms that the CAL protocol requires the review of far fewer documents than required for simple passive or simple active learning. In Matter 201, for example, a CAL review requires inspection of 6,000 documents in order to find 75% of the
relevant files. In sharp contrast, reviewers using a SPL protocol would have to view 284,000 documents. For SAL, they would have to review almost as many, 237,000 documents. Both TAR 1.0 protocols require review of more than 230,000 documents. At $4 per document for review and QC, the extra cost from using the TAR 1.0 protocols would come to almost a million dollars.

Clearly some of the other matters had numbers that were much closer. Matter C, for example, required the review of 4,000 for a CAL protocol but only 5,000 for SAL and 9,000 for SPL. In such a case, the savings are much smaller, hardly justifying a switch in TAR applications. So what might we expect as a general rule if we were considering different approaches to TAR?

Averaging the Results Across Matters

Lacking more comparative data, one way to answer this question is to use the averages across all eight matters to make our analysis.

<p>| Comparing CAL to SPL and SAL with 2,000 Training Seeds |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Collection Size</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>SPL</th>
<th>SAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>284,000</td>
<td>237,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>521,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,118,116</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>502,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>409,277</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>293,549</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>405,796</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>640,111</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>207,875</td>
<td>95,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our average matter size is just over 640,000. The CAL protocol would require review of 9,375 documents. With SPL you would have to review 207,875 documents. With SAL, you would only have to review 95,375 documents. Clearly SAL is to be preferred to SPL but it still required the review of an extra 86,000 documents.

How much would that cost? To determine this there are several factors to consider. First, the TAR 1.0 protocols require that a subject matter expert do the initial training. CAL does not require this. Thus, we have to determine the hourly rate of the SME. We then have to determine how many documents an hour the expert (and later the
reviewers) can get through. Lastly, we have to have an estimate for reviewer costs.

Here are some working assumptions:

2. Cost for a standard reviewer: $60/hour.
3. Documents per hour reviewed (for both SME and reviewer): 60.

If we use these assumptions and work against our matter averages, we find this information about the costs of using the three protocols. On an average review, at least based on these eight matters, you can expect to save over a quarter million dollars in review costs if you use CAL as your TAR protocol. You can expect to save $115,000 over a simple active learning system. These are significant sums.

| Comparing CAL to SPL and SAL with 2,000 Training Seeds |
|-----------------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| Matter | Collection Size | CAL | SPL  | SAL  |
| 201    | 723,537         | 6,000| 284,000| 237,000|
| 202    | 723,537         | 11,000| 47,000 | 34,000 |
| 203    | 723,537         | 6,000 | 521,000| 43,000 |
| 207    | 723,537         | 11,000| 103,000| 55,000 |
| A      | 1,118,116       | 11,000| 502,000| 210,000|
| B      | 409,277         | 8,000 | 142,000| 119,000|
| C      | 293,549         | 4,000 | 9,000  | 5,000  |
| D      | 405,796         | 18,000| 55,000 | 60,000 |

Average | 640,111 | 9,375 | 207,875 | 95,375 |
Reviewed by SME | 2,000 | 2,000 |
Expert review cost | $11,667 | $11,667 |
Reviewer cost | $11,719 | $257,344 | $116,719 |
Total review cost | $11,719 | $269,010 | $128,385 |

**What About Using More Training Seeds?**

As I mentioned earlier, Grossman and Cormack reported the results when substantially more training seeds were used: 5,000 and 8,000. If your subject matter expert is willing to review substantially more training documents, the cost savings from using CAL is less. However, at 60 documents an hour, your SME will spend 83 hours (about two weeks) doing the training with 5,000 seeds. He/she will spend more than 133
hours (about 3.5 weeks) if you go for 8,000 seeds. Even worse, he/she may have to redo the training if new documents come in later.

That said, here is how the numbers worked out for 5,000 training seeds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Collection Size</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>SPL (5,000)</th>
<th>SAL (5,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,118,116</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>409,277</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>293,549</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>405,796</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>640,111</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>144,250</td>
<td>20,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by SME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert review cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,167</td>
<td>$29,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,719</td>
<td>$174,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total review cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,719</td>
<td>$203,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings from CAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$191,510</td>
<td>$36,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And for 8,000 training seeds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Collection Size</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>SPL (8,000)</th>
<th>SAL (8,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,118,116</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>409,277</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>293,549</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>405,796</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>640,111</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>81,500</td>
<td>16,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by SME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert review cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,667</td>
<td>$46,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,719</td>
<td>$91,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total review cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,719</td>
<td>$138,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings from CAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$126,823</td>
<td>$45,729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first thing to note is that the number of documents that ultimately have to be reviewed reduces as you add more training seeds. This seems logical and supports the fundamental CAL notion that the more training seeds you give to the algorithm the better the results. However, also note that the total review cost for SAL increases as you go from 5,000 to 8,000 training seeds. This is because we assume you have to pay more for SME training than review team training. With CAL, the reviewers do the training.
How Much Time Can I Save?

So far, we have only spoken about cost savings. What about time savings? We can quickly see how much time the CAL protocol saves as well.

For 2,000 training seeds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Collection Size</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>SPL (2,000)</th>
<th>SAL (2,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>284,000</td>
<td>237,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>521,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,118,116</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>502,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>409,277</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>293,549</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>405,796</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 640,111 9,375 207,875 95,375
Reviewed by SME 2,000 2,000
Review time (hours) 156 3,465 1,590
Time savings (hours) 3,308 1,433

For 5,000 training seeds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Collection Size</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>SPL (6,000)</th>
<th>SAL (8,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,118,116</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>409,277</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>293,549</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>405,796</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 640,111 9,375 31,530 16,625
Reviewed by SME 8,000 8,000
Review time (hours) 156 1,358 277
Time savings (hours) 1,202 121

And, for 8,000 training seeds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Collection Size</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>SPL (5,000)</th>
<th>SAL (5,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>723,537</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,118,116</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>409,277</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>293,549</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>405,796</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 640,111 9,375 144,250 20,375
Reviewed by SME 5,000 5,000
Review time (hours) 156 2,404 340
Time savings (hours) 2,248 183
As with cost savings, there are substantial review time savings to
be had using CAL over simple passive learning and simple active
learning. The savings range from 121 hours (SAL at 8,000 training
seeds) to as much as 3,308 hours (SPL at 2,000 training seeds).

So How Much Can I Save with CAL?

“A lot” is the answer, based on the Grossman/Cormack research.
We have published similar studies with similar results. Given this
evidence, it is hard to imagine why anyone would use these out-of-
date TAR protocols.

There are a number of other benefits that go beyond cost and
time savings. First, CAL works well with low richness collections, as
Grossman/Cormack point out. While some populations have high
percentages of relevant documents, not all do. Why not choose one
protocol that covers both ends of the spectrum equally well?

Second, as mentioned earlier, the CAL protocol allows for the
continuous addition of documents without need for costly and
time-consuming retraining. Simply add the new documents to the
collection and keep reviewing. This is particularly true if you use
our contextual diversity engine to find documents that are different
from those you have already seen. Contextual diversity protects
against the possibility of bias stemming from using documents found
through keyword searches.

Third, review can begin right away. With TAR 1.0 protocols, the review
team can't begin until an SME does the training. Depending on the
SME's inclination to look at random documents and schedule, the
review can be help up for days or weeks. With CAL, the review starts
right away.

These are just a few ways in which the TAR 1.0 protocols cause real
world problems. Why pay more in review costs and time to use an
inferior protocol? How much can you save with CAL?
Recent advances in Technology Assisted Review (“TAR 2.0”) include the ability to deal with low richness, rolling collections, and flexible inputs in addition to vast improvements in speed. These improvements now allow TAR to be used effectively in many more discovery workflows than its traditional “TAR 1.0” use in classifying large numbers of documents for production.

To better understand this, it helps to begin by examining in more detail the kinds of tasks we face. Broadly speaking, document review tasks fall into three categories:

- **Classification.** This is the most common form of document review, in which documents are sorted into buckets such as responsive or non-responsive so that we can do something different with each class of document. The most common example here is a review for production.

- **Protection.** This is a higher level of review in which the purpose is to protect certain types of information from disclosure.
The most common example is privilege review, but this also encompasses trade secrets and other forms of confidential, protected, or even embarrassing information, such as personally identifiable information (PII) or confidential supervisory information (CSI).

- **Knowledge Generation.** The goal here is learning what stories the documents can tell us and discovering information that could prove useful to our case. A common example of this is searching and reviewing documents received in a production from an opposing party or searching a collection for documents related to specific issues or deposition witnesses.

You’re probably already quite familiar with these types of tasks, but I want to get explicit and discuss them in detail because each of the three has distinctly different recall and precision targets, which in turn have important implications for designing your workflows and integrating TAR.

**Metrics**

Let’s quickly review those two crucial metrics for measuring the effectiveness and defensibility of your discovery processes, “recall” and “precision.” Recall is a measure of completeness, the percentage of relevant documents actually retrieved. Precision measures purity, the percentage of retrieved documents that are relevant.

The higher the percentage of each, the better you've done. If you achieve 100% recall, then you have retrieved all the relevant documents. If all the documents you retrieve are relevant and have no extra junk mixed in, you've achieved 100% precision. But recall and precision are not friends. Typically, a technique that increases one will decrease the other.

This engineering trade-off between recall and precision is why it helps to be explicit and think carefully about what we’re trying to accomplish. Because the three categories of document review have different recall and precision targets, we must choose and tune our technologies—including TAR—with these specific goals in mind so that we maximize effectiveness and minimize cost and risk. Let me explain in more detail.
Classification Tasks

Start with classification—the sorting of documents into buckets. We typically classify so that we can do different things with different subpopulations, such as review, discard, or produce.

Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and as emphasized by The Sedona Conference and any number of court opinions, e-discovery is limited by principles of reasonableness and proportionality. As Magistrate Judge Andrew J. Peck wrote in the seminal case, *Da Silva Moore v. Publicis Groupe*:

*The goal is for the review method to result in higher recall and higher precision than another review method, at a cost proportionate to the value of the case.*

As Judge Peck suggests, when we’re talking document production the goal is to get better results, not perfect results. Given this, you want to achieve reasonably high percentages of recall and precision, but with cost and effort that is proportionate to the case. Thus, a goal of 80% recall—a common TAR target—could well be reasonable when reviewing for responsive documents, especially when current research suggests that the “gold standard” of complete eyes-on review by attorneys can't do any better than that at many times the cost.¹

Precision must also be reasonable, but requesting parties are usually more interested in making sure they get as many responsive documents as possible. So recall usually gets more attention here.²

Protection Tasks

By contrast, when your task is to protect certain types of confidential information (most commonly privilege, but it could be trade secrets, confidential supervisory information, or anything else where the bell can’t be unrung), you need to achieve 100% recall. Period. Nothing can fall through the cracks. This tends to be problematic in practice, as the goal is absolute perfection and the real world seldom obliges.

So to approximate this perfection in practice, we usually need to
use every tool in our toolkit to identify the documents that need to be protected—not just TAR but also keyword searching and human review—and use them effectively against each other. The reason for this is simple: Different review methods make different kinds of mistakes. Human reviewers tend to make random mistakes. TAR systems tend to make very systematic errors, getting entire classifications of documents right or wrong. By combining different techniques into our workflows, one serves as a check against the others.

The best way to maximize recall is to stack techniques.

This is an important point about TAR for data protection tasks, and one I want to reemphasize. The best way to maximize recall is to stack techniques, not to replace them. Because TAR doesn’t make the same class of errors as search terms and human review, it makes an excellent addition to privilege and other data protection workflows—provided the technology can deal with low prevalence and be efficiently deployed.

Precision, on the other hand, is somewhat less important when your task is to protect documents. Precision doesn’t need to be perfect, but because these tasks typically use lots of attorney hours, they’re usually the most expensive part of review. Including unnecessary junk gets expensive quickly. So you still want to achieve a fairly high level of precision (particularly to avoid having to log documents unnecessarily if you are maintaining a privilege log), but recall is still the key metric here.
Knowledge Generation Tasks

The final task we described is where we get the name “discovery” in the first place. What stories do these documents tell? What stories can my opponents tell with these documents? What facts and knowledge can we learn from them? This is the discovery task that is most Google-like. For knowledge generation, we don’t really care about recall. We don’t want all the documents about a topic; we just want the best documents about a topic—the ones that will end up in front of deponents or used at trial.

Precision is therefore the most important metric here. You don’t want to waste your time going through junk—or even duplicative and less relevant documents. This is where TAR can also help, prioritizing the document population by issue and concentrating the most interesting documents at the top of the list so that attorneys can quickly learn what they need to litigate the case.

One nitpicky detail about TAR for issue coding and knowledge generation should be mentioned, though. TAR algorithms rank documents according to their likelihood of getting a thumbs-up or a thumbs-down from a human reviewer. They do not rank documents based on how interesting they are. For example, in a review for responsiveness, some documents could be very easy to predict as being responsive, but not very interesting. On the other hand, some documents could be extremely interesting, but harder to predict because they are so unusual.

On the gripping hand, however, the more interesting documents tend to cluster near the top of the ranking. Interesting documents sort higher this way because they tend to contain stronger terms and concepts as well as more of them. TAR’s ability to concentrate the interesting documents near the top of a ranked list thus makes it a useful addition to knowledge-generation workflows.

What’s Next

With this framework for thinking about, developing, and evaluating different discovery workflows, we can now get into the specifics of how TAR 2.0 can best be used for the various tasks at hand. To
help with this analysis, we have created a TAR checklist (http://www.catalystsecure.com/TARchecklist) you can use to help organize your approach.

In the end, the critical factor in your success will be how effectively you use all the tools and resources you have at your disposal, and TAR 2.0 is a powerful new addition to your toolbox.

---

Footnotes


2. The differing importance of recall and precision both here and in other discovery tasks is one reason the \( F_1 \) measure (the harmonic mean of recall and precision) is often problematic. While it may be a good single measure for information retrieval research, it prematurely blends two measures that often have to be considered and weighted separately in practical discovery tasks.

3. See, e.g. Maura R. Grossman and Gordon V. Cormack, Inconsistent Responsiveness Determination in Document Review: Difference of Opinion or Human Error?, 32 Pace L. Rev. 267 (2012), (finding that coding inconsistencies by human reviewers are largely attributable to human error, and not to documents being “borderline” or any inherent ambiguity in the relevance judgments).

4. Random training approaches such as those used by support vector machine algorithms tend to need prohibitively large samples in order to deal effectively with low richness, which is common in many actual cases. See, e.g. Gordon V. Cormack and Maura R. Grossman, Evaluation of Machine-Learning Protocols for Technology-Assisted Review in Electronic Discovery, SIGIR ’14, July 6–11, 2014, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia (evaluating different
approaches to TAR training across eight data sets with prevalence (richness) ranging from 0.25% to 3.92% with a mean of 1.18%).

5. To be more nitpicky, this search is the most Google-like for the basic task of searching on a single topic. A more challenging problem here is often figuring out all the different possible topic that a collection of documents could speak to – including those that we don’t know we need to look for – and then finding the best examples of each topic to review. This is another area where TAR and similar tools that model the entire document set can be useful.

6. This is true in general, but not always. Consider an email between two key custodians who are usually chatty but that reads simply “Call me.” There are no key terms there for a ranking engine based on full text analysis to latch onto, though the unusual email could be susceptible to other forms of outlier detection and search.
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Measuring Recall for E-Discovery Review

An Introduction to Recall Sampling

A critical metric in Technology Assisted Review (TAR) is recall, which is the percentage of relevant documents actually found from the collection. One of the most compelling reasons for using TAR is the promise that a review team can achieve a desired level of recall (say 75%) after reviewing only a small portion of the total document population (say 5%). The savings come from not having to review the remaining 95% of the documents. The argument is that the remaining documents (the “discard pile”) include so few that are relevant (against so many irrelevant documents) that further review is not economically justified.

How do we prove we have found a given percentage of the relevant documents at whatever point we stop the review? Some suggest you can prove recall by sampling only a relatively few documents, which is not statistically valid. Others suggest approaches that are more statistically valid, but require sampling a lot of documents (as many as 34,000 in one case). Either way, this presents a problem. Legal professionals need a reasonable but also statistically reliable way to measure recall in order to justify review cutoff decisions.
A Hypothetical Review

To illustrate the problem, let’s conjure up a hypothetical review. Assume we collected one million documents. Assume also that the percentage of relevant documents in the collection is 1%. That suggests there are 10,000 relevant documents in our collection (1,000,000*.01).

Using Sampling to Estimate Richness

Typically we don’t know in advance how many relevant documents are in the collection. To find this information, we need to estimate the collection’s richness (aka prevalence) using statistical sampling, which is simply a method in which a sample of the document population is drawn at random, such that statistical properties of the sample may be extrapolated to the entire document population.

To create our sample we must randomly select a subset of the population and use the results to estimate the characteristics of the larger population. The degree of certainty around our estimate is a function of the number of documents we sample.

While this is not meant to be a chapter about statistical sampling, here are a few concepts you should know. Although there are many reference sources for these terms, I will draw from the excellent, *The Grossman-Cormack Glossary of Technology Assisted Review*, 7 Fed. Cts. L. Rev. 1 (2013):

1. **Point Estimate:** The most likely value for a population characteristic. Thus, when we estimate that a document population contains 10,000 relevant documents, we are offering a point estimate.

2. **Confidence Interval:** A range of values around our point estimate that we believe contains the true value of the number being estimated. For example, if the confidence interval for our point estimate ranges from 8,000 to 12,000, that means we believe the true value will appear within that range.

3. **Margin of Error:** The maximum amount by which a point estimate might deviate from the true value, typically expressed as
percentage. People often talk about a 5% margin of error, which simply means the expected confidence interval is 5% above or below the point estimate.

4. **Confidence Level**: The chance that our confidence interval will include the true value. For example, “95% confidence” means that if one were to draw 100 independent random samples of the same size, and compute the point estimate and confidence interval from each sample, about 95 of the 100 confidence intervals would contain the true value.

5. **Sample Size**: The number of documents we have to sample in order to achieve a specific confidence interval and confidence level. In general, the higher the confidence level, the more documents we have to review. Likewise, if we want a narrower confidence interval, we will have to increase our sample size.

It might help to see these concepts displayed visually. Here is a chart showing what a 95% confidence level looks like against a “normal” distribution of document values as well as a specific confidence interval.

![Confidence Interval Chart](chart.png)

**Point Estimate and Confidence Interval**

In this case, our point estimate was 500 relevant documents in our collection. Our confidence interval (shaded) suggests that the actual range of relevant documents could go from 460 at the lower end of our estimate to 540 at the higher end.

Part of the curve is not shaded. It covers the 5% chance that the actual number of relevant documents is either above (2.5%) or below (2.5%) our confidence interval range.

**Our Hypothetical Estimate**

We start our analysis with a sample of 600 documents, chosen randomly from the larger population. The sample size was based on
a desired confidence level of 95% and a desired margin of error of 4%. You can use other numbers for this part of the exercise but these will do for our calculations.

How did we get 600? There are a number of online calculators you can use to determine sample size based on your choices about confidence levels and margin of error. We recommend the Raosoft calculator because it is simple to use.

As you can see, we entered the population size (1,000,000), a desired confidence level (95%), and a margin of error (4%). In turn, the calculator suggested that we look at 600 documents for our sample.

**Initial Sampling Results**

Let’s assume we found six relevant documents out of the 600 we sampled. That translates to 0.01 or 1% richness (6/600). We can use that percentage to estimate that there are 10,000 relevant documents in the total review population (1,000,000*.01). This becomes our point estimate.

What about the margin of error? In this case we chose a sample size that would give us up to a 4% margin of error. That means the estimated number of relevant documents in our population is within a 4% range +/- of our point estimate of 10,000 documents.

As noted, there are a million documents in the collection. Four percent of one million comes to 40,000 documents. If we use that figure for our margin of error, it suggests that our confidence interval for relevant documents could range from the six we found in our sample to as high as 50,000. That is an interesting spread.
Determining the Exact Confidence Interval

In practice we would use a more refined approach to calculate our confidence interval. It turns out that the “exact” confidence interval depends on the results of the random sample. In this case we will use a binomial calculator to incorporate the survey results to determine our exact confidence interval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binomial Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter the observed numerator and denominator counts, then click the <strong>Compute</strong> button:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numerator (x):</strong> 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denominator (N):</strong> 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion (x/N):</strong> 0.0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exact Confidence Interval around Proportion:</strong> 0.0037 to 0.0216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on our planned sample size (600) and the number of relevant documents we found (6), our confidence interval (expressed as a decimal) ranges from 0.0037 (lower) to 0.0216 (upper). We multiply these decimal values against the total number of documents in our collection (1,000,000) to calculate our exact confidence interval. In this case, it runs from 3,700 to 21,600.

So, we have a start on the problem. We believe there are 10,000 relevant documents in our collection (our point estimate) but it could be as high as 21,600 (or as low as 3,700). Let’s move on to our review.

The Review

The team finds 7,500 relevant documents after looking at the first 50,000. Based on our initial point estimate, we could reasonably conclude we have found 75% of the relevant documents. At that point, we might decide to shut down the review. Most courts would view stopping at 75% recall to be more than reasonable.

Your argument to the court seems compelling. If there were only 2,500 relevant documents left in the discard pile, the cost of reviewing another 950,000 documents to find 2,500 relevant ones seems disproportionate. On average, you would have to look at 380
documents to find the next relevant document. At a cost of $2 per document for review, it would cost $760 for each additional relevant document found. If you continued until the end, the cost would be an extra $1.9 million.

**How Do We Know We Achieved 75% Recall?**

Now comes the hard part. How do we know we actually found 75% of the relevant documents?

Remember that our initial point estimate was 10,000 documents, which seems to support this position. However, it had a confidence interval which suggested the real number of relevant documents could be as high as 21,600.

That means our recall estimate could be off by quite a bit. Here are the numbers for this simple mathematical exercise:

- We found 7,500 documents during the review.
- If there are only 10,000 relevant documents in the total population, it is easy to conclude we achieved 75% recall (7,500/10,000).
- However, if there were 21,600 relevant documents in the population (the upper range for the confidence interval), we achieved only 35% recall of relevant documents (7,500/21,600).

Those numbers would give grist for an argument that the producing party did not meet its burden to find a reasonable number of relevant documents. While the team may have found and reviewed 75% of the relevant documents, it is also possible that they found and reviewed only 35%. Most would agree that 35% is not enough to meet your duty as a producing party.

**Sampling the Discard Pile**

So what do we do about this problem? One answer is to sample the discard population to determine its richness (some call this term elusion). If we could show that there were only a limited number of relevant documents in the discard pile, that would help establish our bona fides.
Let’s make some further assumptions. We sample the discard pile (950,000 documents), again reviewing 600 documents based on our choice of a 95% confidence level and a 4% nominal confidence interval.

This time we find two relevant documents, which suggests that the number of relevant documents in the discard pile has dropped to about 0.33% (2/600). From there we can estimate that we would find only 3,135 relevant documents in the discard pile (950,000*0.0033). Added to the 7,500 documents we found in review, that makes a total of 10,635 relevant documents in the collection.

Using that figure we calculate that the review team found about 71% of the relevant documents (7,500/10,635). While not quite 75%, this is a still a number that most courts have accepted as reasonable and proportionate.

What About the Confidence Interval?

But how big is our exact confidence interval? Using our binomial calculator, we get this range:

![Binomial Confidence Intervals](image)

Applying these figures to our discard pile, we estimate that there could be as many as 11,400 relevant documents left (0.0120*950,000).

If we add the 7,500 documents already found to the upper value of 11,400 documents from our sample, we get a much lower estimate of recall. Specifically, we are producing 7,500 out of what could be as many as 18,900 relevant documents. That comes to a recall rate of 40% (7,500/18,900).
Is that enough? Again, I suspect most readers—and courts—would say no. Producing just two out of five relevant documents in a population would not seem reasonable.

### Increasing the Sample Size

What to do? One option is to try to narrow the margin of error (and ultimately the exact confidence interval) with a larger sample. We will narrow the margin of error to 1% and see how that impacts our analysis.

Our calculator suggests we would have to sample 9,508 documents. Assume we find 31 relevant documents out of the 9,508 documents we sampled, which would again support our richness estimate of about 0.33% (31/9508).

We will enter the sampled richness into our binomial calculator to find out our exact confidence interval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binomial Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter the observed numerator and denominator counts, then click the <strong>Compute</strong> button:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerator (x): 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominator (N): 9508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (x/N): 0.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Confidence Interval around Proportion: 0.0022 to 0.0046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying the confidence interval figures to our discard pile we reach the following conclusions:

1. We estimate there are 3,097 relevant documents in the discard pile, about the same as before (950,000*(31/9508)).

2. The lower range of relevant documents is 2,090 (0.0022*950,000).
3. The upper range of relevant documents is 4,370 (0.0046*950,000).

Using these values for our exact confidence interval, the range goes from 63% (7,500/11,870) to 78% (7,500/9,590).

I think most would agree that this type of confidence interval would be reasonable. It would suggest that you found 70% of the relevant documents in your review, with the understanding that the number might be as low as 63% but could be as high as 78%.

**The Cost of Proving Recall**

We have found a method to prove recall by sampling the discard pile. But at what cost? If we are satisfied with a recall rate of 54% for the lower boundary of our confidence interval, we would have to sample 2,395 documents. At 100 documents an hour, the sample would take about 24 hours of review to complete. At $2 per document, the cost would be $4,790.

If we feel we have to narrow the interval and reach a minimum recall rate of 63%, then the sample size quadruples to 9,508 documents. If we again assume 100 documents an hour, review time would go up to 95 hours, which is more than two weeks of effort. At $2 per document, the cost would jump to $19,016.

To make matters worse, what happens if our confirming sample doesn’t support our initial estimate? At that point we would have to continue our review until we found a reasonable percentage. Then we would have to review another sample from the discard pile to confirm that we had indeed found 75% of the relevant documents or whatever number we end up at.

You now see the problem inherent in proving recall. It can require a larger sample size than you might otherwise like.
Five Myths About Technology Assisted Review

How TAR 2.0 Overcomes the Limits of Earlier Systems

There was a time when people believed the earth was flat. Or that humans would never walk on the moon. Or that computers had no place in the law. But then the non-believers proved them wrong. The earth is round, men have walked on the moon, and it is hard to imagine practicing law without a computer.

What about technology assisted review? Are there myths surrounding TAR that will fall by the wayside as we better understand the process? Will we look back and smile at what people believed about TAR way back then? Turns out, that is already happening. Here are five myths that early TAR adopters believed true but that modern TAR systems prove wrong.
1. You Only Get One Bite at the Apple.

One early myth about TAR was that you would run it just once and that was the end of it. This myth grew out of the first TAR processes (TAR 1.0), which required an initial seed set of documents selected at random from the total population. A subject matter expert (usually one senior lawyer) tagged each seed document as relevant or irrelevant. The expert’s tags were then used to “train” the system. Eventually, after reviewing a few thousand documents, the expert could stop. The system would get no better; it was as well trained about your documents as it could be.

With the training complete, a review administrator applied the TAR algorithm to the rest of the document population. The system ranked the unviewed documents in relevance order. Depending on the effectiveness of the ranking, the administrator set a “cutoff” point to govern the review. Documents ranked higher than the cutoff were reviewed and tagged. Documents below the cutoff were discarded (after confirmatory sampling).

Under this approach, the TAR process was static and run once at the beginning. As reviewers progressed through the documents, there was no easy way to feed their findings back into the system to improve the ranking even further. The myth was that “one bite at the apple” was all you could get.

TAR 2.0 systems let you keep biting away, thanks to their capacity for continuous learning. Now, reviewers are given the next most likely relevant documents for consideration. As they tag the documents (either relevant or not), that information is fed back to the system. As it is, the system gets smarter and smarter about your document population.

The process continues until the review is completed. These TAR 2.0 algorithms continually improve as more review judgments are fed back to the system. The smarter the system gets, the fewer the documents you have to review. The fewer the documents you have to review, the more you save on review time.
2. Subject Matter Experts are Required for TAR Training.

Another myth of TAR 1.0 was that only a subject matter expert can do the training. Although the expert didn't have to be a lawyer, it did have to be someone senior in the field who would know how the documents should be classified. Underlying this myth was the fear that, without an expert, inconsistency in training would degrade the algorithm's effectiveness. That would lead to more documents falling above the cutoff and thus require more expensive human review. Recent evidence suggests this is wrong. First, these senior experts are not always consistent in their tagging. People are fallible. Document review can be mind numbing. On one day, you tag them one way; on another, the opposite.

Second, review teams, while not perfect, turn out to do a pretty good job of tagging documents for training. This is particularly true because most TAR 2.0 systems take this natural variation into account. They can also present outliers to an expert for correction as part of a quality control process. Using reviewers to train the system makes the review cheaper (experts typically bill at higher rates). It also means review can start right away, without the delay of waiting for the busy expert to focus on the review and complete the initial training. Most senior attorneys I know feel they have better things to do than TAR training in any event.

3. You Must Train on Randomly Selected Documents.

Many TAR proponents believe that you need to train the system at least initially using documents selected randomly from the review population. If you select training documents by other means (keyword searching, for example), you may bias the training, they argue. Their fear is that you will unwittingly place undue emphasis on documents you think are relevant while ignoring others that might be equally relevant. “You don't know what you don't know,” they say. TAR systems following this approach present the subject matter expert with randomly selected documents for training. This may be tolerable when there are a reasonable number of relevant documents in the population, often called richness. But it can drive you crazy when
the population is not rich. You have to click through hundreds if not thousands of documents before you find relevant ones for training.

Modern TAR systems prove this to be a myth. They allow and encourage you to submit as many documents as you can find for training, regardless of how you find them. You supplement this training with documents you don't know about. They can be selected through some form of diversity sampling (specifically, to find documents you know the least about), systematic sampling (sampling every $n$th document from top to bottom) or even simple random sampling as a supplement but not the main course. The more relevant documents you can find for training, the better the results. Clicking through thousands of random documents is boring and not required for a good TAR result.

4. You Can’t Start TAR Training Until You Have All Your Documents.

One of the bugaboos of TAR 1.0 was the requirement that you collect all documents before beginning training. Early systems required this because they trained against a control set rather than against all of the documents. These systems lacked the horsepower to rank all of the documents for each training round. In order for the control set to be valid, it had to be selected randomly from all of the documents being referenced. If you received additional documents the next week, this created a problem. The addition of new documents in the population meant the control set was no longer valid. It was no longer representative of the larger set.

In the real world of litigation, where collections were ongoing, this meant that training had to be redone each time new collections arrived. For review administrators, this represented an impossible burden. They did not have the luxury of waiting until all the documents were collected or of conducting new rounds of training each time new documents were found. TAR 2.0 systems have made this a myth. With the capacity to handle “big data,” they rank all of the documents each time and don’t use a control set to determine the effectiveness of each ranking.
As a result, new documents can be added continually as they are collected. The new documents may require a few added rounds of training but the process no longer has to start from scratch. They are simply added to the mix and ranked along with the others.

5. TAR Doesn’t Work for Non-English Documents.

Many early TAR users believed that the process worked only on English documents. They assumed that TAR systems “understood” the words and concepts in documents. That being the case, there was no way it could understand other languages. This, too, was a myth. TAR is a mathematical process that ranks documents based on word frequency. It has no idea what the words mean. If the documents are prepared properly, TAR can be just as effective with any language as it can with English. For some languages—such as Chinese, Japanese and Korean—this requires that the text is first broken into individual word segments, a process also called tokenizing. Many TAR 1.0 systems did not have tokenizing engines. Many TAR 2.0 systems are able to tokenize. As long as your trainers understand the documents and can tag them properly, TAR should be just as effective with non-English documents as with English ones.

Myths Help Us Understand Our World.

Myths evolved to help us make sense of things that were beyond our comprehension. We created myths about the sun being drawn by chariots or the moon being made of green cheese. Myths helped us get started in understanding our solar system. As we learn more, myths get replaced by facts, which help us to better navigate our world. As we learn more about TAR and the cost-saving benefits it can provide, many of the initial myths about how it worked have fallen away too.

Turns out, the moon is not made of green cheese, nor is the sun drawn by chariots. And TAR is far more versatile and adaptable than early adopters believed.
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TAR 2.0: Continuous Ranking

Is One Bite at the Apple Really Enough?

For all of its complexity, technology assisted review (TAR) in its traditional form is easy to sum up:

1. A lawyer (subject matter expert) sits down at a computer and looks at a subset of documents.

2. For each, the lawyer records a thumbs-up or thumbs-down decision (tagging the document). The TAR algorithm watches carefully, learning during this training.

3. When training is complete, we let the system rank and divide the full set of documents between (predicted) relevant and irrelevant.¹

4. We then review the relevant documents, ignoring the rest.

The benefits from this process are easy to see. Let’s say you started with a million documents that otherwise would have to be reviewed by your team. If the computer algorithm predicted with the requisite degree of confidence that 700,000 are likely non-relevant, you could then exclude them from the review for a huge savings in review
costs. That is a great result, particularly if you are the one paying the bills.

But is that it? Once you “part the waters” after the document ranking, you are stuck reviewing the 300,000 that fall on the relevant side of the cutoff. If I were the client, I would wonder whether there were steps you could take to reduce the document population even further. While reviewing 300,000 documents is better than a million, cutting that to 250,000 or fewer would be even better.

**Can We Reduce the Review Count Even Further?**

The answer is yes, if we can change the established paradigm. TAR 1.0 was about the benefits of identifying a cutoff point after running a training process using a subject matter expert (SME). TAR 2.0 is about continuous ranking throughout the review process—using review teams as well as SMEs. As the review teams work their way through the documents, their judgments are fed back to the computer algorithm to further improve the ranking. As the ranking improves, the cutoff point is likely to improve as well. That means even fewer documents to review, at a lower cost. The work gets done more quickly as well.

**It Can Be as Simple as That!**

Insight Predict is built around this idea of continuous ranking. While you can use it to run a traditional TAR process, we encourage clients to take more than one bite at the ranking apple. Start the training by finding as many relevant documents (responsive, privileged, etc.) as your team can identify. Supplement these documents (often called seeds) through random sampling, or use our contextual diversity sampling to view documents selected for their distinctiveness from documents already seen.²

The computer algorithm can then use these training seeds as a basis to rank your documents. Direct the top-ranked ones to the review team for their consideration.

In this scenario, the review team starts quickly, working from the top of the ranked list. As they review documents, you feed their
judgments back to the system to improve the ranking, supplemented with other training documents chosen at random or through contextual diversity. Meanwhile, the review team continues to draw from the highest-ranked documents, using the most recent ranking available. They continue until the review is complete.  

**Does It Work?**

Logic tells us that continuously updated rankings will produce better results than a one-time process. As you add more training documents, the algorithm should improve. At least, that is the case with the Catalyst platform. While rankings based on a few thousand training documents can be quite good, they almost always improve through the addition of more training documents. As our Senior Research Scientist Jeremy Pickens says: “More is more.” And more is better.

And while more is better, it does not necessarily mean more work for the team. Our system’s ability to accept additional training documents, and to continually refine its rankings based on those additional exemplars, results in the review team having to review fewer documents, saving both time and money.

**Testing the Hypothesis**

We decided to test our hypothesis using three different review projects. Because each had already gone through linear review, we had what Dr. Pickens calls “ground truth” about all of the records being ranked. Put another way, we already knew whether the documents were responsive or privileged (which were the goals of the different reviews).

Thus, in this case we were not working with a partial sample or drawing conclusions based on a sample set. We could run the ranking process as if the documents had not been reviewed but then match up the results to the actual tags (responsive or privileged) given by the reviewers.

**The Process**

The tests began by picking six documents at random from the total collection. We then used those documents as training seeds for an
initial ranking. We then ranked all the documents based on those six exemplars.⁵

From there, we simulated delivering new training documents to the reviewers. We included a mix of highly ranked and random documents, along with others selected for their contextual diversity (meaning they were different from anything previously selected for training). We used this technique to help ensure that the reviewers saw a diverse range of documents—hopefully improving the ranking results.

Our simulated reviewers made judgments on these new documents based on tags from the earlier linear review. We then submitted their judgments to the algorithm for further training and ranking. We continued this train-rank-review process, working in batches of 300, until we reached an appropriate recall threshold for the documents.

What do I mean by that? At each point during the iteration process, Insight Predict ranked the entire document population. Because we knew the true responsiveness of every document in the collection, we could easily track how far down in the ranking we would have to go to cover 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, or even 95% of the relevant documents.

From there, we plotted the information to compare how many documents you would have to review using a one-time ranking process versus a continuous ranking approach. For clarity and simplicity, I chose two recall points to display: 80% (a common recall level) and 95% (high but achievable with our system). I could have presented several other recall rates as well but it might make the charts more confusing than necessary. The curves all looked similar in any event.

The Research Studies

Below are charts showing the results of our three case studies. These charts are different from the typical yield curves because they serve a different purpose. In this case, we were trying to demonstrate the efficacy of a continuous ranking process rather than a single ranking outcome.
Specifically, along the X-axis is the number of documents that were manually tagged and used as seeds for the process (the simulated review process). Along the Y-axis is the number of documents the review team would have to review (based on the seeds input to that point) to reach a desired recall level. The black diagonal line crossing the middle represents the simulated review counts, which were being continually fed back to the algorithm for additional training.

This will all make more sense when I walk you through the case studies. The facts of these cases are confidential, as are the clients and actual case names. But the results are highly interesting to say the least.

**Research Study One: Wellington F Matter (Responsive Review)**

This case involved a review of 85,506 documents. Of those, 11,460 were judged responsive. That translates to a prevalence (richness) rate of about 13%. Here is the resulting chart from our simulated review:

![Wellington F Matter (85,506 Total Docs)](chart.png)

There is a lot of information on this chart so I will take it step by step. The black diagonal line represents the number of seeds given to our virtual reviewers. It starts at zero and continues along a linear path.
until it intersects the 95% recall line. After that, the line becomes dashed to reflect the documents that might be included in a linear review but would be skipped in a TAR 2.0 review.

The red line represents the number of documents the team would have to review to reach the 80% recall mark. By that I simply mean that after you reviewed that number of documents, you would have seen 80% of the relevant documents in the population. The counts (from the Y axis) range from a starting point of 85,506 documents at zero seeds (essentially a linear review) to 27,488 documents (intersection with the black line) if you used continuous review.

I placed a grey dashed vertical line at the 2,500 document mark. This figure is meant to represent the number of training documents you might use to create a one-time ranking for a traditional TAR 1.0 process. Some systems require a larger number of seeds for this process but the analysis is essentially the same.

Following the dashed grey line upwards, the review team using TAR 1.0 would have to review 60,161 documents to reach a recall rate of 80%. That number is lower than the 85,000+ documents that would be involved with a linear review. But it is still a lot of documents and many more than the 27,488 required using continuous ranking.

With continuous ranking, we would continue to feed training documents to the system and continually improve the yield curve. The additional seeds used in the ranking are represented by the black diagonal line as I described earlier. It continues upwards and to the right as more seeds are reviewed and then fed to the ranking system.

The key point is that the black solid line intersects the red 80% ranking curve at about 27,488 documents. At this point in the review, the review team would have seen 80% of the relevant documents in the collection. We know this is the case because we have the reviewer’s judgments on all of the documents. As I mentioned earlier, we treated those judgments as “ground truth” for this research study.

What Are the Savings?

The savings come from the reduction of documents required to reach the 80% mark. By my calculations, the team would be able to reduce
its review burden from 60,161 documents in the TAR 1.0 process to 27,488 documents in the TAR 2.0 process—a reduction of another 32,673 documents. That translates to an additional 38% reduction in review attributable to the continuous ranking process. That is not a bad result. If you figure $4 a document for review costs, that would come to about $130,692 in additional savings.

It is worth mentioning that total savings from the TAR process are even greater. If we can reduce the total document population from 85,506 to 28,000 documents, that represents a reduction of 58,018 documents, or about 68%. At $4 a document, the total savings from the TAR process comes to $232,072.

We would be missing the boat if we stopped the analysis here. We all know the old expression, “Time is money.” In this case, the time savings from continuous ranking over a one-time ranking can be just as important as the savings on review costs. If we assumed your reviewer could go through 50 documents an hour, the savings for 80% recall would be a whopping 653 hours of review time avoided. At eight hours per review day, that translates to 81 review days saved.10

**How About for 95% Recall?**

If you followed our description of the ranking curve for 80% recall, you can see how we would come out if our goal were to achieve 95% recall. We have placed a summary of the numbers in the chart but we will recap them here.

1. Using 2,500 seeds and the ranking at that point, the TAR 1.0 team would have to review 77,731 documents in order to reach the 95% recall point.

2. With TAR 2.0’s continuous ranking, the review team could drop the count to 36,215 documents for a savings of 41,516 documents. That comes to a 49% savings.

3. At $4 a document, the savings from using continuous ranking instead of TAR 1.0 would be $166,064. The total savings over linear review would be $202,024.
4. Using our review metrics from above, this would amount to saving 830 review hours or 103 review days.

The bottom line on this case is that continuous ranking saves a substantial amount on both review costs and review time.

**Research Study Two: Ocala M Matter (Responsive Review)**

This case involved a review of 57,612 documents. Of those, 11,037 were judged relevant. That translates to a prevalence rate of about 19%, a bit higher than in the Wellington F Matter.

Here is the resulting chart from our simulated review.

![Ocala M Matter Chart](chart.png)

For an 80% recall threshold, the numbers are these:

1. Using TAR 1.0 with 2,500 seeds and the ranking at that point, the team would have to review 29,758 documents in order to reach the 80% recall point.

2. With TAR 2.0 and continuous ranking, the review team could drop the count to 23,706 documents for a savings of 6,052 documents. That would be an 11% savings.
3. At $4 a document, the savings from the continuous ranking process would be $24,208.

Compared to linear review, continuous ranking would reduce the number of documents to review by 33,906, for a cost savings of $135,624.

For a 95% recall objective, the numbers are these:

1. Using 2,500 seeds and the ranking at that point, the TAR 1.0 team would have to review 46,022 documents in order to reach the 95% recall point.

2. With continuous ranking, the TAR 2.0 review team could drop the count to 31,506 documents for a savings of 14,516 documents. That comes to a 25% savings.

3. At $4 a document, the savings from the continuous ranking process would be $58,064.

Not surprisingly, the numbers and percentages in the Ocala M study are different from the numbers in Wellington F, reflecting different documents and review issues. However, the underlying point is the same. Continuous ranking can save a substantial amount on review costs as well as review time.

**Research Study Three: Wellington F Matter (Privilege Review)**

The team on the Wellington F Matter also conducted a privilege review against the 85,000+ documents. We decided to see how the continuous ranking hypothesis would work for finding privileged documents. In this case, the collection was sparse. Of the 85,000+ documents, only 983 were judged to be privileged. That represents a prevalence rate of just over 1%, which is relatively low and can cause a problem for some systems.
Here is the resulting chart using the same methodology:

![Wellington F Priv Matter](image)

For an 80% recall threshold, the numbers are these:

1. The TAR 1.0 training would have finished the process after 2,104 training seeds. The team would have hit the 80% recall point at that time.

2. There would be no gain from continuous ranking in this case because the process would be complete during the initial training.

The upshot from this study is that the team would have saved substantially over traditional means of reviewing for privilege (which would involve linear review of some portion of the documents). However, there were no demonstrative savings from continuous ranking.

We recognize that most attorneys would demand a higher threshold than 80% for a privilege review. For good reasons, they would not be comfortable with allowing 20% of the privileged documents to slip through the net. The 95% threshold might bring them more comfort.
For a 95% recall objective, the numbers are these:

1. Using 2,500 seeds and the ranking at that point, the TAR 1.0 team would have to review 18,736 documents in order to reach the 95% recall point.

2. With continuous ranking, the TAR 2.0 review team could drop the count to 14,404 documents for a savings of 4,332 documents.

3. At $4 a document, the savings from the continuous ranking process would be $17,328.

For actual privilege reviews, we recommend that our clients use many of the other analytics tools in Insight to make sure that confidential documents don’t fall through the net. Thus, for the documents that are not actually reviewed during the TAR 2.0 process, we would be using facets to check the names and organizations involved in the communications to help make sure there is no inadvertent production.

What About the Subject Matter Experts?

In reading this, some of you may wonder what the role of a subject matter expert might be in a world of continuous ranking. Our answer is that the SME’s role is just as important as it was before but the work might be different. Instead of reviewing random documents at the beginning of the process, SMEs might be better advised to use their talents to find as many relevant documents as possible to help train the system. Then, as the review progresses, SMEs play a key role doing QC on reviewer judgments to make sure they are correct and consistent. Our research suggests that having experts review a portion of the documents tagged by the review team can lead to better ranking results at a much lower cost than having the SME review all of the training documents.

Ultimately, a continuous ranking process requires that the review team carry a large part of the training responsibility as they do their work. This sits well with most SMEs who don’t want to do standard review work even when it comes to relatively small training sets. Most senior lawyers that I know have no desire to review the large numbers of documents that would be required to achieve the benefits of continuous ranking. Rather, they typically want to review
as few documents as possible. “Leave it to the review team,” we often hear. “That’s their job.”

Conclusion

As these three research studies demonstrate, continuous ranking can produce better results than the one-time ranking approach associated with traditional TAR. These cases suggest that potential savings can be as high as 49% over the one-time ranking process.

As you feed more seeds into the system, the system’s ability to identify responsive documents continues to improve, which makes sense. The result is that review teams are able to review far fewer documents than traditional methods require and achieve even higher rates of recall.

Traditional TAR systems give you one bite at the apple. But if you want to get down to the core, one bite won’t get you there. Continuous ranking lets one bite feed on another, letting you finish your work more quickly and at lower cost. One bite at the apple is a lot better than none, but why stop there?

Footnotes

1. Relevant in this case means relevant to the issues under review. TAR systems are often used to find responsive documents but they can be used for other inquiries such as privileged, hot or relevant to a particular issue.

2. Catalyst’s contextual diversity algorithm is designed to find documents that are different from those already seen and used for training. We use this method to ensure that we aren’t missing documents that are relevant but different from the mainstream of documents being reviewed.

3. Determining when the review is complete is a subject for another day. Suffice it to say that once you determine the appropriate level of recall for a particular review, it is relatively easy to sample the ranked documents to determine when that recall threshold has been met.
4. We make no claim that a test of three cases is anything more than a start of a larger analysis. We didn't hand pick the cases for their results but would readily concede that more case studies would be required before you could draw a statistical conclusion. We wanted to report on what we could learn from these experiments and invite others to do the same.

5. Catalyst's system ranks all of the documents each time we rank. We do not work off a reference set (i.e. a small sample of the documents).

6. We recognize that IR scientists would argue that you only need to review 80% of the total population to reach 80% recall in a linear review. We could use this figure in our analysis but chose not to simply because the author has never seen a linear review that stopped before all of the documents were reviewed—at least based on an argument that they had achieved a certain recall level as a result of reaching a certain threshold. Clearly you can make this argument and are free to do so. Simply adjust the figures accordingly.

7. This isn't a fair comparison. We don't have access to other TAR systems to see what results they might have after ingesting 2,500 seed documents. Nor can we simulate the process they might use to select those seeds for the best possible ranking results. But it is the data I have to work with. The gap between one-time and continuous ranking may be narrower but I believe the essential point is the same. Continuous ranking is like continuous learning: the more of it the better.

8. In a typical review, the team would not know they were at the 80% mark without testing the document population. We know in this case because we have all the review judgments. In the real world, we recommend the use of a systematic sample to determine when target recall is being approached by the review.

9. We chose this figure as a placeholder for the analysis. We have seen higher and lower figures depending on who is doing the review. Feel free to use a different figure to reflect your actual review costs.

10. We used 50 documents per hour as a placeholder for this calculation. Feel free to substitute different figures based on your experience. But saving on review costs is only half the benefit of a TAR process.

11. Most privilege reviews are not linear in the sense that all documents in a population are reviewed. Typically, some combination of searches is run to identify the likely privileged candidates. That number should be smaller than the total but can't be specified in this exercise.
Subject Matter Experts

What Role Should They Play in TAR 2.0 Training?

If you accept the cost-saving benefits of continuous ranking, you are all but forced to ask about the role of experts. Most experts (often senior lawyers) don’t want to review training documents, even though they may acknowledge the value of this work in cutting review costs. They chafe at clicking through random and often irrelevant documents and put off the work whenever possible.

Often, this holds up the review process and frustrates review managers, who are under pressure to get moving as quickly as possible. New uploads are held hostage until the reluctant expert can come back to the table to review the additional seeds. Indeed, some see the need for experts as one of the bigger negatives about the TAR process.

Continuous ranking using experts would be a non-starter. Asking senior lawyers to review 3,000 or more training documents is one thing.\(^1\) Asking them to continue the process through 10,000, 50,000 or even more documents could lead to early retirement—yours, not
“I didn't go to law school for that kind of work,” they'll say. “Push it down to the associates or those contract reviewers we hired. That's their job.”

So, our goal was to find out how important experts are to the training process, particularly in a TAR 2.0 world. Are their judgments essential to ensure optimal ranking or can review team judgments be just as effective? Ultimately, we wondered if experts could work hand in hand with the review team, doing tasks better suited to their expertise, and achieve better and faster training results—at less cost than using the expert exclusively for the training. Our results were interesting, to say the least.

Research Population

We used data from the 2010 TREC program for our analysis. The TREC data is built on a large volume of the ubiquitous Enron documents, which we used for our ranking analysis. We used judgments about those documents (i.e. relevant to the inquiry or not) provided by a team of contract reviewers hired by TREC for that purpose.

In many cases, we also had judgments on those same documents made by the topic authorities on each of the topics for our study. This was because the TREC participants were allowed to challenge the judgments of the contract reviewers. Once challenged, the document tag would be submitted to the appropriate topic authority for further review. These were the people who had come up with the topics in the first place and presumably knew how the documents should be tagged. We treated them as SMEs for our research.

So, we had data from the review teams and, often, from the topic authorities themselves. In some cases, the topic authority affirmed the reviewer's decision. In other cases, they were reversed. This gave us a chance to compare the quality of the document ranking based on the review team decisions and those of the SMEs.

Methodology

We worked with the four TREC topics from the legal track. These were selected essentially at random. There was nothing about the
documents or the results that caused us to select one topic over the other. In each case, we used the same methodology I will describe here.

For each topic, we started by randomly selecting a subset of the overall documents that had been judged. Those became the training documents, sometimes called seeds. The remaining documents were used as evaluation (testing) documents. After we developed a ranking based on the training documents, we could test the efficacy of that ranking against the actual review tags in the larger evaluation set.4

As mentioned earlier, we had parallel training sets, one from the reviewers and one from the SMEs. Our random selection of documents for training included documents on which both the SME and a basic reviewer agreed, along with documents on which the parties disagreed. Again, the selection was random so we did not control how much agreement or disagreement there was in the training set.

Experts vs. Review Teams: Which Produced the Better Ranking?

We used Insight Predict to create two separate rankings. One was based on training using judgments from the experts. The other was based on training using judgments from the review team. Our idea was to see which training set resulted in a better ranking of the documents.

We tested both rankings against the actual document judgments, plotting our results in standard yield curves. In that regard, we used the judgments of the topic authorities to the extent they differed from those of the review team. Since they were the authorities on the topics, we used their judgments in evaluating the different rankings. We did not try to inject our own judgments to resolve the disagreement.

Using the Experts to QC Reviewer Judgments

As a further experiment, we created a third set of training documents to use in our ranking process. Specifically, we wanted to see what
impact an expert might have on a review team's rankings if the expert were to review and “correct” a percentage of the review team's judgments. We were curious whether it might improve the overall rankings and how that effort might compare to rankings done by an expert or review team without the benefit of a QC process.

We started by submitting the review team's judgments to Predict. We then asked Predict to rank the documents in this fashion:

1. The lowest-ranked positive judgments (reviewer tagged it relevant while Predict ranked it highly non-relevant); and

2. The highest-ranked negative judgments (reviewer tagged it non-relevant while Predict ranked it highly relevant).

The goal here was to select the biggest outliers for consideration. These were documents where our Predict ranking system most strongly differed from the reviewer’s judgment, no matter how the underlying documents were tagged.

We simulated having an expert look at the top 10% of these training documents. In cases where the expert agreed with the reviewer’s judgments, we left the tagging as is. In cases where the expert had overturned the reviewer’s judgment based on a challenge, we reversed the tag. When this process was finished, we ran the ranking again based on the changed values and plotted those values as a separate line in our yield curve.

**Plotting the Differences: Expert vs. Reviewer Yield Curves**

A yield curve presents the results of a ranking process and is a handy way to visualize the difference between two processes. The X-axis shows the percentage of documents that are reviewed. The Y-axis shows the percentage of relevant documents found at each point in the review.

Here were the results of our four experiments.
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The lines above show how quickly you would find relevant documents during your review. As a base line, we created a gray diagonal line to show the progress of a linear review (which essentially moves through the documents in random order). Without a better basis for ordering of the documents, the recall rates for a linear review typically match the percentage of documents actually reviewed—hence the straight line. By the time you have seen 80% of the documents, you probably have seen 80% of the relevant documents.

The blue, green and red lines are meant to show the success of the rankings for the review team, expert and the use of an expert to QC a portion of the review team’s judgments. Notice that all of the lines are above and to the left of the linear review curve. This means that you could dramatically improve the speed at which you found relevant documents over a linear review process with any of these ranking methods. Put another way, it means that a ranked review approach would present more relevant documents at any point in the review (until the end). That is not surprising because TAR is typically more effective at surfacing relevant documents than linear review.

In this first example, the review team seemed to perform at a less effective rate than the expert reviewer at lower recall rates (the blue
curve is below and to the right of the other curves). The review team ranking would, for example, require the review of a slightly higher percentage of documents to achieve an 80% recall rate than the expert ranking. Beyond 80%, however, the lines converge and the review team seems to do as good a job as the expert.

When the review team was assisted by the expert through a QC process, the results were much improved. The rankings generated by the expert-only review were almost identical to the rankings produced by the review team with QC assistance from the expert. We will show later that this approach would save you both time and money, because the review team can move more quickly than a single reviewer and typically bills at a much lower rate.

**Issue Two**

![Graph showing yield curves](image)

In this example, the yield curves are almost identical, with the rankings by the review team being slightly better than those of an expert alone. Oddly, the expert QC rankings drop a bit around the 80% recall line and stay below until about 85%. Nonetheless, this experiment shows that all three methods are viable and will return about the same results.
Issue Three

In this case the ranking lines are identical until about the 80% recall level. At that point, the expert QC ranking process drops a bit and does not catch up to the expert and review team rankings until about 90% recall. Significantly, at 80% recall, all the curves are about the same. Notice that this recall threshold would only require a review of 30% of the documents, which would suggest a 70% cut in review costs and time.

Issue Four
Issue four offers a somewhat surprising result and may be an outlier. In this case, the expert ranking seems substantially inferior to the review team or expert QC rankings. The divergence starts at about the 55% recall rate and continues until about 95% recall. This chart suggests that the review team alone would have done better than the expert alone. However, the expert QC method would have matched the review team’s rankings as well.

**What Does This All Mean?**

That’s the million-dollar question. Let’s start with what it doesn’t mean. These were tests using data we had from the TREC program. We don’t have sufficient data to prove anything definitively but the results sure are interesting. It would be nice to have additional data involving expert and review team judgments to extend the analysis.

In addition, these yield curves came from our product, Insight Predict. We use a proprietary algorithm that could work differently from other TAR products. It may be that experts are the only ones suitable to train some of the other processes. Or not.

That said, these yield curves suggest strongly that the traditional notion that only an expert can train a TAR system may not be correct. On average in these experiments, the review teams did as well or better than the experts at judging training documents. We believe it provides a basis for further experimentation and discussion.

**Why Does This Matter?**

There are several reasons this analysis matters. They revolve around time and money.

First, in many cases, the expert isn’t available to do the initial training, at least not on your schedule. If the review team has to wait for the expert to get through 3,000 or so training documents, the delay in the review can present a problem. Litigation deadlines seem to get tighter and tighter. Getting the review going more quickly can be critical in some instances.

Second, having review teams participate in training can cut review
costs. Typically, the SME charges at a much higher billing rate than a reviewer. If the expert has to review 3,000 training documents at a higher billable rate, total costs for the review increase accordingly. Here is a simple chart illustrating the point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Only</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Review Rate</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Time Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Expert</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert and Review Team</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Review Rate</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Time Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Reviewers</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Expert</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Savings          |         |             |           | $21,750 | 40.0       |

Using the assumptions I have presented, having an expert do all of the training would take 50 hours and cost almost $27,500. In contrast, having a review team do most of the training while the expert does a 10% QC, will reduce the cost by 85%, to $5,750. The time spent on the combined review process changes from 50 hours (6+ days) to 10 combined hours, a bit more than a day.6

You can use different assumptions for this chart but the point is the same. Having the review team involved in the process saves time and money. Our testing suggests that this happens with no material loss to the ranking process.

This all becomes mandatory when you move to continuous ranking. The process is based on using the review team rather than an expert for review. Any other approach would not make sense from an economic perspective or be a good or desirable use of the expert's time.

So what should the expert do in a TAR 2.0 environment? We suggest that experts do what they are trained to do (and have been doing since our profession began). Use the initial time to interview witnesses and find important documents. Feed those documents to the ranking system to get the review started. Then use the time to QC
the review teams and to search for additional good documents. Our research so far suggests that the process makes good sense from both a logical and efficiency standpoint.

---

**Footnotes**

1. Typical processes call for an expert to train about 2,000 documents before the algorithm “stabilizes.” They also require the expert to review 500 or more documents to create a control set for testing the algorithm and a similar amount for testing the ranking results once training is complete. Insight Predict does not use a control set (the system ranks all the documents with each ranking). However, it would require a systematic sample to create a yield curve.

2. The Text Retrieval Conference is sponsored by the National Institute for Standards and Technology. (http://trec.nist.gov/)

3. We aren’t claiming that this perfectly modeled a review situation but it provided a reasonable basis for our experiments. In point of fact, the SME did not re-review all of the judgments made by the review team. Rather, the SME considered those judgments where a vendor appealed a review team assessment. In addition, the SMEs may have made errors in their adjudication or otherwise acted inconsistently. Of course that can happen in a real review as well. We just worked with what we had.

4. Note that we do not consider this the ideal workflow. A completely random seed set, with no iteration and no judgmental/automated seeding, this test does not (and is not intended to) create the best yield curve. Our goal here was to put all three tests on level footing, which this methodology does.

5. In this case, you would have to review 19% of the documents to achieve 80% recall for the ranking based only on the review team’s training and only 14% based on training by an expert.

6. We used “net time spent” for the second part of this chart to illustrate the real impact of the time saved. While the review takes a total of 55 hours (50 for the team and 5 for the expert), the team works concurrently. Thus, the team finishes in just 5 hours, leaving the expert another 5 hours to finish his QC. The training gets done in a day (or so) rather than a week.
Comparing Active Learning to Random Sampling

**Using Zipf’s Law to Evaluate Which is More Effective for TAR**

Maura Grossman and Gordon Cormack recently released a blockbuster article, *Comments on The Implications of Rule 26(g) on the Use of Technology-Assisted Review*, 7 Fed. Cts. L. Rev. 286 (2014). The article was in part a response to an earlier article in the same journal by Karl Schieneman and Thomas Gricks, in which they asserted that Rule 26(g) imposes “unique obligations” on parties using TAR for document productions and suggested using techniques we associate with TAR 1.0 including:

*Training the TAR system using a random “seed” or “training” set as opposed to one relying on judgmental sampling, which “may not be representative of the entire population of electronic documents within a given collection.”*

From the beginning, we have advocated a TAR 2.0 approach that uses judgmental seeds (selected by the trial team using all techniques...
at their disposal to find relevant documents). Random seeds are a convenient shortcut to approximating topical coverage, especially when one doesn't have the algorithms and computing resources to model the entire document collection. But they are neither the best way to train a modern TAR system nor the only way to eliminate bias and ensure full topical coverage. We have published several research papers and articles showing that documents selected via continuous active learning and contextual diversity (active modeling of the entire document set) consistently beat training documents selected at random.

In this latest article and in a recent peer-reviewed study, Cormack and Grossman also make a compelling case that random sampling is one of the least effective methods for training. Indeed, they conclude that even the worst examples of keyword searches are likely to bring better training results than random selection, particularly for populations with low levels of richness.

Ralph Losey has also written on the issue at his e-Discovery Team blog, arguing that relying on random samples rather than judgmental samples “ignores an attorney’s knowledge of the case and the documents. It is equivalent to just rolling dice to decide where to look for something, instead of using your own judgment, your own skills and insights.”

Our experience, like theirs, is that judgmental samples selected using attorneys’ knowledge of the case can get you started more effectively, and that any possible bias arising from the problem of “unknown unknowns” can be easily corrected with the proper tools. We also commonly see document collections with very low richness, which makes these points even more important in actual practice.

Herb Roitblat, the developer of OrcaTec (which apparently uses random sampling for training purposes), believes in the superiority of a random-only sampling approach. His main argument is that training using judgmental seeds backed by review team judgments leads to “bias” because “you don't know what you don't know.” Our experience, which is now backed by the peer-reviewed research of Cormack and Grossman, is that there are more effective ways to avoid bias than simple random sampling.
We certainly agree with Roitblat that there is always a concern for “bias,” at least in the sense of not knowing what you don’t know. But it isn’t necessarily a problem that prevents us from ever using judgmental seeds. Sometimes – depending on the skill, knowledge, and nature of the relevant information in the matter itself – judgmental selection of training documents can indeed cover all relevant aspects of a matter. At other times, judgmental samples will miss some topics because of the problem of “unknown unknowns” but this deficiency can be easily corrected by using an algorithm such as contextual diversity that models the entire document population and actively identifies topics that need human attention rather than blindly relying on random samples to hit those pockets of documents the attorneys missed.

The goal of this post, however, is not to dissect the arguments on either side of the random sampling debate. Rather, we want to have a bit of fun and show you how Zipf’s law and the many ways it is manifest in document populations argue strongly for the form of active learning we use to combat the possibility of bias. Our method is called “contextual diversity” and Zipf’s law can help you understand why it is more efficient and effective than random sampling for ensuring topical coverage and avoiding bias.

**What is Contextual Diversity?**

A typical TAR 1.0 workflow often involves an expert reviewing a relatively small set of documents, feeding those documents into the TAR system to do its thing, and then having a review team check samples to confirm the machine’s performance. But in TAR 2.0, we continuously use all the judgments of the review teams to make the algorithm smarter (which means you find relevant documents faster). Like Cormack and Grossman, we feed documents ranked high for relevance to the review team and use their judgments to train the system. However, our continuous learning approach also throws other options into the mix to further improve performance, combat potential bias, and ensure complete topical coverage. One of these options that addresses all three concerns is our “contextual diversity” algorithm.

Contextual diversity refers to documents that are highly different
from the ones already seen and judged by human reviewers (and thus under a TAR 2.0 approach have been used in training), no matter how those documents were initially selected for review. Because our system ranks all of the documents in the collection on a continual basis, we know a lot about documents – both those the review team has seen but also (and more importantly) those the review team has not yet seen. The contextual diversity algorithm identifies documents based on how significant and how different they are from the ones already seen, and then selects training documents that are the most representative of those unseen topics for human review.

It’s important to note that the algorithm doesn’t know what those topics mean or how to rank them. But it can see that these topics need human judgments on them and then select the most representative documents it can find for the reviewers. This accomplishes two things: (1) it is constantly selecting training documents that will provide the algorithm with the most information possible from one attorney-document view, and (2) it is constantly putting the next biggest “unknown unknown” it can find in front of attorneys so they can judge for themselves whether it is relevant or important to their case.

We feed in enough of the contextual diversity documents to ensure that the review team gets a balanced view of the document population, regardless of how any initial seed documents were selected. But we also want the review team focused on highly relevant documents, not only because this is their ultimate goal, but also because these documents are highly effective at further training the TAR system as Cormack and Grossman now confirm. Therefore, we want to make the contextual diversity portion of the review as efficient as possible. How we optimize that mix is a trade secret, but the concepts behind contextual diversity and active modeling of the entire document population are explained below.

**Contextual Diversity: Explicitly Modeling the Unknown**

In the following example, assume you started the training with contract documents found either through keyword search or witness interviews. You might see terms like the ones above the blue dotted line showing up in the documents. Documents 10 and 11 have
human judgments on them (indicated in red and green), so the TAR system can assign weights to the contract terms (indicated in dark blue).

But what if there are other documents in the collection, like those shown below the dotted line, that have highly technical terms but few or none of the contract terms? Maybe they just arrived in a rolling collection. Or maybe they were there all along but no one knew to look for them. How would you find them based on your initial terms? That's the essence of the bias argument.

With contextual diversity, we analyze all of the documents. Again, we're not solving the strong artificial intelligence problem here, but the machine can still plainly see that there is a pocket of different, unjudged documents there. It can also see that one document in particular, 1781, is the most representative of all those documents, being at the center of the web of connections among the unjudged terms and unjudged documents. Our contextual diversity engine would therefore select that one for review, not only because it gives the best “bang for the buck” for a single human judgment, but also because it gives the attorneys the most representative and efficient look into that topic that the machine can find.
So Who is This Fellow Named Zipf?

Zipf's law was named after the famed American linguist George Kingsley Zipf, who died in 1950. The law refers to the fact that many types of data, including city populations and a host of other things studied in the physical and social sciences, seem to follow a Zipfian distribution, which is part of a larger family of power law probability distributions. (You can read all about Zipf's law in Wikipedia, where we pulled this description.)

Why does this matter? Bear with us, you will see the fun of this in just a minute.

It turns out that the frequency of words and many other features in a body of text tend to follow a Zipfian power law distribution. For example, you can expect the most frequent word in a large population to be twice as frequent as the second most common word, three times as frequent as the third most common word and so on down the line. Studies of Wikipedia itself have found that the most common word, “the,” is twice as frequent as the next, “of,” with the third most frequent word being “and.” You can see how the frequency drops here:
Topical Coverage and Zipf’s Law

Here’s something that may sound familiar: Ever seen a document population where documents about one topic were pretty common, and then those about another topic were somewhat less common, and so forth down to a bunch of small, random stuff? We can model the distribution of subtopics in a document collection using Zipf’s law too. And doing so makes it easier to see why active modeling and contextual diversity is both more efficient and more effective than random sampling.

Here is a model of our document collection, broken out by subtopics. The subtopics are shown as bubbles, scaled so that their areas follow a Zipfian distribution. The biggest bubble represents the most prevalent subtopic, while the smaller bubbles reflect increasingly less frequent subtopics in the documents.

Now to be nitpicky, this is an oversimplification. Subtopics are not always discrete, boundaries are not precise, and the modeling is much too complex to show accurately in two dimensions. But this approximation makes it easier to see the main points.

So let’s start by taking a random sample across the documents, both to start training a TAR engine and also to see what stories the collection can tell us.

We’ll assume that the documents are distributed randomly in this population, so we can draw a grid across the model to represent a simple random sample. The red dots reflect each of 80 sample documents. The portion of the grid outside the circle is ignored.
We can now represent our topical coverage by shading the circles covered by the random sample.

You can see that a number of the randomly sampled documents hit the same topical circles. In fact, over a third (32 out of 80) fall in the largest subtopic. A full dozen are in the next largest. Others hit some of the smaller circles, which is a good thing, and we can see that we've colored a good proportion of our model yellow with this sample.

So in this case, a random sample gives fairly decent results without having to do any analysis or modeling of the entire document population. But it's not great. And with respect to topical coverage, it's not exactly unbiased, either. The biggest topics have a ton of representation, a few tiny ones are now represented by a full 1/80 of the sample, and many larger ones were completely missed. So a random sample has some built-in topical bias that varies randomly—a different random sample might have biases in different directions. Sure, it gives you some rough statistics on what is more or less common in the collection, but both attorneys and TAR engines usually care more about what is in the collection rather than how frequently it appears.

So what if we actually can perform analysis and modeling of the entire document population? Can we do better than a random sample? Yes, as it turns out, and by quite a bit.

Let's attack the problem again by putting attorney eyes on 80 documents—the exact same effort as before—but this time we select the sample documents using a contextual diversity process. Remember: our mission is to find representative documents from as many topical groupings as possible to train the TAR engine most effectively, avoid any bias that might arise from judgmental sampling, and to help the attorneys quickly learn everything they need to from
the collection. Here is the topical coverage achieved using contextual diversity for the the same size review set of 80 documents:

Now look at how much of that collection is colored yellow. By actively modeling the whole collection, the TAR engine with contextual diversity uses everything it can see in the collection to give reviewing attorneys the most representative document it can find from each subtopic. By using its knowledge of the documents to systematically work through the subtopics, it avoids massively oversampling the larger ones and relying on random samples to eventually hit all the smaller ones (which, given the nature of random samples, need to be very large to have a decent chance of hitting all the small stuff). It achieves much broader coverage for the exact same effort.
At right is a comparison of the two different approaches to selecting a sample of 80 documents. The subtopics colored yellow were covered by both. Orange indicates those that were found using contextual diversity but missed by the random sample of the same size. Dark blue shows those smaller topics that the random sample hit but contextual diversity did not reach in the first 80 seed documents.

Finally, here is a side by side comparison of the topical coverage achieved for the same amount of review effort:

Now imagine that the attorneys started with some judgmental seeds taken from one or two topics. You can also see how contextual diversity would help balance the training set and keep the TAR engine from running too far down only one or two paths at the beginning of the review by methodically giving attorneys new, alternative topics to evaluate.
When subtopics roughly follow a Zipfian distribution, we can easily see how simple random sampling tends to produce inferior results compared to an active learning approach like contextual diversity. (In fact, systematic modeling of the collection and algorithmic selection of training documents beats random sampling even if every topic were the exact same size, but for other reasons we will not go into here).

For tasks such as a review for production where the recall and precision standards are based on “reasonableness” and “proportionality,” random sampling—while not optimal—may be good enough. But if you’re looking for a needle in a haystack or trying to make sure that the attorneys’ knowledge about the collection is complete, random sampling quickly falls farther and farther behind active modeling approaches.

So while we strongly agree with the findings of Cormack and Grossman and their conclusions regarding active learning, we also know through our own research that the addition of contextual diversity to the mix makes the results even more efficient.

After all, the goal here is to find relevant documents as quickly and efficiently as possible while also quickly helping attorneys learn everything they need to know to litigate the case effectively. George Zipf is in our corner.
Does Predictive Coding Work for Non-English Languages?

A recent U.S. Department of Justice memorandum questioned the effectiveness of using technology assisted review with non-English documents. The fact is that, done properly, TAR can be just as effective for non-English as it is for English documents.

This is true even for the so-called “CJK languages,” Asian languages including Chinese, Japanese and Korean. Although these languages do not use standard English-language delimiters such as spaces and punctuation, they are nonetheless candidates for the successful use of technology assisted review.

The DOJ memorandum, published on March 26, 2014, addresses the use of TAR by the Antitrust Division. The author, Tracy Greer, senior litigation counsel for electronic discovery, acknowledges that TAR “offers the promise of reducing the costs” for parties responding to a DOJ second request in a proposed merger or acquisition.
Even so, Greer questions whether TAR would be effective with non-English documents. “In investigations in which TAR has been employed, we have not been entirely satisfied that the TAR process works effectively with foreign- and mixed-language documents,” she writes. While the division “would be open to discussion” about using TAR in such cases, she adds, it is not ready to adopt it as a standard procedure.

This is an important issue, not just for antitrust but for litigation and regulatory matters across the board. As the world gets flatter, legal matters increasingly encompass documents in multiple languages. Greer notes this in the antitrust context, writing, “As the division’s investigations touch more international companies, we have seen a substantial increase in foreign-language productions.”

To be fair, the DOJ is not alone in questioning TAR’s effectiveness for non-English documents. Many industry professionals share that doubt. They perceive TAR as a process that involves “understanding” documents. If the documents are in a language the system does not understand, then TAR cannot be effective, they reason.

Of course, computers don't actually “understand” anything (so far, at least). TAR programs simply catalog the words in documents and apply mathematical algorithms to identify relationships among them. To be more precise, we call what they recognize “tokens,” because often the fragments are not even words, but numbers, acronyms, misspellings or even gibberish.

The question, then, is whether computers can recognize tokens (words or otherwise) when they appear in other languages. The simple answer is yes. If the documents are processed properly, TAR can be just as effective for non-English as it is for English documents.

**TAR for Non-English Documents**

To understand why TAR can work with non-English documents, you need to know two basic points:

1. TAR doesn't understand English or any other language. It uses an algorithm to associate words with relevant or irrelevant documents.
2. To use the process for non-English documents, particularly those in Chinese and Japanese, the system has to first tokenize the document text so it can identify individual words.

We will hit these topics in order.

1. **TAR Doesn’t Understand English**

   It is beyond the province of this article to provide a detailed explanation of how TAR works, but a basic explanation will suffice for our purposes. Let me start with this: TAR doesn’t understand English or the actual meaning of documents. Rather, it simply analyzes words algorithmically according to their frequency in relevant documents compared to their frequency in irrelevant documents.

   Think of it this way: We train the system by marking documents as relevant or irrelevant. When I mark a document relevant, the computer algorithm analyzes the words in that document and ranks them based on frequency, proximity or some other such basis. When I mark a document irrelevant, the algorithm does the same, this time giving the words a negative score. At the end of the training process, the computer sums up the analysis from the individual training documents and uses that information to build a search against a larger set of documents.

   While different algorithms work differently, think of the TAR system as creating huge searches using the words developed during training. It might use 10,000 positive terms, with each ranked for importance. It might similarly use 10,000 negative terms, with each ranked in a similar way. The search results would come up in an ordered fashion sorted by importance, with the most likely relevant ones coming first.

   None of this requires that the computer know English or the meaning of the documents or even the words in them. All the computer needs to know is which words are contained in which documents.
2. **If Documents Are Properly Tokenized, the TAR Process Will Work**

Tokenization may be an unfamiliar term to you but it is not difficult to understand. When a computer processes documents for search, it pulls out all of the words and places them in a combined index. When you run a search, the computer doesn’t go through all of your documents one by one. Rather, it goes to an ordered index of terms to find out which documents contain which terms. That’s why search works so quickly. Even Google works this way, using huge indexes of words.

As I mentioned, however, the computer doesn’t understand words or even that a word is a word. Rather, for English documents it identifies a word as a series of characters separated by spaces or punctuation marks. Thus, it recognizes the words in this sentence because each has a space (or a comma) before and after it. Because not every group of characters is necessarily an actual “word,” information retrieval scientists call these groupings “tokens,” and the act of identifying these tokens for the index as “tokenization.”

All of these are tokens:

- Bank
- door
- 12345
- barnyard
- mixxpelling

And so on. All of these will be kept in a token index for fast search and retrieval.

Certain languages, such as Chinese and Japanese, don’t delineate words with spaces or western punctuation. Rather, their characters run through the line break, often with no breaks at all. It is up to the reader to tokenize the sentences in order to understand their meaning.
Many early English-language search systems couldn't tokenize Asian text, resulting in search results that often were less than desirable. More advanced search systems, like the one we chose for Catalyst, had special tokenization engines which were designed to index these Asian languages and many others that don't follow the Western conventions. They provided more accurate search results than did their less-advanced counterparts.

Similarly, the first TAR systems were focused on English-language documents and could not process Asian text. At Catalyst, we added a text tokenizer to make sure that we handled these languages properly. As a result, our TAR system can analyze Chinese and Japanese documents just as if they were in English. Word frequency counts are just as effective for these documents and the resulting rankings are as effective as well.

A Case Study to Prove the Point

Let me illustrate this with an example from a matter we handled not long ago. We were contacted by a major U.S. law firm that was facing review of a set of mixed Japanese and English language documents. It wanted to use TAR on the Japanese documents, with the goal of cutting both the cost and time of the review, but was uncertain whether TAR would work with Japanese.

Our solution to this problem was to first tokenize the Japanese documents before beginning the TAR process. Our method of tokenization—also called segmentation—extracts the Japanese text and then uses language-identification software to break it into words and phrases that the TAR engine can identify.

To achieve this, we loaded the Japanese documents into our review platform. As we loaded the documents, we performed language detection and extracted the Japanese text. Then, using our proprietary technology and methods, we tokenized the text so the system would be able to analyze the Japanese words and phrases.

With tokenization complete, we could begin the TAR process. In this case, senior lawyers from the firm reviewed 500 documents to create a reference set to be used by the system for its analysis. Next, they
reviewed a sample set of 600 documents, marking them relevant or non-relevant. These documents were then used to train the system so it could distinguish between likely relevant and likely non-relevant documents and use that information for ranking.

After the initial review, and based on the training set, we directed the system to rank the remainder of the documents for relevance. The results were compelling:

- The system was able to identify a high percentage of likely relevant documents (98%) and place them at the front of the review queue through its ranking process. As a result, the review team would need to review only about half of the total document population (48%) to cover the bulk of the likely relevant documents.

- The remaining portion of the documents (52%) contained a small percentage of likely relevant documents. The review team reviewed a random sample from this portion and found only 3% were likely relevant. This low percentage suggested that these documents did not need to be reviewed, thus saving the cost of reviewing over half the documents.

By applying tokenization before beginning the TAR process, the law firm was able to target its review toward the most-likely relevant documents and to reduce the total number of documents that needed to be reviewed or translated by more than half.

**Conclusion**

As corporations grow increasingly global, legal matters are increasingly likely to involve non-English language documents. Many believed that TAR was not up to the task of analyzing non-English documents. The truth, however, is that with the proper technology and expertise, TAR can be used with any language, even difficult Asian languages such as Chinese and Japanese.

Whether for English or non-English documents, the benefits of TAR are the same. By using computer algorithms to rank documents by relevance, lawyers can review the most important documents first,
review far fewer documents overall, and ultimately cut both the cost and time of review. In the end, that is something their clients will understand, no matter what language they speak.
Case Study: Using TAR to Find Hot Docs for Depositions

How Insight Predict Succeeded Where Keywords Failed

Common belief is that technology assisted review is useful only when making productions. In fact, it is also highly effective for reviewing productions from an opposing party. This is especially true when imminent depositions create an urgent need to identify hot documents.

A recent multi-district medical device litigation dramatizes this. The opposing party’s production was a “data dump” containing garbled OCR and little metadata. As a result, keyword searching was virtually useless. But by using TAR, the attorneys were able to highlight hot documents and prepare for the depositions with time to spare.
Challenge: Quickly Find Hot Docs in Garbled Production

The attorneys represented the plaintiffs in a multi-district products liability lawsuit involving a medical device. With depositions of the defendants’ witnesses just around the corner, the defendants produced some 77,000 electronic documents. To prepare for the depositions, the attorneys needed to quickly scour the production for hot documents.

But there was a problem. The defendants’ production was a mess. Many documents were poorly scanned and without metadata. The OCR text for the scanned documents was riddled with errors. Thousands of emails had been so completely redacted that even the address and subject line showed only “redacted.”

Given the condition of the data and garbled OCR, keyword searching was ineffective and inconclusive. Reviewing just the documents that hit on highly focused searches, only 5% were potential deposition exhibits and only 51% were either relevant or hot. The attorneys were certain they were missing important documents, even as their time to prepare was running short.

Solution: Using Insight Predict to Prioritize Hot Documents for Review

With depositions looming, the attorneys turned to Catalyst for help zeroing in on hot documents. Using Insight Predict, our TAR 2.0 platform, we were able to help them find and prioritize a significantly greater number of hot and relevant documents than they had been able to do using keyword searching alone.

We started by having a lead attorney QC the documents already tagged as hot. We then had the attorney review a few hundred more targeted hits and some further samples to identify additional hot documents.

Using those documents as seeds, we proceeded to rank the entire population for hot documents, in order to concentrate them at the top of the ranked list. From the resulting ranked list, we then
pulled the top thousand unreviewed documents for the attorneys to evaluate.

In this way, the proportions of hot and relevant documents were greatly enhanced. Through keyword searching, only 5% of documents found were hot and 46% were relevant. But through TAR, 27% of the top-ranked documents were hot and 65% were relevant.

The chart to the right shows the breakdown of that top slice of roughly 1,000 documents out of the 77,000 documents ranked. The second bar shows the 258 documents judged by the reviewing attorneys to be hot. Nearly all the rest of the documents—the first bar of 616—were judged to be at least relevant.

With over 92% relevance and over a quarter of the documents actually deemed “hot,” the attorneys now had a rich, small set of documents to work through. The Predict rankings allowed them to quickly and efficiently find everything they needed.

**Good Results from Difficult Data**

Because Insight Predict lets you use as many seeds as you want from judgmental sampling, we were able to use documents the attorneys
had already coded and quickly achieve results that were far better than would be expected from such a mess of a document set.

The chart at right compares the review ratios for the unranked search hits and for the high-ranked documents ranked by Insight Predict.

Thanks to TAR, the plaintiffs’ attorneys were able to work with a document set that was rich with hot and relevant documents. That enabled them to prepare thoroughly for depositions by reviewing the hot documents that pertained to the deponents and issues in the case.

**The Bottom Line**

One of the best ways to find hot deposition documents in the opposing side’s production is to use TAR. It even helps overcome problems of missing metadata and mangled text. And it continues to improve as you and the system learn more about the case. It saves time and money, helps you prepare sooner, and enables you to focus on what is important.
Case Study: Using TAR to Expedite Multi-Language Review

How Insight Predict’s Unique Capabilities Cut Review by Two Thirds

In a major shareholder class action alleging violations of federal securities laws, the defendant’s legal team was under a tight deadline to review a collection of mixed English and Spanish documents. By prioritizing documents using Insight Predict—Catalyst’s engine for technology assisted review—the team was able to cut the review by two-thirds, saving time and money.

The case illustrates two key capabilities that distinguish TAR 2.0 platforms such as Insight Predict from earlier TAR tools. One is that judgmental seeds, selected by the trial team, were used to train the system, rather than the random seeds used by earlier tools. The other is that Insight Predict’s unique contextual diversity sampling helped discover critical information “hidden” in spreadsheet files.
The Challenge: Quickly Review Multi-Language Documents

Our client, an international provider of products and services, was sued by shareholders in a federal class action alleging violations of the Securities and Exchange Act. Its legal team faced an imminent deadline to produce responsive documents from a collection of 66,000 files. The collection included emails, documents and spreadsheets in both English and Spanish. To save time and money, the team wanted to minimize the number of documents that would require eyes-on review.

The Solution: Prioritize Documents for Review Using Insight Predict

The team decided that the best approach would be to rank documents for review using Insight Predict.

The attorneys had already reviewed a few hundred emails that had been hand-picked for them by two key custodians, so we started the ranking process using those as seeds to initially train the Predict engine.

For the two languages, we created separate rankings. Then, as Predict continuously ranked the documents, on-demand batches were sent to the review team from the top of the most-recent ranking round. Because Insight Predict directly integrates with the Catalyst Insight review platform, Insight’s review module enabled us to set up rules to send the batched documents automatically.

The case illustrates two key capabilities that distinguish TAR 2.0 platforms such as Insight Predict from earlier TAR tools.

An initial random sample of the collection indicated it was only 10% rich. But after training predict with the initial seeds, the richness of the batches being automatically fed to the review team jumped by a factor of four, to 40%.

By using Predict to prioritize all the responsive documents at the front, the team was able to stop the review after reviewing only one
third of the documents. At that point, they had achieved 91% recall—much better than the 80% recall expected from full human review. Even though they put their eyes on every document they produced, they were still able to cut their review by two thirds.

Uncovering a ‘Hidden’ Trove

A potential pitfall of judgmental sampling is bias. When lawyers hand-pick the documents used to train the TAR system, there is the risk that the system will overlook relevant documents they did not know to train it for.

Insight Predict overcomes this potential bias through a unique form of fail-safe called “contextual diversity sampling.” Predict is the only TAR engine that uses it. As Predict runs, it is constantly looking for the next biggest pocket of documents that have no reviewer judgments associated with them. From those pockets, it automatically finds the best example documents and feeds them to the review team for tagging.

![Yield curve after contextual diversity (textual docs only)](image)

In this case, contextual diversity sampling revealed a significant pocket of several hundred financial spreadsheets that were unlike any of the documents that were in the first set that they looked at. As soon as the review team moved from the manual seeds to the automated samples that included contextual diversity, this pocket of documents was found and the performance of the Predict ranking increased significantly.
The Bottom Line

Even with a dual-language document set, Insight Predict was able to sort every responsive text document to the top third of the ranked list for review. For the corporation's legal team, that meant two-thirds fewer documents to review. Insight Predict significantly reduced both the time and the cost of the review and enabled the team to meet their tight deadline for production.

By prioritizing documents using Insight Predict—Catalyst's engine for technology assisted review—the team was able to cut the review by two-thirds, saving time and money.
Case Study: Using Insight Predict for Review of Rolling Opposing Party Productions

Insight Predict Finds 75% of Hot Docs While Cutting Review 92%

Finding “hot” documents in an opposing party's production is rarely easy. But when those productions are large and arrive on a rolling basis, the search can be even more cumbersome, costly and time-consuming.

This was the scenario faced by plaintiffs in a lawsuit alleging predatory home-lending practices by a major financial institution. However, through the use of Insight Predict, the only technology assisted review platform on the market that uses Continuous Active Learning, coupled with Catalyst's unique contextual diversity sampling, the plaintiffs were able to reduce the number of documents they had to review by 92%. 
Challenge: Find Hot Documents in Opponent’s Rolling Productions

The plaintiffs in this case were working with limited resources to take on a major financial institution. In response to the plaintiffs’ discovery requests, the defendant had started to produce large numbers of electronic documents, with the productions arriving in waves on a rolling basis.

To prepare for depositions and further litigation, the plaintiffs had to quickly find the hot documents within these productions. But with limited resources, they could not afford to review them all manually.

Solution: Use Insight Predict to Create Prioritized Review

Two features of Insight Predict made it ideally suited to this case. First was Continuous Active Learning, which gives it the ability to handle rolling productions. Because Predict ranks every document every time, new documents can be added continuously. This differs from earlier TAR platforms, which train against a small reference set and are therefore limited in their ability to handle rolling uploads.

Second, Predict differs from other platforms in its ability to effectively handle document populations with low richness (a low prevalence of relevant documents). In this case, when we evaluated the initial population of the defendant’s produced documents, we estimated that only about 1% were hot. For other platforms, that would have been a problem.

By using Insight Predict to rank the documents most likely to be hot, we were able to bring a higher concentration of them to the front of the review queue. Then, using Predict’s automated workflow, we fed these ranked documents to the review attorneys. Reviewers coded documents in small batches of 20, in order to take maximum advantage of Predict’s seamless Continuous Active Learning. Each completed batch triggered new ranking rounds in the background (each running in under 10 minutes), such that dozens of rounds were run every day to integrate new review feedback and improve the next batches of documents served on-demand to the review team.
For the batches being fed to the reviewers, Predict quickly raised the richness of hot documents from 1% to 7%. That meant that the reviewers were getting seven times the richness they would otherwise have seen.

It also meant that they were able to find the majority of hot documents after reviewing only 8% of the collection. To understand this, compare these two graphs. The first shows the hot documents distributed randomly throughout the population:

This second graph shows the hot documents as ranked by Predict. The area shaded grey represents the last point we measured during this review. At that point, the attorneys had identified about 70% of the total predicted number of hot documents, but had reviewed only 8% of the produced population:

This flux curve further illustrates Predict’s ability to adjust to distinct events during the course of the review, such as the arrival of new productions and the arrival of new, untrained reviewers.

Contextual Diversity vs. ‘Hide the Ball’

One other feature of Predict that proved important in this case was its ability to perform contextual diversity sampling. Predict is the only TAR tool on the market with this ability. It samples the population to
ensure that there are no significant threads or pockets of documents that escape human review, even when a large proportion of the population will not have attorney eyes on it.

This has a significant benefit in a case such as this, where a plaintiff of limited means is up against a Goliath of a defendant. A common story in such cases has the defendant trying to bury revealing or damaging documents within a large, late production. When this happened during a traditional manual review, the documents might not have been noticed for some time.

However, with Predict’s contextual diversity engine re-ranking and analyzing the entire document set every time, a pocket of new documents unlike anything reviewers have seen before is immediately recognized, and exemplars from those new pockets will be pulled as contextual diversity seeds and put in front of reviewers in the very next batch of documents to be reviewed.

The Bottom Line

These plaintiffs lacked the resources to engage in a brute-force review of the defendant’s large, rolling productions. Insight Predict gave them the ability to quickly find the majority of hot documents and reduce the overall number of documents they had to review by more than 90%.
Case Study: TAR Does Double Duty in a Government Probe

*Insight Predict Reduces Review and Rescues Privileged Documents*

In a highly sensitive government investigation, discovery is a delicate balancing act. You want to be sure to produce everything you are supposed to produce. But you just as surely want to steer clear of inadvertently producing privileged information. On both sides of this equation, technology assisted review (TAR) can provide greater certainty, while still reducing the overall time and cost of your review.

This was demonstrated in a case involving a government investigation of a digital entertainment company. Using Insight Predict, Catalyst’s advanced TAR platform, the company’s legal team achieved two critical outcomes. First, even though they wanted eyes-on review of every document that might be produced, they still were able to stop after reviewing just 60% of the total population. Second, by using Predict as a pre-production check for privileged documents, they “rescued” several privileged documents that had been slated for production.
Challenge: Review Carefully but Control Time and Cost

This government investigation required review of about 60,000 documents. Although the document population was relatively small, the case was highly sensitive. For that reason, the legal team wanted to manually review every document that might go out the door, including not only responsive documents, but also family members of those documents that were likely unresponsive.

At the same time, the team wanted to keep the time and cost of the review as low as possible. And they wanted to be extremely careful to avoid inadvertently producing any privileged information.

Solution: Use Insight Predict to Cut Review and Rescue Privileged Docs

The initial sample of the document population found it to have 20% richness. But after the team reviewed a few hundred seed documents, Predict was able to increase fourfold—to 80%—the richness of the documents that it was automatically queuing up for the review team.

Further, despite the legal team’s thorough approach of reviewing every potentially responsive document, Predict enabled them to stop the review just 60% through the total population yet still achieve nearly 96% recall. That means they were able to defensibly cut 40% of the human-reviewable population while still achieving a measured recall well above the theoretical limit for full-scale human review.

The yield curve from the case shows a nearly
perfect ranking for a 20% rich population at first. It is almost a straight line until we reach about 80% recall. Then it starts to flatten out, indicating that we are running out of responsive documents. The shaded line shows a cutoff selected at the 60% mark, resulting in recall (or “yield”) of about 96% of all relevant documents in the population.

Using Predict as a Check for Privileged Documents

A few days before production, we noticed that the legal team had started privilege review. They had already reviewed and QC’d several hundred potentially privileged documents. We suggested that we create an additional Predict ranking for privilege. We would use the documents already coded for privilege as training seeds, and then rank the whole population based on likelihood of being privileged.

This process took about an hour. Once it was done, we batched the top 100 documents that Predict identified as potentially privileged but that reviewers had marked as responsive for production. When the legal team reviewed this batch, they found five privileged documents that would have been produced if not for Predict.

We continued the process several more times that same day, batching documents further down the ranked list. Two more privileged documents were quickly found. After about 500 documents, the technique stopped yielding additional mismarked documents and a safe stopping point had been reached. In all, this process rescued seven privileged documents that would otherwise have been produced.

The Bottom Line

In this case, Insight Predict not only cut the time and cost of the review, but it also served as a critical check and balance on the process. It enabled the company’s legal team to eliminate 40% of the document population from eyes-on review yet still be highly confident of the thoroughness of the production. At the same time, Predict provided a safety net that prevented the inadvertent production of privileged documents.
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Appendix A

TAR in the Courts

A Compendium of Case Law About Technology Assisted Review

It is three years since the first court decision approving the use of technology assisted review in e-discovery. “Counsel no longer have to worry about being the ‘first’ or ‘guinea pig’ for judicial acceptance of computer-assisted review,” U.S. Magistrate Judge Andrew J. Peck declared in his groundbreaking opinion in Da Silva Moore v. Publicis Groupe.

Judge Peck did not open a floodgate of judicial decisions on TAR. To date, there have been fewer than 20 such decisions and not one from an appellate court.

However, what he did do—just as he said—was to set the stage for judicial acceptance of TAR. Not a single court since has questioned the soundness of Judge Peck’s decision. To the contrary, courts uniformly cite his ruling with approval.

That does not mean that every court orders TAR in every case. The one overarching lesson of the TAR decisions to date is that each
case stands on its own merits. Courts look not only to the efficiency and effectiveness of TAR, but also to issues of proportionality and cooperation.

What follows is a summary of the cases to date involving TAR.

2012


**Judge:** U.S. Magistrate Judge Andrew J. Peck

**Holding:** The court formally approved the use of TAR to locate responsive documents. The court also held that Federal Rule of Evidence 702 and the Daubert standard for the admissibility of expert testimony do not apply to discovery search methods.

**Significance:** This is the first judicial opinion approving the use of TAR in e-discovery.

**Notable quote:** “What the Bar should take away from this Opinion is that computer-assisted review is an available tool and should be seriously considered for use in large-data-volume cases where it may save the producing party (or both parties) significant amounts of legal fees in document review. Counsel no longer have to worry about being the ‘first’ or ‘guinea pig’ for judicial acceptance of computer-assisted review.”


**Judge:** Circuit Judge James H. Chamblin

**Holding:** Despite plaintiffs’ objection, court ordered that defendants may use predictive coding for the purposes of processing and producing ESI, without prejudice to plaintiffs later raising issues as to the completeness of the production or the ongoing use of predictive coding.
Significance: This appears to be the first state court case expressly approving the use of TAR.

Notable quote: “Defendants shall be allowed to proceed with the use of predictive coding for purposes of the processing and production of electronically stored information.”


Judge: U.S. District Judge Andrew L. Carter Jr.

Holding: The court affirmed Magistrate Judge Peck’s order approving the use of TAR.

Significance: Insofar as Judge Peck’s order was the first judicial opinion approving the use of TAR, its affirmance by Judge Carter further cemented its significance.

Notable quote: “Judge Peck concluded that under the circumstances of this particular case, the use of the predictive coding software as specified in the ESI protocol is more appropriate than keyword searching. The court does not find a basis to hold that his conclusion is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.”


Judge: U.S. District Judge Shira Scheindlin

Holding: In an action under the federal Freedom of Information Act, the court held that the federal government’s searches for responsive documents were inadequate because of their failure to properly employ modern search technologies.

Significance: In a decision in which Judge Scheindlin urged the
government to “learn to use twenty-first century technologies,” she discussed predictive coding as representative of “emerging best practices” in compensating for the shortcomings of simple keyword search.

Notable quote: “Beyond the use of keyword search, parties can (and frequently should) rely on latent semantic indexing, statistical probability models, and machine learning tools to find responsive documents. Through iterative learning, these methods (known as ‘computer-assisted’ or ‘predictive’ coding) allow humans to teach computers what documents are and are not responsive to a particular FOIA or discovery request and they can significantly increase the effectiveness and efficiency of searches.”


Judge: Magistrate Judge Patrick J. Hanna  

Holding: In a multi-district products liability matter, the magistrate judge approved the parties’ agreement to use TAR for the production of ESI.  

Significance: This case was significant as one of the earliest in which a federal court explicitly endorsed the use of TAR.  

Notable quote: None.

_EORHB, Inc. v. HOA Holdings, LLC, No. 7409-VCL (Del. Ch. Oct. 15, 2012)._  

Judge: Vice Chancellor J. Travis Laster  

Holding: Court on its own initiative ordered parties to use predictive coding or to show cause why they should not.  

Significance: This was another early case in which the judge acknowledged the efficacy of using TAR.
Notable quote: “This seems to me to be an ideal non-expedited case in which the parties would benefit from using predictive coding. I would like you all, if you do not want to use predictive coding, to show cause why this is not a case where predictive coding is the way to go.”

2013


Judge: U.S. District Judge Anthony J. Battaglia

Holding: Following entry of judgment in their favor in a patent infringement case, defendants filed a motion seeking attorneys’ fees, including $2.8 million “attributable to computer-assisted, algorithm-driven document review.” The court found that amount to be reasonable and approved it.

Significance: The court found that the costs of TAR could be recovered as part of the costs and attorneys’ fees awarded to the prevailing party in patent litigation.

Notable quote: “[T]he Court finds [lead counsel] Cooley’s decision to undertake a more efficient and less time-consuming method of document review to be reasonable under the circumstances. In this case, the nature of the Plaintiffs’ claims resulted in significant discovery and document production, and Cooley seemingly reduced the overall fees and attorney hours required by performing electronic document review at the outset. Thus, the Court finds the requested amount of $2,829,349.10 to be reasonable.”


Judge: U.S. District Judge Robert L. Miller Jr.

Holding: Court held that defendant’s use of keyword searching to cull documents population prior to application of TAR was reasonable under the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(b).
It declined to require the defendant to go back and use TAR on the entire ESI population.

**Significance:** The court found that proportionality trumped purity, and that even if predictive coding might unearth additional relevant documents, the cost would far outweigh the likely benefits.

**Notable quote:** “It might well be that predictive coding, instead of a keyword search, at Stage Two of the process would unearth additional relevant documents. But it would cost Biomet a million, or millions, of dollars to test the Steering Committee’s theory that predictive coding would produce a significantly greater number of relevant documents. Even in light of the needs of the hundreds of plaintiffs in this case, the very large amount in controversy, the parties’ resources, the importance of the issues at stake, and the importance of this discovery in resolving the issues, I can’t find that the likely benefits of the discovery proposed by the Steering Committee equals or outweighs its additional burden on, and additional expense to, Biomet.”

---

**EORHB, Inc. v. HOA Holdings, LLC, No. 7409-VCL, 2013 WL 1960621 (Del. Ch. May 6, 2013).**

**Judge:** Vice Chancellor J. Travis Laster.

**Holding:** In an earlier order, the court ordered the parties to “retain a single discovery vendor to be used by both sides” and to “conduct document review with the assistance of predictive coding.” In this new order, the court accepted the parties’ agreement that defendants could use TAR and retain their own vendor and that plaintiffs would not be required to use TAR because the cost would likely outweigh the benefit.

**Significance:** The court declined to require a party to use TAR when its cost would outweigh its anticipated benefit.

**Notable quote:** “[B]ased on the low volume of relevant documents expected to be produced in discovery by [plaintiffs], the cost of using predictive coding assistance would likely be outweighed by any practical benefit of its use.”

**Judge:** U.S. Magistrate Judge Leslie G. Foschio.

**Holding:** Impatient with the parties’ year-long attempts to agree on how to achieve a cost-effective review of some 200,000-300,000 emails, the magistrate judge suggested they try predictive coding. That led to a dispute over the extent to which the parties should meet and confer in order to agree on a TAR protocol. Because the parties ultimately agreed to meet, the judge never decided any substantive TAR issue.

**Significance:** The significance of this case is that it was the judge, not the litigants, who suggested the use of predictive coding.

**Notable quote:** “At the last of a series of ESI discovery status conferences with the court, ... the court expressed dissatisfaction with the parties’ lack of progress toward resolving issues related to completion of review and production of Defendants’ e-mails using the key-word search method, and pointed to the availability of predictive coding, a computer assisted ESI reviewing and production method, directing the parties’ attention to the recent decision of Magistrate Judge Peck in Moore v. Publicis Groupe & MSL Group, 287 F.R.D. 182 (S.D.N.Y. 2012), approving use of predictive coding in a case involving over 3 million e-mails.”

---


**Judge:** U.S. District Judge Robert L. Miller Jr.

**Holding:** The court ruled that defendants need not identify which of the documents, from among those they had already produced, were used in the training of the defendants’ TAR algorithm.

**Significance:** Because defendants had already complied with their obligation under the FRCP to produce relevant documents, the court held that it had no authority to compel the defendants to identify the
specific documents it had used as seeds. Even so, the court said that it was troubled by the defendants’ lack of cooperation.

**Notable quote:** “The Steering Committee knows of the existence and location of each discoverable document Biomet used in the seed set: those documents have been disclosed to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee wants to know, not whether a document exists or where it is, but rather how Biomet used certain documents before disclosing them. Rule 26(b)(1) doesn’t make such information disclosable.”

**2014**


**Judge:** U.S. District Judge Denise Cote

**Holding:** In a memorandum opinion, the judge stated that, earlier in the discovery process, she had permitted one defendant, JPMorgan Chase, to use predictive coding over the plaintiff’s objection. She recounted this in making the point that discovery is not expected to be a perfect process, but one in which parties act with diligence and good faith.

**Significance:** The case is significant as another in which a federal court allowed the use of TAR. It is also significant for its recognition that discovery does not require perfection.

**Notable quote:** “Parties in litigation are required to be diligent and to act in good faith in producing documents in discovery. The production of documents in litigation such as this is a herculean undertaking, requiring an army of personnel and the production of an extraordinary volume of documents. Clients pay counsel vast sums of money in the course of this undertaking, both to produce documents and to review documents received from others. Despite the commitment of these resources, no one could or should expect perfection from this process. All that can be legitimately expected is a good faith, diligent commitment to produce all responsive documents uncovered when following the protocols to which the parties have agreed, or which a court has ordered.”

**Judge:** U.S. Magistrate Judge Peggy A. Leen.

**Holding:** The court rejected a party’s unilateral decision to use TAR because the party had already demonstrated that it lacked the willingness to engage in the type of cooperation and transparency that is needed for a TAR protocol to be accepted by a court.

**Significance:** The case is a reminder that efficiency and cost-effectiveness are not the only factors a court will look at in evaluating the use of TAR. Cooperation and transparency are also important factors.

**Notable quote:** “The cases which have approved technology assisted review of ESI have required an unprecedented degree of transparency and cooperation among counsel in the review and production of ESI responsive to discovery requests.”

---


**Judge:** Magistrate Judge G.R. Smith

**Holding:** In case involving some 2.01 terabytes of data, or 153.6 million pages of documents, the court suggested that the parties consider using TAR.

**Significance:** The court recognized TAR is more accurate than human review or keyword searching.

**Notable quote:** “Predictive coding has emerged as a far more accurate means of producing responsive ESI in discovery. Studies show it is far more accurate than human review or keyword searches which have their own limitations.” (Quoting *Progressive Cas. Ins. Co. v. Delaney*, 2014 WL 2112927 at *8 (D. Nev. May 20, 2014)).

**Judge:** U.S. Magistrate Judge Joe B. Brown.

**Holding:** The court approved the plaintiff’s request to use predictive coding to review over 2 million documents, over defendant’s objections that the request was an unwarranted change in the original case management order and that it would be unfair to use predictive coding after an initial screening has been done with search terms.

**Significance:** The opinion suggests that e-discovery should be a fluid and transparent process and that principles of efficiency and proportionality may justify a party to “switch horses in midstream,” as the magistrate judge wrote.

**Notable quote:** “In the final analysis, the use of predictive coding is a judgment call, hopefully keeping in mind the exhortation of Rule 26 that discovery be tailored by the court to be as efficient and cost-effective as possible. In this case, we are talking about millions of documents to be reviewed with costs likewise in the millions. There is no single, simple, correct solution possible under these circumstances.”

---

**In re Bridgepoint Educ., No. 12cv1737 JM (JLB), 2014 WL 3867495**

**Judge:** Magistrate Judge Jill L. Burkhardt.

**Holding:** This brief order included two holdings pertaining to TAR. First, in declining plaintiffs’ request to expand the scope of discovery as unduly burdensome on defendants, the court rejected plaintiffs’ argument that the use of predictive coding would alleviate any added burden. Second, the court declined to order defendants to use predictive coding for documents they had already produced, reasoning that it had approved defendants’ method of “using linear screening with the aid of search terms.”
Significance: The court applied principles of proportionality to limit the scope of discovery and the use of TAR.

Notable quote: “Defendants argued that putting the Individual Defendant documents already screened through predictive coding is likely to negatively impact the reliability of the predictive coding process. Defendants suggested that they would be willing to run additional search terms for the documents already screened but were not amenable to running these documents through the predictive coding process.”

_Dynamo Holdings Ltd. P’ship v. Comm’r of Internal Revenue, Nos. 2685-11, 8393-12 (T.C. Sept. 17, 2014)._  
Judge: U.S. Tax Court Judge Ronald L. Buch  
Holding: The Tax Court approved petitioner’s use of TAR to identify potentially responsive and privileged data contained on two backup tapes, despite respondent’s objection that the technology was unproven.  
Significance: This is the first opinion to formally sanction the use of TAR in the Tax Court.  
Notable quote: “Although predictive coding is a relatively new technique, and a technique that has yet to be sanctioned (let alone mentioned) by this Court in a published Opinion, the understanding of e-discovery and electronic media has advanced significantly in the last few years, thus making predictive coding more acceptable in the technology industry than it may have previously been. In fact, we understand that the technology industry now considers predictive coding to be widely accepted for limiting e-discovery to relevant documents and effecting discovery of ESI without an undue burden.”
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