

Chatlaw: A Multi-Agent Collaborative Legal Assistant with Knowledge Graph Enhanced Mixture-of-Experts Large Language Model

Jiayi Cui^{1*}, Munan Ning^{1,2,4*}, Zongjian Li^{1*}, Bohua Chen¹, Yang Yan¹, Hao Li^{1,2,4}, Bin Ling^{3,4}, Yonghong Tian^{1,2,4}, and Li Yuan^{1,2,4†}

¹School of Electronic and Computer Engineering, Peking University, Shenzhen, China

²Peng Cheng Laboratory, Shenzhen, China

³Law School, Peking University, Beijing, China

⁴AI for Science (AI4S)-Preferred Program, Peking University Shenzhen Graduate School, Shenzhen, China

*These authors contributed equally to this work

†Corresponding authors: yuanli-ece@pku.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

AI legal assistants based on Large Language Models (LLMs) can provide accessible legal consulting services, but the hallucination problem poses potential legal risks. This paper presents Chatlaw, an innovative legal assistant utilizing a Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) model and a multi-agent system to enhance the reliability and accuracy of AI-driven legal services. By integrating knowledge graphs with artificial screening, we construct a high-quality legal dataset to train the MoE model. This model utilizes different experts to address various legal issues, optimizing the accuracy of legal responses. Additionally, Standardized Operating Procedures (SOP), modeled after real law firm workflows, significantly reduce errors and hallucinations in legal services. Our MoE model outperforms GPT-4 in the Lawbench and Unified Qualification Exam for Legal Professionals by 7.73% in accuracy and 11 points, respectively, and also surpasses other models in multiple dimensions during real-case consultations, demonstrating our robust capability for legal consultation.

Keywords Artificial Intelligence in Law, Mixture of Experts, Large Language Model, Knowledge Graph, Legal Technology

Legal services play a crucial role in protecting individual rights and maintaining social fairness¹⁻³. However, the limited availability of legal professionals and the high cost of their services often restrict access to these services, particularly in China, with its vast population and extensive social interactions. Statistics show that Chinese legal aid centers have accepted 800,000 cases over the past seven years, aiding over 6 million people, yet annually, only one-quarter of the 700,000 cases received can be processed⁴. This gap in legal service provision deeply impacts justice and equity, especially for those lacking the resources to effectively navigate the legal system. This raises a crucial question: can we establish an automated legal assistant to address these challenges?

In recent years, the efficacy of LLMs has been validated across multiple scientific fields, encompassing natural language processing^{5,6}, biochemistry⁷⁻¹⁴, and the medical field¹⁵⁻²². LLMs also offer potential solutions to the challenges in legal services. Popular models like ChatGPT²³ and the LLaMA²⁴ series, along with other general-purpose²⁵⁻³⁰ or law-specific models,^{31,32} can respond to user inputs based on their internal legal knowledge repositories and provide advisory recommendations. However, the inherent *hallucination* issues in LLMs pose potential risks in their application to legal domains³³ since they operate at the level of word distributions rather than validated facts³⁴. The knowledge generated by these models is often incomplete or outdated, leading them to produce illusions that, although seemingly relevant, may be misleading or incorrect^{33,35}.

To address the mentioned issues, this paper designs Chatlaw, a multi-agent virtual legal assistant based on a multi-expert large language model. Chatlaw effectively mitigates hallucination issues through key aspects of data quality, model optimization, and consulting processes. Initially, we create a high-quality legal dataset through multiple screenings and integrate similar advisory knowledge into a knowledge graph to ensure data accuracy. Next, we expand from a single-expert model to an MoE model, increasing the parameter space to allow different experts to handle specific advisory tasks, thus enhancing the accuracy of the legal consult. Building on this, we emulate the service workflows of real law firms and develop a set of SOP for multi-agent collaboration. This SOP includes four independent intelligent agent roles responsible for initial information gathering, in-depth material research, legal advice, and final consultation report writing. This procedural operation ensures each step of information processing is efficient and accurate, significantly enhancing the quality of legal services and client

satisfaction, and preventing inconsistencies and accumulation of hallucinations in handling complex tasks.

Our model demonstrates superior performance in various evaluations, surpassing existing large language models, including GPT-4²³. Specifically, it outperforms GPT-4 in the Lawbench and Unified Qualification Exam for Legal Professionals by 7.73% in accuracy and 11 points, respectively, and receives the highest scores in real-case evaluation feedback from legal experts on 4 dimensions, the completeness, correctness, guidance and authority .

1 Results

1.1 Chatlaw Enhances Dataset Collection for Comprehensive Legal Task Coverage

To address the deficiencies in existing legal datasets, we design and implement a comprehensive legal data collection and processing workflow, successfully constructing the high-quality Chatlaw legal dataset. As shown in Fig. 1(a), we initially gather data from multiple sources and process it using automated tools for deduplication and denoising to obtain standardized legal Q&A datasets. Building on this, we involve law students in categorizing the cases, and domain experts precisely define the problem relationships and node connections, resulting in highly targeted knowledge graphs and intelligent agent task datasets.

As shown in Fig. 2(a), our meticulously constructed legal dataset comprises 10 major categories and 44 minor categories, totaling approximately 4 million data samples. The dataset encompasses a wide array of legal domains, including but not limited to, case classification, statute prediction, legal document drafting, and sub-case segmentation. Additionally, it covers specialized tasks such as public opinion analysis, named entity recognition, and legal consultation. This diversity ensures that our dataset can address various aspects of legal processing, from basic document understanding to complex legal reasoning and argumentation. In this process, task-specific knowledge graphs further enhance the consultation capabilities of models by effectively analyzing missing information in user inputs and prompting users to provide complete information. By incorporating tasks that mimic real-world legal challenges, our dataset helps in training legal models that are not only proficient in fundamental legal tasks but also excel in nuanced and intricate legal scenarios.

1.2 Chatlaw Employs MoE Model to Achieve Superior Performance Across Legal Benchmarks

We construct a MoE model^{36,37}, creating a virtual legal team composed of multiple virtual legal experts specializing in different legal fields to collaboratively address various legal issues. In the MoE model, traditional Feed-Forward Network (FFN) layers are extended to multi-expert layers³⁸⁻⁴⁰. As shown in Fig. 2, each expert layer contains multiple independent neural network experts. Each input token is processed by a routing network responsible for selecting the top k experts. The output of the expert layer is the weighted sum of these selected the outputs of these selected experts. The MoE model achieves specialization at each token level by dynamically selecting the most suitable experts for processing based on differences in input features. This dynamic selection mechanism not only significantly reduces the computational cost per token but also greatly enhances the model robustness, enabling it to better adapt to various task requirements. For example, when encountering specific domain terminologies, the model effectively improves its recognition and processing capabilities⁴¹.

To measure the capabilities of our model, we test our MoE model on two benchmarks and compare it with existing models, evaluating the understanding and mastery of legal systems, regulations, case law, and legal procedures, as well as the ability to apply this knowledge to specific situations.

1.2.1 Performance on LawBench

We first conduct tests on LawBench⁴², a comprehensive evaluation benchmark based on the Chinese legal system. LawBench mainly covers three cognitive levels: 1) Legal Knowledge Memory: Testing the ability of remembering necessary legal concepts, terms, articles, and facts; 2) Legal Knowledge Understanding: assessing whether large language models can understand and interpret entities, events, and relationships in legal texts; 3) Legal Knowledge Application: evaluating the capability for correctly utilizing and reasoning with their legal knowledge to solve different legal tasks in real scenarios.

As shown in Fig. 2(c), in terms of average score, our Chatlaw-MoE model significantly outperforms GPT-4 with a score of 60.08 compared to GPT-4's 52.35. This substantial difference highlights the effectiveness of our model across different cognitive levels. In the memorization category, Chatlaw-MoE leads with a score of 43.86, surpassing GPT-4's 35.29, demonstrating its superior ability to remember legal concepts and terms. For understanding performance, Chatlaw-MoE achieves an impressive score of 62.11, significantly higher than GPT-4's 54.41, indicating better comprehension of legal texts. Finally, in the application category, Chatlaw-MoE scores 61.60, outperforming GPT-4's 54.05, showing its stronger capability in applying legal knowledge to real-world tasks. Among Legal LLMs, Fuzi-Mingcha scores 32.08 on average, with its highest score in understanding at 30.25, while General LLMs see InternLM2-7B as the strongest with an average score of 43.78 and a leading application score of 50.87. Overall, these results underscore Chatlaw-MoE's superiority in all evaluated metrics, firmly establishing it as the most effective model in the context of LawBench evaluation, and highlighting the significant advancements made in our approach compared to GPT-4 and other models.




Figure 1. Framework of Chatlaw. (a) Chatlaw presents a comprehensive and diverse legal dataset. Multi-source data undergoes deduplication and denoising, followed by human finetuning to produce high-quality QA datasets, knowledge graphs, and agent datasets. This process ensures the accuracy and relevance of the legal data used for training. (b) Chatlaw extends LLM to MoE model. This model utilizes a tokenizer to embed legal prompts using multi-head self-attention mechanisms and processes text features through multiple experts. Each expert contributes to the final output based on weighted sums, optimizing the model’s ability to handle various legal tasks efficiently and accurately. (c) Chatlaw employs a multi-agent collaborative framework. This framework involves several roles, and each agent follow a ‘sense-think-action’ three-step process: The Legal Assistant interacts with users to gather information and fill in knowledge graph nodes. The Legal Researcher analyzes and extracts legal entities, relationships, and substantial cases from the legal datasets. The Legal Editor assists users in consulting documents, selecting templates, and filling documents, while also ensuring a firewall strategy for data security. The Senior Lawyer conducts case studies, evaluates the relevance of items, and provides comprehensive results. This collaborative approach ensures efficient and accurate legal consultation, enhancing the quality of legal services and client satisfaction.

that our Chatlaw-MoE not only outperforms specialized legal models but also excels against general-purpose language models, establishing it as the leading model for legal task performance.

1.3 Chatlaw Utilizes Multi-Agent Collaborative Framework to Enhance Legal Service Reliability

Chatlaw encompasses a LLM-based multi-agent collaboration system and simulates a real lawyer consultation process through Role Specialization and Agent Workflow.

Explicit role specialization can decompose complex work into smaller and more specific tasks, accelerating agents with different professional collaborating with each other. We define four roles in our virtual legal firm: Legal Assistant, Legal Researcher, Legal Compliance, and Legal Editor, and specify the profiles of each role, such as role cognition, constraints, and corresponding knowledge templates and skills. For example, the Assistant has a set of legal knowledge graphs, the Researcher can use Internet search tools, and the Senior Lawyer posses document templates.

The agent collaboration workflow follow a sequential SOP. As shown in Figure 1(c): 1) the Legal Assistant analyze the consultation content and select the corresponding legal knowledge graph, then ask the user questions to fill in the graph nodes until necessary information is obtained; 2) the Legal Researcher searches the Internet based on key information, finds relevant legal provisions, and classifies cases to obtain similar cases based on categories; 3) the senior lawyer, analysis relevant cases and provides legal advice; 4) Legal Editor, summarizes opinions and drafts formal legal documents such as contracts to meet user needs based on the previous information. We providing details of each agent in the following sections.

1.3.1 Legal Assistant with Knowledge Graph

Under the guidance of legal experts, we abstract the process of legal consultation into the construction of a professional knowledge graph. Firstly, determining the type of legal consultation question involves acquiring the corresponding predefined entity set. Subsequently, the process of lawyers guiding the consultee to answer questions is based on this entity set. They ask questions to users, gather key information, expand corresponding nodes, until forming a complete consultation knowledge graph, serving as the basis for subsequent processes.

We implement this process using the Legal Assistant agent of the Chatlaw framework. The Legal Assistant first selects appropriate predefined entity clusters based on the consultation question and initially fills in information nodes. For nodes with insufficient information, it integrates them into new questions to ask users, guiding them to add more relevant information to the knowledge graph. As shown in the fig 1(c), we demonstrated a case practice using divorce consultation. The Legal Assistant selects the predefined entity cluster "marital issues" based on user input and asks the user about "child information," "both parties" intentions," "financial information," and "historical information" from the four nodes. After the corresponding nodes are supplemented with complete information, the comprehensive information is passed to the Legal Researcher, who retrieves corresponding cases based on different node keywords and proceeds with the subsequent steps.

1.3.2 Legal Researcher with Retrieval-Augmented Generation

To mitigate the impact of outdated or erroneous legal information stored in LLMs' parameters, we construct a Legal Researcher agent based on Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG). This agent accepts the knowledge graph summarized by the Legal Assistant as input and collects the latest legal statutes and judicial interpretations from external knowledge repositories. Leveraging the knowledge graph established by the Legal Assistant, we combine relevant nodes in the knowledge graph based on legal knowledge to obtain keyword pairs. Then, we call upon the retrieval system to gather relevant information from the internet and domain databases. The retrieved documents are then processed in parallel, and a large language model evaluates each document's relevance to the query. Subsequently, a critic model generates critical evaluations to review the generated content and select the best output. This model may iterate the process, continuously adjusting and optimizing based on the retrieved information and the content generated. Eventually, the model outputs a self-assessed and optimized response, which is more likely to be accurate, relevant, and informative.

1.3.3 Lawyer and Legal Editor Agent

During the actual user consultation process, the next two steps involve providing consultation advice and generating consultation documents, which are implemented in Chatlaw by two agents: Lawyer and Legal Editor. They are responsible for transforming the consultation content obtained by the Assistant and the relevant cases obtained by the Researcher into the final output.

The Lawyer handles the Consultation stage, using the user's consultation questions and auxiliary information as inputs to a large language model to provide consultation advice items. This stage aims to propose as many answers as possible, covering a wide range of scenarios. Subsequently, a firewall strategy is responsible for identifying potential risks for the user and addressing them. Meanwhile, the Editor focuses on reviewing the Lawyer's text and converting it into the final document. Its text repository contains various document templates, into which the Lawyer's output is inserted to obtain the final output.




Figure 3. Evaluation of legal consultation quality and model performance. (a) Criteria for assessing the quality of legal consultations, including Completeness, Logic, Correctness, Language Quality, Guidance, and Authority, rated on a scale from 0 to 10. (b) Performance of various models (GPT-4, GPT-3.5, Baichuan2, ChatGLM2, InternLM2, Qwen, Fuzi, and ChatLaw) across the six quality criteria. ChatLaw consistently achieves the highest overall scores, particularly excelling in Completeness, Guidance, and Authority. (c) Win rate matrix showing the comparative performance of each model against others based on the final mean scores. ChatLaw demonstrates a higher win rate compared to other models, indicating its superior capability in providing high-quality legal consultations.

1.4 Real-world Legal Consultation Performance

To evaluate the performance of Chatlaw, we conducted a comprehensive assessment based on real judicial consultations, focusing on criteria such as Completeness, Correctness, Guidance, and Authority. As illustrated in Figure 3, Chatlaw consistently achieves the highest overall scores across these criteria, particularly excelling in Completeness, Guidance, and Authority. Compared to other models like GPT-4, GPT-3.5, Baichuan2, ChatGLM2, InternLM2, Qwen, and Fuzi, Chatlaw demonstrates superior capability in providing high-quality legal consultations. The win rate matrix in Figure 3 shows that Chatlaw has a higher win rate compared to other models, indicating its overall better performance in cases analysis and law consultation tasks. These results affirm the effectiveness of our multi-agent collaboration system, highlighting its potential to provide robust and accurate legal consultation services.




Figure 4. Multi-Agents Collaboration Process and Legal Consultation Report. The diagram illustrates the collaboration process of multiple agents in providing legal consultation services, with a divorce consultation as an example. The Legal Assistant initiates the consultation by gathering essential information from the user about their divorce case, including details about children, financial situations, and property division. The Legal Researcher then identifies relevant laws and regulations, such as articles from the Civil Code and specific legal opinions. The Senior Lawyer provides comprehensive legal advice based on the collected information and relevant legal frameworks. The process culminates in the generation of a Legal Consultation Report, which outlines the key consultation questions and provides detailed opinions on child custody, property division, domestic violence, infidelity, and divorce agreements. The report also references relevant cases and laws for further guidance, ensuring that the legal advice is thorough and well-supported.

2 Discussion

Overall, as shown in Fig. 1, we establish a comprehensive legal dataset based on the practical experience of real law firms, train a MoE model with precise legal consultation capabilities and further expand it into a complete multi-agent framework. This framework is able to act as a virtual law firm, providing comprehensive legal services to a wide range of users. Evaluations on two benchmarks and the real-case consultation confirms that our approach surpasses the current powerful LLMs.

One limitation of AI legal assistant is the hallucination issue, where LLMs sometimes create information that does not exist in the real world. In the legal field, this may manifest as fabricating non-existent legal provisions or introducing outdated and incorrect laws and cases. To mitigate this issue, we introduced a dedicated legal researcher role that corrects the erroneous information by retrieving the latest legal provisions and relevant cases from the internet, as shown in Fig. 4.

Another challenge is the robustness of the model. When interacting with users from diverse backgrounds, their inputs may exceed our preset input boundaries. Some users might try to guide the model to incorrect answers through deception, concealment, or inducement. We employ the legal assistant agent to guide users to provide all the information corresponding to the consultation content, according to our knowledge graphs.

During our online trial phase, we also identified issues with privacy and record-keeping based on user feedback. Some questions users consult may contain sensitive personal information that they do not wish to be stored or leaked during communication. Other users, however, hope to retain conversation records so that they can receive legal support from AI assistant at any time during the case handling process without having to re-enter relevant information.

Another issue is the demand for computational resources. When a large number of users initiate requests simultaneously, it puts extreme pressure on computational resources, which may lead to response delays and affect the user experience.

To address these issues, we plan to strengthen the privacy protection architecture of our services, enhance the security of communication and data storage, and ensure that user privacy is protected. At the same time, we will explore various model compression techniques, such as knowledge distillation and quantization, to reduce computational demands. Our goal is to develop a small enough model that can run smoothly on personal devices, thereby solving privacy and computational resource issues and greatly enhancing user experience. We hope that by addressing these practical issues, we can popularize our Chatlaw framework and provide timely legal assistance to more users.

3 Methods

3.1 Data Pre-processing

The original format of legal data is not directly applicable for training legal models; therefore, we have processed the collected legal data through a series of steps to convert it into a standard format that large language models can recognize and utilize. For officially published legal provisions and judgment documents, we transformed them into completion tasks based on legal entries, either to complete the full text of provisions or to fill in the entire document based on the basic information of the document. For legal consultation datasets, we formatted them into the standard instruction-input-output format of the LLaMA chat template. To ensure that the legal model operates normally both with and without reference provisions, we prepared two task modes: one adds additional references in the input, and the other allows the model to directly quote the relevant provisions in the output.

3.2 Constructing and Training MoE Model

Our model is based on the MoE Transformer architecture, consisting of the multiple stacked MSA (Multi-Scale Attention) modules, MoE mechanisms, and LN (Layer Normalization) structures, then followed by a linear classification head CLS. Given the *head* to represent the number of parallel attention layers, the multi-head attention mechanism can be formulated as:

$$\text{MSA}(x) = \left[\text{Attention}(W_1^Q x, W_1^K x, W_1^V x), \dots, \text{Attention}(W_{head}^Q x, W_{head}^K x, W_{head}^V x) \right] W^O, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax} \left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right) V = \frac{\exp \left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right)}{\sum_j \exp \left(\frac{QK_j^T}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right)} V. \quad (2)$$

A MoE layer consists of E FFN experts $\mathcal{E} = [e_1, e_2, \dots, e_E]$ and a linear router. The router contains a trainable parameter $W_g \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times E}$, and generates the softmax probabilities for each expert as $G(x) = \text{softmax}(W_g \cdot x)$. Then the MoE layer selects the top- K experts with the highest probabilities, and calculates the weighted sum as follows:

$$\text{MoE}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^K G(x)_i \cdot \mathcal{E}(x)_i = \sum_{i=1}^K \left(\frac{\exp(W_g \cdot x_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^E \exp(W_g \cdot x_j)} \right) \cdot (W_i x + b_i). \quad (3)$$

And here is the generation process of our MoE model: the input token sequences $\mathcal{X}_0 = [t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$, with length of N and dimension of D , are sent to L stacked Decoder blocks and processed by multiple MSA and MoE modules, then transformed to generation text \mathcal{P} with the CLS head, which can be formulated as:

$$\mathcal{X}'_\ell = \text{MSA}(\text{LN}(\mathcal{X}_{\ell-1})) + \mathcal{X}_{\ell-1}, \quad \ell = 1 \dots L, \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_\ell = \text{MoE}(\text{LN}(\mathcal{X}'_\ell)) + \mathcal{X}'_\ell, \quad \ell = 1 \dots L, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \text{CLS}(\text{LN}(\mathcal{X}_L)) \quad (6)$$

During the training phase, we optimize the MoE model with an autoregressive loss function, which involves calculating the cross-entropy loss between the predictions and the corresponding labels at each position:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} = - \sum_i^N \mathcal{Y}_i \log(\mathcal{P}_i), \quad (7)$$

where \mathcal{Y}_i denotes the i -th token of the label, and \mathcal{P}_i denotes the corresponding i -th token of the model prediction. Specifically, we replicate and initialize four copies of the FNN layer from InternLM2²⁹. Each token is processed by the top-2 experts based on the routing weights. When the selected experts are activated, the rest remain inactive, providing the MoE model with a sparse paths for task handling.

3.3 Implementation of Multi-gent SOP

To enable the model’s multi-role collaboration capabilities, we have divided the sub-task data among individual roles and explicitly defined the instruction requirements for each role. During the inference process, we use the output of one role as additional input for another role. Additionally, we have implemented formatting constraints to ensure that agent outputs adhere to the standard template. If the output does not conform to the template, the system will regenerate it, ensuring that the output is in a format that can be utilized by downstream roles.

3.4 Performance Evaluation

For the Lawbench benchmark, we utilized the official provided code. It determines the final accuracy by detecting the options in the large model’s output and assessing the correctness of these options. For judicial examination questions, we used a similar approach based on actual objective questions from judicial exams and recalculated scores for multiple-choice questions according to the official requirements. In evaluating agent capabilities, we employed the Pass@1 metric, which involves having experts judge the output results from a single legal service interaction.

3.5 CO2 Emission Estimation

Our training procedure was conducted on a GPU server equipped with eight 80GB A100 GPUs and two Intel Xeon 8358P processors. The entire training process took approximately 23.14 hours, with an average power consumption of about 4.10 kilowatts. According to the official statistics from Guangdong Province, the average carbon emission factor is 0.4512 kilograms of CO2 per kilowatt-hour of electricity consumed. Based on this information, we estimate that our model training process generated approximately 42.81 kilograms of additional CO2 emissions.

Data and Code Availability

The dataset, codes and deploy details are released in the GitHub repository: github.com/PKU-YuanGroup/ChatLaw.

References

1. Heinz, J. P. *Urban lawyers: The new social structure of the bar* (University of Chicago Press, 2005).
2. Auerbach, J. S. *Unequal justice: Lawyers and social change in modern America* (Oxford University Press, 1977).
3. Tushnet, M. V. *The rights revolution in the twentieth century* (American Historical Association, 2009).
4. Legal aid statistics in china. Accessed: 2024-05-12.
5. Brown, T. B. *et al.* Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, 1877–1901 (2020).
6. Touvron, H. *et al.* Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
7. Ren, R. *et al.* Multiplexed detection of viral antigen and rna using nanopore sensing and encoded molecular probes. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 7362 (2023).
8. Lv, L. *et al.* Prollama: A protein large language model for multi-task protein language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16445* (2024).
9. Peng, D. *et al.* Large-language models facilitate discovery of the molecular signatures regulating sleep and activity. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 3685 (2024).

10. Kuenneth, C. & Ramprasad, R. polybert: a chemical language model to enable fully machine-driven ultrafast polymer informatics. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 4099 (2023).
11. Theodorou, B., Xiao, C. & Sun, J. Synthesize high-dimensional longitudinal electronic health records via hierarchical autoregressive language model. *Nat. communications* **14**, 5305 (2023).
12. Suvarna, M., Vaucher, A. C., Mitchell, S., Laino, T. & Pérez-Ramírez, J. Language models and protocol standardization guidelines for accelerating synthesis planning in heterogeneous catalysis. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 7964 (2023).
13. Choi, J. & Lee, B. Accelerating materials language processing with large language models. *Commun. Mater.* **5**, 13 (2024).
14. Ferruz, N., Schmidt, S. & Höcker, B. Protgpt2 is a deep unsupervised language model for protein design. *Nat. communications* **13**, 4348 (2022).
15. Thirunavukarasu, A. J. *et al.* Large language models in medicine. *Nat. medicine* **29**, 1930–1940 (2023).
16. Clusmann, J. *et al.* The future landscape of large language models in medicine. *Commun. medicine* **3**, 141 (2023).
17. Gilbert, S., Harvey, H., Melvin, T., Vollebregt, E. & Wicks, P. Large language model ai chatbots require approval as medical devices. *Nat. Medicine* **29**, 2396–2398 (2023).
18. Singh, C., Askari, A., Caruana, R. & Gao, J. Augmenting interpretable models with large language models during training. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 7913 (2023).
19. Fan, W. *et al.* A deep-learning-based framework for identifying and localizing multiple abnormalities and assessing cardiomegaly in chest x-ray. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 1347 (2024).
20. Kiyasseh, D., Cohen, A., Jiang, C. & Altieri, N. A framework for evaluating clinical artificial intelligence systems without ground-truth annotations. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 1808 (2024).
21. Nigo, M. *et al.* Deep learning model for personalized prediction of positive mrsa culture using time-series electronic health records. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 2036 (2024).
22. Tayebi Arasteh, S. *et al.* Large language models streamline automated machine learning for clinical studies. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 1603 (2024).
23. OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report (2023). [2303.08774](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774).
24. Touvron, H. *et al.* Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).
25. Bai, J. *et al.* Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609* (2023).
26. Du, Z. *et al.* Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10360* (2021).
27. Zeng, A. *et al.* GLM-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2023).
28. Team, I. Internlm: A multilingual language model with progressively enhanced capabilities. <https://github.com/InternLM/InternLM> (2023).
29. Cai, Z. *et al.* Internlm2 technical report (2024). [2403.17297](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.17297).
30. Yang, A. *et al.* Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305* (2023).
31. Nguyen, H.-T. A brief report on lawgpt 1.0: A virtual legal assistant based on gpt-3. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05729* (2023).
32. Huang, Q. *et al.* Lawyer llama technical report. *ArXiv abs/2305.15062* (2023).
33. Mik, E. Caveat lector: Large language models in legal practice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09163* (2024).
34. McCoy, R. T., Yao, S., Friedman, D., Hardy, M. & Griffiths, T. L. Embers of autoregression: Understanding large language models through the problem they are trained to solve. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13638* (2023).
35. Maynez, J., Narayan, S., Bohnet, B. & McDonald, R. On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00661* (2020).
36. Shazeer, N. *et al.* Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538* (2017).
37. Lepikhin, D. *et al.* Gshard: Scaling giant models with conditional computation and automatic sharding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.16668* (2020).

38. Lin, B. *et al.* Moe-llava: Mixture of experts for large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15947* (2024).
39. Zoph, B. *et al.* St-moe: Designing stable and transferable sparse expert models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08906* (2022).
40. Jiang, A. Q. *et al.* Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088* (2024).
41. Zoph, B. *et al.* St-moe: Designing stable and transferable sparse expert models (2022). [2202.08906](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.08906).
42. Fei, Z. *et al.* Lawbench: Benchmarking legal knowledge of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16289* (2023).

Author contributions statement

J.C., M.N., B.C., Y.Y. and L.Y. conceived the basic idea and designed the research study. J.C., Z.L., B.C and Y.Y. generated the Chatlaw dataset. M.N and Z.L constructed and trained the MoE model. M.N. and Z.L proposed and implemented the multi-agent collaboration framework. M.N. and Z.L. evaluated the performance on the Lawbench and Unified Qualification Exam for Legal Professiona. J.C. and M.N designed the real-case consultation process, and B.L provided the manual evaluation. M.N. and H.L. wrote the manuscript. B.L, Y.T and L.Y. revised the manuscript. Y.T. and Y.L. provided the deep learning training platform.