
OVERVIEW OF THE CAIL 2023 ARGUMENT MINING TRACK

Jingcong Liang
Fudan University
jcliang22@m.fudan.edu.cn

Junlong Wang, Xinyu Zhai
Dalian University of Technology
{jllwang,zhaixy}@mail.dlut.edu.cn

Yungui Zhuang
Tgnet
1506025911@qq.com

Yiyang Zheng
Shanghai University
zhengyiyang@shu.edu.cn

Xin Xu
18896502796@163.com

Xiandong Ran
Xi'an Jiaotong University
rx1218@stu.xjtu.edu.cn

Xiaozheng Dong, Honghui Rong
Lenovo KnowDee Intelligence
{dongxz,ronghh}@knowdee.com

Yanlun Liu
Hunan University
lyl@hnu.edu.cn

Hao Chen
Xiamen Huatian International Vocation Institute
2390207899@qq.com

Yuhan Wei
Northwest Polytechnical University
yhwei@mail.nwpu.edu.cn

Donghai Li
Beijing Thunisoft Yuandian Information Service Co., Ltd.
lidh@thunisoft.com

Jiajie Peng
Northwest Polytechnical University
jiajiepeng@nwpu.edu.cn

Xuanjing Huang
Fudan University
xjhuang@fudan.edu.cn

Chongde Shi
Beijing Thunisoft Yuandian Information Service Co., Ltd.
shichongde@thunisoft.com

Yansong Feng
Peking University
fengyansong@pku.edu.cn

Yun Song*
Northwest University of Political Science and Law
1171991@s.hlju.edu.cn

Zhongyu Wei*
Fudan University
zywei@fudan.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

We give a detailed overview of the CAIL 2023 Argument Mining Track, one of the Chinese AI and Law Challenge (CAIL) 2023 tracks. The main goal of the track is to identify and extract interacting argument pairs in trial dialogs. It mainly uses summarized judgment documents but can also refer to trial recordings. The track consists of two stages, and we introduce the tasks designed for each stage; we also extend the data from previous events into a new dataset — CAIL2023-ArgMine — with annotated new cases from various causes of action. We outline several submissions that achieve the best results, including their methods for different stages. While all submissions rely on language models, they have incorporated strategies that may benefit future work in this field.

Keywords Argument Mining · Judgment Document Comprehension

* Corresponding author.

Table 1: Examples of interacting argument pairs between the plaintiff and defense in different trials. Note that in the last example, the arguments are partially consistent.

No.	Side	Argument
1	Plaintiff	同年3月14日凌晨，被告人何**回到家中向高*谎称李某某走失，并阻止高*报警但未果。
	Defense	当晚11点至12点其回家后，便与女儿高*报警。
2	Plaintiff	被告在家很少操持家务，也很少做饭。
	Defense	被告一直在家伺候公婆和孩子的生活起居，还要兼顾浴池的生意。
3	Plaintiff	2015年12月26日，被告王**、周**因果园种植需要，从原告处借款3万元，约定月利率1.5%，借款期限6个月。
	Defense	被告王**借原告款属实，但借款时原告当场扣除了3000元。

1 Introduction

One of the core tasks for judges during a trial is to understand the arguments and testimonies from the two sides, as they need to base their verdicts on them appropriately. Typically, the panel summarizes the trial dialog into a judgment document, on which this judicial argument comprehension process heavily depends [1]; however, the panel has to perform the task manually by reading the entire document. The call for automating this process and other judicial tasks has yielded various studies and models involving both statistical methods [2, 3] and natural language processing (NLP) techniques [4, 5, 6], including the latest large language models [7, 8, 9, 10].

However, judicial argument comprehension differs from other tasks in the judicial field, as it requires extracting arguments from the trial dialog (and its summarized form) and understanding their interaction, especially between sides. The arguing procedure greatly resembles general argumentation procedures like debates, where such automatic comprehension is also possible [11, 12]. More specifically, the judicial argument comprehension task largely overlaps the domain of argument mining [13]. The development of NLP has also resulted in many studies that aimed to automate argument mining, covering argument structure prediction [14, 15, 16] and interaction identification [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24].

Based on the tasks designed by [24], [25] hosted the SMP-CAIL2020-Argmine Challenge², a track of the Chinese AI and Law Challenge (CAIL) 2020. The track addressed the importance of adapting argument-mining techniques to judicial scenarios and assisting judicial argument comprehension. Participants must develop models to identify and extract *interacting arguments* in trial dialogs. Here, two arguments interact if they come from different sides (plaintiff and defense) and make claims about the same subject, as shown in Table 1. Interacting arguments can be consistent or partially consistent, yet in most cases, one disputes another.

As the direct successor to the SMP-CAIL2020-Argmine Challenge, the latest CAIL 2023 Argument Mining Track³ extended the datasets and introduced new tasks closer to real scenarios. We divided the track into two stages, examining interacting argument identification and extraction abilities. More specifically, the first stage requires the model to choose the argument from five candidates by the defense that interacts with the given plaintiff’s argument. The second stage requires the model to extract interacting argument pairs from judgment documents directly.

In this paper, we report and analyze the best submissions to the track, including their methods and evaluation measures in both stages. All these submissions used language models as their backbone, yet they have used different approaches to improve their performance further. We also discuss the findings and reflections from these submissions for future study in this area.

2 Related Work

Automatic processing of judicial tasks, such as judgment document analysis, has been researched since the 1950s. Early studies mainly focused on quantitative and statistical methods [26, 2, 3]; more recent works also introduced machine learning approaches [27]. Meanwhile, the rapid development of natural language processing (NLP) has greatly aided the current progress in this field. For example, [4] and [6] trained N -gram based classifiers for judicial verdict prediction; [5] and [28] utilized various features to predict criminal case charges. The latest studies also utilized the

²http://cail.cipsc.org.cn/task_summit.html?raceID=3&cail_tag=2020

³http://cail.cipsc.org.cn/task_summit.html?raceID=5&cail_tag=2023

power of large language models (LLM) to tackle general judicial tasks and queries [7, 8]. In 2018, [29] held the Chinese AI Law Challenge (CAIL), initially focusing on judgment prediction, along with a large-scale legal dataset [30]. Since then, more judicial tasks and datasets were included, such as similar case matching [31] and judicial document classification [32].

The specific task of argumentative analysis of judgment documents was introduced in 2020 for its unique characteristic primarily related to argument mining [25]. Argument mining research focuses on defining and evaluating new algorithms for identifying and structurally analyzing human argumentation. Typical tasks in this area include argument segmentation and extraction [33, 34, 35, 36], argument classification [15, 37, 38] and argument relation mining [39, 40, 41]. However, the most related task to the CAIL 2023 Argument Mining Track is interactive argument detection, a combination of argument extraction and relation mining [42, 23]. Specifically, [24] proposed identifying interacting argument pairs in online debate forums, which was the direct inspiration for the tasks in our track. Since then, various methods have been proposed to tackle this task [43, 44].

3 Task Details

3.1 Task Description

The CAIL 2023 Argument Mining Track focused on recognizing interacting argument pairs in trial dialogs. As mentioned in Section 1, we define interacting argument pairs as two arguments, by the plaintiff and defense, respectively, that argue over the same subject. A typical judgment document lists the plaintiff’s claims and evidence first, followed by the defense’s rebuttals. Therefore, in most cases, each of the defense’s arguments is recorded as acknowledging or denying one or more arguments by the plaintiff, forming one or more interacting argument pairs. As a result, the track aimed to find these interacting argument pairs in judgment documents.

We split the track into two stages. The first stage requires identifying pairing arguments from the given candidates, and the second requires extracting argument pairs from judgment documents. Due to the low density of interacting argument pairs, argument pair extraction is more complicated than identification. In this way, we can distinguish models with various levels of ability.

More specifically, in the first stage, given an argument by the plaintiff, we provide five candidate arguments sampled from the defense side. One of these arguments forms an interacting argument paired with the plaintiff’s argument. We guarantee that only one argument can form such a pair, and the model should identify and choose it. Since this task only involves pre-extracted arguments from the judgment document, it is relatively easy but not very practical in real scenarios.

In the second stage, we only provide the judgment documents; the model must extract all interacting argument pairs between the plaintiff and defense. This task is more difficult since only a few arguments can form such pairs, causing the labels to be highly imbalanced. We also provided trial recordings as multimodal data for a portion of the documents as a bonus; these recordings were transcribed, with the speaker of each speech annotated. Samples with and without trial recordings are separated, resulting in two subtasks evaluated separately (using the same metrics).

3.2 Dataset

In the SMP-CAIL2020-Argmine Challenge, [25] annotated a dataset with 4,476 interacting argument pairs from 1,069 judgment documents. Their annotation included the case type (civil, criminal, etc.), the cause of action, the plaintiff and defense, and a list of interacting argument pairs. They also filtered cases that lacked substantial argumentation or were too short or long. In CAIL 2021, they extended the original dataset with more cases. However, the original dataset and the extended version lacked variety regarding the cause of action, especially civil ones.

Following their annotation schema, we refined their dataset and extended it with more trial cases from various crime types. Details of the data collection and annotation procedure are available in Appendix A, including annotation statistics. We name the new dataset CAIL2023-Argmine, and we list its data statistics in Table 2. CAIL2023-Argmine is twice as large as the original dataset and covers more causes of action, especially civil cases. The argument pair density remains low, again emphasizing the challenge of the track tasks.

Table 3 lists data statistics per cause of action in CAIL2023-Argmine. While the cases in the original dataset mainly came from a few causes of action like the crime of intentional injury (“故意伤害罪”) or causing traffic casualties (“交通肇事罪”), new cases are distributed more uniformly and cover more causes of action. Furthermore, the original dataset only contains one civil cause of action — maritime disputes (“海事海商纠纷”) — with only 145 documents. In CAIL2023-Argmine, we annotated nearly 1,200 new documents from 4 different civil causes of action, greatly

Table 2: Overall statistics of the original dataset and CAIL2023-Argmine. 2021: Extended version of the original dataset for CAIL 2021; 2021*: The previous dataset without cases not belonging to any specific cause of action (the last three statistics also exclude them); 2023: CAIL2023-Argmine.

Statistics	2021	2021*	2023
# Documents	1,872	1,449	3,620
# Argument Pairs	10,077	7,618	20,009
Pair Density (%)	6.60	6.20	8.88
# Causes of Actions	5	5	13
# Criminal Cases	1,304	1,304	2,291
# Civil Cases	145	145	1,329

Table 3: Data statistics per cause of action. 2021: the extended version of the dataset in the SMP-CAIL2020-Argmine Challenge; 2023*: new cases included in CAIL2023-Argmine. Causes of action that end with “罪” are criminal causes, while others are civil ones. Note that “其他” is not a valid cause of action, and we excluded corresponding cases in CAIL2023-Argmine.

Dataset	Cause of Action	# Docs	# Sentences	# Pairs	Density (%)
2021	故意伤害罪	956	16,601	4,183	5.44
	交通肇事罪	315	5,237	2,394	10.52
	故意杀人罪	29	405	152	10.22
	虐待罪	4	101	30	6.13
	海事海商纠纷	145	2,639	859	7.59
	其他*	423	7,922	2,459	6.20
2023*	故意杀人罪	272	4,005	1,366	9.25
	抢劫罪	253	3,579	1,698	13.41
	强奸罪	239	3,271	1,501	13.22
	诈骗罪	168	2,601	1,255	12.54
	盗窃罪	55	800	469	16.23
	借款合同纠纷	299	4,157	1,353	9.27
	离婚纠纷	298	4,612	1,498	8.23
	生命权、身体权、健康权纠纷	294	4,515	1,727	9.73
买卖合同纠纷	293	4,248	1,524	9.88	

extending this part of the data. Another observation is that the argument pair density in the new cases is higher than in the old ones, especially in criminal cases.

In addition to judgment documents, we prepared trial audio and transcriptions for the multimodal bonus task in the second stage. Due to limited open access to trial recordings, we could only obtain trial videos for some cases in CAIL2023-Argmine. We extracted the audio from the videos and transcribed them into dialog texts using speech recognition models. Since the model output did not contain speaker information, we further annotated the speaker of each speech in the dialog. Table 4 shows statistics of these multimodal data.

3.3 Evaluation and Baseline

For the first stage, we evaluate the submissions by calculating the accuracy of candidate prediction over the test set:

$$S_1 = \text{Acc} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n I\{y_i = \hat{y}_i\}}{n} \quad (1)$$

where y_i and \hat{y}_i are the true label and prediction of the i -th sample in the test set respectively.

However, the accuracy was no longer suitable for the second stage due to imbalanced labels (pairing or not), as seen in Table 2. Therefore, we used the F_1 score as the evaluation metric for this stage:

$$F_1 = \frac{2\text{TP}}{2\text{TP} + \text{FP} + \text{FN}} \quad (2)$$

Table 4: Statistics of multimodal data in CAIL2023-Argmine. There are more recordings than documents because some cases have multiple trial recordings.

Statistics	Value
# Documents	134
# Argument Pairs	688
Pair Density (%)	8.49
# Recordings	146
Average Duration	50'12''866
# Speeches	22,654

where TP is the number of correct predictions for *all* cases, FP is the number of incorrect predictions, and FN is the number of missed pairs. Specifically, we calculated F_1 scores for multimodal and text-only samples separately, obtaining F_1^m and F_1^t respectively. We took their weighed average as the score of this stage:

$$S_2 = 0.8F_1^t + 0.2F_1^m \quad (3)$$

Finally, we ranked teams that participated in both stages using the following integrated score:

$$S = 0.3S_1 + 0.7S_2 \quad (4)$$

We provided a BERT-based baseline model [45] for both stages during the track⁴. This baseline model treats both tasks as binary classification. It pairs the plaintiff’s argument to each of the defense’s candidate arguments and predicts whether they form an interacting argument pair or not; Specifically, it does not use judgment documents, trial transcripts, or multimodal data. We trained the model with the training set of each stage to obtain the final baseline for that stage.

In the first stage, the model achieved an accuracy of 0.60; however, in the second stage, it only achieved $F_1^m = 0.42$ and $F_1^t = 0.30$. The evaluation result further proved that the task in the second stage is more difficult than in the first stage.

4 Track Results

In the CAIL 2023 Argument Mining Track, 35 teams from universities and enterprises have submitted their models during the first stage. Among them, 28 teams successfully superseded our baseline model and were able to participate in the second stage. Finally, 10 teams have submitted valid models for the second stage.

4.1 Submissions

This section provides descriptions of the top 7 teams to whom we awarded prizes. The rest of the teams were not required to submit technical reports about their models, yet we will still show their results in Section 4.2.

DUT-large fine-tuned multiple pre-trained language models and employed a soft voting approach to ensemble them. In the first stage, they concatenated the plaintiff’s argument with each of the defense’s candidate arguments as the model input. To enhance robustness, they introduced adversarial training through Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) and R-Drop regularization. In the second stage, they used a similar approach by treating the task as a binary classification task. They involved sentence-BERT models [46] for this stage. They employed several techniques, such as pseudo-labeling, focal loss, and the Fast Gradient Method (FGM) for adversarial training.

X used BERT-based models for both stages but under different approaches. In the first stage, they fine-tuned a MacBERT model [47] integrated with a multi-choice setup to match arguments. They also leveraged the sentence-BERT model for sentence pair binary classification in the second stage.

zyy utilized Qwen-14B [48] for both stages. The model was fine-tuned by Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [49], with NefTune applied to enhance performance. They created prompts for each stage, respectively. In the first stage, the prompt included the plaintiff’s argument and all five candidates and instructed the model to choose the interacting one. In the second stage, they provided arguments from both sides, prompting the model to find all matching pairs between them.

xxxin fine-tuned a MacBERT model for the first stage. In addition to argument pairs, they included designated tokens to identify the cause of action (including its category and specific cause) and the plaintiff’s and defense’s arguments.

⁴<https://github.com/china-ai-law-challenge/CAIL2023/tree/main/lblj>

Table 5: CAIL 2023 Argument Mining Track final results, sorted by the final score S . Only teams with valid submissions for the second stage are listed. We round all scores to two digits.

Team	S_1	S_2	S	Rank
DUT-large	0.72	0.50	0.56	1
X	0.68	0.45	0.52	2
zyy	0.69	0.44	0.52	3
xxxin	0.63	0.45	0.51	4
AG	0.65	0.44	0.50	5
福气by	0.69	0.42	0.50	6
酸菜饺子&玉米饺子	0.68	0.35	0.45	7
婷之队	0.67	0.30	0.41	8
争议观点队	0.63	0.28	0.39	9
sxu-wzt	0.64	0.09	0.26	10

Each batch consisted of argument pairs with the same plaintiff’s argument but with different defense arguments. In the second stage, they used multiple methods, such as pseudo-labels, negative sampling, and adversarial training, to deal with imbalanced labels.

AG adopted a list-wise learning approach, transforming both stages into a sorting task. In the first stage, they used the provided candidates directly as a list, and in the second stage, they constructed the list using Cartesian products. They fine-tuned the Lawformer model [50], utilizing adversarial learning with FGM.

福气by introduced multi-model voting for both stages. In the first stage, they employed a combination of a multiple choice question-answering model, a text-matching model capturing argument relation, and a re-ranking model to refine the selection. They did not include the question-answering model and the re-ranking model for the second stage; instead, they enhanced the text-matching model with negative samples.

酸菜饺子&玉米饺子 fine-tuned a RoBERTa [51] model on large law corpora. They also adopted FGM to enhance the robustness of the model.

4.2 Results

Table 5 demonstrates the CAIL 2023 Argument Mining Track results, including the scores of both stages and the final score to rank teams. Although all teams performed better than the baseline in the first stage, not all could beat the baseline in the second stage. DUT-large significantly outperformed all other teams in both stages, followed by X and zyy, which are very close. Other teams mentioned in Section 4.1 were on par with X and zyy in one stage but not in the other (“福气by” and “酸菜饺子&玉米饺子” in the first, xxxin and AG in the second).

The correlation coefficient of S_1 and S_2 is 0.5191, and the distribution of the two scores of different teams is illustrated in Figure 1. Although most teams shared models across the two stages, the scores of the two tasks are not strictly correlated. This is probably because the two tasks, though deeply related, vary in some aspects such as the density of interactive argument pairs.

5 Analysis

5.1 Common Techniques

Upon analyzing the models proposed by top teams, we discovered some common techniques that many teams have adopted:

Task Transformation In both stages, all teams have transformed the task into more standard ones. In the first stage, teams treated the task as binary classification or multiple choice question answering. In the second stage, binary classification was more prevalent, while some teams also turned the task into a ranking problem. Such transformation allowed teams to adopt mature solutions for predefined standard tasks that are easier to implement and train.

Pretrained Language Model All teams have utilized pre-trained language models (PLM) as their backbone, reflecting the power of such models in NLP tasks. The selected models varied among teams, from smaller BERT-sized models




Figure 1: Score distribution of teams with valid submissions for the second stage.

(sBERT, RoBERTa) to larger LLMs (Qwen-14B). Some teams introduced models specifically pre-trained on law corpora (Lawformer) or more general Chinese corpora (ERNIE) [52] to match the tasks more closely.

Domain Specific Fine-tuning Regardless of the backbone PLM selection, all teams have fine-tuned their backbones on the training set we provided and other similar data. This domain adaptation approach could enhance the proficiency of PLMs within the specified scenario and task. Teams adopted different input/output formats and training strategies depending on the model used and how they transformed the tasks.

5.2 Promising Tricks

Besides the above methods, teams have proposed different tricks to improve their results. We list some of them below:

Data Augmentation Some teams have involved data augmentation techniques, including pseudo-labeling and negative sampling. These methods could alleviate the negative effect of imbalanced labels, especially in the second stage. Meanwhile, they could improve the generalizability and robustness of the model.

Adversarial Training Besides data augmentation, several teams have used adversarial training to fight against imbalanced labels. For instance, DUT-large, AG, and “酸菜饺子&玉米饺子” used the Fast Gradient Method (FGM) to implement adversarial training; Moreover, DUT-large adopted Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) for adversarial training in the first stage.

Loss Function and Regularization Since most teams treated the tasks as binary classification, they generally chose cross entropy as the loss function. However, other loss functions were also introduced, such as focal loss. Teams also applied regularization methods like R-Drop to enhance model robustness.

Inter-task Transfer Learning Several teams exploited their model from the first stage during the second stage, transferring it to the new scenario. For example, AG unified the tasks from the two stages and performed further fine-tuning to adapt to the second stage.

Large Language Model As mentioned, zyy utilized Qwen-14B, a large language model (LLM) for text generation. Therefore, they have involved unique fine-tuning strategies for LLMs such as LoRA and NefTune. They also designed prompt templates for the task in the two stages.

Table 6: F_1 scores of the two subtasks in the second stage. We only include teams whose model performed better (achieving a higher S_2) than our baseline in this stage.

Team	F_1^t	F_1^m	S_2
DUT-large	0.52	0.44	0.50
xxxin	0.47	0.39	0.45
X	0.47	0.37	0.45
zyy	0.45	0.42	0.44
AG	0.46	0.36	0.44
福气by	0.44	0.33	0.42
Baseline	0.42	0.30	0.39

Model Ensembling Many teams trained multiple models and compared their performance during each stage. Several teams have employed model ensembling to exploit all model outputs for further improvements. They designed different methods for the final prediction, such as direct or soft voting.

5.3 Multimodal Bonus Task

As stated in Section 3, we split out a multimodal bonus task in the second stage, providing trial recordings and transcriptions for the documents in this task. However, none of the top 7 teams listed in Section 4.1 utilized the multimodal data, only extracting interacting argument pairs from the given judgment document. We conjecture that the large gap between judgment documents and trial recordings (including transcriptions) could have made it more difficult to exploit the multimodal resource.

Nevertheless, Table 6 shows the F_1 scores of teams listed in Table 5 that superseded our baseline in the second stage. Most teams utilized BERT-like PLMs and followed a similar score distribution as our baseline, where F_1^m is significantly lower than F_1^t . This phenomenon follows our expectation because the cases from the bonus task had different causes of action compared to other cases in this stage. In contrast, zyy has gained an F_1^m much closer to F_1^t , using a true LLM (Qwen-14B). This phenomenon suggests that modern LLMs are more robust in cross-domain tasks.

6 Conclusion

This paper presented the CAIL 2023 Argument Mining Track, a track of the Chinese AI and Law Challenge (CAIL) 2023 that focused on identifying and extracting interacting argument pairs in judgment documents. We divided the track into two consecutive stages; we received 10 valid submissions for the second stage from 28 teams that passed the threshold in the first stage. We introduced the tasks and corresponding data for each stage and outlined the best submissions. Compared to our provided baseline, teams have generally performed better, using various techniques that are beneficial for similar tasks in judicial scenarios.

However, there is still a long way to achieve the goal of fully automated judicial argument comprehension. The tasks we proposed in the two stages are simplified from real-world demands, potentially limiting their application in actual trials. Moreover, it remains unclear how much multimodal data from trial recordings can assist such tasks, as the top teams did not exploit the multimodal data we provided.

Nevertheless, we thank all participating teams for taking the time to participate in this challenging track, especially the top teams in the second stage that provided technical reports of their submissions. We believe that future research can use the tasks, data, and submissions from our track to build more powerful automatic systems for judicial use.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62176058) and National Key R & D Program of China (2023YFF1204800). The project’s computational resources are supported by CFFF platform of Fudan University.

References

- [1] Adrian Vermeule. Judicial history. *The Yale Law Journal*, 108(6):1311–1354, 1999.

- [2] S. Sidney Ulmer. Quantitative analysis of judicial processes: Some practical and theoretical applications. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 28(1):164–184, 1963.
- [3] Stuart S. Nagel. Applying correlation analysis to case prediction. *Texas Law Review*, 42:1006, 1963.
- [4] Octavia-Maria Sulea, Marcos Zampieri, Shervin Malmasi, Mihaela Vela, Liviu P. Dinu, and Josef van Genabith. Exploring the use of text classification in the legal domain. October 2017.
- [5] Daniel Martin Katz, Michael J. Bommarito, II, and Josh Blackman. A general approach for predicting the behavior of the supreme court of the united states. *PLOS ONE*, 12(4):1–18, 04 2017.
- [6] Yi-Hung Liu and Yen-Liang Chen. A two-phase sentiment analysis approach for judgement prediction. *Journal of Information Science*, 44(5):594–607, 2018.
- [7] Jiaxi Cui, Zongjian Li, Yang Yan, Bohua Chen, and Li Yuan. Chatlaw: Open-source legal large language model with integrated external knowledge bases. June 2023.
- [8] Shengbin Yue, Wei Chen, Siyuan Wang, Bingxuan Li, Chenchen Shen, Shujun Liu, Yuxuan Zhou, Yao Xiao, Song Yun, Xuanjing Huang, and Zhongyu Wei. Disc-lawllm: Fine-tuning large language models for intelligent legal services. September 2023.
- [9] Xinyi Mou, Zhongyu Wei, and Xuanjing Huang. Unveiling the truth and facilitating change: Towards agent-based large-scale social movement simulation. February 2024.
- [10] Xinnong Zhang, Haoyu Kuang, Xinyi Mou, Hanjia Lyu, Kun Wu, Siming Chen, Jiebo Luo, Xuanjing Huang, and Zhongyu Wei. Somelvlm: A large vision language model for social media processing. February 2024.
- [11] Jiayu Lin, Rong Ye, Meng Han, Qi Zhang, Ruofei Lai, Xinyu Zhang, Zhao Cao, Xuanjing Huang, and Zhongyu Wei. Argue with me tersely: Towards sentence-level counter-argument generation. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16705–16720, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [12] Jingcong Liang, Rong Ye, Meng Han, Ruofei Lai, Xinyu Zhang, Xuanjing Huang, and Zhongyu Wei. Debatrrix: Multi-dimensional debate judge with iterative chronological analysis based on llm. March 2024.
- [13] John Lawrence and Chris Reed. Argument mining: A survey. *Computational Linguistics*, 45(4):765–818, December 2019.
- [14] Li Wang, Marco Lui, Su Nam Kim, Joakim Nivre, and Timothy Baldwin. Predicting thread discourse structure over technical web forums. In Regina Barzilay and Mark Johnson, editors, *Proceedings of the 2011 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 13–25, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK., July 2011. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [15] Christian Stab and Iryna Gurevych. Identifying argumentative discourse structures in persuasive essays. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 46–56, Doha, Qatar, October 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [16] Jiangming Liu, Shay B. Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. Discourse representation parsing for sentences and documents. In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6248–6262, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [17] Kaveh Taghipour and Hwee Tou Ng. A neural approach to automated essay scoring. In Jian Su, Kevin Duh, and Xavier Carreras, editors, *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1882–1891, Austin, Texas, November 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [18] Zhongyu Wei, Yang Liu, and Yi Li. Is this post persuasive? ranking argumentative comments in online forum. In Katrin Erk and Noah A. Smith, editors, *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 195–200, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [19] Chenhao Tan, Vlad Niculae, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Lillian Lee. Winning arguments: Interaction dynamics and persuasion strategies in good-faith online discussions. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW '16*, page 613–624, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE, 2016. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- [20] Ivan Habernal and Iryna Gurevych. Which argument is more convincing? analyzing and predicting convincingsness of web arguments using bidirectional LSTM. In Katrin Erk and Noah A. Smith, editors, *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1589–1599, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [21] Fei Dong, Yue Zhang, and Jie Yang. Attention-based recurrent convolutional neural network for automatic essay scoring. In Roger Levy and Lucia Specia, editors, *Proceedings of the 21st Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL 2017)*, pages 153–162, Vancouver, Canada, August 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [22] Lu Ji, Zhongyu Wei, Xiangkun Hu, Yang Liu, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. Incorporating argument-level interactions for persuasion comments evaluation using co-attention model. In Emily M. Bender, Leon Derczynski, and Pierre Isabelle, editors, *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3703–3714, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA, August 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [23] Liying Cheng, Lidong Bing, Qian Yu, Wei Lu, and Luo Si. APE: Argument pair extraction from peer review and rebuttal via multi-task learning. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7000–7011, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [24] Lu Ji, Zhongyu Wei, Jing Li, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. Discrete argument representation learning for interactive argument pair identification. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5467–5478, Online, June 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [25] Jian Yuan, Zhongyu Wei, Yixu Gao, Wei Chen, Yun Song, Donghua Zhao, Jinglei Ma, Zhen Hu, Shaokun Zou, Donghai Li, and Xuanjing Huang. Overview of SMP-CAIL2020-Argmine: The Interactive Argument-Pair Extraction in Judgement Document Challenge. *Data Intelligence*, 3(2):287–307, June 2021.
- [26] Fred Kort. Predicting supreme court decisions mathematically: A quantitative analysis of the “right to counsel” cases. *American Political Science Review*, 51(1):1–12, 1957.
- [27] B. E. Lauderdale and T. S. Clark. The supreme court’s many median justices. *American Political Science Review*, 106(4):847–866, 2012.
- [28] Bingfeng Luo, Yansong Feng, Jianbo Xu, Xiang Zhang, and Dongyan Zhao. Learning to predict charges for criminal cases with legal basis. In Martha Palmer, Rebecca Hwa, and Sebastian Riedel, editors, *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2727–2736, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [29] Haoxi Zhong, Chaojun Xiao, Zhipeng Guo, Cunchao Tu, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, Yansong Feng, Xianpei Han, Zhen Hu, Heng Wang, and Jianfeng Xu. Overview of cail2018: Legal judgment prediction competition. October 2018.
- [30] Chaojun Xiao, Haoxi Zhong, Zhipeng Guo, Cunchao Tu, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, Yansong Feng, Xianpei Han, Zhen Hu, Heng Wang, and Jianfeng Xu. Cail2018: A large-scale legal dataset for judgment prediction. July 2018.
- [31] Chaojun Xiao, Haoxi Zhong, Zhipeng Guo, Cunchao Tu, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, Tianyang Zhang, Xianpei Han, Zhen Hu, Heng Wang, and Jianfeng Xu. Cail2019-scm: A dataset of similar case matching in legal domain. November 2019.
- [32] Chao-Lin Liu and Chwen-Dar Hsieh. Exploring phrase-based classification of judicial documents for criminal charges in chinese. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Foundations of Intelligent Systems, ISMIS’06*, page 681–690, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer-Verlag.
- [33] Ran Levy, Yonatan Bilu, Daniel Hershcovich, Ehud Aharoni, and Noam Slonim. Context dependent claim detection. In Junichi Tsujii and Jan Hajic, editors, *Proceedings of COLING 2014, the 25th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*, pages 1489–1500, Dublin, Ireland, August 2014. Dublin City University and Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [34] Ran Levy, Shai Gretz, Benjamin Sznajder, Shay Hummel, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. Unsupervised corpus-wide claim detection. In Ivan Habernal, Iryna Gurevych, Kevin Ashley, Claire Cardie, Nancy Green, Diane Litman, Georgios Petasis, Chris Reed, Noam Slonim, and Vern Walker, editors, *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 79–84, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [35] Yamen Ajjour, Wei-Fan Chen, Johannes Kiesel, Henning Wachsmuth, and Benno Stein. Unit segmentation of argumentative texts. In Ivan Habernal, Iryna Gurevych, Kevin Ashley, Claire Cardie, Nancy Green, Diane Litman, Georgios Petasis, Chris Reed, Noam Slonim, and Vern Walker, editors, *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 118–128, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [36] Xinyi Mou, Zhongyu Wei, Changjian Jiang, and Jiajie Peng. A two stage adaptation framework for frame detection via prompt learning. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Chu-Ren Huang, Hansaem Kim, James Pustejovsky, Leo Wanner, Key-Sun Choi, Pum-Mo Ryu, Hsin-Hsi Chen, Lucia Donatelli, Heng Ji, Sadao Kurohashi, Patrizia Paggio, Nianwen Xue, Seokhwan Kim, Younggyun Hahm, Zhong He, Tony Kyungil Lee, Enrico Santus, Francis Bond, and Seung-Hoon Na, editors, *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2968–2978, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 2022. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- [37] Vlad Niculae, Joonsuk Park, and Claire Cardie. Argument mining with structured SVMs and RNNs. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 985–995, Vancouver, Canada, July 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [38] Orith Toledo-Ronen, Matan Orbach, Yonatan Bilu, Artem Spector, and Noam Slonim. Multilingual argument mining: Datasets and analysis. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 303–317, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [39] Andreas Peldszus and Manfred Stede. Joint prediction in MST-style discourse parsing for argumentation mining. In Lluís Màrquez, Chris Callison-Burch, and Jian Su, editors, *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 938–948, Lisbon, Portugal, September 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [40] Isaac Persing and Vincent Ng. End-to-end argumentation mining in student essays. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1384–1394, San Diego, California, June 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [41] Jianzhu Bao, Chuang Fan, Jipeng Wu, Yixue Dang, Jiachen Du, and Ruifeng Xu. A neural transition-based model for argumentation mining. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6354–6364, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [42] Roxanne El Baff, Henning Wachsmuth, Khalid Al Khatib, and Benno Stein. Analyzing the Persuasive Effect of Style in News Editorial Argumentation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3154–3160, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [43] Jian Yuan, Zhongyu Wei, Donghua Zhao, Qi Zhang, and Changjian Jiang. Leveraging argumentation knowledge graph for interactive argument pair identification. In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 2310–2319, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [44] Jingcong Liang, Rong Ye, Meng Han, Qi Zhang, Ruofei Lai, Xinyu Zhang, Zhao Cao, Xuanjing Huang, and Zhongyu Wei. Hi-ArG: Exploring the integration of hierarchical argumentation graphs in language pretraining. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14606–14620, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [45] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [46] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks. In Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [47] Yiming Cui, Wanxiang Che, Ting Liu, Bing Qin, and Ziqing Yang. Pre-training with whole word masking for chinese bert. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 29:3504–3514, 2021.
- [48] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. Qwen technical report. September 2023.

Table 7: Statistics of the annotation for new cases in CAIL2023-Argmine. Causes of action that end with “罪” are criminal causes, while others are civil ones. “Agreement” and “Disagreement” denote agreement and disagreement argument pairs, respectively. We define agreement and disagreement pairs as in [25]: we only count argument pairs where the defense fully acknowledges the plaintiff as agreement ones.

Cause of Action	# Documents	# Agreement	# Disagreement	Cohen’s κ
故意杀人罪	272	604	762	0.18
抢劫罪	253	794	904	0.26
强奸罪	239	414	1,087	0.28
诈骗罪	168	602	653	0.25
盗窃罪	55	319	150	0.21
借款合同纠纷	299	246	1,107	0.15
离婚纠纷	298	282	1,216	0.24
生命权、身体权、健康权纠纷	294	82	1,645	0.28
买卖合同纠纷	293	209	1,315	0.22
Summary	2,171	3,552	8,839	0.24

- [49] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [50] Chaojun Xiao, Xueyu Hu, Zhiyuan Liu, Cunchao Tu, and Maosong Sun. Lawformer: A pre-trained language model for chinese legal long documents. *AI Open*, 2:79–84, 2021.
- [51] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. July 2019.
- [52] Yu Sun, Shuohuan Wang, Shikun Feng, Siyu Ding, Chao Pang, Junyuan Shang, Jiayang Liu, Xuyi Chen, Yanbin Zhao, Yuxiang Lu, Weixin Liu, Zihua Wu, Weibao Gong, Jianzhong Liang, Zhizhou Shang, Peng Sun, Wei Liu, Xuan Ouyang, Dianhai Yu, Hao Tian, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. Ernie 3.0: Large-scale knowledge enhanced pre-training for language understanding and generation. July 2021.

A Annotation Details

The dataset for SMP-CAIL2020-Argmine (including its extension in 2021) only covered 5 causes of action. Meanwhile, many cases did not have a specific cause of action (tagged as “其他”). First, we excluded the above vague cases in CAIL2023-Argmine to ensure the quality of crime features. Next, to increase the diversity of the dataset, we selected 9 causes of action that had no or few cases in the original dataset, including criminal and civil ones, as listed in Table 7. We collected public judgment documents and filtered them according to the rules proposed by [25]; for each cause of action, if there are more than 300 valid cases, we sampled 300 of them.

Next, we arranged for a group of undergraduate and graduate students majoring in law to annotate these documents. We only kept the part containing testimonies from both sides and extracted the sentences from the document beforehand to unify the argument span. The annotation schema was the same as in [25], where annotators needed to choose the case type, the cause of action, the plaintiff and defense, and a list of interacting argument pairs, except that they only needed to select pre-extracted sentences as argument candidates. Two annotators annotated each document. If the list of selected argument pairs differed between the annotators, an adjudicator would decide on the valid pairs among all candidates. We invited a law professor as the adjudicator to ensure the annotation quality.

After annotating all documents, we further filtered documents whose annotated cause of action (by both annotators) did not match its presumed one because it indicates that the cause of action could be vague in this case. Table 7 shows annotation statistics of the final documents per cause of action. In most cases, there are more disagree pairs than agree pairs, especially in civil cases; the only exception is larceny (“盗窃罪”), where the evidence is usually undoubtedly clear. The Cohen’s κ is not very high, making adjudication critical during annotation.