

A Comprehensive Survey on Legal Summarization: Challenges and Future Directions

MOUSUMI AKTER, TU Dortmund University & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany

ERION ÇANO, Ruhr University Bochum & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany

ERIK WEBER, TU Dortmund University & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany

DENNIS DOBLER, TU Dortmund University & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany

IVAN HABERNAL, Ruhr University Bochum & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany

This article provides a systematic up-to-date survey of automatic summarization techniques, datasets, models, and evaluation methods in the legal domain. Through specific source selection criteria, we thoroughly review over 120 papers spanning the modern ‘transformer’ era of natural language processing (NLP), thus filling a gap in existing systematic surveys on the matter. We present existing research along several axes and discuss trends, challenges, and opportunities for future research.

CCS Concepts: • **Natural Language Processing** → **Legal Summarization**; *Survey*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Legal, Law, Summarization, Survey

ACM Reference Format:

Mousumi Akter, Erion Çano, Erik Weber, Dennis Dobler, and Ivan Habernal. 2025. A Comprehensive Survey on Legal Summarization: Challenges and Future Directions. 1, 1 (January 2025), 31 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

In the legal domain, language is not just a means of communication, but rather the currency of the profession. The constant engagement with extensive written materials is fundamental and immensely time-consuming [104]. Legal professionals often spend hours, if not days, combing through documents to find precedents or relevant cases that could be pivotal to their current cases. This laborious process is a significant part of the workload of legal professionals like lawyers and judges, taking up lots of time that could be invested otherwise. Automatic summarization tools could help to condense lengthy legal documents into concise summaries, helping to save both time and costs. Moreover, integrating advanced Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques into legal research holds significant promise for democratizing access to legal information. Figure 1 shows the general pipeline for legal summarization.

Compared to other domains, legal texts present unique challenges that distinguish them from other document types. Legal documents tend to be longer and more detailed than those from other domains. They feature complex language with abundant domain-specific terminology, abbreviations, and extensive use of citations or references to

Authors’ Contact Information: Mousumi Akter, TU Dortmund University & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany, mousumi.akter@tu-dortmund.de; Erion Çano, Ruhr University Bochum & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany, erion.cano@ruhr-uni-bochum.de; Erik Weber, TU Dortmund University & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany, erik.weber@tu-dortmund.de; Dennis Dobler, TU Dortmund University & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany, dobler@statistik.tu-dortmund.de; Ivan Habernal, Ruhr University Bochum & Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security, Germany, ivan.habernal@ruhr-uni-bochum.de.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1




Fig. 1. Schematic Legal Summarization Pipeline: Legal summarization pipelines process lengthy, structurally diverse documents to generate summaries, serving both general audiences and domain experts.

related documents, leading to this language often being referred to as 'legalese'. Moreover, legal documents exhibit diverse structural formats based on their country of origin. For example, the legal documentation from the United States differs significantly in structure from that of India. This variation can pose considerable challenges when developing a generalized tool for summarizing legal documents effectively.

Legal summarization can generally be divided into three main aspects: region-specific legal documents, summarization strategies and summarization methods. Region-specific legal summarization focuses on developing tools that can handle documents from particular countries or languages. Additionally, general summarization strategies have also been identified in legal summarization, including extractive, abstractive, and hybrid approaches. The extractive approach involves directly copying significant sentences from the source document and combining them to create the output [23]. In contrast, the abstractive approach mimics human understanding by interpreting the source document and producing a summary based on its key concepts [105]. The hybrid approach aims to combine the strengths of both methods by rewriting a summary that utilizes selected important content extracted from the source document. On the other hand, summarization methods vary from rank-based, graph-based, transformer-based, and others.

Despite significant progress in the research of legal document summarization [3, 7, 16, 56, 63, 117], the field lacks a comprehensive and timely survey. We address this gap in our article as follows:

Comprehensive overview of summarization research We provide a comprehensive survey on the current state of summarization approaches specifically designed for the legal domain. This encompasses three main areas of legal summarization: existing methods and approaches, available datasets, and evaluation metrics used.

Comprehensive analysis of research trends in legal summarization We conduct a thorough examination of research trends in legal summarization, exploring three aspects such as region-specific trends, legal summarization strategies, and various methodologies. This analysis aims to provide valuable insights into the evolving landscape of legal summarization practices.

Challenges and future directions We examine the limitations present in current methodologies and propose future research directions that hold significant promise. Key areas for exploration include enhancements in model design, improvements in the quality and diversity of datasets, as well as the feasibility of automated evaluation metrics alongside human evaluation strategies.

Primary repositories	
ACL	https://aclanthology.org
TACL	https://direct.mit.edu/tacl
Springer Link	https://link.springer.com
ScienceDirect	https://www.sciencedirect.com
IEEEExplore	http://ieeexplore.ieee.org
ACM Digital Library	http://dl.acm.org
JURIX 2023	https://jurix23.maastrichtlawtech.eu
Artificial Intelligence and Law	https://link.springer.com/journal/10506
Secondary repositories	
Scopus	http://www.scopus.com
Semantic Scholar	https://www.semanticscholar.org
Google Scholar	https://scholar.google.com
DBLP	https://dblp.org

Table 1. Main libraries searched for primary studies.

Keyword	Synonyms
legal	law, legislative, jurisdiction
text	textual, text-based, document, contract, decisions, ruling
summarization	summary
dialogue	question and answering

Table 2. Set of keywords and synonyms for search.

This survey is organized as follows. First, an overview of the paper selection methodology for the survey is presented in Section 2. Next, Section 3 provides a detailed overview of the available legal summarization datasets. The later part of the survey offers a comprehensive review of research trends in legal summarization from three perspectives: regional specifics, discussed in Section 4; approaches for legal summarization strategies, covered in Section 5; and legal summarization methodologies, detailed in Section 6. In Section 7, we examine the trends in evaluation approaches for legal summarization and discuss the available metrics. Section 8 addresses the limitations of current approaches and outlines promising directions for future research in this field. Finally, Section 9 concludes the survey.

2 Paper selection methodology

The steps we followed during the paper selection phase are similar to the ones suggested in the guidelines for systematic literature reviews defined by Kitchenham and Charters [66], commonly followed in similar studies [19, 40]. The purpose of using a popular and reproducible methodological approach is to ensure that the treatment of the research topic is verifiable and unbiased.

We chose eight main digital repositories of primary studies and four more secondary (indexing) digital repositories, shown in Table 1.

Furthermore, we defined (“legal”, “text”, “summarization”, “dialogue”) as the set of the main keywords. Each of them was augmented with synonyms. The full list of search terms is shown in Table 2. The search query derived from the keywords and synonyms is (“legal” OR “law” OR “legislative”) AND (“summarization” OR “summary”) AND (“of” OR “about”) AND (“dialogues” OR “question and answering” OR “text” OR “textual” OR “text-based” OR “document”).

The search query was used in the search engines of the digital libraries; different numbers of papers were returned by each of them. The retrieval process was conducted during July 2024.

To be objective in deciding which papers to include and which not, we defined a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria presented in Table 3. The inclusion and exclusion criteria reflect the objectives of the survey. They helped us to thematically focus on the most recent and relevant studies, to see at what scale Transformer-based models have been adopted in the legal domain, and to find sources of datasets and evaluation metrics.

Inclusion criteria
Papers on methods, datasets and metrics for legal summarization
Papers published in general conferences/journals and legal/summarization/evaluation workshops
Papers published from 2017 to 2024 (Transformer era)
Papers with datasets and metrics, we include paper before 2017
Exclusion criteria
Papers not about summarization
Papers outside the legal domain
Gray literature (not published in any reputable venue)
Papers published before 2017
Publications not in English

Table 3. Inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Initially, we started with a coarse selection of the papers. During this phase, we checked titles and abstracts only. Making use of the inclusion and exclusion criteria and checking titles and abstracts, we reached to a collection of 262 papers. Duplicates were removed and a more detailed inspection of each paper was conducted, carefully reading the abstract and other sections. Besides relevance, completeness in terms of task definition, description of the proposed model or method, and presentation of results were considered. The inclusion and exclusion decisions were made in agreement between the first three authors. At the end of this phase, a total of 123 final papers were reached. Some publication details of those papers are presented in the Appendix.

3 Datasets

While there is an extensive amount of unlabeled legal data, there are only a few datasets available for the task of legal summarization. These include a diverse range of documents such as contracts, legislative bills, and judicial decisions, sourced from various countries, institutions, and companies. This section is dedicated to offering a systematic overview of these documents, organizing them by type.

3.1 Court rulings

Court rulings are formal decisions issued by judges or judicial bodies in legal disputes, often serving as precedents or interpretations of law. They represent the largest group of documents within the domain of legal summarization.

- Grover et al. [46] gathered a corpus of 188 judgments of the British House of Lords, out of which 153 judgments had the corresponding hand-written summaries. The dataset does not seem to be available anymore.
- Various methods utilized the *BrazilianBR* dataset proposed by de Vargas Feijó and Moreira [27]. It contains roughly 10,000 rulings from the Brazilian Federal Supreme Court. Each document consists of four parts. The

first part, the *Ementa* is a brief summary of the case and the final decision, which can be used as the reference summary.

- Shukla et al. [117] proposed three novel datasets for legal summarization, two datasets for abstractive summarization and one dataset for extractive summarization. The *IN-Abs* dataset contains 7,130 cases from the Indian Supreme Court collected from Legal Information Institute of India¹ with respective headnotes as reference summaries. Contrarily, the *IN-Ext* dataset consists of 50 judgments from the Indian Supreme Court with human-generated extractive summaries through three legal professionals from the Gandhi School of Intellectual Property Law. These summaries are about one third of the length of the original document and were written with respect to seven rhetorical segments, which were labeled beforehand. Finally, the *UK-Abs* dataset consists of 793 UK Supreme Court judgments² with their official press summaries, which can be utilized as the reference abstractive summaries of the documents.
- The Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLII)³ is an organization that provides open online access to legislative decisions and documents, including summaries for many cases. The data was used in several publications such as Elaraby and Litman [35], Elaraby et al. [37], Xu et al. [130]
- Zhong et al. [136] utilized cases from the US Board of Veterans' Appeals (BVA)⁴, particularly those dealing with service-connected post-traumatic stress disorder. For a number of these cases, extractive summaries were manually created by law experts. The data used for the paper were publicly accessible⁵.
- Galgani and Hoffmann [42] released their dataset with about 4000 cases of the Federal Court of Australia. The dataset includes catchphrases for every document, where the catchphrases can be used as reference summaries.
- Shen et al. [114] proposed the Multi-LexSum dataset, which contains 40,000 source documents for roughly 4,500 federal U.S. civil rights lawsuits. It contains multi-document summaries at three different levels of granularity, i.e., long summaries (for every case), small summaries (for about 70% of the cases) and tiny summaries (for about 36% of the cases). The data stems from the Civil Rights Litigation Clearinghouse (CRIC)⁶, an NGO dedicated to provide access to resources and information relating to civil rights litigation.
- Glaser et al. [45] proposed a large-scale dataset of roughly 100,000 German court rulings with short summaries. The data was crawled from several sources⁷ and contains cases of different German courts and legal areas.
- Koniaris et al. [69] published a dataset of 8,395 cases from the Greek Supreme Court. 6,370 of these cases are classified with one or more tags. Every case consists of a heading, a summary written by a legal expert, an introduction to the case, a legal analysis as well as the final decision of the judges.
- Liu et al. [79] released the CLSum dataset, which consists of four different sub-datasets for legal summarization in low-resource settings. CLSum-CA contains 192 cases collected from the Supreme Court of Canada between 2018 and 2023. Case briefs are used as reference summaries. CLSum-HK contains 233 judgments and their respective press summaries from the legal reference system of Hong Kong between 2012 and 2023. CLSum-AUS covers 1,019 cases from the High Court of Australia between 2005 and 2023, collected from the courts website. The fourth subset, CLSum-UK stems from Shukla et al. [117] and contains 793 judgments from the United Kingdom Supreme Court.

¹<http://www.liiofindia.org/in/cases/cen/INSC/>

²<https://www.supremecourt.uk/decided-cases/>

³<https://www.canlii.org/en/>

⁴<https://www.bva.va.gov/>

⁵<https://github.com/luimagroup/bva-summarization/>

⁶<https://clearinghouse.net/>

⁷<https://www.otto-schmidt.de/,gesetz-bayern.de,justiz.nrw.de>

3.2 Legislative documents

- Kornilova and Eidelman [70] proposed the *BillSum* dataset of US Congressional and California state bills. Upon release it consisted of 22,218 bills of the US Congress as well as 1,237 California state bills, both with human-written reference summaries. The data was sourced from the Govinfo service, which is facilitated by the United States Government Publishing Office (GPO)⁸. The dataset is publicly available⁹.
- The *EUR-Lex-Sum* dataset proposed by Aumiller et al. [8] is a multilingual dataset that contains legal acts issued by the European Union and their respective human-written summaries for each of the 24 official languages within the EU. Depending on the language, between 391 (Irish) and 1,505 (French) document-summary pairs are available. The data and the code are available online.¹⁰
- Klaus et al. [68] published a similar resource, also based on EUR-Lex documents. In contrast, the *EUR-LexSum* dataset is a monolingual corpus that consists of 4,595 documents with their respective summaries.
- Elnaggar et al. [38] released a corpus derived of the original large-scale JRC Acquis corpus by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, which contains legislative documents of the European Parliament since 1958. The data comes in 7 languages (cs, de, en, es, fr, it, sv), with up to 22,000 documents per language.

3.3 Privacy policies

- Keymanesh et al. [65] published a dataset that contains the privacy policies of 151 companies, each sentence annotated with a label reflecting its privacy-related 'risk class'¹¹. These labels, as well as their reference plain language summaries, have been taken from the *TOS;DR* website¹², a site that evaluates and explains companies' privacy policies in plain English.
- Another dataset for privacy policy summarization was introduced by Bannihatti Kumar et al. [13]. They leveraged a large English language privacy policy dataset originally published by Amos et al. [5] and sampled 20,000 policies from this dataset. Afterwards, 24,000 sections were randomly sampled and body-title pairs were extracted.

3.4 Other domains

In addition to court rulings, legislative documents, and privacy policies, legal summarization can also be applied to other areas such as legal opinions and legal briefs.

- Bajaj et al. [10] collected a dataset of 120 so-called Amicus Briefs, which include detailed case arguments that the court should consider as source texts and their summaries as targets.

In addition to the discussion above, Table 4 provides an overview of all datasets available for legal summarization.

4 Region-specific legal summarization

The legal domain is highly region-specific and is shaped by unique cultural, linguistic, and legal traditions. Legal summarization research is no exception to this. The effectiveness of the summarization approaches depends heavily on their ability to handle regional nuances. Models designed for one legal system often cannot be seamlessly transferred to another, as legal texts are closely tied to the jurisdictions that produce them. For instance, Common Law jurisdictions

⁸<https://github.com/unitedstates/congress?tab=readme-ov-file>

⁹<https://github.com/FiscalNote/BillSum>

¹⁰<https://github.com/achouhan93/eur-lex-sum>

¹¹<https://github.com/senjed/Summarization-of-Privacy-Policies>

¹²<https://tosdr.org/>

like the United States or the United Kingdom heavily rely on precedents, resulting in lengthy and narrative case law. In contrast, civil law systems, as in Germany or Brazil, focus on statutes that demand concise and precise legal language. A summarization model trained on documents from a Common Law jurisdiction might fail when applied to the succinct and structured statutes of civil law countries.

One example of applying legal summarization techniques across multiple jurisdictions is [56] where they conducted a case study analyzing the challenges. The study highlighted significant difficulties in generalizing methods trained on legal documents from one region to another. Similarly, [117] conducted research on legal document summarization for Indian and UK Supreme Courts. Their work demonstrates the need for jurisdiction-specific datasets, as models trained on one legal system often fail to generalize to another. Fine-tuning models like Legal-Pegasus on domain-specific corpora significantly enhances summarization performance, emphasizing the limitations of general-purpose models. Not only do legal summarization models face challenges when applied across different countries, but even within a single country, different courts pose distinct obstacles. This has been demonstrated with two Italian courts in [2]. It is also worthy mentioning that recent publications in the field of legal summarization like [10] have shifted the focus on low-resource languages and jurisdictions. A list of works and resources specific to certain regions of the world are provided below.

English and international. English is the dominant language when it comes to approaches for summarizing court rulings. Summarization datasets from Common Law countries (e.g., UK, USA, Canada, Australia, India) such as BillSum [70], the HOLJ corpus [46], the CanLII database,¹³ or the AustLII corpus [41] have been utilized in various papers to train legal summarization models. For instance, the BillSum dataset was used in 14 papers we collected. Furthermore, legal documents from India, particularly judgments from the Indian Supreme Court represent another important source of data in legal summarization research. Despite India's multilingual context, these rulings are predominantly written in English. Datasets like IN-ABS and IN-EXT,¹⁴ which provide abstractive and extractive summaries, respectively, have been used in various studies.

¹³<https://www.canlii.org/en>

¹⁴<https://github.com/Law-AI/summarization?tab=readme-ov-file>




Fig. 2. Countries identified in the collection of papers during the survey study




Fig. 3. Legal summarization research trends for last 5 years

European specifics. European legal summarization approaches have been focused around a couple of available datasets and reflect the highly regulative nature of European legislation. Some of them include legislative acts passed by the European Union. One such datasets is EUR-Lex-Sum released by [9]. It is a multi-lingual and cross-lingual collection which covers 24 European languages. Another very similar dataset is EUR-LexSum released in [68]. It comprises 4,595 documents, again based on legislative acts passed by the European Union. Contrary to EUR-Lex-Sum, the documents in EUR-LexSum are in English only. Multi-LexSum released in [115] is another dataset pertaining to the European landscape. It includes 9,280 summaries of experts, based on publications from the CRLC (Civil Rights Litigation Clearinghouse). Multi-LexSum is distinct from other collections in its multiple target summaries, each at a different granularity. Experimenting with short summaries is also important in some cases. JRC-Acquis¹⁵ is a collection of legislative documents of the European Parliament with short (e.g., 1-3 sentences long) summaries that can be utilized for that purpose. Other datasets such as LegalSum [45] and ITA-CaseHold [77] contain documents in European languages (German and Italian, respectively) and they reflect the legal nuances of the respective countries.

Asia. There are several corpora from different countries in east Asia included in our study. China judgment Online¹⁶ is one of them, consisting of both criminal and civil cases. CAIL2020 [132] is another collection of 13,531 court rulings. Mandarin Chinese is also represented in the Court Debt Dataset [61] which is a large collection of 30,481 court cases, totaling 1,144,425 utterances exchanged between the plaintiff and the defendant. Finally, another corpus coming from this region of this world is KorCase_Summ¹⁷ which includes precedents of the Korean Court.

Latin America. A good representative of the Latin America countries is BrazillianBR, a collection of decisions from the supreme court of Brazil, dating between 2011 and 2018 [27]. Each document is in Portuguese and contains four parts, one of which is an abstractive summary which can be used as reference.

5 Strategies for legal summarization

This section provides a thorough overview of legal summarization strategies, focusing on both extractive and abstractive methods. Additionally, we include a summary table in Appendix that encompasses all of the discussed methods for easy reference.

¹⁵ Available at <https://mediatum.ub.tum.de/1446654>

¹⁶ <https://wenshu.court.gov.cn>

¹⁷ <https://www.law.go.kr/LSW/lawPetitionForm.do?subMenuId=79&menuId=13>

5.1 Extractive legal summarization

In legal summarization, extractive strategies have become increasingly popular. This approach involves extracting essential information from lengthy, domain-specific texts, such as judicial decisions, legal judgments, and contracts. Extractive methods are particularly effective in the legal field because they preserve the integrity of the original text, ensuring that critical legal content is not misinterpreted. We observed several highlights of approaches for legal summarization.

Rule-based approaches. Optimization techniques and heuristic algorithms play a significant role in ranking or selecting sentences for legal summarization, offering a rule-based and algorithmic approach with lower computational overhead compared to embedding-based methods. These techniques are particularly effective in tasks where domain knowledge can be encoded through explicit rules. For instance, researchers have utilized latent semantic analysis [87, 107] and document-specific catchphrases [83] to enhance extractive summaries. Bayesian optimization [53] of TextRank hyperparameters has also been employed to refine the summarization process. Additionally, algorithm-based approaches like a reweighting mechanism for HipoRank [137] have gained attention, enabling dynamic updates to sentence importance scores based on the history of previously selected sentences, resulting in more accurate extractive summaries of legal documents. Furthermore, [34] proposed an extractive summarization framework for court debates, utilizing an encoder-decoder neural network to jointly model debate utterances alongside additional information, such as legal knowledge graphs and semantic data, to enhance summarization performance.

Further advancements incorporate hybrid and optimization-driven techniques. For instance, one study combines Legal-BERT sentence embeddings with Anonymous Walk Embeddings [55] of the entire document graph through concatenation. This combined representation is then utilized in a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) to classify the summarization potential of sentences. Another method employs Integer Linear Programming (ILP) [17] to optimize an objective function, generating summaries that capture the most informative sentences, ensure balanced representation across different thematic segments, and reduce redundancy. These developments illustrate the increasing complexity and sophistication of approaches aimed at overcoming the specific challenges associated with legal text summarization. Meanwhile, [91] begins by training an extractive summarization backbone model using standard supervised training. It then fine-tunes this backbone using reinforcement learning, incorporating a novel reward model that seamlessly integrates lexical, sentence, and keyword-level semantics into a single reward function.

Rank-based approaches. These approaches are popular for ranking essential legal information based on relevance or contextual scores [58]. They often combine traditional information retrieval methods, such as BM25 [26] and TF-IDF [99], with modern embedding models to enhance relevance. Classic methods are less computationally intensive and effectively complement neural models in processing long legal documents for extractive summarization.

Model-centric approaches. These approaches that utilize pre-trained neural models, embeddings, or deep learning techniques often involve fine-tuning models based on architectures such as CNN [71], LSTM [48], or Transformers [126]. One method is query-based summarization [139], which extracts sentences relevant to predefined queries. After this process, the generated summary is provided to GPT-3.5 for information extraction. Purnima et al. [101] used LegalBERT to obtain sentence embeddings for both citation sentences and judgment sentences. Then, cosine similarity is employed to select the summary sentence. They have various approaches for scoring the sentences. On the other hand, [14] used a Longformer encoder, pre-trained on the LegalBART objective using 6 million U.S. Court opinions. Classic deep learning models such as CNN and LSTMs remain relevant in legal summarization. For instance, a method proposed




Fig. 4. Taxonomy of legal summarization strategies categorized into three main approaches, each with more specific sub-categories.

in [22] incorporates a sentence encoder, topic model, position encoder, TS-LSTM network, law article processing, and a sentence classifier for enhanced summarization. Moreover, [6] utilize weak supervision to label sentences as important or not, and then apply LSTM to generate the summary.

On the other hand, [136] developed a CNN-based model that selects predictive sentences from legal case documents. The model classifies these sentences into types and employs maximal margin relevance alongside a summarization template to generate the summaries. Some studies also provide comparisons [106] of model-based approaches. For example, one study [67] comparing BERT, DistilBERT, and RoBERTa against TextRank demonstrated that the former performed better, even when fine-tuned with limited data from the EUR-LexSum dataset.

Region-specific approaches. Region-specific adaptations often involve fine-tuning pre-trained models on datasets specific to a particular jurisdiction. In work [123], the authors specifically focused on Indian legal documents and employs a Support Vector Machine (SVM) classifier to extract a summary of each legal document, which is then utilized to search for similar judgment cases and documents. Additionally, the study examines a Portuguese dataset [86]. The authors begin by preprocessing the documents and then perform extractive summarization of sentences using the PageRank algorithm. Following this, they employ a Bag-of-Words representation and Support Vector Classifier (SVC) to classify the documents into their respective categories. There has also been a specific focus on Italian extractive legal case summarization, [77] fine-tuning the Italian-BERT, ItalianLEGAL-BERT, and Italian-LEGAL-BERT-SC models to predict the most relevant sentences and then create the summary.

5.2 Abstractive legal summarization

Abstractive legal summarization aims to condense extensive legal documents into concise, coherent summaries that capture the essence of the original texts without merely copying them. This task is particularly challenging due to the complexity and technical nature of legal language, which demands a high level of understanding and accuracy

in the summarization process. In this section, we will take a broader look at various strategies for abstractive legal summarization.

Selective approaches. These approaches focus on identifying and abstracting the most relevant information from source documents. For instance, [59] begins by generating k extractive summaries from the original dataset and then creates new training samples by aligning these extractive summaries with ground truth summaries. Subsequently, a pre-trained BART model is fine-tuned to produce high-quality abstractive summaries. Another approach [138] employs a multi-stage process: in Stage 1, a sentence structure classifier is trained on manually annotated opinion-summary pairs; in Stage 2, the classifier predicts silver labels for unannotated summaries, with special marker tokens guiding the model to adhere to a specific structure. These predicted labels are used to fine-tune an LED model, which is then applied for inference in Stage 3. Tran et al. [122] segmented documents into three parts, generating summaries for each segment using an extractive summarization model (BSLT) that combines a BERTSUM-based Lawformer encoder with a Transformer architecture to capture document-level features. This approach is further extended with an abstractive summarization model (LPGN), which integrates a pointer-generator network (PGN) with a Lawformer encoder to enhance the accuracy of case descriptions, resulting in higher-quality summaries. Another strategy [80] leverages weak supervision to label important sentences based on specific criteria. A BERT-based classifier is subsequently trained on these labeled sentences, followed by a sequence-to-sequence model to generate abstractive summaries. Similar approaches have been utilized in other studies, albeit with slight variations. For instance, Bajaj et al. [11] employs the GPT-2 model to select relevant sentences, which are then used to create an abstractive summary. In contrast, Xu and Ashley [128] first classifies text segments as argumentative or non-argumentative, passing only the argumentative segments for summarization.

Anchor-based approaches. Anchor-based approaches leverage specific keywords or topics as "anchors" to guide the summarization process, ensuring that the summarized content remains rooted in the main points of the text. These techniques have become increasingly important in generating abstractive legal summaries. For instance, one study employs special tokens to delineate keywords, facilitating the summarization process [92]. Another approach enhances this method by integrating a transformer model, dividing the process into two distinct stages: an initial stage that extracts keywords and key sentences using a combination of BERT and LSTM technologies, followed by a second stage that generates abstractive summaries utilizing UNILM with attention mechanisms [50]. Similarly, topics have also been employed as anchors to improve summarization. For example, a study uses two encoders and one decoder with topic words to enhance summarization based on the Point-Generator Network (PTGEN) [52]. Another approach introduces the Element Graph concept to capture topic information, which is then combined with BERT in a dual-encoder framework to generate abstractive summaries [51]. These studies highlight the potential of anchor-based methods to effectively bridge the gap between extraction and abstraction in legal summarization tasks.

Transformer-based approaches. Transformer-based approaches, particularly those utilizing the encoder-decoder architecture, are widely employed for abstractive summarization, including in the legal domain. Models such as BART [76], Pegasus [134], and T5 [103] have been effectively applied to generate abstractive legal summaries. For instance, one study trained an abstractive legal summarization model using BART and subsequently integrated it with a legal judgment prediction (LJP) model. A custom loss function was employed to compare embeddings generated by the LJP model based on the summary and the original text [118]. Another study utilized Conditional Random Fields (CRF) and BiLSTM to extract and label 13 rhetorical roles, representing the function of each sentence, which were then used

in an ensemble summarization framework combining BART and legal Pegasus to produce abstractive summaries [89]. Additionally, T5 was fine-tuned on a custom dataset for abstractive summarization of legal documents, demonstrating its effectiveness in this domain [100].

Legal documents are typically lengthy, posing unique challenges for abstractive summarization. Various approaches have been developed to address these issues. One method involves dividing documents into sections, processing each section through a transformer model to generate candidate summaries, and evaluating these summaries using BERT to select the highest-scoring summary [28]. Another approach utilizes a supervised variant of BERTopic to create seven clusters of contracts, followed by employing Legal Pegasus, fine-tuned for the legal domain, to generate summaries for each cluster [47]. The Longformer [15] model has also gained attraction for handling long documents which has been applied in legal domain too. In one study, a pretrained Longformer Encoder-Decoder model was fine-tuned on a specific legal dataset for summarization [111]. Another study used the LED model to generate candidate summaries and employed a scoring function to evaluate argumentative alignment with the input document, selecting the best candidate [37]. Additionally, a cost-effective pretraining strategy for the Longformer was proposed, utilizing a Replaced Token Detection (RTD) task on legal texts from the "Pile of Law" corpus. This pretrained model was then applied to domain-specific summarization tasks in legal and medical domains [93].

5.3 Hybrid legal summarization

Hybrid approaches to legal summarization combine both extractive and abstractive architectures. The primary concept is similar to selective methods used in abstractive summarization. In this approach, extractive models are trained or fine-tuned for improved extractive summaries, which are then linked to create more effective abstractive summaries. Additionally, some architectural modifications have been implemented for both extractive and abstractive methods to enhance performance. For example, Moro et al. [88] proposed a transfer learning approach that uses extractive techniques to select sentences, which are subsequently passed through GPT-2 for abstractive summarization, addressing the lack of labeled legal datasets. Another method employed domain-specific training and fine-tuning of Legal Pegasus, combined with chunking long documents and summarizing them using Longformer, followed by an extractive-to-abstractive pipeline [117]. Voting-based ensemble methods have also been introduced, including ranked list-based ensembles (using Borda count and Reciprocal Ranking) and graph-based ensembles, where a graph of sentence similarity identifies key sentences for summarization [32]. Feature selection methods that integrate generic text features with legal domain-specific features have further advanced this hybrid approach [110]. Additionally, models such as BSLT (extractive) and LPGN (abstractive), based on Lawformer, have been designed to address the challenges of long legal documents [24].

Several studies have explored modifications to extractive summarization processes only in hybrid approaches by incorporating rules and advanced machine learning techniques. One approach involves normalizing legal texts using dictionaries for abbreviations and structured elements like articles and sections. The normalized text is then processed using BART for extractive summarization and PEGASUS for abstractive summarization, with extractive BART achieving the best results [44]. Another study employs machine learning to label sentences as important or not, followed by LSTMs to summarize these sentences, which are compared against PEGASUS summaries [43].

A hybrid approach uses RoBERTa to convert documents into vectorized sentences, which are passed to an extractive model based on Dilated Gated CNN to extract relevant content. The extracted sentences are then fed into T5-PEGASUS for abstractive summarization [102]. In a different methodology, Ripple Down Rules are applied to classify sentences into 13 rhetorical roles using algorithms such as decision trees, Naive Bayes, SVM, Conditional Random Fields, and BiLSTM [121].

Lastly, an ontology-based approach extracts semantic knowledge from Chinese legal documents, summarizes the content into knowledge blocks, computes similarities between these blocks, and categorizes the documents accordingly [81]. These methods demonstrate the integration of extractive and abstractive approaches improves the quality and relevance of summaries in legal document processing.

6 Methods for legal summarization

From the methodological perspective, legal text summarization research works of the last seven years include techniques that have been proposed over a long period of time. The earliest methods we identified are the machine learning or graph-based classifiers proposed invented in the '90s or early '00s. LLM-based techniques proposed in the last years stand on the opposite side.

Tuning large language models. Some papers that utilize LLMs usually tune them with legal corpora in English or some other language. For example, in [77] they introduce a legal holding extraction method based on Italian-LEGAL-BERT, a BERT derivative tuned with legal documents in Italian. Furthermore, in [62] they create a corpus of legal documents enriched with rhetorical roles. They create a baseline using Legal Pegasus, a fine-tuned version of Pegasus [134]. Tuned Legal Pegasus was also used in [47] to generate summaries of legal documents pre-clustered in seven categories. InLegalBERT and InCaseLawBERT were developed recently by re-training Legal-BERT [98]. They were used in [18] to evaluate the role of citing judgments in creating extractive summaries. Several LLMs like LegalBERT, DistilBERT and RoBERTa were also used in [125] after being fine-tuned with legal summaries. The authors check if predictions based on summaries are as effective as predictions based on whole legal documents. Finally, T5 fine-tuned with a newly created corpus of 350 judgments is used in [100] to generate abstractive summaries.

Transformers combined with LSTMs or CNNs. There are other studies that combine Transformer encoders or decoders with LSTM or CNN structures to form specific network architecture. In [50] for example, they propose a two-stage summarization approach. First, they use a BERT+LSTM model to annotate sentences for indicating which of them should be part of summary. Next, they input the extracted key sentences to an abstractive model based on the unified pre-training language model [33] to get the final summary. Authors of [33] fuse topic vectors into an LSTM for improving its ability to extract legal text features. Moreover, in [136] they adopt a CNN as classifier for iteratively predict summary sentences from legal case documents. They later select a subset of the sentences for the summary using maximal margin relevance from the summarization template and evaluate with ROUGE metrics.

Weak supervision for labeling sentences. Some studies adopt weakly-supervised learning strategies for labeling legal text sentences as important or not. In [97] for example, they create a dataset and use a weakly-supervised model to automatically label legal text sentences as summary worthy or not. They also experiment with a 2-layer bidirectional LSTM to produce document summaries. Similarly, in [6] they implement a form of weak supervision by automatically labeling the content sentences as important or not using their similarity with headnote sentences their corpus contains. In the next step, they generate the summary documents by using either a feed-forward neural network or an LSTM.

Data preprocessing and augmentation. There are also studies that make some preprocessing of the documents for extracting features, for scoring sentences, or for data augmentation with additional information. In [92] for example, they introduce keywords into the summarization models to help them locate and capture key information from long legal texts. Also, in [50] the authors follow a two stages approach by first selecting key sentences from the legal judgments. In the second stage, they extract keywords related to technical terms in legal texts and introduce them to

the summary-generation model. In [99], they score the sentence relevance using TF-IDF and revise the initial scores based on entities, dates, and proximity of the sentence to the section headings. Finally, in [26] they first utilize BERT for clustering candidate sentences and then use BM25 method for ranking the candidates and selecting the best ones for the summary.

Benchmarking with multiple methods. A high number of papers perform benchmarks or comparisons using supervised learning. This usually happens in cases when newly created data collections are proposed. In [113] for example, several supervised learning, graph-based or LLM-based techniques are used to provide baselines for a new dataset they propose. Similarly, LexRank is compared with BERT in [69]. There are also studies like [119] that use different techniques and comparing their results not just on legal text summarization, but also on other tasks like document classification.

Less frequent methods. Some studies utilize methods which are rarely used for legal text summarization. One example is [17] where they make use of ILP (Integer Linear Programming). Another example is [112] where reinforcement learning is used. Finally, in [32] they get predictions from different predictors and aggregate by using voting schemes.

Papers without any method. It is important to note that there are also some works which do not propose or utilize any method at all. For example, in [120] the authors involve legal experts to investigate the validity of ROUGE scores in the automatic summarization of legal texts. Similarly, in [29] they analyze expert-generated summaries by comparing them with respective algorithmic summaries, focusing on the important sentences of legal documents that are missed. Similarly, in [127] they propose an evaluation framework based on question-answer pairs generated by GPT-4 which cover the main points of the referenced summary. There are also studies like [64] where they describe the steps they followed to create a data set of privacy policies in Greek.

7 Evaluation metrics for legal summarization

Evaluation is crucial for tracking progress in the field of legal summarization. Evaluation metrics assess the performance of current methods, providing developers with insights on areas for improvement and focus. While automated evaluation metrics are the most popular due to their efficiency in replacing time-consuming human evaluations, human evaluation remains essential for making fair judgments in the legal domain too. In this section, we will discuss the various automated metrics and the human evaluation dimensions we observed during our study.

7.1 Automated evaluation metrics

Many automated evaluation metrics for legal summarization have been adapted from general summarization research. While metrics commonly used in summarization are also applied to legal contexts, we have observed key characteristics in the metrics utilized in this field. For instance, some metrics emphasize lexical overlap, while others prioritize semantic similarity or the quality of rankings.

Lexical-overlap based metrics. *ROUGE* [78] is the most popular lexical overlap-based metric for summarization. It measures n-gram overlap between the summary and the reference text and is commonly used in summarization tasks. We have observed that approximately 95% of method-based papers have utilized the *ROUGE* metric to report the performance of legal summarization methods. In addition to *ROUGE*, other lexical overlap-based metrics such as *BLEU* [96] and *METEOR* [12] have also been adapted for this purpose in some studies [13, 30–32, 54, 80, 89, 108, 108, 128]. *BLEU* measures n-gram precision originally for machine translation but can also be applied to summarization. *METEOR*, conversely, combines unigram precision and recall with an emphasis on synonyms and stemming.

The metrics mentioned are outdated and often do not account for the complexity of the texts. Lexical overlap-based metrics can unfairly penalize paraphrases, and other semantically equivalent variations, often failing to provide a holistic view of the performance of legal summarization methods. Steffes et al. [120] conducted a thorough analysis of the relationship between ROUGE scores and the coverage of legal content. They found that *ROUGE* does not precisely and exhaustively measure legal content, making its reliability questionable.

Embedding-based metrics. These metrics utilize semantic representations of text to evaluate quality. Among these, *BERTScore* [135] and *BARTScore* [133] have been frequently used in studies of legal summarization [13, 25, 31, 37, 82, 117, 138]. *BERTScore* measures semantic similarity by comparing the contextual embeddings of tokens generated by BERT models. In contrast, *BARTScore* assesses the likelihood of a summary based on the source or reference using a generative model like BART. Additionally, Cosine Similarity has been employed to assess the quality of legal summary [54] by computing the cosine distance between vector representations of the summary and the reference or source text. These metrics focus on semantic similarity rather than exact word overlap, making them more robust to paraphrasing and linguistic variations.

Factuality and consistency metrics. Factual consistency in legal summarization is crucial because errors can lead to misinterpretations or unjust outcomes in high-stakes situations, such as contracts or court cases. Maintaining consistency helps build trust in legal AI tools and upholds the ethical standards of the legal profession. Abstractive legal summaries can sometimes produce inaccurate information, which has led to numerous studies supporting the performance of various proposed methods through the use of factual consistency metrics [30, 31, 88, 117, 138].

These metrics include *FActCC* [73], which assesses factual consistency by verifying information against external sources. *SummaC* [75] offers a specific approach for evaluating factuality through sentence-level comparisons. Additionally, *NEPrec* assesses the precision of named entities, while *NumPrec* focuses on ensuring numeric accuracy in summaries. Key characteristics of these metrics include evaluating the faithfulness and factual accuracy of generated content, which is critical for abstractive legal summaries that are prone to hallucination.

Ranking metrics. Extractive approaches to legal summarization often involve identifying and ranking relevant information from source documents. Metrics commonly used in ranking, retrieval, and evaluating ordered results can be effectively applied in this context to assess the quality of the ranking mechanisms. For example, some studies have employed ranking and relevance metrics to demonstrate the performance of their proposed methods [109]. Notably, Mean Average Precision (*MAP*) [1], which evaluates ranking quality based on precision at each relevant document, and Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (*NDCG*) [60], which assesses ranking quality by considering both the relevance of items and their positions, have been utilized. These metrics emphasize the importance of relevance and positional significance in evaluating ranked results.

Classification metrics. Extractive legal summarization often involves classifying the worthiness of sentences for inclusion in the summary, determining whether a sentence is important or unimportant, or identifying segments as argumentative or non-argumentative. To evaluate the performance of these classification tasks, metrics such as *F1*, *Micro F1*, and *Macro F1* are used as well [43, 47, 49, 86, 109, 125, 129, 130]. *Micro F1* aggregates contributions from all classes, making it more sensitive to larger classes, while *Macro F1* calculates the average F1 score across all classes, treating each class equally regardless of size. These metrics provide a comprehensive evaluation of classification performance by balancing precision and recall across different scenarios.




Fig. 5. Overview of key aspects and dimensions in human evaluation for legal summarization

In addition to the discussion above, Appendix A.2 provides an overview of the various metrics utilized in different works.

7.2 Human evaluation

As discussed earlier, various evaluation metrics have been utilized for legal summarization. This raises the natural question of which evaluation metric to trust and which one effectively represents progress in legal summarization methods. This issue is not unique to the legal domain; it has also been observed in the broader summarization community [39]. Unfortunately, there is no single metric that can be relied upon blindly. As a result, researchers frequently turn to additional manual evaluation approaches to further validate their proposed methodologies. While we believe that supporting automated evaluations with human assessments is crucial, only 20% of studies have backed up their methods with human evaluation. Moreover, only 9% of these studies have employed experts to conduct this evaluation in the legal domain.

We have identified several key characteristics for human evaluation that serve as a meta-evaluation framework in legal summarization, which includes: **content representation**, **efficiency**, **language quality**, **content coverage**, and **summary impact**. Each characteristic comprises specific dimensions, as shown in Figure 5, which are essential for evaluating the quality of a summary. For instance, **relevance** ensures the inclusion of information that aligns with the main topics of source document, while **importance** emphasizes whether the presented sentence in model summary was important for a goal-oriented reader even if it was not in the human summary. **Informativeness** evaluates the breadth and depth of meaningful content conveyed, and **faithfulness** ensures the summary remains factually consistent with the source text, avoiding hallucinations or misrepresentations. **Accuracy** verifies the correctness of all details and claims, and **consistency** ensures the absence of internal contradictions. **Redundancy** focuses on eliminating unnecessary repetition, promoting efficiency and conciseness. **Fluency** assesses whether the language used is natural and grammatically sound, contributing to readability, while **grammaticality** ensures adherence to proper language rules. **Coherence** examines the logical flow and organization of ideas, and **readability** considers the ease

of comprehension based on structure and vocabulary. *Style* evaluates whether the tone and formality align with the intended purpose or audience, and *usefulness* measures how effectively the summary supports achieving a specific task or goal. Table 5 offers a detailed overview of these dimensions.

The common approach involves asking multiple human annotators or legal experts to evaluate a small sample of model-generated summaries using a Likert scale (ranging from 1 to 5 or 1 to 3). This evaluation focuses on specific dimensions to assess the quality of the legal summaries [16, 26, 28, 31, 51, 69, 74, 77, 79, 93, 99, 108, 109, 112, 113, 121, 136–138]. However, the meta-evaluation samples in the study did not exceed 50, which we believe is quite small. This limitation is understandable, as obtaining expert annotations is both time-consuming and costly, especially for specific legal documents in a particular language. There needs to be a community effort to create benchmark meta-evaluation datasets for various regional legal documents.

7.3 Research efforts on metrics in legal summarization

Legal summarization is a complex task due to the presence of technical jargon and the intricacies of multiple sources in legal documents. It is crucial to ensure factual consistency in legal summarization as well, as inaccuracies can lead to severe legal consequences. Additionally, preserving domain-specific nuances is essential, since even subtle changes in wording or context can alter the meaning of legal statements. There is a significant need for evaluation metrics specifically designed to address the unique challenges of legal summarization. However, there have only been a limited number of research efforts focused on developing evaluation metrics dedicated solely to this area.

Recently, Xu and Ashley [127] proposed a question-answering approach to evaluate legal summaries. In this method, GPT-4 [95] generates a set of question-answer pairs that encompass the main points and information from the reference summary. GPT-4 is then used to provide answers based on the generated questions related to the summary. In contrast, Mullick et al. [90] introduced an intent-based evaluation metric, demonstrating its effectiveness in assessing legal documents. On the other hand, Elaraby et al. [36] focuses on a human evaluation strategy for legal summarization. This paper explores the concept of argument coverage and conducts a human evaluation study where argument roles are treated as atomic units. Additionally, Yamada et al. [131] concentrates on human annotation strategies, specifically for Japanese legal documents. This work proposes an annotation method for Japanese civil judgment documents aimed at creating flexible summaries.

8 Challenges and future directions

In this section, we will discuss the challenges we observed during our study, and from these observations, we will provide some ideas for possible future directions.

User-specific ground truth summary. It is crucial to consider who the end user of the legal summary is, as summarization needs can vary significantly depending on the user. For example, a judge may be more interested in judicial decisions, while a lawyer would focus on the factual summary of legal documents. Conversely, if the summary is intended for the general public, a plain language approach is essential, with minimal legal jargon. So far, we have observed that legal summaries are primarily written by legal experts, with little emphasis on user-specific legal summaries.

Multi-reference summary dataset. So far, we have observed that all legal summarization datasets include only one reference or ground truth summary. Human summarizers can be biased and may focus on only specific parts of a document when creating a summary. However, a set of documents can have multiple distinct and equally valid

summaries. A stable consensus summary can be achieved if a large number of references are gathered. To date, we have not noted any efforts to create a multi-reference summarization dataset in the legal domain.

Domain-specific embeddings in legal summarization. Legal summarization, which is a downstream natural language processing (NLP) task, heavily relies on the accurate representation of legal terms and documents. These legal texts often contain specialized jargon, complex syntax, and domain-specific semantics. However, there has been limited progress in developing embeddings specifically optimized for legal texts, such as Law2Vec [21]. Existing general-purpose embeddings may not effectively capture the nuanced relationships between legal terms, resulting in performance degradation for legal summarization. To address this issue, there is a need for dedicated efforts to create domain-specific embeddings tailored to legal documents. This can be accomplished through a collaborative, community-driven approach that includes collecting high-quality legal corpora, training specialized embedding models, and benchmarking these models on relevant legal tasks to ensure their effectiveness.

Challenges with lengthy legal documents. Legal documents are inherently lengthy and complex, posing significant challenges for summarization. While researchers have recently begun addressing these challenges, simply applying generic summarization techniques without analyzing their limitations within the legal domain can hinder progress. Current neural summarization models often lack transparency, making it difficult to understand the strategies they employ and assess their effectiveness. Common approaches, such as extractive summarization through document truncation or direct application of abstractive techniques, may fail to capture the full breadth of critical information dispersed throughout legal documents. Furthermore, legal texts often contain dense, interdependent sections where key details may appear in non-contiguous parts of the document. Thus, it is essential to ensure that the generated summaries comprehensively capture and accurately represent the crucial information, while maintaining the logical structure and meaning of the original document. A deeper investigation into model interpretability specific to legal summarization is necessary to address these challenges effectively.

Practicality of legal summarization evaluation metrics. We have observed the use of the ROUGE metric in more than 95% of the relevant papers. However, the limitations of the ROUGE metric have been widely explored [4, 72, 85]. This metric only captures the lexical overlap between reference summaries and model-generated summaries, and it fails to account for the complexities of legal jargon. On the other hand, in the context of abstractive summarization, there should also be a check for hallucinated information. To date, there is no metric that can be blindly trusted. That said, there should be encouragement for the meta-evaluation of model summaries, as well as a more systematic approach to collecting meta-evaluation datasets, similar to SummEval [39] in the general summarization domain. Although these issues have been recognized to some extent, there has not been a community-wide effort to create benchmarks for evaluation metrics and human evaluation strategies.

Towards multimodal and context-aware legal summarization. A significant limitation in the current research on legal summarization is its narrow focus on summarizing specific types of legal documents, such as court judgments, contracts, and legislative acts. Other important areas, like summarizing legal meetings, dialogues, legal news, legal opinion, court transcripts, and courtroom recordings, have largely been overlooked. Moreover, existing approaches primarily rely on unimodal frameworks that process text alone, without utilizing the potential of multimodal strategies. By integrating multimodal approaches—such as combining textual data with audio or visual content from legal proceedings—it may be possible to create richer and more context-aware summaries. Addressing these gaps, particularly in multilingual and low-resource settings, represents an important opportunity for future research.

9 Conclusion

Through our extensive systematic survey of 123 papers published since the advent of the ‘transformer era’ in 2017, we have identified the common contemporary methods for legal document summarization and highlighted the skewed distribution of countries from which the datasets originate. Our critical analysis revealed gaps in current research, including the lack of multi-reference summaries, the lack of personalization of summaries to possibly diverse target groups, or the almost-exclusive reliance on obsolete summarization metrics such as ROUGE. We also outlined possible future directions including context-aware or multimodal legal summarization.

Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by the Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security <https://rc-trust.ai>, one of the Research Alliance centers within the <https://uaruhr.de>.

Dataset	Source	Domain	Short description	Language(s)	Size (# Docs)
HOLJ Corpus Grover et al. [46]	n.a. anymore	Court rulings	Judgements from the British House of Lords with human written summaries	English	188 (153)
BrazilianBR de Vargas Feijó and Moreira [27]	https://github.com/diego-feijo/rulingbr	Court rulings	Rulings from the Brazilian Supreme Court. Every document consists of four parts, the Ementa can be used as abstractive reference summary	Portuguese	10,623
IN-Abs Shukla et al. [117]	https://github.com/Law-AI/summarization	Court rulings	Judgements from the Indian Supreme Court with headnotes as abstractive reference summaries	English	7,130
IN-Ext Shukla et al. [117]	https://github.com/Law-AI/summarization	Court rulings	Judgements from the Indian Supreme Court with human-written extractive reference summaries. Summaries cover 7 rhetorical segments.	English	50
UK-Abs Shukla et al. [117]	https://github.com/Law-AI/summarization	Court rulings	Judgements from the UK Supreme Court with press summaries as abstractive reference summaries	English	793
AustLII Galvani [41]	https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/239/legal+case+reports	Court rulings	Cases from the Federal Court of Australia with catchphrases, citations sentences, citation catchphrases, and citation classes.	English	3,890
LegalSum (German) Glaser et al. [45]	https://github.com/sebimo/legalsum	Court rulings	German court rulings with guiding principles as reference summaries.	German	100,018
Multi-LexSum Shen et al. [116]	https://multilexsum.github.io/	Court rulings	Documents for 4,534 civil right cases from the CRLC with abstractive summaries in three different lengths.	English	40,119 (9,280)
CanLII	https://www.canlii.org/en	Court rulings	Cases from Canadian courts gathered by the Canadian Legal Information Institute.	English	28,733
LexAbSumm Ty.s.s. et al. [124]	https://huggingface.co/datasets/MahmoudAly/LexAbSumm	Court rulings	Aspect-Judgement-Summary triplets from the ECHR	English	1,053
ITA-CaseHold Licari et al. [77]	https://github.com/dlicari/ITA-CASEHOLD	Court rulings	Pairs of judgments and holdings from the archives of Italian Administrative Justice	Italian	1,101
GreekLegalSum	https://huggingface.co/datasets/DominusTea/GreekLegalSum	Court rulings	Judgements and summaries from the Supreme Civil and Criminal Court of Greece	Greek	8,395 cases + summaries, 6,370 with classification
CLSum-CA Liu et al. [79]	https://github.com/StevenLau6/CLSum	Court rulings	Judgements and case briefs from 2018 to 2023 from the Supreme Court of Canada	English	192
CLSum-HK Liu et al. [79]	https://github.com/StevenLau6/CLSum	Court rulings	Cases from multilevel courts in Hong Kong including press summaries	English	793
CLSum-AUS Liu et al. [79]	https://github.com/StevenLau6/CLSum	Court rulings	Australian judgment documents and their summaries from 2005 to 2023	English	1,019
MILDSum Datta et al. [25]	https://github.com/Law-AI/MILDSum	Court rulings	Case judgments from multiple High Courts and the Supreme Court of India	English, Hindi	3,122
RechtspraakNL Schraagen et al. [112]	https://git.science.uu.nl/n.vandeluijtgaarden/legal-text-summarization	Court rulings	Large collection of Dutch cases	Dutch	400k
Privacy Policy Summarization Dataset Bannihatti Kumar et al. [13]	https://github.com/awslabs/summarization-privacy-policies	Privacy Policy	Sections of large English privacy policy dataset with short title summaries	English	24,000
KorCase_Summ	https://github.com/saekomdalkom/KorCase_summ	Privacy Policy	Precedents released on the Korean Court Comprehensive Legal Information website	Korean	72,537
Amicus Briefs Bajaj et al. [10]	https://www.publichealthlawcenter.org/litigation-tracker	Legal Briefs	Arguments that the court should consider for a case and their summary	English	120
BillSumm Kornilova and Eidelman [70]	https://github.com/FiscalNote/BillSum	Legislative bill	Mid-length bills with 5,000 to 20,000 characters length from the US congress or the state of California	English	22,218 + 1,237
JRC Acquis	https://mediatum.ub.tum.de/1446654	Legislative acts	Legislative documents of the European Parliament with short 1-3 sentences summaries	CS, DE, EN, ES, FR, IT, SV	≤ 22,751 docs per language
EUR-Lex-Sum Aumiller et al. [8]	https://github.com/achouhan93/eur-lex-sum	Legislative acts	Legal regulatory acts passed by the European Union with abstractive reference summaries	24 official EU languages	≤ 1,505 docs per language
EUR-LexSum Klaus et al. [67]	https://github.com/sveaklaus/Legal-Documents-Summarization	Legislative acts	Legal regulatory acts passed by the European Union	English	4,595
TL,DR/TOS,DR Manor and Li [84]	https://github.com/lauramanor/legal_summarization	Contracts	Software licenses and agreement texts with abstractive plain language summaries	English	506

Table 4. Overview of legal summarization datasets

Characteristics	Dimension	Focus	Key Aspect
Content Coverage	Relevance	Selection of appropriate content	Inclusion of meaningful information
	Importance	Prioritization of key content	Summary includes the most significant points from the source
Content Representation	Informativeness	Breadth of relevant information	Amount of meaningful content conveyed
	Faithfulness	Accuracy and truthfulness	Factual consistency of summary with the source text
	Consistency	Uniformity of information	Summary presents internally consistent information without contradictions
Efficiency	Redundancy	Avoidance of repetition	Ensures conciseness and efficiency by presenting unique information
	Fluency	Smoothness of language	Grammatically correct language is used in summary
Language Quality	Grammaticality	Correct use of grammar	Summary adheres to standard grammar rules
	Coherence	Logical connection of ideas	The points in the summary are logically organized and flow naturally
	Readability	Ease of understanding	Measures how easy it is for readers to comprehend the summary
	Style	Appropriateness of tone	Summary's tone, formality, and language style are suitable for its purpose
Summary Impact	Usefulness	General utility in context	Overall practical value of the summary for a specific user or scenario

Table 5. Overview of Human Evaluation Dimensions, Focus, and Key Aspects in Legal Summarization

References

- [1] 2009. Mean Average Precision. In *Encyclopedia of Database Systems*. Springer US, 1703.
- [2] Flavia Aचना, David Preti, Davide Venditti, Leonardo Ranaldi, Cristina Giannone, Fabio Massimo Zanzotto, Andrea Favalli, Raniero Romagnoli, et al. 2023. Legal Summarization: to Each Court its Own Model. In *CLiC-it*.
- [3] Kanika Agrawal. 2020. Legal case summarization: An application for text summarization. In *2020 International conference on computer communication and informatics (ICCCI)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [4] Mousumi Akter, Naman Bansal, and Shubhra Kanti Karmaker Santu. 2022. Revisiting Automatic Evaluation of Extractive Summarization Task: Can We Do Better than ROUGE?. In *ACL (Findings)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1547–1560.
- [5] Ryan Amos, Gunes Acar, Eli Lucherini, Mihir Kshirsagar, Arvind Narayanan, and Jonathan Mayer. 2021. Privacy Policies over Time: Curation and Analysis of a Million-Document Dataset. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021 (WWW '21)*. ACM, 2165–2176. doi:10.1145/3442381.3450048
- [6] Deepa Anand and Rupali Wagh. 2022. Effective deep learning approaches for summarization of legal texts. *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences* 34, 5 (2022), 2141–2150. doi:10.1016/j.jksuci.2019.11.015
- [7] Farid Arai and Gianluca Demartini. 2024. Natural Language Processing for the Legal Domain: A Survey of Tasks, Datasets, Models, and Challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21306* (2024).
- [8] Dennis Aumiller, Ashish Chouhan, and Michael Gertz. 2022. EUR-Lex-Sum: A Multi- and Cross-lingual Dataset for Long-form Summarization in the Legal Domain.
- [9] Dennis Aumiller, Ashish Chouhan, and Michael Gertz. 2022. EUR-Lex-Sum: A Multi- and Cross-lingual Dataset for Long-form Summarization in the Legal Domain. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 7626–7639. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.519>
- [10] Ahsaas Bajaj, Pavitra Dangati, Kalpesh Krishna, Pradhiksha Ashok Kumar, Rheeeya Uppaal, Bradford Windsor, Eliot Brenner, Dominic Dotterer, Rajarshi Das, and Andrew McCallum. 2021. Long Document Summarization in a Low Resource Setting using Pretrained Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: Student Research Workshop*. Jad Kabbara, Haitao Lin, Amandalynne Paullada, and Jannis Vamvas (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 71–80. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.acl-srw.7
- [11] Ahsaas Bajaj, Pavitra Dangati, Kalpesh Krishna, Pradhiksha Ashok Kumar, Rheeeya Uppaal, Bradford Windsor, Eliot Brenner, Dominic Dotterer, Rajarshi Das, and Andrew McCallum. 2021. Long Document Summarization in a Low Resource Setting using Pretrained Language Models. In *ACL (student)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 71–80.
- [12] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. In *IJEEvaluation@ACL*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 65–72.
- [13] Vinayshekhar Bannihatti Kumar, Kasturi Bhattacharjee, and Rashmi Gangadharaiah. 2022. Towards Cross-Domain Transferability of Text Generation Models for Legal Text. In *Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2022*, Nikolaos Aletras, Ilias Chalkidis, Leslie Barrett, Cătălina Goanță, and Daniel Preoțiuc-Pietro (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid), 111–118. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.nllp-1.9
- [14] Emmanuel Bauer, Dominik Stambach, Nianlong Gu, and Elliott Ash. 2023. Legal Extractive Summarization of U.S. Court Opinions. In *LIRAI@HT (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 3594)*. CEUR-WS.org, 10–30.
- [15] Iz Beltagy, Matthew E. Peters, and Arman Cohan. 2020. Longformer: The Long-Document Transformer. *CoRR* abs/2004.05150 (2020).
- [16] Paheli Bhattacharya, Kaustubh Hiware, Subham Rajgaria, Nilay Pochhi, Kripabandhu Ghosh, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2019. A Comparative Study of Summarization Algorithms Applied to Legal Case Judgments. In *ECIR (1) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 11437)*. Springer, 413–428.
- [17] Paheli Bhattacharya, Soham Poddar, Koustav Rudra, Kripabandhu Ghosh, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2021. Incorporating domain knowledge for extractive summarization of legal case documents. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (São Paulo, Brazil) (ICAIL '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 22–31. doi:10.1145/3462757.3466092
- [18] Purnima Bindal, Vikas Kumar, Vasudha Bhatnagar, Parikshet Sirohi, and Ashwini Siwal. 2023. Citation-Based Summarization of Landmark Judgments. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Natural Language Processing (ICON)*, Jyoti D. Pawar and Sobha Lalitha Devi (Eds.). NLP Association of India (NLPAD), Goa University, Goa, India, 588–593. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.icon-1.56>
- [19] Erion Çano and Maurizio Morisio. 2017. Hybrid recommender systems: A systematic literature review. *Intelligent Data Analysis* 21, 6 (2017), 1487–1524. doi:10.3233/IDA-163209
- [20] Ilias Chalkidis, Manos Fergadiotis, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Nikolaos Aletras, and Ion Androutsopoulos. 2020. LEGAL-BERT: The Muppets straight out of Law School. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.02559>
- [21] Ilias Chalkidis and Dimitrios Kampas. 2019. Deep learning in law: early adaptation and legal word embeddings trained on large corpora. *Artif. Intell. Law* 27, 2 (2019), 171–198.
- [22] Zhe Chen, Lin Ye, and Hongli Zhang. 2023. Enhancing LSTM and Fusing Articles of Law for Legal Text Summarization. In *ICONIP (14) (Communications in Computer and Information Science, Vol. 1968)*. Springer, 110–124.
- [23] Jianpeng Cheng and Mirella Lapata. 2016. Neural Summarization by Extracting Sentences and Words. In *ACL (1)*. The Association for Computer Linguistics.

- [24] Jingpei Dan, Weixuan Hu, and Yuming Wang. 2023. Enhancing legal judgment summarization with integrated semantic and structural information. *Artificial Intelligence and Law* (2023), 1–22.
- [25] Debtanu Datta, Shubham Soni, Rajdeep Mukherjee, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2023. MILDSum: A Novel Benchmark Dataset for Multilingual Summarization of Indian Legal Case Judgments. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 5291–5302. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.321
- [26] Leonardo de Andrade and Karin Becker. 2023. BB25HLegalSum: Leveraging BM25 and BERT-Based Clustering for the Summarization of Legal Documents. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing*, Ruslan Mitkov and Galia Angelova (Eds.). INCOMA Ltd., Shoumen, Bulgaria, Varna, Bulgaria, 255–263. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.ranlp-1.29/>
- [27] Diego de Vargas Feijó and Viviane Pereira Moreira. 2018. Rulingbr: A summarization dataset for legal texts. In *International Conference on Computational Processing of the Portuguese Language*. Springer, 255–264. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-99722-3_26
- [28] Diego de Vargas Feijó and Viviane P. Moreira. 2023. Improving abstractive summarization of legal rulings through textual entailment. *Artif. Intell. Law* 31, 1 (2023), 91–113.
- [29] Aniket Deroy, Paheli Bhattacharya, Kripabandhu Ghosh, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2021. An Analytical Study of Algorithmic and Expert Summaries of Legal Cases. In *International Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:245009600>
- [30] Aniket Deroy, Kripabandhu Ghosh, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2023. How ready are pre-trained abstractive models and LLMs for legal case judgement summarization? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01248* (2023).
- [31] Aniket Deroy, Kripabandhu Ghosh, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2024. Applicability of Large Language Models and Generative Models for Legal Case Judgement Summarization. *CoRR* abs/2407.12848 (2024).
- [32] Aniket Deroy, Kripabandhu Ghosh, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2024. Ensemble methods for improving extractive summarization of legal case judgements. *Artif. Intell. Law* 32, 1 (2024), 231–289. doi:10.1007/s10506-023-09349-8
- [33] Li Dong, Nan Yang, Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Xiaodong Liu, Yu Wang, Jianfeng Gao, Ming Zhou, and Hsiao-Wuen Hon. 2019. *Unified language model pre-training for natural language understanding and generation*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA.
- [34] Xinyu Duan, Yating Zhang, Lin Yuan, Xin Zhou, Xiaozhong Liu, Tianyi Wang, Ruocheng Wang, Qiong Zhang, Changlong Sun, and Fei Wu. 2019. Legal Summarization for Multi-role Debate Dialogue via Controversy Focus Mining and Multi-task Learning. In *CIKM*. ACM, 1361–1370.
- [35] Mohamed Elaraby and Diane Litman. 2022. ArgLegalSumm: Improving abstractive summarization of legal documents with argument mining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.01650* (2022).
- [36] Mohamed Elaraby, Huihui Xu, Morgan Gray, Kevin D Ashley, and Diane Litman. 2024. Adding Argumentation into Human Evaluation of Long Document Abstractive Summarization: A Case Study on Legal Opinions. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Human Evaluation of NLP Systems (HumEval)@LREC-COLING 2024*. 28–35.
- [37] Mohamed Elaraby, Yang Zhong, and Diane Litman. 2023. Towards Argument-Aware Abstractive Summarization of Long Legal Opinions with Summary Reranking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 7601–7612. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.481
- [38] Ahmed Elnaggar, Christoph Gebendorfer, Ingo Glaser, and Florian Matthes. 2018. Multi-Task Deep Learning for Legal Document Translation, Summarization and Multi-Label Classification. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.07513>
- [39] Alexander R. Fabbri, Wojciech Kryscinski, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir R. Radev. 2021. SummEval: Re-evaluating Summarization Evaluation. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics* 9 (2021), 391–409.
- [40] Cristhian Figueroa, Iacopo Vagliano, Oscar Rodriguez Rocha, and Maurizio Morisio. 2015. A systematic literature review of Linked Data-based recommender systems. *Concurr. Comput. Pract. Exp.* 27, 17 (2015), 4659–4684. doi:10.1002/CPE.3449
- [41] Filippo Galgani. 2010. Legal Case Reports. UCI Machine Learning Repository. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5ZS41>.
- [42] Filippo Galgani and Achim Hoffmann. 2011. LEXA: Towards Automatic Legal Citation Classification. In *AI 2010: Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, Jiuyong Li (Ed.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 445–454.
- [43] Aashish Ghimire, Raj Shrestha, and John Edwards. 2023. Too Legal; Didn't Read (TLDR): Summarization of Court Opinions. In *2023 Intermountain Engineering, Technology and Computing (IETC)*. IEEE, 164–169.
- [44] Satyajit Ghosh, Mousumi Dutta, and Tanaya Das. 2022. Indian legal text summarization: A text normalization-based approach. In *2022 IEEE 19th India Council International Conference (INDICON)*. IEEE, 1–4.
- [45] Ingo Glaser, Sebastian Moser, and Florian Matthes. 2021. Summarization of German Court Rulings. In *Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2021*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 180–189. <https://aclanthology.org/2021.nllp-1.19>
- [46] Claire Grover, Ben Hachey, and Ian Hughson. 2004. The HOLJ Corpus. Supporting Summarisation of Legal Texts. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Linguistically Interpreted Corpora*, Silvia Hansen-Schirra, Stephan Oepen, and Hans Uszkoreit (Eds.). COLING, Geneva, Switzerland, 47–54. <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1907>
- [47] Karunya Harikrishnan, Malathi M, and Sundharakumar K B. 2024. Topic-Driven Contractual Language Understanding and Summarization: An Integrated Approach for Simplifying Legal Documents. In *2024 4th International Conference on Intelligent Technologies (CONIT)*. IEEE, 1–6. doi:10.1109/CONIT61985.2024.10627025
- [48] S Hochreiter. 1997. Long Short-term Memory. *Neural Computation MIT-Press* (1997).

- [49] Yu-Xiang Hong and Chia-Hui Chang. 2023. Improving colloquial case legal judgment prediction via abstractive text summarization. *Comput. Law Secur. Rev.* 51 (2023), 105863.
- [50] Yue Huang, Lijuan Sun, Chong Han, and Jian Guo. 2023. A high-precision two-stage legal judgment summarization. *Mathematics* 11, 6 (2023), 1320. doi:10.3390/math11061320
- [51] Yuxin Huang, Zhengtao Yu, Junjun Guo, Yan Xiang, and Yantuan Xian. 2021. Element graph-augmented abstractive summarization for legal public opinion news with graph transformer. *Neurocomputing* 460 (2021), 166–180.
- [52] Yuxin Huang, Zhengtao Yu, Junjun Guo, Zhiqiang Yu, and Yantuan Xian. 2020. Legal public opinion news abstractive summarization by incorporating topic information. *Int. J. Mach. Learn. Cybern.* 11, 9 (2020), 2039–2050.
- [53] Deepali Jain, Malaya Dutta Borah, and Anupam Biswas. 2020. Fine-Tuning Textrank for Legal Document Summarization: A Bayesian Optimization Based Approach. In *FIRE*. ACM, 41–48.
- [54] Deepali Jain, Malaya Dutta Borah, and Anupam Biswas. 2021. Automatic summarization of legal bills: A comparative analysis of classical extractive approaches. In *2021 international conference on computing, communication, and intelligent systems (ICCCIS)*. IEEE, 394–400.
- [55] Deepali Jain, Malaya Dutta Borah, and Anupam Biswas. 2021. CAWESumm: A Contextual and Anonymous Walk Embedding Based Extractive Summarization of Legal Bills. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Natural Language Processing (ICON 2021), National Institute of Technology Silchar, Silchar, India, December 16 - 19, 2021*. NLP Association of India (NLP AI), 414–422. <https://aclanthology.org/2021.icon-main.50>
- [56] Deepali Jain, Malaya Dutta Borah, and Anupam Biswas. 2021. Summarization of legal documents: Where are we now and the way forward. *Comput. Sci. Rev.* 40 (2021), 100388.
- [57] Deepali Jain, Malaya Dutta Borah, and Anupam Biswas. 2023. Bayesian Optimization based Score Fusion of Linguistic Approaches for Improving Legal Document Summarization. *Knowl. Based Syst.* 264 (2023), 110336.
- [58] Deepali Jain, Malaya Dutta Borah, and Anupam Biswas. 2024. A sentence is known by the company it keeps: Improving Legal Document Summarization Using Deep Clustering. *Artif. Intell. Law* 32, 1 (2024), 165–200.
- [59] Deepali Jain, Malaya Dutta Borah, and Anupam Biswas. 2024. Summarization of Lengthy Legal Documents via Abstractive Dataset Building: An Extract-then-Assign Approach. *Expert Syst. Appl.* 237, Part B (2024), 121571.
- [60] Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. 2002. Cumulated gain-based evaluation of IR techniques. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 20, 4 (2002), 422–446.
- [61] Changzhen Ji, Yating Zhang, Adam Jatowt, and Haipang Wu. 2023. CDD: A Large Scale Dataset for Legal Intelligence Research. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track*, Mingxuan Wang and Imed Zitouni (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 66–73. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-industry.7
- [62] Prathamesh Kalamkar, Aman Tiwari, Astha Agarwal, Saurabh Karn, Smita Gupta, Vivek Raghavan, and Ashutosh Modi. 2022. Corpus for Automatic Structuring of Legal Documents. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, Nicoletta Calzolari, Frédéric Bèchet, Philippe Blache, Khalid Choukri, Christopher Cieri, Thierry Declerck, Sara Goggi, Hitoshi Isahara, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Hélène Mazo, Jan Odijk, and Stelios Piperidis (Eds.)*. European Language Resources Association, Marseille, France, 4420–4429. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.lrec-1.470>
- [63] Ambedkar Kanapala, Sukomal Pal, and Rajendra Pamula. 2019. Text summarization from legal documents: a survey. *Artif. Intell. Rev.* 51, 3 (2019), 371–402.
- [64] Georgia Kapitsaki and Maria Papoutsoglou. 2024. A privacy policies dataset in Greek in the GDPR era. In *Proceedings of the 27th Pan-Hellenic Conference on Progress in Computing and Informatics (Lamia, Greece) (PCI '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 199–205. doi:10.1145/3635059.3635090
- [65] Moniba Keymanesh, Micha Elsner, and Srinivasan Sarthasathary. 2020. Toward Domain-Guided Controllable Summarization of Privacy Policies.. In *NLLP@ KDD*. 18–24.
- [66] Barbara Ann Kitchenham and Stuart Charters. 2007. *Guidelines for performing Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering*. Technical Report EBSE 2007-001. Keele University and Durham University Joint Report. https://www.elsevier.com/_data/promis_misc/525444systematicreviewguide.pdf
- [67] Svea Klaus, Ria Van Hecke, Kaweh Djafari Naini, Ismail Sengor Altingovde, Juan Bernabé-Moreno, and Enrique Herrera-Viedma. 2022. Summarizing Legal Regulatory Documents using Transformers. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 2426–2430.
- [68] Svea Klaus, Ria Van Hecke, Kaweh Djafari Naini, Ismail Sengor Altingovde, Juan Bernabé-Moreno, and Enrique Herrera-Viedma. 2022. Summarizing Legal Regulatory Documents using Transformers. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Madrid, Spain) (SIGIR '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2426–2430. doi:10.1145/3477495.3531872
- [69] Marios Koniaris, Dimitris Galanis, Eugenia Giannini, and Panayiotis Tsanakas. 2023. Evaluation of Automatic Legal Text Summarization Techniques for Greek Case Law. *Information* 14, 4 (2023). doi:10.3390/info14040250
- [70] Anastassia Kornilova and Vladimir Eidelman. 2019. BillSum: A Corpus for Automatic Summarization of US Legislation. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, Lu Wang, Jackie Chi Kit Cheung, Giuseppe Carenini, and Fei Liu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 48–56. doi:10.18653/v1/D19-5406
- [71] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2017. ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Commun. ACM* 60, 6 (2017), 84–90.
- [72] Wojciech Kryscinski, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2019. Neural Text Summarization: A Critical Evaluation. In *EMNLP/IJCNLP (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 540–551.

- [73] Wojciech Kryscinski, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2020. Evaluating the Factual Consistency of Abstractive Text Summarization. In *EMNLP (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 9332–9346.
- [74] Litton J. Kurisinkel and Nancy Chen. 2022. Tractable & Coherent Multi-Document Summarization: Discrete Optimization of Multiple Neural Modeling Streams via Integer Linear Programming. In *EMNLP (Industry Track)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 237–243.
- [75] Philippe Laban, Tobias Schnabel, Paul N. Bennett, and Marti A. Hearst. 2022. SummaC: Re-Visiting NLI-based Models for Inconsistency Detection in Summarization. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics* 10 (2022), 163–177.
- [76] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension. In *ACL*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 7871–7880.
- [77] Daniele Licari, Praveen Bushipaka, Gabriele Marino, Giovanni Comandé, and Tommaso Cucinotta. 2023. Legal Holding Extraction from Italian Case Documents using Italian-LEGAL-BERT Text Summarization. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (Braga, Portugal) (ICAIL '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 148–156. doi:10.1145/3594536.3595177
- [78] Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Barcelona, Spain, 74–81. <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>
- [79] Shuaiqi Liu, Jiannong Cao, Yicong Li, Ruosong Yang, and Zhiyuan Wen. 2024. Low-resource court judgment summarization for common law systems. *Information Processing & Management* 61, 5 (2024), 103796. doi:10.1016/j.ipm.2024.103796
- [80] Emilia Lukose, Suparna De, and Jon Johnson. 2022. Privacy Pitfalls of Online Service Terms and Conditions: a Hybrid Approach for Classification and Summarization. In *NLLP@EMNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 65–75.
- [81] Yinglong Ma, Peng Zhang, and Jiangang Ma. 2018. An Ontology Driven Knowledge Block Summarization Approach for Chinese Judgment Document Classification. *IEEE Access* 6 (2018), 71327–71338.
- [82] Manuj Malik, Zheng Zhao, Marcio Fonseca, Shrisha Rao, and Shay B. Cohen. 2024. CivilSum: A Dataset for Abstractive Summarization of Indian Court Decisions. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 2241–2250.
- [83] Arpan Mandal, Paheli Bhattacharya, Sekhar Mandal, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2021. Improving Legal Case Summarization Using Document-Specific Catchphrases. In *JURIX (Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications, Vol. 346)*. IOS Press, 76–81.
- [84] Laura Manor and Junyi Jessy Li. 2019. Plain English Summarization of Contracts. In *Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2019*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1–11. <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W19-2201>
- [85] Joshua Maynez, Shashi Narayan, Bernd Bohnet, and Ryan T. McDonald. 2020. On Faithfulness and Factuality in Abstractive Summarization. In *ACL*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1906–1919.
- [86] Marie Chantelle Cruz Medina, Lucas Mathews Da Silva Oliveira, Jean Felipe Coelho Ferreira, Leandro Honorato de Souza Silva, Cleyton Mário de Oliveira Rodrigues, João Fausto Lorenzato de Oliveira, Paulo Christiano Sobral, Bruno Souza, Dionizio Feitosa, and Bruno J. T. Fernandes. 2022. Classification of Legal Documents in Portuguese Language Based on Summarization. In *LA-CCI*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [87] Kaiz Merchant and Yash Pande. 2018. NLP Based Latent Semantic Analysis for Legal Text Summarization. In *ICACCI*. IEEE, 1803–1807.
- [88] Gianluca Moro, Nicola Piscaglia, Luca Ragazzi, and Paolo Italiani. 2024. Multi-language transfer learning for low-resource legal case summarization. *Artif. Intell. Law* 32, 4 (2024), 1111–1139.
- [89] Akheel Muhammed, Hamna Muslihuddeen, Shalaka Sankar, and M Anand Kumar. 2024. Impact of Rhetorical Roles in Abstractive Legal Document Summarization. In *2024 5th International Conference on Innovative Trends in Information Technology (ICITIT)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [90] Ankan Mullick, Abhilash Nandy, Manav Nitin Kapadnis, Sohan Patnaik, R. Raghav, and Roshni Kar. 2022. An Evaluation Framework for Legal Document Summarization. In *LREC*. European Language Resources Association, 4747–4753.
- [91] Duy-Hung Nguyen, Bao-Sinh Nguyen, Nguyen-Viet-Dung Nghiem, Dung Tien Le, Mim Amina Khatun, Minh-Tien Nguyen, and Hung Le. 2021. Robust Deep Reinforcement Learning for Extractive Legal Summarization. In *ICONIP (6) (Communications in Computer and Information Science, Vol. 1517)*. Springer, 597–604.
- [92] Huyen Nguyen and Junhua Ding. 2023. Keyword-based Augmentation Method to Enhance Abstractive Summarization for Legal Documents. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (Braga, Portugal) (ICAIL '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 437–441. doi:10.1145/3594536.3595120
- [93] Joel Niklaus and Daniele Giofré. 2023. Can we Pretrain a SotA Legal Language Model on a Budget From Scratch?. In *SustainNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 158–182.
- [94] Joel Niklaus, Veton Matoshi, Matthias Stürmer, Ilias Chalkidis, and Daniel Ho. 2024. MultiLegalPile: A 689GB Multilingual Legal Corpus. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 15077–15094. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.805
- [95] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. *CoRR* abs/2303.08774 (2023).
- [96] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. In *ACL*, 311–318.
- [97] Vedant Parikh, Vidit Mathur, Parth Mehta, Namita Mittal, and Prasenjit Majumder. 2021. LawSum: A weakly supervised approach for Indian Legal Document Summarization. *CoRR* abs/2110.01188 (2021). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.01188>
- [98] Shounak Paul, Arpan Mandal, Pawan Goyal, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2023. Pre-trained Language Models for the Legal Domain: A Case Study on Indian Law. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.06049>

- [99] Seth Polsley, Pooja Jhunjhunwala, and Ruihong Huang. 2016. CaseSummarizer: A System for Automated Summarization of Legal Texts. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, Hideo Watanabe (Ed.). The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee, Osaka, Japan, 258–262. <https://aclanthology.org/C16-2054>
- [100] Priyanka Prabhakar, Deepa Gupta, and Peeta Basa Pati. 2022. Abstractive Summarization of Indian Legal Judgments. In *OCIT*. IEEE, 256–261. doi:10.1109/OCIT56763.2022.00056
- [101] Bindal Purnima, Kumar Vikas, Bhatnagar Vasudha, Sirohi Parikshet, and Siwal Ashwini. 2023. Citation-Based Summarization of Landmark Judgments. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Natural Language Processing (ICON)*. 588–593.
- [102] Weijian Qin and Xudong Luo. 2023. A Legal News Summarisation Model Based on RoBERTa, T5 and Dilated Gated CNN. In *ICTAI*. IEEE, 889–897.
- [103] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21 (2020), 140:1–140:67.
- [104] Thomson Reuters. 2023. Legal Drafting Challenges, Risks, and Opportunities. <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/blog/legal-drafting-challenges-risks-and-opportunities/>. Accessed: 2023-02-04.
- [105] Alexander M. Rush, Sumit Chopra, and Jason Weston. 2015. A Neural Attention Model for Abstractive Sentence Summarization. In *EMNLP*. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 379–389.
- [106] Siddhartha Rusiya and Anupam Jamatia. 2023. Implementation of legal documents text summarization and classification by applying neural network techniques. In *Machine Intelligence Techniques for Data Analysis and Signal Processing: Proceedings of the 4th International Conference MISP 2022, Volume 1*. Springer, 329–341.
- [107] Ria Ambrocio Sagum, Patrick Anndwin C. Clacio, Rey Edison R. Cayetano, and Airis Dale F. Lobrio. 2023. Philippine Court Case Summarizer using Latent Semantic Analysis. In *ICCCSI (Procedia Computer Science, Vol. 227)*. Elsevier, 474–481.
- [108] Olivier Salaün, Aurore Clément Troussel, Sylvain Longhais, Hannes Westermann, Philippe Langlais, and Karim Benyekhlef. 2022. Conditional Abstractive Summarization of Court Decisions for Laymen and Insights from Human Evaluation. In *JURIX (Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications, Vol. 362)*. IOS Press, 123–132.
- [109] Abhilasha Sancheti, Aparna Garimella, Balaji Vasan Srinivasan, and Rachel Rudinger. 2023. What to Read in a Contract? Party-Specific Summarization of Legal Obligations, Entitlements, and Prohibitions. In *EMNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 14708–14725.
- [110] Ajay V Saravade and Pratiksha R Deshmukh. 2023. Improving Feature Vector for Extractive Text Summarization of Legal Judgement. In *2023 International Conference on Electrical, Electronics, Communication and Computers (ELEXCOM)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [111] Ayesha Sarwar, Seemab Latif, Rabia Irfan, Adnan Ul-Hasan, and Faisal Shafait. 2022. Text Summarization from Judicial Records using Deep Neural Machines. In *2022 International Conference on Electrical, Computer, Communications and Mechatronics Engineering (ICECCME)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [112] Marijn Schraagen, Floris Bex, Nick Van De Luijtgaarden, and Daniël Prijs. 2022. Abstractive Summarization of Dutch Court Verdicts Using Sequence-to-sequence Models. In *Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2022*, Nikolaos Aletras, Ilias Chalkidis, Leslie Barrett, Cătălina Goanță, and Daniel Preoțiuc-Pietro (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid), 76–87. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.nllp-1.7
- [113] Saloni Sharma, Surabhi Srivastava, Pradeepika Verma, Anshul Verma, and Sachchida Nand Chaurasia. 2023. A comprehensive analysis of indian legal documents summarization techniques. *SN Computer Science* 4, 5 (2023), 614. doi:10.1007/s42979-023-01983-y
- [114] Zejiang Shen, Kyle Lo, Lauren Yu, Nathan Dahlberg, Margo Schlanger, and Doug Downey. 2022. Multi-LexSum: Real-World Summaries of Civil Rights Lawsuits at Multiple Granularities. *CoRR* abs/2206.10883 (2022). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2206.10883
- [115] Zejiang Shen, Kyle Lo, Lauren Yu, Nathan Dahlberg, Margo Schlanger, and Doug Downey. 2022. Multi-LexSum: Real-World Summaries of Civil Rights Lawsuits at Multiple Granularities. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.10883>
- [116] Zejiang Shen, Kyle Lo, Lauren Yu, Nathan Dahlberg, Margo Schlanger, and Doug Downey. 2024. Multi-LexSum: real-world summaries of civil rights lawsuits at multiple granularities. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (New Orleans, LA, USA) (NIPS '22)*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA.
- [117] Abhay Shukla, Paheli Bhattacharya, Soham Poddar, Rajdeep Mukherjee, Kripabandhu Ghosh, Pawan Goyal, and Saptarshi Ghosh. 2022. Legal Case Document Summarization: Extractive and Abstractive Methods and their Evaluation. In *AAACL/TJCNLP (1)*, Yulan He, Heng Ji, Sujian Li, Yang Liu, and Chua-Hui Chang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online only, 1048–1064. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.aacl-main.77>
- [118] Samarth Singhal, Siddhant Singh, Sandeep Yadav, and Anil Singh Parihar. 2023. LTSum: Legal Text Summarizer. In *ICCCNT*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [119] Dezhao Song, Sally Gao, Baosheng He, and Frank Schilder. 2022. On the Effectiveness of Pre-Trained Language Models for Legal Natural Language Processing: An Empirical Study. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 75835–75858. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3190408
- [120] Bianca Steffes, Piotr Rataj, Luise Burger, and Lukas Roth. 2023. On evaluating legal summaries with ROUGE. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (Braga, Portugal) (ICAIL '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 457–461. doi:10.1145/3594536.3595150
- [121] Sheetal A Takale, Sandeep A Thorat, and Rajani S Sajjan. 2022. Legal document summarization using ripple down rules. In *2022 IEEE International Women in Engineering (WIE) Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering (WIECON-ECE)*. IEEE, 78–83.
- [122] Vu D. Tran, Minh Le Nguyen, Satoshi Tojo, and Ken Satoh. 2020. Encoded summarization: summarizing documents into continuous vector space for legal case retrieval. *Artif. Intell. Law* 28, 4 (2020), 441–467.
- [123] Aashka Trivedi, Anya Trivedi, Sourabh Varshney, Vidhey Joshipura, Rupa G. Mehta, and Jenish Dhanani. 2020. Extracted Summary Based Recommendation System for Indian Legal Documents. In *ICCCNT*. IEEE, 1–6.

- [124] Santosh T.y.s.s., Mahmoud Aly, and Matthias Grabmair. 2024. LexAbSumm: Aspect-based Summarization of Legal Decisions. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, Nicoletta Calzolari, Min-Yen Kan, Veronique Hoste, Alessandro Lenci, Sakriani Sakti, and Nianwen Xue (Eds.). ELRA and ICCL, Torino, Italia, 10422–10431. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.lrec-main.911>
- [125] Surisetty Hima Varshini, Gottimukkala Sarayu Varma, Priyanka Prabhakar, and Peeta Basa Pati. 2024. Comparative Analysis of Legal Outcome Prediction with Detailed and Summarized Text. In *2024 IEEE 9th International Conference for Convergence in Technology (I2CT)*. 1–6. doi:10.1109/I2CT61223.2024.10544203
- [126] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention Is All You Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*. Curran Associates, Inc., Long Beach, CA, USA, 5998–6008.
- [127] Huihui Xu and Kevin Ashley. 2023. *A Question-Answering Approach to Evaluating Legal Summaries*. IOS Press. doi:10.3233/faia230977
- [128] Huihui Xu and Kevin D. Ashley. 2023. Argumentative Segmentation Enhancement for Legal Summarization. In *ASAIL@ICAIL (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 3441)*. CEUR-WS.org, 141–150.
- [129] Huihui Xu, Jaromir Savelka, and Kevin D. Ashley. 2021. Toward summarizing case decisions via extracting argument issues, reasons, and conclusions. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (São Paulo, Brazil) (ICAIL '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 250–254. doi:10.1145/3462757.3466098
- [130] Huihui Xu, Jaromir Savelka, and Kevin D. Ashley. 2020. Using argument mining for legal text summarization. In *IOS Press*, Vol. 334. IOS Press, 184. doi:10.3233/faia200862
- [131] Hiroaki Yamada, Simone Teufel, and Takenobu Tokunaga. 2017. Annotation of argument structure in Japanese legal documents. In *ArgMining@EMNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 22–31.
- [132] Jian Yuan, Zhongyu Wei, Yixu Gao, Wei Chen, Yun Song, Donghua Zhao, Jinglei Ma, Zhen Hu, Shaokun Zou, Donghai Li, and Xuanjing Huang. 2021. Overview of SMP-CAIL2020-Argmine: The Interactive Argument-Pair Extraction in Judgement Document Challenge. *Data Intelligence* 3, 2 (2021), 287–307. doi:10.1162/dint_a_00094
- [133] Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. BARTScore: Evaluating Generated Text as Text Generation. In *NeurIPS*. 27263–27277.
- [134] Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. PEGASUS: Pre-training with Extracted Gap-sentences for Abstractive Summarization. In *ICML (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 119)*. PMLR, 11328–11339.
- [135] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- [136] Linwu Zhong, Ziyi Zhong, Zinian Zhao, Siyuan Wang, Kevin D. Ashley, and Matthias Grabmair. 2019. Automatic Summarization of Legal Decisions using Iterative Masking of Predictive Sentences. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (Montreal, QC, Canada) (ICAIL '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 163–172. doi:10.1145/3322640.3326728
- [137] Yang Zhong and Diane J. Litman. 2022. Computing and Exploiting Document Structure to Improve Unsupervised Extractive Summarization of Legal Case Decisions. In *NLLP@EMNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 322–337.
- [138] Yang Zhong and Diane J. Litman. 2023. STRONG - Structure Controllable Legal Opinion Summary Generation. In *IJCNLP (Findings)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 431–448.
- [139] May Myo Zin, Ha-Thanh Nguyen, Ken Satoh, Saku Sugawara, and Fumihito Nishino. 2023. Information Extraction from Lengthy Legal Contracts: Leveraging Query-Based Summarization and GPT-3.5. In *JURIX (Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications, Vol. 379)*. IOS Press, 177–186.

A Appendix

A.1 Pretraining corpora

While not directly related to legal summarization, pretraining corpora are essential for developing models that can effectively process legal text. These corpora establish the foundational linguistic and contextual understanding needed for subsequent fine-tuning on specialized legal datasets. Table 6 highlights two important pretraining corpora in the legal domain.

Source	Corpora	No. of Documents	Total Size in GB	Repository
Legal BERT [20]	EU Legislation	61,826	1.9 (16.5%)	EURLEX (eur-lex.europa.eu)
	UK Legislation	19,867	1.4 (12.2%)	LEGISLATION.GOV.UK
	ECJ cases	19,867	0.6 (5.2%)	EURLEX
	ECHR cases	12,554	0.5 (4.3%)	HUDOC
	US court cases	164,141	3.2 (27.8%)	CASE LAW ACCESS PROJECT
	US contracts	76,366	3.9 (34.0%)	SEC-EDGAR
MultiLegalPile [94]	Eurlex Resources		179 (26.0%)	eur-lex.europa.eu/content/legal-notice
	Native Multi Legal Pile		112 (16.3%)	
	Legal mC4		106 (15.4%)	huggingface.co/datasets/mc4
	Pile of Law		292 (42.4%)	huggingface.co/datasets/pile-of-law

Table 6. Pretraining corpora available for legal domain

A.2 Legal Summarization Overview

Work	Year	Method	Description	Dataset	Metric	HumEval
[58]	2024	DCESumm	Identify and rank sentence relevance in a document using Legal BERT, refine scores with deep clustering, and select sorted sentences based on the desired summary length	BillSum, Forum	ROUGE	No
[77]	2023	Italian-LEGAL-BERT	Fine-tuned Italian-BERT, Italian-LEGAL-BERT, and Italian-LEGAL-BERT-SC models to predict the most relevant sentences	ITA CaseHold	ROUGE	Yes
[26]	2023	BB25HLegalSum	Leverage BERT and BM25 to rank and cluster unique, relevant sentences, aggregate them into candidate summaries, and present the most representative summary by highlighting the most representative sentences.	BillSum	ROUGE	Yes
[101]	2023	CB-JSumm	Used InLegalBERT to obtain embeddings for citation and judgment sentences, then applied cosine similarity to select summary sentences. Landmark judgments attract public attention and gather numerous citations, highlighting arguments and precedents that reinforce the cited ruling.	IN-Jud-Cit	ROUGE	No
[139]	2023	GPT-3.5	Query-based summarization extracts key sentences relevant to predefined queries, which are then processed by GPT-3.5 for information extraction	CUAD	F1	No
[22]	2023		Proposed method comprises a Sentence Encoder, Topic Model, Position Encoder, TS-LSTM Network, Law Article Processor, and Sentence Classifier	CAIL	ROUGE	No
[14]	2023	Lawformer	Utilized the Longformer encoder, which was pre-trained on the LegalBART objective using 6 million U.S. court opinions.	BillSum	ROUGE	No
[106]	2023		Compared BERT, RoBERTa, and XLNet for extractive summarization in the legal domain	AILA	ROUGE	No
[57]	2023	Bayesian Optimization Score Fusion	Current extractive and graph-based methods such as TextRank, LSA, and KLSum have been enhanced with a technique for scoring significant sentences based on linguistic features	BillSum, Gov-Report, AILA	ROUGE, FIRE,	No
[137]	2022	Unsupervised Graph-based Ranking model	HipoRank employs a reweighting algorithm that considers the history of previously selected sentences to iteratively update sentence importance scores and then select top-k candidates for extractive summary	CanLII	ROUGE, BERTScore	Yes
[17]	2021	DELSumm	An Integer Linear Programming (ILP) objective maximizes summaries by selecting informative sentences, balancing thematic segment representation, and minimizing redundancy, ensuring comprehensive and concise content	Private	ROUGE	No
[55]	2021	CAWESumm (Contextual Anonymous Walk Embedding Summarizer)	Legal-BERT sentence embeddings and Anonymous Walk Embeddings are concatenated and input into an MLP model to learn binary classification of sentence summary-worthiness during training.	BillSum	ROUGE	No

Table 7. List of datasets, methods, and metrics related to extractive legal document summarization. Manuscript submitted to ACM

Work	Year	Method	Description	Dataset	Metric	HumEval
[59]	2024	Extract-then-Assign	Extractive summaries are generated and matched to ground truth summaries, creating new training samples. BART is then fine-tuned for abstractive summarization using this augmented dataset	BillSum, FIRE	ROUGE, BERTScore	No
[47]	2024		A supervised BERTopic variant clusters contracts into seven groups, followed by Legal Pegasus, fine-tuned for the legal domain, to generate summaries for each document cluster	Contract Understanding Atticus Dataset (CUAD)	F1	No
[50]	2023		A two-stage approach: keywords and key sentences are extracted using BERT+LSTM in the first stage, followed by abstractive summary generation with UNILM and attention mechanisms in the second stage	CAIL, LCRD	ROUGE	No
[138]	2023	STRONG (Structure controllable OpinNion summary Generation)	A three-stage process: train a sentence structure classifier on annotated data, predict silver labels for unannotated summaries, and fine-tune the LED model using structure-guided tokens for test set inference	CanLII	ROUGE, BERTScore	Yes
[112]	2022		Two methods are proposed: a hybrid reinforcement learning approach combining extractive sentence selection with abstractive rewriting, and a transformer-based summarization method leveraging BART	RechtspraakNL	ROUGE	Yes
[108]	2022	VanBART, FPT-BART	Court decision summaries are generated based on a question-answer-decision triplet, designed to be intelligible for ordinary citizens without legal expertise	JusticeBot, CanLII	ROUGE	Yes
[11]	2021	BART	Long documents are compressed by identifying salient sentences, which are then input into BART to generate abstractive summaries	Amicus data	ROUGE	No
[51]	2021	ERG-GAT, ERG-GTN, TIG-GAT, TIG-GTN	A dual-encoder model combines BERT with an Element Graph concept that encodes topic information, enhancing summarization by integrating structured topic representation LPO-news	ROUGE	Yes	
[122]	2020		Documents are segmented into three parts for summary generation. BSLT uses BERTSUM-based Lawformer and Transformer for extraction, while LPGN combines PGN and Lawformer for accurate, high-quality abstractive summaries	CAIL	ROUGE	No
[52]	2020		Abstractive summarization model with two encoders and one decoder, incorporating topic words to enhance performance, built on the Point-Generator Network (PTGEN) framework	Private	ROUGE	No

Table 8. List of datasets, methods, and metrics related to abstractive legal document summarization.

Work	Year	Method	Description	Dataset	Metric	HumEval
[32]	2024	Ensemble different summarization algorithms	Three ensemble methods are proposed: voting-based, ranked-list ensemble (using Borda count and Reciprocal Ranking), and graph-based (leveraging sentence similarity graphs to select identical sentences from connected components) for better summarization	IN-Ext, IN-abs	ROUGE, METEOR	No
[24]	2023	BSLT LPGN	A hybrid legal summarization approach combines the extractive model BSLT and the abstractive model LPGN based on Lawformer to generate the summary	CAIL2020	ROUGE	No
[88]	2023	Extractive then abstractive	A transfer learning approach combines extractive and abstractive techniques for legal summarization, addressing limited labeled data by selecting sentences and generating summaries using GPT-2	Australian Legal Case Report Dataset	ROUGE, FactCC	No
[44]	2023	Extractive then abstractive	Legal texts are normalized using dictionaries for abbreviations and article summaries, then processed with BART for extractive summarization and PEGASUS for abstractive summarization	SCI, IndianKanoon, Manupatra, ILDC	ROUGE	No
[43]	2023	Extractive then abstractive	Machine learning methods label sentences as important or not, followed by LSTMs for summarization, which are then compared to PEGASUS for performance evaluation	Opinion of the supreme court of Utah, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, and Colorado	Recall, F1	No
[102]	2023	Extractive then abstractive	RoBERTa vectorizes document sentences, which are processed by a Dilated Gated CNN extractive model to select relevant sentences. The resulting corpus is then fed into T5 PEGASUS for abstractive summarization	CAIL	ROUGE	No
[121]	2022	Extractive then abstractive	Ripple Down Rules classify sentences into 13 rhetorical roles using C4.5 decision trees, Naive Bayes, SVM, Conditional Random Fields, and BiLSTM algorithms for improved sentence categorization	50 documents of Bombay High Court collected from Legal Search of Manupatra	ROUGE	Yes
[81]	2018	Ontology-based	An ontology-based approach extracts semantic knowledge from Chinese legal documents, summarizes it into knowledge blocks, computes block similarity, and classifies the documents into different categories	CTA, CDD	Accuracy	No

Table 9. List of datasets, methods, and metrics related to hybrid legal document summarization.