
Neural Contract Element Extraction Revisited: *Letters from Sesame Street* (New updated version available only on Arxiv)¹

Ilias Chalkidis, Manos Fergadiotis, Prodromos Malakasiotis, and
Ion Androutsopoulos

Institute of Informatics & Telecommunications, NCSR “Demokritos”, Greece
Department of Informatics, Athens University of Economics and Business, Greece

Abstract

We investigate contract element extraction. We show that LSTM-based encoders perform better than dilated CNNs, Transformers, and BERT in this task. We also find that domain-specific WORD2VEC embeddings outperform generic pre-trained GLOVE embeddings. Morpho-syntactic features in the form of POS tag and token shape embeddings, as well as context-aware ELMO embeddings do not improve performance. Several of these observations contradict choices or findings of previous work on contract element extraction and generic sequence labeling tasks, indicating that contract element extraction requires careful task-specific choices. Analyzing the results of (i) plain TRANSFORMER-based and (ii) BERT-based models, we find that in the examined task, where the entities are highly context-sensitive, the lack of recurrency in TRANSFORMERS greatly affects their performance.¹

1 Introduction

Extracting information from contracts and other legal agreements is an important part of daily business worldwide. Thousands of agreements are written up every day, resulting in a huge volume of legal documents relating to several business processes, such as employment, services/vendors, loans, leases, investments. These documents contain crucial information (e.g., contract terms, pay rates, termination rights). More importantly, when negotiating or revising agreements, the parties involved need to scrutinize all the terms of the agreements as recorded in the corresponding documents.

In this work, we focus on contract element extraction, i.e., extracting information (e.g., parties, dates of interest, means of dispute, amounts) from contracts. As in our previous work [2, 3], the task is viewed as sequence labeling, i.e., we aim to classify each token as (possibly part of) a party name, effective date, jurisdiction, address, amount, etc. or ‘none’. However, we use a single (multi-class) classifier for all the contract elements that may reside in each contract zone (e.g., header or applicable law section), which allows the classifier of each zone to generalize across contract entity types, whereas our previous work [2, 3] used a separate (binary) classifier for each contract element type per zone. Furthermore, we investigate how the following three factors affect the extractors (classifiers).

Sequence encoders: We compare several neural encoders, namely stacked BILSTMs [8], DILATED-CNNs [10], stacked TRANSFORMERS [19], and BERT [7], whereas Chalkidis et al. [2] considered only stacked BILSTMs. Contrary to previous studies on generic sequence labeling tasks [18], we show that DILATED-CNNs are not comparable to stacked BILSTMs. More interestingly, we show that stacked BILSTMs also outperform the state-of-the-art language model BERT in this task.

¹**Disclaimer:** This is an updated version that includes new results and findings that are not presented in the original version [4] (<https://openreview.net/forum?id=B1x6fa95UH>).

A combination of BERT with stacked BILSTMs provides comparable performance with stacked BILSTMs using WORD2VEC embeddings, leading us to the conclusion that the lack of recurrency in TRANSFORMER-based models hurts the performance in the examined task, where entities are highly context-sensitive.

CRF layers: We show that the use of (linear-chain) CRFs [13] on top of each encoder has a significant positive impact in all encoders, contrary to the findings of our previous work [2], where the contribution of the CRF layer was unclear. This is most probably due to our use of multi-class classifiers, which leads to more constraints in the permissible sequences of predicted labels.

Input representations: We experiment with 200-D GLOVE word embeddings and domain-specific 200-D WORD2VEC embeddings pre-trained on approx. 750k contracts [3].² We also consider additional WORD2VEC embeddings representing POS tags and token shapes [2], character-based word embeddings obtained by character-level CNNs [16], and context-aware ELMO embeddings [17]. Domain-specific WORD2VEC embeddings outperform generic GLOVE embeddings in two out of three datasets. Similar results are obtained by using LEGALBERT [5], a BERT model pre-trained on legal corpora, comparing to the original BERT model, pre-trained on generic corpora. Morpho-syntactic (POS tags, token shapes), character-level, and context-aware embeddings (ELMO) increase computational complexity without delivering any significant performance improvement in this task.

2 Related Work

Huang et al. [9] introduced BILSTM-CRF for sequence labeling (e.g., NER, POS tagging). Lample et al. [14] and Ma et al. [16] further improved the performance of BILSTM-CRF by adding character-based word embeddings obtained with BILSTM and CNN character encoders. Chiu et al. [6] reported mixed results by adding capitalization features and gazetteers. Strubell et al. [18] reported that DILATED-CNNs [10] have comparable results with BILSTMs, while being faster. Peters et al. [17] reported gains on several datasets, including the CONLL-2003 NER dataset, by exploiting context-aware word representations (ELMO), while Devlin et al. [7] achieved further improvements with BERT. In previous work [3], we introduced the task of contract element extraction, initially showing that linear window-based classifiers outperform rule-based ones. In follow up work [2], we improved performance in most cases, using LSTM-based methods, with BILSTM-CRF being one of the best methods. We did not, however, compare to alternative (other than LSTM-based) encoders, neither did we investigate the necessity of the morpho-syntactic features we had included in our input representations. Also, in our previous work we did not experiment with character-based word representations and context-aware word embeddings (ELMO) or pre-trained TRANSFORMER-based language models [7, 15].

3 Task Definition and Datasets

We experimented with two subsets (Header/Preamble and Applicable Law) of the publicly available data provided by Chalkidis et al. [2, 3], and an in-house dataset with sections from lease agreements.

Contract Header / Preamble This subset contains the contract headers of the contracts of Chalkidis et al. [2, 3], where the goal is to identify *contract titles* (3836 training/650 test element instances), *parties* (6780/1250), *start dates* (2210/293) and *effective dates* (594/85). Start date is the date of signature and effective date is the date the agreement is enforced/activated.

Applicable Law: This subset contains the sections of the contracts of Chalkidis et al. [2, 3] where the *governing law* (2080 training/289 test) and *jurisdiction* (1245/229) elements need to be identified. In case of legal disputes between parties, the governing law specifies the country or state whose laws and case law apply, while jurisdiction specifies the courts responsible to resolve any dispute.³

Lease Particulars: This dataset contains sections from lease agreements with the following elements: address of the leased *property* (2066 training/486 test), *landlord* (2269/559), who owns the property, *tenant* (2110/519), who rents the property, *start date* (1458/346), *effective date* (971/248), *end date* (821/216), *term* (period) of the lease (869/196), and the agreed *rent amount* (1776/457).⁴

²We used 200-D WORD2VEC embeddings, as in our previous work, as well as generic GLOVE embeddings that are available in the same dimensionality (trained on 6 billions tokens from Wikipedia and Gigaword).

³For examples of *applicable law*, see <https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/applicable-law>.

⁴Examples of *lease particulars* can be found at [https://www.lawinsider.com/search?_index\[0\]=contract&q=lease%20particulars](https://www.lawinsider.com/search?_index[0]=contract&q=lease%20particulars).

CONTRACT HEADER												
	BILSTM-CRF			DILATED-CNNS-CRF			TRANSFORMERS-CRF			BERT-CRF		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Title	96.0	96.4	96.2	94.7	94.9	94.8	93.1	93.2	93.1	93.0	93.7	93.4
Party	95.3	88.9	92.0	93.7	86.2	89.8	88.4	79.4	83.6	89.4	87.2	88.3
S. Date	96.8	97.4	97.1	91.3	96.6	93.8	91.3	92.7	92.0	94.4	96.3	95.3
E. Date	94.6	96.9	95.7	96.9	95.1	95.9	92.0	88.5	90.1	86.9	91.3	89.0
MACRO-AVG	95.7	94.9	95.2	94.1	93.2	93.6	91.2	88.4	89.7	90.9	92.1	91.5
APPLICABLE LAW												
	BILSTM-CRF			DILATED-CNNS-CRF			TRANSFORMERS-CRF			BERT-CRF		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Jurisdiction	79.7	72.4	75.9	69.6	67.6	68.4	73.6	58.5	65.0	74.7	66.8	70.5
Gov. Law	98.1	96.3	97.2	95.1	92.5	93.8	98.0	90.3	94.0	93.8	92.2	93.0
MACRO-AVG	88.9	84.4	86.5	82.3	80.0	81.1	85.8	74.4	79.5	84.3	79.5	81.8
LEASE HEADER												
	BILSTM-CRF			DILATED-CNNS-CRF			TRANSFORMERS-CRF			BERT-CRF		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Property	67.0	65.8	66.2	61.8	61.8	61.7	53.9	50.1	51.8	54.1	56.1	55.1
Landlord	87.7	86.6	87.2	83.4	83.8	83.6	76.5	68.7	72.3	80.6	81.9	81.2
Tenant	90.7	90.9	90.8	89.7	87.8	88.7	81.5	72.4	76.6	85.1	87.1	86.1
S. Date	92.4	95.0	93.7	91.7	93.4	92.5	88.2	90.5	89.3	89.8	93.2	91.5
E. Date	88.7	90.8	89.7	81.1	87.5	84.1	79.9	71.1	75.2	85.1	91.9	88.3
T. Date	93.9	85.4	89.3	91.3	84.2	87.6	73.2	67.7	70.2	86.3	87.0	86.6
Period	86.6	89.1	87.8	81.9	87.0	84.3	76.5	75.5	75.8	81.8	88.8	84.7
Rent	86.5	86.0	86.2	81.2	82.5	81.7	81.4	74.3	77.5	82.2	88.2	85.0
MACRO-AVG	86.7	86.2	86.4	82.8	83.5	83.0	76.4	71.3	73.6	80.6	84.2	82.3

Table 1: Results with alternative sequence encoders. BILSTM-based models are clearly better.

4 Experiments

Experimental Setup: We used HYPEROPT and 5-fold Monte Carlo cross-validation to tune the following hyper-parameters on the training data with the following ranges: ENCODER output units {100, 150, 200, 250, 300}, ENCODER layers {1, 2, 3, 4}, batch size {8, 12, 16, 24, 32}, DROPOUT rate {0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6}, word DROPOUT rate {0.0, 0.05, 0.1}. We use the ADAM optimizer [12] with initial learning rate 1e-3. In the case of BERT, we grid-search for learning rate {2e-5, 3e-5, 4e-5, 5e-5}, as suggested by Devlin et al. [7]. We use the BASE versions of BERT and LEGALBERT, i.e., 12 layers, 768 hidden units and 12 attention heads. All models were evaluated in terms of precision, recall, and F1-score per entity. We report mean scores on test data.

Alternative Encoders: Table 1 reports results with different sequence encoders, always followed by a CRF layer.⁵ In these experiments except for BERT-CRF, the input representation of each token is the concatenation of its word, POS, and shape embeddings, as in our previous work [2]. Contrary to recent findings in sequence labeling [18, 7], BILSTMs outperform DILATED-CNNS, stacked TRANSFORMERS, and BERT in all cases. Notice the particularly poor performance of TRANSFORMERS-CRF, which uses the same pre-trained WORD2VEC embeddings as BILSTM-CRF and no other pre-training. This observation highlights the superiority of BILSTMs over TRANSFORMERS, when pre-training is limited to word embeddings, in the tasks we consider.

More precisely, comparing TRANSFORMER-based methods (TRANSFORMERS-CRF, BERT-CRF) to BILSTMs across entity types, we observe that the largest performance drop in: *parties* (8.4 and 3.7 F1 decrease for TRANSFORMERS-CRF and BERT BERT-CRF, respectively), *jurisdiction* (10.9, 5.4), *property* (14.4, 11.1), *landlord* (14.9, 6), *tenant* (14.2, 4.7), and *period* (12.0, 3.1). This could be attributed to the fact that, although TRANSFORMERS and BERT include positional embeddings and have large receptive fields, BILSTM-based models still cope better with *long-term dependencies* and *sequentiality*, which are important in legal documents. For example, to distinguish start and effective dates, or tenants, landlords and other parties (e.g., guarantors, etc.), or property address and other locations, one often has to consider a broader context than in generic named entity recognition.

⁵With all encoders, a dense layer with a softmax activation operates on the top-level representation of each token, providing a probability distribution over the labels, which is fed to the CRF.

The particular order (sequentiality) of the context words is also important. For example, in the sentence “*This Service Agreement is signed on **February 26th, 2021**, and effective as of **May 1st, 2021**.*”, the relative position of the words ‘signed’ and ‘effective’ is crucial to discriminate the two dates.

	CONTRACT HEADER			APPLICABLE LAW			LEASE PARTICULARS		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
BILSTMS	93.4	94.0	93.7	81.6	80.7	81.1	82.0	82.7	82.3
+ CRF	95.7	94.9	95.2	88.9	84.4	86.5	86.7	86.2	86.4
DILATED-CNNs	84.2	88.0	86.0	68.7	72.7	70.5	65.9	74.3	69.8
+ CRF	94.1	93.2	93.6	82.3	80.0	81.1	82.8	83.5	83.0
TRANSFORMERS	81.8	86.4	84.0	54.5	53.9	54.1	58.0	64.1	60.8
+ CRF	91.2	88.4	89.7	85.8	74.4	79.5	76.4	71.3	73.6
BERT	90.0	90.9	90.4	78.3	78.1	78.2	77.0	79.8	78.2
+ CRF	90.9	92.1	91.5	84.3	79.5	81.8	80.6	84.2	82.3

Table 2: Macro-averaged results with/without CRF layers. CRFs always improve performance.

Impact of CRFs: Table 2 compares the performance of all encoders with and without CRFs. In each dataset, results are macro-averaged over contract element types. Similarly to prior sequence labeling studies [14, 18] and unlike our previous work [2], we find that CRFs always improve performance, especially for non-BILSTM encoders that lack recurrency (DILATED-CNNs, TRANSFORMERS).⁶

	CONTRACT HEADER			APPLICABLE LAW			LEASE PARTICULARS		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
GLOVE (generic)	90.2	89.6	89.9	88.7	84.3	86.4	66.1	65.8	65.9
W2V-WORD (domain-specific)	95.7	95.1	95.4	89.0	84.1	86.5	87.0	86.2	86.6
W2V-ALL (incl. POS, shape)	95.7	94.9	95.2	88.9	84.4	86.5	86.7	86.2	86.4
W2V-ALL+CHAR	96.1	94.0	95.0	89.3	82.2	85.5	87.8	86.1	86.9
W2V-ALL+ELMO	95.8	94.8	95.3	89.3	84.2	86.7	86.0	87.5	86.7

Table 3: Macro-averaged BILSTM-CRF results with alternative input representations. Domain-specific WORD2VEC embeddings outperform generic GLOVE ones. POS and token shape (ALL), character-based (CHAR), and context-aware embeddings (ELMO) lead to no significant/consistent improvement.

Alternative Feature Representations: Table 3 compares the performance of BILSTM-CRF, the best encoder, with different input representations. Generic word embeddings (GLOVE) are vastly outperformed by domain-specific ones (W2V-WORD) in two out of three datasets (*contract header*, *lease particulars*). Adding POS tag and token shape embeddings (W2V-ALL) does not improve overall performance (see F1 scores). Adding character-level word embeddings (W2V-WORD+CHAR) also has no consistent or significant positive impact on F1. ELMO embeddings also do not lead to consistent noticeable improvements, possibly because the generic corpora that ELMO was trained on are very different than contracts. We suspect that in-domain knowledge is not important in *applicable law*, as entities (*governing law*, *jurisdiction*) are mostly locations (e.g., US states or districts and nationality adjectives) that are properly covered in generic corpora used to pre-train GLOVE and ELMO.

	CONTRACT HEADER		APPLICABLE LAW		LEASE PARTICULARS	
	Full Vocab.	Entities	Full Vocab.	Entities	Full Vocab.	Entities
BERT	2.10	1.81	1.71	1.23	2.55	2.47
LEGALBERT	2.09	1.92	1.61	1.39	2.45	2.47

Table 4: *Word Fragmentation Ratio* (WFR), i.e., average ratio of sub-word units per word, for both BERT variants. We report WFRs (i) for the full vocabulary in each dataset and (ii) only for vocabulary tokens included in entities. The average WFR ranges from 1.2 to 2.6 and is highest in *lease particulars*.

Why is BERT worse than BILSTM? In order to better understand the failure of BERT in contract element extraction, we study three factors (see Table 5): (a) the importance of in-domain language, where we compare LEGALBERT (a BERT model pre-trained on legal corpora [5]) with the original pre-trained BERT; (b) the impact of recurrency, comparing with a BILSTM-based model that operates

⁶DILATED-CNNs stack convolutional layers with increasingly larger strides to quickly obtain a large receptive field. TRANSFORMERS solely rely on additive positional embeddings and are otherwise insensitive to word order.








	CONTRACT HEADER			APPLICABLE LAW			LEASE PARTICULARS		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
STAND-ALONE PRE-TRAINED TRANSFORMERS									
BERT-CRF	90.9	92.1	91.5	84.3	79.5	81.8	80.6	84.2	82.3
LEGALBERT-CRF	93.6	93.5	93.5	81.6	78.8	80.1	81.6	83.2	82.4
FEATURE-BASED TRANSFER LEARNING WITH BILSTM-CRF (SIMILAR TO TABLE 3)									
WORD2VEC 	95.7	95.1	95.4	89.0	84.1	86.5	87.0	86.2	86.6
BERT 	95.1	92.4	93.7	90.5	83.9	87.1	84.4	85.5	84.9
LEGALBERT 	95.0	95.4	95.1	90.6	83.4	86.7	85.1	88.2	86.6
FINETUNING END-TO-END (BERT  , BILSTM-CRF )									
BERT-BILSTM-CRF	94.0	94.1	94.0	88.1	82.7	85.2	83.8	86.4	85.0
LEGALBERT-BILSTM-CRF	96.3	95.3	95.8	87.3	82.4	84.7	86.9	87.1	86.9

Table 5: Macro-averaged results for BERT-based variants: *stand-alone* (upper section) and *combined* with BILSTMs (middle, lower). In the middle section, the BILSTM is fed with frozen WORD2VEC embeddings, or frozen subword embeddings produced by BERT or LEGALBERT. In the lower section, BERT and LEGALBERT are also fine-tuned during training. Replacing BERT by LEGALBERT improves performance in two out of three datasets. Adding BILSTM layers further improves performance.

on top of BERT (BERT-BILSTM-CRF) or on top of LEGALBERT (LEGALBERT-BILSTM-CRF) in two different settings (*frozen* and *fine-tuned*, denoted by  and ); and (c) the impact of using sub-word embeddings that lead to word fragmentation (Table 4), again comparing to BERT-BILSTM-CRF and LEGALBERT-BILSTM-CRF. Models relying on sub-word units need to correctly classify more tokens, contrary to models relying on words, which may lead to a performance drop. Table 5 reports results for the aforementioned models. Our observations are the following:

- Inspecting Table 5, we observe that LEGALBERT leads to better performance than BERT in two out of three datasets, further highlighting the importance of in-domain knowledge in *contract header* and *lease particulars*, as we originally observed in Table 3. While BERT is better in the *applicable law* subset, LEGALBERT seems to better cover companies and their roles, as suggested by the higher F1-score of LEGALBERT-CRF comparing to BERT-CRF in the corresponding entity types, i.e., *party* (89.6 vs. 88.3), *landlord* (85.2 vs. 81.2) and *tenant* (90.5 vs. 86.1).⁷ This observation is consistent across all methods presented in Table 5, especially when BILSTMs are included. Note that LEGALBERT uses a vocabulary that presumably better accommodates legal language and has been pre-trained on legal corpora, while BERT uses a generic vocabulary and has been pre-trained in Wikipedia and the Children Books Corpus.
- Inspecting the mid and lower sections of Table 5, we observe that the methods that combine BERT or LEGALBERT with BILSTM-CRF are comparable to BILSTM-CRF relying on WORD2VEC embeddings, especially when models are fine-tuned end-to-end (Table 5, lower section). These empirical results support two important findings: (a) despite their ability to capture long-term dependencies, the lack of recurrency in TRANSFORMER-based methods leads to worse performance, as most of the entity types greatly depend on context and sequentiality, which can be better captured by BILSTMs; (b) BILSTM-CRF has comparable performance when operating on in-domain WORD2VEC or LEGALBERT embeddings; thus, there is no concrete evidence that the use of sub-words and the corresponding word fragmentation negatively affect performance. It seems that adding a BILSTM-CRF on top of BERT or LEGALBERT subword embeddings alleviates any potential negative impact caused by the word fragmentation.

An important take away is that in contract element extraction, the much simpler (at least in terms of number of trainable parameters) BILSTM-CRF with frozen in-domain WORD2VEC embeddings is very competitive to methods that employ BERT models, even when the latter are given in-domain pre-training (LEGALBERT) and combined with BILSTMs (LEGALBERT-BILSTM-CRF).

⁷Per entity type scores are not presented in Table 5 for brevity.

5 Limitations and Future Work

BERT [7] was pre-trained on generic corpora, i.e, the English Wikipedia and the Children Books Corpus, while LEGALBERT [5] was pre-trained on various legal corpora, comprising of legislation, regulations, court cases and contracts. Pre-training a new BERT model on larger contractual corpora,⁸ similar to those used to train WORD2VEC embeddings in Chalkidis et al. [3], could possibly further improve the performance of BERT-based models, surpassing our currently best methods. Similarly, one can pre-train the full BERT-BILSTM encoder end-to-end, instead of plugging in randomly initialized BILSTMs. On the other hand, from a practical perspective, the additional computational cost needed to support the fine-tuning and inference of BERT-BILSTM-CRF models is not justified by the minor sporadic improvements in performance. We leave this for future work, along with further investigation of the superior results of BILSTM-based methods on our datasets. The latter has possible implications in other tasks as well, given recent reports that TRANSFORMER-based models under-perform in other context-sensitive (event-based) tasks [11].

References

- [1] Vijay K. Bhatia. Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings. *London Longman*, 16, 12 1994. doi: 10.1017/S0272263100013668.
- [2] I. Chalkidis and I. Androustopoulos. A deep learning approach to contract element extraction. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems (JURIX)*, pages 155–164, Luxembourg, 2017.
- [3] I. Chalkidis, I. Androustopoulos, and A. Michos. Extracting contract elements. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (ICAIL)*, pages 19–28, London, UK, 2017.
- [4] Ilias Chalkidis, Manos Fergadiotis, Makis Malakasiotis, and Ion Androustopoulos. Neural Contract Element Extraction Revisited. In *Proceedings of the Document Intelligence Workshop of the 33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, Vancouver, Canada, 2019.
- [5] Ilias Chalkidis, Manos Fergadiotis, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Nikolaos Aletras, and Ion Androustopoulos. LEGAL-BERT: The muppets straight out of law school. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 2898–2904, Online, 2020.
- [6] J. Chiu and E. Nichols. Named Entity Recognition with Bidirectional LSTM-CNNs. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics (TACL)*, 4:357–370, 2016.
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, 2019.
- [8] S. Hochreiter and J. Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Computations*, 9(8): 1735–1780, 1997.
- [9] Z. Huang, W. Xu, and K. Yu. Bidirectional LSTM-CRF Models for Sequence Tagging. *Arxiv*, 2015.
- [10] N. Kalchbrenner, L. Espeholt, K. Simonyan, Aäron van den Oord, Alex Graves, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Neural Machine Translation in Linear Time. *Arxiv*, 2016.
- [11] Nora Kassner and Hinrich Schütze. Negated and misprimed probes for pretrained language models: Birds can talk, but cannot fly. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, Online, 2020. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.acl-main.698>.

⁸Contractual writing is indeed very different from other genres of legal writing; for example, academic legal writing as in law journals and juridical legal writing as in court judgments [1].

- [12] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, San Diego, CA, USA, 2015.
- [13] J.D. Lafferty, A. McCallum, and F.C.N. Pereira. Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Williamstown, MA, USA, 2001.
- [14] G. Lample, M. Ballesteros, S. Subramanian, K. Kawakami, and Chris Dyer. Neural architectures for named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the North American Chapter of the ACL: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*, pages 260–270, San Diego, California, 2016.
- [15] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *CoRR*, abs/1907.11692, 2019.
- [16] X. Ma and E. Hovy. End-to-end sequence labeling via bi-directional LSTM-CNNs-CRF. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association of Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 1064—1074, Berlin, Germany, 2016.
- [17] Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Deep contextualized word representations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, 2018.
- [18] E. Strubell, P. Verga, D. Belanger, and A. McCallum. Fast and Accurate Entity Recognition with Iterated Dilated Convolutions. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2017.
- [19] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention Is All You Need. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, Long Beach, USA, 2017.