

Legal Prompting: Teaching a Language Model to Think Like a Lawyer

Fangyi Yu*

Thomson Reuters Labs
19 Duncan Street
Toronto, ON M5H 3G6
Canada
fangyi.yu@tr.com

Lee Quarley

Thomson Reuters Labs
3 Times Square
New York, NY 10036
United States
lee.quarley@tr.com

Frank Schilder

Thomson Reuters Labs
610 Opperman Drive
Eagan, MN 55123
United States
frank.schilder@tr.com

Abstract

Large language models that are capable of zero or few-shot prompting approaches have given rise to the new research area of prompt engineering. Recent advances showed that for example Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompts can improve arithmetic or common sense tasks significantly. We explore how such approaches fare with legal reasoning tasks and take the COLIEE entailment task based on the Japanese Bar exam for testing zero-shot/few-shot and fine-tuning approaches. Our findings show that while CoT prompting and fine-tuning with explanations approaches show improvements, the best results are produced by prompts that are derived from specific legal reasoning techniques such as IRAC (Issue, Rule, Application, Conclusion). Based on our experiments we improve the 2021 best result from 0.7037 accuracy to 0.8148 accuracy and beat the 2022 best system of 0.6789 accuracy with an accuracy of 0.7431.

1 Introduction

One of the most fundamental responsibilities of a legal professional is to leverage analytical problem solving skills in applying a seemingly endless universe of law to an equally endless universe of scenarios. Such laws can be confusing and contradictory, well-reasoned rationales may be far from straightforward, and application may be inconsistent. Accordingly, the passing rates for the bar examination – a critical step toward becoming a practicing attorney in many countries – range from about 80% in the United States in 2021¹ to 39.2% in Japan in 2020 (widely regarded as one of the most difficult of all bar examinations)². The best

attorneys are not only able to achieve these tasks with ease, but they are also able to effectively *explain* the basis for their work. More often than not, a simple binary response to a given legal question is far from acceptable without the appropriate rationale to conclude it, perhaps accompanied by a chain of references to applicable statutes or a legal reasoning technique such as *Issue, Rule, Application, Conclusion* (Burton, 2017).

Application of reason-based prompting mechanisms with large language models is becoming an increasingly prevalent focus area in natural language processing research. Models like OpenAI’s GPT-3 achieve satisfactory results – 81% accuracy with a zero-shot approach and 82.8% accuracy with a few-shot approach – on commonsense reasoning tasks drawn from the PhysicalQA dataset (Brown et al., 2020), but, as we observe, struggle significantly with more specialized domain data. Further research builds on these basic queries by implementing a variety of so-called prompt engineering approaches, which range from soliciting a model to “think step by step” in producing incremental reasoning to underscore a given response (Kojima et al., 2022), to leveraging an iterative cycle of model generated rationales to bootstrap its own ability to produce more elaborate reasoning approaches (Zelikman et al., 2022); these approaches have demonstrated a nominal improvement in a language model’s ability to rationalize a correct response to a particular baseline query.

Our research aims to explore the effects of such approaches on highly specialized domain data, namely that in the legal field drawn from the Japanese bar exam. We frame our approach around the University of Alberta’s annual Competition on Legal Information Extraction/Entailment – or COLIEE – event (Rabelo et al., 2022), in which certain subtasks are devoted to reasoning through legal hypotheses given contextual articles; the COLIEE data itself solicits a yes/no response following a

*The first author was a student at Ontario Tech University at the time of submission of this paper. This is work done during an internship at Thomson Reuters Labs. Please reach out to fangyi.yu@ontariotechu.net for questions.

¹<https://www.reuters.com/legal/legalindustry/bar-exam-pass-rate-dropped-last-year-first-time-testers-2022-04-26/>

²<https://www.nippon.com/en/japan-data/h00942/>

proposed hypothesis and supporting legal statutes.

We first explore zero through few-shot approaches using pretrained LLMs, coupled with prompts either drawn from existing work (e.g., “Let’s think step by step” (Kojima et al., 2022)) or generated by ourselves (e.g., “Please determine if the following hypothesis is True or False based on the given premise”).

Additionally, we assess the impacts of fine tuning an LLM to infer binary responses both with and without explanations (either machine generated or extracted from the supporting premise). The best results on the COLIEE 2021 test set, though, result from a zero-shot, legal-prompt approach, which surpasses state of the art COLIEE performance by 15.79%. Similarly, an 8-shot approach yields the best performance on 2022 COLIEE test data, with an overall accuracy improvement of 9.46%.

Our experiments show that few-shot and fine-tuning with explanation approaches show good and consistent results for the two test sets of the COLIEE competition we used for evaluation. Zero-shot and a fine-tuning approach using the labels only show more inconsistent results across the two years. The zero-shot with legal reasoning approach shows the best result for one year only and may be more prone to overfitting to a specific test set indicating that further research of those prompting approaches is needed.

2 Legal Entailment task

The COLIEE competition (Rabelo et al., 2022) has been carried out since 2014 driving research in the area of legal retrieval and entailment. Two of the competition’s tasks are using data from the Japanese bar exam. The exam requires lawyers to determine whether a given legal statement is true or false. In order to answer the questions, the lawyer has to first determine which articles of the Japanese statutes are most relevant to the given question. Task 3 of the competition covers this retrieval task. Given one or more articles relevant to the question, the lawyer has then to determine whether the question (i.e., the hypothesis) is true or false given the selected articles (i.e., the premise). This task is captured as task 4 in the COLIEE competition and we are focusing on this task with our work on legal reasoning:

Hypothesis: If the grounds of commencement of assistance cease to exist, the family court may

rescind the decision for commencement of assistance without any party’s request.

Premise: Article 18 (1) If the grounds prescribed in the main clause of Article 15, paragraph (1) cease to exist, the family court must rescind the decision for commencement of assistance at the request of the person in question, that person’s spouse, that person’s relative within the fourth degree of kinship, the guardian of a minor, the supervisor of a minor’s guardian, the assistant, the assistant’s supervisor, or a public prosecutor.

(2) At the request of a person as prescribed in the preceding paragraph, the family court may rescind all or part of the decision referred to in paragraph (1) of the preceding Article.

Entailment: NO

More formally the task is defined by the organizers as a legal entailment task:

Given a question Q , after retrieving relevant articles $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n$ determine if the relevant articles entail “Q” or “not Q”.

$$\text{Entails}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n, Q) \text{ or}$$

$$\text{Entails}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n, \neg Q).$$

The answer of this task is binary: “YES” (“Q”) or “NO” (“ $\neg Q$ ”). The evaluation metric is accuracy and a random baseline (or simply giving always “YES” or always “NO”) would lead to an accuracy about 0.5 since most test sets have an approximate equal distribution of positive and negative answers.

One of the main challenges of this competition is the relatively small size of the training and test set. Past competitions provide the answered questions of previous competitions resulting in a total of 806 questions. The 2021 test set contain 81 questions whereas the 2022 test set contained 109 questions.

3 Prior work

An overview of all COLIEE tasks and their respective approaches can be found in (Rabelo et al., 2022). Most systems addressing task 4 were BERT-based (Devlin et al., 2019) despite the small training set. Interestingly enough, the best performing system in 2021 utilized a method for increasing the training pool and deployed an ensemble of different BERT-based systems (Yoshioka et al., 2021). Other systems relied on different types on language

models including DistilRoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019), LEGAL-BERT (Chalkidis et al., 2020), T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) and Electra (Clark et al., 2020) (i.e., (Schilder et al., 2021))

Other notable past systems used the Japanese original text and developed a rule-based system to identify entailment (Fujita et al., 2021) while another system was based on a Graph Neural network using DistilRoBERTa and LEGAL-BERT embeddings as nodes (Wehnert et al., 2021).

Only one system (Schilder et al., 2021) looked into a few-shot learning approach utilizing GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020). The system was based on a few-shot approach addressing task 3 and task 4 together³. Their experiments showed that GPT-3 without any further fine-tuning and without prompting of the relevant articles from the Japanese statutes does not perform very well on this task reaching results even below the random baseline. These results indicate that even large LMs have not stored enough knowledge about Japanese law and more advanced prompting and/or fine-tuning techniques are required.

Other prior work we draw from explores the utility of prompting and explanations in order to have LLM solve more complex tasks such as commonsense reasoning or mathematical word problems. We draw from recent work that proposed so-called Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompts that have shown improved results of Zero-Shot (ZS) and Few-Shot (FS) approaches (Kojima et al., 2022).

Previous approaches to incorporating explanations into the reasoning process also show improvements over standard prompting or fine-tuning approaches. By relying on the generation capability of LLMs to produce reasoning text, those approaches produce text that then is used to fine-tune the language model. In contrast to earlier approaches that relied on manually created explanations (Rajani et al., 2019), Zelikman et al. (2022) propose a method that automatically creates rationales using GPT-J for Arithmetic word problems, Commonsense QA, and Grad School Math problems. Their STaR system keeps the rationales if the LLM produces the correct answer and creates a new set of training data they train the LM with. They show significant improvements over previous approaches that are fine-tuned on the answers only and comparable performance to a much larger LM

³The organizers offered a task 5 that would require a system to do task 3 (i.e., retrieval) and task 4 (i.e., entailment) in one step.

(i.e., GPT-3) on CommonsenseQA.

4 Experiments and results

This section contains descriptions of all experiments we conducted using various zero and few-shot approaches, different prompting strategies and fine-tuning approaches with or without explanations. We applied approaches that have been shown to improve the SOTA performance for general commonsense datasets to the COLIEE legal data. We use GPT-3 as the LLM and test on the COLIEE 2021 and 2022 test sets. All experiments were conducted with OpenAI’s GPT-3 (text-davinci-002) model, the most competent GPT-3 engine of the four (davinci, curie, babbage and ada). We use accuracy as the evaluation metric since the COLIEE test sets have an approximate equal distribution of positive and negative answers.

4.1 Zero-shot (ZS)

We design and incorporate different prompts for the ZS setting, none of which involve domain specific information. In Section 4.5, we describe ZS with domain-specific prompts that integrate legal reasoning approaches.

To ensure that the completion of GPT-3 is deterministic and the same each time it is executed with the same input, we set the temperature for all experiments to 0. Other GPT-3 parameters are set to their default values (Top P=1, Frequency penalty = 0, Presence penalty = 0). We use greedy decoding throughout this paper for simplicity.

For ZS, the input we give GPT-3 contains the following parts: the instructive prompts we designed, the premise-hypothesis pairs from the COLIEE dataset, and the phrase “True or False?”. We experimented with three different prompts on GPT-3, as shown in Table 1. Simply adding the term “following” to specify the location of the premise can enhance GPT-3’s accuracy from 0.7160 to 0.7407. If the prompt is less instructive, for instance, if “the given premise” is replaced with “Japanese civil code statutes”, the accuracy decreases from 0.7407 to 0.7037. Note that “the given premise” consists of the Japanese civil code statutes that is most closely associated with the given hypothesis. Be aware that the accuracy 2021 COLIEE winner obtained was 0.7037, which is the same as our least performing prompt in the ZS setting. Thus, by simply providing a more specific, relevant, and instructive prompt to GPT-3, we can outperform the 2021 COLIEE

Table 1: GPT-3’s ZS performance with different prompts on the COLIEE 2021 test set. Minor changes in the prompt can impact GPT-3’s accuracy largely.

Input	Prompt	Accuracy
{prompt} + {premise} + {hypothesis} + “True or False?”	Prompt1: Please determine if the hypothesis is True or False based on the given premise.	0.7160
	Prompt2: Please determine if the following hypothesis is True or False based on the given premise.	0.7407
	Prompt3: Please determine if the following hypothesis is True or False based on the Japanese civil code statutes.	0.7037

winner by 3.70% point of accuracy.

We use prompt2 (“Please determine if the following hypothesis is True or False based on the given premise.”) in all the following discussed approaches since it achieves the best accuracy in the ZS setting.

4.2 Few-shot (FS)

Brown et al. (2020) proved that the FS performance of LLMs is superior to that of ZS and some SOTA fine-tuning techniques in a variety of tasks. We thus evaluate GPT-3 in the FS setting by giving GPT-3 examples of hypothesis-answer pairs from a blog⁴ including previously evaluated bar exam questions. The original hypothesis-answer pairs from the blog are in Japanese, we use the Google-translated English version as the few shots.

We conducted experiments using 1-shot, 3-shot, and 8-shot, where one, three, and eight question-answer pairs are provided to GPT-3, respectively. The 1-shot example with a specific hypothesis-premise pair is shown in Figure 1.

The result is shown in Table 2. On the 2021 COLIEE test set, 3-shot and 8-shot achieve the same accuracy, outperforming 1-shot, and all three exceed the 2021 COLIEE winner (0.7037). On the 2022 COLIEE test set, 8-shot outperforms 3-shot and 1-shot, and all three beat the 2022 COLIEE winner (0.6789).

Table 2: GPT-3’s accuracy when provided with different numbers of examples as demonstrations. All three settings outperform 2021 and 2022 COLIEE winners (0.7037 and 0.6789, respectively).

Number of shots	2021	2022
1-shot	0.7160	0.7064
3-shot	0.7531	0.7339
8-shot	0.7531	0.7432

4.3 Zero-shot-Chain of Thought (ZS-CoT)

Kojima et al. (2022) showed that LLMs can gen-

⁴<https://www.crear-ac.co.jp/shoshi/kakomon/>

Please determine if the following hypothesis is True or False based on the given premise.	
Hypothesis: Since it is necessary to seal the will of the self-written certificate, the will is invalid if it is so-called a finger. Answer: False. In order to make a will with a self-written certificate, the testator must write the full text, date and name of the will and stamp it (People 968, paragraph 1). This seal may belong to the testator and may be a real seal or a seal. In addition, it is said that a finger mark is sufficient (Most Judgment Heigen 2.16). [Hei 20-23-D]	← A question-answer pair demonstration
Hypothesis: A, who acts as the agent of B, concluded a contract with C for sale of land owned by B. However, A had no authority to represent to conclude the contract. If B ratifies the contract of sales, A is not liable to C as an unauthorized agency. Premise: Article 117 (1) A person who concludes a contract as an agent of another person is liable to the counterparty for the performance of the contract or compensation for loss or damage, as chosen by the counterparty, unless the person proves the authority to represent or the principal ratifies the contract.	

Figure 1: 1-shot with a specific hypothesis-premise pair where the 1-shot is from a Japanese bar exam preparation blog and the hypothesis-premise pair is from the COLIEE 2021 test set.

erate chain-of-thought reasoning processes and have superior reasoning capabilities by just adding “Let’s think step by step” before each answer for common sense reasoning tasks. Hence, we experimented with GPT-3 using two-stage prompting (i.e., the output of the generated text from the first prompt is used for the second prompt): “Let’s think step by step” and “Therefore, the hypothesis is (True or False)”. An illustration for the ZS-CoT pipeline using a hypothesis-premise pair from the 2021 COLIEE dataset is shown in Figure 2.

Though ZS-CoT is theoretically straightforward, its nuance lies in the fact that it employs prompting twice. As shown in Figure 2, in the first stage, which is the reasoning extraction process, we provide GPT-3 with {prompt} + {premise} + {hypothesis} + {CoT} as input, where the prompt is the prompt2 described in Section 4.1, and CoT is “Let’s think step by step” since this CoT prompt demonstrates to obtain the best performance in common




Figure 2: The complete ZS-CoT pipeline. First, we use the “reasoning” prompt to extract a complete reasoning process from GPT-3, then we use the “answer” prompt to extract the answer in the proper format from the reasoning text.

sense reasoning tasks (Kojima et al., 2022). GPT-3 generates its reasoning process based on the input, but the generated completion may (or may not) contain the final answer (True or False in our case). In the second stage, which is the answer extraction process, we provide GPT-3 with both the input and output from the first stage as well as a second prompt (answer trigger): “Therefore, the hypothesis (True or False) is”. The prompted text is passed to GPT-3 as input to create the final binary answer.

When ZS-CoT is applied to GPT-3 on the COLIEE test sets, however, the results are not as strong as the results reported by Kojima et al. (2022) for common sense datasets. The accuracies are 0.6296, and 0.7064 on the COLIEE 2021 and 2022 test sets, respectively. While ZS-CoT outperforms ZS on the 2022 test set, and outperforms the 2022 COLIEE winner by 4.05%, it underperforms ZS on the 2021 test set by 17.65%.

Notably, GPT-3 is capable of generating explanations in all of the previously stated approaches, including ZS, FS, and ZS-CoT, although not all

ZS and FS completions contain explanations. Particularly when the predicted answer is True, explanations are often not provided. Explanations are always generated by GPT-3 when prompted by ZS-CoT though.

4.4 Fine-tuning LM with and without explanations

Fine-tuning language models can usually gain strong performance on many benchmarks (Brown et al., 2020). It involves updating the weights of a pre-trained language model by training on an annotated dataset specific to the desired task. We fine-tune GPT-3 with the 2021 COLIEE training set and expect the fine-tuned model to achieve better performance compared to using the pre-trained model directly.

To fine-tune GPT-3, a collection of training samples consisting of the expected input and its corresponding output (“completion”) are required. We fine-tune GPT-3 using the 2021 COLIEE training set, where premise-hypothesis pairs are utilized in

the input and answers are used in the completions. We fine-tune GPT-3 with two types of completions: binary answers only (True or False) and binary answers with explanations. The explanations are either explanations created by GPT-3 or pseudo-explanations extracted as stated below.

Although OpenAI’s documentation states that no prompt is necessary in the input for fine-tuning GPT-3, we nevertheless utilize two forms of input: without prompt and with prompt2 specified in Section 4.1 to examine the effect of prompts during GPT-3’s fine-tuning process. The fine-tuned model is then tested on the 2021 COLIEE test set. The result is shown in Table 3. It is shown that GPT-3 fine-tuned with instructive prompts outperforms the setting without prompts by 23.99%.

When fine-tuning GPT-3 with both binary answers and explanations, we use two types of explanations that are created using different approaches.

Pseudo-explanation. We select from each premise the sentence that is most relevant to its corresponding hypothesis as the pseudo-explanation. More specifically, for each hypothesis-premise pair, we first split the premise into sentences, encode each sentence using the MPNet encoder (Song et al., 2020), compute the cosine similarity score between each sentence and the hypothesis, then choose the sentence with the highest similarity score as the explanation. Since fine-tuning with binary answers achieves higher accuracy when an instructive prompt is included in the input, hence we provide GPT-3 with {prompt} + {premise} + {hypothesis} + “True or False” as input and {label} + “Because according to ” + {pseudo-explanation} as completion during the fine-tuning process with both binary answers and explanations. In this manner, we assist GPT-3 in determining which portion of the premise it should focus on in order to arrive at the final response. Similar to the completion used to fine-tune GPT-3, the completion generated during inference also contains binary answer and explanation, which is one sentence from the premise with the greatest similarity score to the hypothesis.




Figure 3: The pipeline of fine-tuning GPT-3 with pseudo-explanation.

The fine-tuning process is illustrated in Figure 3, and the inference results can be seen in Table 3.

GPT-3-generated explanation. This approach is inspired by the “Self-Taught Reasoner” (STaR bootstrapping) approach (Zelikman et al., 2022), which iteratively employs LLM-generated explanations to bootstrap the LLM’s capacity to execute more complicated reasoning. In a single loop of STaR bootstrapping: LLM creates explanations to answer a given question; if the answer generated is incorrect, LLM will retry to generate an explanation based on the right answer and then fine-tune on the explanations that produce correct answers. Since repeatedly fine-tuning GPT-3 is a costly process, we provide an alternative to the STaR bootstrapping approach, which is shown in Figure 4. In our approach, we prompt GPT-3 to generate explanations for each hypothesis-premise-answer triplets by providing it with “Please explain why the following hypothesis is” + {label} + “based on the given premise.” + {premise} + {hypothesis}, then use the hypothesis-premise-answer-explanation quartets to fine-tune GPT-3, that is, providing GPT-3 with input: {prompt} + {premise} + {hypothesis} + “True or False”, and completion: {explanation}, where the explanation is the GPT-3-generated explanations from the previous step. To decrease cost, we only fine-tune GPT-3 once as opposed to repeatedly. During inference, the fine-tuned model could provide both binary answers and plausible-seeming explanations. The inference accuracy is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: The accuracy achieved by the fine-tuned GPT-3 on the 2021 COLIEE test set. GPT-3 were fine-tuned with various input and completion. The prompt in the input is “Please determine if the following hypothesis is True or False based on the given premise.”

Input during Fine-tuning	Completion during Fine-tuning	Accuracy
{premise} + {hypothesis} + “True or False?”	{label}	0.6173
{prompt} + {premise} + {hypothesis} + “True or False?”	{label}	0.7654
{prompt} + {premise} + {hypothesis} + “True or False?”	{label} + “Because according to ” + {pseudo-explanation}	0.7160
{prompt} + {premise} + {hypothesis} + “True or False?”	{GPT-3-generated explanation}	0.6173




Figure 4: The pipeline of fine-tuning GPT-3 with GPT-3-generated-explanation.

As shown in Table 3, fine-tuning GPT-3 with pseudo-explanation surpasses fine-tuning GPT-3 with its own explanation. One possible reason is that GPT-3-generated explanations are not always accurate, and fine-tuning with incorrect explanations will decrease accuracy. Furthermore, fine-tuning GPT-3 with either pseudo-explanation or GPT-3-generated explanation underperforms fine-tuning GPT-3 with instructive prompts and labels alone. This indicates that encouraging GPT-3 to “think” and “reason” independently by providing it with instructive prompts and less intervention could lead to better results.

4.5 Legal Reasoning (LR) prompt

A common assumption in the literature is that prompts function as semantically meaningful task instructions and it requires experts to precisely define the task at hand (Webson and Pavlick, 2022). Reformatting NLP tasks with varied prompts significantly increased ZS and FS performance compared to traditional fine-tuned models (Wei et al., 2022; Le Scao and Rush, 2021; Schick and Schütze, 2021; Sanh et al., 2022). For COLIEE task 4, the above discussed experiments show that fine-tuning GPT-3 and FS with 3 or 8 examples outperform ZS. We thus utilize legal reasoning prompts to boost GPT-3’s accuracy under the ZS setting.

“Legal reasoning”, “creative thinking” and “critical analysis” are the pillars to “think like a lawyer” and contribute to the formation of a professional legal identity (Kift et al., 2011). Burton (2017) identified a number of acronyms used to teach traditional legal reasoning, which appear to represent legal reasoning approaches often used by legal experts and practitioners. For example, approach IRAC is the acronym for *Issue, Rule, Application, Conclusion*. Here, *issue* means issue spotting, or thinking about what facts and circumstances brought the parties to




Figure 5: GPT-3’s input and output when applying ZS with a LR prompt. Here, the LR approach used is IRAC.

court. *Rule* means to find the governing law for the issue. *Application* refers to the process of applying the rule to the facts of the issue. *Conclusion* is to come up with the conclusion from the application as to whether the rule applies to the facts. We thus ask GPT-3 to think like a lawyer by prompting it with {prompt} + {approach} + {premise} + {hypothesis} + “True or False?”. We use “Please analyze if the hypothesis is True or False according to the given legal reasoning approach” as the prompt. An illustration of GPT-3’s input and output when applying the LR prompt in the ZS setting is shown in Figure 5. The approach is extracted from the legal reasoning approaches summarized

Table 4: GPT-3’s performance on the 2021 and 2022 COLIEE test sets by applying various legal reasoning approaches to the ZS setting. The best performing approach in 2021 TRRAC outperforms the 2021 COLIEE winner by 15.79%, and the best performing approaches in 2022, IRREAC and IRRAC, surpass the 2022 COLIEE winner by 5.41%.

Approach	Details	Accuracy (2021)	Accuracy(2022)
TRRAC	Thesis, rule, rule, application, conclusion	0.8148	0.6881
CLEO	Claim, law, evaluation, outcome	0.8025	0.6881
ILAC	Issue, law, application, conclusion	0.7778	0.6972
IRAACP	Issue, rule, apply, apply, conclusion, policy	0.7778	0.6881
IRREAC	Issue, rule, rule, application, conclusion	0.7778	0.7156
IGPAC	Issue, general rule, precedent, application, conclusion	0.7654	0.6697
IPAAC	Issue, principle, authority, application, conclusion	0.7654	0.6606
IRRAC	Issue, rule, reasoning, application, conclusion	0.7654	0.7156
IRAC	Issue, rule, application, conclusion	0.7284	0.6881




Figure 6: Comparison of the accuracy of COLIEE winners and GPT-3 when different approaches are used. FT1 refers to fine-tuning GPT-3 with binary answers and prompt, FT2 refers to fine-tuning GPT-3 with pseudo-explanation.

by [Burton \(2017\)](#), which can be found in Table 4. As indicated in the table, TRRAC beats COLIEE winner by 15.79% in 2021, and IRREAC and IRRAC beat COLIEE winner by 5.41% in 2022. Note also that GPT-3 could provide explanations that seem to adhere to the provided legal reasoning method. Some explanation examples are shown in the Appendix.

Figure 6 shows a comparison of the accuracy of each approach applied to GPT-3. For the ZS approach we select the best-performing schema that is when prompt2 is used; for ZS with legal reasoning prompts approach, we select the best-performing legal reasoning approach for 2021 and 2022, which are TRRAC, and IRREAC/IRRAC. For the fine-tuning approach, we fine-tune and test GPT-3 on the same year’s training and test set provided by the COLIEE organizer.

5 Conclusions and discussion

Over the past several years, significant focus has been placed on leveraging reasoning-based-prompt approaches for increasing system performance in large language model-based question answering (e.g., ([Rajani et al., 2019](#); [Kojima et al., 2022](#); [Zelikman et al., 2022](#))). While simple zero or few-shot approaches are well-performant on basic benchmark or trivia tasks, elaborate reasoning-based strategies are required for more complex domains, such as scientific examinations or legal entailment, where successfully answering a query requires following a chain of logic from a stated (or implicit) context. Practitioners specifically within the legal domain will often follow certain well-defined approaches to reasoning, such as *Issue, Rule, Application, Conclusion*, and our hypothesis was that prompting language models in a similar fashion – alongside explanation-based fine-tuning – could improve capabilities against complex reasoning queries.

Leveraging data from the 2021 and 2022 COLIEE competitions ([Rabelo et al., 2022](#)) for training/testing, our exploration found that the most significant improvements in accuracy can be achieved by applying zero-shot queries to GPT-3 legal-reasoning (i.e., *Thesis, rule, rule, application, conclusion* ([Burton, 2017](#))) prompts on 2021 data, but these approaches did not perform that well on the 2022 test data. A 8-shot few-shot learning approach turned out to show the best results for the 2022 data. Nevertheless, both approaches significantly outperform COLIEE state-of-the-art, improving the 2021 best system from 0.7037 accuracy to 0.8148, and the 2022 best system from 0.6789 accuracy to

0.7431.

Additionally, we like to emphasize certain counterintuitive experimental findings. In our experiment, 1-shot underperform zero-shot by 2.47% point of accuracy on 2021 test set, and fine-tuning performed worse than zero-shot when applying the same prompt. We argue that zero-shot is our baseline and reflects GPT-3’s intrinsic reasoning capability, and the question-answer pair example we used in 1-shot may be irrelevant to any of the questions in the test set, which may have misled GPT-3 and reduced its performance. Therefore, an idea for future work is to carefully select the few-shot examples, ensuring that the topics covered in the test sets are the same as or relevant to those in the examples.

Further, we find that several other approaches also perform comparatively well versus COLIEE competition winners, such as zero shot chain-of-thought (Zelikman et al., 2022) outperforming the 2022 COLIEE winner by 4.05% (but underperforming the 2021 results by 17.65%) and fine-tuning with pseudo-explanations explicitly derived from the query data’s premise (yielding 71.6% accuracy on the 2021 test set). The few-shot approaches show the most promising because they achieved good and consistent performance results over the two years, while the zero-shot with legal reasoning prompts show outstanding results for one year but lower results for the other year. This indicates that such prompting approaches require to be tested more thoroughly and need to be investigated further. Although the performance of zero-shot with legal reasoning prompts is inconsistent between the two years, for instance, TRRAC had the highest accuracy in 2021 but the third highest accuracy in 2022, all legal reasoning approaches we tested outperformed COLIEE winners for 2021, and half outperformed COLIEE winners for 2022. Future study could construct an ensemble method for selecting the final binary answer for each question by referencing the responses obtained from multiple legal reasoning approaches based on majority voting.

While our analysis shows significant promise in prompt engineering for high-order LLM-based reasoning tasks, it is questionable whether prompting actually teaches a LM to “think like a lawyer” and further exploration is warranted to determine the likelihood of success of fine-tuning with explanation and (legal) reasoning prompting on the legal

or other domains and data sets.

References

- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Kelley Burton. 2017. “Think like a lawyer” using a legal reasoning grid and criterion-referenced assessment rubric on irac (issue, rule, application, conclusion). *Journal of Learning Design*, 10(2):57–68.
- Ilias Chalkidis, Manos Fergadiotis, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Nikolaos Aletras, and Ion Androutsopoulos. 2020. [LEGAL-BERT: The muppets straight out of law school](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 2898–2904, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kevin Clark, Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher Manning. 2020. [Electra: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators](#). In *ICLR*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Masaki Fujita, Naoki Kiyota, and Yoshinobu Kano. 2021. Predicate’s argument resolver and entity abstraction for legal question answering: Kis teams at coliee 2021 shared task. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Competition on Legal Information Extraction/Entailment (COLIEE 2021)*, pages 15–24.
- Sally Kift, Mark Israel, and Rachael Field. 2011. *Bachelor of Laws: learning and teaching academic standards statement: December 2010 [Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Project]*. Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11916*.

- Teven Le Scao and Alexander Rush. 2021. [How many data points is a prompt worth?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2627–2636, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach](#). *CoRR*, abs/1907.11692.
- Juliano Rabelo, Randy Goebel, Mi-Young Kim, Yoshinobu Kano, Masaharu Yoshioka, and Ken Satoh. 2022. [Overview and discussion of the competition on legal information extraction/entailment \(COLIEE\) 2021](#). *The Review of Socionetwork Strategies*, 16(1):111–133.
- 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](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2019. [Explain yourself! leveraging language models for commonsense reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4932–4942, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Taewoon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Fevry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Teven Le Scao, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M Rush. 2022. [Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. [It’s not just size that matters: Small language models are also few-shot learners](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2339–2352, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Frank Schilder, Dhivya Chinnappa, Kanika Madan, Jinane Harmouche, Andrew Vold, Hiroko Bretz, and John Hudzina. 2021. [A Pentapus Grapples with Legal Reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Competition on Legal Information Extraction/Entailment (COLIEE 2021)*, pages 60–68.
- Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. MPNet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:16857–16867.
- Albert Webson and Ellie Pavlick. 2022. [Do prompt-based models really understand the meaning of their prompts?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2300–2344, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sabine Wehnert, Shipra Dureja, Libin Kutty, Viju Sudhi, and Ernesto William De Luca. 2021. Using contextual word embeddings and graph embeddings for legal textual entailment classification. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Competition on Legal Information Extraction/Entailment (COLIEE 2021)*, pages 69–77.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Masaharu Yoshioka, Yasuhiro Aoki, and Youta Suzuki. 2021. [BERT-based ensemble methods with data augmentation for legal textual entailment in COLIEE statute law task](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. ACM.
- Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, and Noah D Goodman. 2022. STaR: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14465*.

A Appendix

Some explanation examples generated by GPT-3 using ZS with the TRRAC legal reasoning prompt on 2021 COLIEE test set are shown below.

ID: R02-24-O

Hypothesis: In the case that the seller cannot acquire and transfer the rights to the buyer, the buyer may not make a claim for damages to the seller in good faith without giving a notice within a year from the time when the seller knows the fact that the rights belong to others.

Premise: Article 566 If the subject matter delivered by the seller to the buyer does not conform to the terms of the contract with respect to the kind or quality, and the buyer fails to notify the seller of the non-conformity within one year from the time when the buyer becomes aware of it, the buyer may not demand cure of the non-conformity of performance, demand a reduction of the price, claim compensation for loss or damage, or cancel the

contract, on the grounds of the non-conformity; provided, however, that this does not apply if the seller knew or did not know due to gross negligence the non-conformity at the time of the delivery.

Answer and explanation: False. The buyer may not make a claim for damages to the seller in good faith without giving a notice within a year from the time when the seller knows the fact that the rights belong to others, but the buyer may demand cure of the non-conformity of performance, demand a reduction of the price, claim compensation for loss or damage, or cancel the contract.

ID: R02-27-O

Hypothesis: A partner may seek the division of the partnership property before liquidation if the consent of the majority of partners exists.

Premise: Article 676 (3) A partner may not seek the division of the partnership property before liquidation.

Answer and explanation: False. The rule states that a partner may not seek the division of the partnership property before liquidation. The application of the rule is that the consent of the majority of partners does not exist. Therefore, the conclusion is that a partner may not seek the division of the partnership property before liquidation.

ID: R02-12-A

Hypothesis: An obligor (A) created a mortgage for an obligee (B) on the real property owned by A and the creation was registered. A may assert the extinctive prescription of the mortgage if 20 years have passed from the time when it becomes exercisable, even if the claim the mortgage secures is not extinguished.

Premise: Article 396 No mortgage is extinguished by prescription in relation to obligors and mortgagors unless it is extinguished simultaneously with the claim the mortgage secures.

Answer and explanation: False. The mortgage is not extinguished by prescription unless the claim it secures is extinguished.

ID: R02-1-A

Hypothesis: The family court may decide to commence an assistance also in respect of a person whose capacity to appreciate their own situation is extremely inadequate due to a mental disorder.

Premise: Article 15 (1) The family court may decide to commence an assistance in respect of a

person whose capacity to appreciate their own situation is inadequate due to a mental disorder, at the request of the person in question, that person's spouse, that person's relative within the fourth degree of kinship, the guardian, the guardian's supervisor, the curator, the curator's supervisor, or a public prosecutor; provided, however, that this does not apply to a person with respect to whom there are grounds as prescribed in Article 7 or the main clause of Article 11. Article 11 The family court may decide to commence a curatorship in respect of a person whose capacity to appreciate their own situation is extremely inadequate due to a mental disorder, at the request of the person in question, the person's spouse, the person's relative within the fourth degree of kinship, the guardian, the guardian's supervisor, the assistant, the assistant's supervisor, or a public prosecutor; provided, however, that this does not apply to a person in respect of whom a cause set forth in Article 7 exists.

Answer and explanation: False. The family court may only decide to commence an assistance in respect of a person whose capacity to appreciate their own situation is inadequate due to a mental disorder, not a person whose capacity to appreciate their own situation is extremely inadequate due to a mental disorder.

ID: R02-4-A

Hypothesis: A, who acts as the agent of B, concluded a contract with C for sale of land owned by B. However, A had no authority to represent to conclude the contract. A is liable for the performance of the contract or compensation for loss or damage, as chosen by A.

Premise: Article 117 (1) A person who concludes a contract as an agent of another person is liable to the counterparty for the performance of the contract or compensation for loss or damage, as chosen by the counterparty, unless the person proves the authority to represent or the principal ratifies the contract.

Answer and explanation: False. A is not liable for the performance of the contract or compensation for loss or damage, as chosen by A.

ID: R02-8-E

Hypothesis: A took the jewelry that B had forgotten, believing without negligence that it belonged to A. In this case, A may not obtain the ownership of the jewelry by good faith acquisition.

Premise: Article 192 A person that commences the possession of movables peacefully and openly by a transactional act acquires the rights that are exercised with respect to the movables immediately if the person possesses it in good faith and without negligence.

Answer and explanation: The hypothesis is true. A cannot obtain the ownership of the jewelry by good faith acquisition because B did not give A permission to take the jewelry and A did not have knowledge that the jewelry belonged to B.

ID: R02-25-E

Hypothesis: If the lessee lawfully subleases a leased thing, the lessor may not duly assert against the sublessee the cancellation by agreement of the lease with the lessee even if the lessor has a right to cancel due to non-performance on the part of the lessee at the time of the cancellation.

Premise: Article 613 (3) If the lessee lawfully subleases a leased thing, the lessor may not duly assert against the sublessee the cancellation by agreement of the lease with the lessee; provided, however, that this does not apply if, at the time of the cancellation, the lessor has a right to cancel due to non-performance on the part of the lessee.

Answer and explanation: False. The lessor may assert the cancellation by agreement of the lease against the sublessee if the lessor has a right to cancel due to non-performance on the part of the lessee at the time of the cancellation.

ID: R02-1-U

Hypothesis: If the grounds of commencement of assistance cease to exist, the family court may rescind the decision for commencement of assistance without any party's request.

Premise: Article 18 (1) If the grounds prescribed in the main clause of Article 15, paragraph (1) cease to exist, the family court must rescind the decision for commencement of assistance at the request of the person in question, that person's spouse, that person's relative within the fourth degree of kinship, the guardian of a minor, the supervisor of a minor's guardian, the assistant, the assistant's supervisor, or a public prosecutor. (2) At the request of a person as prescribed in the preceding paragraph, the family court may rescind all or part of the decision referred to in paragraph (1) of the preceding Article.

Answer and explanation: False. The family

court may rescind the decision for commencement of assistance only at the request of the person in question, that person's spouse, that person's relative within the fourth degree of kinship, the guardian of a minor, the supervisor of a minor's guardian, the assistant, the assistant's supervisor, or a public prosecutor.

ID: R02-26-I

Hypothesis: The provisions regarding mandate of juridical acts do not apply mutatis mutandis to entrustments of business that do not constitute juridical acts.

Premise: Article 656 The provisions of this Section apply mutatis mutandis to entrustments of business that do not constitute juridical acts.

Answer and explanation: False. The provisions of Article 656 do apply mutatis mutandis to entrustments of business that do not constitute juridical acts.