

# Investigating Strategies for Clause Recommendation

Sagar JOSHI<sup>a,1</sup>, Sumanth BALAJI<sup>a,2</sup>, Jerrin THOMAS<sup>a</sup>, Aparna GARIMELLA<sup>b</sup> and Vasudeva VARMA<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*International Institute of Information technology, Hyderabad, India*

<sup>b</sup>*Adobe Research, India*

ORCID ID: Sagar Joshi <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6095-9713>, Sumanth Balaji <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5669-7519>

**Abstract.** Clause recommendation is the problem of recommending a clause to a legal contract, given the context of the contract in question and the clause type to which the clause should belong. With not much prior work being done toward the generation of legal contracts, this problem was proposed as a first step toward the bigger problem of contract generation. As an open-ended text generation problem, the distinguishing characteristics of this problem lie in the nature of legal language as a sublanguage and the considerable similarity of textual content within the clauses of a specific type. This similarity aspect in legal clauses drives us to investigate the importance of similar contracts' representation for recommending clauses. In our work, we experiment with generating clauses for 15 commonly occurring clause types in contracts expanding upon the previous work on this problem and analyzing clause recommendations in varying settings using information derived from similar contracts.

**Keywords.** Clause recommendation, Legal contracts, Legal NLP

## 1. Introduction


AI-driven assistance in drafting legal contracts as a tool can greatly benefit small and medium-sized enterprises. These enterprises often have limited legal support in contractual requirements compared to their large-scale counterparts that can afford sophisticated support from large legal teams. Contracts, being a type of legal document, can be characterized as being composed of a series of individual clauses or provisions, each capturing the legally binding rights, obligations, and agreements between the involved negotiating parties. As pointed out in [1], these clauses serve as the fundamental discourse units while drafting or reviewing contracts and encompass the legal essence of a contract.

The problem of clause recommendation [2] (ClauseRec) was proposed to assist contract drafting by recommending a clause to a contract. It was the first attempt at clause generation itself with the use of transformer-based techniques in NLP. For clause recom-

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding Author: Sagar Joshi; Email: [sagar.joshi@resarch.iiit.ac.in](mailto:sagar.joshi@resarch.iiit.ac.in)

<sup>2</sup>Corresponding Author: Sumanth Balaji; Email: [sumanth.balaji@resarch.iiit.ac.in](mailto:sumanth.balaji@resarch.iiit.ac.in). Both the corresponding authors have contributed equally to this work.



**Figure 1.** A pipeline for clause recommendation: We have an incomplete, in-draft contract at the input and the name of a clause type for which we need to recommend a new clause to the contract. We first compute the representation of the current contract. Since we know the clause type, we also compute a representation of the clause type based on a library of all the clauses under that type. Based on the representation of the current contract, we fetch  $k$  similar contracts and average them to obtain a similar contract representation. Now, making use of these three representations, we aggregate them before sending them to our transformer-based clause decoder to generate or recommend a new clause of the specified clause type to be added to the in-draft contract.

mentation, consider an incomplete contract in the draft to which the drafter of the contract wishes to add a new clause of a specific clause type. Clause recommendation serves to add such a clause based by taking into account the context of the current contract in the process. The work also introduced the problem of clause type relevance prediction to determine the relevance of a clause type to be added to the contract before proceeding with clause generation. However, the problem was modeled as a binary classification problem to determine whether or not a given clause type is relevant to the current contract. The pipeline for clause recommendation nevertheless makes use of the clause type information, hence serving the problem of clause type relevance as a secondary problem - extra to clause recommendation. However, it keeps opening the question of whether or not the clause type information should be taken from the user (i.e., the contract drafter).

In our work, we study the problem of clause recommendation by experimenting with several strategies for representing the context for clause generation and showing the significance of clause type information for clause generation. We improve the pipeline proposed by [2] by adding similar contract representations to the context. Figure 1 shows our best-performing pipeline for clause recommendation, which incorporates information from similar contracts in addition to the current contract and specified clause type. The generation is analyzed over 15 commonly different clause types in legal contracts. With research on legal clause generation currently in its infancy, we conclude by discussing the potential areas for improvement in clause generation. We open-source our code to ease future work on this problem<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>[https://github.com/sagarsj42/strategies\\_for\\_clause\\_recommendation](https://github.com/sagarsj42/strategies_for_clause_recommendation)

## 2. Related Work

Previous work in legal contracts has focused on understanding tasks in legal NLP directed towards easier review and analysis of contracts. Identification of entities in contracts is looked upon in [3], [4], the latter introducing a dataset of 179 contracts specific to lease agreements. The dataset introduced by [4] also provides labeled data for identifying potentially unfair clauses, a task attempted prior by [5]. [6] identify critical contract clauses using a set of Context-Free Grammar (CFG) rules. The task of semantically retrieving legal clauses from a library of contracts as a span identification problem was introduced in [7]. An expert annotation dataset for contract review is provided in [8]. LEDGAR - a dataset for large-scale multilabel classification was introduced in [1]. The sheer size of this dataset and the variety of clause types covered makes its applicability much beyond the task for which it was introduced, an example being the current work for clause generation.

Since legal language is different from the general open domain language on which most of the models are pretrained, special attention has been paid to developing models to give representations specialized to the domain. LegalBERT [9] introduces a family of BERT-based models for application on downstream legal tasks. [2] train a further pretrained version of BERT for use in context building for clause recommendation and show the superiority of the trained embeddings by showing distinguishable representations based on the clause type. ALeaseBERT trained in [4] is another task-specific pretrained model on legal contracts. We make use of LegalBERT representations in our work.

## 3. Method

The problem of clause recommendation can be modeled as a controlled text generation problem  $P(y|context)$  in which we generate a clause  $y$  given some contextual representation  $context$ . The  $context$  representation can be modeled by making use of the inputs that can be made available from an incomplete version of the contract being drafted. Since a contract is essentially a collection of clauses, the representation of a contract can be obtained by averaging the representation of each  $clause$  in the contract. The average representation serves as the contract-specific contextual input. Thus for a contract having  $n_{clause}$  clauses, we can use a sequence encoder to get the representation of each clause before averaging to get the contract representation.

$$contract = \frac{\sum_{clause} Encoder(clause)}{n_{clause}} \quad (1)$$

The type of a legal clause is highly indicative of the clause since clauses under a single type are similar to each other. So, the clause type representation  $clause\_type$  can be considered indicative in determining the characteristic text of the clause to be generated. For calculating this representation, we consider the library of all the clauses,  $N_{clause\_type}$  occurring under the concerned clause type and compute an average of the individual clause embeddings.

$$clause\_type = \frac{\sum_{clause} Encoder(clause)}{N_{clause\_type}} \quad (2)$$

The *contract* representation can be used to retrieve  $k$  most similar contracts (*sim\_contracts*) from an index of all the contract representations. Each of the retrieved  $k$  contracts can be used to provide additional context in two ways:

(1) *full\_sim\_contr*: Using the representations calculated for an entire contract and averaging over all  $k$  contracts

$$full\_sim\_contr = (\sum_{sim\_contract \in sim\_contracts} [\sum_{clause \in sim\_contract} \frac{\sum_{clause} Encoder(clause)}{n_{clause}}]) / k \quad (3)$$

(2) *clause\_sim\_contr*: Using only the representation of the clauses of clause type  $t$  for which we need a clause recommendation. Here, we average the per-contract representations calculated for the clauses of the specified type before averaging over the  $k$  contracts.

$$clause\_sim\_contr = (\sum_{sim\_contract \in sim\_contracts} [\frac{\sum_{clause \in sim\_contract} \mathbb{1}\{clause \in t\} \cdot Encoder(clause)}{\sum_{clause \in sim\_contract} \mathbb{1}\{clause \in t\}}]) / k \quad (4)$$

By making use of these representations, we compute the *context* vector in the following ways:

1. ONLY\_CONTR: Using only the *contract* representation tries to predict the clause in a clause type agnostic setting, i.e., the model has no information of which particular clause type it has to recommend a clause, making the task more difficult since the model has to predict the topic as well as the underlying content, and thus results in much poorer performance as compared to clause type aware outputs.

$$context = contract \quad (5)$$

2. CONTR\_TYPE: This was the methodology adopted in ClauseRec and that takes into account both - *contract* as well as *clause\_type* representations.

$$context = (contract + clause\_type) / 2 \quad (6)$$

3. CONTR\_FULLSIM: In this experiment performed in a clause type agnostic setting, we complement the *contract* representation with the *full\_sim\_contr* to see the effect of similar contract representation when the clause type is not known.

$$context = [contract ; full\_sim\_contr] \quad (7)$$

Here,  $[\cdot ; \cdot]$  indicates concatenation of the vectors.

4. CONTR\_TYPE\_FULLSIM: The original ClauseRec representation is augmented with *full\_sim\_contr*.

$$context = [(contract + clause\_type) / 2 ; full\_sim\_contr] \quad (8)$$

- CONTR\_TYPE\_CLAUSESIM: Since we are aware of the clause type of clause to generate, *clause\_sim\_contr* is used of to see if more specific information can help generate better clauses.

$$context = [(contract + clause\_type)/2 ; clause\_sim\_contr] \quad (9)$$

Once we have the strategy for computing the *context* vector, a language model with trainable parameters  $\theta$  is trained to condition on this representation by minimizing the negative log-likelihood loss between the predicted and the expected output tokens.

$$l_{gen} = -\log[p(y | context, \theta)] \quad (10)$$

#### 4. Experimentation

This section explains our filtering and re-purposing of the LEDGAR dataset, experiments with encoder models, different values of  $k$  for similar contract retrieval, and metrics chosen for evaluation.

**Dataset.** We re-purpose the LEDGAR [1] dataset for multilabel clause type identification for our task. The dataset in its cleaned version consists of 60,540 contracts having 846,274 clauses from 12,608 different types. We filter the dataset first to eliminate all contracts with less than five clauses present, resulting in 34,442 contracts, following which we select the top 15 clause types for analyzing the generation. The selected clause types, along with their clause counts and length information, can be seen in Table 1.

Clause type	# clauses	mean length	std length
governing laws	15291	103.00	104.80
amendments	12571	127.19	119.26
entire agreements	11023	98.01	64.50
counterparts	10415	80.47	55.49
notices	9726	148.20	105.62
waivers	8945	133.93	107.43
severability	8776	107.72	61.93
expenses	8365	138.66	119.72
successors	8184	116.60	87.98
survival	6102	89.14	84.58
assigns	6099	106.94	82.61
assignments	5976	127.23	95.94
representations	5373	136.16	102.57
warranties	5320	138.06	138.13
taxes	5184	164.87	126.78

**Table 1.** Distribution of the selected clause types from LEDGAR.

**Encoders.** Considering the domain-specific nature of English in legal contracts, directly using transformer encoder models pretrained on generic corpora would not yield good results, as remarked in [2]. We experimented across three models - LegalBERT [9] trained on diverse legal texts (LegalBERT-all), LegalBERT trained only on US con-

tracts from EDGAR (LegalBERT-contracts), and a further pretrained version of BERT [10] on our task-specific data using masked language modeling objective (BERT-mlm). The further pretrained BERT model was pretrained for two epochs on the clauses in LEDGAR data. Unlike the previous work, we did not pretrain a ContractBERT model due to computational limitations and focused on using existing large pretrained models available. base versions of all the BERT-based models were used in the experiments performed. To determine the best encoder model for representation, we trained using the representations from these three models on CONTR\_TYPE, CONTR\_TYPE\_FULLLSIM and CONTR\_TYPE\_CLAUSESIM strategies, the results of which are shown in Table 2.

Encoder	Strategy					
	CONTR_TYPE		CONTR_TYPE_FULLLSIM		CONTR_CLAUSESIM	
	ROUGE-L	BLEU	ROUGE-L	BLEU	ROUGE-L	BLEU
BERT-mlm	38.39	22.46	38.50	22.33	38.33	21.49
LegalBERT-contracts	38.31	21.53	38.89	22.01	37.45	20.63
LegalBERT-all	<b>38.75</b>	<b>22.96</b>	<b>39.28</b>	<b>22.69</b>	<b>38.85</b>	<b>23.33</b>

**Table 2.** Performance of encoder models on 3 strategies: CONTR\_TYPE, CONTR\_TYPE\_FULLLSIM, CONTR\_CLAUSESIM.

LegalBERT trained on diverse legal corpora was consistently observed to outperform the other two models and was chosen as the base encoder for all subsequent experiments.

**Indexing.** An HNSW [11] index of the precomputed contract representations was built using FAISS [12] indexing library, and a similarity search was performed using L2 distance. Care was taken to eliminate the contract for which the recommended clause is not in retrieved contracts, and the similar contract representation was averaged on the rest. Because of this consideration, the minimum value of  $k$  was kept as 2.

To understand the number of retrieved similar contracts needed to build a suitable context, the experiments were conducted by varying values of  $k$  from 2 to 12 in steps of 2 for CONTR\_TYPE\_FULLLSIM strategy. Not much variance in the text generations scores was observed, with the BLEU and ROUGE-L metrics staying more or less around the same values. The value of  $k$  was fixed to 6 for subsequent experiments.

**Model.** A transformer decoder [13] with three layers was trained from scratch across all the experiments, following the setting in ClauseRec. A wordpiece tokenizer was trained on output clauses with a vocabulary size of 8192 tokens. For the final experiments, all the decoder models were trained for 50 epochs using AdamW [14] optimization with a learning rate schedule having 25% warmup up to  $6e-5$  followed by linear decay. A batch size of 24 with accumulated gradients over three steps was used. Each of the experiments was performed using 2 RTX 2080 Ti GPUs.

Computing the input representations to the decoder was computationally heavy at training time, even without flowing gradients through the encoders for backpropagation. One epoch took approximately 17 hours on a single GPU, most of which was spent calculating the input representation. This prohibitively high time severely restricted the number of experiments that could be performed on our computational resources. Hence, to fasten the decoder training process, we serialized all the representations to be used prior to the experiment, which reduced the per-epoch per-GPU duration to less than 30 min.

**Metrics.** Commonly used text generation metrics ROUGE [15] and BLEU [16] were used to evaluate the system’s performance. ROUGE, a recall-oriented metric, can be used

to indicate how many of the necessary legal phrases are generated in clauses while BLEU is indicative of the precision of the phrases. Human evaluation was not performed due to practical constraints in obtaining domain-specific experts for clause comprehension.

## 5. Results

Strategy	Clause type / Overall	ROUGE			BLEU		
		ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BLEU-1	BLEU-2	BLEU
ONLY_CONTR	governing laws	38.44	18.89	30.55	14.84	11.46	10.22
	amendments	33.25	13.78	24.35	15.78	12.45	12.18
	entire agreements	34.26	13.68	25.13	10.88	10.12	9.60
	Overall	34.94	15.08	25.52	13.49	12.23	11.32
CONTR_TYPE	governing laws	52.92	37.78	46.38	47.90	33.04	31.32
	amendments	37.98	20.38	31.72	14.16	8.43	8.01
	entire agreements	48.48	28.49	40.78	26.28	15.02	13.53
	Overall	47.93	29.20	38.75	39.01	24.26	22.96
CONTR_FULLLSIM	governing laws	40.57	22.11	33.48	27.45	15.24	14.70
	amendments	28.62	7.85	19.23	20.13	6.58	5.61
	entire agreements	23.78	5.25	16.12	10.97	2.41	1.25
	Overall	31.45	12.43	23.30	21.06	8.60	8.14
CONTR_TYPE_FULLLSIM	governing laws	54.27	38.07	47.00	50.60	34.27	32.37
	amendments	41.35	23.86	34.74	20.72	13.19	12.78
	entire agreements	49.21	29.68	41.57	24.85	15.14	13.94
	Overall	<b>48.38</b>	<b>29.72</b>	<b>39.26</b>	<b>39.04</b>	<b>24.39</b>	<b>23.05</b>
CONTR_TYPE_CLAUSESIM	governing laws	52.66	36.62	45.89	47.84	33.24	31.66
	amendments	40.54	21.42	32.12	24.37	14.63	14.16
	entire agreements	49.79	30.17	42.00	28.21	17.58	16.26
	Overall	47.75	29.30	38.85	39.12	24.60	23.33

**Table 3.** Clause recommendation results across all the strategies tried out shown for top 3 clause types (based on no. of clauses) and overall metrics calculated on all the types.

Table 3 shows the metrics across all the strategies for the top 3 clause types (based on the no. of clauses in the dataset) and the overall scores computed for clauses for all the 15 clause types.


From the results, it can be easily observed that similar contracts with clause type and input contract provide the best contextual representation among the strategies tried. However, the strategy excluding similar contract representation performs competitively with the former. In a clause-type agnostic setting, the problem becomes much more difficult with modest ROUGE scores and dismal BLEU scores indicating a high amount of hallucinated, irrelevant content. Unlike clause type aware setting, the augmentation of similar contract information does not help, with an observed degradation in model output.

Among the top 3 clause types shown, the highest values are achieved by *governing laws* followed by *entire agreements* and *amendment* for most cases. The relatively less value of BLEU scores indicates that models struggle to produce content with a high precision, and thus may have a substantial amount of hallucinated or irrelevant content.

## 6. Analysis


We conduct analysis based on the generation of clauses from the best performing CONTR\_TYPE\_FULLSIM strategy.

The performance of clause generation across all the 15 clause types on BLEU and ROUGE-L scores can be seen in Figure 2. The clause types *successors* and *counterparts* have the highest BLEU and ROUGE-L scores, respectively. It can be observed that the clause types with generally higher BLEU (*governing laws*, *counterparts*, *successors*) scores follow suit in ROUGE-L scores, and those performing poorly in terms of BLEU (*amendments*, *representations*, *warranties*, *taxes*) have poor ROUGE-L scores.



**Figure 2.** Variation of BLEU and ROUGE score across all 15 clause types considered using the CONTR\_TYPE\_FULLSIM


In Figure 3, we plot the TSNE representations of the actual and generated clauses for a subset of 1000 randomly sampled clauses from our test set. We use LegalBERT-all for encoding the clauses, followed by dimensionality reduction to obtain the plot. The plot showcases the semantic closeness of the actual and generated clauses based on the closeness of the two distributions.



**Figure 3.** TSNE plot comparing the representations obtained for clause generated by the CONTR\_TYPE\_FULLSIM strategy against actual clauses



We show examples of a few generated clauses by the model in Figure 4. Based on the comparison with their expected counterparts, we can appreciate the ability of the model to generate characteristic clause content based on the type of clause. The exactness of the clause is not guaranteed here, as the model may generate semantically equivalent content deemed to be an equally valid clause, such as “this release” v/s “this agreement.” Tailoring clauses to bear exact phrasal content can entail incorporating keyword-level information as future work.



**Figure 4.** Examples of generated clauses in comparison to their expected (actual) counterparts using the CONTR.TYPE.FULLSIM strategy

One issue we would like to point out in the current generation is the tendency of the model to typically generate verbose clauses, which might have resulted from optimization on the training objective to include as many valid phrases as possible in a clause. As seen in Table 4, the mean and median lengths of generated clauses are far more than the actual clauses. The Pearson correlation coefficient between the two length distributions turned out to be 0.36, indicating a weak correlation. Reducing such extraneous content in generated clauses will work towards finer clause generation.

	mean	std	median
actual	88.05	88.54	54.0
generated	108.02	84.14	84.0

**Table 4.** Statistics of generated and actual clause lengths

## 7. Conclusion & Future scope

In this work, we explored the problem of clause recommendation by experimenting with several strategies for modeling the contextual input for recommendation and observed the effectiveness of similar contract representation in a clause-type aware setting. While decent results are obtained in this paradigm, the clause type agnostic setting remains a complex problem to solve and is more relevant for scaling clause recommendation to a broader set of clauses. With the considerably large size of contractual documents, fu-

ture work can explore tackling the cold start problem in clause recommendation (i.e., recommending clause without prior contract state as context) and allowing for disentangling and customization of named entities in recommended clauses. Future work can also achieve robustness by handling a more diverse range and a larger number of clause types compared to the 15 clause topics we focus on.

## References

- [1] Tuggenen, D, Däniken, P, Peetz, T, Cieliebak, M LEDGAR: A Large-Scale Multi-label Corpus for Text Classification of Legal Provisions in Contracts. In Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference 2020 (pp. 1235–1241). European Language Resources Association.
- [2] Aggarwal, V, Garimella, A, Srinivasan, B, N, A, Jain, R ClauseRec: A Clause Recommendation Framework for AI-aided Contract Authoring. In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing 2021 (pp. 8770–8776). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [3] Chalkidis, I, Androutsopoulos, I, Michos, A Extracting Contract Elements. In Proceedings of the 16th Edition of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law 2017 (pp. 19–28). Association for Computing Machinery.
- [4] Leivaditi, S, Rossi, J, Kanoulas, E. A Benchmark for Lease Contract Review.
- [5] Marco Lippi, Przemyslaw Palka, Giuseppe Contissa, Francesca Lagioia, Hans-Wolfgang Micklitz, Giovanni Sartor, Paolo Torroni. "CLAUDETTE: an automated detector of potentially unfair clauses in online terms of service". *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 2019; 27(2):117–139.
- [6] Kubeka, S, Ade-Ibijola, A. "Automatic Comprehension and Summarisation of Legal Contracts". *Advances in Science, Technology and Engineering Systems Journal* 2021; 6(2):19–28.
- [7] Borchmann, L, Wisniewski, D, Gretkowski, A, Kosmala, I, Jurkiewicz, D, Szalkiewicz, , Palka, G, Kaczmarek, K, Kaliska, A, Gralinski F. "Contract Discovery: Dataset and a Few-Shot Semantic Retrieval Challenge with Competitive Baselines". In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020 2020 (pp. 4254–4268). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [8] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Anya Chen, Spencer Ball. "CUAD: An Expert-Annotated NLP Dataset for Legal Contract Review". *NeurIPS* 2021.
- [9] Chalkidis, I, Fergadiotis, M, Malakasiotis, P, Aletras, N, Androutsopoulos, I. "LEGAL-BERT: The Muppets straight out of Law School". In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020 2020 (pp. 2898–2904). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [10] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova. "BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding".
- [11] Malkov, Y, Yashunin, D. "Efficient and Robust Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search Using Hierarchical Navigable Small World Graphs". *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 2020; 42(4):824–836.
- [12] Johnson, J, Douze, M, Jegou, H. "Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs". *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* 2019; 7(3):535–547.
- [13] Vaswani, A, Shazeer, N, Parmar, N, Uszkoreit, J, Jones, L, Gomez, A, Kaiser, Polosukhin, I. "Attention is All You Need". In Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017 (pp. 6000–6010). Curran Associates Inc..
- [14] Ilya Loshchilov, Frank Hutter. "Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization". In *ICLR* 2019 .
- [15] Lin, CY ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out* 2004 (pp. 74–81). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [16] Papineni, K, Roukos, S, Ward, T, Zhu, WJ BLEU: A Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. In Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics 2002 (pp. 311–318). Association for Computational Linguistics.