

Addressing Information Asymmetry in Legal Disputes through Data-Driven Law Firm Rankings

Alexandre Mojon^a, Robert Mahari^{b,c}, Sandro Claudio Lera^{†b,d}

^aUniversity of St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland

^bMassachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

^cHarvard Law School, Cambridge, USA

^dSouthern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, China

Abstract

Legal disputes are on the rise, contributing to growing litigation costs. Parties in these disputes must select a law firm to represent them, however, public rankings of law firms are based on reputation and, we find, have little correlation with actual litigation outcomes, giving parties with more experience and inside knowledge an advantage. To enable litigants to make informed decisions, we present a novel dataset of 310,876 U.S. civil lawsuits and we apply an algorithm that generalizes the Bradley-Terry model to assess law firm effectiveness. We find that our outcome-based ranking system better accounts for future performance than traditional reputation-based rankings, which often fail to reflect future legal performance. Moreover, this predictability decays to zero as the number of interactions between law firms increases, providing new evidence to the long-standing debate about whether litigation win rates approach 50% as information asymmetry diminishes. By prioritizing empirical results, our approach aims to provide a more equitable assessment of law firm quality, challenging existing prestige-focused metrics, and levels the playing field between litigants.

Introduction

Litigation costs are on the rise [1]. Meanwhile, most widely used law firm rankings such as the Vault Law 100 are based on law firm reputation, rather than on empirical litigation outcomes. This makes it challenging to litigants to select the best firm for their case, or to assess value-for-money, especially when they do not have experience from prior litigation. Against this backdrop, legal scholars have begun examining the degree to which the choice of lawyer affects litigation outcomes [2], finding that in most instances clients represented by a lawyer experience better outcomes.

Not only do litigants represented by an attorney fare better in court, but the quality of representation also matters. The quality of legal representation, and thus, the likelihood of success in legal proceedings, is significantly shaped by the information asymmetry regarding the experience and capabilities of engaged law firms [3]. This information gap bestows a marked advantage on those who possess the knowledge and financial means to identify and engage legal representatives that are equipped with the relevant resources to adeptly maneuver through the complexities of the legal system [2, 4]. For example, in asylum cases empirical evidence suggests that individuals with better attorneys have a higher probability of prevailing [5]. It remains unclear to what extent public reputation-based law firm rankings capture the true quality of law firms and, if they fail to do so, whether litigants with access to non-

public information about lawyer’s performance enjoy an advantage. However, prior research as a whole suggests that the justice system favors those with access to information and higher socioeconomic status, rather than those with stronger legal merits to their cases. [6–8].

To mitigate the disparities in legal representation and to provide an objective perspective on law firm quality, a ranking grounded in objective outcomes is imperative. Such a ranking would provide all litigants with the information needed to make informed decisions when selecting legal representation or in deciding on litigation strategies. As we show, common law firm rankings that emphasize prestige and revenue, do not necessarily correlate with the outcomes achieved for clients. This focus not only obscures the true skill of legal counsel but also perpetuates feedback loops where financially affluent firms attract more clients based on their ranking, thereby amplifying their prestige and financial success [9].

In light of these considerations, we leverage a novel dataset of U.S. civil lawsuits to derive a more objective ranking system based on observed case outcomes. This methodology shifts the focus from reputation and operational metrics to the actual effectiveness of legal representation, as evidenced by the results achieved in court. By prioritizing outcomes over subjective factors, our ranking approach seeks to highlight law firms that deliver better results, thereby offering a more meaningful assessment of legal excellence.

Central to our methodology is the construction of a comprehensive dataset that amalgamates several pre-existing data sources and extracts pertinent information from judges’ published decisions. Our dataset encompasses detailed informa-

[†]Corresponding author: slera@mit.edu.

The authors declare no competing interest.




Figure 1: We observe N lawsuits in form of judges’ detailed textual decisions (‘opinions’). From each opinion, we extract information about case type, case outcome and law firms involved. We interpret each lawsuit as a ‘game’ in which the defendant’s law firm ‘plays’ against the plaintiff’s, and either wins or loses. We assume that each of the five case types has its own defendant bias (‘home field advantage’) ϵ_t which is a measure of the a priori likelihood that the defendant wins the case for case type t . Each law firm is assumed to have a latent score, or skill, which we infer from the observed outcomes. The probability that defendant law firm B with score S_B is favored over plaintiff law firm A with score S_A is a sigmoid function of $(S_B + \epsilon) - S_A$. In other words: the larger the bias adjusted score of B relative to A , the more likely that law firm B wins the case. Based on these assumptions, we run an expectation maximization algorithm to infer the latent rankings $\{S\}$ that most likely generate the observed outcomes.

tion on 310,876 U.S. civil lawsuit cases in U.S. Federal District Courts, including the names of the law firms representing plaintiffs and defendants, respectively, alongside the case outcome, that is whether the plaintiff or defendant won the case. We interpret this data as a set of ‘games’ (lawsuits) in which two ‘teams’ (the plaintiff’s and defendant’s law firm, respectively) compete against each other, and one of them wins. We generalize a ranking algorithm designed for heterogeneous pairwise zero-sum interactions [10] by also accounting for ‘home field advantage’ (the defendant is more likely to win [11]). Applying this algorithm to the data allows us to estimate a latent ranking of law firms that maximizes the likelihood of observed outcomes (Figure 1). We find that this data-driven rating bears no significant correlation with existing rankings of law firms, but that it is able to predict the outcome of future lawsuits with up to 10% higher accuracy than predictions based on official rankings. Moreover, this predictability converges to 50% as the number of interactions between law firms increases. This provides new evidence related to the long-standing debate about whether the winning probability of cases brought to trial approaches 50% in the limit of vanishing information asymmetry [12–14].

In summary, we present an outcome-based law firm ranking system and demonstrate that this objective approach predicts

case outcomes with significantly higher accuracy than existing prestige-focused rankings, thereby challenging traditional metrics and paving the way towards a more equitable legal system.

Results

A Dataset of Zero-Sum Law Games

We ground our ranking of law firms in a novel dataset of 310,876 civil lawsuits in U.S. federal courts. This dataset sets itself apart from prior work by focusing not just on the presence or absence of legal representation but also including the identity of the law firms [2]. In addition, while most prior studies focus on disputes involving individuals and relatively small amounts in controversy such as small claims court [15], family law [16], and housing law [17]), our dataset covers a wide range of disputes from civil rights and torts to large commercial disputes. We base our data on a repository of digitized judicial opinions provided by the Case Law Access Project which provides U.S. Federal District Court opinions dating back to 1880. These opinions are unstructured text, but they contain information about case types and case outcomes which are extracted by fine-tuning a transformer language model [18]. Five case types are distinguished (civil rights, contracts, labor, torts and ‘other’)

which vary in their observed frequency (Table 1). The case outcome is a binary decision variable equal to 1 if the plaintiff has won the case and 0 otherwise. In addition to the previously extracted case types and outcomes [18], we identify the law firms for the plaintiffs and defendants from the opinions (see Methods). This yields a new dataset containing information involving 85,502 individual law firms across 310,876 trials along with information on which law firm won and lost each case as well as case type.

We use this dataset to compare the performance across law firms. Naively, one can compute each law firm’s overall win rate. However, this baseline has at least two limitations: First, there is an intrinsic bias towards the defendant winning the case (analogous to a ‘home field advantage’ in sports) [11, 18, 19]. Hence, a win for the plaintiff is not to be weighted the same as a win for the defendant. Second, there are different case types (analogous to ‘rules of the game’) and the baseline defendant win rate varies with case type (Table 1). While law firms tend to specialize to some extent, they engage in cases of different case types, and therefore wins have to be counted across different types. We next propose a ranking method that adequately accounts for these biases.

Type	Fraction	Win Rate	Specialization
Torts	17.5%	73.2%	11.8%
Contract	14.4%	60.2%	15.9%
Civil Rights	9.4%	79.4%	13.1%
Labor	5.9%	66.9%	5.6%
Other	52.7%	71.7%	27.8%

Table 1: Summary statistics across five case types. (Column 1) Total fraction of cases corresponding to this case type. (Column 2) Average defendant win rate for this case type. (Column 3) Fraction of law firms which specialize in only this case type.

Ranking of Law Firms

Consider a scenario where entities engage in pairwise interactions (‘games’) with a winner and a loser, such as in sport tournaments, or, in our case, lawsuits. The results of these interactions are tracked, and the goal is to rank the entities from best to worst. This ranking is complicated by the fact that each interaction typically involves a source of ‘noise’ or ‘luck’, such that superior competitors might lose, and inferior ones might win [20]. A well-known approach to this problem is the probabilistic Bradley-Terry model which assumes that the probability that entity A beats entity B is proportional to the difference in their ranking [21]. This model has been extended to account for different interaction types [10], which is important for our application where we consider outcomes across different case types. For instance, if law firm A is more highly ranked than law firm B, in one case type, for example civil rights, A would generally prevail, whereas in another type of case the outcome might be much more random. A crucial distinction of our problem over typical games is that one party has a strong ‘home field advantage’, in the sense that, on average, the defendant is much more likely to win (Table 1). We thus extend the class of

ranking algorithms to account for both multiple types of interactions (case types) as well as game asymmetry due to defendant bias (see Methods). Henceforth, we refer to this method as the asymmetric, heterogeneous pairwise interactions (AHPI) ranking algorithm.




Figure 2: We compare our AHPI scores with three widely used firm rankings: Vault 100, ALM’s Global 200 and Embroker Top 300. The comparison includes 30 law firms which are common across all four rankings. A point close to the periphery means a higher rank than one closer to the center. As visually apparent and indicated by the low correlation coefficients in the ‘Correlation’ column, there are significant differences between AHPI scores and other rankings. Accordingly, the success of these rankings in predicting the outcome of new cases is varied (‘Accuracy’ column), with AHPI yielding highest accuracy.

The AHPI algorithm is a Bayesian expectation maximization with a logistic prior over the scores (see Methods). It takes as input K data points in form of K binary outcomes of K asymmetric games that have been played between pairs of N entities. The game is asymmetric in the sense that, in case their ratings are equal, party 1 (the defendant, ‘the home team’) has an a priori higher chance of winning than party 2 (the plaintiff). There is a total of M game types (cases types, ‘rules’), and each game type is characterized by a different baseline probability for party 1 to win over party 2 if the former has a higher rank than the latter.

We apply the AHPI ranking algorithm to our data to estimate latent rankings for the law firms. To put this ranking into perspective, we compare it against three public and widely used rankings: *Vault Law 100*, *ALM’s Global 200* and *Embroker Top 300* from the year 2022. While the three rankings differ in their

methodology, none of them use litigation data but instead they use a combination of extraneous factors such as reputation or headcount growth (see SI Appendix for details). Figure 2 compares the AHPI against the three official rankings for the 30 firms that appear in all rankings. The correlations, ranging from 3% to 23%, are rather small and call into question the methodologies behind existing rankings (see Discussion).

Rank-Based Prediction of Trial Outcomes




Figure 3: The predicted probabilities that the defendant’s law firm wins the case are assigned to one of four bins of similar magnitude. (top) Number of out-of-sample cases for which we predict the outcome. (bottom) For the data within each bin, we show along the y-axis the out-of-sample accuracy of case outcome predictions. Error bars are obtained as standard deviations from bootstrapping 100 times. The horizontal line represent performance of the naive benchmark prediction ‘defendant always wins’.

An important part of an attorney’s role is to predict the likely outcome of litigation, and these predictions have been subject to theoretical and empirical investigations [12–14]. The rise of big data and machine learning have further advanced this field towards systematic, data-driven predictions where algorithms evaluate the viability of lawsuits for strategic purposes [22–24]. These prediction methodologies have found practical application in the industry, notably within the burgeoning field of litigation finance where portfolios of lawsuits are systematically investigated for their potential returns [19, 25].

We thus examine whether our law firm rankings can help predict litigation outcomes. To this end, we use 80% of our data to generate the rankings and reserve the remainder as test data. We then predict the outcome of a case from the test data as a function of the difference in the relevant law firm scores and the case type. Concretely, once fitted, the AHPI algorithm maps the difference in scores to a probability that the defendant will prevail via sigmoid function (Methods). In other words, the larger the difference in scores, the more certain we are about which party will win the case. We therefore group our predictions into different bins of defendant winning probabilities (Figure 3). The naive prediction that the defendant always wins serves

as benchmark. For most cases, the model predicts that the defendant wins with high probability, reflecting the bias against plaintiffs. We note that our model outperforms the baseline for these cases. Our model also achieves superior performance for cases with low predicted probability that the defendant wins (albeit with higher error due to a lower number of samples).

We further compare the performance of our ranking against that of the three official ones (Figure 2, top). To make the results comparable, we down-sample the test-data to be balanced for each ranking such that there is an equal number of cases that are lost and won by the plaintiff, respectively. When the model predicts a defendant winning probability greater or equal to 50%, we count this as a prediction that the defendant will win. We notice that all three existing rankings fail to outperform the naive baseline of a random guess that achieves 50% accuracy. By contrast, our ranking offers significantly superior performance, with an excess predictability of roughly 2% across all predictions. This suggests that the data-driven ranking allows us to make superior predictions about litigation outcomes on the basis of the law firms alone.

As a byproduct of the fitted law firm scores, we also fit valence probabilities which can be qualitatively interpreted as the degree of relevance of the law firm scores. A minimal valence probability of 0.5 indicates that the scores of the law firm have no influence on the case outcome, whereas the valence probability close to 1 indicates a strong influence (see Methods). Our results indicate consistently high valence probabilities, thereby further validating anecdotal and empirical evidence of the importance of a good lawyer [3, 5].

Asymptotic Unpredictability




Figure 4: The Q -factor measures the average number of interactions per law firm in a given subset of our data. The higher the Q -factor, the more frequent the average number of interactions among the law firms. We observe empirically that an increase in Q leads to a decrease in accuracy (averaged across case types) for both our predictions and the naive benchmark ‘the defendant always wins’.

The set of cases brought to courts represents a small fraction of legal disputes, with the vast majority being resolved through private settlements which are not reflected in our data [26]. This

selective nature of litigation data underscores a pivotal question in legal studies: what motivates parties to choose the courtroom over the negotiating table? A foundational litigation model posits that defendant and plaintiff win rates should converge to 50% [12]. This equilibrium theory suggests that any significant deviation from this probability would incentivize one of the parties to opt for a settlement, aiming to avoid the uncertainty and costs of a trial.

Empirical evidence supporting this hypothesis has been elusive as plaintiff win rates have tended to decline over time [14, 19, 27]. This in turn has prompted scholars to explore alternative explanations that incorporate factors like information asymmetry to better align with observed outcomes [13, 28, 29]. A first-order representation of these models is as follows: A case is assumed to have a certain *merit* $y > 0$, which can roughly be interpreted as the expected value that would be awarded if the plaintiff wins. The plaintiff’s and the defendant’s law firms do not directly observe this merit; rather, each party makes estimates that are subject to errors and noise such as incomplete information and misinterpretations of the law. It is assumed that the plaintiff estimates a merit $Y_p = y_p$ where Y_p is a (normally) distributed random variable with expected value y and standard deviation σ_p . Similarly, the defendant estimates a merit $Y_d = y_d$ where Y_d is a random variable that is distributed with expected value y and standard deviation σ_d . Whether a case is brought to court depends on Y_p, Y_d , as well as other aspects of the case such as case costs. Prior theoretical work shows that win rates only tend to 50% for a fairly general class of modeling parameters in the limit where both σ_p and σ_d converge to zero, that is both parties estimate the same case merit [30].

Our research contributes to this discourse by offering insights that may bridge the gap between the theoretical model and empirical realities: We find that in the limit of a large number of repeated law firms interactions, predictability indeed converges towards 50%. To make this more concrete, we define the Q -factor of a given subset of cases as the average number of observed cases per law firm. Recall that we work with 310,876 cases across 85,502 law firms. Because some cases contain multiple law firms on the plaintiff or defendant side, we end up with a total of 368,970 pairwise interactions. The Q -factor of our entire dataset is thus equal to 4.3. By systematically removing law firms with low number of observed interactions, we can systematically reduce our dataset while increasing its Q -factor (see Methods). For a given dataset with given Q -factor, we fit the law firm scores on training data and predict the outcome of lawsuits on test data. The outcome of this analysis is depicted in Figure 4: As Q increases, the predictability of case outcomes converges towards 50%. Because a high Q -factor means large number of observed cases, one can interpret the Q -factor as a proxy for average law firm experience, and thus a better ability to estimate case merit. As such our findings reconcile empirical and theoretical findings on win rate convergence: Empirical win rates tend towards 50% when law firms have sufficient experience to accurately assess case merit.

Discussion

Limited data availability stands in the way of large-scale quantitative analyses of legal systems, including the study of law firm impact [31]. We overcome this limitation by extracting information from unstructured judicial opinions to develop a novel dataset on empirical law firm performance for civil lawsuits in U.S. federal district courts. This data enables us to establish an empirical ranking of U.S. law firms focused on litigation success rather than conventional metrics of reputation or prestige. We find that existing rankings bear little connection to actual attorney performance, while the data-driven rankings we obtain correlate with attorney success.

The application of our ranking approach offers practical benefits, particularly in enhancing decision-making capabilities for litigants. It provides a quantitative basis for selecting law firms and devising litigation strategies, supporting more informed decisions such as whether to settle a case based on the litigation strength of the opposing law firm. Although well-resourced litigants may already possess a qualitative understanding of law firm performance, our approach democratizes access to these insights, making them available more broadly and equitably. This shift could transform how parties engage with legal representation and influence broader legal strategy dynamics. We find that existing rankings, which are based on reputation and other extraneous factors, do not capture litigation success. Our finding parallels similar results for physician rankings, which were shown to bear little correlation with the *US News & World Report* medical school ranking [32].

Our finding that prediction accuracies approach 50% as the number of observed interactions increases also sheds light on prior work on plaintiff win-rates. Specifically, [12] hypothesize that as parties’ error in estimating case merit diminishes, plaintiff and defendant trial win rates should tend toward 50%. This hypothesis has generated a large amount of academic debate that seeks to test the hypothesis both theoretically and empirically [30, 33, 34]. Our work provides some additional evidence in support of the hypothesis: The hypothesis focuses on cases where the uncertainty in the case merit approaches zero (and thus both sides have a similar assessment of case merit). In our dataset, we observe that the larger the Q -factor, that is the more experience the relevant law firms possess, the lower the predictability of the outcome. Interpreting a larger number of previous interactions as a proxy for the skill of assessing case-merit, our empirical evidence is consistent with the prediction that the empirical plaintiff win rate approaches 50% in the limit of mutual certainty about case merit.

Although we study over 300,000 cases spanning many decades, our reliance on published judicial opinions means that non-public settlements cannot be captured. While it is extremely difficult to obtain data on private legal disputes, legal scholars have suggested that court cases are generally representative of these private disputes [12, 35]. Nonetheless, an important extension of this work is to consider not just trial outcomes but also to measure the performance of law firms in other adversarial settings such as settlement negotiations. We restrict ourselves to U.S. federal data which we were able to

obtain for this study. However, an important extension to our work would replicate our ranking approach in other jurisdictions. This would also allow us to gather more empirical data on the Priest and Klein hypothesis in non-U.S. jurisdictions, which remain under-explored in this context [36].

We initially leverage our dataset for law firm rankings without considering factors such as individual judges or the differences between judicial circuits. While we believe this approach provides valuable new insights, we also hope to invite future work that provides more fine grained rankings to allow litigants to make choices based on their specific context. The market for law firms tends to operate on national levels, but there is an increasing number of multinational firms and thus a ranking could assess law firm’s defendant bias by comparing the performance of national to international firms. We treat litigation outcomes as binary, however, not all trial wins are equal and so an important extension would focus on the size of settlements, ideally in proportion to process costs (which may be proxied by case duration [19]). Relatedly, we do not consider a law firm’s cost or fee arrangement. While data on this may be challenging to obtain, future work could focus on other aspects of law firm excellence such as value-for-money, rather than just its performance. It would be especially interesting to explore whether firms that achieve higher performance are able to charge outsized fees (the low correlation between our ranking and pre-existing reputation-based/profit-based rankings provides some initial evidence that this is not the case). Our approach does not currently capture other data that could be readily extracted from judicial opinions or other filings such as the presiding judge, procedural history, or precedential citations and these factors could be used to inform a more fine-grained ranking. While we focus on civil cases files in federal district courts because trial outcomes at higher courts can be more complex to interpret (for example, cases are frequently remanded back to district courts). We focus on civil litigation because criminal cases are brought by the government, rather than another party represented by a law firm. Nonetheless, extending our ranking approach to higher courts and criminal cases represent important extensions of this work. Finally, our methodology may be extended to non-legal contexts such as political races or lobbying, or it may be generalized to games involving most then two parties such as agents competing for clients or auction settings.

Conclusions

We construct a rich new dataset based on open source data of U.S. trials, from which we derive a novel empirically grounded ranking of law firms. We find that this ranking outperforms widely used reputation based or profit oriented rankings in predicting case outcomes. This ranking’s structure allows us to predict trial outcomes with accuracies significantly exceeding benchmark predictions from official rankings. Our results provide a more meritocratic approach to law firm rankings that allow all litigants to make more informed decisions in selecting law firms, leveling the playing field for less experienced parties. Finally, our results shed light on the long-standing Priest and Klein hypothesis by showing that predicted win-rates for more

experienced firms tend to 50%, suggesting that these firms may be able to more accurately estimate case merit.

Data Availability

Source data for our work is based on [18] and augmented by identifying and disambiguating law firms and their roles. The data to reproduce all results will be made available upon publication. The analyses and rankings we report may be reproduced by running the our software.

Code Availability

The code to reproduce all analysis from this paper can be found via GitHub at https://github.com/mojona/law_firm_ranking.

References

- [1] E. G. Lee, T. E. Willging, Defining the problem of cost in federal civil litigation, *Duke Law Journal* 60 (3) (2010) 765–788.
- [2] E. S. T. Poppe, J. J. Rachlinski, Do lawyers matter? the effect of legal representation in civil disputes, *Pepperdine Law Review* 43 (2015) 881.
- [3] J. Szmer, S. W. Johnson, T. A. Sarver, Does the lawyer matter? Influencing outcomes on the Supreme Court of Canada, *Law & Society Review* 41 (2) (2007) 279–304.
- [4] R. L. Sandefur, Elements of professional expertise: Understanding relational and substantive expertise through lawyers’ impact, *American Sociological Review* 80 (5) (2015) 909–933.
- [5] B. Miller, L. C. Keith, J. S. Holmes, Leveling the odds: The effect of quality legal representation in cases of asymmetrical capability, *Law & Society Review* 49 (1) (2015) 209–239.
- [6] M. G., Why the “Haves” Come out Ahead: Speculations on the Limits of Legal Change, *Law & Society Review* 9 (1) (1974) 95–160.
- [7] D. L. Rhode, *Access to Justice*, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [8] B. L. Garrett, *Convicting the innocent: Where criminal prosecutions go wrong*, Harvard University Press, 2011.
- [9] F. C. Zacharias, Effects of reputation on the legal profession, *Wash. & Lee L. Rev.* 65 (2008) 173.
- [10] M. E. J. Newman, Ranking with multiple types of pairwise comparisons, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* 478 (2266) (2022) 20220517.
- [11] T. Eisenberg, J. Goerd, B. Ostrom, D. Rottman, Litigation outcomes in state and federal courts: A statistical portrait, *Seattle University Law Review* 19 (1995) 433.
- [12] G. L. Priest, B. Klein, The Selection of Disputes for Litigation, *The Journal of Legal Studies* 13 (1) (1984) 1–55.
- [13] S. Shavell, Any frequency of plaintiff victory at trial is possible, *The Journal of Legal Studies* 25 (2) (1996) 493–501.
- [14] Y.-C. Chang, W. Hubbard, New empirical tests for classic litigation selection models: Evidence from a low settlement environment, *American Law and Economics Review* 23 (2) (2021) 348–394.
- [15] G. LaFree, C. Rack, The Effects of Participants’ Ethnicity and Gender on Monetary Outcomes in Mediated and Adjudicated Civil Cases, *Law & Society Review* 30 (4) (1996) 767–797.
- [16] E. E. Maccoby, R. H. Mnookin, *Dividing the child: Social and legal dilemmas of custody*, Harvard University Press, 1992.
- [17] P. Hannaford-Agor, N. Mott, Research on self-represented litigation: Preliminary results and methodological considerations, *Justice System Journal* 24 (2) (2003) 163–181.
- [18] R. Mahari, S. C. Lera, Quantifying Judicial Impartiality, Working Paper 1 (1) (2024).
- [19] S. C. Lera, R. Mahari, M. S. Strub, Litigation Finance at Trial: Model and Data, SSRN Working Paper (4091716) (2022).
- [20] M. Jerdee, M. E. J. Newman, Luck, skill, and depth of competition in games and social hierarchies, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04711 (2023).

- [21] R. A. Bradley, M. E. Terry, Rank Analysis of Incomplete Block Designs: I. The Method of Paired Comparisons, *Biometrika* 39 (3/4) (1952) 324–345.
- [22] T. W. Ruger, P. T. Kim, A. D. Martin, K. M. Quinn, The supreme court forecasting project: Legal and political science approaches to predicting supreme court decisionmaking, *Columbia law review* (2004) 1150–1210.
- [23] H. Zhong, Z. Guo, C. Tu, C. Xiao, Z. Liu, M. Sun, Legal judgment prediction via topological learning, in: *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2018, pp. 3540–3549.
- [24] M. Medvedeva, M. Vols, M. Wieling, Using machine learning to predict decisions of the European Court of Human Rights, *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 28 (2) (2020) 237–266.
- [25] J. T. Molot, Litigation Finance: A Market Solution to a Procedural Problem, *Geo. LJ* 99 (2010) 65.
- [26] J. J. Prescott, K. E. Spier, A comprehensive theory of civil settlement, *New York University Law Review* 91 (2016) 59.
- [27] A. D. Lahav, P. Siegelman, The Curious Incident of the Falling Win Rate: Individual vs System-Level Justification and the Rule of Law, *UC Davis Law Review* 52 (2018) 1371.
- [28] J. J. Prescott, K. E. Spier, A comprehensive theory of civil settlement, *NYUL Rev.* 91 (2016) 59.
- [29] J. B. Gelbach, The Reduced Form of Litigation Models and the Plaintiff’s Win Rate, *The Journal of Law and Economics* 61 (1) (2018) 125–157.
- [30] Y.-H. A. Lee, D. Klerman, The Priest-Klein hypotheses: Proofs and generality, *International Review of Law and Economics* 48 (2016) 59–76.
- [31] A. R. Pah, D. L. Schwartz, S. Sanga, Z. D. Clopton, P. DiCola, R. D. Mersey, C. S. Alexander, K. J. Hammond, L. A. N. Amaral, How to build a more open justice system, *Science* 369 (6500) (2020) 134–136.
- [32] Y. Tsugawa, D. M. Blumenthal, A. K. Jha, E. J. Orav, A. B. Jena, Association between physician US News & World Report medical school ranking and patient outcomes and costs of care: observational study, *BMJ* 362 (2018) k3640.
- [33] P. Siegelman, J. J. Donohue III, The selection of employment discrimination disputes for litigation: Using business cycle effects to test the Priest-Klein hypothesis, *The Journal of Legal Studies* 24 (2) (1995) 427–462.
- [34] R. E. Thomas, The trial selection hypothesis without the 50 percent rule: some experimental evidence, *The Journal of Legal Studies* 24 (1) (1995) 209–228.
- [35] R. Cooter, S. Marks, R. Mnookin, Bargaining in the shadow of the law: A testable model of strategic behavior, *The Journal of Legal Studies* 11 (2) (1982) 225–251.
- [36] Y.-C. Chang, W. Hubbard, Does the Priest and Klein model travel? Testing litigation selection hypotheses with foreign court data, *Coase-Sandor Working Paper Series in Law and Economics* (2018).
- [37] L. Page, S. Brin, R. Motwani, T. Winograd, The PageRank Citation Ranking : Bringing Order to the Web, in: *The Web Conference*, 1999.
- [38] T. Saaty, Decision making with the Analytic Hierarchy Process, *Int. J. Services Sciences* 1 (2008) 83–98.
- [39] M. E. Glickman, A. C. Jones, Rating the chess rating system (1999).
- [40] C. N. Avery, M. E. Glickman, C. M. Hoxby, A. Metrick, A Revealed Preference Ranking of U.S. Colleges and Universities, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 128 (1) (2013) 425–467.
- [41] J. T. Whelan, Prior Distributions for the Bradley-Terry Model of Paired Comparisons, *arXiv:1712.05311* (2017).

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Methods

Data

We build our data by merging two datasets. The first one contains information about the law firms, while the second one contains information about case outcomes and types.

The first dataset is the Case Law Access Project (CAP) which contains unstructured judicial opinions. Within these opinions, we can identify information about each party’s law firms, as well as their roles. While CAP contains both criminal and civil opinions from federal district, appellate, and the Supreme court, we restrict ourselves to civil opinions filed in district courts. Due to OCR errors and spelling variations (e.g. ‘Putman & Putman’ vs. ‘Put-Man and Put-Man’), we cannot immediately identify each law firm from the text as its own entity. To disambiguate law firms, we apply a hierarchical clustering algorithm with Levensthein distance. A similar approach is used to determine which party is represented by which law firm (see SI Appendix for details).

The second dataset is the Integrated Database (IDB) provided by the Federal Judicial Center (FJC). The IDB contains tabular information on federal civil lawsuits. For each lawsuit, we extract five items: the date the case was filed, the case type, the names of the law firm(s) representing the defendant(s), the names of the law firm(s) representing the plaintiff(s), and the case outcome. There are three possible case outcomes: the plaintiff either ‘won’, ‘lost’, or the outcome is ‘unknown’. The later most likely corresponds to private settlements and are subsequently discarded (cf. Discussion section regarding selection bias). Case types which are comparatively rare (‘real property’ and ‘prisoner petitions’) are added to the generic case type ‘other’ (Table 1).

We rely on a previously established mapping to match cases between the two databases via docket numbers, courts, dates and party names. [18]. Additionally, missing IDB data has been augmented by fine-tuning a transformer model with existing IDB data as training labels (see Ref. [18] for details). This gives rise to a total of 310,876 cases across 85,502 law firms. For each case, we have information about the time the case was filed, the case type, the (unique) name of the plaintiff’s and defendant’s law firm, and the case outcome (plaintiff either won or lost).

Some cases contain several law firms on either the defendant or plaintiff side. We represent this as a set of pairwise interactions in which every defendant law firm competes against every plaintiff law firm. We leave generalizations that directly consider multiple entities on each side for future work. Our final data is thus comprised of 368,970 interactions that arise from 310,876 cases across 85,502 law firms. Each interaction can be interpreted as a pairwise interaction between plaintiff and defendant law firm with a single winner.

Modeling Asymmetric, Heterogeneous, Pairwise Interactions

Ranking entities based on pairwise interactions is an ubiquitous problem arising in domains such as information retrieval [37], decision theory [38], sports [39] and university rankings [40]. Several algorithms have been established to estimate rankings from observed outcomes: The Elo rating system is known for its deployment in chess [39]. The Bradley and Terry model represents the probability of one competitor defeating another as a logistic function of the difference in their latent skill levels [21]. Recently, this model has been extended to accommodate

different types of interaction while also enhancing computational efficiency [10]. We proposed the ‘‘asymmetric heterogeneous pairwise interactions’’-ranking algorithm (AHPI) which further extends this model to also take into consideration asymmetric games, where one entity has a higher a priori chance of winning (‘home field advantage’).

We consider N entities (e.g. law firms) $n = 1, \dots, N$ competing in a total of R pairwise interactions (e.g. lawsuits) $r = 1, \dots, R$. Each interaction is of one of M types (e.g. lawsuit case types, or variations of the game) $t = 1, \dots, M$. The interaction is asymmetric in the sense that defendants are more likely to win a case. We assume this ‘home field advantage’ or ‘defendant bias’ to be specific to the case type and denote it by ϵ_t . The AHPI-algorithm assigns a score S_n to every competing entity n . Consider interaction $r \in \{1, \dots, R\}$ which is of type t and involves privileged entity a and entity b with respective scores S_a and S_b . The outcome is modeled in two stages: First, a favored entity is determined. The probability that a is favored is given by

$$\rho_r(a) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-((S_a + \epsilon_t) - S_b))} \quad (1a)$$

where the privilege ϵ_t skews this probability in a ’s favor. It is implicitly understood that interaction type t is dependent on game r , that is $t = t(r)$. We denote ϵ_t for brevity, and similarly for all subsequent quantities. Second, the winner of the interaction is determined by introducing the valence probability q_t . The valence probability captures the probability that the favored entity wins. Hence, a wins with probability

$$p_r(a) = q_t \cdot \rho_t(a) + (1 - q_t) \cdot (1 - \rho_t(a)) \quad (1b)$$

and b wins with probability $1 - p_r(a)$. The advantage of this two-step approach is that the skills of the entities, expressed in their scores s , are decoupled from the probabilistic outcome associated with interaction type t through q_t . If the score difference corrected by the privilege in (1a) is 0, both entities have equal probability of being favored. To what extent being favored implies winning is subsequently determined by the valence probability q_t . A value of q_t close to 1 indicates that the favored entity is highly likely to win, whereas $q_t = 0.5$ indicates that being favored does not have an impact. This approach has been previously used to calibrate the relative contributions of skill and luck [20]. We find that fitted valence probabilities tend to be close to 1, suggesting that the law firms’ score differences are highly indicative of case outcomes.

Estimation of Latent Scores

We now turn to the estimation of the scores $\{S_n\}$, privileges $\{\epsilon_t\}$ and valence probabilities $\{q_t\}$ given R observed interactions $\{I_r\}$. To this end, we introduce for every interaction r the stance variable σ_r which takes a value of 1 if the favored entity is the winner, and 0 else. We label the winning entity by u_r and the losing one by v_r . It is convenient to define $\lambda_n \equiv e^{S_n}$. To further simplify notation, we use S instead of $\{S_n\}$ to denote the set of scores, and similar for $\{\sigma_r\}$, $\{\epsilon_t\}$ and $\{q_t\}$. In order to tackle potential convergence issues, we use a Bayesian framework and

introduce logistic priors for the scores and privileges [10, 41]. Applying Bayes’ theorem, the likelihood $P(s, q, \sigma, \epsilon | x)$ is

$$\prod_r P_r(x, \sigma | \lambda_u, \lambda_v, \epsilon, q) \prod_{n=1}^N \frac{\lambda_n}{(\lambda_n + 1)^2} \prod_{t=1}^M \frac{1}{(e^{\epsilon_t} + 1)(e^{-\epsilon_t} + 1)} \quad (2)$$

where the second and third product terms stem from the prior on the scores and privileges, respectively. By defining the privilege stance variable c_r as taking value -1 if the winner was privileged and 1 else, and by using the definitions of the probabilities ρ_r and p_r in (1), it holds that

$$P_r(x, \sigma | \lambda_u, \lambda_v, \epsilon, q) = \frac{(e^{c_r \epsilon_t} \cdot \lambda_u \cdot q_t)^\sigma \cdot (\lambda_v (1 - q_t))^{1-\sigma}}{e^{c_r \epsilon_t} \lambda_u + \lambda_v}. \quad (3)$$

It turns out that directly maximizing (the log of) the likelihood (2) is challenging and an expectation maximization algorithm is better suited [10]. To this end, we first note that across R games, there is a total of $K = 2^R$ outcomes of the binary stance variables $\{\sigma_r\}$ and we denote by Π any probability distribution over these outcomes. By Jensen’s inequality, it holds that

$$\log \sum_{k=1}^K P(S, q, \sigma, \epsilon | x) \geq \sum_{k=1}^K \Pi(\sigma) \log \frac{P(S, q, \sigma, \epsilon | x)}{\Pi(\sigma)}. \quad (4)$$

If the right hand side equals the left hand side, we can work with the sum of logarithms which renders the calculations below analytically tractable. For fixed S , ϵ and q , equality holds for a specific probability distribution Π :

$$\Pi(\sigma) = \prod_{r=1}^R \pi_r^{\sigma_r} (1 - \pi_r)^{1-\sigma_r} \quad (5a)$$

where

$$\pi_r = \frac{e^{c_r \epsilon_t} \cdot \lambda_{u_r} \cdot q_{t_r}}{\lambda_{u_r} \cdot e^{c_r \epsilon_t} \cdot q_{t_r} + \lambda_{v_r} \cdot (1 - q_{t_r})} \quad (5b)$$

can be interpreted as the posterior probability that u_r is the favoured entity [10].

We now apply expectation maximization to the right hand side of (4) with Π given by (5). To maximize expectations, we set the derivative of the right-hand-side of (4) with respect to S , ϵ and q equal to zero while holding the distribution over σ constant. This results in the following set of equations where $\delta_{\mu, \nu}$ is the Kronecker delta.

$$q_t = \frac{\sum_{r=1}^R \delta_{t, t_r} \cdot \pi_r}{\sum_{r=1}^R \delta_{t, t_r}} \quad (6a)$$

$$0 = \frac{1 - e^{\epsilon_t}}{1 + e^{\epsilon_t}} + \sum_{r=1}^R \delta_{t, t_r} \cdot \left[\pi_r c_r - \frac{\lambda_{u_r} \cdot e^{c_r \epsilon_t}}{\lambda_{u_r} \cdot e^{c_r \epsilon_t} + \lambda_{v_r}} c_r \right] \quad (6b)$$

$$\lambda_n = \left[1 + \sum_{r=1}^R \delta_{u_r, n} \pi_r + \delta_{v_r, n} (1 - \pi_r) \right] \cdot \left[\frac{2}{1 + \lambda_n} + \sum_{r=1}^R \frac{\delta_{u_r, n} \gamma_r (\gamma_r \lambda_{u_r} + \lambda_n) + \delta_{v_r, n} (\gamma_r \lambda_n + \lambda_{v_r})}{(\gamma_r \lambda_n + \lambda_{v_r}) (\gamma_r \lambda_{u_r} + \lambda_n)} \right]^{-1} \quad (6c)$$

Equation (6a) yields an explicit expression for the valence probability q_t where π_r is given by (5b). Equation (6b) yields an implicit expression for the privilege ϵ_t which can be solved numerically. Equation (6c) yields a nested set of equations for the exponential scores λ_n which can be solved iteratively until convergence is reached.

Finally, it should be noted that the above calculations are invariant under the mapping

$$\begin{cases} f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \\ f(S, \epsilon, q) = (-S, -\epsilon, 1 - q) \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

which suggests that the ranking might be ‘inverted’. This symmetry can be broken by analyzing the values of the valence probabilities. If for an interaction type t a higher rank is assumed to imply a higher winning probability, but if $q_t < 0.5$, then the ranking must be inverted according to (7). Likewise, if a higher rank is assumed to imply a lower winning probability and $q_t > 0.5$, then the ranking must be inverted.

Fitting Latent Scores on Dense Data Subsets

Our dataset contains 368,970 interactions (‘games’) across 85,502 law firms (‘entities’). Each interaction is of one of five types (Table 1). Ideally, we assign a ranking score S_n to each law firm $n \in 1, \dots, 85,502$ by applying the above expectation maximization algorithm. However, it is intuitively plausible that the fewer interactions are observed per entity, the less reliable the estimated scores (see SI Appendix for a demonstration on data with known ground truth). We therefore systematically trim our dataset to a subset of sufficient interactions as follows: For a given dataset of pairwise interactions, we define its Q -factor as the average number of interactions per entity. By definition, the Q factor of our total dataset is $368,970/85,502 \approx 4.3$. In order to find a subset of the data with sufficiently high target Q -factor, we iteratively remove the entities with lowest number of interactions and recalculate the Q -factor. We stop once the average number of interactions in

the remaining data is larger or equal to Q . Case statistics (Table 1), law firm rankings (Figure 2) and outcome predictions (Figure 3) have been calculated on a subset with $Q = 40$ for which the number of law firms is reduced to 2,003 and the number of interactions is reduced to 80,158. Qualitatively similar results for a larger range of Q -factors are found in the SI Appendix. Figure 4 shows the prediction accuracy averaged over case types as a function of the Q -factor.

For a given dataset of interactions with sufficiently high Q -factor, we proceed with the estimation of the model parameters. Concretely, we estimate the law firm scores $S_n = \log(\lambda_n)$, the case type asymmetries ϵ_t and the valence probabilities q_t via the above described expectation maximization algorithm. The following initial values are used for all firms and interaction types, respectively: $\lambda_n = 0.9$, $q_t = 0.5$, $\epsilon_t = 0$. The algorithm is iterated until convergence is reached, that is once the correlation between the ranking of two subsequent iterations is above 99.9% and the maximum absolute change in any ranking score, valence probability and case type asymmetry is below 0.01.


The parameters are only fitted on the first 80% of the data according to their temporal order (accordingly, the Q -factor was determined only on the training data, not the test data). The remaining 20% are used to predict defendant winning probabilities via (1) where S_n, ϵ_t and q_t are replaced by their fitted best estimates $\hat{s}_n, \hat{\epsilon}_t$ and \hat{q}_t , respectively. The accuracy of the predictions binned by predicted winning probability and averaged across case types is visualized in Figure 3 for $Q = 40$. In accordance with the defendant bias (Table 1), we estimate consistently positive $\hat{\epsilon}_t$ parameters equal to 1.56, 1.31, 0.56, 0.93 and 1.39 for ‘other’, ‘contract’, ‘torts’, ‘labor’ and ‘civil rights’ cases, respectively. The valence probabilities are found to be very close to or even equal to 1.0, implying that the favored entity typically wins. Similarly high values have been observed in previous work [10] and we refer to the SI Appendix for additional discussions. Qualitatively, this suggests that the outcome of a lawsuit is strongly influenced by the difference of skill-levels of the competing law firms.

SI Appendix

Appendix A. Official Law Firm Rankings

A natural source to contextualise our approach is to compare our ranking with preexisting ones. We have drawn on three common open source ranking:

- The ‘Vault Law 100’ ranking is determined by averaging the prestige scores from anonymous surveys completed by law firm associates across the U.S., focusing solely on the perceived prestige of working for these firms rather than their financial or operational metrics. The ranking we use was based on surveys conducted from January to March 2022.* The “Vault100” is the most prevalent law firm ranking and among the three presented rankings the only one providing actual scores as opposed to just rankings. We visualise our ranking’s scores vs. the “Vault100” ranking’s scores in Supplementary Figure 1.
- ‘The Embroker Law 300’ Award ranking distinguishes itself by evaluating law firms on innovative criteria such as the adoption of advanced courtroom technology, initiatives for environmental sustainability, progressive employment practices, and efforts to ensure equal access to justice, rather than traditional metrics like revenue and firm size. We use the 2022 ranking.†
- ‘ALM’s Global 200’ ranking is calculated based on the analysis of key financial metrics such as revenue, profits, and headcount growth for each of the world’s 200 largest law firms. We use the 2022 ranking.‡



Supplementary Figure 1: Scatter plot visualising ‘Vault Law 100’ scores from 2022 vs. the scores fitted by our AHPI algorithm. No significant correlation is found.

*Retrieved from <https://firsthand.co/best-companies-to-work-for/law/top-100-law-firms-rankings> in February 2023.

†Retrieved from <https://www.embroker.com/blog/top-300-law-firms/> in February 2023.

‡Retrieved from <https://www.law.com/law-firms/> in February 2023.

Appendix B. Extracting Law Firm Names and Roles

One of the two data sets we use, the Case Law Access Project (CAP), contains judicial opinions. From these opinions we extract information about each party’s law firms, as well as their roles, that is whether they represent the plaintiff or the defendant.

For every case, CAP contains a list of strings describing attorneys. We call each string inside the list “attorney substring”. For instance, a case with list

```
['Michael H. Auen, of Foley & Lardner, Madison, Wis., for plaintiff.', 'David C. Rice, Patton Boggs, L.L.P., Madison, Wis., for defendants.']
```

consists of the two attorney substrings

```
'Michael H. Auen, of Foley & Lardner, Madison, Wis., for plaintiff.'
```

and

```
'David C. Rice, Patton Boggs, L.L.P., Madison, Wis., for defendants.'
```

For this exemplified case, our extraction procedure should yield the following two tuples:

```
('plaintiff', ['foley & lardner']), ('defendant', ['patton boggs']).
```

We now provide a brief overview of how law firm names and roles are extracted. More detailed information can be found in the Python code that is available upon request.

1. We apply basic string processing. Frequent expressions containing full-points are replaced by their written-out equivalents (e.g. ‘U.S.’ is replaced by ‘United States’).
2. We discard cases with fewer than two attorney substrings since we require information for both the defendant and the plaintiff.
3. In the vast majority of attorney substrings, the role of a law firm follows on the expression ‘ for ’ (e.g. ‘for plaintiff’). Therefore, the expression following on ‘ for ’ is read out.
4. We are interested in cases where every law firm is mapped to a unique (defendant- or plaintiff-) role: If more than one role has been extracted from an attorney substring, this case is discarded.
5. Law firms containing the string ‘ & ’ are read out by extracting the term around ‘ & ’, for example from ‘... of Foley & Lardner, Madison ...’ we extract ‘Foley & Lardner’.
6. Based on inspection of the CAP data and open source information of law firms, we compile a list of keywords such as “L.L.P.”. Law firms containing such a keyword are read out by extracting terms around them.
7. The terms extracted for the law firms in steps 5 and 6 are set to lowercase. To account for anomalies and Optical Character Recognition (OCR) errors, we alter the terms by removing or replacing specific strings in specific positions. For example, the string “<&” is replaced by “&”, hereby presumably correcting an OCR error.

Appendix C. Clustering Law Firm Names

Above, we have described how we extract for each case a tuple of the form ‘(law firm name, role)’. However, due to OCR errors and spelling mistakes, we cannot directly associate each law firm name or role as its unique identity (e.g. ‘putman & putman’ vs. ‘put-man & put-man’). We thus apply an agglomerative clustering mechanism which groups together similar strings. We separately apply this procedure both for the law firm names and the roles. Here, we focus on the law firms, but the procedure for the roles is similar, albeit simpler. We refer to our Python implementation for more details.

To assign strings to clusters, we must first define a metric that measures the distance between two strings. We use the Levenshtein distance which counts how many transformations of a single character (insertions, deletions or substitutions) have to be made to transform one string into another one. For example, $\text{lev}(\text{plaintiff}, \text{plaintif}) = 1$ and $\text{lev}(\text{plaintiff}, \text{defendant}) = 8$. More formally, the Levenshtein distance between two strings a and b is defined as:

$$\text{lev}(a, b) = \begin{cases} |a| & \text{if } |b|=0 \\ |b| & \text{if } |a|=0 \\ \text{lev}(\text{tail}(a), \text{tail}(b)) & \text{if } a[0] = b[0] \\ 1 + \min \begin{cases} \text{lev}(\text{tail}(a), b) \\ \text{lev}(a, \text{tail}(b)) \\ \text{lev}(\text{tail}(a), \text{tail}(b)) \end{cases} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where for a string x :

- $|x|$ is defined as the length of the string x ,
- $\text{tail}(x)$ is defined as the string created from x by removing the first character,
- $x[n]$ is the n -th character of x with a zero-based counting.

Now that we have a metric that measures distances between strings, we define the distance between two clusters of strings as the average of the pairwise distances. Concretely, if we have two clusters A and B , each representing a set of strings, we define the distance between A and B as

$$l(A, B) = \frac{1}{|A| \cdot |B|} \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{b \in B} \text{lev}(a, b).$$

We can now deploy agglomerate clustering at threshold $c > 0$ to assign every string to a unique cluster as follows: We initialize the algorithm by considering each string its own cluster. Then, we merge any two clusters A_i and A_j whose distance $l(A_i, A_j)$ is smaller than c into a single cluster. We repeat the previous step iteratively for as long as we find at least one pair of clusters with distance l below c .

An appropriate clustering threshold c for the roles can be determined by directly looking at the roles which are clustered at every step. While thresholds of up to 2.5 cluster alternative spellings and spelling mistakes, the first wrongly clustered roles are ‘appellee’ and ‘appellant’ at a distance of 3. These common roles should be distinguished by the clustering mechanism, hence a clustering threshold between 2.5 and 3 is chosen, namely 2.7.

Because of the large number of law firm names, determining an appropriate clustering threshold requires a different approach: We extract a list of law firm names from three major law firm rankings (see Appendix A). We call this list ‘list 1’ and assume it is free of spelling errors. We call the list containing the law firm names extract from the CAP data ‘list 2’. We expect many spelling mistakes in list 2 but not in list 1. Further, we expect spelling variations to be ‘minor’ in the sense that the Levenshtein distance between two variations of one law firm name is smaller than some threshold. Hence, if we apply the agglomerative clustering to both list 1 and list 2, we expect that

- for low clustering thresholds the relative decrease in the number of law firm names in list 2 will be steeper than in list 1 because for low thresholds spelling variations are grouped together,
- for high clustering thresholds, we expect the relative decrease to be comparable in the two lists.

For a given clustering threshold c , we run the agglomerative clustering both on the list of official rankings (list 1) and our own list (list 2). Then, we gradually vary c from 0 to 5, and for each value compare the number of law firm names in each list. In list 1, increasing the clustering threshold from 0.1 to 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1 reduces the number of law firm names by 1%, 1%, 3% and 5%, respectively. In list 2, increasing the clustering threshold from 0.1 to 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1 reduces the number of law firm names by 8%, 6%, 5% and 6%, respectively. This can be explained as follows:

- Names grouped together with a clustering threshold smaller than 2.1 mainly differ due to spelling variations.
- With clustering thresholds higher than 3.1, genuinely different law firm names are predominantly grouped together.


Therefore, a clustering threshold between 2.1 and 3.1, namely 2.7, is chosen for the law firm names.

Finally, the most frequent representative of every cluster is assigned to every element of the cluster. For example, in {‘putman & putman’, ‘put-man and put-man’, ‘putman < & putman’} with frequencies (100, 5, 1) ‘putman & putman’ would replace all three strings.


Appendix D. Q-factor: Subsampling Pairwise Interactions

As elaborated on in the ‘Data’ section above, our dataset contains a total of 368,970 pairwise interactions among law firms. However, for some of those law firms, we only observe a very limited amount of interactions. We expect more robust fitting results from subsamples of the data in which each law firm has a large number of observed interactions (see also ‘AHPI Algorithm: Fitting and Synthetic Data’ below for more concrete results). To work with such subsamples, we introduce the Q -factor $Q \equiv \frac{R}{N}$ where N is the number of law firms and R is the number of pairwise interactions. In other words, the Q factor is just the average number of interactions per law firm. A subsample with a specific Q -factor is extracted by removing the law firms involved in the minimal number of interactions. The removal is repeated until the wanted Q -factor is reached or there are no firms left, meaning that the specific Q -factor is too high to be achieved by this approach.

Supplementary Figure 2 (left) shows a linear decrease in the number of interactions as Q increases, while Supplementary Figure 2 (right) shows an exponential decrease in the number of firms. In Supplementary Figure 3 (left) we observe that more recent interactions are more common for a higher Q -factor. As expected by construction of the Q -factor, its increase leads to an increased lower bound for the degrees of firms in the sample (Supplementary Figure 3 (middle)). A higher Q -factor is also associated with firms participating across more different case types which can be seen in Supplementary Figure 3 (right).



Supplementary Figure 2: Decreasing number of interactions (left) and entities (right) as the Q -factor is increased.



Supplementary Figure 3: We show the distribution of dates (left), number of interactions (middle) and different case types (right) for different values of Q .


Appendix E. Case Statistics

For the intermediate Q -factor of 40, Supplementary Figure 4 (left) displays the distribution of the fitted scores. The scores are distributed around 0 by construction of AHPI. Supplementary Figure 4 (middle) shows the bimodal distribution of empirical win rates. This suggest that a large fraction of firms either mostly lose or mostly win. Supplementary Figure 4 (right) shows the distribution of shares of trials representing the defendant per law firm. Its bi-modality suggest that most law firms either specialize on the defendant or the plaintiff side.

Appendix F. Fitting AHPI Algorithm on Synthetic Data

We test the fitting accuracy of the AHPI algorithm by generating synthetic data with known ground truth. Concretely, we generate R interactions among N entities, and each interaction is of one of M types. To stay close to our actual data on lawsuits, we pick R , N and M given by our empirical data on lawsuits. Figures 2 and 3 in the main paper have been obtained for a Q factor of 40 which results in 80, 158, $N = 2,003$ and $M = 5$. To generate synthetic data for we proceed as follows:

1. We randomly assign to each entity a score drawn at random from our N empirically fitted scores.
2. We generate an interaction by randomly selecting two of N entities. Similarly, we randomly sample the interaction type $t \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ in proportion to their empirical occurrence (Table 1 in main paper).
3. For each interaction, a favoured individual is chosen proportional to probability (1a). As bias ϵ_t we use our empirically fitted value $\hat{\epsilon}_t$.
4. The winner of the interaction is picked based on (1b) with q_t replaced by our empirically fitted value \hat{q}_t .




Supplementary Figure 4: (left) Distribution of fitted scores. (middle) Distribution of empirically observed win rates. (right) Distribution of fraction of share of trials as representative of the defendant across law firms.

We generate 80 different sets of synthetic data as described in steps 1-4 above, and fit the AHPI algorithm on each. We then calculate the average value of each fitted parameter across the 80 sets, and we use the standard deviations as error bars. The result is depicted in Supplementary Table 1. We notice that the true scores and the fitted scores are, on average, 81% correlated. In line with our empirical fits, the valence probabilities are consistently large. The values for ϵ are close to the real values, albeit with slight biases. These results suggest that our fitted scores capture the relevant tendencies, yet there is room for improvement. Better fits might further increase our out-of-sample accuracies for case outcome predictions. We leave this for future research, and refer to refs. [10, 20] for more discussions on this topic.

	actual data	synthetic data
scores Kendall's τ	–	0.81 ± 0.00
ϵ_{other}	1.56	1.38 ± 0.02
$\epsilon_{\text{contract}}$	1.31	1.15 ± 0.02
ϵ_{torts}	0.56	0.51 ± 0.02
ϵ_{labor}	0.93	0.83 ± 0.02
$\epsilon_{\text{civil rights}}$	1.39	1.19 ± 0.03
q_{other}	1.00	1.00 ± 0.00
q_{contract}	0.98	0.99 ± 0.00
q_{torts}	1.00	1.00 ± 0.00
q_{labor}	1.00	1.00 ± 0.00
$q_{\text{civil rights}}$	0.91	0.93 ± 0.00

Supplementary Table 1: The left column shows the fitted model parameters on empirical data with $Q = 40$. The right column shows average and standard deviation of fits on synthetic data. In particular, the top row shows the correlation between fitted and true values.


A central parameter used to characterize data is the ratio of the number of interactions R to the number of entities N , which we call the Q -factor (see above). We expect that as the Q -factor increases, the AHPI algorithm becomes more accurate. To test this, we iteratively increase the Q factor by removing entities with the lowest number of interactions, and repeat the above described fitting procedure on synthetic data for a sequence of Q factors. The outcome is depicted in Supplementary Figure 5 and in line with our expectation: The higher the Q -factor, the closer the fitted values are to the ground truth. However, we notice that certain biases exist even when Q becomes very large. As mentioned above, we leave a more detailed examination of this for future research, and refer to refs. [10, 20] for more discussions on this topic.




Supplementary Figure 5: AHPI fitting accuracy as a function of the Q -factor. (left) Fitted biases ϵ_i . Dashed lines indicate ground truth values. Even for large values of Q some biases remain. (middle) Fitted valence probabilities q_i . Similar to the fits of ϵ_i , we notice slight biases. (right) Kendall correlation between ground truth scores and fitted scores.

Appendix G. Legal Case Outcome Predictions for Various Q -Factors


Recall from above that the Q factor is defined as the average number of interactions per law firm in a given dataset. In Figure 3 of the main paper we have shown prediction accuracies on a subset where $Q = 40$. In Supplementary Figure 6, we show that qualitatively similar results are obtained for $Q = 20, 30, 50, 60, 70$.




(1) $Q = 20$





(2) $Q = 30$



(3) $Q = 40$



(4) $Q = 50$

(5) $Q = 60$ (6) $Q = 70$ Supplementary Figure 6: Same as Fig 3 in the main, but for Q -factors 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 and 60.