

Prompt Criteria writing: Recommendations and examples

When writing the aiR for Review prompt criteria, there are some things to keep in mind, and some best practices to be aware of.

- Above all: write clearly, as if writing for a colleague
- The model starts with a great deal of fluency in the law but will need context on the specifics of the matter.
- Keep in mind that “less is more.” Rather than pasting in a long and complicated review protocol, we see better results with concise descriptions and key passages from review protocols. Note also that there is a 10,000-character limit to the total text entered into the instructions section.
- Do not give instructions directly to the underlying large language model, such as “you will review XX.” Follow the lead of the helper text in the text boxes to provide direct, succinct inputs. Relativity provides the instructions which surround these inputs when it submits the document.
- Write clearly. Avoid negatives and especially double negatives. Do not use the phrase “including, but not limited to”.
- Give implicit instructions on what should or should not be considered. As much as possible, be explicit, clear, and unambiguous.
- There is not a “correct format” for the instructions. Simple formatting such as bullet points might be useful for the People and Aliases section, but paragraphs might make sense in another section. Use the format that would make most sense when writing for a human reader.”

Guidance	Instead of this...	...Write this
Above all, ask yourself: would a person understand it? Write well and you will be rewarded with accuracy	Industrial spying, because of the growling use of computers to store and process corporate information, is increasing rapidly.	Industrial spying is increasing rapidly because of the growing use of computers to store and process corporate information.
Use formatting (whitespace and punctuation) where it can make things clearer. There isn't a “right way to format”, but if you can write clearly for a human audience, you should do that here	John Doe - CEO of Acme; Jane Ng - CEO of Bradshaw; Jim Smith- cfo Acme; Rodriguez, Jacinda – cfo@Bradshaw; Jin Zheng-CIO acme	Acme Corp Execs: - John Doe – CEO - Jim Smith – CFO - Jin Zheng – CIO Bradshaw Corp Execs - Jane Ng – CEO - Jacinda (“JJ”) Rodriguez – CFO
Reduce “fluffy” and imprecise descriptions	The description for this product should be fairly short, a few sentences only, and not too much more	Use a 3 to 5 sentence paragraph to describe this product.

Try not to use double negatives	... but the document provides no evidence that Acme Corp was uninvolved in the action	...even if the document does not show that Acme Corp was involved in the action
Instead of just saying what not to do, say what to do instead	Do not consider the document relevant if it only discusses project Pegasus and not project Thor	If the document discusses project Thor, it should be considered relevant. If the document discusses only project Pegasus, it should be considered not relevant
Using "ALL CAPS" can point the model to essential information that it should pay close attention to.	Any document which discusses jellybeans should be considered responsive.	If the document discusses jellybeans, it MUST be considered responsive.
Aliases and acronyms are very important, they frequently make a 10% difference in identifying responsive documents	FOIA: freedom of information act request (unnecessary, because it's a commonly understood acronym)	a4R, afR: shorthand for the aiR for Review product mtv: Shorthand for the home office (also referred to as "Mountain View")
Do not include explanations of the law.	The matter concerns an investor call in 2020, where the CEO is alleged to have engaged in insider trading. Insider trading is the trading of a public company's stock or other securities (such as bonds or stock options) based on material, nonpublic information about the company.	The matter concerns an investor call in 2020, where the CEO is alleged to have engaged in insider trading.