



Utilizing Analytic Tools in Opposing Party Productions

Managed Review – Case Study & Cost Analysis

Innovative Discovery, LLC

Context

The Client received an Opposing Party Production consisting of approximately 100,000 documents that needed to be reviewed in anticipation of upcoming depositions. Innovative Discovery, LLC (“ID”) consulted with the Client to create a workflow integrating analytic tools that would increase efficiency of the limited resources available – specifically, the Subject Matter Expert(s) (“SME”) handling the litigation.

Challenges

- **Search Terms** - One of the difficulties of working with Search Terms is that their effectiveness is closely tied to knowledge of the documents being searched, meaning the search results will not identify every document relevant or necessary for deposition preparation unless the search terms are created with prior in-depth knowledge of the documents. On one hand, the Client may choose to cast a “broad net” of search terms which would result in a larger universe of documents requiring review. On the other hand, a smaller number of search terms may exclude documents that are directly related to the matter.
- **Limited Resources** - The limited amount of time and resources available significantly influenced the workflow design for this particular matter. Taking into account a firm 14-day timeline, the SME(s) needed to prioritize the groups of documents most pertinent to the matter without neglecting the less substantial documents and potentially overlooking the significant documents that would not have hit on search terms.

Managed Review

The first phase of ID’s workflow was to organize the documents in a manner that was most efficient and effective, which was accomplished by utilizing the analytic Clustering tool. Clusters, which can be created without any user input, are mutually exclusive groups of conceptually similar content. This organizational method allowed the SMEs to quickly identify groups of documents that required further review and groups that were of less importance, and prioritize their review accordingly.

As the SMEs reviewed the clusters of documents and made decisions based on the relevance and content of those documents, ID utilized those decisions to categorize the remaining un-reviewed documents. Categorization uses previously coded documents to find conceptually similar documents in the review universe which can then be prioritized for review. This method allowed ID to identify additional relevant and important documents for the SME’s review that may not have been caught by applying search terms.

By applying Clustering and Categorization to this review universe, ID was able to significantly decrease the number of documents requiring review and as a direct result, the total amount of time needed for review was also significantly decreased. ***ID’s integration of analytics into the workflow allowed the SMEs to prepare for upcoming depositions more thoroughly and prevented unanticipated documents from being brought forth – and ultimately saved the Client over \$85,000 as compared to a linear review performed by Contract Attorneys.***

Review Category	Documents per Hour	Documents Reviewed	Hours to Complete Review	Cost to Complete Review
SME Review (Law Firm Associates)	65	10,015	154.1	-
Cost of Analytics (per GB)	N/A	N/A	25.04 GB ⁱ	-
Project Management & Workflow Consultation	N/A	N/A	23.1	-
TOTAL - TECHNOLOGY ASSISTED REVIEW			177.2	\$ 53,397.60
Linear Review (Legal Reviewers)	50	100,142	2,002.8	-
Project Management	N/A	N/A	300.4 ⁱⁱ	-
TOTAL - LINEAR REVIEW			N/A	\$ 142,702.35
**SAVINGS USING TECHNOLOGY ASSISTED REVIEW				\$ 89,304.75

ⁱ ID assumed 4,000 documents per GB.

ⁱⁱ ID estimated Project Management hours to be 15% of Linear Review hours.