US010824797B2

(12) **United States Patent**
Herr et al.

(10) **Patent No.: US 10,824,797 B2**
(45) **Date of Patent: Nov. 3, 2020**

(54) **METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR SUGGESTING REVISIONS TO AN ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT**

(71) Applicant: **BLACKBOILER LLC**, Arlington, VA (US)

(72) Inventors: **Jonathan Herr**, Washington, DC (US); **Daniel P. Broderick**, Arlington, VA (US); **Daniel Edward Simonson**, Arlington, VA (US)

(73) Assignee: **BLACKBOILER, INC.**, Arlington, VA (US)

(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this patent is extended or adjusted under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) by 0 days.

(21) Appl. No.: **16/689,685**

(22) Filed: **Nov. 20, 2019**

(65) **Prior Publication Data**

US 2020/0089743 A1 Mar. 19, 2020

Related U.S. Application Data

(63) Continuation of application No. 16/244,217, filed on Jan. 10, 2019, now Pat. No. 10,489,500, which is a (Continued)

(51) **Int. Cl.**
G06F 40/166 (2020.01)
G06F 40/186 (2020.01)
(Continued)

(52) **U.S. Cl.**
CPC ***G06F 40/166*** (2020.01); ***G06F 40/186*** (2020.01); ***G06F 40/197*** (2020.01);
(Continued)

(58) **Field of Classification Search**
CPC G06F 17/30011; G06F 17/30864; G06F 17/30675; G06F 17/274; G06F 17/277;
(Continued)

(56) **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

5,692,206 A 11/1997 Shirley
6,438,543 B1 8/2002 Kazi
(Continued)

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Zhemin Zhu et al, A Monolingual Tree-based Translation Model for Sentence Simplification, Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling 2010), pp. 1353-1361, Beijing, Aug. 2010.
(Continued)

Primary Examiner — Quoc A Tran
(74) *Attorney, Agent, or Firm* — Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck, P.C.

(57) **ABSTRACT**

Disclosed is a method for suggesting revisions to a document-under-analysis ("DUA") from a seed database, the seed database including a plurality of original texts each respectively associated with one of a plurality of final texts. The method includes tokenizing the DUA into a plurality of statements-under-analysis ("SUAs"), selecting a first SUA of the plurality of SUAs, generating a first similarity score for each of the plurality of the original texts, the similarity score representing a degree of similarity between the first SUA and each of the original texts, selecting a first candidate original text of the plurality of the original texts, and creating an edited SUA ("ESUA") by modifying a copy of the first SUA consistent with a first candidate final text associated with the first candidate original text.

22 Claims, 9 Drawing Sheets



Related U.S. Application Data

continuation of application No. 15/227,093, filed on Aug. 3, 2016, now Pat. No. 10,216,715.

(60) Provisional application No. 62/200,261, filed on Aug. 3, 2015.

(51) **Int. Cl.**

G06F 40/197	(2020.01)
G06F 40/253	(2020.01)
G06Q 10/10	(2012.01)
G06F 16/93	(2019.01)
G06F 16/33	(2019.01)
G06F 16/951	(2019.01)
G06F 40/30	(2020.01)
G06F 40/284	(2020.01)
G06N 3/04	(2006.01)
G06N 3/08	(2006.01)
G06F 40/295	(2020.01)
G06F 17/00	(2019.01)

(52) **U.S. Cl.**

CPC ***G06F 40/253*** (2020.01); *G06F 16/334* (2019.01); *G06F 16/93* (2019.01); *G06F 16/951* (2019.01); *G06F 40/284* (2020.01); *G06F 40/295* (2020.01); *G06F 40/30* (2020.01); *G06N 3/0454* (2013.01); *G06N 3/08* (2013.01); *G06Q 10/10* (2013.01)

(58) **Field of Classification Search**

CPC G06F 40/166; G06F 40/186; G06F 40/197; G06F 40/253; G06F 40/30; G06F 40/284; G06F 16/93; G06F 16/334; G06F 16/951; G06F 17/278; G06F 40/295; G06F 17/2785; G06Q 10/10; G06N 3/08; G06N 3/0454

See application file for complete search history.

(56) **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

7,080,076	B1	7/2006	Williamson	
7,519,607	B2	4/2009	Anderson, IV	
7,668,865	B2	2/2010	McDonald	
8,037,086	B1	10/2011	Upstill	
8,046,372	B1 *	10/2011	Thirumalai	G06F 16/313 707/749
8,442,771	B2	5/2013	Wang	
8,788,523	B2	7/2014	Martin et al.	
8,886,648	B1 *	11/2014	Procopio	G06F 16/93 707/737
9,514,103	B2	12/2016	Kletter	
10,102,193	B2	10/2018	Riediger	
10,127,212	B1	11/2018	Kim	
10,191,893	B2	1/2019	Riediger	
2002/0002567	A1	1/2002	Kanie	
2003/0023539	A1	1/2003	Wilce	
2003/0074633	A1	4/2003	Boulmakoul	
2004/0102958	A1	5/2004	Anderson	
2005/0182736	A1	8/2005	Castellanos	
2007/0073532	A1	3/2007	Brockett et al.	
2007/0192355	A1	8/2007	Vasey	
2007/0192688	A1	8/2007	Vasey	
2007/0300295	A1	12/2007	Kwok	
2008/0103759	A1	5/2008	Dolan et al.	
2009/0007267	A1	1/2009	Hoffmann	
2009/0099993	A1	4/2009	Seuss	
2009/0138257	A1	5/2009	Verma	
2009/0138793	A1	5/2009	Verma	
2009/0216545	A1	8/2009	Rajkumar et al.	
2009/0300064	A1	12/2009	Dettinger	
2009/0300471	A1	12/2009	Dettinger	
2010/0005386	A1	1/2010	Verma	
2011/0055206	A1	3/2011	Martin	
2013/0036348	A1	2/2013	Hazard	
2013/0091422	A1	4/2013	Potnis	
2013/0151235	A1	6/2013	Och	
2014/0040270	A1	2/2014	O'Sullivan	
2015/0347393	A1	12/2015	Futrell et al.	
2015/0379887	A1 *	12/2015	Becker	G09B 19/00 715/229
2016/0012061	A1	1/2016	Sperling	
2016/0055196	A1	2/2016	Collins	
2016/0224524	A1	8/2016	Kay	
2017/0039176	A1	2/2017	Broderick et al.	
2017/0287090	A1	10/2017	Hunn	
2017/0364495	A1	12/2017	Srinivasan	
2018/0005186	A1	1/2018	Hunn	
2018/0253409	A1	9/2018	Carlson	
2018/0268506	A1	9/2018	Wodetzki	
2018/0365201	A1	12/2018	Hunn	
2018/0365216	A1	12/2018	Kao	
2019/0065456	A1	2/2019	Platow	

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Bill MacCartney, Michel Galley, Christopher D. Manning, A Phrase-Based Alignment Model for Natural Language Inference, Proceedings of the 2008 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 802-811, Honolulu, Oct. 2008.

Ion Androutsopoulos and Prodromos Malakasiotis, A Survey of Paraphrasing and Textual Entailment Methods, Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research 38 (2010) 135-187 Submitted Dec. 2009; published May 2010.

Marie-Catherine De Marneffe, Trond Grenager, Bill MacCartney, Daniel Cer, Daniel Ramage, Chlo'e Kiddon, Christopher D. Manning, Aligning semantic graphs for textual inference and machine reading, American Association for Artificial Intelligence, 2006.

Bill MacCartney and Christopher D. Manning, An extended model of natural logic, Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Computational Semantics, pp. 140-156, Tilburg, Jan. 2009.

Md Arafat Sultan, Steven Bethard and Tamara Sumner, Back to Basics for Monolingual Alignment: ExploitingWord Similarity and Contextual Evidence, Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 2 (2014) 219-230. Action Editor: Alexander Koller. Submitted Nov. 2013; Revised Jan. 2014; Published May 2014.

Rada Mihalcea, Courtney Corley, Carlo Strapparava, Corpus-based and Knowledge-based Measures of Text Semantic Similarity, American Association for Artificial intelligence, p. 775-780, 2006.

Rohit J. Kate, A Dependency-based Word Subsequence Kernel, Proceedings of the 2006 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 400-409, Honolulu, Oct. 2008.

Yangfeng Ji and Jacob Eisenstein, Discriminative Improvements to Distributional Sentence Similarity, Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 891-696, Seattle, Washington, USA, Oct. 18-21, 2013.

Richard Socher, Eric H. Huang, Jeffrey Pennington, Andrew Y. Ng, Christopher D. Manning, Dynamic Pooling and Unfolding Recursive Autoencoders for Paraphrase Detection, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24, Jan. 2011.

Michael Heilman and Noah A. Smith, Extracting Simplied Statements for Factual Question Generation, Mar. 29, 2010.

Amit Bronner and Christof Monz, User Edits Classification Using Document Revision Histories, Proceedings of the 13th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 356-366, Avignon, France, Apr. 23-27, 2012.

Felix Hill, Kyunghyun Cho, Anna Korhonen, Learning Distributed Representations of Sentences from Unlabelled Data, CoRR, abs/1602.03483, 2016, available at: http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.03483.

Shashi Narayan, Claire Gardent. Hybrid Simplication using Deep Semantics and Machine Translation. the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Jun. 2014, Baltimore, United States. pp. 435-445, 2014, Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics.

Kristian Woodsend and Mirella Lapata, Learning to Simplify Sen-

(56) **References Cited**

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

tences with Quasi-Synchronous Grammar and Integer Programming, Proceedings of the 2011 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 409-420, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, Jul. 27-31, 2011.

Bill MacCartney, Christopher D. Manning, Modeling Semantic Containment and Exclusion in Natural Language Inference, Proceeding COLING '08 Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Computational Linguistics—vol. 1 pp. 521-528 Association for Computational Linguistics Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2008.

Bill MacCartney, Christopher D. Manning, Modeling Semantic Containment and Exclusion in Natural Language Inference (a presentation), Aug. 2008.

Hua He and Jimmy Lin, Pairwise Word Interaction Modeling with Deep Neural Networks for Semantic Similarity Measurement, Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2016, pp. 937-948, San Diego, California, Jun. 12-17, 2016.

Dr. Radim Rehurek, scalability of semantic analysis in natural language processing, PH.D Thesis, May 2011.

Richard Socher Brody Huval Christopher D. Manning Andrew Y. Ng, Semantic Compositionality through Recursive Matrix-Vector Spaces, Proceedings of the 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning, pp. 1201-1211, Jeju Island, Korea, Jul. 12-14, 2012.

Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, Quoc V. Le, Sequence to Sequence Learning with Neural Networks, Advances in neural information processing systems, pp. 3104-3112, 2014.

Ryan Kiros, Yukun Zhu, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Richard S. Zemel, Antonio Torralba, Raquel Urtasun, Sanja Fidler, Skip-Thought Vectors, arXiv:1506.06726, Jun. 2015.

Radim Rehurek and Petr Sojka, Software Framework for Topic Modeling with Large Corpora, In Proceedings of LREC 2010 workshop New Challenges for NLP Frameworks. Valletta, Malta: University of Malta, 2010. s. 46-50, 5 s. ISBN 2-9517408-6-7.

Samuel R. Bowman, Jon Gauthier, Abhinav Rastogi, Raghav Gupta, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Potts, A Fast Unified Model for Parsing and Sentence Understanding, arXiv:1603,06021, Mar. 2016.

Xiang Zhang, Yann Lecun, Text Understanding from Scratch, arXiv:1502.01710, Apr. 2016.

Furong Huang, Animashree Anandkumar, Unsupervised Learning of Word-Sequence Representations from Scratch via Convolutional Tensor Decomposition, arXiv:1606.03153, Jun. 2015.

Chambers, N. and Jurafsky, D., "Unsupervised learning of narrative event chains," Proceedings of ACL-08, Columbus, Ohio, Jun. 2008, pp. 789-797.

Chambers, N. and Jurafsky, D., "Unsupervised learning of narrative schemas and their participants," Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting of the ACL and the 4th IJCNLP of the AFNLP, Suntec, Singapore, Aug. 2-7, 2009, pp. 602-610.

Chen, D. and Manning, C. D., "A fast and accurate dependency parser using neural networks," Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Doha, Qatar, Oct. 25-29, 2014, pp. 740-750.

Justeson, J, S. and Katz, S, M., "Technical terminology: some linguistic properties and an algorithm for identification in text," 1995, Natural Language Engineering 1(1):9-27.

Honnibal, M. and Johnson, M., "An improved non-monotonic transition system for dependency parsing," Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Lisbon, Portugal, Sep. 17-21, 2015, pp. 1373-1378.

Petrov, S., et al., "Learning accurate, compact, and interpretable tree annotation," Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Computational Linguistics and 44th Annual Meeting of the ACL, Sydney, Australia, Jul. 2006, pp. 433-440.

Simonson, D. E., "Investigations of the properties of narrative schemas," a dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Nov. 17, 2017, 259 pages.

Aswani, N., and Gaizauskas, R., "A hybrid approach to align sentences and words in English-Hindi parallel corpora," Jun. 2005, Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Building and Using Parallel Texts, Association for Computation Linguistics, pp. 57-64.

Manning, C. D., and Schüutze, H., Foundations of statistical natural language processing, 1999, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 44 pages.

International Search Report and Written Opinion issued for PCT/US2019/023854 dated Jun. 27, 2019, 17 pages.

* cited by examiner


Start
Receive Document
110
Create Original Document and Final Document
120
Tokenize Original Document
130
Tokenize Final Document
140
Correlate Original Texts and Final Texts
150
Store Original Texts, Final Texts, and Correlations
160

FIG. 1


Start
Tokenize DUA
210
Select SUA
220
Generate Similarity Score
230
Select Candidate Original Text
240
Create ESUA
250
Update Seed Database
260
Record ESUA
270

FIG. 2


SUA (310)
Subcontractor guarantees that the work is of good quality and free from defects.
OT1 (320)
Subcontractor guarantees that all material and equipment are free from defects.
FT1 (330)
Subcontractor guarantees that all material and equipment are free from material defects.
ESUA (340)
Subcontractor guarantees that the work is of good quality and free from material defects.

FIG. 3


First Alignment
SUA (410)
OT1 (420)
FT1 (430)
ESUA1 (440)
Second Alignment
ESUA1(450)
OT1 (460)
FT1 (470)
ESUA2 (480)

FIG. 4


First Alignment:
SUA (310)
Subcontractor guarantees that the work is of good quality and free from defects.
OT1 (320)
Subcontractor guarantees that all material and equipment are free from defects.
FT1 (330)
Subcontractor guarantees that all material and equipment are free from material defects.
ESUA1 (340)
Subcontractor guarantees that the work is of good quality and free from material defects.
Second Alignment:
ESUA1 (510)
Subcontractor guarantees that the work is of good quality and free from material defects.
OT2 (520)
Subcontractor warrants that the work is of good quality
FT2 (530)
Subcontractor warrants that the work is of ~~good~~ the quality specified
ESUA2 (540)
Subcontractor guarantees that the work is of ~~good~~ the quality specified and free from material defects

FIG. 5


Generate First Similarity Score
610
Create Subset of Original Texts
620
Generate Second Similarity Score
630
Generate Similarity Score
230

FIG. 6

Unedited Sentence

	Contractor	shall	indemnify	and	hold	harmless	the	owner	from	all	damages	and	expenses	including	attorney's	fees	710
Extracted Sentence	Contractor	shall	indemnify				the	owner	from	all	damages						711
	Contractor	shall	indemnify				the	owner	from	all			expenses				712
	Contractor	shall	indemnify				the	owner	from	all					attorney's	fees	713
	Contractor	shall			hold	harmless	the	owner	from	all	damages						714
	Contractor	shall			hold	harmless	the	owner	from	all			expenses				715
	Contractor	shall			hold	harmless	the	owner	from	all					attorney's	fees	716

Edited Sentence

	Contractor	shall	indemnify	~~and~~	~~hold~~	~~harmless~~	the	owner	from	all	proven	damages	and	expenses	~~including~~	~~attorney's~~	~~fees~~	720
Extracted Sentence	Contractor	shall	indemnify				the	owner	from	all	proven	damages						721
	Contractor	shall	indemnify				the	owner	from	all	proven			expenses				722
	Contractor	shall	indemnify				the	owner	from	all	proven					~~attorney's~~	~~fees~~	723
	Contractor	shall			~~hold~~	~~harmless~~	the	owner	from	all	proven	damages						724
	Contractor	shall			~~hold~~	~~harmless~~	the	owner	from	all	proven			expenses				725
	Contractor	shall			~~hold~~	~~harmless~~	the	owner	from	all	proven					~~attorney's~~	~~fees~~	726

FIG. 7


Start
Tokenize DUA
810
Select SUA
820
Generate Similarity Score
830
Select Candidate Original Text
840
Align SUA with Candidate Original Text
850
Align Candidate Original Text with Candidate Final Text
855
Select New Candidate
845
Create/Update ESUA
860
yes
More Candidates?
870
no
Update Seed Database
880
Record ESUA
890

FIG. 8


Start
Tokenize DUA
910
Select SUA
920
Create ESUA
930
Update Seed Database
940

FIG. 9

METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR SUGGESTING REVISIONS TO AN ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT

CROSS REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATION

This application is a continuation of U.S. application Ser. No. 16/244,217, filed Jan. 10, 2019, which is a continuation of U.S. application Ser. No. 15/227,093, filed Aug. 3, 2016 (now U.S. Pat. No. 10,216,715), which claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 62/200,261, filed Aug. 3, 2015, the disclosures of which are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

Field of the Invention

The embodiments of the invention relate to a method and system for revising electronic documents, and more particularly, to a method and system for suggesting edits to an electronic document. Although embodiments of the invention are suitable for a wide scope of applications, it is particularly suitable for suggesting revisions to electronic documents where the suggested revisions are similar to past revisions of similar documents.

Discussion of the Related Art

In the related art, revisions to electronic documents are performed primarily manually by a human editor. In the case of an electronic document such a legal contract, an editor may choose to make revisions that are similar to past revisions for legal consistency. Likewise, an editor may choose not to make revisions to documents (or its constituent parts) that are similar to past documents. For example, if a particular paragraph was revised in a particular way in a prior similar document, an editor may choose to edit the particular paragraph in the same way. Similarly, an editor may choose to make revisions that are similar to past revision to meet certain requirements.

The related art includes software that performs redlining to indicate differences between an original document and an edited document. Redlining, generally, displays new text as underlined and deleted text as strikethrough. For example: "Within 15 calendar days after execution of the Agreement, Subcontractor shall submit to the Owner a schedule of values allocating the contract sum to the various portions of the work."

The related art also include software such as Dealmaker by Bloomberg that compares document against a database of related documents to create redlines. The software displays, differences between a selected contract or part thereof and the most common contract or part thereof in the Dealmaker database of contracts. For example, the user may want to compare a lease against other leases. Dealmaker allows the user to compare the lease to the most common form of lease within the Dealmaker database and create a simple redline. Likewise, the user can compare a single provision against the most standard form of that provision within the dealmaker database and create a simple redline.

Many problems exist with the prior art. For example, it may be difficult for an editor to know which of many prior documents contained similar language. Similarly, an editor might not have access to all prior documents or the prior documents might be held by many different users. Thus, according to the related art, an editor may need to look at many documents and coordinate with other persons to find similar language. It can be time consuming and burdensome to identify and locate many prior documents and to review changes to similar language even with the related art redlining software. In some cases, previously reviewed documents can be overlooked and the organization would effectively lose the institutional knowledge of those prior revision. In the case of a large organization, there may be many editors and each individual editor may not be aware of edits made by other editors. Identifying similarity with precision can be difficult for an editor to accomplish with consistency. Additionally, edits made by human editors are limited by the editor's understanding of English grammar and the content of the portions being revised. As such, different human editors may revise the same portion of a document differently, even in view of the same past-documents.

There are also problems with the related art Dealmaker software as it is primarily a comparison tool. Dealmaker can show the lexical differences between a selected document, or part thereof, and the most common form of that document within the Dealmaker database. Dealmaker, however, does not propose revisions to documents that will make them acceptable to the user. Similarly, Dealmaker considers only a single source for comparison of each reviewed passage. Dealmaker only displays a simple redline between the subject document and the database document. Dealmaker does not consider parts of speech, verb tense, sentence structure, or semantic similarity. Thus Dealmaker may indicate that particular documents and clauses are different when in fact they have the same meaning.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Accordingly, embodiments of the invention are directed to a method and system for suggesting revisions to an electronic document that substantially obviates one or more of the problems due to limitations and disadvantages of the related art.

An object of embodiments of the invention is to provide an automated method of suggesting edits to a document.

Another object of embodiments of the invention is to provide a database of previously edited documents.

Yet another object of embodiments of the invention is to provide an engine to parse and compare a document to previously reviewed documents.

Still another object of embodiments of the invention is to provide a system that remembers revisions made to documents and suggests such revisions in view of future similar documents.

Another object of embodiments of the invention is to identify and remember text that was not edited.

Additional features and advantages of embodiments of the invention will be set forth in the description which follows, and in part will be apparent from the description, or may be learned by practice of embodiments of the invention. The objectives and other advantages of the embodiments of the invention will be realized and attained by the structure particularly pointed out in the written description and claims hereof as well as the appended drawings.

To achieve these and other advantages and in accordance with the purpose of embodiments of the invention, as embodied and broadly described, a method and system for suggesting revisions to an electronic document tokenizing a document-under-analysis ("DUA") into a plurality of statements-under-analysis ("SUAs"), selecting a first SUA of the plurality of SUAs, generating a first similarity score for each

of a plurality of the original texts, the similarity score representing a degree of similarity between the first SUA and each of the original texts, selecting a first candidate original text of the plurality of the original texts, and creating an edited SUA ("ESUA") by modifying a copy of the first SUA consistent with a first candidate final text associated with the first candidate original text.

In another embodiment, a method and system for suggesting revisions to an electronic document includes tokenizing a DUA into a plurality of statements-under-analysis ("SUAs"), selecting a first SUA of the plurality of SUAs, generating a first similarity score for each of a plurality of original texts, the first similarity score representing a degree of similarity between the first SUA and each of the original texts, respectively, generating a second similarity score for each of a subset of the plurality of original texts, the second similarity score representing a degree of similarity between the first SUA and each of the subset of the plurality of original texts, respectively, selecting a first candidate original text of the subset of plurality of the original texts, aligning the first SUA with the first candidate original text according to a first alignment, creating an edited SUA ("ESUA") by modifying a copy of the first SUA consistent with a first candidate final text associated with the first candidate original text.

In yet another embodiment, a method and system for suggesting revisions to an electronic document includes tokenizing a DUA into a plurality of statements-under-analysis ("SUAs"), selecting a first SUA of the plurality of SUAs, generating a first similarity score for each of a plurality of original texts, the first similarity score representing a degree of similarity between the first SUA and each of the original texts, respectively, generating a second similarity score for each of a subset of the plurality of original texts, the second similarity score representing a degree of similarity between the first SUA and each of the subset of the plurality of original texts, respectively, selecting a first candidate original text of the subset of plurality of the original texts, aligning the first SUA with the first candidate original text according to a first alignment, creating an edited SUA ("ESUA") by modifying a copy of the first SUA consistent with a first candidate final text associated with the first candidate original text, selecting a second candidate original text of the subset of plurality of the original texts, and modifying the ESUA consistent with a second candidate final text associated with the second candidate original text.

It is to be understood that both the foregoing general description and the following detailed description are exemplary and explanatory and are intended to provide further explanation of embodiments of the invention as claimed.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

The accompanying drawings, which are included to provide a further understanding of embodiments of the invention and are incorporated in and constitute a part of this specification, illustrate embodiments of the invention and together with the description serve to explain the principles of embodiments of the invention.

FIG. **1** is a process flowchart for creating a seed database according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention;

FIG. **2** is a process flowchart for editing a document and updating a seed database according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention;

FIG. **3** is an illustration of single alignment according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention;

FIG. **4** is an illustration of multiple alignment according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention;

FIG. **5** is an illustration of multiple statement alignment according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention;

FIG. **6** is a process flowchart for generating a similarity score according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention;

FIG. **7** is an illustration of multiple statement extraction according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention;

FIG. **8** is a process flowchart for editing a document and updating a seed database according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention; and

FIG. **9** is a process flowchart for editing a document and updating a seed database according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS

Reference will now be made in detail to the preferred embodiments of the invention, examples of which are illustrated in the accompanying drawings. The invention may, however, be embodied in many different forms and should not be construed as being limited to the embodiments set forth herein; rather, these embodiments are provided so that this disclosure will be thorough and complete, and will fully convey the concept of the invention to those skilled in the art. In the drawings, the thicknesses of layers and regions are exaggerated for clarity. Like reference numerals in the drawings denote like elements.

The invention disclosed herein is described, in part, in terms that are unique to the problem being solved. Thus, for the avoidance of doubt, the below descriptions and definitions are provided for clarity. The term DUA means "document under analysis." A DUA is, generally, a document that is being analyzed for potential revision. A DUA can be, for example, a sales contract that is received by a real estate office. The term SUA means "statement under analysis." The DUA can be divided into a plurality of statements, and each statement can be called a SUA. The SUA can be analyzed according to the systems and methods described herein to provide suggested revisions to the SUA. Generally speaking, the SUA can be a sentence and the DUA can be tokenized into SUAs based on sentence breaks (e.g. periods). The SUA, however, is not limited to sentences and the SUA can be, for example, an entire paragraph or a portion or phrase of larger sentence. The term ESUA means "edited statement under analysis." The term "sentence" means sentence in the traditional sense, that is, a string of words terminating with a period that would be interpreted as a sentence according to the rules of grammar. The description of embodiments of the invention herein use the word "sentence" without prejudice to the generality of the invention. One of skill in the art would appreciate that "sentence" could be replaced with "phrase" or "paragraph" and the invention would be equally applicable.

The term "original document" means a document that has not been edited by the methods described herein. The term "final document" means the final version of a corresponding original document. A final document can be an edited version of an original document. The term "original text" means part of an original document (e.g. a sentence). The term "final text" means part of a final document (e.g. a sentence). A phrase or sentence is "compound" when it includes multiple ideas. For example, the sentence "It is hot and rainy" is compound because it includes two ideas: (1) "It is hot"; and (2) "It is rainy."

Embodiments of the invention can further include a "seed database." A seed database can be derived from one or more "seed documents" which are generally original documents and final documents. In some instances, a seed document can be both an original document and a final document such as documents that include "track changes" that are common with documents created in Microsoft Word. The original text of each seed document can be can be tokenized into one or more tokens. The final text of each seed document can be tokenized into one or more tokens. Each token of original text can be correlated with its respective final text. The each original text token and its corresponding final text can be stored in the seed database. In some instances, an original text and a final text can be identical, for example when no edits or changes were made. In such instances, the original text and corresponding identical final text can be saved in the seed database.

The term "similarity score" means a value (or relative value) that is generated from the comparison of an SUA and an original text. The similarity score can be, for example, an absolute number (e.g. 0.625 or 2044) or a percentage (e.g. 95%). Multiple methods for generating a similarity score are described herein or are otherwise known in the art and any such method or formula can be used to generate a similarity score.

The term "aligning" or "alignment" means matching the words and phrases of one sentence to another. Words and phrases can be matched according to lexical or semantic similarity. Alignment is frequently imprecise due to variation between sentences. Thus, "alignment" does not necessarily imply a 1:1 correlation between words and, in many cases, alignment is partial.

FIG. **1** is a process flowchart for creating a seed database according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As shown in FIG. **1**, a creating a seed database includes receiving **110** a seed document, creating **120** an original document and a final document, tokenizing **130** the original document, tokenizing **140** the final document, correlating **150** each original texts with a corresponding and final text, and storing 160 each original text, its corresponding final text, and the correlation in the seed database.

In step **110**, one or more seed documents can be selected. The seed documents can be for example, Microsoft Word documents. The seed documents can include "track changes" such as underline and strike-through to denote additions and deletions, respectively. In an alternative embodiment, a seed document can be a pair of documents such as original version and an edited version. The seed documents relate to a common subject or share a common purpose such as a commercial leases or professional services contracts. The seed documents can represent documents that have been edited and reviewed from the original text to the final text.

The edits and revisions can embody, for example, the unwritten policy or guidelines of a particular organization. As an example, a company may receive a lease document from a prospective landlord. The original document provided by the landlord may provide "this lease may be terminated by either party on 30-days notice." The company may have an internal policy that it will only accept leases requiring 60-days notice. Accordingly, in the exemplary lease, an employee of the company may revise the lease agreement to say "this lease may be terminated by either party on 60-days notice." As a second example, the proposed lease provided by the prospective landlord may include a provision that states "all disputes must be heard in a court in Alexandria, Va." These terms may be acceptable to the company and the company may choose to accept that language in a final version.

In the example of the company, one or more seed documents can be selected in step **110**. The seed documents can be for example, commercial leases that have been proposed by prospective landlords and have been edited to include revisions in the form of "track changes" of the apartment rental company. In the alternative, a seed document can comprise two separate documents. The first document can be an original document such as the lease proposed by a prospective landlords. The second document can be an edited version that includes revisions made by the company.

In step optional step **120**, a seed document having embedded track changes can be split into two documents. A first document can be an original document and a second document can be a final document.

In step **130**, the original text of each original document can be tokenized into a plurality of original texts. The original document can be tokenized according to a variety of hard or soft delimiters. In the simplest form, a token delimiter can be a paragraph. In this example, an original document can be tokenized according to the paragraphs of the document with each paragraph being separated into a distinct token. The original document can also be tokenized according to sentences as indicated by a period mark. Paragraph marks, period marks, and other visible indicia can be called "hard" delimiters. In more complex examples, original document can be tokenized according to "soft" delimiters to create tokens that include only a portion of sentence. A "soft" delimiter can be based on sentence structure rather than a visible indicia. For example, a sentence can be tokenized according to a subject and predicate. In another example, a sentence can be tokenized according to a clause and a dependent clause. In another example, a sentence can be tokenized into a condition and a result such as an if-then statement.

In step **140**, the final text of each final document can be tokenized into a plurality of final texts. The tokenization of the final document can be performed in the same manner as described in conjunction with the tokenization of the original document.

In step **150**, each original text is correlated to its respective final text. For example, the original text "this lease may be terminated by either party on 30-days notice" can be correlated with the final text "this lease may be terminated by either party on 60-days notice." In a second example where no changes are made, the original text "all disputes must be heard in a court in Alexandria, Va." can be correlated with the final text "all disputes must be heard in a court in Alexandria, Va." In the alternative, the original text of second example can be correlated with flag indicating the original text and the final text are the same. In a third example, where a deletion is made, original text "landlord shall pay all attorneys fees" can be correlated with final text of a null string. In the alternative, the original text of the third example can be correlated with a flag indicating the original text was deleted in its entirety.

In step **160**, each original text, its corresponding final text, and the correlation can be saved in the seed database. The correlation can be explicit or implied. In an explicit correlation, each original text can be stored with additional information identifying its corresponding final text and vice versa. In an exemplary embodiment, each original text and each final text can be given a unique identifier. An explicit correlation can specify the unique identifier of the corresponding original text or final text. A correlation can also be

implied. For example, an original text can be stored in the same data structure or database object as a final text. In this instance, although there is not explicit correlation, the correlation can be implied by the proximity or grouping. The seed database can then be used to suggest revisions to future documents as explained in greater detail in conjunction with FIG. **2**.

It is contemplated that a user editor may desire to take advantage of the novel benefits invention without having a repository of past documents to prime the seed database. Therefore, embodiments of the invention further include a sample database of original text and corresponding final text for a variety of document types. Embodiments of the invention can further include a user questionnaire or interview to determine the user's preferences and then load the seed database with portions of the sample database consistent with the user's answers to the questionnaire. For example, a new user may desire to use the invention but that particular new user does not have previously edited documents with which to prime the seed database. Embodiments of the invention may ask the use questions, such as "will you agree to fee shifting provisions?" If the user answers "yes", then the seed database can be loaded with original and final text from the sample database that include fee shifting. If the user answers "no", then the seed database can be loaded with original and final text from the sample database that has original text including fee shifting and final text where fee shifting has been deleted or edited. In another example, a sample question includes "how many days notice do you require to terminate a lease?" If a user answers "60", then the seed database can be loaded with original and final text from the sample database that has a 60-day lease-termination notice provision, or, as another example, where the original text has N-day termination provisions and the final text has a 60-day termination provision.

FIG. **2** is a process flowchart for editing a document and updating a seed database according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As shown in FIG. **2**, editing a document and updating a seed database can include tokenizing **210** a DUA (document under analysis), selecting **220** a SUA (statement under analysis), generating **230** similarity scores, selecting **240** a candidate original text, creating **250** an ESUA (edited statement under analysis), updating **260** the seed database, and recording **270** the ESUA.

In step **210**, a DUA can be tokenized into a plurality of SUAs. The DUA can be tokenized in the same way as described in conjunction with FIG. **1** with tokenizing the original document and final document in creation of the seed database. The DUA can be selected by a user. The DUA can be an electronic document. The DUA can be proposed legal document such as lease, contract, or agreement. In the example of the apartment rental company, a DUA can be a proposed lease agreement provided by a prospective tenant. The DUA can be selected via a file-chooser dialog. The DUA can be selected via a context-menu. The DUA can be selected via a drop-down menu. The DUA can be selected via plug-in for a document management system or an e-mail program.

In step **220**, an SUA can be selected. The SUA can be a first SUA of the DUA. In subsequent iterations, successive SUAs can be selected such as the second SUA, the third SUA, and so on. Each SUA can be selected in succession.

In step **230**, a similarity score can be generated. The similarity score can represent a degree of similarity between the currently selected SUA and each of the original texts in the seed database.

A similarity score for a given SUA and original text can be calculated by comparing the total number of words or the number of words with similar semantics. In exemplary embodiments of the invention, a model of semantically similar words can be used in conjunction with generating the similarity score. For example, the database can specify that "contract" has a similar meaning as "agreement." The step of calculating a similarity score can further include assessing words with similar semantics. For example, using the model, the SUA "the contract requires X" can be calculated to have a similarity score of nearly 100% similar to the original text "the agreement requires X" in the seed database.

Generating a similarity score can include assigning a lower weight to proper nouns. In other embodiments, generating a similarity score can include ignoring proper nouns. Generating a similarity score can include classifying a SUA based on comparing various parts of the SUA. For example, a SUA's subject, verb, object, and modifiers may be compared to each of the subject, verb, object, and modifiers of the original texts in the seed database. Additionally, modifiers of a SUA with a specific characteristics may be compared to the modifiers of various other original texts that all have the same specific characteristics.

The following is an example of two original texts in an exemplary seed database, the corresponding final texts to those two original texts, a SUA from a DUA, and edits made to the SUA consistent with the final texts.

Original Text 1:
"Contractor shall submit a schedule of values of the various portions of the work."
Noun: (nominal subject) Contractor
Verb: Submit
Noun: (direct object) Schedule
Corresponding Final Text 1:
"Contractor shall submit a schedule of values allocating the contract sum to the various portions of the work."
Original Text 2:
"Contractor shall submit to Owner for approval a schedule of values immediately after execution of the Agreement."
Noun: (nominal subject) Contractor
Verb: Submit
Noun: (direct object) Schedule
Final Text 2:
"Contractor shall submit to Owner for prompt approval a schedule of values prior to the first application for payment."
SUA:
"Immediately after execution of the Agreement, Contractor shall submit to Owner for approval a schedule of values of the various portions of the work."
Noun: (nominal subject) Contractor
Verb: Submit
Noun: (direct object) Schedule
Edited SUA:
"Prior to the first application for payment, Contractor shall submit to Owner for prompt approval a schedule of values allocating the contract sum to the various portions of the work."

In the above example, all the sentences contained the same nominal subject, verb, and direct object. The invention can classify these sentences based upon the similarity of the nominal subject, verb, and direct object as having a high similarity. The invention then compare the other parts of the SUA to the original text from Original Text 1 and 2 and made corresponding edits to the similar portions of the DUA sentence.

Generating a similarity score can include assigning a lower weight to insignificant parts of speech. For example, in the phrase, "therefore, Contractor shall perform the Contract" the word "therefore" can be assigned a lower weight in assessing similarity.

Generating a similarity score can include stemming words and comparing the stems. For example, the words, "argue", "argued", "argues", "arguing", and "argus" reduce to the stem "argu" and the stem "argue" could be used for the purpose of generating a similarity score.

The similarity score can be generated according to well-known methods in the art. The similarity score can be a cosine similarity score, a clustering metric, or other well-known string similarity metrics such as Jaro-Winkler, Jaccard or Levenshtein. In preferred embodiments a similarity score is a cosine similarity score that represents the degree of lexical overlap between the selected SUA and each of the original texts. A cosine similarity score can be computationally fast to calculate in comparison to other similarity scoring methods. A cosine similarity score can be calculated according to methods known in the art, such as described in U.S. Pat. No. 8,886,648 to Procopio et. al the entirety of which is hereby incorporated by reference. A cosine similarity score can have a range between 0 and 1 where scores closer to 1 can indicate a high degree of similarity and scores closer to 0 can indicate a lower degree of similarity.

A clustering algorithm can plot a loose association of related strings in two or more dimensions and use their distance in space as a similarity score. A string similarity metric can provide an algorithm specific indication of distance ('inverse similarity') between two strings.

In step **240**, a candidate original text can be selected. The candidate original text can be the original text having the best similarity score calculated in step **230**. As used herein, the term "best" can mean the similarity score indicating the highest degree of similarity. In the alternative, a threshold cut-off can be implemented and a second criteria can be used to perform the selection of step **240**. For example, a threshold cut-off can be all similarity scores that exceed a predetermined level such as "similarity scores greater than 0.65". In another example, a threshold cut-off can be a predetermined number of original texts having the best similarity score such as the "top 3" or the "top 5." In an exemplary threshold cut-off only scores that exceed the threshold cut-off are considered for selection in step **240**. The selection can include selecting the original text having the best similarity score. The section can include choosing the original text having the largest number of similar words to the SUA. The selection can include choosing the original text having the largest identical substring with the SUA. Subsequent selections under step **240** can omit previously selected original texts.

In step **250**, an ESUA (edited statement under analysis) can be created. The ESUA can be created by applying the same edits from a final text associated with the candidate original text to the SUA. The process of applying the edits is described in more particularity in conjunction with discussion of alignment in FIG. **3**-FIG. **5**. After step **250**, the process can transition back to step **220** where another SUA is selected. If there are no more SUAs, the process can transition to step **260** wherein the seed database is updated.

Although not shown in FIG. **2**, an optional step (not shown) can occur before the update the seed database step **260**. In the optional step (not shown) the ESUAs can be displayed to a user for approval and confirmation. A user can further edit the ESUAs according to preference or business and legal objectives. The SUA and the ESUA (including any user-entered revisions thereto) can be stored in the seed database in step **260**.

In step **260**, the seed database can be updated by saving the SUAs and the corresponding ESUAs. In this way, the seed database grows with each DUA and edits made to an SUA will be retained in the institutional knowledge of the seed database.

In step **270**, the ESUAs can be recorded. In a first example, the ESUAs can be recorded at the end of the DUA in an appendix. The appendix can specify amendments and edits to the DUA. In this way, and original words of the DUA are not directly edited, but an appendix specifies the revised terms. This first method of recording the ESUAs can be utilized when the DUA is a PDF document that cannot easily be edited. In a second example, the ESUA can be recorded in-line in the DUA. Each ESUA can be used to replace the corresponding SUA. In embodiments of the invention, the ESUA can be inserted in place of the SUA with "track changes" indicating the edits being made. This second method of recording the ESUAs can be utilized when the DUA is in an easily editable format such as Microsoft Word. In a third example, the ESUAs can be recorded in a separate document than the DUA. The separate document can be an appendix maintained as a separate file. The separate document can refer to the SUAs of the DUA and identify corresponding ESUAs. This third method can be utilized when the DUA is a locked or secured document that does not allow editing.

FIG. **3** is an illustration of single alignment according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As shown in FIG. **3**, single alignment includes aligning an SUA **310** to an original text "OT1" **320**, aligning a corresponding final text "FT1" **330** to the original text **320** and finally creating the ESUA **340**. The illustration of FIG. **3** is described as a "single alignment" because the SUA **310** is aligned with OT1 **320** one time. To align the SUA **310** and the OT1 **320**, each word of the SUA **310** is matched to a corresponding word of the OT1 **320**, where applicable. In the example of FIG. **3**, the words "subcontractor guarantees that" in the SUA **310** are the same as the words "subcontractor guarantees that" of the OT1 **320**. These words are denoted as "aligned" by the arrows extending therebetween. The next words of the SUA **310** "the work is of good quality and", however, have no corresponding words in the OT1 **320**. These words cannot be aligned. Finally, the words "free from defects" in the SUA **310** are matched to the words "free from defects" in the OT1 **320** completing the alignment of the SUA **310** to the OT1 **320**. In this example, only six of the words matched, but the SUA **310** and the OT1 **320** are nevertheless described as aligned.

While the example of FIG. **3** illustrates alignment by correlating identical words, the invention is not limited to identical words. Alignment according to the invention further contemplates alignment of similar words such as synonyms or words that are interchangeable in context such as "guarantees" and "warrants." A word embedding model can be used to align sentences having similar meanings although they have few words in common.

Word embedding is the collective name for a set of language modeling and feature learning techniques in natural language processing (NLP) where words or phrases from the vocabulary are mapped to vectors of real numbers in a low-dimensional space relative to the vocabulary size ("continuous space"). A word embedding model can be generated by learning how words are used in context by reading many millions of samples. By training the model on domain

relevant text, a word embedding model can be built which effectively understands how words are used within that domain, thereby providing a means for determining when two words are equivalent in a given context. Methods to generate this mapping include neural networks, dimensionality reduction on the word co-occurrence matrix, probabilistic models, and explicit representation in terms of the context in which words appear. Word and phrase embeddings, when used as the underlying input representation, boost the performance in NLP tasks such as syntactic parsing and sentiment analysis.

Word2vec is an exemplary word embedding toolkit which can train vector space models. A method named Item2Vec provides scalable item-item collaborative filtering. Item2Vec is based on word2vec with minor modifications and produces low dimensional representation for items, where the affinity between items can be measured by cosine similarity. Software for training and using word embeddings includes Tomas Mikolov's Word2vec, Stanford University's GloVe and Deeplearning4j. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and T-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) can both be used to reduce the dimensionality of word vector spaces and visualize word embeddings and clusters.

The alignment of the FT1 **330** and the OT1 **320** can proceed in the same way as the alignment of OT1 **320** with the SUA **310**. As shown in FIG. **3**, the words of FT1 **330** can be matched to the aligned words of the OT1 **320**.

After the SUA **310**, the OT1 **320**, and the FT1 **330** are aligned, the edits from the FT1 **330** can be applied to the SUA **310** to create the ESUA **340**. In the example of FIG. **3**, the word "material" was added to the FT1 **330** and, because of the alignment, the word "material" is added in the corresponding location in the SUA **310** to create the ESUA **340**.

An expression can be generated that describes the steps to convert the OT1 **320** into the FT1 **330**. The expression can describe, for example, a series of edit operations, such as [Insert 1,3,1,1] to insert words 1-3 from the FT1 **330** at position 1 of the OT1 **320**. A similar expression can be generated that describes the steps to convert the SUA **310** to the OT1 **320**. The two resulting expressions can be combined to generate a combined expression(s) describing equal subsequences where edits could be applied from the FT1 **330** to the SUA **310**. Applying the combined expression to the SUA **310** can produce the ESUA **340**.

FIG. **4** is an illustration of multiple alignment according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As shown in FIG. **4**, the SUA **410** and the original text OT1 **420** are essentially the same, except that the order of some of the words is changed. In a simplified example, the SUA **410** says "Subcontractor guarantees A, B and C" while the OT1 says "Subcontractor guarantees C, B and A." As shown in the final text FT1 **430**, edits were made to the words corresponding to clause C and A in the simplified example. In this case, the OT1 **420** can be aligned in more than one way so that the edits of the FT1 **430** can be applied to the corresponding clauses A and C of the SUA.

In more detail, in a first alignment, the words "subcontractor guarantees that the work will be" of the SUA **410** are aligned with the same words "subcontractor guarantees that the work will be" of the OT1 **420**. Similarly, the words "of good quality" are aligned with identical words in the OT1 **420**. Under this alignment, however, the words "new and free from defects" of the SUA **410**, however, do not align with any text in the OT1. Nevertheless, the OT1 **420** is considered aligned with the SUA **410**.

Next, the final text FT1 (**430**) is aligned with the OT1 (**420**) and the edits from the FT1 **430** are implemented in the corresponding locations of the SUA **410** to create the ESUA1 **440**.

It will be noted from this example of a first alignment, that some of the edits from the FT1 (e.g. "free from material defects") were not aligned under the first alignment and were not implemented in the ESUA1 **440**. However, examining the ESUA1 **440** reveals that the ESUA1 (and the SUA) included words that should have been edited (e.g. "free from defects"). To capture these edits to the FT1 **430** in the ESUA **440**, a second alignment is performed.

In more detail, a second alignment begins with the ESUA1 **450** that was the output ESUA1 **440** from the first alignment. In the second alignment of the OT1 (**460**) with the ESUA1 (**450**) the words "free from defects" are aligned instead of the "of good quality" as in the first alignment. Next, the FT1 **470** is aligned with the OT1 (**460**) and the edits from the FT1 **470** are implemented in the corresponding locations of the ESUA1 **450** to create the ESUA2 **480**.

In summary, as shown in FIG. **4**, a first alignment aligns one clause of the SUA **410** (e.g. clause A from the simplified example) to the OT1 **420** and corresponding edits of the FT1 **430** are applied to the SUA **410** to create the ESUA1 **440**. Next, a second alignment a second clause of the ESUA1 **450** (e.g. clause C from the simplified example) to the OT1 **460** and the corresponding edits of the FT1 **470** are applied to the ESUA1 **450** to create the ESUA2 **480**.

FIG. **5** is an illustration of multiple statement alignment according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As shown in FIG. **5** a SUA **310** can be aligned according to a first alignment with a first original text OT1 **320**. The ESUA1 **510** can then be aligned with a second original text OT2 **520**. The first alignment of FIG. **5** can be the same as described in conjunction with FIG. **3**. The OT1 **320** can be an original text from the seed database having best a similarity score. The OT2 **520** can be an original text from the seed database having a second best similarity score. After the first alignment and edits are performed as described in conjunction with FIG. **3**, OT2 **520** can be selected as a basis to further edit the ESUA1 **510**. The alignment of the ESUA1 **510** with the OT2 **520**, the alignment of OT2 **520** with the correlated final text FT2 **530**, and the implementation of edits to yield the ESUA2 **540** can proceed in the same manner as the first alignment although this time using the ESUA1 **540** as a starting point and using the OT2 **520** and FT2 **530**. It should be noted that when two or more original texts having identical or similar edits are used in multi-statement alignment, the identical or similar edits are only applied once (e.g. the term "material" would not be inserted twice.)

Multiple statement alignment according to the invention can beneficial when an SUA has high similarity with two or more original texts. By aligning and inserting edits from multiple final texts, the ESUA can more closely resembles prior edits made to similar text. It is contemplated that multiple alignments can be performed on a first original text (as described in conjunction with FIG. **4**) and that multiple alignments can be performed with multiple original texts. In more detail, a first original text can be aligned with an SUA according to a first alignment, the first original text can then be aligned with the resultant ESUA according to a second alignment, a second original text can be aligned with the resultant ESUA according to a yet another alignment, and the second original text can be aligned with the resultant ESUA according to a fourth alignment. In this way, the end ESUA has the benefit of edits made to two original texts,

each aligned in two different ways. The foregoing example is not limiting and the invention contemplates three, four, or more alignments of a single original text with an SUA and further alignment three, four, or more other original texts.

FIG. **6** is a process flowchart for generating a similarity score according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As shown in FIG. **6**, generating **230** a similarity score can include generating **610** a first similarity score, creating **620** a subset of original texts, and generating **630** a second similarity score. It is contemplated that generation of a similarity score, generally, can be computationally expensive. If a computationally expensive similarity score is generated for every original text in a seed database, the overall process of generating the similarity score can become lengthy. Thus it is contemplated that a computationally "cheap" similarity score be generated for a large number of original texts and a second computationally expensive similarity score be generated for good candidates.

In step **610** a first similarity score can be generated between an SUA and a large number of original texts in the seed database. The similarity score can be generated by a computationally cheap algorithm such as cosine similarity. The scored original texts can represent all original texts in the seed database. The scored original texts can represent a portion of the original texts in the database. The portion can be determined based on the subject matter of the DUA and the content of the SUA. For example, in a DUA that is a lease and an SUA that relates to attorneys fees, the portion of original texts of the seed database can be original texts that relate to attorneys fees in lease agreements. In this way, a first similarity score is not even generated for original texts that are unlikely to have similarity with the DUA.

In step **620**, a subset of the original texts for which a similarity score was generated in step **610** is chosen. The subset can be selected by thresholds and cutoffs. For example, a subset can include original texts that have a similarity score that exceed a threshold. In another example, a subset can include the original texts having the "top 5" or "top 20" similarity scores.

In step **630**, a second similarity score can be generated between the original texts in the subset and the SUA. The second similarity score can be a computationally expensive similarity score such as word-embedding model or syntactic structure oriented model that would require more time but would run on a subset of the original texts that appear to be related by cosine or another fast string matching score. In this way, the number of computationally expensive similarity scores to be calculated can be reduced.

FIG. **7** is an illustration of multiple statement extraction according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As shown in FIG. **7**, an unedited compound sentence **710** can be "expanded" into many simplified unedited sentences **711-716**. Each of the simplified unedited sentences **711-716** represents a logically truthful statement in view of the unedited compound sentence **710**. Similarly, the edited compound sentence **720** can be "expanded" into many simplified edited sentences **721-726**, each representing a logically truthful statement in view of the edited compound sentence **720**. The expansion can be performed over conjunctions or lists of items.

In a more generalized example, the statement "you shall do A and B" is the logical concatenation of "you shall do A" and "you shall do B." It follows then that if the statement is edited to "you shall do A' and B" that the extracted statements "you shall do A'" and "you shall do B" are also true for the edited statement. In this simplified example there are at least two pieces of information having general applicability. First, that A has been edited to A' and second, that B has remained B. In view of the foregoing, embodiments of the invention can suggest A be changed to A' and B remain as B when reviewing other SUAs within the DUA or in other DUAs.

For the purposes of augmenting the seed database with more generalized original texts, an unedited compound statement such as **710** can be expanded to the simplified unedited sentences **711-716**. These simplified unedited sentences **711-716** can be separately stored in the seed database together with their corresponding simplified edited sentences **721-726** expanded from the edited compound sentence **720**.

FIG. **8** is a process flowchart for editing a document and updating a seed database according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As shown in FIG. **8**, editing a document and updating a seed database can include tokenizing **810** a DUA (document under analysis), selecting **820** a SUA (statement under analysis), generating **830** similarity scores, selecting **340** a candidate original text, aligning **850** the SUA with the candidate original text, aligning **855** a candidate final text with the candidate original text, creating **860** an ESUA (edited statement under analysis), determining **870** whether there are additional candidates, selecting **845** a new candidate, updating **880** the seed database, and recording **8900** the ESUA.

In step **810**, a DUA can be tokenized into a plurality of SUAs. The DUA can be tokenized in the same way as described in conjunction with FIG. **1** with tokenizing the original document and final document in creation of the seed database. The DUA can be selected by a user. The DUA can be an electronic document. The DUA can be proposed legal document such as lease, contract, or agreement. In the example of the apartment rental company, a DUA can be a proposed lease agreement provided by a prospective tenant. The DUA can be selected via a file-chooser dialog. The DUA can be selected via a context-menu. The DUA can be selected via a drop-down menu. The DUA can be selected via plug-in for a document management system or an e-mail program.

In step **820**, an SUA can be selected. The SUA can be a first SUA of the DUA. In subsequent iterations, successive SUAs can be selected such as the second SUA, the third SUA, and so on. Each SUA can be selected in succession.

In step **830**, a similarity score can be generated. The similarity score can represent a degree of similarity between the currently selected SUA and at least some of the original texts in the seed database. The similarity score can be generated according to the process described in conjunction with FIG. **6**.

In step **840**, a candidate original text can be selected. The selected candidate original text can be the original text having the best similarity score. In embodiments where a single similarity score is calculated, the candidate original text can be selected from the original texts for which a similarity score was generated. In embodiments where two similarity scores are generated, such as described in conjunction with FIG. **6**, the candidate original text can be selected from the original texts for which a second similarity score was generated.

A candidate original text can be selected from a filtered subset of the original texts. For example, a candidate original text can be selected from the "top 10" original texts based on a second similarity score. In another example, a candidate original text can be selected from the set of original texts having a second similarity score that exceeds a predetermined threshold. The selection can be the "best"

similarity score. The selection can be the original text from a filter list having a longest matching substring in common with the SUA.

In step **850**, the selected candidate original text can be aligned with the SUA.

In step **855**, the candidate edited text can be aligned with the candidate original text.

In step **860**, an ESUA (edited statement under analysis) can be created. The ESUA can be created by applying edits from a final text associated with the candidate original text to the SUA. The process of applying the edits is described in more particularity in conjunction with discussion of alignment in FIG. **3**-FIG. **5**.

The foregoing alignment and creating an ESUA (steps **850**, **855**, and **860**) of the embodiment described in FIG. **8** can be described as a single alignment of an SUA, original text, and edited text. However, it should be appreciated that the steps **850**, **855**, and **860** could be repeated to achieve a second alignment and updating of the ESUA consistent with the example described in conjunction with FIG. **4**.

In step **870**, it can be determined if there are additional candidate original texts. In the example where a "top 10" original texts are filtered from the original texts for consideration in the selection step **840**, the decision step **870** can evaluate whether there are additional original texts of the "top 10" to be considered. If there are additional candidates, the process can transition to select new candidate step **845**. If no candidates remain, the process can transition to update seed database step **880**.

The select new candidate step **845** can be consistent with the multiple statement alignment described in conjunction with FIG. **5**. In the example where a "top 10" original texts were filtered for potential selection in step **840**, an unselected one of the "top 10" can be selected in the select new candidate step **845**. The new candidate original text and its corresponding edited text can be aligned with the SUA in steps **850** and **855**. The ESUA can be updated with the edits from the new candidate in step **860**.

Although not shown in FIG. **8**, it should be appreciated that throughout the process of suggesting edits, various edits and suggestions can be presented to the user for confirmation and further editing prior to finalizing a document. For example, a user interface for a software application implementing the invention can provide a visual indication of all of the edits suggested to a DUA and its SUAs. A user can use such a user interface to further revise the ESUAs or edit unedited SUAs. A user can further select an unedited SUA and manual enter revisions. Revisions entered by a user can be stored in the seed database in step **880**.

In update seed database step **880**, the seed database can be updated by saving the SUAs and the corresponding ESUAs. In some cases the SUA will not have a corresponding ESUA indicating that the text was acceptable as proposed. In these cases, an ESUA can be generated that is identical to the SUA and both SUA and identical ESUA can be stored in the seed database. In this way, the seed database grows with each DUA and edits made to an SUA or SUAs accepted without revision will be retained in the institutional knowledge of the seed database. Although this step **880** is illustrated as occurring after the step **860** and before the step **820**, it should be appreciated that the updating the seed database step **880** can occur at any time after an ESUA is created. In a preferred embodiment, the updating the seed database step **880** can occur after all SUAs of a DUA have been analyzed and a user has confirmed the edits are accurate and complete.

In step **890**, the ESUAs can be recorded. In a first example, the ESUAs can be recorded at the end of the DUA in an appendix. The appendix can specify amendments and edits to the DUA. In this way, and original words of the DUA are not directly edited, but an appendix specifies the revised terms. This first method of recording the ESUAs can be utilized with the DUA is a PDF document than cannot easily be edited. In a second example, the ESUA can be recorded in-line in the DUA. Each ESUA can be used to replace the corresponding SUA. In embodiments of the invention, the ESUA can be inserted in place of the SUA with "track changes" indicating the edits being made. This second method of recording the ESUAs can be utilized when the DUA is in an easily editable format such as Microsoft Word. In a third example, the ESUAs can be recorded in a separate document. The separate document can refer to the SUAs of the DUA and identify corresponding ESUAs. This third method can be utilized when the DUA is a locked or secured document that does not allow editing.

Again, although this step **890** is illustrated as occurring after the step **880** and before the step **820**, it should be appreciated that the recording the ESUA step **890** can occur at any time after an ESUA is created. In a preferred embodiment, the recording the ESUA step **890** can occur after all SUAs of a DUA have been analyzed and a user has confirmed the edits are accurate and complete.

FIG. **9** is a process flowchart for editing a document and updating a seed database according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As shown in FIG. **9**, editing a document and updating a seed database can include tokenizing **910** a DUA, selecting **920** an SUA, creating **930** an ESUA, and updating **940** a seed database.

In step **910**, a DUA can be tokenized in the same manner as described in conjunction with step **210** of FIG. **2**.

In step **920**, a SUA can be manually selected by a user. A user can select an SUA that the user desires to modify.

In step **930**, a user can manually modify an SUA to create an ESUA. This process of selecting and editing can be consistent with a user revising a document according to their knowledge, expertise, or business objectives.

In step **940**, the SUA and the ESUA can be stored in a seed database. If the SUA was not edited, the SUA can be copied to the ESUA and both can be stored in a seed database. The embodiment of FIG. **9** can be useful when a seed database does not exist. The embodiment of FIG. **9** can be useful when the seed database has insufficient content to suggest useful edits. In this way, the seed database can grow from normal document review and editing.

Embodiments of the invention can be implemented as a software application executable on a computer terminal or distributed as a series of instructions recorded on computer-readable medium such as a CD-ROM. The computer can have memory such as a disk for storage, a processor for performing calculations, a network interface for communications, a keyboard and mouse for input and selection, and a display for viewing. Portions of the invention, such as the seed database, can be implemented on a database server or stored locally on a user's computer. Embodiments of the invention can be implemented in a remote or cloud computing environment where a user can interface with the invention through a web browser. Embodiments of the invention can be implemented as plug-in for popular document editing software (e.g. Microsoft Word) that can suggest revisions to an SUA through the document editing software.

It will be apparent to those skilled in the art that various modifications and variations can be made in the method and system for suggesting revisions to an electronic document without departing from the spirit or scope of the invention. Thus, it is intended that embodiments of the invention cover

the modifications and variations of this invention provided they come within the scope of the appended claims and their equivalents.

What is claimed is:

1. A computer-implemented method for priming a seed database for suggesting revisions to text data, the method comprising:

obtaining a sample database comprising a plurality of sample original texts and a plurality of sample final texts, wherein each sample original text is associated with a respective sample final text;

obtaining an input comprising an indication of a user preference;

selecting one or more of the plurality of sample originals texts and the plurality of sample final texts is based on the user preference;

loading, into the seed database, the selected one or more of the plurality of sample original texts and the plurality of sample final texts;

obtaining an electronic document under analysis (DUA);

tokenizing the DUA into one or more statements under analysis (SUAs);

selecting a first SUA of the one or more SUAs;

selecting a candidate original text from the seed database; and

determining, using a natural language processing (NLP) alignment of the first SUA and the candidate original text, an edit operation to apply to the DUA.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the determined edit operation is based on the user preference.

3. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

applying the determined edit operation to the DUA.

4. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

providing a questionnaire to a user, wherein the obtained input comprising the indication of the user preference comprises a response to the questionnaire.

5. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

interviewing a user, wherein the obtained input comprising the indication of the user preference comprises a response to the interview.

6. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

obtaining a sample original text;

generating a sample final text, the sample final text comprising an edit to a text of the sample original text consistent with the user preference; and

associating the sample final text with the sample original text.

7. The method of claim 6, wherein the edit to the text of the sample original document comprises one or more of: (i) deleting text in the sample original document based on the user preference and (ii) adding text in the sample original document based on the user preference.

8. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

obtaining a sample original document and a sample final original document associated with the sample original document;

tokenizing the sample original document to create a plurality of sample original texts;

tokenizing the sample edited document associated with the sample original document to create a plurality of final texts;

correlating each of the plurality of sample original texts, respectively, with one of the plurality of sample final texts to create a plurality of correlations; and

storing the plurality of original texts, the plurality of final texts, and the plurality of correlations in the sample database.

9. The method of claim 1, wherein the determining, using the NLP alignment of the first SUA and the candidate original text, the edit operation to apply to the DUA further comprises:

aligning the first SUA with the candidate original text according to a first alignment;

obtaining a candidate final text associated with the candidate original text;

determining a first set of one or more edit operations that convert the first SUA to the candidate final text, wherein the first set of one or more edit operations comprises the first determined edit operation; and,

creating a first edited SUA (first "ESUA") by applying to the first SUA one or more edit operations from the first set of one or more edit operations according to the first alignment.

10. A non-transitory computer readable medium storing instructions configured to cause a computer to perform the method of claim 1.

11. The method of claim 1, wherein the edit operation comprises one or more of a deletion of text data from the DUA or insertion of text data into the DUA.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein the user preference comprises an indication of one or more of: inclusion of text data in a document, exclusion of text data in document, or a value of numeric text data in a document.

13. A computer implemented method for priming a seed database for suggesting revisions to text data, the method comprising:

transmitting an indication of a user preference used for selecting a plurality of sample original texts and a plurality of sample final texts for inclusion in a seed database;

transmitting a first DUA over a network, and,

receiving a second DUA over the network, the second DUA comprising:

one or more tokenized statements-under-analysis ("SUAs"), and

an indication of a suggested revision to a first SUA of the one or more tokenized SUAs, wherein the suggested revision to the first SUA comprises an application of one or more edit operations determined using a natural language processing (NLP) alignment of the selected SUA and a candidate original text selected from the seed database.

14. A system for priming a seed database for suggesting revisions to text data, the system comprising:

a processor;

a non-transitory computer readable memory coupled to the processor, wherein the processor is configured to:

obtain a sample database comprising a plurality of sample original texts and a plurality of sample final texts, wherein each sample original text is associated with a respective sample final text;

obtain an input comprising an indication of a user preference;

selecting one or more of the plurality of sample originals texts and the plurality of sample final texts based on the user preference;

load, into the seed database, the selected one or more of the plurality of sample original texts and the plurality of sample final texts;

obtain an electronic document under analysis (DUA);

tokenize the DUA into one or more statements under analysis (SUAs);

select a first SUA of the one or more SUAs;

select a candidate original text from the seed database; and

determine, using database natural language processing (NLP) alignment of the first SUA and the candidate original text, an edit operation to apply to the DUA.

15. The system of claim **14**, wherein the determined edit operation is based on the user preference.

16. The system of claim **14**, wherein the processor is further configured to:

apply the determined edit operation to the DUA.

17. The system of claim **14**, wherein the processor is further configured to:

provide a questionnaire to a user, wherein the obtained input comprising the indication of the user preference comprises a response to the questionnaire.

18. The system of claim **14**, wherein the processor is further configured to:

interview a user, wherein the obtained input comprising the indication of the user preference comprises a response to the interview.

19. The system of claim **14**, wherein the processor is further configured to:

obtain a sample original text;

generate a sample final text, the sample final text comprising an edit to a text of the sample original text consistent with the user preference; and

associate the sample final text with the sample original text.

20. The system of claim **19**, wherein the edit to the text of the sample original document comprises one or more of: (i) deleting text in the sample original document based on the user preference and (ii) adding text in the sample original document based on the user preference.

21. The system of claim **14**, wherein the processor is further configured to:

obtain a sample original document and a sample final original document associated with the sample original document;

tokenize the sample original document to create a plurality of sample original texts;

tokenize the sample edited document associated with the sample original document to create a plurality of final texts;

correlate each of the plurality of sample original texts, respectively, with one of the plurality of sample final texts to create a plurality of correlations; and

store the plurality of original texts, the plurality of final texts, and the plurality of correlations in the sample database.

22. The system of claim **14**, wherein the processor is further configured to:

align the first SUA with the candidate original text according to a first alignment;

obtain a candidate final text associated with the candidate original text;

determine a first set of one or more edit operations that convert the first SUA to the candidate final text, wherein the first set of one or more edit operations comprises the first determined edit operation; and,

create a first edited SUA (first "ESUA") by applying to the first SUA one or more edit operations from the first set of one or more edit operations according to the first alignment.

* * * * *