

Technology Assisted Review For UK Lawyers

Technology-Assisted Review (TAR) amplifies human judgement by ranking documents. Its defensibility relies on the training record and validation statistics, both of which are built, not assumed. This guide covers models, training, validation, and its place in legal protocols and tool chains.

e-discovery.uk, Computer Forensics Lab. Published 2026-08-30.
<https://e-discovery.uk/library/technology-assisted-review-for-uk-lawyers>

TECHNOLOGY - ASSISTED REVIEW · A GUIDE FOR UK LAWYERS Technology-Assisted Review for UK Lawyers Predictive Coding, Continuous Active Learning and Defending the Machine's Judgement COMPUTER FORENSICS LAB

§ ABOUT THE AUTHOR PREPARED BY COMPUTER FORENSICS LAB E-DISCOVERY TEAM
VALIDATION STATISTICS CPR PART 35 EXPERT REPORT S FULL CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY DOCUMENTATION

§ CONTENTS In this guide 01 Executive summary 02 The problem in plain English: teaching a machine what relevant looks like 03 How TAR works: models, training and the two generations 04 The human layer: seeds, subject-matter reviewers and consistency 05 Validation: recall, precision and the stopping decision 06 TAR in the protocol: disclosure, negotiation and the courts 07 TAR in the tool chain: keywords, threading and privilege 08 Source architecture: where else the evidence lives 09 Worked examples 10 Common mistakes and technical limitations 11 Questions to ask · Suggested wording 12 Checklist and red flags · When to involve a digital forensic expert 13 Frequently asked questions 14 Glossary · References · Disclaimer · How a specialist laboratory can assist

§ 01 · ORIENTATION Executive summary THE HEADLINE POINT:
TARISHUMANJUDGEMENTAMPLIFIEDBYRANKING: ITS
DEFENSIBILITYISTHETRAININGRECORDPLUSTHEVALIDATIONSTATISTICS,
ANDBOTH AREBUILT, NOTASSUMED

§ 02 · FIRST PRINCIPLES The problem in plain English: teaching a machine what relevant looks like

§ 03 · THEMACHINERY How TAR works: models, training and the two generations

§ 04 · THETEACHERS The human layer: seeds, subject-matter reviewers and consistency

§ 05 · THELICENCETOSTOP Validation: recall, precision and the stopping decision

§ 06 · THE PAPER WORK AND THE COURT S TAR in the protocol: disclosure, negotiation and the courts

§ 07 · THETOOLCHAINSEAT TAR in the tool chain: keywords, threading and privilege

§ 08 · THEWIDERMAP Source architecture: where else the evidence lives QUESTION
QUALIT Y TRAINING VALIDATION PROTOCOL & PLATFORM N ON-TEXT RECORD FILE

CORRESPONDENCE LOGS ROUTES TEXT- LAYER

§ 09 · IN THE WILD Worked examples EXAMPLE1 · THE1.
8MILLIONDOCUMENTSREVIEWEDBY140, EXAMPLE2 ·
THESTOPPINGDECISIONTHATWASABUDGETINCOSTUME EXAMPLE3 ·
THEELUSIONFINDTHATWASASCOPEHOLE

§ 10 · WHEREITGOESWRONG Common mistakes and technical limitations Common mistakes
Technical limitations

§ 11 · INTERROGATORIES & DRAFTING AIDS Questions to ask · Suggested wording Ask
your client Ask your opponent Ask your e Discovery / forensic provider SUGGESTED
WORDING · TA R PA R AG RAPHFORTHEDRD / PROTOCOL

§ 12 · QUICK CONTROL Checklist and red flags · When to involve a digital forensic expert The
TAR checklist Red flags When to involve a digital forensic expert

§ 13 · COMMON QUESTIONS Frequently asked questions Is predictive coding actually
approved by the English courts? How big does a matter need to be before TAR makes sense?
Can the model miss the smoking gun? Do we have to tell the other side we are using TAR? What
recall target should we agree? Is TAR the same as using generative AI for review?

§ 14 · REFERENCE Glossary CAL Sources and authoritative references DISCLAIMER

§ HOW A SPECIALIST LABORATORY CAN ASSIST Working with Computer Forensics Lab
Speak to a forensic examiner, not a salesperson. INSTRUCTTHELAB
NEWENQUIRIESEMAILE - DISCOVERY

Questions and answers

Is predictive coding actually approved by the English courts?

Yes: approval dates from the mid-2010s authorities and the current PD 57AD regime expects technology-assisted approaches to be considered on suitable matters: the live questions are always methodology and validation, never permission. Parties lose TAR arguments by running it secretly or stopping it unscientifically, not by using it.

How big does a matter need to be before TAR makes sense?

There is no statutory floor: the judgement weighs volume against prevalence, text share and timetable: as a working shape, six figures of post-dedup documents usually rewards CAL, low five figures usually does not, and between them the review-cost arithmetic decides. An honest provider will some time answer "keywords and targeted review", and that answer is worth having.

Can the model miss the smoking gun?

It can rank oddly anything unlike its training: which is why the method never relies on ranking alone: keyword retrieval guards the nameable, targeted searches guard rare critical classes, elusion sampling measures the remainder, and Example 3 shows the finds being read for scope. The linear-review comparator misses things too: it just never measures what.

Do we have to tell the other side we are using TAR?

Under PD 57AD's cooperation model, effectively yes: methodology transparency is the expectation, the DRD provides the fields, and undisclosed TAR surfacing later is the single most avoidable way to convert a sound review into a satellite dispute. What is disclosed is workflow and validation: not your document scores or coding decisions.

What recall target should we agree?

Commonly agreed targets sit in the range where the marginal documents are overwhelmingly duplicative or peripheral, with the precise figure and confidence negotiated against the matter's stakes and prevalence: the honest framing is that the target prices residual risk, and guide 85's arithmetic makes the pricing explicit. Refuse false precision: an estimate with a stated interval beats a confident bare percentage.

Is TAR the same as using generative AI for review?

No: classic TAR ranks by learned classification and is decade-settled law; generative approaches read and characterise documents and arrive under newer guidance with their own verification disciplines: guide 90 treats them. What transfers unchanged is the constitution: human judgement in charge, methodology disclosed, results validated by sampling: the parts of this guide that will outlive every tool it mentions. cflab. u k · e-discove ry. u k ©2026 Computer Forensics Lab Ltd ·cflab.uk ·e-discovery.uk ·info@cflab.uk ·+44 (0)20 7164 6915 Page 15 of 17