

PersonaMatrix: A Recipe for Persona-Aware Evaluation of Legal Summarization

Tsz Fung PANG^{a,1}, Maryam BERIJANIAN^b, Thomas ORTH^a,
Breanna SHI^a, Charlotte S. ALEXANDER^a

^a*Georgia Institute of Technology*

^b*Michigan State University*

Abstract.

Legal documents are often long, dense, and difficult to comprehend, not only for laypeople but also for legal experts. While automated document summarization has great potential to improve access to legal knowledge, prevailing task-based evaluators overlook divergent user and stakeholder needs. Tool development is needed to encompass the technicality of a case summary for a litigator yet be accessible for a self-help public researching for their lawsuit. We introduce *PersonaMatrix*, a persona-by-criterion evaluation framework that scores summaries through the lens of six personas, including legal and non-legal users. We also introduce a *controlled dimension-shifted* pilot dataset of U.S. civil rights case summaries that varies along depth, accessibility, and procedural detail as well as *Diversity-Coverage Index (DCI)* to expose divergent optima of legal summary between persona-aware and persona-agnostic judges. This work enables refinement of legal AI summarization systems for both expert and non-expert users, with the potential to increase access to legal knowledge. The code base and data are publicly available in GitHub².

Keywords. legal summarization, evaluation metrics, large language models, persona-based evaluation, human-centered AI, stakeholder utility.

1. Introduction


Automatic summarization of lengthy, complex legal documents can expand access and comprehension for diverse end users. Although large language models (LLMs) have advanced fluency and coherence, evaluating whether a summary meets user needs remains challenging. Traditional metrics such as ROUGE [1], BLEU [2], METEOR [3], and BERTScore [4] measure lexical or semantic similarity to references, but such overlap is an unreliable proxy for utility. N-gram methods can only reward wording mimicry and even favor incoherent outputs [5,6]; embedding-based methods like BERTScore improve semantic matching yet still prioritize closeness to a reference over *fitness for task*.

As LLMs are deployed in domain-specific settings, LLM-as-a-judge and agentic-judge frameworks have emerged as alternatives. Structured designs such as AgentEval


¹Corresponding Author: Tsz Fung Pang, tpang34@gatech.edu

²<https://github.com/sampangtf/persona-matrix>

Contingency Tables: Argmax Level Distribution by Framework



(a) Optimal Shift Level Heatmap



(b) Persona Judges' Deviated Optima from Generic

Figure 1. (a) Distribution of optimal (argmax) levels along three summary quality dimensions (Depth vs. Conciseness, Technical Precision vs. Lay Accessibility, and Procedural Focus vs. Narrative Story) for 6 persona judges and 2 generic judges over 25 civil rights cases. (b) Direction and magnitude of deviation of persona-aware judges' mean optimal levels from generic judges.

[7] stabilize judgments and improve explainability, sometimes correlating better with ground truths. Yet these methods assume a single notion of utility. In legal summarization, stakeholders have divergent priorities, and collapsing judgments into a scalar score with standardized criteria obscures real trade-offs. We therefore introduce *PersonaMatrix*, a persona-by-criterion evaluation framework that fills the gap by capturing multi-objective utility and distinct priorities across heterogeneous stakeholders. It operationalizes persona-centered utility via scalable persona-conditioned evaluators, offering a middle ground between costly user studies and generic automated metrics.

Stakeholder-sensitive evaluation requires datasets where the same case is summarized along controlled quality dimensions. In this paper, a *quality dimension* refers to a specific controllable aspect of writing that characterizes a summarization, including but not limited to lexical choice, stylistic register, compression ratio and content selection. To probe trade-offs systematically, we construct a *controlled dimension-shifted dataset* of U.S. civil rights case summaries, where each case is summarized along conflicting quality dimensions. A scalable LLM-driven pipeline generates and validates these controlled variants, enabling sensitivity analysis at manageable cost. We instantiate six personas as representative stakeholders: (1) Litigator, (2) Legal Educator, (3) Journalist, (4) Self-Help Public, (5) Academic Researcher, and (6) Policy Advocate. For example, litigators require procedural precision and citations, whereas journalists or public-facing communicators prioritize clarity, brevity, and plain language. Documentation for other persona designs, along with the full code base and data, is available in GitHub. Gains for one group often entail losses for another: procedural detail helps lawyers but bur-

dens general readers; simplifying language aids readability but can obscure legal reasoning, controlling rules or citations. Figure 1 shows our evaluation results over the pilot datasets, demonstrating deviated optima of persona-aware judges relative to generic judges: baseline (vanilla LLM-as-a-judge) and AgentEval.

We further propose the *Diversity-Coverage Index (DCI)*, a bounded metric that measures how well an evaluation framework preserves between-persona diversity while maintaining within-persona coherence. DCI benchmarks persona-aware evaluation and exposes limitations of single-perspective judges. We show that persona-conditioned evaluation diverges in a statistically significant way from persona-agnostic judges, revealing systematic biases and stakeholder-specific utility gaps, and enabling multi-lens reporting and iterative refinement to make legal summaries more useful for a wide range of users with differing informational needs and levels of legal expertise, unlocking legal knowledge for all walks of life.

Contributions. The key contributions are:

1. Formalize legal-summary evaluation as a multi-objective problem across distinct stakeholders.
2. Assemble a controlled dimension-shifted dataset of U.S. civil rights case summaries that systematically varies summaries along three conflicting quality dimensions to probe stakeholder trade-offs, namely depth \leftrightarrow conciseness, technical precision \leftrightarrow lay accessibility, and procedural detail \leftrightarrow narrative story.
3. Present PersonaMatrix, a persona-aware evaluation framework that couples persona-conditioned judges with the dimension-shifted dataset.
4. Introduce a novel metric, Diversity-Coverage Index (DCI), to quantify an evaluation framework’s ability to capture between-persona distinctness and within-persona coherence.
5. Provide empirical comparison between persona-aware and persona-agnostic evaluators, demonstrating statistically significant divergences in stakeholder needs and revealing systematic biases in generic evaluators.

2. Related Work

Recent AI-and-Law work demonstrates the importance of persona-driven, user-centered design for legal AI systems [8,9], supported by findings of wide gaps in usability difficulties between non-lawyers and lawyers [10]. Bex (2024) explicitly calls for evaluating AI legal systems with stakeholders from practice [11]. Hagan (2024) advocates for multi-stakeholder criteria-based evaluation for Legal Q-and-A systems with the support of human user studies [12]. While recent legal summarization systems target plain-language, accessible summaries for non-lawyers [13], we still lack evaluation frameworks that assess fitness across stakeholder groups. We fill these gaps by operationalizing persona-driven evaluation for legal summarization, enabling automatic feedback for continual refinement of legal summarization systems for all stakeholders.

LLM-as-a-judge evaluates summaries with rubric-guided scoring [14], but is sensitive to prompt design and exhibits well-documented positional and verbosity biases [15]. Agentic frameworks such as AgentEval decompose evaluation into criteria generation and scoring, improving interpretability [7]. However, both assume a single optimal

rubric, ignoring divergent stakeholder needs in domains like legal summarization. PersonaMatrix addresses these shortcomings by accounting for distinct informational priorities across personas and expanding evaluation beyond persona-agnostic biases.

A parallel thread in NLP and Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) has shifted system evaluation toward assessing whether outputs support decision making and task completion, aligning with usability and user experience principles [16,17,18]. Although user studies remain the “gold standard”, they are costly and slow, limiting scalability.

In HCI, *personas* serve as archetypes grounding design in concrete user needs [19,20]. In NLP, personas have primarily shaped dialogue generation [21], with little attention to their role as *evaluation lenses*. PersonaMatrix operationalizes persona-centered utility via scalable persona-aware evaluators, offering a middle ground between costly user studies and generic automated metrics.

Analyzing stakeholder-sensitive evaluation requires datasets where the same case is summarized along controlled quality dimensions. Existing legal datasets such as MultiLexSum [22] and BillSum [23] are valuable but lack systematic dimension-shifting for summaries of the same case. MultiLexSum varies summary length, but does not capture trade-offs beyond granularity. Outside law, PersonalSum [24] offers personalized news summaries conditioned on reader profiles, but this targets individual preferences rather than conflicting, role-based notions of utility. To fill this gap, we introduce a *controlled dimension-shifted* dataset of U.S. civil rights cases, explicitly varying summaries along conflicting quality dimensions to expose cross-persona trade-offs.

3. Methodology

3.1. Controlled Dimension-Shifted Dataset

We design a scalable LLM-driven generator that transforms a seed summary into variants shifted along stakeholder-prioritized dimensions. This produces sets of summaries of the same case with systematically varied quality dimensions, avoiding bias from differences in case complexity. These controlled variants allow us to detect persona-specific preference along dimension-shift spectra, revealing distinct and diverse optima. We test two hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1 (H1) *PersonaMatrix produces diverse, representative evaluation results across distinct personas, revealing multiple optima in different directions and magnitudes. In contrast, persona-agnostic frameworks (LLM-as-a-judge, AgentEval) collapse to a scalar score from a single perspective, as shown by the Diversity-Coverage Index (DCI).*

Hypothesis 2 (H2) *The observed diversity detected by persona-aware evaluation framework reflects systematic persona signals rather than random noise.*

We identified a list of dimensions of legal summary qualities that are in conflict with each other and are prioritized by distinct stakeholders: (1) Depth vs. Conciseness, (2) Technical Precision vs. Lay Accessibility, and (3) Procedural Focus vs. Narrative Story. We chose these dimensions because they can be defined objectively and validated with measurable metrics, enabling automatic and scalable transformation and validation,

Table 1. Three quality dimensions for controlled shifts. Level 0 represents the expert-authored original legal summary from the Civil Rights Clearinghouse. Levels 1-4 are the derivative summaries transformed and validated by structured dataset generator. The last row shows how each dimension shift is validated across levels.

| Level | Detailed \Rightarrow Concise | Technical Precision \Rightarrow Lay Accessibility | Procedural Focus \Rightarrow Narrative Story | Typical Stakeholder Alignment |
|---------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 0 | More than 500 words | Legal jargon | Full procedure | Legal professionals |
| 1 | Condense sentences | Professional summary | Explain rationale | Academics |
| 2 | Summarize procedural cluster | Plain language with explanation | Only central legal issues | Transitional |
| 3 | Executive brief | Simple analogies | Outcome focus | Non-legal users |
| 4 | Headlines & bullets | Basic vocab | Narrative human story | Public |
| Metric | Word count in target range & < prev. level | Readability grade < prev. level | Procedural keyword count < prev. level | N/A |

and they are likely differentially prioritized by different stakeholders, manifesting the dilemma in optimizing the summary for multi-stakeholders, as shown in the rightmost column in Table 1. The typical stakeholder alignment is intended as *refutable intuition*, not fixed mapping.

We developed a scalable dataset generator using an Extractor \rightarrow Rewriter \rightarrow Validator agentic pipeline (Figure 2-top) that shifts summaries along the three quality dimensions while enforcing factual consistency and progressive change through a multi-step validation process, including metric-based checks and LLM-powered pairwise critiques. Rewriting prompts and validation logic are detailed in the GitHub.

Seed summaries are drawn from the Civil Rights Litigation Clearinghouse³, authored and validated by legal experts—law professors and law students at the University of Michigan Law School. These texts emphasize depth, technical precision, and procedural details, enabling unidirectional quality shifts along our selected dimensions. We provide an initial probe dataset of 25 cases ($\times 3$ dimensions $\times 4$ levels = 300 shifted summaries with 25 originals) together with code for reproducibility.

3.2. PersonaMatrix Evaluator

We adapt AgentEval’s [7] Critic-Quantifier pipeline to a persona-aware setting. The **Critic agent** defines task-based criteria and acceptable values; the **Quantifier agent** scores inputs against them (Figure 2-bottom).

Let $\mathcal{P} = \{\text{Litigators, Public, Journalists, Researchers, Educators, Advocates}\}$ denote persona judges. For each persona $p \in \mathcal{P}$, a Persona-Critic generates a rubric conditioned on persona-specific context for p . Each criterion c defines accepted values (ordinal labels with descriptions). Full implementation can be found in the GitHub repo.

Rubrics are cached per persona and reused across cases. On top of the task-based evaluation criteria generation prompt suggested in AgentEval, we append the persona name and one-sentence intended usage to the Critic agent’s system prompt. We demonstrate that minimal context suffices to elicit stakeholder-specific criteria. Then, a Quantifier agent assigns both ordinal labels and numeric scores $s_{p,c} \in [0, 5]$ for each criterion. Scores are aligned with ordinal classes (e.g., top class $\approx 4.5-5$), requiring no rescaling.

³<https://clearinghouse.net/>




Figure 2. Demonstrations of how legal summary is rewritten in Controlled Dimension-Shifted Dataset Generator using the shift from Precision to Accessibility as example (top), and scored in PersonaMatrix Agentic Evaluator (bottom). There are n PersonaCritics generating n sets of evaluation criteria for n personas in parallel.

3.3. Diversity-Coverage Index (DCI)

We propose the Diversity-Coverage Index (DCI) to measure how well multi-persona evaluation captures divergent stakeholder preferences. It is formally composed of two terms derived from the distribution of optima, which, in this work, is the argmax level of dimension shifts resulting from judges:

1. Persona signal: distinctiveness of persona-specific optima, measured by normalized mutual information (NMI).
2. Distinctness: deviation from persona-agnostic baselines, measured by Earth Mover’s Distance (EMD) and Jensen–Shannon divergence (JSD).

Definition. Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$ index a quality dimension with levels $\mathcal{L}_d = \{0, \dots, K_d - 1\}$. Let $K_d := |\mathcal{L}_d|$, $\Delta^{K_d-1} = \{u \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K_d} : \sum_{\ell=0}^{K_d-1} u(\ell) = 1\}$, and let L_d be the level r.v. on \mathcal{L}_d . P denotes the persona random variable with weights $\pi = (\pi_a)$, where $\sum_a \pi_a = 1$ ($\Pr[P = a] = \pi_a$). For persona a , let $p_{a,d} \in \Delta^{K_d-1}$ be the empirical distribution of optima (argmax over cases) on dimension d , i.e. $p_{a,d}(\ell) = \Pr[L_d = \ell \mid P = a]$. The persona-marginal probability is defined as $q_d(\ell) = \sum_a \pi_a p_{a,d}(\ell) = \Pr[L_d = \ell]$. If available, $b_d \in \Delta^{K_d-1}$ serves as a persona-agnostic baseline on \mathcal{L}_d . Unless otherwise stated, we use equal persona weights ($\pi = 1/|\mathcal{P}|$) and set $\lambda = 0.5$. Let CDF $F_u(\ell)$ be $\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} u(j)$. The persona signal is defined as

$$I_d := \text{NMI}_d = \frac{2I(P;L_d)}{H(P)+H(L_d)} = \frac{2[H(q_d) - \sum_a \pi_a H(p_{a,d})]}{H(P)+H(q_d)} \in [0, 1], \quad (1)$$

with joint $\Pr[P = a, L_d = \ell] = \pi_a p_{a,d}(\ell)$. The distinctness (persona-averaged) is

$$\bar{J}_d := \sum_a \pi_a \text{JSD}_{\log_2}(p_{a,d} \| b_d) \in [0, 1], \quad \bar{S}_d := \sum_a \pi_a \tilde{W}_1(p_{a,d}, b_d) \in [0, 1], \quad (2)$$

$$D_d := \frac{1}{2}(\bar{J}_d + \bar{S}_d) \in [0, 1], \quad (3)$$

$$\tilde{W}_1(p, b) = W_1(p, b)/(K_d - 1), \quad W_1(p, b) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{K_d-1} |F_p(\ell) - F_b(\ell)|. \quad (4)$$

The per-dimension and overall indices for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ are

$$\text{DCI}_d(\lambda) = \lambda I_d + (1 - \lambda)D_d \in [0, 1], \quad (5)$$

$$\text{DCI}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \text{DCI}_d(\lambda). \quad (6)$$

If no baseline exists, set $\lambda = 1$.

Interpretation. I_d increases when personas are internally coherent yet differ across levels. D_d increases when persona-specific optima deviate from generic judges, both in distributional mass (JSD) and in location/consistency along the ordered scale (EMD).

Lemma 1 (Shuffle Sanity) *Shuffling persona labels across i.i.d. cases removes persona effects on optimal levels, preserving the marginal π independently of \mathcal{L}_d but making $\tilde{P} \perp \mathcal{L}_d$. Thus $I(\tilde{P}, \mathcal{L}_d) = 0$ and $I_d = 0$, so $\text{DCI}_d(\lambda) = (1 - \lambda)D_d$. Moreover, the plug-in estimator satisfies $\widehat{\text{NMI}}_d \xrightarrow{p} 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where n is the total number of persona–case pairs (P, \mathcal{L}_d) in the shuffled sample. Proof can be accessed in [GitHub](#).*

4. Experimental Setup

We evaluate summaries in the controlled dimension-shifted dataset using three evaluators: (1) vanilla LLM-as-a-judge (baseline), (2) AgentEval [7], and (3) PersonaMatrix. For criteria generation, we compared several reasoning LLMs (GPT-5[25], GPT-5-mini[25], Gemini-2.5-pro[26], Gemini-2.5-flash[26]) and selected GPT-5-mini. Criteria lists are available in our [GitHub](#).

For quantification, we use public leaderboard standings which motivate this choice: GPT-5-mini (minimal-reasoning) is preferred for its stability, discriminative power (ability to separate systems in evaluation), human correlation in creative judgment, and cost-efficiency, as evidenced by its top-5 placement on EQ-Bench Judgemark-v2.1⁴. To reduce bias and improve reproducibility, we blind the Quantifier to shift levels and run three stochastic passes per summary, averaging the scores. We do not scale numerical scores, since our analysis only relies on the ordinal order of scores, converting them into argmax shift levels for each legal case.

To study the impact of persona awareness, we test the robustness of PersonaMatrix against corrupted persona labels. We conduct a *corruption sweep* by randomly permuting persona labels for a fraction $r \in [0, 1]$ of cases. Each corruption ratio is repeated 2000

⁴EQ-Bench Judgemark v2.1 Leaderboard, assessed on 2025-08-09. Archived copy: Wayback Machine snapshot (<https://web.archive.org/web/20250809161133/https://eqbench.com/judgemark-v2.html>).




Figure 3. (a) The changes of DCI broken down into components against the corruption ratio over Procedural dimension, (b) changes of final DCI against increasing corruption ratio. Bottom-right figure in (a) is the same as bottom-left figure in (b).

times for statistical stability. This allows us to track how DCI degrades as the persona signal is intentionally weakened. We report mean DCI scores with standard deviations as error bars (Figure 3).

5. Results and Discussion

Persona-aware judges exhibit divergent optima. We convert numerical scores to argmax shift levels per case, and summarize the resulting distributions in Figure 1a. In the case of ties, we use the median rounded level with the max scores as the argmax. Relative to generic judges, persona-conditioned judges exhibit shifted optima in both direction and magnitude across all three dimensions (summarized in Figure 1b). Concretely:

- Depth vs. Conciseness. Persona optima concentrate at intermediate levels (L1–L2), rather than the originals (L0), indicating that “more detail” is not universally preferred. This supports our multi-objective view of legal summarization: informative yet skim-efficient abstracts are often optimal for downstream users.
- Technical vs. Accessible. Journalists and public-facing personas tilt toward higher accessibility (L3), whereas legally oriented personas prefer more technical phrasing. Extreme accessibility (L4) is disfavored across personas, consistent with criteria that reward both clarity and retention of dispositive content.
- Procedural vs. Narrative. Most personas avoid highly narrative variants (L4), but “self-help” shows mild tolerance for L2–L4 when factual outcomes and stakes remain salient.

Statistically significant divergence between persona-aware and generic judges. These shifts are not just qualitative. The χ^2 tests show statistically reliable divergences from the generic judges in several persona-dimension pairs: Journalism/Media differs from Baseline on Precision \leftrightarrow Accessibility ($p=0.028$) and Procedural \leftrightarrow Narrative ($p=0.001$); Academic/Research differs from Baseline on Procedural \leftrightarrow Narrative ($p=0.002$) and from AgentEval on Depth \leftrightarrow Conciseness ($p=0.025$). These results empirically support H1: persona-aware judgments expose trade-offs missed by single-perspective judges.

Operationalizing DCI: persona signal and deviation from generic judges. Using the argmax distributions as inputs, we compute the components of the DCI (Section 3.3). Before corruption ($r=0$), PersonaMatrix shows high persona signal (NMI) and clear deviations from persona-agnostic judges (JSD, EMD). As we gradually corrupt persona labels (shuffle rate $r \in [0, 1]$), the components decay almost monotonically across three dimensions. Figure 3a shows changes in DCI components for Procedural \leftrightarrow Narrative dimension. Across three dimensions, the combined DCI drops accordingly (Figure 3b). This matches Lemma 1: shuffling destroys persona-level associations, driving $\text{NMI} \rightarrow 0$ and reducing distinctness from generic judges. These trends support H2: diversity signals are not artifacts of noise.

Why does Precision \leftrightarrow Accessibility decay more slowly? Two factors likely compress separation on this axis (Figure 1a). First, the accessibility rewrite deliberately preserves length and procedural cues, dampening gains from persona conditioning relative to the other axes. Second, readability constraints induce mid-level convergence: several rubrics reward plain phrasing and preservation of dispositive content, which tends to select L2–L3 for multiple personas, yielding flatter decay under corruption.

High-corruption rebound is a clustering artifact. The small DCI uptick at high-corruption level (as r increases from 0.75 to 1) shown in Figure 3b is consistent with random re-assembly of partial persona clusters during permutation. Personas with similar distribution of optima towards shift levels could be re-assigned to the same pseudo-persona, thus regaining partial persona-aware signals. For example, legal educators and litigators share similar optima patterns and may be clustered again upon near-full shuffle of persona labels.

Linking trends to criteria: why persona-aware beats generic? The divergence patterns align with the learned rubrics. For instance, generic AgentEval includes “Completeness of Core Case Elements”, which implicitly rewards procedural density and can bias toward L0–L1 on Depth \leftrightarrow Conciseness, consistent with generic peaks at lower shift levels. In contrast, litigation-focused criteria such as “Holding clarity and citable form” and “Clarity, Conciseness, Formatting, and Navigability” value rule-like, extractable statements; this rationalizes Litigator preferences for mid-level concision and moderate accessibility (L1–L2/L3). On the narrative axis, Litigator’s “Material Facts—Relevance and Completeness” and AgentEval’s “Brevity vs. Necessary Detail” penalize story-heavy rewrites, explaining the broad disfavor of L4.

Takeaways for evaluation practice:

- Intermediate optima are the norm. Across personas, the best summaries are typically not the longest or the simplest; they sit at interior points on each axis, reinforcing that legal summarization is a multi-objective balancing problem.
- Persona lenses change the answer. Statistically significant χ^2 differences and high DCI at $r=0$ show that one rubric cannot faithfully stand in for heterogeneous stakeholders.
- Corruption tests matter. The near-monotone DCI decay under label shuffling is a strong, scalable sanity check that persona signals are real rather than prompt artifacts.

6. Limitations and Future Work

DCI quantifies the diversity of signals from persona judges but it does not account for correlations with human judgments. Despite diverse optima across personas, the persona-specific optima from the agentic judges in Figure 1a do not align precisely with some of our refutable intuitions on the typical stakeholder alignment in Table 1, emphasizing the challenge of precisely defining persona-specific utility. Given the criteria-based PersonaMatrix’s interpretability, future studies should conduct multi-stakeholder surveys to validate the persona-specific criteria and optimal levels of dimension shifts.

Our controlled dimension-shifted dataset is also confined to a pilot evaluation set of 25 cases due to limited research budgets. We try to sample a variety of civil rights cases to mitigate sampling bias, with 12 distinct civil rights types in our dataset. The dataset is also limited to U.S. civil rights cases with uncertain generalizability across jurisdictions. Future works should expand the size and diversity of the dimension-shifted datasets to increase power and narrow confidence intervals on the divergence analysis.

Some generic criteria (e.g., metadata or links) can be spuriously satisfied, and certain persona criteria may double-count holdings and issues, thereby encouraging verbosity. We mitigate this by macro-averaging across criteria and applying corruption tests. Future work should focus on automatically detecting and downweighting low-observability criteria.

7. Conclusion

Legal summary quality is inherently multi-objective. The increasingly popular application of agentic summarization invokes a need for human-centered evaluation frameworks that can capture the multi-perspective utility signals and offer richer feedback to improve automatic summarization systems.

Across all three axes we studied, persona-aware judges select interior optima that differ by stakeholder, whereas persona-agnostic judges collapse to single-perspective peaks. Using controlled dimension shifts and the Diversity-Coverage Index (DCI), we show that these persona signals are systematic (high NMI, nontrivial JSD and EMD) and fragile to label corruption, confirming they are not prompt noise.

PersonaMatrix—combining controlled shifts, persona-conditioned criteria, and DCI—offers a practical recipe for stakeholder-sensitive evaluation in high-stakes settings. In practice: (1) one-size-fits-all judges risk mis-scoring summaries tailored to different users; (2) reporting persona-specific results alongside generic scores surfaces real trade-offs; and (3) DCI provides a compact, sanity-checked indicator of between-persona distinctness and within-persona coherence.

Limitations include dataset scale and the lack of direct human ground truth for persona-specific optima. Even with these limits, our results argue that evaluation frameworks and, by extension, legal AI systems should be designed and reported through multiple stakeholder lenses rather than a single universal rubric.

PersonaMatrix lets researchers and developers score and tune their AI-powered legal summarization applications through the lens of real stakeholders—for example litigators, journalists, and the public. It enables multi-lens reporting that provides reliable feedback for the continual refinement of legal AI summarization and increases the accessibility of legal knowledge to a broader audience, from legal experts to laypeople.

References

- [1] Lin CY. ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. Text Summarization Branches Out. 2004:74-81. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>.
- [2] Papineni K, Roukos S, Ward T, Zhu WJ. Bleu: a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 2002:311-8. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/P02-1040>.
- [3] Banerjee S, Lavie A. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization. 2005:65-72. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/W05-0909>.
- [4] Zhang T, Kishore V, Wu F, Weinberger KQ, Artzi Y. BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. International Conference on Learning Representations. 2020. Available from: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SkeHuCVFDr>.
- [5] Callison-Burch C, Osborne M, Koehn P. Re-evaluating the Role of Bleu in Machine Translation Research. In: McCarthy D, Wintner S, editors. 11th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Trento, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2006. p. 249-56. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/E06-1032/>.
- [6] Akter M, Bansal N, Karmaker SK. Revisiting Automatic Evaluation of Extractive Summarization Task: Can We Do Better than ROUGE? In: Muresan S, Nakov P, Villavicencio A, editors. Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2022. p. 1547-60. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-acl.122/>.
- [7] Arabzadeh N, Huo S, Mehta N, Wu Q, Wang C, Awadallah AH, et al. Assessing and Verifying Task Utility in LLM-Powered Applications. In: Al-Onaizan Y, Bansal M, Chen YN, editors. Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Miami, Florida, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2024. p. 21868-88. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.1219/>.
- [8] Adler RF, Paley A, Li Zhao AL, Pack H, Servantez S, Pah AR, et al. A user-centered approach to developing an AI system analyzing US federal court data. Artificial Intelligence and Law. 2023;31(3):547-70.
- [9] Kolkman D, Bex F, Narayan N, van der Put M. Justitia ex machina: The impact of an AI system on legal decision-making and discretionary authority. Big Data & Society. 2024;11(2):20539517241255101.
- [10] Newman DR, Doherty U. Making the law accessible to non-lawyers: effects of different kinds of expertise on perceived usability of online legal information services. Behaviour & Information Technology. 2008;27(5):423-37. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01449290601111002>.
- [11] Bex F. Transdisciplinary research as a way forward in AI & Law. Journal of Cross-disciplinary Research in Computational Law. 2024;2(2).
- [12] Hagan M. Measuring What Matters: Developing Human-Centered Legal Q-and-A Quality Standards through Multi-Stakeholder Research. Available at SSRN 5146722. 2024.
- [13] Ash E, Kesari A, Naidu S, Song L, Stammbach D. Translating Legalese: Enhancing Public Understanding of Court Opinions with Legal Summarizers. In: Proceedings of the 2024 Symposium on Computer Science and Law. CSLAW '24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2024. p. 136-157. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3614407.3643700>.
- [14] Liu Y, Iter D, Xu Y, Wang S, Xu R, Zhu C. G-Eval: NLG Evaluation using GPT-4 with Better Human Alignment. arXiv. 2023. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.16634>.
- [15] Zheng L, Chiang WL, Sheng Y, Zhuang S, Wu Z, Zhuang Y, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. Advances in neural information processing systems. 2023;36:46595-623.
- [16] Blodgett SL, Cheung JCK, Liao V, Xiao Z. Human-Centered Evaluation of Language Technologies. In: Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Tutorial Abstracts. Miami, Florida, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2024. p. 39-43. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-tutorials.6/>.
- [17] Amar R, Eagan J, Stasko J. Low-level components of analytic activity in information visualization. In: IEEE Symposium on Information Visualization, 2005. INFOVIS 2005.; 2005. p. 111-7.
- [18] Lai V, Chen C, Liao QV, Smith-Renner A, Tan C. Towards a science of human-ai decision making: a survey of empirical studies. arXiv preprint arXiv:211211471. 2021.
- [19] Chang Yn, Lim Yk, Stolterman E. Personas: from theory to practices. Proceedings of the 5th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Building Bridges. 2008:439-442. Available from:

September 2025

- <https://doi.org/10.1145/1463160.1463214>.
- [20] Salminen J, Wenyun Guan K, Jung SG, Jansen B. Use Cases for Design Personas: A Systematic Review and New Frontiers. In: Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. CHI '22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2022. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517589>.
 - [21] Zhang S, Dinan E, Urbanek J, Szlam A, Kiela D, Weston J. Personalizing Dialogue Agents: I have a dog, do you have pets too? In: Gurevych I, Miyao Y, editors. Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). Melbourne, Australia: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2018. p. 2204-13. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1205/>.
 - [22] Shen Z, Lo K, Yu L, Dahlberg N, Schlanger M, Downey D. Multi-LexSum: Real-World Summaries of Civil Rights Lawsuits at Multiple Granularities. CoRR. 2022;abs/2206.10883. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.10883>.
 - [23] Kornilova A, Eidelman V. BillSum: A Corpus for Automatic Summarization of US Legislation. In: Wang L, Cheung JCK, Carenini G, Liu F, editors. Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization. Hong Kong, China: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2019. p. 48-56. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/D19-5406>.
 - [24] Zhang L, Liu P, Henriksboe M, Lauvrak E, Gulla JA, Ramampiaro H. Personalsum: A user-subjective guided personalized summarization dataset for large language models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. 2024;37:99333-46.
 - [25] OpenAI. GPT-5 System Card; 2025. Accessed 2025-09-09. Available from: <https://cdn.openai.com/gpt-5-system-card.pdf>.
 - [26] Comanici G, Bieber E, Schaekermann M, Pasupat I, Sachdeva N, Dhillon I, et al.. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the Frontier with Advanced Reasoning, Multimodality, Long Context, and Next Generation Agentic Capabilities; 2025. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.06261>.