This set of slides on JADE Visualisations provides a quick overview of the main analytical uses of them. For more information on Visualisations and their wider application in analysing cases and legislation, contact editors@jade.io
**Similarity** assists with identifying similar cases on 2 bases:

- Shared catchwords; and
- Shared citations.

To interpret Similarity, note:

1. The cases are represented by small coloured balls, with different colours for decisions from different courts.
2. Three balls are numbered 1, 2, 3 – 1 represents your case, 2 & 3 are the cases considered to be most similar to it.
3. Clicking on the grey lines connecting the cases reveals what shared citations exist between them.
4. Typing in the name of a case in ‘Find’, will put a purple ring around the case so that you can locate where it is.
5. Key catchwords used in the case are indicated shading around the balls. You can filter out cases by the catchword used in the judgment by clicking the colours.
6. Move the scale left or right to add or take away cases in the diagram.

From Similarity, you can also critique and compare the judicial treatment of earlier cases and legislation cited across later decisions.

This is done by:

1. **Drawing** a box with your mouse around the cases you would like to compare. (This produces a Commonality Report).
2. **Reviewing** the shared citations between the case. The number to left indicates the number of cases in your box, which cite the particular case. Click down on the green citation link to drill down.
3. **Scrolling** across windows to compare how each case in your drawn box has referred to the case in the green citation.
**Precedent Tracker** maps out the cases cited by and citing your decision. It extracts the citations and provides enough context to let you decide whether the case has been merely considered, applied, approved or distinguished.

Imagine a vertical line that goes straight through the ball that represents your decision. *Your decision will have the biggest ball on the diagram.*

- To the left are cases and citations cited by your decision.
- To the right are cases that have cited your decision.

What the different colours mean are explained in the key to the right. To identify the case that the ball represents, hover your cursor over it.

To help answer the question of **whether your decision is still good law:**

- Click on the ball representing the decision. A pop up box will appear and provide extracts of all citations made to the decision. *If there have been no citations made to the decision, the pop up box will show all citations made to the other cases in the diagram by the decision.*
- Review the extracts to determine whether the decision has been considered, applied, approved or distinguished.
Parallel Citations maps out subsequent cases that share at least two citations with your current case, regardless of whether these cases actually cite it.

This visualisation helps answer the question: why might by decision not be good law?

Imagine a vertical line that goes straight through the ball that represents your decision. Your decision will have the biggest ball on the diagram.

- To the left are cases cited by your decision and cases that have cited 2 of those cases cited by your decision.
- To the right are cases that have cited 2 of those cases cited by your decision and possibly your decision.

To figure out whether the decisions to the right have cited your decision, look to see if there are any grey lines connecting the later decision to your decision.

If there are no grey lines, click on the later decision to see what it has cited instead and have a look into why.
**HotSpot** aims to contextualise the legal significance of a decision in a particular legal precedent chain or legal topic area.

It does this by looking at the pinpoint citations used in the decision and then maps out:

- other cases that have cited the same pinpoint citations; and
- any cross citations between those cases (including yours).

To determine its legal significance, you can compare the proportion of the diameter that your decision has in relation to the proportions taken up by the pinpoint citations mapped out.

In this example, you will note that the citations to and from *Alcan (NT) v Commissioner of Territory Revenue* are not as great as *CIC Insurance v Bankstown Football Club Ltd* or *Project Blue Sky v Australian Broadcasting Authority*, and therefore has not likely changed what those two decisions stated about statutory interpretation and the role of context.

*To make the most of HotSpot requires an intimate level of background knowledge.*
Overlap. Search Parameters. Shared citations.

Overlap contextualises your search results by mapping out results that have shared citations (to either cases or legislation) between them.

It enables you to see what potential areas of law are involved or touched upon by your search string, by reviewing the shared:
- Cases; and
- Legislation

The cases in your search results are labelled with bolded text in the diagram.

By following the grey lines connecting an outlying ball without any text to the bolded cases, you can isolate cases in your search results that involve the area of interest.

Depending on the search criteria used, you can use overlap for background research purposes.
**Visual History** enables you to analyse legislative changes at a *section* level.

1. Coloured dots indicate how a specific section has changed. The **Legend** explains what each colour means.
2. Hover mouse on a dot to see the summary of amendments.
3. Click on a dot or **Section History** to view the compilations of that section, where there has been a change to it.

Select the compilations of the Act that you want to compare.

JADE highlights the changes.