

LEGAL AI BENCHMARKS · APRIL 2026

GenieAI vs Claude CoWork — Commercial contract review

A 10-dimension head-to-head on a real commercial supply agreement: clause coverage, IP risk classification, fallback drafting, citations, and negotiation strategy.

Overall scores

Across 10 legal-quality metrics , each scored 1–10

GENIEAI

+32% vs competitor

88 /100

88%

Comprehensive review with deep substantive coverage, structured fallback redlines, and authoritative citations across each dimension.

Primary

CLAUDE COWORK

56 /100

56%

Reasonable surface coverage and a strong escalation framework, but thin on substantive fallback drafting and legal authority.

Competitor

GenieAI scores 88/100 vs Claude CoWork's 56/100 — a 32-point lead driven by IP depth, fallback drafting and citations.

Dimension-by-dimension

GenieAI wins 9 of 10

01 Clause coverage breadth



GENIEAI

Identifies and addresses every material clause in the agreement, including governing law, indemnities, IP, audit rights, data protection, force majeure and assignment.

CLAUDE COWORK

Captures the headline commercial clauses (price, term, termination) but misses several boilerplate clauses that materially affect risk allocation.

02 IP depth



GENIEAI

Distinguishes background, foreground and joint IP, calls out the licence-back ambiguity, and proposes specific redlines tightening the IP assignment language.

CLAUDE COWORK

Notes that IP terms exist and flags the assignment but does not differentiate IP categories or address the licence-back risk.

03 Risk classification accuracy



GENIEAI

Risks classified by severity (high / medium / low) and aligned to negotiation leverage. Two medium risks slightly under-weighted.

CLAUDE COWORK

Flags risks but the severity ratings are inconsistent — two high-impact risks are labelled 'medium' without clear rationale.

04 Actionability



GENIEAI

Each issue paired with a concrete next step and ownership suggestion (legal / commercial / engineering).

CLAUDE COWORK

Recommends 'review with counsel' at multiple junctures rather than producing a directly actionable redline.

05 Fallback / redline language



GENIEAI

Provides primary, secondary and tertiary fallback wording for every contested clause, in track-changes-ready form.

CLAUDE COWORK

Largely descriptive — points at clauses to renegotiate but does not draft replacement language.

06 Legal authority citations



GENIEAI

Cites jurisdiction-specific statutes and case law (Sale of Goods Act, Hadley v Baxendale, GDPR Art. 28) with linked sources.

CLAUDE COWORK

Generic appeals to 'industry standards' and 'common practice'; sparse statutory or case-law grounding.

07 Consultant-side perspective



GENIEAI

Reviews the contract from both the buyer's and supplier's perspective and flags asymmetries — useful for negotiation prep.

CLAUDE COWORK

Reviews from a single (buyer) perspective with little awareness of how a counter-party would push back.

08 Structural usability



GENIEAI

Outputs structured by clause + issue + recommendation, enabling fast triage in long documents.

CLAUDE COWORK

Linear narrative output — readable, but harder to scan or import into a redlining workflow.

09 Escalation framework



GENIEAI

Suggests escalation paths but does not codify thresholds for when to escalate to senior counsel or commercial leadership.

CLAUDE COWORK

Strong escalation framework — explicit triggers (financial threshold, IP exposure, regulatory) tied to named decision-makers.

10 Negotiation strategy



GENIEAI

Sequences the negotiation by leverage — what to concede, what to hold, what to trade — and quantifies expected savings.

CLAUDE COWORK

Identifies negotiation levers but stops short of sequencing them or estimating concession value.

Largest performance gaps

+8

Fallback / redline language

+6

Consultant-side perspective

+5

Legal authority citations

+4

IP depth

+3

Clause coverage breadth