
Taylor concludes that Shepard's is more current with negative treatment, typically having editorial analysis available at least a week before KeyCite. Taylor states:

“Shepard’s is evidently faster at getting the analyses of unrelated opinions into the database: the median number of workdays that Shepard’s took was between three and four, and the 11 percent of cases that took longer bad all been analyzed by the fifth or sixth workday. For KeyCite, on the other hand, the median number of workdays was between nine and ten, and almost 25 percent of the cases took eleven to fifteen workdays.” 92 L. LIBR. J. at 132, ¶19.

Taylor also concludes that Shepard’s is more complete with case law coverage, including very recent decisions. Referring to a 1998 study by librarian Fred R. Shapiro,** Taylor states:

“As expected, the discrepancy that Shapiro found no longer exists. Shepard’s retrieved 1,764 citations and KeyCite retrieved 1,752. Similarly, where Shapiro had seen 619 citations that were retrieved only by KeyCite and 39 retrieved only by Shepard’s, in my test there were 100 citations unique to KeyCite and 112 unique to Shepard’s. The redesign of the Shepard’s database seems to have eliminated the disadvantage pointed out by Shapiro’s article.” 92 L. LIBR. J. at 129, ¶9.
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** Fred R. Shapiro, KeyCite and Shepard’s—Coverage and Currency of Citations to Recent Cases: A Comparative Study, LEGAL INFO. ALERT, April 1998, at 1.