

Learning Robust Named Entity Recognizers From Noisy Data With Retrieval Augmentation^{*}

Chaoyi Ai^a, Yong Jiang^{b,**}, Shen Huang^b, Pengjun Xie^b and Kewei Tu^{a,*}

^aSchool of Information Science and Technology, ShanghaiTech University, No. 393 Huaxia Middle Road, Shanghai, 201210, China

^bAlibaba Group, No. 969, Wen Yi West Road, Yuhang District, Hangzhou, 311121, China

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

named entity recognition
robust learning from noisy data
retrieval augmentation

ABSTRACT

Named entity recognition (NER) models often struggle with noisy inputs, such as those with spelling mistakes or errors generated by Optical Character Recognition processes, and learning a robust NER model is challenging. Existing robust NER models utilize both noisy text and its corresponding gold text for training, which is infeasible in many real-world applications in which gold text is not available. In this paper, we consider a more realistic setting in which only noisy text and its NER labels are available. We propose to retrieve relevant text of the noisy text from a knowledge corpus and use it to enhance the representation of the original noisy input. We design three retrieval methods: sparse retrieval based on lexicon similarity, dense retrieval based on semantic similarity, and self-retrieval based on task-specific text. After retrieving relevant text, we concatenate the retrieved text with the original noisy text and encode them with a transformer network, utilizing self-attention to enhance the contextual token representations of the noisy text using the retrieved text. We further employ a multi-view training framework that improves robust NER without retrieving text during inference. Experiments show that our retrieval-augmented model achieves significant improvements in various noisy NER settings.

1. Introduction

Named entity recognition (NER) (Chinchor and Robinson, 1997) is an important task in natural language processing that has a variety of applications and serves as a foundation for several downstream tasks such as machine translation (Hálek, Rosa, Tamchyna and Bojar, 2011), intelligent question answering (Lee, Hwang and Jang, 2007), knowledge graphs (Thukral, Dhiman, Meher and Bedi, 2023), and event extraction (Zhang, Wei, Li and Yan, 2022; Edouard, Cabrio, Tonelli and Le Thanh, 2017). The performance of NER directly impacts the performance of these downstream tasks. However, current NER models are trained on clean text and pre-trained models used for NER are also based on clean text. In reality, input text may contain noises, e.g., spelling mistakes or errors from Optical Character Recognition (OCR) processes, which can lead to a drop in NER performance and propagate errors to downstream tasks. Therefore, robust NER that can handle both clean and noisy text is a valuable task in need of further research.

Existing models (Namysl, Behnke and Köhler, 2020, 2021) for robust NER rely on the use of both noisy text and its corresponding gold text for training. Specifically, they are trained to output similar results from noisy and gold texts.

^{*}This document is the results of the research project funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (61976139) and Alibaba Group through Alibaba Innovative Research Program.

^{*}Principal corresponding author

^{**}Corresponding author

✉ aichaoyi1998@gmail.com (C. Ai); yongjiang.jy@alibaba-inc.com (Y. Jiang); pangda@alibaba-inc.com (S. Huang); chengchen.xpj@alibaba-inc.com (P. Xie); tukw@shanghaitech.edu.cn (K. Tu)

🌐 <http://jiangyong.site/> (Y. Jiang);

<https://faculty.sist.shanghaitech.edu.cn/faculty/tukw/> (K. Tu)

ORCID(s):




Figure 1: A Comparative Illustration of the Divergence Between the Frameworks of Existing Robust Named Entity Recognition Models and Our Robust Named Entity Recognition Model

The NAT model (Namysl et al., 2020) handles noisy text with spelling mistakes, which are token-level noises and do not change the length of sentences. It is trained to encourage similar predictions at each position from noisy and gold texts. However, it cannot handle errors generated by OCR which are sentence-level noises that may change the length of sentences. An extended model (Namysl et al., 2021) aligns a noisy sentence with OCR errors to the corresponding gold sentence at the token level using the Levenshtein Distance to ensure that the two sentences have the same length. Specifically, if a single word is recognized as multiple separate words by the OCR process, then these recognized words are treated as a cohesive unit aligned to the original word; if a single word is not recognized at all, then it is treated as a

“blank”. After the alignment process is complete, the lengths of the noisy and gold texts are equal and hence they can be inputted into the NAT model (Namysl et al., 2020).

Unlike prior studies, this paper addresses the challenge of robust NER in a more realistic setting where only noisy training text is available and its corresponding gold text is absent (as illustrated in Figure 1). Additionally, we assume that NER annotations are based on the noisy text rather than the gold text, so for texts with OCR errors, the number of labels is equal to the number of recognized words after OCR, which is again more realistic.

To tackle robust NER in this demanding setting, we draw inspiration from humans. Humans are capable of recognizing and annotating entities in noisy text by using domain knowledge retrieved from their memory to correct errors and resolve ambiguity. Accordingly, we propose to solve robust NER in two steps. First, we retrieve relevant text of the noisy text from a background knowledge corpus. Second, we concatenate the noisy text with the retrieved text and feed them into a transformer. The self-attention mechanism of the transformer can enhance the contextual token representation of the noisy text, leveraging the information from the retrieved text. We then use the enhanced contextual token representation for the final NER prediction. Our method can be seen as an extension of retrieval-augmented NER (Wang, Jiang, Bach, Wang, Huang, Huang and Tu, 2021; Wang, Gui, Jiang, Jia, Bach, Wang, Huang and Tu, 2022b; Wang, Cai, Jiang, Xie, Tu and Lu, 2022a), but unlike previous work, we use text retrieval for the purpose of de-noising.

We use three retrieval methods in the first step, namely, sparse retrieval based on lexicon similarity, dense retrieval based on semantic similarity, and self-retrieval based on task-specific text.

- **Sparse retrieval based on lexicon similarity.** This simple and effective method uses BM25 (Robertson and Walker, 1994) to perform sparse retrieval based on string matching and retrieve relevant information from Wikipedia, a constantly evolving source of knowledge.
- **Dense retrieval based on semantic similarity.** BM25 requires at least one word from the query text to match. To overcome this limitation, we can use dense retrieval (Deerwester, Dumais, Furnas, Landauer and Harshman, 1990), which first encodes sentences into embeddings and then retrieves through K-Nearest Neighbors. To train the encoder, we employ a contrastive learning approach (Gao, Yao and Chen, 2021) using both clean text from Wikipedia and corresponding simulated noisy text as inputs.
- **Self retrieval based on task-specific text.** It is likely that a word may appear for multiple times in a noisy dataset in different forms: either its correct form or various noisy forms. Therefore, we can use noisy text as query to retrieve from the noisy dataset itself, hoping that the retrieved text may contain correct or less

noisy forms of words in the query text. BERTScore (Zhang, Kishore, Wu, Weinberger and Artzi), which uses contextual embeddings to represent tokens and calculates matching using cosine similarity, is more fine-grained than dense retrieval that directly uses sentence representation. However, BERTScore requires calculating the cosine similarity of each pair of token representations of two sentences and storing all contextual token embeddings, making it infeasible for use with Wikipedia.

While our method provides robust NER without relying on gold text during training, it requires retrieval from a background knowledge corpus. This may not be always possible or desirable, particularly in time-sensitive situations or online serving where retrieval could be too time-consuming. To address this issue, we use multi-view learning (Clark, Luong, Manning and Le, 2018; Wang et al., 2021) to train the NER model from two views, one being the original noisy text view and the other being the retrieval-based view that concatenates the noisy and retrieved texts. We encourage the two views to produce similar contextual embedding representations or predicted label distributions, thus improving the NER accuracy of the original noisy text view.

The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We propose the first approach to robust NER with only noisy training text and without its corresponding gold text.
- We empirically show that retrieval-augmentation can improve noisy named entity recognition with misspelling mistakes and OCR errors, and our model achieves significant improvements over the baseline in various experimental settings, i.e., with various levels of misspelling mistakes and types of OCR errors.
- We use three retrieval methods, specifically, self retrieval based on task-specific text, i.e., BERTScore to retrieve noisy dataset self, sparse retrieval based on lexicon similarity, i.e., BM25 to retrieve Wikipedia, and dense retrieval based on semantic similarity to retrieve Wikipedia. In the dense retrieval, we train the encode by a contrastive learning method using Wikipedia’s clean text and its corresponding synthetic noisy text.

2. Problem Definition

We model the named entity recognition (NER) task as a sequence labeling problem. Given a sentence $\mathbf{w} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with n tokens, sequence labeling aims to predict a label sequence $\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ for each position. The BIO tagging scheme, which stands for Beginning, Inside and Outside subtags, is often used. A typical architecture of sequence labeling for NER is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: NER as sequence labeling.

To reduce the vocabulary size and better handle similar words, natural language models often use word segmentation (Saffran, Newport and Aslin, 1996), i.e., tokenizers. Sequence labeling begins with tokenizing the sentence into smaller subwords, which are then transformed into token embeddings using a vocabulary embedding table. These token embeddings are then inputted into a feature extraction model, which outputs contextual token embeddings based on interactions among tokens of different positions. The feature extraction model can be a pre-trained transformer, such as BERT (Devlin, Chang, Lee and Toutanova, 2019) or RoBERTa (Liu, Ott, Goyal, Du, Joshi, Chen, Levy, Lewis, Zettlemoyer and Stoyanov, 2019), which has powerful text representation ability due to the self-attention mechanism and pre-training on large corpora using mask language modeling.

To account for the fact that a single token can be tokenized into multiple subtokens, a pooling operation is used to merge the contextual token embeddings at consecutive positions to create token-level embeddings, such as first pooling, i.e., using the embedding of the first sub-token. The pooled contextual token embeddings are then converted to non-normalized logits in each position through a fully connected layer. A softmax layer can be added to get normalized logits for the label in each position, but in practice, a Conditional Random Fields (CRF) layer is often used which effectively considers relationship between consecutive labels to enforce constraints, such as ensuring that there is a Beginning tag before an Inside tag.

The vocabulary embedding table, the feature extraction model, and the CRF layer can be jointly trained using backpropagation, while the tokenizer is not trained and the size and words of the vocabulary embedding table remain unchanged.

When the input text is noisy, the process of tokenization may produce different results compared with that from the corresponding clean text. This can lead to errors that will

propagate through to the final predicted result. There are many kinds of noise in the text and two of the most important ones are spelling mistakes and errors generated by Optical Character Recognition (OCR). Spelling mistakes alter individual letters within words (including replacing, adding and deleting), resulting in token-level noises, but they do not change the number of words in a sentence. Words with spelling mistakes are often tokenized into single characters or marked as unknown words after tokenization. On the other hand, OCR-generated errors may change the number of words of a sentence, resulting in sentence-level noises. The OCR process recognizes words from images of texts and hence the wrongly recognized words are often highly similar to the original ones, so they may be tokenized into fragments of the original words. The difference of tokenization between spelling mistakes and OCR errors can be demonstrated through the BERTScore experiment (Section 4.1), where the BERTScore (Zhang et al.) for text with spelling mistakes is low, while that for text with OCR errors is relatively high, indicating that text with OCR errors is quite similar to its corresponding original text. The correlation between the similarity of two sentences and their BERTScores is direct, with increased similarity leading to a higher BERTScore score.

Unlike previous work, we assume that during training, we only have noisy training text and do not know its corresponding gold text. Furthermore, we assume that NER annotations are derived from the noisy text, as opposed to the gold text. In this setting, the number of labels for OCR-erroneous texts is equivalent to the number of words recognized through OCR, which is more practical and realistic.

3. Method

Our proposed framework consists of two main components: a Retrieval Module and a NER model with multi-view learning, as depicted in Figure 3. The Retrieval Module is used to obtain text related to the input text from a background knowledge corpus. The NER model is a transformer-based model with two views. In the retrieval-based view, we concatenate the original noisy text with the retrieved text and input them into the transformer-based model, hoping to enhance the contextual token representation of the noisy text leveraging the information from the retrieved text. In the original noisy text view, the noisy text is directly inputted into the NER model without retrieval. We employ multi-view learning to encourage two views to produce similar contextual embeddings or predicted label distributions, ultimately improving the accuracy of the original noisy text view, which can be used when retrieval is impossible or undesirable.

3.1. Retrieval Module

We design three retrieval methods: sparse retrieval based on lexicon similarity, dense retrieval based on semantic similarity, and self retrieval based on task-specific text.




Figure 3: Our model architecture

3.1.1. Sparse retrieval based on lexicon similarity

Wikipedia¹, the largest encyclopedia in the world, boasts a vast collection of clean and well-organized text on a wide range of topics and domains. The simplest method for retrieving information from Wikipedia is through the BM25 algorithm (Robertson and Walker, 1994), a string matching-based approach.

3.1.2. Dense retrieval based on semantic similarity

The BM25 algorithm requires that retrieved strings contain at least one word from the input query, making it less effective for retrieving results from noisy text containing errors. Fuzzy retrieval based on Levenshtein distance may be used instead. However, due to the vast size of Wikipedia, the word with the smallest Levenshtein distance to the noisy text may not necessarily be the correct word, resulting in sub-optimal results. To address this, we apply a dense retrieval method, which encodes sentences into embeddings and then retrieves text through K-Nearest Neighbors. To obtain the encoder, we utilize contrastive learning (Gao et al., 2021) to fine-tune a pre-trained model using clean text from Wikipedia and its noisy version with simulated corruptions. We use the InfoNCE loss (Oord, Li and Vinyals, 2018) as the training loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_i = -\log \frac{e^{\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i^{\text{noisy}}, \mathbf{h}_i^{\text{gold}})/\tau}}{\sum_{j=1}^N e^{\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i^{\text{noisy}}, \mathbf{h}_j^{\text{gold}})/\tau}} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_i^{\text{noisy}}$ is the embedding of noisy text, $\mathbf{h}_i^{\text{gold}}$ is the embedding of the corresponding gold text, τ is the temperature hyperparameter, $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the cosine similarity, and N is the batchsize. We select the best encoder model by measuring $\text{recall}@k$ of using simulated noisy text of Wikipedia to retrieve the corresponding gold text. $\text{recall}@k$ is measured by comparing the top k retrieved results with the gold text and calculating the proportion of times the gold text is included in the top k results, as shown by the following equation:

$$\text{recall}@k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}[\text{gold}_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{top}k}(\text{noisy}_i)]}{n} \quad (2)$$

¹<https://www.wikipedia.org/>

where noisy_i is the i -th simulated noisy text of Wikipedia, gold_i is the corresponding clean gold text, $\mathbb{R}_{\text{top}k}(x)$ is the top- k results of using x to retrieve clean texts from Wikipedia, $\mathbb{1}[x]$ is equal to 1 if x is true and 0 otherwise, and n is the number of simulated noisy texts.

An encoder trained in this way could produce similar embeddings for noisy text and its corresponding gold text. Subsequently, we utilize the K-nearest neighbors (knn) algorithm to retrieve Wikipedia sentences.

3.1.3. Self retrieval based on task-specific text

The dense retrieval method encodes an entire sentence into a single embedding. A more fine-grained retrieval method is to use BERTScore (Zhang et al.), which calculates the average maximum cosine similarity between the contextual token embeddings of the input sentence and the retrieved sentence, which is then used to determine the precision (P) and recall (R). We use F1-score (harmonic mean of P and R) to rank the retrieved sentences. However, BERTScore has high computational complexity and a large memory footprint, making it difficult to use on large datasets like Wikipedia. Therefore, we apply it to retrieve text from the training dataset itself, which is small and contains sentences of the same domain as the query sentence. For the dataset self, it is smaller and from the same domain, where the same words may have the same semantics, appear multiple times and may or may not be changed by a noising process. The BERTScore’s F1-score can be used to retrieve and rank the noisy dataset itself. Since our experiment is inductive, with test instances being independent of each other, we retrieve from the same training set for all sets: training, validation, and test.

3.2. NER model with multi-view learning

For the NER model, we use a pre-trained transformer-based model and a CRF layer as the backbone. Our method employs two views: the original noisy text view and the retrieval-based view. Both views share the same parameters in their pre-trained transformer-based models and CRF layers. The retrieval-based view combines the noisy text with the corresponding retrieved text from the Retrieval Module to form a concatenated input $[\mathbf{x}, [\mathbf{X}], \tilde{\mathbf{x}}]$, where \mathbf{x} is the noisy text, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is the corresponding retrieved text, and $[\mathbf{X}]$ is a special token dependent on the pre-trained transformer-based model used by NER (e.g., “[SEP]” in BERT and “</s>” in RoBERTa). The transformer-based embedding model, utilizing its self-attention mechanism, enhances the contextual token representations of the noisy text by the retrieval text, ultimately leading to improved NER performance. Note that in the retrieval-based view, we only input the embeddings of the original noisy text into the CRF layer, discarding the embedding of the retrieval text since we do not need to predict their labels.

As discussed earlier, retrieval is slow and may not be suitable for time-sensitive scenarios. Therefore, we use multi-view learning to improve the original noisy text view with the help from the retrieval-based view. For the original noisy text view, denote the contextual token representations

after the pre-trained transformer as $\{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$. After the CRF layer, the label distribution is:

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \psi(y_{i-1}, y_i, r_i)}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathbf{x})} \prod_{i=1}^n \psi(y'_{i-1}, y'_i, r_i)} \quad (3)$$

where θ is the model parameters, ψ is the potential function, and $\mathcal{Y}(\mathbf{x})$ is the set of all possible label sequences given the sentence \mathbf{x} . Note that the denominator can be computed using the classic forward algorithm. Denote the gold label sequence as $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$. The negative log-likelihood loss for the original noisy text view is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{text}}(\theta) = -\log p_\theta(\hat{\mathbf{y}}|\mathbf{x}) \quad (4)$$

Similarly, the negative log-likelihood loss of the retrieval-based view is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{retrieval}}(\theta) = -\log p_\theta(\hat{\mathbf{y}}|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \quad (5)$$

To jointly train the two views by multi-view learning, we use L2 distance or KL distance to reduce the gap between the two views. Specifically, the L2 distance is the distance between the token representations of the two views after the transformer-based embedding model:

$$\mathcal{L}_{L_2}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \|r'_i - r_i\|^2 \quad (6)$$

The KL distance is the distance between the predicted label distributions of the two views after the CRF layer:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{KL}}(\theta) = \text{KL}(p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \| p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})) \quad (7)$$

$$= \text{CE}(p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}), p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})) - \text{H}(p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}})) \quad (8)$$

$$\triangleq \text{CE}(p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}), p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})) \quad (9)$$

$$= - \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathbf{x})} p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \log p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \quad (10)$$

$$\triangleq - \sum_{i=1}^n q_\theta(y_i|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \log q_\theta(y_i|\mathbf{x}) \quad (11)$$

where $\text{KL}(\cdot \| \cdot)$ denotes the Kullback-Leibler divergence, $\text{CE}(\cdot \| \cdot)$ represents the Cross-Entropy, $\text{H}(\cdot)$ signifies the Entropy, and $q_\theta(y_k | *)$ is proportional to the product of the forward score and backward score generated by the classic forward-backward algorithm.

Note that the retrieval-based view has additional information of retrieval text so we does not necessitate parameter adjustment through back-propagation. Consequently, $\text{H}(p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}))$ remains constant and can be disregarded, leading to Equation (9) \triangleq .

Due to the exponential size of $\mathcal{Y}(\mathbf{x})$, we approximate the Cross-Entropy over the label sequence with the summation of position-wise Cross-Entropy, as shown in Equation (11) \triangleq .

In the training phase, we simultaneously train the two views by optimizing the sum of the loss functions:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{text}}(\theta) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{retrieval}}(\theta) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{MV}}(\theta) \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{MV}}(\theta)$ is either $\mathcal{L}_{L_2}(\theta)$ or $\mathcal{L}_{\text{KL}}(\theta)$.

During the inference stage, the original noisy text view is fed with the noisy text input, while the retrieval-based view receives a combination of the noisy text and its corresponding retrieved text. The two views are evaluated separately via entity-level F1 scores.

4. Experiment

4.1. Dataset Construction

In light of the absence of publicly accessible noisy datasets specifically designed for Named Entity Recognition (NER) tasks – with an emphasis on noisy text rather than noisy labels – we have undertaken the development of our own noisy datasets. These custom datasets are constructed using two established NER corpora as a foundation: the WNUT-17 dataset (Derczynski, Nichols, van Erp and Limsopatham, 2017) collected from social media and the CoNLL-03 English dataset (Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder, 2003) derived from news.

We induce two types of noise into clean text, i.e., spelling mistakes and errors caused by Optical Character Recognition (OCR). To simulate spelling mistakes, we employ the NAT model proposed by Namysl et al. (2020) (Namysl et al., 2020). This model uses a character confusion matrix to generate errors, where the probabilities of insertion, deletion, and substitution are each equal to $p/3$, given an overall noise level of p . The alphabet Σ , which excludes the symbol ϵ , comprises all letters present in the original corpus. In applying this method, we first insert the ϵ symbol between every pair of adjacent letters in the original text, as well as before the first letter and after the last letter. Next, we utilize the character confusion matrix to create the modified sequence. Specifically, insertions transform ϵ into a character from Σ , deletions change the original character to ϵ , and substitutions replace the original character with another distinct character from Σ . Finally, we remove the ϵ symbols to produce the resulting noisy text containing spelling errors.

In order to simulate errors introduced by OCR, we make use of the Text Recognition Data Generator (TRDG) package² to convert each sentence into an image, employing 90 distinct fonts. Subsequently, we introduce random distortions to the sentences within the images or incorporate background noise. To extract potentially noisy text from these images, we employ the Tesseract-OCR engine³. Considering that OCR may alter sentence length, we align the noisy OCR sentences with their respective clean counterparts using the Levenshtein Distance Algorithm, consistent with prior work (Namysl et al., 2021). In our approach, the number of labels corresponds to the total number of words recognized following the OCR process. This differs from previous research (Namysl et al., 2021), where the number of labels equaled the number of original words, which does not reflect real-world scenarios.

²<https://github.com/Belval/TextRecognitionDataGenerator>

³<https://github.com/tesseract-ocr/tesseract>

Table 1

Four ways of OCR noise.

OCR type	distorted sentences	noisy backdrop	WNUT 17	CoNLL 03
OCR_1	✗	✗	2.53%	1.81%
OCR_2	✓	✗	8.07%	5.37%
OCR_3	✗	✓	13.62%	10.84%
OCR_4	✓	✓	26.41%	21.23%

Table 2

BERTScore between noisy text and the corresponding gold text.

dataset	DeBERTa-XLarge-MNLI		XLM-RoBERTa-large	
	WNUT 17	CoNLL 03	WNUT 17	CoNLL 03
typos_0.1	0.791 ± 0.092	0.790 ± 0.110	0.923 ± 0.029	0.923 ± 0.037
typos_0.2	0.657 ± 0.100	0.660 ± 0.125	0.880 ± 0.030	0.883 ± 0.040
typos_0.3	0.561 ± 0.097	0.571 ± 0.129	0.849 ± 0.030	0.856 ± 0.042
OCR_1	0.964 ± 0.048	0.977 ± 0.051	0.985 ± 0.019	0.992 ± 0.018
OCR_2	0.878 ± 0.094	0.920 ± 0.091	0.955 ± 0.032	0.971 ± 0.032
OCR_3	0.829 ± 0.184	0.875 ± 0.172	0.939 ± 0.061	0.956 ± 0.058
OCR_4	0.696 ± 0.202	0.779 ± 0.209	0.896 ± 0.065	0.924 ± 0.067

We use three different noise levels of spelling mistakes, i.e., $p = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3$, and four kinds of OCR noise, i.e., whether to combine geometrical distortions for sentences and whether to induce pixel-level noise to the background, whose token error rate can be seen in Table 1. The token error rate is calculated as the ratio of the Levenshtein Distance between the noisy and original sentences to the total length of the original sentences. The noisy level of the noisy sentences and its Levenshtein Distance are positively correlated: as the Levenshtein Distance increases, the noisy level also increases.

To evaluate the differences between the two noise-induced methods, we conducted an experiment using BERTScore to measure the similarity between the noisy text and the corresponding gold text as shown in Table 2, where $typos_p$ in the dataset is the noisy dataset generated using spelling mistakes with the noise level p , $OCR_1/OCR_2/OCR_3/OCR_4$ denote the noisy dataset induced by four kinds of OCR noise. We use two pre-trained transformer models in the BERTScore experiment, i.e., DeBERTa-XLarge-MNLI and XLM-RoBERTa-large. The DeBERTa-XLarge-MNLI model (He, Liu, Gao and Chen, 2021) is the best model for BERTScore and the XLM-RoBERTa-large model (Conneau, Khandelwal, Goyal, Chaudhary, Wenzek, Guzmán, Grave, Ott, Zettlemoyer and Stoyanov, 2020) is used in our NER model. The BERTScore of sentences with spelling mistakes is really low while that with OCR noise is very high, which indicates that spelling mistakes and OCR noise are very different.

4.2. Retrieval Module Configuration

4.2.1. BM25 retrieval (sparse retrieval)

We employ the 2022-07-01 version of the Wikipedia data dump⁴ as our primary data source, which is subsequently converted into plain text format for efficient processing. For the implementation of the BM25 retrieval algorithm, we utilize Elasticsearch⁵ to index and retrieve sentences within the Wikipedia corpus. In this configuration, the smallest searchable unit is defined as a single sentence. Furthermore, the matching algorithm is configured to “match”, signifying that the retrieved results must contain a minimum of one word from the query sentence.

4.2.2. Dense retrieval

In our dense retrieval experiment, we utilize the entire Wikipedia corpus to retrieve, consistent with the BM25 retrieval method, and an encoder trained using the unsupervised SimCSE approach (Gao et al., 2021). The encoder is fine-tuned on the XLM-RoBERTa-large model through contrastive learning, employing simulated noisy text and clean text from Wikipedia. Two distinct noise induction techniques, spelling mistakes and OCR errors, are applied separately. In order to address challenges over RAM usage and computational speed and inspired by BERT-whitening (Su, Cao, Liu and Ou, 2021), we generate sentence embeddings, perform PCA for dimensionality reduction, and save the embeddings as npy files. We leverage the FAISS library⁶ to implement the Inverted File System (Mazur, 1979) using the `index_factory` function, incorporating the Hierarchical Navigable Small World (HNSW) technique (Malkov and Yashunin, 2018) and the cosine distance metric. Further details can be found in the Appendix A.

4.2.3. BERTScore retrieval (self retrieval)

The official implementation of BERTScore⁷ can only calculate paired inputs, which is very slow for a large number of query and target sentences. We modify the source code by first encoding all the query and target sentences to contextual token embeddings, then doing matching for each pair of sentences, and finally outputting their similarity scores. It is worth noting that each noisy text is tested individually and does not interfere with each other, i.e., inductive inference. Therefore, we independently retrieve texts for the training, development, and testing sets from the same source corpus, i.e., the training set.

4.2.4. Postprocessing

We use top-10 retrieved results. For better utilization of retrieval results of Wikipedia, we follow previous work (Wang, Shen, Cai, Wang, Wang, Xie, Huang, Lu, Zhuang, Tu, Lu and Jiang, 2022c) and use three options, i.e., using the matched paragraph, using the matched sentence, and using the matched sentence but removing wiki anchors, i.e., mention hyperlinks, which can provide rich and useful clues

⁴<https://dumps.wikipedia.org/>

⁵<https://www.elastic.co>

⁶<https://github.com/facebookresearch/faiss>

⁷https://github.com/Tiiiger/bert_score

Table 3
NER performance with spelling mistakes

(a) WNUT-17									(b) CoNLL-03								
noise level	0		0.1		0.2		0.3		noise level	0		0.1		0.2		0.3	
	OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV		OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV
<i>Baselines:</i>									<i>Baselines:</i>								
<i>noisy text only</i>									<i>noisy text only</i>								
<i>w/o context</i>									<i>w/o context</i>								
correct									correct								
<i>w/o context</i>									<i>w/o context</i>								
natas									natas								
hunspell									hunspell								
natas+check									natas+check								
hunspell+check									hunspell+check								
<i>with gold text</i>									<i>with gold text</i>								
<i>w/ gold full</i>									<i>w/ gold full</i>								
<i>w/ gold KL</i>									<i>w/ gold KL</i>								
<i>w/ gold L2</i>									<i>w/ gold L2</i>								
<i>self-retrieval</i>									<i>self-retrieval</i>								
<i>w/ self full</i>									<i>w/ self full</i>								
<i>w/ self KL</i>									<i>w/ self KL</i>								
<i>w/ self L2</i>									<i>w/ self L2</i>								
<i>BM25-retrieval</i>									<i>BM25-retrieval</i>								
<i>w/ para full</i>									<i>w/ para full</i>								
<i>w/ sent-link full</i>									<i>w/ sent-link full</i>								
<i>w/ sent full</i>									<i>w/ sent full</i>								
<i>w/ para KL</i>									<i>w/ para KL</i>								
<i>w/ sent-link KL</i>									<i>w/ sent-link KL</i>								
<i>w/ sent KL</i>									<i>w/ sent KL</i>								
<i>w/ para L2</i>									<i>w/ para L2</i>								
<i>w/ sent-link L2</i>									<i>w/ sent-link L2</i>								
<i>w/ sent L2</i>									<i>w/ sent L2</i>								
<i>dense-retrieval</i>									<i>dense-retrieval</i>								
<i>w/ para full</i>									<i>w/ para full</i>								
<i>w/ sent-link full</i>									<i>w/ sent-link full</i>								
<i>w/ sent full</i>									<i>w/ sent full</i>								
<i>w/ para KL</i>									<i>w/ para KL</i>								
<i>w/ sent-link KL</i>									<i>w/ sent-link KL</i>								
<i>w/ sent KL</i>									<i>w/ sent KL</i>								
<i>w/ para L2</i>									<i>w/ para L2</i>								
<i>w/ sent-link L2</i>									<i>w/ sent-link L2</i>								
<i>w/ sent L2</i>									<i>w/ sent L2</i>								

The † symbol indicates that the corresponding model demonstrates a significant improvement over the baseline model (*noisy text only w/o context*) at a confidence level of $p < 0.01$.

for mention detection in NER. If there is a hyperlink [A → B], we will transfer word A in the sentence to $\langle e : B \rangle$ A $\langle /e \rangle$. For each retrieval result from Wikipedia, we concatenate it with the corresponding title to form the final retrieval result. To get the matched paragraph for dense retrieval, we can use Elasticsearch by the matching algorithm “term”, i.e., complete matching, to search Wikipedia. For the results retrieved from the noisy dataset itself, we do not do post-processing.

4.3. NER Module Configuration

We use XLM-RoBERTa-large (Conneau et al., 2020) as the pre-trained transformer-based model, tune the learning rate of the transformer within $[1 \times 10^6, 1 \times 10^5]$, and use grid search to find the ratio of CRF learning rate and transformer learning rate within [3000, 12000].

4.4. Main Results

We employ entity-level F1 scores as the evaluation metric for Named Entity Recognition (NER). For each experimental setting, we run four different seeds and then average the results. The NER performance is shown in Table 3 and Table 4 for spelling mistakes and OCR noise respectively.

For the first row, 0 or *no* denotes the original clean text without noise and the other denote different types of noisy text; *OV* is the original noisy text view and *RV* is the retrieval-based view. There are many settings that correspond to each column, as detailed below:

- *noisy text only w/o context* only uses the original noisy text without the retrieved text.
- *w/o context natas/hunspell* only uses the original noisy text without the retrieved text but the noisy text is corrected before inputting by natas/hunspell.
- *w/o context natas/hunspell + check* adds a check process which only retains words corrected rightly but keeps the original noisy words if corrected wrongly.
- *w/ gold/self* uses both the original noisy text and the external context which is the corresponding gold text or the self retrieval context.
- *w/ para/sent/sent-link* uses both the original noisy text and the external context which is the matched paragraph, the matched sentence and the matched sentence without wiki anchors.

Table 4
NER performance with OCR noise

(a) WNUT-17										(b) CoNLL-03											
OCR type	no		OCR 1		OCR 2		OCR 3		OCR 4		OCR type	no		OCR 1		OCR 2		OCR 3		OCR 4	
	OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV		OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV	OV	RV
<i>Baselines:</i>																					
<i>noisy text only</i>																					
<i>w/o context</i>																					
	58.21	-	53.95	-	50.00	-	45.63	-	35.24	-		92.98	-	92.88	-	91.45	-	86.77	-	79.83	-
<i>correct</i>																					
<i>w/o context</i>																					
	-	-	45.27	-	42.06	-	38.76	-	28.05	-		-	-	89.22	-	87.04	-	82.78	-	75.19	-
	-	-	50.66	-	45.60	-	40.44	-	31.90	-		-	-	91.22	-	89.71	-	84.91	-	77.55	-
<i>with gold text</i>																					
	-	-	-	53.99	-	52.37 [†]	-	52.07 [†]	-	48.59 [†]		-	-	93.06 [†]	-	92.90 [†]	-	91.60 [†]	-	89.53 [†]	
	-	-	55.25 [†]	55.13 [†]	50.83 [†]	53.06 [†]	45.86 [†]	50.98 [†]	38.31 [†]	48.44 [†]		-	-	92.94 [†]	93.00 [†]	91.51 [†]	92.79 [†]	87.01 [†]	91.58 [†]	80.09 [†]	89.34 [†]
	-	-	54.61 [†]	54.55 [†]	51.18 [†]	53.72 [†]	45.89 [†]	51.43 [†]	37.95 [†]	48.27 [†]		-	-	92.91 [†]	92.97 [†]	91.52 [†]	92.85 [†]	87.24 [†]	91.68 [†]	80.13 [†]	89.30 [†]
<i>self-retrieval</i>																					
	-	58.90 [†]	-	54.72 [†]	-	51.30 [†]	-	45.68 [†]	-	37.18 [†]		-	93.10 [†]	-	92.99 [†]	-	91.48 [†]	-	86.91 [†]	-	80.37 [†]
	59.59 [†]	59.87 [†]	55.07 [†]	55.11 [†]	51.13 [†]	51.21 [†]	45.92 [†]	45.99 [†]	37.47 [†]	37.98 [†]		93.21 [†]	93.46 [†]	92.99 [†]	93.27 [†]	91.48 [†]	91.76 [†]	86.87 [†]	87.33 [†]	79.98 [†]	80.79 [†]
	59.02 [†]	59.21 [†]	55.21 [†]	54.73 [†]	51.04 [†]	51.52 [†]	45.98 [†]	46.09 [†]	37.59 [†]	37.42 [†]		93.13 [†]	93.54 [†]	92.96 [†]	93.19 [†]	91.47 [†]	91.81 [†]	86.84 [†]	87.32 [†]	79.86 [†]	80.72 [†]
<i>BM25-retrieval</i>																					
	-	59.29 [†]	-	54.53 [†]	-	51.38 [†]	-	46.21 [†]	-	38.01 [†]		-	93.33 [†]	-	93.21 [†]	-	91.78 [†]	-	87.18 [†]	-	80.15 [†]
	-	59.88 [†]	-	56.33 [†]	-	51.03 [†]	-	46.30 [†]	-	37.96 [†]		-	93.27 [†]	-	93.23 [†]	-	91.79 [†]	-	87.10 [†]	-	80.24 [†]
	-	59.15 [†]	-	55.26 [†]	-	51.53 [†]	-	46.10 [†]	-	37.75 [†]		-	93.33 [†]	-	93.08 [†]	-	91.63 [†]	-	87.18 [†]	-	80.27 [†]
	59.39 [†]	60.02 [†]	55.05 [†]	55.38 [†]	51.13 [†]	52.28 [†]	46.36 [†]	46.37 [†]	37.76 [†]	38.49 [†]		93.07 [†]	93.26 [†]	92.91 [†]	93.00 [†]	91.47 [†]	91.71 [†]	87.05 [†]	87.34 [†]	79.77	80.25 [†]
	59.54 [†]	60.61 [†]	54.90 [†]	55.76 [†]	50.99 [†]	52.01 [†]	45.93 [†]	45.94 [†]	37.19 [†]	38.23 [†]		93.08 [†]	93.34 [†]	93.10 [†]	93.47 [†]	91.47 [†]	91.90 [†]	86.93 [†]	87.34 [†]	79.39	80.06 [†]
	59.21 [†]	59.65 [†]	54.95 [†]	55.35 [†]	51.00 [†]	51.58 [†]	45.81 [†]	46.80 [†]	37.85 [†]	38.25 [†]		93.05 [†]	93.48 [†]	93.01 [†]	93.24 [†]	91.57 [†]	91.96 [†]	87.06 [†]	87.31 [†]	79.26	79.87 [†]
	59.94 [†]	59.92 [†]	54.99 [†]	55.16 [†]	51.10 [†]	52.09 [†]	46.51 [†]	46.54 [†]	37.33 [†]	37.70 [†]		93.10 [†]	93.31 [†]	93.01 [†]	93.23 [†]	91.66 [†]	91.85 [†]	86.95 [†]	87.18 [†]	79.70	80.22 [†]
	59.02 [†]	59.05 [†]	55.06 [†]	56.10 [†]	51.47 [†]	52.54 [†]	46.86 [†]	47.30 [†]	37.31 [†]	37.75 [†]		93.14 [†]	93.53 [†]	92.90 [†]	93.30 [†]	91.51 [†]	91.74 [†]	86.88 [†]	87.36 [†]	79.60	80.64 [†]
	59.10 [†]	59.39 [†]	55.05 [†]	55.51 [†]	51.18 [†]	52.73 [†]	46.56 [†]	47.25 [†]	37.36 [†]	37.39 [†]		93.19 [†]	93.42 [†]	92.94 [†]	93.07 [†]	91.53 [†]	91.93 [†]	87.06 [†]	87.44 [†]	79.76	80.49 [†]
<i>dense-retrieval</i>																					
	-	59.09 [†]	-	54.73 [†]	-	51.70 [†]	-	47.18 [†]	-	37.33 [†]		-	93.33 [†]	-	93.21 [†]	-	91.68 [†]	-	87.18 [†]	-	80.34 [†]
	-	58.95 [†]	-	54.42 [†]	-	51.06 [†]	-	47.77 [†]	-	37.30 [†]		-	93.27 [†]	-	93.23 [†]	-	91.86 [†]	-	87.14 [†]	-	80.06 [†]
	-	59.23 [†]	-	54.38 [†]	-	51.49 [†]	-	47.10 [†]	-	37.92 [†]		-	93.35 [†]	-	93.01 [†]	-	91.50 [†]	-	87.21 [†]	-	80.37 [†]
	59.21 [†]	59.70 [†]	55.24 [†]	54.96 [†]	51.46 [†]	51.28 [†]	46.72 [†]	46.79 [†]	37.99 [†]	38.11 [†]		93.26 [†]	93.27 [†]	92.98 [†]	92.92 [†]	91.62 [†]	91.83 [†]	87.25 [†]	87.44 [†]	80.07 [†]	80.21 [†]
	59.99 [†]	60.04 [†]	54.89 [†]	55.11 [†]	51.13 [†]	51.50 [†]	46.68 [†]	47.63 [†]	37.31 [†]	37.72 [†]		93.21 [†]	93.43 [†]	93.04 [†]	93.26 [†]	91.51 [†]	91.87 [†]	87.18 [†]	87.36 [†]	79.86 [†]	80.19 [†]
	59.26 [†]	59.79 [†]	54.54 [†]	53.91 [†]	51.70 [†]	51.57 [†]	46.19 [†]	46.87 [†]	37.42 [†]	37.20 [†]		93.08 [†]	93.36 [†]	93.06 [†]	93.13 [†]	91.56 [†]	91.83 [†]	87.11 [†]	87.30 [†]	79.98 [†]	80.29 [†]
	59.57 [†]	59.46 [†]	55.70 [†]	55.28 [†]	51.57 [†]	51.16 [†]	46.92 [†]	46.46 [†]	38.35 [†]	37.70 [†]		93.09 [†]	93.23 [†]	92.89 [†]	92.97 [†]	91.76 [†]	91.82 [†]	87.04 [†]	87.37 [†]	79.87 [†]	80.10 [†]
	58.98 [†]	59.29 [†]	55.39 [†]	55.07 [†]	50.81 [†]	51.28 [†]	46.23 [†]	46.62 [†]	37.22 [†]	37.07 [†]		93.14 [†]	93.53 [†]	92.90 [†]	93.28 [†]	91.57 [†]	91.85 [†]	87.03 [†]	87.41 [†]	79.86 [†]	80.06 [†]
	59.04 [†]	58.97 [†]	54.79 [†]	54.09 [†]	50.76 [†]	51.34 [†]	46.55 [†]	46.96 [†]	37.30 [†]	37.62 [†]		93.07 [†]	93.23 [†]	93.05 [†]	93.10 [†]	91.59 [†]	91.93 [†]	87.08 [†]	87.26 [†]	80.00 [†]	80.44 [†]

The [†] symbol indicates that the corresponding model demonstrates a significant improvement over the baseline model (*noisy text only w/o context*) at a confidence level of $p < 0.01$.

- *full* denotes using only the original noisy text concatenated with retrieved context.
- *KL* denotes using multi-view learning with the KL loss.
- *L2* denotes using multi-view learning with the L2 loss.

The baseline model is *noisy text only w/o context*. We are the first approach to robust NER with only noisy training text and without its corresponding gold text, so there is not SoTA. We employ the Deep Dominance method (Dror, Shlomov and Reichart, 2019) to perform statistical significance testing. In Tables 3 and 4, it is evident that our proposed method exhibits a significant improvement in NER performance over the baseline.

We also use the post-correction model NATAS⁸ (Hämäläinen and Hengchen, 2019) and the spell checker Hunspell⁹ to correct the words before feeding them into the NER model, but find that the performance is worse than only using noisy text, which is probably because of erroneous corrections. Furthermore, when we keep the corrected words which are error-corrected the same as the gold words while not correcting them if error-correcting wrongly, which can be

⁸<https://github.com/mikahama/natas>

⁹<http://hunspell.github.io/>

seen in the setting of *w/o context natas/hunspell + check*, then the performance is about the same as the original noisy text. This suggests that erroneous correction of words may result in a detrimental effect on the NER performance due to the self-attention mechanism inherent in transformer-based models by the words of erroneous correction. More statistics of the correction experiment can be seen in Appendix C.

From the results in the setting of *with gold text*, we can see that if we concatenate noisy text with the corresponding gold text, then the performance is competitive with inputting clean text without noise, which shows that the self-attention mechanism of transformer-based model can improve the representation of noisy text.

The reason why the original WNUT-17 dataset has worse NER performance compared with the original CoNLL-03 dataset is due to the former being sourced from Twitter, which inherently has more noise, while the latter is sourced from news articles, which are cleaner. Hence, when using retrieval augmentation, the improvement of NER performance in WNUT-17 is more significant.

The performance of the three retrieval approaches demonstrates no discernible uniformity and not regular, as their outcomes exhibit considerable diversity across disparate data domains, unique noise introduction techniques, and fluctuating noise intensities.

Table 5
Cross-experiment on spelling mistakes text and clean text

dataset	model	clean	typos_0.1	typos_0.2	typos_0.3
	<i>WNUT-17</i>	clean	58.21	56.00	50.15
	typos_0.1	44.0	46.26		
	typos_0.2	26.29		33.45	
	typos_0.3	12.48			24.72
<i>CoNLL-03</i>	clean	92.98	92.73	92.42	92.00
	typos_0.1	80.72	88.82		
	typos_0.2	68.27		84.37	
	typos_0.3	54.02			79.53

Table 6
Cross-experiment on OCR erroneous text and clean text

dataset	model	clean	OCR_1	OCR_2	OCR_3	OCR_4
	<i>WNUT-17</i>	clean	58.21	54.95	54.44	54.92
	OCR_1	56.79	53.95			
	OCR_2	51.83		50.00		
	OCR_3	47.74			45.63	
	OCR_4	37.95				35.24
<i>CoNLL-03</i>	clean	92.98	93.13	93.12	92.80	92.65
	OCR1	91.86	92.88			
	OCR2	88.17		91.45		
	OCR3	81.78			86.77	
	OCR4	71.46				79.83

4.5. Comparing the model using noisy text vs. using clean text

We do a cross-experiment using noisy text and clean text. The results can be seen in Table 5 and Table 6 for spelling mistakes and OCR noise respectively. The model trained on noisy text can perform well on clean text, which indicates that the robust NER model is capable of recognizing both noisy text and clean text.

5. Related Work

Robust representations One way to make a model more robust is to make the representations less sensitive to noisy input. (Zheng, Song, Leung and Goodfellow, 2016; Cheng, Tu, Meng, Zhai and Liu, 2018) add noise to input in each epoch and use pairs of noisy input and the corresponding gold input for training. (Piktus, Edizel, Bojanowski, Grave, Ferreira and Silvestri, 2019; Jones, Jia, Raghunathan and Liang, 2020) improve robust encoding by embedding misspellings close to their correct variants and mapping sentences to a smaller discrete space. However, these methods all require gold text, which is impractical in real scenarios.

Noisy sequence labeling There are a few previous studies of noisy sequence labeling (Namysl et al., 2020, 2021), which use gold text to improve the performance on noisy text. However, gold text may be unavailable or undesirable in many scenarios, such as there are only noisy text in the real scenario. In contrast, our work does not rely on gold

text. In the OCR errors setting, (Namysl et al., 2021) make the length of noisy text and that of the corresponding gold text the same, which is unrealistic, while in our setting the number of labels is the same as the number of recognized words after OCR.

Error correction A straightforward method to handle noisy text is to correct it. There are many studies on error correction, such as spelling-correction (Etoori, Chinnakotla and Mamidi, 2018), post-OCR correction (Hämäläinen and Hengchen, 2019), and sequence-to-sequence model (Ge, Wei and Zhou, 2018). However, these error correction models rely on priori error correction knowledge, which may be different from the given datasets, so the error correction models do not work well in our experiments.

Retrieval augmentation Many previous studies use retrieval augmentation to improve specific task performance, such as language generation (Lewis, Perez, Piktus, Petroni, Karpukhin, Goyal, Küttler, Lewis, Yih, Rocktäschel et al., 2020) and relation extraction (Zhang, Fei and Li, 2021). For the NER task, (Wang et al., 2021, 2022b,a) use external retrieved context to improve the performance of NER and multi-modal NER respectively.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a robust Named Entity Recognition (NER) model that is able to effectively handle noisy text without the need for corresponding gold text during training. Our approach utilizes retrieval augmentation and we jointly train a retrieval-based view and an original noisy text view using multi-view learning. Our approach results in significant improvements in handling both misspelling mistakes and OCR errors.

A. the details of dense retrieval

The dense retrieval approach utilizes the entire Wikipedia, same as BM25 retrieval. Our encoder is trained on a dataset of randomly sampled sentences from Wikipedia, preprocessed using the unsupervised SimCSE method (Gao et al., 2021), with a sentence size set to 10^6 . To simulate noisy text, we introduce noise into these sentences and partition the dataset into train, development, and test sets in an 8:1:1 ratio. Our experiments involve two distinct noise induction methods, namely spelling mistakes and OCR errors, conducted separately.

For spelling mistakes, we introduce noise at random levels ranging from 0 to 0.4. In the case of OCR errors, we incorporate random fronts and random OCR error induction approaches. We employ the XLM-RoBERTa-large model, fine-tuned using contrastive learning on the simulated noisy text and the corresponding original clean text sourced from Wikipedia. The sentence embeddings are generated by averaging the embeddings of the first and last layers. Model selection is based on the ($Recall@1 + Recall@4 + Recall@16 + Recall@64$) metric, which

measures the retrieval performance of the corresponding gold text in Wikipedia using the simulated noisy text in the development set. The contrastive learning model is trained with a temperature hyperparameter of 0.3 and an epoch of 1. Detailed training information can be found in Appendix B.

Upon completion of encoder training, we utilize dense retrieval to search the entire Wikipedia using the FAISS library. As Wikipedia comprises approximately 2.29×10^8 sentences, dense retrieval poses significant challenges in terms of RAM usage and computational speed. To address these issues, we encode the Wikipedia sentences into 1024-dimensional embeddings and store them as npy files on disk, which has greater capacity than RAM. We then perform dense retrieval on these files. Drawing inspiration from BERT-whitening (Su et al., 2021), we employ PCA to reduce the embedding dimensions from 1024 to 128, enabling the dense retrieval model to operate within a 250 GB RAM constraint. The PCA model is trained on a random sample of 20% of Wikipedia sentences, approximately 4.57×10^7 in number.

To expedite the retrieval process, we implement the Inverted File System (IVF) (Mazur, 1979) using the `index_factory` function in FAISS. Specifically, we configure the `index_factory(1024, "PCA128, IVF262144_HNSW32, Flat")` to represent 262,144 clustering centers. The base index relies on the Hierarchical Navigable Small World (HNSW) (Malkov and Yashunin, 2018) graph-based approach, utilizing 32 neighbors. As HNSW cannot be accelerated by GPU, we train on GPU and execute other operations, such as retrieval, on CPU. Our model leverages pre-normalized embeddings and the L2 distance measure to evaluate embedding similarity, which is widely used and well-supported in FAISS, rendering it equivalent to cosine distance. We set the `nprobe` hyperparameter to 64, allowing the model to perform fine-grained retrieval in the 64 nearest clusters following the `knn` algorithm applied to the clustering centers. The `nprobe` value balances recall and search efficiency.

B. the details of contrastive learning training

The details of contrastive learning training is as Table 7 and Table 8. *not_train* is the XLM-RoBERTa-large model which is not fine-tuned. $recall_avg = (recall@1 + recall@4 + recall@16 + recall@64)/4$, *typos_mix* or *OCR_mix* is the uniform mixing noisy dataset. Each column in the experimental results represents a distinct setting, denoting the effectiveness of the model trained through contrastive learning in retrieving various forms of noisy or mixed noisy text, as measured by the $recall@k$ metric.

C. the statistics of errors in the correction experiment

The statistics of errors in the correction experiment is as Table 9 and Table 10. The *ent* is the number of entities, *ent_true* is the number of correct entities in which all words

Table 7

details of contrastive learning training in spelling mistakes datasets

batchsize learning rate	64			512			not train
	1e-5	3e-5	5e-5	1e-5	3e-5	5e-5	
<i>typos_0.1</i>							
recall@1	0.9943	0.9279	0.9240	0.9924	0.9932	0.9939	0.4657
recall@4	0.9961	0.9382	0.9345	0.9945	0.9953	0.9960	0.5010
recall@16	0.9966	0.9453	0.9412	0.9951	0.9960	0.9965	0.5287
recall@64	0.9968	0.9512	0.9470	0.9953	0.9961	0.9967	0.5547
recall_avg	0.9959	0.9407	0.9367	0.9943	0.9952	0.9958	0.5125
<i>typos_0.2</i>							
recall@1	0.9799	0.8014	0.8047	0.9701	0.9765	0.9795	0.1250
recall@4	0.9848	0.8188	0.8215	0.9768	0.9822	0.9848	0.1545
recall@16	0.9862	0.8325	0.8321	0.9788	0.9837	0.9862	0.1854
recall@64	0.9867	0.8474	0.8424	0.9796	0.9842	0.9866	0.2219
recall_avg	0.9844	0.8250	0.8252	0.9763	0.9816	0.9843	0.1717
<i>typos_0.3</i>							
recall@1	0.9496	0.7291	0.7296	0.9199	0.9411	0.9483	0.0444
recall@4	0.9623	0.7482	0.7555	0.9415	0.9561	0.9626	0.0583
recall@16	0.9659	0.7605	0.7685	0.9488	0.9606	0.9668	0.0763
recall@64	0.9674	0.7730	0.7787	0.9519	0.9623	0.9682	0.1008
recall_avg	0.9613	0.7527	0.7581	0.9405	0.9550	0.9615	0.0700
<i>typos_mix</i>							
recall@1	0.9676	0.8233	0.8220	0.9500	0.9626	0.9666	0.2863
recall@4	0.9762	0.8388	0.8405	0.9634	0.9726	0.9764	0.3064
recall@16	0.9789	0.8485	0.8506	0.9685	0.9759	0.9792	0.3257
recall@64	0.9800	0.8582	0.8589	0.9708	0.9773	0.9804	0.3489
recall_avg	0.9757	0.8422	0.8430	0.9632	0.9721	0.9757	0.3168

Table 8

details of contrastive learning training in OCR errors datasets

batchsize learning rate	64			512			not train
	1e-5	3e-5	5e-5	1e-5	3e-5	5e-5	
<i>OCR_1</i>							
recall@1	0.9952	0.9976	0.9974	0.9971	0.9980	0.9981	0.9247
recall@4	0.9961	0.9982	0.9980	0.9978	0.9986	0.9987	0.9258
recall@16	0.9965	0.9984	0.9983	0.9981	0.9988	0.9990	0.9264
recall@64	0.9968	0.9986	0.9986	0.9983	0.9991	0.9992	0.9269
recall_avg	0.9961	0.9982	0.9981	0.9978	0.9986	0.9987	0.9259
<i>OCR_2</i>							
recall@1	0.9815	0.9899	0.9871	0.9901	0.9921	0.9919	0.8291
recall@4	0.9849	0.9921	0.9898	0.9924	0.9942	0.9939	0.8359
recall@16	0.9864	0.9930	0.9910	0.9936	0.9951	0.9948	0.8396
recall@64	0.9875	0.9937	0.9917	0.9943	0.9958	0.9955	0.8427
recall_avg	0.9850	0.9922	0.9899	0.9926	0.9943	0.9940	0.8368
<i>OCR_3</i>							
recall@1	0.9945	0.9970	0.9967	0.9967	0.9975	0.9975	0.9212
recall@4	0.9954	0.9976	0.9974	0.9973	0.9981	0.9982	0.9227
recall@16	0.9958	0.9979	0.9978	0.9976	0.9985	0.9985	0.9234
recall@64	0.9963	0.9983	0.9983	0.9981	0.9989	0.9989	0.9240
recall_avg	0.9955	0.9977	0.9976	0.9974	0.9983	0.9983	0.9229
<i>OCR_4</i>							
recall@1	0.9767	0.9866	0.9824	0.9869	0.9891	0.9889	0.8059
recall@4	0.9806	0.9893	0.9858	0.9897	0.9915	0.9914	0.8132
recall@16	0.9826	0.9905	0.9873	0.9913	0.9927	0.9927	0.8180
recall@64	0.9840	0.9915	0.9885	0.9923	0.9938	0.9937	0.8225
recall_avg	0.9810	0.9895	0.9860	0.9901	0.9918	0.9917	0.8149
<i>OCR_mix</i>							
recall@1	0.9869	0.9928	0.9907	0.9928	0.9942	0.9941	0.8694
recall@4	0.9892	0.9943	0.9926	0.9945	0.9956	0.9955	0.8736
recall@16	0.9903	0.9950	0.9934	0.9953	0.9964	0.9961	0.8761
recall@64	0.9912	0.9957	0.9941	0.9960	0.9970	0.9968	0.8782
recall_avg	0.9894	0.9944	0.9927	0.9947	0.9958	0.9956	0.8743

are correct, *ent_rate* is the ratio. The *token*, *token_true* and *token_rate* is similar for the words in the sentences.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Chaoyi Ai: Methodology, Software, Data curation, Writing – original draft. **Yong Jiang:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Funding acquisition. **Shen Huang:** Conceptualization, Methodology. **Pengjun Xie:** Supervision, Funding acquisition. **Kewei Tu:** Supervision, Writing – review & editing, Methodology, Funding acquisition.

Table 9
the errors statistics of spelling mistakes on WNUT-17 dataset

noisy_level	ent	ent_true	ent_rate	token	token_true	token_rate
<i>not correct</i>						
0.1	3890	1743	44.81	101857	70194	68.91
0.2	3890	878	22.57	101857	51608	50.67
0.3	3890	510	13.11	101857	39014	38.30
<i>natas</i>						
0.1	3890	878	22.57	101857	56533	55.50
0.2	3890	428	11.00	101857	44020	43.22
0.3	3890	243	6.25	101857	35338	34.69
<i>hunspell</i>						
0.1	3890	1695	43.57	101857	74196	72.84
0.2	3890	1181	30.36	101857	60803	59.69
0.3	3890	854	21.95	101857	49001	48.11
<i>natas+check</i>						
0.1	3890	1759	45.22	101857	72845	71.52
0.2	3890	895	23.01	101857	55121	54.12
0.3	3890	519	13.34	101857	42741	41.96
<i>hunspell+check</i>						
0.1	3890	2399	61.67	101857	80038	78.58
0.2	3890	1535	39.46	101857	64160	62.99
0.3	3890	1053	27.07	101857	51169	50.24

Table 10
the errors statistics of spelling mistakes on CoNLL-03 dataset

noisy_level	ent	ent_true	ent_rate	token	token_true	token_rate
<i>not correct</i>						
0.1	35089	15145	43.16	301418	201883	66.98
0.2	35089	7118	20.29	301418	142756	47.36
0.3	35089	3448	9.83	301418	105795	35.10
<i>natas</i>						
0.1	35089	7430	21.17	301418	173173	57.45
0.2	35089	3414	9.73	301418	129644	43.01
0.3	35089	1646	4.69	301418	100673	33.40
<i>hunspell</i>						
0.1	35089	17322	49.37	301418	230626	76.51
0.2	35089	12946	36.89	301418	186334	61.82
0.3	35089	9264	26.40	301418	148364	49.22
<i>natas+check</i>						
0.1	35089	15149	43.17	301418	210017	69.68
0.2	35089	7122	20.30	301418	153086	50.79
0.3	35089	3450	9.83	301418	115691	38.38
<i>hunspell+check</i>						
0.1	35089	22755	64.85	301418	242080	80.31
0.2	35089	15556	44.33	301418	193167	64.09
0.3	35089	10536	30.03	301418	152582	50.62

References

- Cheng, Y., Tu, Z., Meng, F., Zhai, J., Liu, Y., 2018. Towards robust neural machine translation, in: Proceedings of the 56th ACL (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL, Melbourne, Australia. pp. 1756–1766. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1163>, doi:10.18653/v1/P18-1163.
- Chinchor, N., Robinson, P., 1997. Muc-7 named entity task definition, in: Proceedings of the 7th Conference on Message Understanding, pp. 1–21.
- Clark, K., Luong, M.T., Manning, C.D., Le, Q., 2018. Semi-supervised sequence modeling with cross-view training, in: Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on EMNLP, ACL, Brussels, Belgium. pp. 1914–1925. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/D18-1217>, doi:10.18653/v1/D18-1217.
- Conneau, A., Khandelwal, K., Goyal, N., Chaudhary, V., Wenzek, G., Guzmán, F., Grave, E., Ott, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Stoyanov, V., 2020. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale, in: Proceedings of the 58th ACL, ACL, Online. pp. 8440–8451. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.747>, doi:10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.747.
- Deerwester, S., Dumais, S.T., Furnas, G.W., Landauer, T.K., Harshman, R., 1990. Indexing by latent semantic analysis. *Journal of the American society for information science* 41, 391–407.
- Derczynski, L., Nichols, E., van Erp, M., Limsopatham, N., 2017. Results of the WNUT2017 shared task on novel and emerging entity recognition, in: Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text, ACL, Copenhagen, Denmark. pp. 140–147. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/W17-4418>, doi:10.18653/v1/W17-4418.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K., 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding, in: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the NAACL: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), ACL, Minneapolis, Minnesota. pp. 4171–4186. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1423>, doi:10.18653/v1/N19-1423.
- Dror, R., Shlomov, S., Reichart, R., 2019. Deep dominance - how to properly compare deep neural models, in: Proceedings of the 57th ACL, ACL, Florence, Italy. pp. 2773–2785. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1266>, doi:10.18653/v1/P19-1266.
- Edouard, A., Cabrio, E., Tonelli, S., Le Thanh, N., 2017. Graph-based event extraction from twitter, in: RANLP17-Recent advances in natural language processing.
- Etoori, P., Chinnakotla, M., Mamidi, R., 2018. Automatic spelling correction for resource-scarce languages using deep learning, in: Proceedings of ACL 2018, Student Research Workshop, ACL, Melbourne, Australia. pp. 146–152. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/P18-3021>, doi:10.18653/v1/P18-3021.
- Gao, T., Yao, X., Chen, D., 2021. SimCSE: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings, in: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on EMNLP, ACL, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. pp. 6894–6910. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.552>, doi:10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.552.
- Ge, T., Wei, F., Zhou, M., 2018. Reaching human-level performance in automatic grammatical error correction: An empirical study. arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01270.
- Hálek, O., Rosa, R., Tamchyna, A., Bojar, O., 2011. Named entities from wikipedia for machine translation., in: ITAT, pp. 23–30.
- Hämäläinen, M., Hengchen, S., 2019. From the past to the future: a fully automatic NMT and word embeddings method for OCR post-correction, in: Proceedings of the International Conference on Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing (RANLP 2019), INCOMA Ltd., Varna, Bulgaria. pp. 431–436. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/R19-1051>, doi:10.26615/978-954-452-056-4_051.
- He, P., Liu, X., Gao, J., Chen, W., 2021. DeBERTa: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention, in: International Conference on Learning Representations. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=XPZiaotutsD>.
- Jones, E., Jia, R., Raghunathan, A., Liang, P., 2020. Robust encodings: A framework for combating adversarial typos, in: Proceedings of the 58th ACL, ACL, Online. pp. 2752–2765. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.245>, doi:10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.245.
- Lee, C., Hwang, Y.G., Jang, M.G., 2007. Fine-grained named entity recognition and relation extraction for question answering, in: Proceedings of the 30th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval, pp. 799–800.
- Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W.t., Rocktäschel, T., et al., 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33, 9459–9474.
- Liu, Y., Ott, M., Goyal, N., Du, J., Joshi, M., Chen, D., Levy, O., Lewis, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Stoyanov, V., 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692.
- Malkov, Y.A., Yashunin, D.A., 2018. Efficient and robust approximate nearest neighbor search using hierarchical navigable small world graphs. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 42, 824–836.
- Mazur, Z., 1979. Inverted file organization in the information retrieval system based on thesaurus with weights. *Information Processing & Management* 15, 227–234.
- Namysl, M., Behnke, S., Köhler, J., 2020. NAT: Noise-aware training for robust neural sequence labeling, in: Proceedings of the 58th ACL, ACL, Online. pp. 1501–1517. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.138>, doi:10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.138.
- Namysl, M., Behnke, S., Köhler, J., 2021. Empirical error modeling improves robustness of noisy neural sequence labeling, in: Findings of the ACL: ACL-IJCNLP 2021, ACL, Online. pp. 314–329. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.findings-acl.27>, doi:10.18653/v1/2021.findings-acl.27.

- Oord, A.v.d., Li, Y., Vinyals, O., 2018. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748 .
- Piktus, A., Edizel, N.B., Bojanowski, P., Grave, E., Ferreira, R., Silvestri, F., 2019. Misspelling oblivious word embeddings, in: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the NAACL: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), ACL, Minneapolis, Minnesota. pp. 3226–3234. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1326>, doi:10.18653/v1/N19-1326.
- Robertson, S.E., Walker, S., 1994. Some simple effective approximations to the 2-poisson model for probabilistic weighted retrieval, in: SIGIR'94, Springer. pp. 232–241.
- Saffran, J.R., Newport, E.L., Aslin, R.N., 1996. Word segmentation: The role of distributional cues. *Journal of memory and language* 35, 606–621.
- Su, J., Cao, J., Liu, W., Ou, Y., 2021. Whitening sentence representations for better semantics and faster retrieval. arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.15316 .
- Thukral, A., Dhiman, S., Meher, R., Bedi, P., 2023. Knowledge graph enrichment from clinical narratives using nlp, ner, and biomedical ontologies for healthcare applications. *International Journal of Information Technology* , 1–13.
- Tjong Kim Sang, E.F., De Meulder, F., 2003. Introduction to the CoNLL-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition, in: Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural Language Learning at HLT-NAACL 2003, pp. 142–147. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/W03-0419>.
- Wang, X., Cai, J., Jiang, Y., Xie, P., Tu, K., Lu, W., 2022a. Named entity and relation extraction with multi-modal retrieval. ArXiv abs/2212.01612.
- Wang, X., Gui, M., Jiang, Y., Jia, Z., Bach, N., Wang, T., Huang, Z., Tu, K., 2022b. ITA: Image-text alignments for multi-modal named entity recognition, in: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the NAACL: Human Language Technologies, ACL, Seattle, United States. pp. 3176–3189. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.naacl-main.232>, doi:10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.232.
- Wang, X., Jiang, Y., Bach, N., Wang, T., Huang, Z., Huang, F., Tu, K., 2021. Improving named entity recognition by external context retrieving and cooperative learning, in: Proceedings of the 59th ACL and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL, Online. pp. 1800–1812. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.142>, doi:10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.142.
- Wang, X., Shen, Y., Cai, J., Wang, T., Wang, X., Xie, P., Huang, F., Lu, W., Zhuang, Y., Tu, K., Lu, W., Jiang, Y., 2022c. DAMO-NLP at SemEval-2022 task 11: A knowledge-based system for multilingual named entity recognition, in: Proceedings of the 16th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2022), ACL, Seattle, United States. pp. 1457–1468. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.semeval-1.200>, doi:10.18653/v1/2022.semeval-1.200.
- Zhang, Q., Wei, S., Li, Z., Yan, W., 2022. Combining nsp and ner for public opinion event extraction model. *Frontiers in Physics* 10, 1159.
- Zhang, T., Kishore, V., Wu, F., Weinberger, K.Q., Artzi, Y., . Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- Zhang, Y., Fei, H., Li, P., 2021. Readsre: Retrieval-augmented distantly supervised relation extraction, in: Diaz, F., Shah, C., Suel, T., Castells, P., Jones, R., Sakai, T. (Eds.), SIGIR '21, Virtual Event, Canada, July 11–15, 2021, ACM. pp. 2257–2262. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3463103>, doi:10.1145/3404835.3463103.
- Zheng, S., Song, Y., Leung, T., Goodfellow, I., 2016. Improving the robustness of deep neural networks via stability training, in: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pp. 4480–4488.