

# SAIL: Sample-Centric In-Context Learning for Document Information Extraction

Jinyu Zhang<sup>1\*</sup>, Zhiyuan You<sup>2\*</sup>, Jize Wang<sup>1</sup>, Xinyi Le<sup>1†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Shanghai Jiao Tong University <sup>2</sup>The Chinese University of Hong Kong  
 {zhang\_jinyu, jizewang2000, lexinyi}@sjtu.edu.cn zhiyuanyou@foxmail.com

## Abstract

Document Information Extraction (DIE) aims to extract structured information from Visually Rich Documents (VRDs). Previous full-training approaches have demonstrated strong performance but may struggle with generalization to unseen data. In contrast, training-free methods leverage powerful pre-trained models like Large Language Models (LLMs) to address various downstream tasks with only a few examples. Nonetheless, training-free methods for DIE encounter two primary challenges: (1) understanding the complex relationship between layout and textual elements in VRDs, and (2) providing accurate guidance to pre-trained models. To address these challenges, we propose Sample-centric In-context Learning (SAIL). SAIL introduces a fine-grained entity-level textual similarity to facilitate in-depth text analysis by LLMs and incorporates layout similarity to enhance the analysis of layouts in VRDs. Moreover, SAIL formulates a unified In-Context Learning (ICL) prompt template for various sample-centric examples, enabling tailored prompts that deliver precise guidance to pre-trained models for each sample. Extensive experiments on FUNSD, CORD, and SROIE benchmarks with various base models (e.g., LLMs) indicate that our SAIL outperforms training-free baselines, even closer to the full-training methods, showing the superiority and generalization of our method.

**Code** — <https://github.com/sky-goldfish/SAIL>

## 1 Introduction

Document Information Extraction (DIE) focuses on extracting structured information from Visually Rich Documents (VRDs) such as receipts, forms, and invoices (Park et al. 2019; Huang et al. 2019; Jaume, Ekenel, and Thiran 2019). Previous works, including LayoutLMv3 (Huang et al. 2022), primarily concentrate on full-training methodologies that demand extensive task-specific labeled data. While these models have achieved notable success on the trained dataset, they often struggle to generalize effectively to unseen data, especially when the test data distribution significantly diverges from that of the training data. To address this challenge, training-free DIE methods (He et al. 2023) leverage

\*These authors contributed equally.

†Corresponding author




Figure 1: For the (a) test sample from the CORD dataset (Park et al. 2019), our SAIL selects (b) layout similarity examples (grey marked), entity-level similarity examples (yellow marked), and document-level similarity examples (orange marked) to construct ICL prompts. (c) Benefiting from these examples, SAIL precisely extracts all information, while even the powerful GPT-4o (OpenAI 2023b) misidentifies three entities and incorrectly labels three entities.

powerful pre-trained models like Large Language Models (LLMs) that can generalize to unseen data given only a few examples, and thus begin to attract more research interests.

One of the primary challenges in the training-free DIE task is understanding the complex relationship between the document layout and its textual entities using only a few examples. VRDs possess discrete textual elements alongside flexible, inherently structured layouts, complicating the establishment of relationships between textual entities and the extraction of implicit layout information. Even the advanced multi-modal LLMs like GPT-4o (OpenAI 2023b) demonstrate limited effectiveness in performing DIE task. As illustrated in Figure 1(c), GPT-4o misidentifies three entity texts and labels three entity texts incorrectly, highlighting the challenges inherent in the training-free DIE task.

Another significant challenge is providing a clear and effective guidance to pre-trained models (e.g., LLMs). AI-

though these models possess extensive knowledge and capabilities, they necessitate appropriate instructions for optimal performance on specific downstream tasks. Recent research has incorporated In-Context Learning (ICL) within LLMs to enhance the DIE performance (He et al. 2023). This approach involves selecting a few textually similar examples and carefully crafting the in-context prompts with diverse demonstrations for the entire dataset. While this method shows promising results in GPT-3.5 (Brown et al. 2020), the fixed in-context examples fail to effectively guide different LLMs, leading to a significant performance decline when transitioning across different LLMs, as detailed in Table 1.

To address these challenges, we propose a **S**AMPLE-centric In-context Learning (SAIL) method. Our method follows two core principles: (a) To enhance LLMs’ understanding of the complex interplay between layout and text within VRDs, the provided prompts must analyze the question from different angles in depth. (b) To ensure precise guidance, it is essential to develop a customized prompt for each test sample. Regarding the first principle, previous methods (He et al. 2023) only adopted rough document-level textual similarity for example selection, which inadequately supports LLMs in understanding textual information in lengthy documents. Consequently, we propose a refined entity-level text similarity for in-depth text analysis. Additionally, we incorporate layout similarity to identify examples that enjoy similar layouts, facilitating LLMs in comprehending complex layout information in VRDs. The three distinct examples are illustrated in figure 1(b). For the second principle, we select distinct examples for each test sample and integrate them into a unified prompt template with clear instructions to devise a tailored sample-centric in-context prompt.

Equipped with these designs, our proposed SAIL demonstrates versatility across various LLMs on multiple benchmarks. SAIL not only stably surpasses all training-free baselines, but even achieves comparable performance to many fully-trained models when implemented with GPT-4. Overall, our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce **layout similarity** and **entity-level text similarity**, each highlighting unique facets of VRDs, resulting in a thorough and in-depth analysis of VRDs.
- To form **sample-centric** in-context prompts, we propose a unified ICL prompt template applicable to various examples. With clear instructions, LLMs enhance their attention to specific information in the examples.
- We conduct extensive experiments on multiple benchmarks including FUNSD, CORD, and SROIE with various base LLMs. Our SAIL achieves superior performance than training-free baselines, even closer to the performance of full-training methods.

## 2 Related Works

**Document Information Extraction (DIE).** Traditional DIE methods primarily rely on extensive datasets for model pre-training and subsequent fine-tuning on downstream tasks. These methods can be classified into four main categories. The first category consists of grid-based methods (Katti et al.

2018; Zhao et al. 2019; Denk and Reisswig 2019; Kerroumi, Sayem, and Shabou 2021), which encode each document page as a two-dimensional character grid of characters to preserve the document’s layout. The second category, graph-based methods, utilizes Graph Convolutional Networks (GCN) (Qian et al. 2019; Liu et al. 2019) or Graph Neural Networks (GNN) (Tang et al. 2021) for DIE. The third category encompasses transformer-based (Vaswani et al. 2017) methods. Traditional methods design small models in specialized fields. Some methods integrate text semantics and layout modality for model pre-training (Li et al. 2021; Hong et al. 2022; Wang, Jin, and Ding 2022; Wang et al. 2023b), while other methods jointly leverage text, layout, and image modality to enhance document understanding (Da et al. 2023; Xu et al. 2020, 2021; Huang et al. 2022). A recent trend has seen numerous studies employing LLMs’ advanced language capabilities. (Wang et al. 2023a; Perot et al. 2023; Lu et al. 2024; Li et al. 2024; Luo et al. 2024; Fujitake 2024). In contrast to the categories above that necessitate OCR for text and box recognition, the final category aims to bypass the OCR process and establish end-to-end models (Wang et al. 2021; Kim et al. 2022; Liu et al. 2024b; Mao et al. 2024; Hu et al. 2024; Abramovich et al. 2024). Despite the notable performance of many methods, they demand retraining for specific downstream tasks.

**In-Context Learning (ICL).** Brown et al. (2020) discovered that pre-trained LLMs can address unseen tasks using only a few examples without weight updates through ICL. From then on, ICL has been widely adopted in question answering (Yang et al. 2022; Liu et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2024), multi-modal named entity recognition (Cai et al. 2023), and dialogue improvement (Meade et al. 2023; Hu et al. 2022).

**ICL-based DIE.** ICL presents a viable approach for performing the DIE task with minimal examples. ICL-D3IE (He et al. 2023), the first work to construct ICL prompts for DIE, utilizes diverse demonstrations through examples selected via text semantic search. Nonetheless, ICL-D3IE exhibits limited generalization capabilities to novel LLMs, primarily due to its reliance on fixed examples and handcrafted prompts. Our method clearly distinguishes itself from this work. First, we dynamically select unique examples for each test sample, in contrast to ICL-D3IE’s fixed examples. Second, we employ a unified template to construct prompts that can be generalized to various LLMs, while ICL-D3IE adopts specifically designed prompts that are less adaptable to new models. Third, we demonstrate that relying solely on document-level text similarity is inadequate for identifying optimal examples, and thus introduce layout similarity and entity-level text similarity for enhanced performance. With these designs, our method achieves better results than ICL-D3IE across various base LLMs.

## 3 Methods

### 3.1 Problem Formulation

Training-free DIE leverages pre-trained models (*e.g.*, LLMs) to extract specified categories of text information (*e.g.*, company, address, and date (Huang et al. 2019)) from VRDs. Specifically, given a document image  $I$ , the




Figure 2: **Illustration of SAIL framework**, including extracting texts  $T$  and boxes  $B$  from document images, encoding them separately, selecting textually similar entities, layout similar documents, and textually similar documents for each test sample, constructing sample-centric prompts using diverse examples, and generating predicted labels.

goal is to label all entities within  $I$ . First, entity texts  $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n_e}\}$  and their corresponding boxes  $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n_e}\}$  are recognized from  $I$  by an OCR system, where  $n_e$  is the total number of entities in the document image. To effectively utilize LLMs, in-context prompts  $C$  are designed to convey the extraction intention. For ICL-based DIE,  $C$  is constructed by selecting several examples demonstrating how to solve DIE tasks. With these in-context prompts as illustrations, LLMs are tasked with generating labels  $Y_{pred}$  for all detected entities. The process is achieved by maximizing the conditional probability  $P(Y|T, B)$  while incorporating the prompts  $C$  as an additional condition:

$$P(Y|T, B) = \frac{1}{n_e} \sum_{k=1}^{n_e} P_{LM}(l_k|C, \varphi(T, B)), \quad (1)$$

where  $P_{LM}$  is the conditional probability predicted by the LLMs, and  $\varphi$  denotes the operation of converting the entity texts and boxes into a textual format suitable for LLMs' input. In training-free DIE, the construction of effective in-context prompt  $C$  is crucial, which is the primary focus of this work. Finally, the predicted labels  $Y_{pred}$  are evaluated using F1 scores against the ground truth labels  $Y_{gt}$ .

### 3.2 Overview Framework

To maximize  $P(Y|T, B)$  with the in-context prompt  $C$ , we propose SAIL, a sample-centric in-context prompt construction method for DIE. SAIL focuses on designing  $C$  for individual samples by automatically selecting tailored layout examples, document-level text similarity examples, and entity-level text similarity examples based on the test sample, subsequently leveraging these examples to generate  $C$ .

The overall architecture, illustrated in Figure 2, comprises five steps. Firstly, the test document image and  $m$  training document images are processed through OCR to extract entity texts  $T$  and boxes  $B$ . Secondly,  $T$  are transformed into entity-level text embeddings  $E_{ent}$  and document-level text embeddings  $E_{doc}$ .  $B$  are used to construct layout image  $\tilde{I}$ . Thirdly,  $E_{ent}$ ,  $\tilde{I}$  and  $E_{doc}$  are used to select textually similar entities, layout similar documents, and textually similar documents for the test sample. Then, these selections are substituted into the prompt template to form a tailored in-context prompt  $C$ . Finally, LLM performs inference with  $C$  and question  $\varphi(T, B)$  to generate predicted labels  $Y_{pred}$ .

### 3.3 Document-Level Text Similarity Examples

To improve the capability of ICL, we employ text semantic search to select the nearest training document examples for a given test sample (Liu et al. 2022). The entity texts  $T$  extracted from a document image are concatenated into a single sentence and encoded with Sentence-BERT (Reimers and Gurevych 2019), resulting in a text semantic embedding  $E_{doc}$  for the document. We determine the nearest training examples by computing the document-level text similarity  $T_{sim\_doc}$  between the test embedding  $E_{doc}^{test}$  and  $m$  training embeddings  $E_{doc}^{train}$  using the cosine similarity score:

$$T_{sim\_doc} = \frac{E_{doc}^{test} \cdot E_{doc}^{train}}{\|E_{doc}^{test}\| \|E_{doc}^{train}\|}. \quad (2)$$

### 3.4 Entity-Level Text Similarity Examples

The document-level text similarity  $T_{sim\_doc}$  between a lengthy text document and the found text-similar documents




Figure 3: **Illustration of layout similarity evaluation**, including drawing boxes onto a blank image, cropping and resizing to form layout image, and comparing layout images.

is notably low. To facilitate LLMs in generating text with more relevant examples for learning, we propose entity-level text similarity examples, as shown in Figure 2.

Entity texts  $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n_e}\}$  recognized by OCR are filtered to exclude texts consisting solely of numbers, which provide minimal semantic content. Subsequently, the filtered  $m_f$  training entity texts and  $n_f$  test entity texts are encoded using Sentence-BERT to derive the semantic embedding  $E_{ent}$ . The entity-level text similarity  $T_{sim\_ent}$  is computed from the semantic embedding  $E_{ent}$  by employing the cosine similarity score, defined as follows:

$$T_{sim\_ent} = \frac{E_{ent}^{test} \cdot E_{ent}^{train}}{\|E_{ent}^{test}\| \|E_{ent}^{train}\|}. \quad (3)$$

We select  $n_s$  textually similar entities for each test entity by nearest neighbor search and obtain  $n_f \times n_s$  examples.

### 3.5 Layout Similarity Examples

To identify documents with similar layouts, we introduce a layout similarity assessment methodology, illustrated in Figure 3. Firstly, all  $b_i$  from boxes  $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n_e}\}$  are rendered as black rectangles on a blank image. Subsequently, we define the information area as the minimal region that contains all entity texts and crop the layout image to maintain a 10-pixel margin between the information area and the image borders. Next, we standardize the layout image dimensions through resizing. Finally, we select  $n_s$  layout similar documents by calculating the layout similarity  $L_{sim}$  between the training layout image  $\tilde{I}^{train}$  and the test layout image  $\tilde{I}^{test}$  using Mean Square Error (MSE) loss:

$$L_{sim} = \frac{1}{\text{MSE}} = \frac{n_1}{(U - V)^T (U - V)}, \quad (4)$$

where  $U, V$  are the pixel matrix of  $\tilde{I}^{train}$  and  $\tilde{I}^{test}$ , and  $n_1$  is the total number of pixels in the layout image.

Moreover, to enhance the understanding of layouts by LLMs, we substitute the boxes from the cropped image  $B'$  for all documents in the prompt instead of using  $B$ .

### 3.6 Sample-Centric ICL Prompt Template

To construct  $C$  for an individual test sample, we propose an adaptive sample-specific ICL prompt template. The template is comprised of 5 parts: candidate labels illustration

$C_{cl}$ , entity-level text demonstrations  $C_{et}$ , layout demonstrations  $C_l$ , document-level text demonstrations  $C_{dt}$  and test question  $\varphi(T, B)$ , as shown on the right of Figure 2.

Candidate labels illustration  $C_{cl}$  enumerates all potential labels for the DIE task. For abbreviated labels, a corresponding natural language description is appended.

Entity-level text demonstrations  $C_{et}$  present textually similar entities. The prompt  $p_e$  “*Sample text and corresponding label:*” in conjunction with the labels of the selected  $n_s$  textually similar entity examples  $Y_{et}$ , formulates the entity-level text similarity demonstrations:

$$C_{et} = \text{CONCAT}[p_e, Y_{et}]. \quad (5)$$

Layout demonstrations  $C_l$  aim to facilitate LLMs in analyzing the layout of the test document. After obtaining  $n_s$  layout similar documents, we introduce a layout analysis step. This step enables LLMs to comprehend the overall document structure and the relationship between layout and label selection. The layout analysis prompt  $p_a$  is defined as: “*These are the information extracted from the document through OCR, and the Box is the position of the text in the document. Please analyze where each label is generally located in the document.*”, which can apply to any dataset. The labels of layout-similar documents  $Y_l$  are input into LLMs together with  $p_a$ , allowing LLMs to analyze the layout information in layout-similar documents by themselves. The resulting output from the LLM is denoted as  $A_l$ . A layout similarity demonstration  $C_l$  is formulated as follows:

$$C_l = \text{CONCAT}[Y_l, p_a, A_l]. \quad (6)$$

Document-level text demonstrations  $C_{dt}$  showcase textually similar documents in question-answer format, guiding LLMs to produce answers in a specific format. The textually similar documents  $X_{dt}$ , the ground truth answer  $Y_{dt}$  and the DIE instruction  $p_q$  such as “*What are the labels for these texts?*” form the Document-level text demonstration prompt:

$$C_{dt} = \text{CONCAT}[X_{dt}, p_q, Y_{dt}]. \quad (7)$$

Finally, the test question  $\varphi(T, B)$  for the test sample is:

$$\varphi(T, B) = \text{CONCAT}[T, B', p_q]. \quad (8)$$

### 3.7 Inference

After selecting a diverse set of examples, ICL prompts facilitate LLMs in generating entity labels  $Y_{pred}$ . This process is mathematically represented as follows:

$$P(Y|T, B) = \frac{1}{n_e} \sum_{k=1}^{n_e} P_{LM}(l_k | C_{cl}, C_{et}, C_l, C_{dt}, \varphi(T, B)). \quad (9)$$

Subsequently, entity labels  $Y_{pred}$  are extracted from the generated output. We assess the accuracy of  $Y_{pred}$  against the ground truth labels  $Y_{gt}$  utilizing the F1 score.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Datasets, Metrics, and Details

FUNSD (Jaume, Ekenel, and Thiran 2019) is a dataset for understanding the content of tables in scanned documents.

It contains 149 tables and 7,411 entities in the training set, and 50 tables and 2,332 entities in the test set. In the DIE task, the candidate labels of the FUNSD dataset include “Header”, “Question”, “Answer”, and “Other”.

**SROIE** (Huang et al. 2019) is another scanned receipt understanding dataset, containing 626 receipts in the training set and 347 in the test set. The DIE task needs to extract “company”, “date”, “address”, and “total” information.

**CORD** (Park et al. 2019) is a receipt understanding dataset that contains 800 training data, 100 test data, and 100 validation data. This dataset features 30 detailed and hierarchical labels, much more than the above two datasets.

**Metrics.** Following previous works (He et al. 2023), we adopt entity-level **F1 score**, **precision** and **recall** as metrics.

**Details.** We evaluate our method using three LLMs: the open-source ChatGLM3 (THUDM 2023) and the closed-source GPT-3.5 (OpenAI 2023a) and GPT-4 (OpenAI 2023b). Specifically, we use the `chatglm3-6b-32k` version for ChatGLM3, `gpt-3.5-turbo` API version for GPT-3.5, and `gpt-4o` API version for GPT-4. For GPT-3.5 and GPT-4o, we set the temperature parameter to 0 to enhance the reproducibility. In the case of GPT-4o, we only provide text prompts as input, while also testing its multi-modal capabilities by providing document images and clear task instructions. In our experiments, for each test document, we select four textually similar documents and four layout-similar documents as examples due to the limitation of prompt token number. Furthermore, for each filtered test entity, we choose four textually similar entity examples.

## 4.2 Results on DIE Benchmarks

**Baselines.** We compare our SAIL against baseline models including BERT (Devlin et al. 2019), LiLT (Wang, Jin, and Ding 2022), BROS (Hong et al. 2022), XYLayoutLM (Gu et al. 2022), LayoutLM (Gu et al. 2022), LayoutLMv2 (Xu et al. 2021), and LayoutLMv3 (Huang et al. 2022) in both full-training and few-shot settings. We borrow their metrics from (He et al. 2023). Training-free methods including standard ICL and ICL-D3IE (He et al. 2023) are also compared. ICL-D3IE only reports the performance of standard ICL and ICL-D3IE with GPT-3.5, so we evaluate their performance with GPT-4 and ChatGLM3 using their official repositories.

**Quantitative results** are presented in Table 1. First, overall, our method stably outperforms ICL-D3IE across different LLMs on all datasets. Second, when switching the LLM from GPT-3.5 to ChatGLM3, the performance drop of ICL-D3IE is significantly larger than our SAIL (*e.g.*, -73.8% vs. -12.73% in SROIE), demonstrating that our method has better robustness and adaptability to various LLMs. Third, the performance of ICL-D3IE degrades slightly when transitioning from GPT-3.5 to the more advanced GPT-4 on FUNSD and SROIE datasets, further indicating its incompatibility with new LLMs. However, in all datasets, our method achieves better performance on more advanced GPT-4 than on GPT-3.5, which is intuitive and reasonable. These results demonstrate the advantages of our method.

**Qualitative results** are illustrated in Figure 4. ICL-D3IE incorrectly predicts the entities on the three left green boxes as “answer”, while our SAIL accurately identifies them as

Setting	Methods	FUNSD	CORD	SROIE	
Full-Training	BERT <sub>BASE</sub>	60.26	89.68	90.99	
	LiLT <sub>BASE</sub>	88.41	96.07	94.68	
	BROS <sub>BASE</sub>	83.05	95.73	95.48	
	XYLayoutLM <sub>BASE</sub>	83.35	94.45	95.74	
	LayoutLM <sub>BASE</sub>	79.27	91.06	94.38	
	LayoutLMv2 <sub>BASE</sub>	82.76	94.95	96.25	
	LayoutLMv3 <sub>BASE</sub>	90.29	96.56	96.89	
Few-Shot	BERT <sub>BASE</sub>	38.76	38.88	38.76	
	LiLT <sub>BASE</sub>	54.88	69.12	84.03	
	BROS <sub>BASE</sub>	59.46	72.78	76.78	
	XYLayoutLM <sub>BASE</sub>	65.44	69.16	75.66	
	LayoutLM <sub>BASE</sub>	32.49	40.19	76.79	
	LayoutLMv2 <sub>BASE</sub>	71.42	65.71	81.81	
	LayoutLMv3 <sub>BASE</sub>	70.67	70.13	79.13	
Training-Free	ChatGLM3	Standard ICL	40.93	67.30	81.37
		ICL-D3IE	35.90	36.44	18.83
		SAIL (ours)	<b>58.24</b>	<b>83.04</b>	<b>85.03</b>
	GPT-3.5	Standard ICL	72.76	68.34	82.11
		ICL-D3IE	<b>83.66</b>	87.13	92.63
		SAIL (ours)	83.48	<b>95.80</b>	<b>97.76</b>
	GPT-4	Standard ICL	75.15	90.22	96.00
		ICL-D3IE	78.94	87.47	89.23
		SAIL (ours)	<b>84.67</b>	<b>96.41</b>	<b>98.18</b>

Table 1: **Quantitative results** with F1 metric. Our SAIL stably surpasses baselines across various base LLMs.

“question”. This indicates that fixed examples in ICL-D3IE are insufficient to guide LLMs in effectively learning the relationship between discrete texts, highlighting the importance of selecting diverse examples for each test sample.

## 4.3 Comparison with Multi-modal LLMs

**Baselines.** Recent years have witnessed the rapid development of multi-modal LLMs (MLLMs) represented by GPT-4o (OpenAI 2023b). To further validate the effectiveness of our method, we also compare our SAIL with MLLMs including open-source LLaVA-1.5 (Liu et al. 2024a) and proprietary GPT-4o. We provide these MLLMs with explicit and detailed instructions to inform the task definition.

**Quantitative results** are provided in Table 2. The open-source LLaVA exhibits limited DIE capabilities, resulting in a low F1 score (*e.g.*, 0.7% in FUNSD). The proprietary GPT-4o significantly outperforms LLaVA (50.72% vs 0.7% in FUNSD), yet still falls short when compared to specialized DIE methods. Therefore, despite their rapid evolution, MLLMs still underperform in the DIE task, highlighting the importance and contribution of our proposed work.

## 4.4 Ablation Studies


**Effect of Adaptive Example.** We assess the influence of adaptive examples by employing both fixed and adaptive examples to construct in-context prompts within the same prompt template. The base LLM is selected as GPT-3.5, and the results are illustrated in Table 3. The utilization of adaptive examples results in superior F1 scores, confirming the

Methods	SROIE			CORD			FUNSD		
	F1	Precision	Recall	F1	Precision	Recall	F1	Precision	Recall
GPT-4o	47.49	46.77	48.24	71.53	82.96	62.87	50.72	73.01	38.85
LLaVA-v1.5-7B	2.32	5.49	1.47	8.85	67.39	4.74	0.70	61.54	0.35
SAIL (ours)	<b>98.18</b>	<b>97.72</b>	<b>98.64</b>	<b>96.41</b>	<b>96.41</b>	<b>96.41</b>	<b>84.67</b>	<b>84.67</b>	<b>84.67</b>

Table 2: **Performance comparison** with multi-modal LLMs. Multi-modal LLMs even powerful GPT-4o still struggle with DIE tasks and our method significantly surpasses GPT-4o and LLaVA-v1.5-7B.


Setting	FUNSD	CORD	SROIE
Fixed example	74.23	82.35	91.08
Adaptive example	<b>83.48</b>	<b>95.80</b>	<b>97.76</b>
$\Delta$	9.25	13.45	6.68

Table 3: **Ablation study of adaptive examples** with F1 metric. Adaptive examples is superior than fixed examples.



(a) ICL-D3IE

**Question:** {text:"# CASES",Box:[307 426 359 439]} {text:"KENT III K. S.",Box:[306 454 379 465]}.....{text:"1",Box:[429 482 440 495]}....., What are the labels for these texts?



(b) Ours

**Answer:** {text:"# CASES",Box:[307 426 359 439],entity:header} {text:"KENT III K. S.",Box:[306 454 379 465],entity:answer} ✘ {text:"KENT III 100",Box:[306 466 376 479],entity:answer} {text:"TRUE K. S.",Box:[306 480 363 493],entity:answer} .....

**Answer:** {text:"# CASES",Box:[307 426 359 439],entity:header} {text:"KENT III K. S.",Box:[306 454 379 465],entity:question} ✔ {text:"KENT III 100",Box:[306 466 376 479],entity:question} {text:"TRUE K. S.",Box:[306 480 363 493],entity:question} .....

Figure 4: **Case study** on performance comparison of (a) ICL-D3IE and (b) our SAIL. ICL-D3IE wrongly predicts the three green boxes on the left as “answer”. In contrast, our proposed SAIL correctly predicts them as “question”.

effectiveness of our method. Among the three datasets, the performance improvement with adaptive examples is most pronounced in the CORD dataset (13.45%). Note that the CORD dataset contains 30 labels, much more complex than the other two datasets with only four labels. This suggests that sample-centric examples could more effectively guide the LLMs to comprehend the layout and text information especially in complex situations.

**Effect of Different Examples.** We conduct ablation experiments using GPT-3.5 to evaluate the influence of different examples, as shown in Table 5. In #0, where none of the three examples are available, we employ fixed random

Text	Layout	Ascending	Descending
	Ascending		95.19
Descending		94.73	<b>95.80</b>

Table 4: **Performance comparison of the example order** in the prompt with F1 metric in the CORD dataset.

#	Similar			FUNSD	CORD	SROIE
	Text-Doc.	Layout	Text-Ent.			
0				69.87	83.04	95.08
1	✓			69.60	92.13	96.38
2	✓	✓		73.13	92.97	97.24
3	✓		✓	81.67	92.51	97.13
4	✓	✓	✓	<b>83.48</b>	<b>95.80</b>	<b>97.76</b>

Table 5: **Ablation study of various similarity** with F1 metric. Text-Doc., Layout, & Text-Ent. mean textual similar documents, layout similar documents, & textual similar entities.




Figure 5: **Ablation study of layout analysis.** “w/o LA” means without adding layout analysis. Adding layout analysis achieves higher F1 scores across all three datasets.

examples to instruct the LLM to generate answers in a specific format, simplifying the label extraction. The highest F1 score is observed when document-level text similarity examples, layout examples, and entity-level text similarity examples (#4) are used, validating the efficiency of the three examples. The addition of layout examples (#1 vs. #2) or entity-level text similarity examples (#1 vs. #3) to document-level text similarity examples results in superior F1 scores.

For the long text FUNSD dataset, the F1 score with document-level text similarity examples is even lower than fixed examples (#0 vs. #1). This could be attributed to the inherent randomness of LLM generation, but it also signi-




Figure 6: (a) **Case study** on comparison of (a1) without and (a2) with layout similar examples. Adding layout similar examples helps accurately distinguish between the two “13.000”. (b) **Case study** on comparison of (b1) without and (b2) with entity-level text similar examples. The LLM labels entities correctly with the demonstration of entity-level text similar examples.

fies that in lengthy documents, document-level text similarity examples do not provide effective guidance for the LLM. In the FUNSD dataset, adding entity-level text similarity examples (10.35%, #2 vs. #4) is much superior than adding layout similarity examples (1.81%, #3 vs. #4), suggesting that entity-level text similarity examples are more important for lengthy documents. For the CORD and SROIE datasets, removing layout similarity examples (#3 vs. #4) causes a greater F1 score decrease than omitting entity-level text similarity examples (#2 vs. #4), indicating the higher significance of layout information for these two datasets.

**Effect of Example Order.** We perform experiments on the CORD dataset using GPT-3.5 to test the effect of example order, as detailed in Table 4. When layout-similar and text-similar document examples are arranged in a consistent order based on their similarity, F1 scores tend to be higher. This phenomenon may result from improved attention allocation within the LLM due to the consistent ordering. Furthermore, the highest F1 scores are observed when layout-similar and text-similar examples are sorted from high to low similarity concerning the test sample. This suggests that the LLM can capitalize on the information presented first.

**Effect of Layout Analysis.** Our methodology requires the LLM to perform layout analysis on our searched layout-similar examples. To assess the impact of layout analysis, we conduct comparative experiments with / without the layout analysis on the FUNSD, CORD, and SROIE datasets using the GPT-3.5. As illustrated in Figure 5, the results indicate that F1 scores are consistently higher when incorporating

layout analysis compared to only using layout-similar examples across all datasets. This suggests that layout analysis is able to enhance the LLM’s comprehension of layout.

**Case Study.** Figure 6(a) illustrates a comparison from the CORD dataset regarding the inclusion of layout demonstrations in the prompt. Using the prompt without layout similar demonstrations, the LLM predicts two “13.000” both as “MENU.PRICE”, while our SAIL distinguishes the left “13.000” as “MENU.UNITPRICE” and the right “13.000” as “MENU.PRICE”. This outcome underscores the necessity of incorporating layout demonstrations for LLMs to grasp document structure effectively. Figure 6(b) showcases a comparison from the FUNSD dataset about the addition of entity-level text demonstrations in the prompt. Upon omitting these demonstrations, the LLM mistakenly predicts “COMPOUND SENSITIVE TO” as “question” and incorrectly classifies the four subsequent entities as “answer”. Although this prediction makes sense in terms of layout, it fails to correspond with the textual context, highlighting the critical role of entity-level text similarity examples.

## 5 Conclusions and Limitations

In this work, we propose SAIL, a sample-centric ICL method for training-free DIE task. Our SAIL leverages layout similarity and entity-level text similarity in combination with a unified prompt template, constructing tailored prompts for each test sample, showcasing superiority over baselines on three DIE benchmarks with different LLMs.

## 6 Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62422311, 62176152), and Shanghai Committee of Science and Technology, China (No. 24TS1413500).

## References

- Abramovich, O.; Nayman, N.; Fogel, S.; Lavi, I.; Litman, R.; Tsiper, S.; Tichauer, R.; Appalaraju, S.; Mazor, S.; and Manmatha, R. 2024. VisFocus: Prompt-guided vision encoders for ocr-free dense document understanding. In *ECCV*.
- Brown, T.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J. D.; Dhariwal, P.; Neelakantan, A.; Shyam, P.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *NeurIPS*.
- Cai, C.; Wang, Q.; Liang, B.; Qin, B.; Yang, M.; Wong, K.-F.; and Xu, R. 2023. In-context learning for few-shot multimodal named entity recognition. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*.
- Da, C.; Luo, C.; Zheng, Q.; and Yao, C. 2023. Vision grid transformer for document layout analysis. In *ICCV*.
- Denk, T. I.; and Reisswig, C. 2019. Bertgrid: Contextualized embedding for 2d document representation and understanding. In *Workshop on Document Intelligence at NeurIPS*.
- Devlin, J.; Chang, M.-W.; Lee, K.; and Toutanova, K. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- Fujitake, M. 2024. LayoutLLM: Large language model instruction tuning for visually rich document understanding. In *LREC-COLING*.
- Gu, Z.; Meng, C.; Wang, K.; Lan, J.; Wang, W.; Gu, M.; and Zhang, L. 2022. Xylayoutlm: Towards layout-aware multimodal networks for visually-rich document understanding. In *CVPR*.
- He, J.; Wang, L.; Hu, Y.; Liu, N.; Liu, H.; Xu, X.; and Shen, H. T. 2023. Icl-d3ie: In-context learning with diverse demonstrations updating for document information extraction. In *ICCV*.
- Hong, T.; Kim, D.; Ji, M.; Hwang, W.; Nam, D.; and Park, S. 2022. Bros: A pre-trained language model focusing on text and layout for better key information extraction from documents. In *AAAI*.
- Hu, A.; Xu, H.; Ye, J.; Yan, M.; Zhang, L.; Zhang, B.; Li, C.; Zhang, J.; Jin, Q.; Huang, F.; et al. 2024. Mplug-docowl 1.5: Unified structure learning for ocr-free document understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12895*.
- Hu, Y.; Lee, C.-H.; Xie, T.; Yu, T.; Smith, N. A.; and Ostendorf, M. 2022. In-context learning for few-shot dialogue state tracking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*.
- Huang, Y.; Lv, T.; Cui, L.; Lu, Y.; and Wei, F. 2022. Layoutlmv3: Pre-training for document ai with unified text and image masking. In *ACM MM*.
- Huang, Z.; Chen, K.; He, J.; Bai, X.; Karatzas, D.; Lu, S.; and Jawahar, C. 2019. Icdar2019 competition on scanned receipt ocr and information extraction. In *ICDAR*.
- Jaume, G.; Ekenel, H. K.; and Thiran, J.-P. 2019. Funsd: A dataset for form understanding in noisy scanned documents. In *ICDARW*.
- Katti, A. R.; Reisswig, C.; Guder, C.; Brarda, S.; Bickel, S.; Höhne, J.; and Faddoul, J. B. 2018. Chargrid: Towards understanding 2d documents. In *EMNLP*.
- Kerroumi, M.; Sayem, O.; and Shabou, A. 2021. VisualWordGrid: Information extraction from scanned documents using a multimodal approach. In *ICDAR*.
- Kim, G.; Hong, T.; Yim, M.; Nam, J.; Park, J.; Yim, J.; Hwang, W.; Yun, S.; Han, D.; and Park, S. 2022. Ocr-free document understanding transformer. In *ECCV*.
- Li, C.; Bi, B.; Yan, M.; Wang, W.; Huang, S.; Huang, F.; and Si, L. 2021. StructuralLM: Structural pre-training for form understanding. In *ACL-IJCNLP*.
- Li, X.; Wu, Y.; Jiang, X.; Guo, Z.; Gong, M.; Cao, H.; Liu, Y.; Jiang, D.; and Sun, X. 2024. Enhancing visual document understanding with contrastive learning in large visual-language models. In *CVPR*.
- Liu, H.; Li, C.; Li, Y.; and Lee, Y. J. 2024a. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. In *CVPR*.
- Liu, J.; Shen, D.; Zhang, Y.; Dolan, W. B.; Carin, L.; and Chen, W. 2022. What makes good in-context examples for GPT-3? In *DeeLIO: The 3rd Workshop on Knowledge Extraction and Integration for Deep Learning Architectures*.
- Liu, W.; Lei, F.; Luo, T.; Lei, J.; He, S.; Zhao, J.; and Liu, K. 2023. MMHQA-ICL: Multimodal in-context learning for hybrid question answering over text, tables and images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04790*.
- Liu, X.; Gao, F.; Zhang, Q.; and Zhao, H. 2019. Graph convolution for multimodal information extraction from visually rich documents. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- Liu, Y.; Yang, B.; Liu, Q.; Li, Z.; Ma, Z.; Zhang, S.; and Bai, X. 2024b. Textmonkey: An ocr-free large multimodal model for understanding document. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04473*.
- Lu, J.; Yu, H.; Wang, Y.; Ye, Y.; Tang, J.; Yang, Z.; Wu, B.; Liu, Q.; Feng, H.; Wang, H.; et al. 2024. A bounding box is worth one token: Interleaving layout and text in a large language model for document understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01976*.
- Luo, C.; Shen, Y.; Zhu, Z.; Zheng, Q.; Yu, Z.; and Yao, C. 2024. LayoutLLM: Layout instruction tuning with large language models for document understanding. In *CVPR*.
- Mao, Z.; Bai, H.; Hou, L.; Wei, J.; Jiang, X.; Liu, Q.; and Wong, K.-F. 2024. Visually guided generative text-layout pre-training for document intelligence. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- Meade, N.; Gella, S.; Hazarika, D.; Gupta, P.; Jin, D.; Reddy, S.; Liu, Y.; and Hakkani-Tür, D. 2023. Using in-context learning to improve dialogue safety. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*.
- OpenAI. 2023a. gpt-3.5-turbo.
- OpenAI. 2023b. GPT-4o System Card.
- Park, S.; Shin, S.; Lee, B.; Lee, J.; Surh, J.; Seo, M.; and Lee, H. 2019. CORD: A consolidated receipt dataset for post-ocr parsing. In *NeurIPS Workshop*.
- Perot, V.; Kang, K.; Luisier, F.; Su, G.; Sun, X.; Boppana, R. S.; Wang, Z.; Mu, J.; Zhang, H.; and Hua, N. 2023. Lmdx: Language model-based document information extraction and localization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10952*.
- Qian, Y.; Santus, E.; Jin, Z.; Guo, J.; and Barzilay, R. 2019. Graphie: A graph-based framework for information extraction. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- Reimers, N.; and Gurevych, I. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using siamese BERT-networks. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*.
- Tang, G.; Xie, L.; Jin, L.; Wang, J.; Chen, J.; Xu, Z.; Wang, Q.; Wu, Y.; and Li, H. 2021. Matchvie: Exploiting match relevancy between entities for visual information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.12940*.
- THUDM. 2023. Chatglm3.



Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, Ł.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *NeurIPS*.

Wang, D.; Raman, N.; Sibue, M.; Ma, Z.; Babkin, P.; Kaur, S.; Pei, Y.; Nourbakhsh, A.; and Liu, X. 2023a. DocLLM: A layout-aware generative language model for multimodal document understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00908*.

Wang, J.; Jin, L.; and Ding, K. 2022. Lilt: A simple yet effective language-independent layout transformer for structured document understanding. In *ACL*.

Wang, J.; Le, X.; Peng, X.; and Chen, C. 2023b. Adaptive hinge balance loss for document-level relation extraction. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*.

Wang, J.; Liu, C.; Jin, L.; Tang, G.; Zhang, J.; Zhang, S.; Wang, Q.; Wu, Y.; and Cai, M. 2021. Towards robust visual information extraction in real world: new dataset and novel solution. In *AAAI*.

Wang, L.; Hu, Y.; He, J.; Xu, X.; Liu, N.; Liu, H.; and Shen, H. T. 2024. T-sciq: Teaching multimodal chain-of-thought reasoning via large language model signals for science question answering. In *AAAI*.

Xu, Y.; Li, M.; Cui, L.; Huang, S.; Wei, F.; and Zhou, M. 2020. Layoutlm: Pre-training of text and layout for document image understanding. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*.

Xu, Y.; Xu, Y.; Lv, T.; Cui, L.; Wei, F.; Wang, G.; Lu, Y.; Florencio, D.; Zhang, C.; Che, W.; et al. 2021. Layoutlmv2: Multi-modal pre-training for visually-rich document understanding. In *ACL-IJCNLP*.

Yang, Z.; Gan, Z.; Wang, J.; Hu, X.; Lu, Y.; Liu, Z.; and Wang, L. 2022. An empirical study of gpt-3 for few-shot knowledge-based vqa. In *AAAI*.

Zhao, X.; Niu, E.; Wu, Z.; and Wang, X. 2019. Cutie: Learning to understand documents with convolutional universal text information extractor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.12363*.

## Appendix

### A Implementation Detail

We test our SAIL with ChatGLM3 on an RTX 3090 GPU. For FUNSD, we set the maximum token output to 2500; For CORD and SROIE, we set the maximum token output to 1500. Due to the randomness of the generation of LLMs, we have set some simple checks, such as whether there is a “{”, and if the generated result does not meet the requirements, it is regenerated. In the FUNSD dataset, we set the number of examples to 2, and if the number of tokens exceeds the limit, the number of examples is changed to 1. In the SROIE dataset, we set the number of examples to 4, and if the number of tokens exceeds the limit, the number of examples is changed to 2.

### B Additional Ablation Studies

**Results on Synthetic Data.** We explore two data-synthetic methods.

- Replace text. Randomly replace the text with other texts of the same label while keeping the original layout.
- Replace layout. Keep the text unchanged and replace the layout with those from other documents.

Method	Data	F1 Scores
GPT-4o	-	50.72
ICL-D3IE	100% real	87.13
SAIL	100% real	95.80
SAIL	50% real	92.59
SAIL	50% replace text	86.71
SAIL	50% replace layout	85.10

Table A1: **Results on synthetic data** with F1 metric in the CORD dataset.

CORD, F1	GPT-3.5-turbo	GPT-4o
full dataset	95.80	96.41
half dataset	92.59	94.65
30 examples	84.57	92.36

Table A2: **Results on constructing an example pool** with F1 metric in the CORD dataset.

We conducted experiments on the CORD with gpt-3.5-turbo in Table A1. Even with only synthetic data, SAIL achieves better results than GPT-4o and similar results with ICL-D3IE.

**Constructing an Example Pool.** Because the extracted information of different datasets varies, we explored how to construct an example pool for each dataset. We found that even using only 30 examples, the performance is still high, as shown in Table A2.

**Effect of the Layout Similarity Comparison Method.** We present the F1 score of different layout similarity comparison methods in Table A3. When using cosine similarity, the layout images are pulled into a one-dimensional vector before comparing similarity. From the table, it can be seen that the F1 score of using Mean Square Error (MSE) to compare the similarity between layout images is the highest. Besides, the F1 score of comparing the cosine similarity is much lower than the F1 score of comparing the MSE or Structural Similarity (SSIM) between the images. This indicates that pulling into a one-dimensional vector destroys the overall structure of the layout image and loses some layout information. Therefore, it is necessary to directly compare the similarity between the layout images.

**Effect of the Number of Document-Level Examples.** We tested the effect of the number of document-level examples in the CORD dataset when comparing the similarity of layout images using MSE and cosine similarity separately. In our experience, the number of layout-similar document examples and textually similar document examples were the same and this number was the independent variable. Due to the limitation on the length of the prompt words, only the cases with 1–5 document-level examples were tested. The results are shown in Figure A1. It can be observed that, overall, the more document-level examples selected, the higher the F1 score is. However, when the number of document-level examples is 3, the prediction effect is significantly worse compared to when the number of document-level ex-

Layout Similarity Comparison Methods	F1 Scores
Cosine Similarity	94.73
Structural Similarity (SSIM)	95.42
Mean Square Error (MSE)	<b>95.80</b>

Table A3: **Performance comparison of the layout similarity comparison methods** with F1 metric in the CORD dataset.

Resize Methods	F1 Scores
Calculate coordinates before generation	95.26
Bilinear Interpolation	94.73
LANCZOS Interpolation	94.88
Area Interpolation	95.11
LANCZOS Interpolation and Binarization	<b>95.42</b>

Table A4: **Performance comparison of resize methods** with F1 metric in the CORD dataset.

amples is 2 and 4. This is a very peculiar phenomenon. Additionally, the performance difference when the number of document-level examples is 2 and 4 is not very large. If cost-saving is a priority, using shorter prompt words and selecting 2 layout-similar document examples and 2 textually similar document examples can also yield good results.

**Effect of Different Resize Methods.** When comparing the similarity of layout images processed by SSIM, the effect of different methods of resizing layout images was tested in the CORD dataset. Our experience includes 5 resize methods. The first method involves calculating the position coordinates of the boxes in the resized image before drawing them. Since the coordinates can only be integers, they need to be rounded off first. The resized layout images are generated using these coordinates directly. The second to fourth methods involve bilinear interpolation, LANCZOS interpolation, and area interpolation. Using these methods, the layout image is no longer binary after resizing. The fifth method involves first performing LANCZOS interpolation, and then binarizing the image with 128 as the boundary to obtain a black-and-white binary layout image. The result is shown in Table A4. From the table, it can be seen that the F1 scores of obtaining non-binary layout images through bilinear interpolation, area interpolation, and LANCZOS interpolation are somewhat lower. Among them, area interpolation still generates binary layout images by choosing neighboring pixel values when enlarging images, and generates non-binary layout images when reducing images, so its F1 score is relatively higher than bilinear interpolation and LANCZOS interpolation. Therefore, comparing the similarity of images by generating binary layout images after resizing is more conducive to correct prediction when searching for similar layout documents. Among the two ways to generate binary layout images, the F1 score of LANCZOS interpolation and binarization is a bit higher, indicating that it is the best way to resize layout images.




Figure A1: **Performance comparison of the number of example documents** with F1 metric in the CORD dataset.

Box From	F1 Scores
Original image ( $B$ )	95.11
Cropped image ( $B'$ )	<b>95.42</b>

Table A5: **Performance comparison of different boxes in the prompt** with F1 metric in the CORD dataset.

**Effect of Different Boxes in the Prompt.** In SAIL, we substitute the boxes from the cropped image  $B'$  for all documents in the prompt instead of using  $B$ . To test the effect of this step, we conduct comparative experiments using two document-level examples and comparing the similarity of layout images with MSE. The result is shown in Table A5. The F1 score of using  $B'$  is higher, proving that using the boxes from the cropped image is more beneficial for LLMs to observe the layout relationships between documents.

**Effect of Representation Format for Textually Similar Entities.** Since the focus of the entity-level text similarity example is primarily on textual information, two representations are considered: one is "text: label", and the other is the format "text: "...", Box:  $[x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2]$ , entity: ...". Under the condition of selecting 2 entity-level text similarity examples for each testing entity, we conduct experiment to test the effect of two representation formats in the FUNSD dataset. The result is shown in Table A6. It can be seen that the F1 score is higher when the position coordinates of the text blocks are included. This indicates that in entity-level similar text demonstrations, the position coordinates of the text blocks are very important. They can help LLMs make better judgments about which example to primarily refer to when the texts are the same but the labels are different.

**Effect of the Number of Entity-Level Text Similarity Examples.** When using the format of "text: "...", Box:  $[x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2]$ , entity: ...", we compared the effect of the number of entity-level text similarity examples in the FUNSD dataset. From Table A7, it can be seen that increasing the number of examples can improve the F1 score.

Representation Format	F1 Scores
“text: label”	79.43
“text: “...”, Box: $[x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2]$ , entity: ...”	<b>82.20</b>

Table A6: **Performance comparison of representation formats for textually similar entities** with F1 metric in the FUNSD dataset.

Number of Examples	F1 Scores
2	82.20
4	<b>83.48</b>

Table A7: **Performance comparison of the number of entity-level text similarity examples** with F1 metric in the FUNSD dataset.

## C Results

We use the F1 scores of the samples obtained by D3IE and our SAIL for Wilcoxon signed-rank, and the p scores are shown in Table A8. The results show that the p-values of all three datasets are less than 0.05, indicating that the change is significant.

Datasets	FUNSD	CORD	SROIE
p-value	2.415e-2	4.057e-5	2.288e-17

Table A8: **Wilcoxon signed-rank in D3IE and our SAIL.** The p-values of all three datasets are less than 0.05, indicating that the change is significant.

More visual examples of our SAIL are shown in Figure A2 to Figure A11.

## D Limitations

Our SAIL mainly suffers from two limitations.

- The search process incurs an additional time cost, accounting for 13.3% when using GPT-4.
- The use of diverse examples increases the total token count.

Thus, how to improve the search method and reduce the token count will be the focus of our future work.




Figure A2: Example of the test layout image and selected similar layout images on CORD.






Figure A3: Visualization of two cases on FUNSD, which are predicted by GPT-4. Blue: “header”, Red: “question”, Green: “answer”, Grey: “other”. The entities contained within the red box are predicted inaccurately.







(a) ChatGLM3



(b) GPT-3.5



(c) GPT-4



(d) Ground Truth

Figure A5: Visualization of four cases on CORD, which are predicted by (a) ChatGLM3, (b) GPT-3.5, (c) GPT-4, and (d) Ground Truth. The entities contained within the red box are predicted inaccurately. The corresponding prediction is shown in Figure A6.

(a) ChatGLM3

```
A: {text:"1",Box:[40 10 59 28],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"[LG] BLACK SAKURA",Box:[66 10 369 31],entity:MENU.NM}
{text:"59,091",Box:[640 13 737 34],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"1",Box:[42 33 56 51],entity:MENU.CNT}
{text:"LONGAN",Box:[66 31 195 51],entity:MENU.NM}{text:"0",Box:[718 36 739 56],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"1",
Box:[40 56 56 75],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"ROASTED ALMOND",Box:[62 54 353 76],entity:MENU.NM}{text:"0",
Box:[718 59 739 78],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"1",Box:[36 78 54 96],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"IVANGGO",Box:[61 78
207 98],entity:MENU.NM}{text:"0",Box:[718 82 742 101],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"1",Box:[36 102 52 119],
entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"IVINERAL WATER (bundling) 5k",Box:[61 101 512 126],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"4,545",
Box:[658 104 744 127],entity:SUB_TOTAL.SUBTOTAL_PRICE}{text:"PB1 (10%) 4,545",Box:[19 169 748 198],
entity:SUB_TOTAL.TAX_PRICE}{text:"Rounding 0",Box:[17 193 746 220],entity:SUB_TOTAL.ETC}{text:"Total
70,000",Box:[15 220 747 251],entity:TOTAL.TOTAL_PRICE}{text:"Cash Payment 100,000",Box:[12 271 750
301],entity:TOTAL.CASHPRICE}{text:"Change 30,000",Box:[10 295 750 325],entity:TOTAL.CHANGEPRICE}
```

(b) GPT-3.5

```
A: {text:"1",Box:[40 10 59 28],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"[LG] BLACK SAKURA",Box:[66 10 369 31],entity:MENU.NM}
{text:"59,091",Box:[640 13 737 34],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"1",Box:[42 33 56 51],entity:MENU.CNT}
{text:"LONGAN",Box:[66 31 195 51],entity:MENU.NM}{text:"0",Box:[718 36 739 56],entity:MENU.PRICE}
{text:"1",Box:[40 56 56 75],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"ROASTED ALMOND",Box:[62 54 353 76],entity:MENU.NM}
{text:"0",Box:[718 59 739 78],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"1",Box:[36 78 54 96],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"IVANGGO",
Box:[61 78 207 98],entity:MENU.NM}{text:"0",Box:[718 82 742 101],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"1",Box:[36 102 52
119],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"IVINERAL WATER (bundling) 5k",Box:[61 101 512 126],entity:MENU.NM}
{text:"4,545",Box:[658 104 744 127],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"Sub Total 63,636",Box:[22 147 745 175],
entity:SUB_TOTAL.SUBTOTAL_PRICE}{text:"PB1 (10%) 6,364",Box:[19 169 748 198],
entity:SUB_TOTAL.TAX_PRICE}{text:"Rounding 0",Box:[17 193 746 220],entity:SUB_TOTAL.ETC}{text:"Total
70,000",Box:[15 220 747 251],entity:TOTAL.TOTAL_PRICE}{text:"Cash Payment 100,000",Box:[12 271 750 301],
entity:TOTAL.CASHPRICE}{text:"Change 30,000",Box:[10 295 750 325],entity:TOTAL.CHANGEPRICE}
```

(c) GPT-4

```
A: {text:"1",Box:[40 10 59 28],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"[LG] BLACK SAKURA",Box:[66 10 369 31],entity:MENU.NM}
{text:"59,091",Box:[640 13 737 34],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"1",Box:[42 33 56 51],entity:MENU.SUB.CNT}
{text:"LONGAN",Box:[66 31 195 51],entity:MENU.SUB.NM}{text:"0",Box:[718 36 739 56],entity:MENU.SUB.PRICE}
{text:"1",Box:[40 56 56 75],entity:MENU.SUB.CNT}{text:"ROASTED ALMOND",Box:[62 54 353 76],
entity:MENU.SUB.NM}{text:"0",Box:[718 59 739 78],entity:MENU.SUB.PRICE}{text:"1",Box:[36 78 54 96],
entity:MENU.SUB.CNT}{text:"IVANGGO",Box:[61 78 207 98],entity:MENU.SUB.NM}{text:"0",Box:[718 82 742 101],
entity:MENU.SUB.PRICE}{text:"1",Box:[36 102 52 119],entity:MENU.SUB.CNT}{text:"IVINERAL WATER (bundling)
5k",Box:[61 101 512 126],entity:MENU.SUB.NM}{text:"4,545",Box:[658 104 744 127],entity:MENU.SUB.PRICE}
{text:"Sub Total 63,636",Box:[22 147 745 175],entity:SUB_TOTAL.SUBTOTAL_PRICE}{text:"PB1 (10%) 6,364",
Box:[19 169 748 198],entity:SUB_TOTAL.TAX_PRICE}{text:"Rounding 0",Box:[17 193 746 220],
entity:SUB_TOTAL.ETC}{text:"Total 70,000",Box:[15 220 747 251],entity:TOTAL.TOTAL_PRICE}{text:"Cash
Payment 100,000",Box:[12 271 750 301],entity:TOTAL.CASHPRICE}{text:"Change 30,000",Box:[10 295 750 325],
entity:TOTAL.CHANGEPRICE}
```

(d) Ground Truth

```
{text:"1",Box:[129 492 148 510],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"1",Box:[131 515 145 533],entity:MENU.SUB.CNT}{text:"1",
Box:[129 538 145 557],entity:MENU.SUB.CNT}{text:"1",Box:[125 560 143 578],entity:MENU.SUB.CNT}{text:"1",
Box:[125 584 141 601],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"[LG] BLACK SAKURA",Box:[155 492 458 513],entity:MENU.NM}
{text:"LONGAN",Box:[155 513 284 533],entity:MENU.SUB.NM}{text:"ROASTED ALMOND",Box:[151 536 442 558],
entity:MENU.SUB.NM}{text:"IVANGGO",Box:[150 560 296 580],entity:MENU.SUB.NM}{text:"IVINERAL WATER
(bundling) 5k",Box:[150 583 601 608],entity:MENU.NM}{text:"59,091",Box:[729 495 826 516],entity:MENU.PRICE}
{text:"0",Box:[807 518 828 538],entity:MENU.SUB.PRICE}{text:"0",Box:[807 541 828 560],entity:MENU.SUB.PRICE}
{text:"0",Box:[807 564 831 583],entity:MENU.SUB.PRICE}{text:"4,545",Box:[747 586 833 609],entity:MENU.PRICE}
{text:"Total 70,000",Box:[104 702 836 733],entity:TOTAL.TOTAL_PRICE}{text:"Rounding 0",Box:[106 675 835 702],
entity:SUB_TOTAL.ETC}{text:"PB1 (10%) 6,364",Box:[108 651 837 680],entity:SUB_TOTAL.TAX_PRICE}{text:"Sub
Total 63,636",Box:[111 629 834 657],entity:SUB_TOTAL.SUBTOTAL_PRICE}{text:"Change 30,000",Box:[99 777
839 807],entity:TOTAL.CHANGEPRICE}{text:"Cash Payment 100,000",Box:[101 753 839 783],
entity:TOTAL.CASHPRICE}
```

Figure A6: Examples of prediction by (a) ChatGLM3, (b) GPT-3.5, (c) GPT-4, and (d) Ground Truth on CORD. The labels of the red color are inaccurate.




Figure A7: Visualization of four cases on SROIE, which are predicted by (a) ChatGLM3, (b) GPT-3.5, (c) GPT-4, and (d) Ground Truth. Blue: “company”, grey: “address”, green: “date”, orange: “total”. The entities contained within the red box are predicted inaccurately. The corresponding prediction is shown in Figure A8.



(a) ChatGLM3

```
{  
  "company": "OLDTOWN WHITE COFFEE",  
  "date": "22 MAR 18 12:44:00 PM",  
  "address": "OLD TOWN KOPITIAM SDN BHD (716269-X)",  
  "total": "30.24"  
}
```

(b) GPT-3.5

```
A:{  
  "company": "OLD TOWN KOPITIAM SDN BHD",  
  "date": "22 MAR 18",  
  "address": "SRI RAMPAL",  
  "total": "30.24"  
}
```

(c) GPT-4

```
A:{  
  "company": "OLD TOWN KOPITIAM SDN BHD",  
  "date": "22 MAR 18",  
  "address": "SRI RAMPAL",  
  "total": "30.25"  
}
```

(d) Ground Truth

```
{  
  "company": "OLD TOWN KOPITAM SND BHD",  
  "date": "22 MAR 18",  
  "address": "SRI RAMPAL",  
  "total": "30.25"  
}
```

Figure A8: Examples of prediction by (a) ChatGLM3, (b) GPT-3.5, (c) GPT-4, and (d) Ground Truth on SROIE. The labels of the red color are inaccurate.

Labels:  
"header", "question", "answer", "other"

Sample text and corresponding label:  
{text:"TO:",Box:[10 59 34 70],entity:"question"}  
{text:"FROM:",Box:[11 40 51 55],entity:"question"}  
{text:"Reported by:",Box:[10 152 125 169],entity:"question"}  
{text:"TO:",Box:[11 12 29 23],entity:"question"}  
{text:"K. P. Augustyn",Box:[481 714 578 730],entity:"other"}  
{text:"K. P. AUGUSTYN",Box:[168 174 268 193],entity:"answer"}  
{text:"K. P. Augustyn",Box:[479 718 578 733],entity:"answer"}  
{text:"Species",Box:[381 285 433 299],entity:"question"}  
{text:"SUBMISSION DATE",Box:[403 14 540 28],entity:"header"}  
{text:"SUBMISSION DATE",Box:[390 11 502 25],entity:"header"}  
{text:"SUBMISSION DATE",Box:[447 12 543 25],entity:"header"}  
{text:"SUBMISSION DATE:",Box:[411 10 549 27],entity:"header"}  
.....

Document {text:"TENNIS TOURNAMENT",Box:[14 559 224 576],entity:question}{text:"(Ladies & Men) . . . Friday, August 16, starting time is 3:00 P. M.",Box:[195 560 553 595],entity:answer}{text:"I will participate in the Tennis Tournament I would classify myself as (please check appropriate box)",Box:[14 626 521 656],entity:question}{text:"<> Beginner",Box:[15 670 133 686],entity:question}{text:"<> Fair",Box:[15 687 96 700],entity:question}{text:"<> Good",Box:[17 701 98 714],entity:question}{text:"<> Excellent",Box:[17 716 142 729],entity:question}{text:"NAME",Box:[15 762 54 775],entity:question}{text:"FIRM NAME",Box:[15 793 97 806],entity:question}{text:"NYSAWMD, INC. 211 EAST 43RD STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10017-4707",Box:[39 870 574 885],entity:question}{text:"A",Box:[631 863 655 897],entity:other}{text:"CONVFORM.96 ",Box:[18 902 78 913],entity:other}  
.....

These are the information extracted from the document through OCR, and the Box is the position of the text in the document. Please analyze where each label is generally located in the document.  
Sure, here's the general analysis of where each label (header, question, answer, and other) is located in the documents:  
- **Headers** generally appear at the tops of documents or sections, serving as titles or section headings.  
- **Questions** appear frequently across documents, typically left-aligned, serving as prompts or data requests.  
- **Answers** are located next to or beneath questions they respond to, filling in requested information.  
- **Other** includes content that doesn't fit neatly into the previous categories, like page numbers, document identifiers, etc.

This spatial layout helps in understanding the document's structure and can aid in automating tasks like data extraction or form filling.

Q:{text:"DIRECT ACCOUNTS AND CHAINS HEADQUARTERED OUTSIDE THE REGION (15+ STORES) STOCKING NO MAVERICK SPECIALS MENTHOL",Box:[11 548 390 578]}{text:"NAME OF ACCOUNT",Box:[21 588 125 605]}{text:"IND LOR VOLUME",Box:[145 577 190 604]}{text:"NO. OF STORES",Box:[214 577 258 604]}{text:"NAME OF ACCOUNT",Box:[293 590 397 605]}{text:"IND LOR VOLUME",Box:[421 577 470 604]}{text:"NO. OF STORES",Box:[488 577 532 604]}{text:"Coastal Mart (210- 06)",Box:[14 608 113 622]}{text:"31",Box:[233 611 250 621]}{text:"\_7-Eleven ",Box:[280 608 362 625]}{text:"25",Box:[503 609 517 620]}{text:"Conoco (524- 10)",Box:[14 626 91 643]}{text:"17",Box:[235 629 250 640]}{text:"Dairy Mart (417- 47)",Box:[14 644 105 664]}{text:"Emro (411- 07)",Box:[14 664 81 682]}{text:"15",Box:[235 647 250 660]}{text:"39",Box:[233 667 251 678]}{text:"EZ Serve (810 76B)",Box:[14 683 105 700]}{text:"25",Box:[235 686 250 697]}{text:"CVS- Revco (014- 20)",Box:[14 703 113 718]}{text:"Rite Aid (209- 07)",Box:[16 721 93 738]}{text:"Walgreen (625- 60)",Box:[13 741 101 756]}{text:"Walmart (527- 35)",Box:[13 760 97 775]}{text:"460",Box:[233 704 253 715]}{text:"79",Box:[236 722 251 733]}{text:"17",Box:[236 742 250 753]}{text:"112",Box:[235 760 256 774]}{text:"81619511",Box:[666 706 886 814]}{text:"MAVPROG.XLS",Box:[34 855 97 868]}{text:"Page1 of 3 Pages",Box:[528 850 630 868]}, What are the labels for these texts?

A:{text:"DIRECT ACCOUNTS AND CHAINS HEADQUARTERED OUTSIDE THE REGION (15+ STORES) STOCKING NO MAVERICK SPECIALS MENTHOL",Box:[11 548 390 578],entity:header}{text:"NAME OF ACCOUNT",Box:[21 588 125 605],entity:question}{text:"IND LOR VOLUME",Box:[145 577 190 604],entity:question}{text:"NO. OF STORES",Box:[214 577 258 604],entity:question}{text:"NAME OF ACCOUNT",Box:[293 590 397 605],entity:question}{text:"IND LOR VOLUME",Box:[421 577 470 604],entity:question}{text:"NO. OF STORES",Box:[488 577 532 604],entity:question}{text:"Coastal Mart (210- 06)",Box:[14 608 113 622],entity:answer}{text:"31",Box:[233 611 250 621],entity:answer}{text:"\_7-Eleven ",Box:[280 608 362 625],entity:answer}{text:"25",Box:[503 609 517 620],entity:answer}{text:"Conoco (524- 10)",Box:[14 626 91 643],entity:answer}{text:"17",Box:[235 629 250 640],entity:answer}{text:"Dairy Mart (417- 47)",Box:[14 644 105 664],entity:answer}{text:"Emro (411- 07)",Box:[14 664 81 682],entity:answer}{text:"15",Box:[235 647 250 660],entity:answer}{text:"39",Box:[233 667 251 678],entity:answer}{text:"EZ Serve (810 76B)",Box:[14 683 105 700],entity:answer}{text:"25",Box:[235 686 250 697],entity:answer}{text:"CVS- Revco (014- 20)",Box:[14 703 113 718],entity:answer}{text:"Rite Aid (209- 07)",Box:[16 721 93 738],entity:answer}{text:"Walgreen (625- 60)",Box:[13 741 101 756],entity:answer}{text:"Walmart (527- 35)",Box:[13 760 97 775],entity:answer}{text:"460",Box:[233 704 253 715],entity:answer}{text:"79",Box:[236 722 251 733],entity:answer}{text:"17",Box:[236 742 250 753],entity:answer}{text:"112",Box:[235 760 256 774],entity:answer}{text:"81619511",Box:[666 706 886 814],entity:other}{text:"MAVPROG.XLS",Box:[34 855 97 868],entity:other}{text:"Page1 of 3 Pages",Box:[528 850 630 868],entity:other}  
.....

Q:{text:"TO:",Box:[17 17 39 29]}{text:"K. A. Sparrow",Box:[168 11 247 29]}{text:"SUBMISSION DATE",Box:[490 10 633 30]}{text:"FROM:",Box:[12 49 58 64]}{text:"D. J. Landro",Box:[169 46 236 64]}{text:"MAY 12",Box:[407 48 455 63]}{text:"AUG 4",Box:[525 46 566 66]}{text:"JUN 23",Box:[403 79 457 98]}{text:"SEP 15",Box:[519 76 570 96]}{text:"SUBJECT:",Box:[16 116 76 130]}{text:"OLD GOLD MENTHOL LIGHTS & ULTRA LIGHTS 100'S PROGRESS REPORT",Box:[168 112 602 130]}{text:"GEOGRAPHY",Box:[129 164 221 179]}, What are the labels for these texts?

Figure A9: An example of SAIL prompt for FUNSD dataset. Pink: candidate labels illustration ( $C_{cl}$ ), orange: entity-level text demonstrations ( $C_{et}$ ), green: layout demonstrations ( $C_l$ ), blue: entity-level text demonstrations ( $C_{de}$ ), purple: test question.

**Label:**  
MENU.NM : name of menu  
MENU.NUM : identification of menu  
MENU.UNITPRICE : unit price of menu  
MENU.CNT : quantity of menu  
MENU.DISCOUNTPRICE : discounted price of menu  
MENU.PRICE : total price of menu  
MENU.ITEMSUBTOTAL : price of each menu after discount applied  
MENU.VATYN : whether the price includes tax or not  
MENU.ETC : others  
MENU.SUB.NM : name of submenu  
MENU.SUB.UNITPRICE : unit price of submenu  
MENU.SUB.CNT : quantity of submenu  
MENU.SUB.PRICE : total price of submenu  
.....

**Sample text and corresponding label:**  
{text:"CABE KERITING CURA",Box:[28 299 452 343],entity:MENU.NM}  
{text:"KWE BUN SAPI",Box:[10 17 393 50],entity:MENU.NM}

Document:{text:"TENNIS TOURNAMENT",Box:[14 559 224 576],entity:question}{text:"(Ladies & Men) . . . Friday, August 16, starting time is 3:00 P. M.",Box:[195 560 553 595],entity:answer}{text:"I will participate in the Tennis Tournament I would classify myself as (please check appropriate box)",Box:[14 626 521 656],entity:question}{text:"<> Beginner",Box:[15 670 133 686],entity:question}{text:"<> Fair",Box:[15 687 96 700],entity:question}{text:"<> Good",Box:[17 701 98 714],entity:question}{text:"<> Excellent",Box:[17 716 142 729],entity:question}{text:"NAME",Box:[15 762 54 775],entity:question}{text:"FIRM NAME",Box:[15 793 97 806],entity:question}{text:"NSAWMD, INC. 211 EAST 43RD STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10017-4707",Box:[39 870 574 885],entity:question}{text:"A",Box:[631 863 655 897],entity:other}{text:"CONVFORM.96 ",Box:[18 902 78 913],entity:other}  
.....

These are the information extracted from the document through OCR, and the Box is the position of the text in the document. Please analyze where each label is generally located in the document.  
Based on the provided document, here's an analysis of where each label is generally located:

1. MENU.NM (name of menu): The name of the menu is located under the "MENU.NM" label, which appears in the first three documents.
2. MENU.NUM (identification of menu): The identification of the menu is located under the "MENU.NUM" label, which appears in the first three documents.
3. MENU.UNITPRICE (unit price of menu): The unit price of the menu is located under the "MENU.UNITPRICE" label, which appears in the first three documents.
4. MENU.CNT (quantity of menu): The quantity of the menu is located under the "MENU.CNT" label, which appears in the first three documents.
5. MENU.DISCOUNTPRICE (discounted price of menu): The discounted price of the menu is not present in the provided document.
6. MENU.PRICE (total price of menu): The total price of the menu is located under the "MENU.PRICE" label, which appears in the first three documents.
7. MENU.ITEMSUBTOTAL (price of each menu after discount applied): The price of each menu after discount applied is not present in the provided document.

.....

Q:{text:"SB 1 HC",Box:[81 10 193 34]}{text:"27,727",Box:[486 19 574 39]}{text:"1",Box:[10 10 21 28]}{text:"CHARGE TA",Box:[81 33 220 59]}{text:"909",Box:[524 41 570 61]}{text:"1",Box:[10 34 21 53]}{text:"Sub Total 28,636",Box:[241 85 572 110]}{text:"P.Rest 10 % 2,864",Box:[209 156 577 184]}{text:"Total 31,500",Box:[294 211 580 250]}{text:"Cash 50,000",Box:[308 246 583 274]}{text:"<embali 18,500",Box:[267 295 586 323]}{text:"2 Items,",Box:[54 396 174 419]}, What are the labels for these texts?  
A:{text:"SB 1 HC",Box:[81 10 193 34],entity:MENU.NM}{text:"27,727",Box:[486 19 574 39],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"1",Box:[10 10 21 28],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"CHARGE TA",Box:[81 33 220 59],entity:MENU.NM}{text:"909",Box:[524 41 570 61],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"1",Box:[10 34 21 53],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"Sub Total 28,636",Box:[241 85 572 110],entity:SUB\_TOTAL.SUBTOTAL\_PRICE}{text:"P.Rest 10 % 2,864",Box:[209 156 577 184],entity:SUB\_TOTAL.SUBTOTAL\_PRICE}{text:"Total 31,500",Box:[294 211 580 250],entity:TOTAL\_TOTAL\_PRICE}{text:"Cash 50,000",Box:[308 246 583 274],entity:TOTAL.CASHPRICE}{text:"<embali 18,500",Box:[267 295 586 323],entity:TOTAL.CHANGEPRICE}{text:"2 Items,",Box:[54 396 174 419],entity:TOTAL.MENUQTY\_CNT}

Q:{text:"TRAD KY TOAST CARTE",Box:[10 15 350 37]}{text:"28.182",Box:[512 10 633 29]}{text:"1.00",Box:[276 40 352 60]}{text:"SUBTTL 28.182",Box:[15 59 633 83]}{text:"PB-1 10% 2.818",Box:[15 83 633 105]}{text:"TOTAL 31.000",Box:[19 108 631 129]}{text:"CASH 31.000",Box:[19 131 631 152]}, What are the labels for these texts?  
A:{text:"TRAD KY TOAST CARTE",Box:[10 15 350 37],entity:MENU.NM}{text:"28.182",Box:[512 10 633 29],entity:MENU.PRICE}{text:"1.00",Box:[276 40 352 60],entity:MENU.CNT}{text:"SUBTTL 28.182",Box:[15 59 633 83],entity:SUB\_TOTAL.SUBTOTAL\_PRICE}{text:"PB-1 10% 2.818",Box:[15 83 633 105],entity:SUB\_TOTAL.SUBTOTAL\_PRICE}{text:"TOTAL 31.000",Box:[19 108 631 129],entity:TOTAL\_TOTAL\_PRICE}{text:"CASH 31.000",Box:[19 131 631 152],entity:TOTAL.CASHPRICE}

Q:{text:"TO:",Box:[17 17 39 29]}{text:"K. A. Sparrow",Box:[168 11 247 29]}{text:"SUBMISSION DATE",Box:[490 10 633 30]}{text:"FROM:",Box:[12 49 58 64]}{text:"D. J. Landro",Box:[169 46 236 64]}{text:"MAY 12",Box:[407 48 455 63]}{text:"AUG 4",Box:[525 46 566 66]}{text:"JUN 23",Box:[403 79 457 98]}{text:"SEP 15",Box:[519 76 570 96]}{text:"SUBJECT:",Box:[16 116 76 130]}{text:"OLD GOLD MENTHOL LIGHTS & ULTRA LIGHTS 100'S PROGRESS REPORT",Box:[168 112 602 130]}{text:"GEOGRAPHY",Box:[129 164 221 179]}, What are the labels for these texts?

Figure A10: An example of SAIL prompt for CORD dataset. Pink: candidate labels illustration ( $C_{cl}$ ), orange: entity-level text demonstrations ( $C_{et}$ ), green: layout demonstrations ( $C_l$ ), blue: entity-level text demonstrations ( $C_{dt}$ ), purple: test question.

Label:  
"company", "address", "date", "total"

Sample text and corresponding label:  
{text:"YONG TAT HARDWARE TRADING",Box:[29 10 345 42],entity:company}  
{text:"BEYOND BROTHERS HARDWARE",Box:[72 10 812 65],entity:company}  
{text:"BEYOND BROTHERS HARDWARE",Box:[65 10 828 59],entity:company}  
{text:"LOT 1-0-2, JLN 1/50,",Box:[280 109 606 153],entity:address}  
{text:"ORD #50 -REG #19- 18/01/2018 10:27:03",Box:[12 613 509 642],entity:date}  
{text:"JLN PUTERI 1/6,",Box:[38 217 217 247],entity:address}  
{text:"DOMINO'S PIZZA",Box:[510 93 1029 155],entity:company}  
{text:"OFF JLN GOMBAK",Box:[295 207 589 243],entity:address}  
{text:"LOT 1-0-2, JLN 1/50,",Box:[280 109 606 153],entity:address}  
{text:"JLN BESAR KEPONG",Box:[255 831 528 866],entity:address}

.....

Document:{text:"KEDAI PAPAN YEW CHUAN",Box:[133 10 728 56],entity:company}{text:"(0005583085-K)",Box:[305 55 577 95],entity:other}{text:"LOT 276 JALAN BANTING",Box:[223 102 636 138],entity:address}{text:"43800 DENGKIL, SELANGOR.",Box:[199 152 675 189],entity:address}{text:"TEL : 03-87686092",Box:[111 222 409 264],entity:other}{text:"FAX : 03-87686092",Box:[450 227 749 263],entity:other}{text:"GST ID : 000781500416",Box:[240 277 618 313],entity:other}{text:"TAX INVOICE",Box:[308 331 547 370],entity:other}{text:"BILL TO :",Box:[103 376 128 413],entity:other}{text:"SUCI ALAM JAYA TRANSPORT",Box:[14 430 526 464],entity:other}{text:"NO 1 JALAN AMAN 2",Box:[14 470 344 507],entity:other}{text:"TAMAN DESA 43800",Box:[13 513 340 552],entity:other}{text:"DENGKIL SELANGOR",Box:[13 565 363 599],entity:address}{text:"017-6057770",Box:[10 613 221 646],entity:other}{text:"DOC NO.",Box:[13 658 142 690],entity:other}{text:"",Box:[222 662 239 689],entity:other}{text:"CS00011904",Box:[255 658 457 692],entity:other}{text:"DATE: 17/04/2018",Box:[566 659 845 696],entity:date}{text:"CASHIER",Box:[10 705 139 741],entity:other}{text:"",Box:[223 712 236 738],entity:other}{text:"USER",Box:[255 708 352 742],entity:other}{text:"TIME: 10:50:00",Box:[567 709 809 745],entity:other}{text:"SALESPERSON",Box:[10 755 202 798],entity:other}{text:"",Box:[220 767 239 791],entity:other}{text:"REF.",Box:[577 760 657 799],entity:other}{text:"ITEM",Box:[11 863 75 893],entity:other}{text:"QTY",Box:[253 861 307 900],entity:other}{text:"S/PRICE",Box:[356 863 455 892],entity:other}{text:"S/PRICE",Box:[487 864 589 894],entity:other}{text:"(GST)",Box:[494 832 583 865],entity:other}

.....

These are the information extracted from the document through OCR, and the Box is the position of the text in the document. Please analyze where each label is generally located in the document.  
In both documents, the company name and address are typically located at the top of the document. The date is usually found towards the middle of the document, below the company information. The total amount, including the total sales, GST, and change, is located towards the bottom of the document. Other information such as document number, cashier details, item details, and GST summary are spread throughout the document but are generally found in the middle section.

Q:{text:"SYARIKAT PERNIAGAAN GIN KEE",Box:[62 10 812 65]}{text:"(81109-A)",Box:[354 72 518 109]}{text:"NO 290, JALAN AIR PANAS",Box:[212 112 655 152]}{text:"SETAPAK",Box:[346 160 525 205]}{text:"53200, KUALA LUMPUR",Box:[232 209 638 251]}{text:"TEL : 03-40210276",Box:[291 256 597 306]}{text:"GST ID : 000750673920",Box:[241 321 624 356]}{text:"SIMPLIFIED TAX INVOICE",Box:[209 366 670 413]}{text:"CASH",Box:[12 441 127 483]}{text:"DOC NO.",Box:[17 496 146 531]}{text:"CASHIER",Box:[15 541 154 586]}.....{text:"0.00",Box:[650 1273 737 1313]}{text:"TOTAL GST :",Box:[371 1325 565 1367]}{text:"5.37",Box:[655 1325 742 1367]}{text:"ROUNDING :",Box:[383 1380 560 1425]}{text:"0.00",Box:[662 1385 739 1427]}{text:"TOTAL SALES (INCLUSIVE OF GST) :",Box:[47 1445 567 1482]}{text:"94.87",Box:[645 1447 735 1482]}{text:"CASH :",Box:[421 1502 565 1539]}{text:"94.87",Box:[637 1497 734 1542]}{text:"CHANGE :",Box:[398 1554 570 1591]}{text:"0.00",Box:[662 1549 744 1591]}{text:"GST SUMMARY",Box:[77 1646 366 1691]}{text:"TAX CODE",Box:[87 1714 249 1746]}{text:"%",Box:[319 1704 361 1749]}{text:"AMT(RM)",Box:[428 1706 590 1748]}{text:"TAX(RM)",Box:[640 1709 794 1749]}{text:"SR",Box:[85 1751 142 1793]}{text:"6",Box:[331 1758 356 1790]}{text:"89.50",Box:[486 1753 601 1790]}{text:"5.37",Box:[715 1756 797 1796]}{text:"TOTAL :",Box:[256 1816 388 1856]}{text:"89.50",Box:[486 1813 593 1848]}{text:"5.37",Box:[720 1815 797 1851]}{text:"GOODS SOLD ARE NOT RETURNABLE, THANK YOU.",Box:[64 1906 804 1950]}, return one company and its original address, one total, and one date?  
A:"company":{"SYARIKAT PERNIAGAAN GIN KEE"}  
"address":{"NO 290, JALAN AIR PANAS,"SETAPAK","53200, KUALA LUMPUR"}  
"date":{"DATE: 03/01/2018"}  
"total":{"94.87"}

Q:{text:"BEYOND BROTHERS HARDWARE",Box:[59 10 659 51]}{text:"LOT 1-0-2, JLN 1/50,",Box:[219 82 489 123]}{text:"(872981-V)",Box:[287 46 433 82]}{text:"DIAMOND SQUARE",Box:[225 129 493 165]}{text:"OFF JLN GOMBAK",Box:[235 165 482 201]}{text:"TEL : 03-40211233",Box:[105 242 346 279]}{text:"IVAN\_KONG12@HOTMAIL.COM",Box:[148 285 566 322]}{text:"53000 KUALA LUMPER",Box:[204 208 510 242]}{text:"FAX : 03-40223233",Box:[369 249 616 285]}{text:"GST ID : 001921974272",Box:[210 323 512 357]}{text:"TAX INVOICE",Box:[259 370 458 404]}{text:"DOC NO.",Box:[20 409 123 446]}{text:"CASHIER",Box:[14 453 126 490]}{text:"CS00059502",Box:[187 409 388 450]}.....{text:"0.00",Box:[561 1215 618 1243]}{text:"TOTAL GST :",Box:[324 1256 478 1286]}{text:"3.84",Box:[557 1260 618 1290]}{text:"ROUNDING :",Box:[328 1301 480 1338]}{text:"0.01",Box:[553 1303 616 1339]}{text:"TOTAL SALES (INCLUSIVE OF GST) :",Box:[54 1347 478 1390]}{text:"67.85",Box:[543 1353 612 1390]}{text:"CASH :",Box:[362 1402 478 1436]}{text:"70.00",Box:[541 1404 618 1438]}{text:"CHANGE :",Box:[340 1440 478 1476]}{text:"2.15",Box:[551 1445 618 1471]}{text:"GST SUMMARY",Box:[56 1520 263 1557]}{text:"TAX CODE",Box:[63 1572 185 1598]}{text:"%",Box:[255 1572 283 1600]}{text:"AMT(RM)",Box:[358 1571 477 1602]}{text:"TAX(RM)",Box:[539 1569 652 1602]}{text:"SR",Box:[58 1605 105 1635]}{text:"6",Box:[257 1607 283 1639]}{text:"TOTAL:",Box:[213 1646 301 1677]}{text:"64.00",Box:[407 1609 484 1643]}{text:"64.00",Box:[399 1646 475 1677]}{text:"3.84",Box:[594 1615 655 1647]}{text:"3.84",Box:[593 1655 650 1681]}{text:"GOODS SOLD ARE NOT RETURNABLE, THANK YOU.",Box:[43 1713 628 1751]}, return one company and its original address, one total, and one date?

Figure A11: An example of SAIL prompt for SROIE dataset. Pink: candidate labels illustration ( $C_{cl}$ ), orange: entity-level text demonstrations ( $C_{et}$ ), green: layout demonstrations ( $C_l$ ), blue: entity-level text demonstrations ( $C_{dt}$ ), purple: test question.