

# MultiOCR-QA: Dataset for Evaluating Robustness of LLMs in Question Answering on Multilingual OCR Texts

Bhawna Piryani  
bhawna.piryani@uibk.ac.at  
University of Innsbruck  
Innsbruck, Austria

Jamshid Mozafari  
jamshid.mozafari@uibk.ac.at  
University of Innsbruck  
Innsbruck, Austria

Abdelrahman Abdallah  
abdelrehman.abdallah@uibk.ac.at  
University of Innsbruck  
Innsbruck, Austria

Antoine Doucet  
antoine.doucet@univ-lr.fr  
University of La Rochelle  
La Rochelle, France

Adam Jatowt  
adam.jatowt@uibk.ac.at  
University of Innsbruck  
Innsbruck, Austria

## Abstract

Optical Character Recognition (OCR) plays a crucial role in digitizing historical and multilingual documents, yet OCR errors - imperfect extraction of the text, including character insertion, deletion and permutation- can significantly impact downstream tasks like question-answering (QA). In this work, we introduce a multilingual QA dataset MultiOCR-QA, designed to analyze the effects of OCR noise on QA systems' performance. The MultiOCR-QA dataset comprises 60K question-answer pairs covering three languages, English, French, and German. The dataset is curated from OCR-ed old documents, allowing for the evaluation of OCR-induced challenges on question answering. We evaluate MultiOCR-QA on various levels and types of OCR errors to access the robustness of LLMs in handling real-world digitization errors. Our findings show that QA systems are highly prone to OCR induced errors and exhibit performance degradation on noisy OCR text.

## CCS Concepts

• **Information systems** → **Question answering; Content analysis and feature selection.**

## Keywords

Multilingual QA, OCR Text, Large Language Models

## ACM Reference Format:

Bhawna Piryani, Jamshid Mozafari, Abdelrahman Abdallah, Antoine Doucet, and Adam Jatowt. 2018. MultiOCR-QA: Dataset for Evaluating Robustness of LLMs in Question Answering on Multilingual OCR Texts. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (SIGIR '25)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).  
*SIGIR '25, Padova, IT*

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.  
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06  
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction


Optical Character Recognition (OCR) technology has played a crucial role in preserving and providing access to historical texts. Over the past decade, significant advancements in OCR have improved text recognition accuracy, leading to the development of large-scale digital libraries of historical texts [33]. These libraries serve as valuable resources for researchers, historians, and the general public, granting access to old manuscripts, newspapers, and other archival materials. Historical documents hold a wealth of knowledge, offering insights into past events, cultures, and people. Many professionals such as historians, journalists, or sociologists rely on these collections for various research and analysis tasks.

Historical corpora have been widely used for numerous natural language processing (NLP) tasks, including Named Entity Recognition (NER), topic modeling, text classification, neural ranking, and understanding semantic changes in language over time [7, 8, 20, 31, 39]. Among these, question answering (QA) provides a direct approach to extracting precise and relevant information from historical texts. Unlike broader text-processing tasks, QA focuses on retrieving specific answers to user queries, making it an essential tool for efficiently accessing historical knowledge.

Despite the advancements in OCR technology, several challenges persist. OCR-generated text, referred as **RawOCR text** in this paper, often contains errors due to the degraded conditions of historical documents. Factors like faded ink and paper, irregular fonts, physical damage, and printing inconsistencies cause recognition errors that negatively impact downstream NLP tasks such as information retrieval, machine translation, and QA systems. Since QA models heavily depend on the quality of the input text, errors in raw OCR text can significantly affect the accuracy and reliability of generated answers.

For instance, in German, a passage with OCR error "*Der Bericht der Lagsatzungsgesandtschaft wird verlesen und von Hrn. Bürgermeistert Mousson als erstem Gesandten des Standes Zürich mit einigen Bemerkungen begleitet.*"<sup>1</sup> contains multiple insertion, deletion, and substitution errors, such as "*Lagsatzungsgesandtschaft*" (should be "*Tagsatzungsgesandtschaft*") and "*Bürgermeistet*" (should be "*Bürgermeister*"). When a QA model encounters such a noisy OCR text, it may generate an incorrect answer. For example, given the question: "*Wer hat den Bericht der Tagsatzungsgesandtschaft verlesen?*" (Who

<sup>1</sup>English Translation: The report of the legislative mission is read out and accompanied by a few comments from Mr. Mayor Mousson, the first envoy of the Zurich state.



**Figure 1: An example of CorrectedOCR and RawOCR text from the MultiOCR dataset for the English language, highlighting different types of errors along with questions corresponding to this text. WER and CER denote Word Error Rate and Character Error Rate, respectively, indicating the level of errors in the text. The green highlights represent insertion errors, where IEO denotes Insertion Edit Operations - the number of insertions needed to transform RawOCR into CorrectedOCR. Similarly, red and blue highlights indicate deletion and substitution errors, with DEO and SEO representing Deletion Edit Operations and Substitution Edit Operations, respectively. The black boxes with numbers in the CorrectedOCR and RawOCR text correspond to the answers for each question in the paragraph.**

read the report of the parliamentary delegation?) the model incorrectly responds "Der Bericht der Tagsatzungsgesandtschaft wurde von Hr. Bürgermeister Mousson verlesen." (The report of the parliamentary delegation was read out by Mr. Mayor Mousson.) which retains the OCR error and potentially misleads the QA system. This example highlights how even minor OCR errors can significantly affect QA accuracy, leading to misleading or incorrect answers.

Although extensive research has focused on improving OCR accuracy and post-processing correction techniques, the specific impact of OCR noise on QA tasks remains underexplored. Previous studies have examined challenges related to OCR in information retrieval (IR) [4], historical text processing [26], and entity recognition [11]. However, a systematic investigation of how OCR errors affect QA model performance is still lacking. Additionally, although large language models (LLMs) have been increasingly used to process OCR text, [22, 34], their robustness in handling QA tasks with noisy OCR text remains an open research question.

In this paper, we address the critical gap in understanding how large language models (LLMs) perform in question-answering (QA) tasks when dealing with noisy OCR-generated text. Specifically, we analyze the robustness of LLMs in QA tasks using RawOCR text and introduce MultiOCR-QA<sup>2</sup>, a new multilingual QA dataset constructed from the ICDAR dataset, covering English, French, and German. This dataset includes both **RawOCR text** (OCR-generated text with errors) and **CorrectedOCR text** (ground truth), allowing a direct comparison of QA performance under different text quality conditions. To generate contextually relevant question-answer pairs from historical text excerpts, we leverage instruction-fine-tuned LLMs. We then systematically evaluate the impact of different

<sup>2</sup>The dataset is freely available at: <https://github.com/DataScienceUIBK/MultiOCR-QA>


types of OCR errors—insertions, deletions, and substitutions—on QA model performance, offering new insights into the strengths and limitations of LLMs when processing noisy historical data. Figure 1 illustrates an example from the MultiOCR-QA dataset, showcasing various OCR errors and their impact on text accuracy. It presents QA pairs and responses using both CorrectedOCR and RawOCR text as context, demonstrating the effects of OCR noise on QA performance.

In summary, we make the following contributions in this work:

- We introduce MultiOCR-QA, a new multilingual QA dataset from historical texts in English, French, and German, featuring both raw and corrected OCR text, allowing direct comparison under varying text quality conditions.
- Using MultiOCR-QA, we then conduct a comprehensive evaluation of LLM robustness against noisy OCR text analyzing their impact on QA performance.
- We also categorize different types and levels of OCR errors, evaluating their individual impact on QA performance, providing insights into how LLMs handle OCR-related challenges for different types of error.

## 2 Related Work

Optical Character Recognition (OCR) technology has significantly contributed to the digitization of historical documents, enabling large-scale access to printed and handwritten archives. However, the accuracy of OCR output is highly dependent on factors such as document quality, font variations, language complexity, and historical text degradation. Early studies on OCR error analysis



**Figure 2: The Pipeline for MultiOCR-QA generation: Arrows represent the output quantity based on the number of documents and callouts illustrate the statistics for English, French and German Language. Ps and QAs denote the number of paragraphs and question-answer pairs, respectively. Note, to supplement the data for English Language 10,000 questions from ChronicingAmericaQA were included.**

focused primarily on measuring character- and word-level error rates to assess their impact on text-based applications [15, 26].

Researchers have extensively studied the limitations of OCR for historical documents and its impact on information retrieval (IR). Croft et al. [3] and Traub et al. [35] examined how OCR errors reduce retrieval effectiveness. Chiron et al. [2] found that 7% of the relevant documents were missed due to OCR misrecognition, demonstrating the risk of failure in matching noisy texts to user queries. While these studies highlight OCR challenges, they focus primarily on document retrieval and not on question answering (QA), which requires a more fine-grained understanding of text.

Beyond IR, OCR errors have been studied in multiple tasks, including named entity recognition (NER) [12, 14], entity linking [21], text classification [37, 43], topic modeling [25, 42], document summarization [18], machine translation [9, 19], and document ranking [10]. OCR noise has been shown to significantly degrade performance across these tasks. For instance, van Strien et al. [36] demonstrated that low-quality documents negatively impact multiple tasks, including dependency parsing and sentence segmentation. Hamdi et al. [13] found that 80.75% of the named entities were misrecognized due to OCR errors, causing substantial drops in accuracy. Similarly, Hamdi et al. [14] reported that the F1-score for NER drops from 90% to 50% when the character error rate increases from 2% to 30%. In topic modeling, Mutuvi et al. [25] showed that OCR noise distorts the identification of key topics. For document retrieval, de Oliveira et al. [4] analyzed performance degradation at different OCR error rates, noting that retrieval effectiveness begins to decline at a word error rate of 5% and worsens as the error rate increases. Giamphy et al. [10] further examined the impact of different types of OCR noise on document ranking and advocated for developing more robust ranking methodologies.

Despite these insights into OCR’s effects on IR and NLP tasks, research on its impact on question answering remains limited. In the context of historical document collections, the only existing QA dataset, ChronicingAmericaQA [27], focuses primarily on creating a QA dataset from historical newspapers rather than systematically analyzing how different types of OCR errors affect QA performance. While studies on document retrieval and IR highlight OCR-related challenges, a comprehensive investigation into QA performance under different types and severity levels of OCR errors is still lacking. Our work fills this gap by introducing a multilingual QA dataset

(MultiOCR-QA) and providing a detailed evaluation of large language models (LLMs) on the raw OCR text of MultiOCR-QA.

### 3 Methodology

To systematically investigate the impact of OCR errors on QA systems, we constructed MultiOCR-QA, a new multilingual QA dataset derived from historical texts processed with OCR. This section details the two main stages of the dataset creation pipeline: Data Collection and Question-Answer Generation. Figure 2 provides an overview of this process.

#### 3.1 Data Collection

In this section, we describe the process of collecting documents to generate question-and-answer pairs to carry out our study. We utilized the ICDAR 2019 POST-OCR Text Correction dataset<sup>3</sup> [29] as our primary historical text source. We selected this dataset as it contains CorrectedOCR text (Ground Truth Text) along with RawOCR text. The dataset contains 22 million OCR-processed characters and corresponding ground truth text for ten European languages (English, French, German, Finnish, Spanish, Dutch, Czech, Bulgarian, Slovak, and Polish). In our study, we focused on English, French, and German.

**Language Specific Data Collection:** We extracted text in these three languages from the ICDAR 2019 dataset. The texts originally came from various historical document repositories.

- **English:** The documents for the English language in the ICDAR 2019 dataset are sourced from IMPACT - British Library, comprising a total of 150 files.
- **French:** For the French language, the ICDAR 2019 dataset provides a collection from three sources: the HIMANIS<sup>4</sup> Project, IMPACT - National Library of France, and the RECEIPT<sup>5</sup> dataset. The original dataset contained 2,800 files.
- **German:** The German-language dataset includes the OCR-processed text from multiple sources, such as, front pages of the Swiss newspaper NZZ<sup>6</sup>, IMPACT - German National

<sup>3</sup><https://sites.google.com/view/icdar2019-postcorrectionocr>

<sup>4</sup><https://www.himanis.org>

<sup>5</sup><http://findit.univ-lr.fr/>

<sup>6</sup><https://zenodo.org/records/3333627>

Library, GT4Hist-dta19 dataset, GT4Hist - EarlyModern-Latin, GT4Hist - Kallimachos, GT4Hist - RefCorpus-ENHG-Incunabula, and GT4Hist - RIDGES-Fraktur<sup>7</sup> [30]. The German dataset in ICDAR 2019 originally contained 10,032 files.

**Language Verification and Filtering:** Prior to QA pair generation, we preprocessed the ICDAR dataset to ensure that each document contains text in the correct target language. We applied langdetect<sup>8</sup> library to detect the language of documents. The analysis revealed that some documents labeled as English, French and German were actually in other languages, particularly Latin. To maintain dataset integrity, we removed non-target language documents, resulting in the following reductions: We removed non-English documents, reducing the number of documents in the English dataset to 141. Similarly, we discarded non-French documents, reducing the dataset to 1,713 French-language files, and eliminating 1,086 Latin-language files. Finally, for German, we removed Latin or other non-German files and retained a total of 9,075 German-language files.

Furthermore, the ICDAR dataset, originally intended for post-OCR correction, contained special alignment symbols (e.g., @, #) to map the RawOCR text to its ground-truth counterpart. We removed the alignment symbols from the ground-truth text before generating questions. We also excluded files where the ground-truth text was missing, resulting in the removal of 16 files for English, 3 files for French, and none for German. This preprocessing step ensured that all QA pairs were generated from text that had both CorrectedOCR text and RawOCR text<sup>9</sup>.

### 3.2 Question-Answer Generation

To construct the multilingual QA dataset, we opted for automatic QA pair generation, as manual dataset creation would require substantial human resources. To achieve this, we instruction fine-tuned a pretrained LLM for each target language to generate QA pairs from CorrectedOCR text.

While LLMs are pretrained on diverse NLP tasks, they typically generate a variety of question types, including non-factoid and open-ended questions. Since our goal is to develop a factoid QA dataset, we fine-tuned the models using language-specific QA datasets to ensure the generation of structured, precise, and factual question-answer pairs.

Instruction fine-tuning enhances both the capabilities and controllability of LLMs [41]. Fine-tuning instruction-based datasets across multiple languages allows the model to generalize across different question-answering styles, ensuring that the generated questions remain relevant even when dealing with language-specific variations. We opted to finetune Llama-3.1-70B instruct model [6] separately for each language using widely adopted QA datasets.

For fine-tuning the model in English, we used the SQuAD v1 dataset [28]. We randomly selected 2,067 paragraphs and 10,570 questions from the development set and 3,000 paragraphs and 13,894 questions from the test set. In total, we fine-tuned the LLaMA-3.1-70B instruct model for English QA dataset generation using

5,067 paragraphs and 24,464 questions. Similarly, for the French language, we fine-tuned the model on the FQuAD dataset [5], utilizing both the validation and training sets, comprising 5,689 paragraphs and 23,919 questions. For the German language, we fine-tuned the model on the GermanQuAD dataset [24] using the training and validation sets, which consisted of 3,014 paragraphs and 13,722 questions. This fine-tuning step ensured that the model accurately generated factoid-style QA pairs, reducing instances of open-ended or conversational questions.

After instruction fine-tuning, we used the fine-tuned model for each language to generate questions for the preprocessed dataset prepared in the initial step. To systematically generate high-quality QA pairs, we employed a **two-step prompt-based approach**: Answer Extraction and Question Generation for the Extracted Answers.

**Answer Extraction:** The model was first prompted to extract multiple candidate answer spans from a given passage. These spans included entities, numbers, dates, locations, and key phrases that could serve as factual answers. The following prompt was used for the extraction of the candidate answer.

#### English Answer Extraction Prompt

**System:** You are an expert at extracting key information from text. Your goal is to identify spans of text that are likely to serve as answers to potential questions based on the input passage. Focus on meaningful, distinct, and diverse snippets such as entities, nouns, verbs, adjectives, numbers, dates, and phrases. Avoid redundancy and ensure the answers are diverse, representing key information in the passage.

**User:** Given the passage below, extract several candidate spans that are likely to be answers to potential questions. Write only the extracted answers, separated by a semicolon (;). Passage : {context}

After generating the candidate answers, we checked for duplicated answer spans. If the answers were duplicate, we removed them and retained only unique answers. This prompt was applied uniformly across all three languages, with translations adapted to each language.

**Question Generation:** Following answer extraction, the extracted answer spans were re-fed into the model, and it was prompted to generate questions that align with each answer while maintaining contextual relevance. The generated questions were structured to be standalone, well-formed, and factually grounded in the passage. The following Prompt was used for Question Generation from the Extracted Answers.

#### English Question Generation Prompt

**System:** You are an expert at generating standalone questions based on the provided passage. Your goal is to create a clear, relevant, and self-contained question that aligns with the information in the passage. The question should not explicitly reference the passage or require additional information to be understandable. Ensure the question is concise, well-structured, and meaningful.

**User:** Based on the passage below, please generate a question that is relevant to the information provided. The question should be standalone, clear, and understandable without referencing the passage directly. The answer to the question should be [answer]. Passage : {context}

Using this approach, we generated 941 questions for English, 10,522 questions for French, and 44,607 questions for German.

<sup>7</sup><https://zenodo.org/records/1344132>

<sup>8</sup><https://github.com/Mimino666/langdetect>

<sup>9</sup>We will sometimes use CorrectedOCR and RawOCR to denote the text that was subject to post-OCR error correction and one without such correction, respectively.

**Table 1: Basic statistics of the MultiOCR-QA dataset, including question-answer (QA) pair count, paragraph count, and average text lengths across languages.**

	English	French	German
#QA pairs	10,875	10,004	39,200
#Paragraphs	6,525	1,670	9,075
Average Corrected OCR paragraph length (words)	219.09	297.53	212.86
Average Raw OCR paragraph length (words)	233.25	335.73	193.23
Average question length (words)	10.98	8.73	8.08
Average answer length (words)	2.05	3.12	5.63
Average questions per paragraph	1.67	5.99	4.32

**Dataset Filtering:** After generating the dataset for each language, we applied additional filtering steps to ensure quality and consistency. Specifically, we removed questions that did not end with a question mark, duplicate questions, and questions with excessively long answers. Since LLM-generated datasets may contain hallucinated long answers, we applied this additional filtering by removing excessively long answers.

As a result, we removed 66 questions for English Language, 530 questions for French Language, and 7,210 questions for German Language. This final filtering step ensured that the MultiOCR-QA dataset consisted of concise, well-structured, and factually accurate question-answer pairs.

## 4 Dataset Analysis

After applying all the filtering steps, we obtained the final dataset, comprising 50,079 question-answer pairs. Due to the relatively low number of English-language documents in the ICDAR 2019 dataset, the initial MultiOCR-QA dataset contained only 875 QA pairs for English. To balance the distribution of QA pairs across languages, we incorporated 10,000 additional QA pairs from the *ChroniclingAmericaQA* dataset [27]. That dataset, sourced from the American historical newspaper collection called *Chronicling America*<sup>10</sup>, spans over 120 years from 1800-1920. It includes both ground-truth and RawOCR text, making it particularly relevant to our study. Consequently, the final MultiOCR-QA dataset consists of documents from historical newspapers, books, and centuries-old scripts, with 10,875 QA pairs in English, 10,004 in French, and 39,200 in German. The dataset statistics, including average paragraph length, question length, and answer length, are presented in Table 1.

### 4.1 Quantifying and Filtering OCR Noise

To assess the impact of OCR noise on QA quality, we quantified the noise level in the RawOCR text using two standard metrics: Character Error Rate (CER) and Word Error Rate (WER). CER measures the proportion of character-level errors in the raw OCR text compared to the ground truth text. It is computed as the number of insertions, deletions, and substitutions (including spaces) required to transform the RawOCR text into its correct form. WER quantifies word-level discrepancies, representing the proportion of words that require modifications (insertions, deletions, or substitutions) to match ground truth text. Both CER and WER were computed using the Levenshtein distance [23], which determines the minimum number of edits needed to correct the OCR-generated text.

<sup>10</sup><https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/about/>

**Table 2: OCR Error Statistics across Languages**

Metric	English	French	German
<b>Character Error Rate (CER)</b>			
Mean	0.0988	0.0519	0.2816
Median	0.0826	0.0440	0.2592
<b>Word Error Rate (WER)</b>			
Mean	0.2587	0.1904	0.8713
Median	0.2319	0.1760	0.8730
<b>Edit Operations</b>			
Mean Substitutions	74.66	31.51	240.23
Median Substitutions	61.00	21.00	230.50
Median Deletions	11.74	41.09	85.09
Median Deletions	7.00	25.00	39.00
Median Insertions	39.02	20.90	82.60
Median Insertions	30.00	11.00	80.00

A high CER but low WER suggests that errors are concentrated within a few words (e.g., spelling variations), whereas a high WER indicates distortions across multiple words, significantly affecting readability.

**Outlier Detection:** To ensure a reliable analysis, we applied the Interquartile Range (IQR) method to detect and remove outliers in CER values. Outliers were defined as CER values below  $Q1 - 1.5 * IQR$  or above  $Q3 + 1.5 * IQR$ , where  $Q1$  and  $Q3$  represent the 33th and 66th percentiles of the CER distribution, respectively, and  $IQR$  is the difference between  $Q3$  and  $Q1$ . This filtering resulted in the removal of 1,056 English, 351 French, and 2,423 German paragraphs.

Following outlier removal, we categorized the remaining paragraphs into three noise levels based on CER percentiles for each language. Documents with CER below the 33rd percentile were classified as "low noise," those between the 33rd and 66th percentiles as "medium noise", and those above the 66th percentile as "high noise." The specific CER thresholds for each category and language were as follows:

- English: Low:  $CER < 0.0618$ , Medium:  $0.0618 \leq CER < 0.1104$ , High:  $CER \geq 0.1104$
- French: Low:  $CER < 0.0357$ , Medium:  $0.0357 \leq CER < 0.0558$ , High:  $CER \geq 0.0558$
- German: Low:  $CER < 0.8489$ , Medium:  $0.8489 \leq CER < 0.8947$ , High:  $CER \geq 0.8947$

In addition to CER-based classification, we analyzed the distribution of three specific OCR error types: insertions, deletions, and substitutions. Each error type was categorized separately using a percentile-based approach, allowing for a more detailed examination of the nature and severity of OCR distortions. To further investigate OCR noise patterns, we classified insertion, deletion, and substitution errors into low, medium, and high noise levels. As illustrated in Figure 3, the distribution of these error types varies significantly across languages, reflecting differences in OCR quality and text processing challenges in English, French, and German. Additionally, Table 2 presents the statistical characteristics of the distribution of OCR error metrics across languages, including CER, WER, and edit operations, providing further insights into the OCR noise characteristics.






Figure 3: Statistics of insertion, deletion, and substitution errors for each language, categorized into low, medium, and high noise levels.

Table 3: Human evaluation results of MultiOCR-QA dataset.

Language	Question Readability	Answer Readability	Relevance	Answer Correctness
English	4.13	4.03	3.33	3.75
French	4.16	4.14	3.75	3.30
German	2.80	1.92	1.64	1.59

## 4.2 Human Evaluation

To assess the quality of the MultiOCR-QA dataset, we also conducted a manual evaluation study. A total of 100 question-answer pairs were randomly selected for evaluation from each language. We asked native speakers for each language, to rate the questions. The evaluation followed a five-point rating scale (1 to 5), where 1 indicated very poor and 5 indicated very good. The assessment was based on four key criteria: (1) Question Readability, assessing grammatical correctness and fluency; (2) Answer Readability, ensuring coherence and grammatical correctness; (3) Relevance, verifying whether the generated question aligns with the passage; and (4) Answer correctness, confirming the accuracy and completeness of the answer.

Each question was rated by an annotator, and the final scores for each criterion were averaged to obtain an overall evaluation. The results of the human evaluation are presented in Table 3. The evaluation showed high scores for both question and answer readability for the English and French language. The scores for relevance and answer correctness were moderate for these languages, indicating that most of the questions generated were contextually appropriate and that the answers provided were generally correct. But the results for German language were very low depicting that the CorrectedOCR text has a huge number of OCR errors so the errors are carried out further in the generated dataset. Such levels of errors are common when digitizing old historical texts due to the physical damage, irregular fonts, or faded ink of original document [16].

## 5 Experiments and Results

In this section, we conduct a comprehensive analysis of MultiOCR-QA from several perspectives. First, we evaluate the performance of

MultiOCR-QA across various LLMs, comparing different model families and sizes to assess their effectiveness in handling OCR-generated text. Second, we investigate the impact of OCR errors on QA performance, focusing on three primary error types: insertion errors, deletion errors, and substitution errors. By analyzing these aspects, we aim to quantify the robustness of LLMs in processing noisy OCR text and provide insights into the challenges associated with question-answering on historical documents.

### 5.1 Experimental Settings

We conducted experiments using multiple large language models (LLMs), including Qwen2.5 7B [38], LLaMa 3.1-8B [6], Gemma-2-27B [32], Mixtral 8×7B [17], LLaMA 3.3-70B [6], and Qwen2.5 72B [38]. These models span different architectures and parameter sizes, allowing for a comprehensive comparison on OCR text.

Traditionally, QA systems are evaluated using Exact Match (EM). However, these metrics can be insufficient for LLMs, as models often generate verbose responses, leading to low EM scores even when the correct answer is included in the response. To address this limitation, we evaluate MultiOCR-QA using BERTScore [40] alongside EM. Additionally, we introduce another evaluation metric, **Contains**, to better assess MultiOCR-QA performance. Contains measures the extent to which the ground truth is present in the response generated by the model, regardless of the verbosity. We will apply these metrics to evaluate the QA results on RawOCR texts and then on CorrectedOCR texts used as context.

### 5.2 Experimental Results

Tables 4, 5, and 6 present the impact of OCR errors on the performance of various LLMs in question-answering tasks for English, French, and German texts.

Table 4 presents the performance of LLMs on English text using both CorrectedOCR (CP) and RawOCR (RP) paragraphs. Across all models, the transition from CP to RP negatively impacts performance. The best-performing model on CP is Gemma-2 27B with a BERTScore of 62.90, followed by LLaMA-3.3-70B at 60.71. When switching to RP, Gemma-2 still achieves the highest BERTScore 59.70, but with a 5.09% drop, highlighting its robustness. The lowest-performing model is Mixtral 8×22B, showing the most significant

**Table 4: Performance of LLMs on English Language: Comparison Using CorrectedOCR Paragraphs (CP) and RawOCR Paragraphs (RP) as Context. Red numbers indicate the percentage decrease in performance with RP. Bold values highlight the highest performance for each metric with CP, while underlined values denote the best performance for each metric with RP.**

Model	Parameter	BERTScore	Contains	EM
Qwen-2.5 (CP)	7B	49.58	57.36	8.50
Qwen-2.5 (RP)	7B	48.24 (2.70%↓)	48.67 (15.17%↓)	7.17 (15.67%↓)
LLaMA-3.1 (CP)	8B	50.18	59.27	0.344
LLaMA-3.1 (RP)	8B	08.42 (3.51%↓)	52.03 (12.22%↓)	0.266 (22.58%↓)
Gemma-2 (CP)	27B	<b>62.90</b>	53.16	<b>19.05</b>
Gemma-2 (RP)	27B	<u>59.70</u> (5.09%↓)	49.16 (7.53%↓)	<u>14.75</u> (22.57%↓)
Mixtral (CP)	8x22B	40.81	57.89	1.92
Mixtral (RP)	8x22B	39.93 (2.16%↓)	51.37 (11.26%↓)	1.58 (17.34%↓)
LLaMA-3.3 (CP)	70B	60.71	53.39	11.22
LLaMA-3.3 (RP)	70B	59.06 (2.72%↓)	48.76 (8.67%↓)	9.15 (18.50%↓)
Qwen-2.5 (CP)	72B	49.64	<b>59.95</b>	11.53
Qwen-2.5 (RP)	72B	47.41 (4.49%↓)	<u>54.26</u> (9.48%↓)	8.79 (23.77%↓)

impact of OCR errors. Qwen-2.5 72B model achieves the best performance in CP for the Contains metric of 59.95, indicating its strong retrieval ability in clean text. However, it experiences a 9.48% drop in RP, suggesting moderate sensitivity to OCR errors. The lowest performing model in RP is again Mixtral 8×22B for Contains metric which sees an 11.26% decrease, indicating its greater vulnerability to noisy text. The Exact Match (EM) metric shows the steepest decline across models, emphasizing that OCR errors severely impact the models' ability to generate precise answers.

Table 5 reports the performance of LLMs on French text, again comparing CorrectedOCR and RawOCR paragraphs. The same as in English, the models perform better with CorrectedOCR, confirming and quantifying the negative influence of OCR errors on the QA accuracy. Gemma-2 27B model achieves the highest BERTScore of 76.51 on CP, demonstrating its strong ability to capture semantic similarity. Despite the 1.46% drop, it still maintains the highest performance with a BERTScore of 75.39 on RP, indicating robustness to OCR noise. Mixtral 8×22B model shows the smallest drop of 1.05%, but its overall score remains lower than the ones for the other models. For Contains, Qwen-2.5 72B achieves the highest score on CP 57.55, highlighting superior retrieval performance on clean text. However, it experiences a 19.90% drop in RP, reinforcing its vulnerability to OCR errors. LLaMA-3.1 8B also struggles, with a 19.63% decline, showing difficulty in retrieving spans from noisy text. In terms of EM, Gemma-2 27B outperforms all models with an EM of 17.46 on CP. Although it drops by 15.23%, it still maintains the best EM value 14.80 in RP. Mixtral 8×22B model is the most affected in EM, dropping by 27.99%, suggesting that OCR noise drastically reduces its accuracy in generating exact answers.

Table 6 examines the performance of the model in the German text, revealing the most significant performance decline among the three languages. Unlike English and French, German exhibits the largest performance drop due to its lower OCR quality, and the models struggle more with its linguistic structure. Among the models evaluated, Gemma-2 27B achieves the highest BERTScore

**Table 5: Performance of LLMs on French Language: Comparison Using CorrectedOCR Paragraphs (CP) and RawOCR Paragraphs (RP) as Context. Red numbers indicate the percentage decrease in performance with RP. Bold values highlight the highest performance for each metric with CP, while underlined values denote the best performance for each metric with RP.**

Model	Parameter	BERTScore	Contains	EM
Qwen-2.5 (CP)	7B	73.12	54.82	11.38
Qwen-2.5 (RP)	7B	72.03 (1.49%↓)	42.99 (21.58%↓)	9.59 (15.75%↓)
LLaMA-3.1 (CP)	8B	70.16	51.35	0.64
LLaMA-3.1 (RP)	8B	69.30 (1.23%↓)	41.27 (19.63%↓)	0.61 (5.56%↓)
Gemma-2 (CP)	27B	<b>76.51</b>	52.58	<b>17.46</b>
Gemma-2 (RP)	27B	<u>75.39</u> (1.46%↓)	42.05 (20.02%↓)	<u>14.80</u> (15.23%↓)
Mixtral (CP)	8x22B	68.65	48.32	0.30
Mixtral (RP)	8x22B	67.93 (1.05%↓)	38.96 (19.37%↓)	0.21 (27.99%↓)
LLaMA-3.3 (CP)	70B	72.50	54.00	4.41
LLaMA-3.3 (RP)	70B	71.42 (1.49%↓)	43.22 (19.96%↓)	3.89 (11.72%↓)
Qwen-2.5 (CP)	72B	73.26	<b>57.55</b>	10.62
Qwen-2.5 (RP)	72B	71.98 (1.75%↓)	<u>46.10</u> (19.90%↓)	7.84 (26.16%↓)

**Table 6: Performance of LLMs on German Language: Comparison Using CorrectedOCR Paragraphs (CP) and RawOCR Paragraphs (RP) as Context. Red numbers indicate the percentage decrease in performance with RP. Bold values highlight the highest performance for each metric with CP, while underlined values denote the best performance for each metric with RP.**

Model	Parameter	BERTScore	Contains	EM
Qwen-2.5 (CP)	7B	62.76	15.88	0.389
Qwen-2.5 (RP)	7B	59.52 (5.16%↓)	5.33 (66.40%↓)	0.192 (50.45%↓)
LLaMA-3.1 (CP)	8B	63.87	15.36	0.457
LLaMA-3.1 (RP)	8B	58.29 (8.74%↓)	5.31 (65.37%↓)	0.135 (70.31%↓)
Gemma-2 (CP)	27B	<b>67.07</b>	11.56	<b>2.691</b>
Gemma-2 (RP)	27B	<u>63.78</u> (4.91%↓)	4.47 (61.27%↓)	<u>0.564</u> (79.04%↓)
Mixtral (CP)	8x22B	60.87	11.23	0.078
Mixtral (RP)	8x22B	58.14 (4.48%↓)	4.56 (59.37%↓)	0.021 (72.74%↓)
LLaMA-3.3 (CP)	70B	63.82	<b>17.68</b>	0.553
LLaMA-3.3 (RP)	70B	58.44 (8.43%↓)	6.24 (64.72%↓)	0.203 (63.23%↓)
Qwen-2.5 (CP)	72B	63.25	16.43	0.699
Qwen-2.5 (RP)	72B	60.04 (5.08%↓)	<u>6.50</u> (60.44%↓)	0.167 (76.02%↓)

of 67.07 on CP, confirming its strong ability to capture semantic similarity in clean text. It also maintains the best performance on RP (63.78); however, it still experiences a 4.91% decrease, highlighting the adverse effects of OCR errors. In contrast, LLaMA-3.1 8B and LLaMA-3.3 70B show the biggest BERTScore drop (8.74% and 8.43% respectively), suggesting that these models struggle more with OCR noise. For the Contains metric, LLaMA-3.3 70B achieves the highest Contains score on CP, making it the most effective for retrieving relevant information in clean text. However, all models suffer a severe drop in Contains when moving to RP, with reductions exceeding 65%. Qwen-2.5 7B has the worst drop 66.40%, indicating that it faces challenges to retrieve information from noisy text. In terms of EM, Gemma-2 27B achieves the highest EM score on CP 2.69, while Mixtral 8×22B has the lowest EM 0.078. EM scores




Figure 4: BERTScore of different error types on Low, medium and High categories for each Language in MultiOCR-QA dataset.

drop drastically across all models, the largest decrease is 79.04% for Gemma-2, reinforcing that word-level distortions from OCR errors make exact answer matching nearly impossible. The Mixtral model drops 72.74% in EM, making it highly unreliable for exact answers in noisy OCR text.

**Summary of findings:** OCR errors consistently degrade the performance of the models in English, French and German texts, resulting in maximum drop of 5.09%, 1.75%, and 8.74% in BERTScore, respectively. The most severe impact was observed in German due to the lower quality of the OCR and the complex linguistic structure. While larger models like Gemma-2 27B and LLaMA-3.3 70B demonstrate greater resilience, all models suffer substantial declines in Contains and Exact Match (EM) metrics, highlighting their weakness in retrieving and generating precise answers from noisy text. Gemma-2 27B consistently outperforms others, maintaining the highest BERTScore and EM across all languages, but still experiences notable degradation in noisy conditions. Mixtral 8×22B emerges as the most vulnerable, exhibiting the lowest absolute performance and struggling particularly with exact answer generation.

### 5.3 Performance based on Different Error Types

In this section, we conduct an in-depth analysis of the impact of different types of OCR errors. Insertion, deletion, and substitution on QA systems. We use Gemma-2 (27B) for this analysis, as it was found to consistently outperform the other models across English, French, and German. As detailed in Section 4.1, each error type is categorized into three levels: Low, Medium, and High, where Low represents minimal presence and High indicates the most

frequent occurrence of a particular type of error. We evaluated MultiOCR-QA’s performance across these categories, as illustrated in Figure 4.

Insertion errors introduce extraneous characters or words, leading to moderate performance degradation. At low and medium insertion levels, the effect on BERTScore remains relatively minor, suggesting that small insertions do not always disrupt semantic meaning. However, at high insertion levels, performance drops sharply, indicating that excessive insertions impair both readability and semantic coherence.

Deletion errors impact sentence coherence and factual consistency, especially when they corrupt or remove key words or essential contextual phrases. Although the impact is less pronounced at lower levels, it escalates sharply as the frequency of deletions increases. At higher levels of deletion error, the degradation in BERTScore is similar to that seen with substitution errors, highlighting how missing characters or words disrupt structured text.

Substitution errors exhibit the most severe impact on QA performance in English and French, causing the steepest decline in BERTScore as their frequency increases. Since these errors modify characters within words, they often alter word meaning and disrupt sentence structure, making them highly detrimental to text comprehension.

However, in German, substitution errors appear to be less disruptive than in English and French. This can be attributed to the compound word structure in German, where minor substitutions can still preserve some semantic similarity. In contrast, deletions or insertions tend to fragment meaningful lexical units, making them more impactful in German than in other languages.



**Table 7: Performance Metrics of QA Systems Using Pre-Processed and Post-Processed OCR Text. Red indicates the percentage drop in performance when using different variants of paragraph used as context, compared to Corrected Paragraph (Ground Truth).**

Approach	BERTScore	Contains	EM
Corrected Paragraph (Ground Truth)	63.99	58.09	16.76
RawOCR Paragraph	58.08 (9.24%↓)	46.20 (20.45%↓)	9.36 (44.15%↓)
LLM Corrected Paragraph	59.33 (7.28%↓)	43.08 (25.81%↓)	12.28 (26.73%↓)
RawOCR Corrected Answer	56.10 (12.33%↓)	41.33 (28.86%↓)	9.16 (45.35%↓)

**Summary of findings:** Across languages, the results reveal that English and French exhibit similar degradation patterns, with BERTScore progressively decreasing as the OCR error frequency increases. However, in German, the sharpest decline is observed across all error types, particularly for substitutions and deletions. This suggests that OCR noise in German is more detrimental, probably because the older scripts have content in old German where characters such as (long s) are used instead of "s", which can be often misread as "f" or "l".

The results indicate that *substitution errors are the most disruptive in English and French, while German is more affected by deletions* due to its compound word structure. *Insertion errors generally cause moderate degradation*, but severe performance drops occur at high error levels. Overall, *German experiences the highest performance drop*, reinforcing its greater vulnerability to OCR distortions and highlighting the need for effective OCR correction strategies.

#### 5.4 Performance based on Pre-Processed and Post-Processed OCR Text

In this section, we conduct an additional study to assess the impact of OCR on QA through pre-processing and post-processing Raw OCR text. In this experiment, we focus exclusively on paragraphs and their corresponding questions derived solely from the ICDAR dataset for the English language, comprising 83 paragraphs and 513 questions. We chose this subset of paragraphs and questions because its OCR ground truth is manually curated, offering a robust basis for comparison, unlike the CorrectedOCR text in the ChroniclingAmerica QA, which has been refined using GPT 3.5 [1]. Our approach involves two strategies: pre-processing, where RawOCR text is corrected using the Gemma-2 27B model prior to answering the questions, and post-processing, where answers generated from RawOCR text are subsequently corrected. Gemma-2 27B was used in this experiment as it is identified as the best performing model among all other LLMs as demonstrated in Section 5.2. The results for each strategy are presented in Table 7.

The results in Table 7 indicate that using ground truth paragraph as context gives better performance metrics, with a BERTScore of 63.99, Contains of 58.09, and EM of 16.76, compared to using RawOCR text or LLM corrected passage as context. The comparative analysis reveals that pre-processing the RawOCR text significantly enhances QA performance, as evidenced by higher BERTScore, Contains, and EM scores. This suggests that correcting OCR errors prior to QA processing preserves the semantic integrity of the text, thereby facilitating more accurate answer generation. However, it

shows a percentage drop of 7.28% compared to the Ground Truth BERTScore. In contrast, *post-processing the generated answer is less effective*, resulting in the highest drop of 12.33% and the lowest BertScore among others. This is likely because that approach does not include any contextual reference and leads to generation of corrected words that have limited relation to context.

These findings emphasize the *importance of integrating OCR error correction early in the QA pipeline* to improve the reliability of QA systems, especially when dealing with historical texts or other archival materials. However, given the huge collections of digitized content with vastly varying levels of OCR quality that the current memory institutions (archives, libraries, museums, etc.) held, the correction cost and effort would be enormous. It is also difficult to correct the queried texts at inference time as this would also introduce computational cost and latency in online systems. Therefore, more robust QA systems that are aware of OCR errors and capable of predicting correct answers based on contextual information are required.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce MultiOCR-QA, a multilingual question-answering dataset for historical texts processed by OCR. Our dataset is unique as it is specifically designed to assess the impact of OCR errors on QA system performance, enabling a systematic analysis of how different error types—insertions, deletions, and substitutions—affect the accuracy and robustness of large language models. By incorporating both CorrectedOCR (clean text) and RawOCR (OCR-ed text), MultiOCR-QA facilitates comparative assessments that highlight the challenges posed by OCR noise in historical document processing. Our evaluation of multiple state-of-the-art LLMs demonstrates that OCR errors significantly degrade QA performance, with the most pronounced effects observed in languages with higher OCR error rates. Although larger models such as Gemma-2 27B and Qwen-2.5 72B exhibit greater resilience to OCR noise, smaller models and low-resource QA systems show a more substantial performance drop. These findings underscore the need for OCR-aware training strategies, particularly for historical document processing and multilingual QA tasks.

**Use cases:** The MultiOCR-QA dataset offers a unique resource to advance research on OCR-aware QA and studying QA on noisy OCR text, making it useful in several ways; It can be used to train LLMs to improve error correction capabilities and enhancing robustness against OCR inaccuracies while preserving the archaic language structure. It can be also used to expand LLMs' multilingual processing abilities by training on multilingual OCR texts, improving accuracy in low-resourced languages.

**Limitations and Future work:** While MultiOCR-QA includes English, French and German, it does not encompass low resource languages or scripts such Latin, Finish and others. Future research should incorporate low-resourced languages to improve generalization and greater applicability across diverse languages. Additionally, methodologies that not only remove OCR errors but also preserve the original structure of documents could be applied.

## References

- [1] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda

- Askill, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [2] Guillaume Chiron, Antoine Doucet, Mickaël Coustaty, Muriel Visani, and Jean-Philippe Moreux. 2017. Impact of OCR errors on the use of digital libraries: towards a better access to information. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries* (Toronto, Ontario, Canada) (JCDL '17). IEEE Press, 249–252.
- [3] W Bruce Croft, SM Harding, Kazem Taghva, and Julie Borsack. 1994. An evaluation of information retrieval accuracy with simulated OCR output. In *Symposium on Document Analysis and Information Retrieval*. 115–126.
- [4] Lucas Lima de Oliveira, Danny Suarez Vargas, Antônio Marcelo Azevedo Alexandre, Fábio Corrêa Cordeiro, Diogo da Silva Magalhães Gomes, Max de Castro Rodrigues, Regis Kruehl Romeu, and Viviane Pereira Moreira. 2023. Evaluating and mitigating the impact of OCR errors on information retrieval. *Int. J. Digit. Libr.* 24, 1 (Jan. 2023), 45–62. doi:10.1007/s00799-023-00345-6
- [5] Martin d'Hoffschmidt, Wacim Belblidia, Quentin Heinrich, Tom Brendlé, and Maxime Vidal. 2020. FQuAD: French Question Answering Dataset. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 1193–1208. doi:10.18653/v1/2020.findings-emnlp.107
- [6] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [7] Maud Ehrmann, Ahmed Hamdi, Elvys Linhares Pontes, Matteo Romanello, and Antoine Doucet. 2023. Named entity recognition and classification in historical documents: A survey. *Comput. Surv. Surv.* 56, 2 (2023), 1–47.
- [8] Maud Ehrmann, Matteo Romanello, Alex Flückiger, and Simon Clematide. 2020. Overview of CLEF HIPE 2020: Named entity recognition and linking on historical newspapers. In *Experimental IR Meets Multilinguality, Multimodality, and Interaction: 11th International Conference of the CLEF Association, CLEF 2020, Thessaloniki, Greece, September 22–25, 2020, Proceedings 11*. Springer, 288–310.
- [9] Faisal Farooq<sup>1</sup>, SUNY CEDAR, and Yaser Al-Onaizan. 2005. Effect of degraded input on statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings 2005 Symposium on Document Image Understanding Technology*. UMD, 103.
- [10] Edward Giamphy, Kevin Sanchis, Gohar Dashyan, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Ahmed Hamdi, Lilian Sanselme, and Antoine Doucet. 2023. A Quantitative Analysis of Noise Impact on Document Ranking. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*. IEEE, 4612–4618.
- [11] Claire Grover, Sharon Givon, Richard Tobin, and Julian Ball. 2008. Named Entity Recognition for Digitised Historical Texts. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'08)*, Nicoletta Calzolari, Khalid Choukri, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Jan Odijk, Stelios Piperidis, and Daniel Tapias (Eds.). European Language Resources Association (ELRA), Marrakech, Morocco. <https://aclanthology.org/L08-1253/>
- [12] Ahmed Hamdi, Axel Jean-Caurant, Nicolas Sidère, Mickaël Coustaty, and Antoine Doucet. 2020. Assessing and minimizing the impact of OCR quality on named entity recognition. In *Digital Libraries for Open Knowledge: 24th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries, TPDL 2020, Lyon, France, August 25–27, 2020, Proceedings 24*. Springer, 87–101.
- [13] Ahmed Hamdi, Elvys Linhares Pontes, Nicolas Sidère, Mickaël Coustaty, and Antoine Doucet. 2022. In-Depth Analysis of the Impact of OCR Errors on Named Entity Recognition and Linking. *Journal of Natural Language Processing* (03 2022), 24. doi:10.1017/S1351324922000110
- [14] Ahmed Hamdi, Elvys Linhares Pontes, Nicolas Sidère, Mickaël Coustaty, and Antoine Doucet. 2023. In-depth analysis of the impact of OCR errors on named entity recognition and linking. *Natural Language Engineering* 29, 2 (2023), 425–448.
- [15] Mark J Hill and Simon Hengchen. 2019. Quantifying the impact of dirty OCR on historical text analysis: Eighteenth Century Collections Online as a case study. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 34, 4 (2019), 825–843.
- [16] Adam Jatowt, Mickael Coustaty, Nhu-Van Nguyen, Antoine Doucet, et al. 2019. Deep statistical analysis of OCR errors for effective post-OCR processing. In *2019 ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL)*. IEEE, 29–38.
- [17] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. 2024. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088* (2024).
- [18] Hongyan Jing, Daniel Lopresti, and Chilin Shih. 2003. Summarizing noisy documents. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Document Image Understanding Technology*. 111–119.
- [19] Huda Khayrallah and Philipp Koehn. 2018. On the Impact of Various Types of Noise on Neural Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Neural Machine Translation and Generation*, Alexandra Birch, Andrew Finch, Thang Luong, Graham Neubig, and Yusuke Oda (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia, 74–83. doi:10.18653/v1/W18-2709
- [20] Chaya Liebeskind and Shmuel Liebeskind. 2020. Deep Learning for Period Classification of Historical Hebrew Texts. *J. Data Min. Digit. Humanit.* 2020 (2020). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:225718181>
- [21] Elvys Linhares Pontes, Ahmed Hamdi, Nicolas Sidère, and Antoine Doucet. 2019. Impact of OCR quality on named entity linking. In *Digital Libraries at the Crossroads of Digital Information for the Future: 21st International Conference on Asia-Pacific Digital Libraries, ICADL 2019, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, November 4–7, 2019, Proceedings 21*. Springer, 102–115.
- [22] Gábor Madarász, Noémi Ligeti-Nagy, András Holl, and Tamás Várad. 2024. Ocr cleaning of scientific texts with llms. In *International Workshop on Natural Scientific Language Processing and Research Knowledge Graphs*. Springer Nature Switzerland Cham, 49–58.
- [23] Frederic P. Miller, Agnes F. Vandome, and John McBrewhster. 2009. *Levenshtein Distance: Information theory, Computer science, String (computer science), String metric, Damerau/Levenshtein distance, Spell checker, Hamming distance*. Alpha Press.
- [24] Timo Möller, Julian Risch, and Malte Pietsch. 2021. GermanQuAD and GermanDPR: Improving Non-English Question Answering and Passage Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Machine Reading for Question Answering*, Adam Fisch, Alon Talmor, Danqi Chen, Eunsoo Choi, Minjoon Seo, Patrick Lewis, Robin Jia, and Sewon Min (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 42–50. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.mrqa-1.4
- [25] Stepha Mutuvi, Antoine Doucet, Moses Ode, and Adam Jatowt. 2018. Evaluating the impact of OCR errors on topic modeling. In *International Conference on Asian Digital Libraries*. Springer, 3–14.
- [26] Michael Piotrowski. 2012. *Natural language processing for historical texts*. Vol. 17. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [27] Bhawna Piryani, Jamshid Mozafari, and Adam Jatowt. 2024. Chronicling AmericaQA: A Large-scale Question Answering Dataset based on Historical American Newspaper Pages. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Washington DC, USA) (SIGIR '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2038–2048. doi:10.1145/3626772.3657891
- [28] Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. SQuAD: 100,000+ Questions for Machine Comprehension of Text. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Jian Su, Kevin Duh, and Xavier Carreras (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Austin, Texas, 2383–2392. doi:10.18653/v1/D16-1264
- [29] Christophe Rigaud, Antoine Doucet, Mickaël Coustaty, and Jean-Philippe Moreux. 2019. ICDAR 2019 Competition on Post-OCR Text Correction. In *2019 International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR)*. 1588–1593. doi:10.1109/ICDAR.2019.00255
- [30] Uwe Springmann, Christian Reul, Stefanie Dipper, and Johannes Baiter. 2018. Ground Truth for training OCR engines on historical documents in German Fraktur and Early Modern Latin. *J. Lang. Technol. Comput. Linguistics* 33, 1 (2018), 97–114. [https://jclcl.org/content/2-allissues/1-heft1-2018/jclcl\\_2018-1\\_5.pdf](https://jclcl.org/content/2-allissues/1-heft1-2018/jclcl_2018-1_5.pdf)
- [31] Nishant Subramani, Alexandre Matton, Malcolm Greaves, and Adrian Lam. 2020. A survey of deep learning approaches for ocr and document understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13534* (2020).
- [32] Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. 2024. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118* (2024).
- [33] MELISSA M TERRAS. 2011. 1. THE RISE OF DIGITIZATION. *Digitisation Perspectives* (2011), 3.
- [34] Alan Thomas, Robert Gaizauskas, and Haiping Lu. 2024. Leveraging LLMs for Post-OCR Correction of Historical Newspapers. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Language Technologies for Historical and Ancient Languages (L4HALA) @ LREC-COLING-2024*, Rachele Sprugnoli and Marco Passarotti (Eds.). ELRA and ICCL, Torino, Italia, 116–121. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.l4hala-1.14/>
- [35] Myriam C Traub, Jacco Van Ossenberg, and Lynda Hardman. 2015. Impact analysis of OCR quality on research tasks in digital archives. In *Research and Advanced Technology for Digital Libraries: 19th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries, TPDL 2015, Poznań, Poland, September 14-18, 2015, Proceedings 19*. Springer, 252–263.
- [36] Daniel Alexander van Strien, Kaspar Beelen, Mariona Coll Ardanuy, Kasra Hoseini, Barbara McGillivray, and Giovanni Colavizza. 2020. Assessing the Impact of OCR Quality on Downstream NLP Tasks. In *International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:215756646>
- [37] Oxana Vitman, Yevhen Kostyuk, Paul Plachinda, Alisa Zhila, Grigori Sidorov, and Alexander Gelbukh. 2022. Evaluating the Impact of OCR Quality on Short Texts Classification Task. In *Mexican International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 163–177.
- [38] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. 2024. Qwen2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115* (2024).
- [39] Tze-I Yang, Andrew Torget, and Rada Mihalcea. 2011. Topic Modeling on Historical Newspapers. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACL-HLT Workshop on Language Technology for Cultural Heritage, Social Sciences, and Humanities*, Kalliopi Zervanou and Pirooska Lendvai (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics,

- Portland, OR, USA, 96–104. <https://aclanthology.org/W11-1513/>
- [40] Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. BARTSCORE: evaluating generated text as text generation. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS '21)*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 2088, 15 pages.
- [41] Shengyu Zhang, Linfeng Dong, Xiaoya Li, Sen Zhang, Xiaofei Sun, Shuhe Wang, Jiwei Li, Runyi Hu, Tianwei Zhang, Fei Wu, et al. 2023. Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10792* (2023).
- [42] Elaine Zosa, Stephen Mutuvi, Mark Granroth-Wilding, and Antoine Doucet. 2021. Evaluating the robustness of embedding-based topic models to OCR noise. In *Towards Open and Trustworthy Digital Societies: 23rd International Conference on Asia-Pacific Digital Libraries, ICADL 2021, Virtual Event, December 1–3, 2021, Proceedings 23*. Springer, 392–400.
- [43] Guowei Zu, Mayo Murata, Wataru Ohyama, Tetsushi Wakabayashi, and Fumitaka Kimura. 2004. The impact of OCR accuracy on automatic text classification. In *Content Computing: Advanced Workshop on Content Computing, AWCC 2004, Zhenjiang, Jiangsu, China, November 15-17, 2004, Proceedings*. Springer, 403–409.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009