

Quantifying Character Similarity with Vision Transformers

Xinmei Yang¹, Abhishek Arora², Shao-Yu Jheng², Melissa Dell^{2,3*}

¹Renmin University; Beijing, China.

²Harvard University; Cambridge, MA, USA.

³National Bureau of Economic Research; Cambridge, MA, USA.

*Corresponding author: melissadell@fas.harvard.edu.

Abstract

Record linkage is a bedrock of quantitative social science, as analyses often require linking data from multiple, noisy sources. Off-the-shelf string matching methods are widely used, as they are straightforward and cheap to implement and scale. Not all character substitutions are equally probable, and for some settings there are widely used handcrafted lists denoting which string substitutions are more likely, that improve the accuracy of string matching. However, such lists do not exist for many settings, skewing research with linked datasets towards a few high-resource contexts that are not representative of the diversity of human societies. This study develops an extensible way to measure character substitution costs for OCR’ed documents, by employing large-scale self-supervised training of vision transformers (ViT) with augmented digital fonts. For each language written with the CJK script, we contrastively learn a metric space where different augmentations of the same character are represented nearby. In this space, homoglyphic characters - those with similar appearance such as “O” and “0” - have similar vector representations. Using the cosine distance between characters’ representations as the substitution cost in an edit distance matching algorithm significantly improves record linkage compared to other widely used string matching methods, as OCR errors tend to be homoglyphic in nature. Homoglyphs can plausibly capture character visual similarity across *any* script, including low-resource settings. We illustrate this by creating homoglyph sets for 3,000 year old ancient Chinese characters, which are highly pictorial. Fascinatingly, a ViT is able to capture relationships in how different abstract concepts were conceptualized by ancient societies, that have been noted in the archaeological literature.

require linking information from multiple datasets. For example, researchers and governments link historical censuses, match hand-written records from vaccination campaigns to administrative data, and de-duplicate voter rolls. The sources to be linked often contain noise, particularly when they were created with optical character recognition (OCR). String matching methods are widely used to link entities across datasets, as they are straightforward to implement off-the-shelf and can be scaled to massive datasets (Binette and Steorts, 2022; Abramitzky et al., 2021).

Most simply, approximate string matching methods count the number of edits (insertions, deletions, and substitutions) to transform one string into another (Levenshtein et al., 1966). Another common approach computes the similarity between n -gram representations of strings, where n -grams are all substrings of length n (Okazaki and Tsujii, 2010).

In practice, not all string substitutions are equally probable, and efforts to construct lists that vary their costs date back over a century. For example, in 1918 Russell and Odell patented Soundex, a sound standardization toolkit that accounts for the fact that census enumerators often misspelled names according to their sound. Together with the updated New York State Identification and Intelligence System (Silbert, 1970), it remains a bedrock for linking U.S. historical censuses (Abramitzky et al., 2021). Similarly, Novosad (2018) adjusts Levenshtein distance to impose smaller penalties for common alternative spellings in Hindi, and the FuzzyChinese package (znwang25, 2020) uses strokes as the unit for n -grams substring representations, where the strokes for a given character are drawn from an external database (kfd, 2015) covering a subset of the CJK script. Characters sharing strokes are more likely to be matched.

Such methods can perform well in the contexts for which they are tailored but are labor-intensive to extend to new settings, due to the use of hand-

1 Introduction

Many quantitative analyses in the social sciences - as well as government and business applications -

crafted features. Low extensibility skews research with linked data - necessary to examine intergenerational mobility, the evolution of firm productivity, the persistence of poverty, and many other topics - towards a few higher resource settings that are not representative of the diversity of human societies.

This study aims to preserve the advantages of string matching methods - simple off-the-shelf implementation and high scalability - while developing an extensible, self-supervised method for determining the relative costs of character substitutions in databases created with OCR. OCR often confuses characters with their homoglyphs, which have a similar visual appearance (*e.g.* “0” and “O”). Incorporating character visual similarity into string matching can thus plausibly improve record linkage. Homoglyphs can be constructed by hand for small script sets such as Latin, as in a psychology literature on literacy acquisition (Simpson et al., 2013), but for a script such as CJK, containing over 38,000 characters, this is infeasible.

Following a literature on self-supervision through simple data augmentation for image encoders (Grill et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Chen and He, 2021), this study uses augmented digital fonts to contrastively learn a metric space where different augmentations of a character have similar vector representations. The resulting space can be used, with a reference font, to measure the visual similarity of different characters. Figure 1 shows representative examples of how the same characters are rendered very differently across fonts. These different representations form positive examples for the contrastively trained HOMOGLYPH model. This purely self-supervised approach can be extended to any character set, but since creating evaluation data for record linkage is costly, the study focuses on languages written with CJK: Simplified and Traditional Chinese, Japanese, and Korean.

We train on augmentations of the same character - rather than paired data across characters - because a self-supervised approach is more extensible. Paired character similarity data are limited. Unicode maintains a set of confusables - constructed with rule-based methods - but for CJK the only confusables are structurally identical characters with different Unicode codepoints. Despite a large post-OCR error correction literature (Lyu et al., 2021; Nguyen et al., 2021; van Strien. et al., 2020), there is also limited ground truth data about the types of errors that OCR makes across architectures, lan-

language	Example Character	Diversity of Characters Across Fonts				
		1	2	3	4	5
Japanese	畑	畑	畑	畑	畑	畑
	榊	榊	榊	榊	榊	榊
	腺	腺	腺	腺	腺	腺
Korean	난	난	난	난	난	난
	농	농	농	농	농	농
	닥	닥	닥	닥	닥	닥
Traditional Chinese	茶	茶	茶	茶	茶	茶
	梅	梅	梅	梅	梅	梅
	蕪	蕪	蕪	蕪	蕪	蕪
Simplified Chinese	职	职	职	职	职	职
	欢	欢	欢	欢	欢	欢
	钢	钢	钢	钢	钢	钢

Figure 1: **Character variation across fonts.** This figure illustrates examples of the same character rendered with different fonts. Augmentations of these comprise positives in the HOMOGLYPH training data.

guages, scripts, layouts, and document contexts.

Using the cosine distance between two characters as the substitution cost within a Levenshtein edit distance framework (Levenshtein et al., 1966) improves record linkage with 1950s firm level data about Japanese supply chains (Jinji Koshinjo, 1954; Teikoku Koshinjo, 1957), relative to other string matching methods. The study also compares to end-to-end deep learning methods for record linkage. While these methods can outperform string matching, the data required for them are not always available and technical requirements for implementation are higher, explaining why string matching methods predominate in social science applications. Homoglyphic matching is a cheap and extensible way to improve these predominant methods.

Because creating annotated ground truth data is costly, we provide additional evaluations using synthetically generated data. We augment image renders of place and firm names written with different fonts, for Simplified and Traditional Chinese, Japanese, and Korean character sets. We then OCR two different views of each entity with different OCR engines - EasyOCR and PaddleOCR - that

use very different architectures. The different augmentations and OCR engines lead to different text string views of the same entity with high frequency. We then link these using string matching methods. Homoglyphic matching outperforms other widely used string matching techniques for all four scripts. Our HomoglyphsCJK python package provides a simple, off-the-shelf implementation.¹

Homoglyphs can be extended to any script. To explore this, we contrastively train a HOMOGLYPH model for ancient Chinese characters, using a database that provides views of the same character from different archaeological sites and time periods (Academia Sinica et al., 2023). Ancient characters are much more pictorial than their more abstract, modern equivalents. Fascinatingly, homoglyphs constructed with a ViT for the Shang Dynasty (1600 BC-1045 BC) capture ways in which ancient Chinese society related abstract concepts that have been noted in the archaeological literature (e.g. Wang (2003)).

The rest of this study is organized as follows: Section 2 develops methods for learning character similarity and incorporating it into record linkage, and Section 3 describes the evaluation datasets. Section 4 compares the performance of homoglyphic edit distance to other string matching and neural methods for record linkage. Section 5 examines extensibility by constructing homoglyphs for ancient Chinese, Section 6 discusses the limitations of homoglyphs, and Section 7 concludes.

2 Methods

2.1 The HOMOGLYPH model

The HOMOGLYPH model contrastively learns a mapping between character crops and dense vector representations, such that crops of augmentations of the same character are nearby. HOMOGLYPH is trained purely on digital fonts. Figure 1 shows variations of the same characters rendered with different fonts, which form positive examples for training. Variations across fonts are non-trivial, forcing the model to learn character similarities at varying levels of abstraction.

We use a DINO (Self-Distillation, No Labels) pre-trained ViT as the encoder (Caron et al., 2021). DINO ViT embeddings perform well as a nearest neighbor classifier, making them well-suited for homoglyphic matching. The model is trained using a

¹Package available at <https://pypi.org/project/HomoglyphsCJK/>.

language	Example Character	Character Inner Product Similarity Rank				
		1	2	3	4	5
Japanese	畑	沔	独	佃	畝	細
	榊	鯡	狲	柿	榭	襪
	腺	原	泉	腺	潦	娘
Korean	난	냐	년	논	는	산
	농	능	ㅎ	동	등	닝
	닥	탁	박	덱	닷	학
Traditional Chinese	茶	荼	荼	拳	荃	蔎
	梅	桉	侮	晦	每	晦
	蕪	萁	蘋	蔚	蒔	葑
Simplified Chinese	职	貯	聒	聆	瞋	取
	欢	炊	饮	软	钦	钡
	钢	纲	网	鋼	冈	惘

Figure 2: **Homoglyphs.** This figure illustrates the five nearest neighbors in the HOMOGLYPH embedding space for representative characters.

Supervised Contrastive loss function (Khosla et al., 2020), a generalization of the InfoNCE loss (Oord et al., 2018) that allows for multiple positive and negative pairs for a given anchor:

$$\sum_{i \in I} \frac{-1}{|P(i)|} \sum_{p \in P(i)} \log \frac{\exp(z_i \cdot z_p / \tau)}{\sum_{a \in A(i)} \exp(z_i \cdot z_a / \tau)} \quad (1)$$

where τ is a temperature parameter (equal to 0.1), i indexes a sample in a “multiviewed” batch (in this case multiple fonts/augmentations of characters with the same identity), $P(i)$ is the set of indices of all positives in the multiviewed batch that are distinct from i , $A(i)$ is the set of all indices excluding i , and z is an embedding of a sample in the batch. Training details are describe in the supplementary materials.

To compute characters’ similarity, we embed their image crops, created with a reference font (Google Noto), and compute cosine similarity with a Facebook Artificial Intelligence Similarly Search backend (Johnson et al., 2019).

Figure 2 shows representative examples of characters and their five nearest neighbors. Characters with similar vector representations have qualitatively similar appearances.

HOMOGLYPH shares common elements with EfficientOCR (Carlson et al., 2023), an OCR architecture that learns to recognize characters by contrastively training on character crops rendered with augmented digital fonts. Different augmentations of a character provide positive examples. At inference time, localized characters are OCR’ed by retrieving their nearest neighbor from an index of exemplary character embeddings. The OCR application of contrastive learning on character renders aims to retrieve the same character in an offline index, whereas HOMOGLYPH measures similarity across characters. While HOMOGLYPH shares the architecture of the EfficientOCR character recognizer, it does not use the same model weights or training data as EffOCR (which does not support Chinese or Korean and is also trained on labeled crops from historical documents).

2.2 String Matching Methods

Dunn (1946) - in one of the first treatments of record linkage - wrote: “Each person in the world creates a Book of Life. This Book starts with birth and ends with death. Its pages are made up of the records of the principal events in life. Record linkage is the name given to the process of assembling the pages of this Book into a volume.”

Edit distance metrics are widely used for this task e.g. Levenshtein et al. (1966); Jaro (1989); Winkler (1990). Another common approach computes the cosine similarity between n -gram representations of strings (Okazaki and Tsujii, 2010).

There are a variety of ways that character-level visual similarity could be incorporated into record linkage. We follow the literature modifying Levenshtein distance, e.g. Novosad (2018), by using cosine distance in the HOMOGLYPH space as the substitution cost. Insertion and deletion costs are set to one. It is straightforward to scale the insertion and deletion costs using parameters estimated on a validation set, but we focus on performance without any tuned parameters to maintain a purely off-the-shelf, self-supervised implementation.

We compare matching with homographic edit distance to a variety of other methods. The first comparison is to classic Levenshtein distance (insertions, deletions, and substitutions are all equally costly), to isolate the effect of varying the substitution cost. We also compare to the popular Simstring package, which uses a variety of similarity metrics (Jaccard, cosine, and Dice similarity), computed

with 2-gram substrings (Okazaki and Tsujii, 2010). The third comparison is to FuzzyChinese, a widely used package that uses strokes or characters as the fundamental unit for n -gram substring representations (we use the default 3-grams). These are compared using the TF-IDF vectors. The strokes in each character are drawn from an external database (kfcd, 2015) covering a subset of the CJK script.

3 Evaluation Datasets

To our knowledge, there are not widely used benchmarks for evaluating record linkage for the CJK script. Hence, we develop evaluation data. First, we link a dataset on the customers and suppliers of major Japanese firms, drawn from a 1956 Japanese firm publication (Jinji Koshinjo, 1954), to a firm index of around 7,000 firms. The index is from the same publication but written in a different font. Supply chains are fundamental to the transmission of economic shocks (Acemoglu et al., 2016, 2012), agglomeration (Ellison et al., 2010), and economic development (Hirschman, 1958; Myrdal and Sitohang, 1957; Rasmussen, 1956; Bartelme and Gorodnichenko, 2015; Lane, 2022). Supply chains are challenging to study historically, as they require accurate record linkage. This makes them a particularly relevant test case for downstream applications.

Firm names are localized with LayoutParser (Shen et al., 2021) and then OCR’ed twice, to shed light on whether errors tend to be homographic in popular vision-only OCR and vision-language sequence-to-sequence OCR. We employ two widely used, open-source OCR engines: PaddleOCR and EasyOCR. EasyOCR uses a convolutional recurrent neural network (CRNN) (Shi et al., 2016), with learned embeddings from a vision model serving as inputs to a learned language model. PaddleOCR abandons language modeling, dividing text images into small patches, using mixing blocks to perceive inter- and intra-character patterns, and recognizing text by linear prediction (Du et al., 2022). Neither engine localizes individual characters.

In a second exercise, we use the dataset examined in Arora et al. (2023), which links the same customer-supplier list to a firm directory containing over 70,000 firms (Teikoku Koshinjo, 1957). Examining this dataset allows a comparison of string matching methods to the OCR-free vision only methods and multimodal methods from Arora et al.

(2023). This dataset was created with EfficientOCR (Carlson et al., 2023) and cannot be re-created with EasyOCR or PaddleOCR because the directory is written vertically, which these engines do not support. We would expect EfficientOCR’s character retrieval framework to make homoglyphic errors. Performance across datasets created by three highly diverse OCR architectures is important to extensibility, since database collections have also been constructed with diverse OCR architectures.

Because creating ground truth data for record linkage is costly, we use synthetically generated data for a third set of evaluations. We render place and firm names using different digital fonts and image augmentations, conducting separate experiments for Traditional Chinese, Simplified Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. For Simplified Chinese, Japanese, and Korean, we draw placenames from the Geonames database (Geonames, 2023). Because Traditional Chinese placenames in Geonames are rare, we instead draw from a list of Taiwanese firms, as Taiwan - unlike Mainland China - still uses Traditional Chinese (Taiwan Ministry of Economic Affairs, 2023). We randomly select two image crops of each entity name, and OCR them using EasyOCR and PaddleOCR. Anywhere from 40% (Simplified Chinese) to 88% (Traditional Chinese) of OCR’ed string pairs differ between the two OCR engines. We limit the evaluation dataset to pairs where the two string representations differ.²

4 Results

Homoglyphic edit distance outperforms the other string matching methods in all three evaluation exercises - across different OCR engines and languages - typically by an appreciable margin. This illustrates that homoglyphic errors in OCR are common and can be captured with self-supervised vision transformers.

Our first evaluation exercise - with linked Japanese supply chain data - aims to elucidate whether homoglyphic matching is as helpful for linking datasets created with vision-language OCR as for linking datasets created with vision-only OCR, and whether it can similarly be useful for linking datasets created with different OCR architectures. We hence separately consider results linking PaddleOCR’ed customers and suppliers to the

²The sample size is 20,162 for Simplified Chinese, 66,943 for Traditional Chinese, 86,470 for Japanese, and 48,809 for Korean.

Method	OCR Engines			
	Paddle to Easy	Easy to Paddle	Paddle to Paddle	Easy to Easy
Homoglyphic distance	0.808	0.753	0.844	0.728
Levenshtein distance	0.766	0.697	0.807	0.693
Simstring (cosine)	0.762	0.662	0.787	0.673
Simstring (dice)	0.763	0.663	0.788	0.673
Simstring (jaccard)	0.763	0.663	0.788	0.673
FuzzyChinese (stroke)	0.690	0.567	0.717	0.554
FuzzyChinese (character)	0.533	0.445	0.559	0.464

Table 1: **Baseline Matching Results: Historical Japanese Data.** This table reports accuracy using a variety of different methods for linking Japanese firms from supply chain records to a horizontally written firm directory. The four columns report results when (1) PaddleOCR is used to OCR the firm list and EasyOCR the directory, (2) EasyOCR is used to OCR the firm list and PaddleOCR the directory, (3) PaddleOCR is used to OCR both lists, (4) EasyOCR is used to OCR both lists.

EasyOCR’ed firm index, vice versa, as well as linking when both are OCR’ed by either PaddleOCR or EasyOCR. Homoglyphic edit distance outperforms other string matching methods and does so by a similar margin (around 4 percentage points higher accuracy) regardless of the OCR architecture used. FuzzyChinese has the weakest performance, as expected, since many Japanese characters are not covered in their stroke dictionary.

The primary objective of our second evaluation is to compare homoglyphic matching to the OCR-free vision-only and end-to-end multimodal frameworks developed in Arora et al. (2023), using customer-supplier data linked to an extensive index of 70K Japanese firms. Homoglyphic distance outperforms all other string matching methods, with a matching accuracy of 82%. The Arora et al. (2023) self-supervised multimodal record linkage model - which employs language-image contrastive pre-training on firm image crop-OCR text pairs (following Radford et al. (2021)) - outperforms homoglyphic distance, with 85% matching accuracy. The supervised multimodal model outperforms by a wider margin (95% accuracy). These methods avoid the OCR information bottleneck by using crops from the original document images. Moreover, the language model can understand different

Method	Accuracy
Panel A: String-Matching	
Homoglyphic distance	0.824
Levenshtein distance	0.731
Simstring (cosine)	0.748
Simstring (dice)	0.752
Simstring (jaccard)	0.752
FuzzyChinese (stroke)	0.735
FuzzyChinese (character)	0.618
Panel B: Neural Methods	
Self-Supervised Multimodal Linking	0.849
Supervised Vision-Only Linking	0.878
Supervised Multimodal Linking	0.945

Table 2: **Comparisons to fully neural record linkage methods:** This table links Japanese firms from supply chain records to an extensive firm directory. String matching methods are reported in Panel A. End-to-end neural methods are reported in Panel B.

ways of writing the same firm name (*e.g.*, using different terms for corporation).

The Arora et al. (2023) supervised vision-only approach, which contrastively trains different views of the same firm’s image crops to have similar representations, also outperforms homoglyphic matching (88% accuracy). While homoglyphs do not fully eliminate the OCR information bottleneck, they do significantly reduce it relative to widely used string matching methods (*e.g.* 75% accuracy with the Simstring package), with the advantage of not requiring labeled data or image crops.

HOMOGLYPH complements end-to-end deep neural methods. The Arora et al. (2023) methods cannot be used when researchers lack access to the original document images. Moreover, researchers often lack the compute or technical requirements to work with image data, whereas the vast majority of quantitative social science researchers are comfortable processing strings. On the language side, there are many contexts where using a language model may contribute little. Person or location names - for instance - don’t contain much natural language relative to firm names. String matching methods remain the most widely used because they are simple and cheap to use off-the-shelf, and there are contexts where more sophisticated methods may not be feasible or offer large incremental gains. HOMOGLYPH is an extensible way to improve string matching when linking OCR’ed datasets.

Finally, Table 3 reports results with the synthetically generated record linkage dataset, to eluci-

	Japanese	Korean	Simplified Chinese	Traditional Chinese
Homoglyphic distance	0.456	0.292	0.476	0.465
Levenshtein distance	0.396	0.188	0.375	0.407
Simstring (cosine)	0.376	0.247	0.425	0.383
Simstring (dice)	0.380	0.248	0.426	0.385
Simstring (jaccard)	0.380	0.248	0.426	0.385
FuzzyChinese (stroke)	0.168	0.000	0.473	0.372
FuzzyChinese (character)	0.230	0.110	0.137	0.197

Table 3: **Matching Results: Synthetic Data.** This table reports accuracy linking synthetic paired data generated by OCR’ing location and firm names - rendered with augmented digital fonts - with two different OCR engines.

date the performance of homoglyphic matching across languages using the CJK script. Homoglyphs outperform other string matching methods. The only case where the performance of another method is similar is Simplified Chinese, where the FuzzyChinese package using stroke level n -grams performs similarly. The stroke dictionary that underlies FuzzyChinese was crafted for Simplified Chinese, yet homoglyphs can perform similarly with self-supervised methods. On Traditional Chinese, which proliferates in historical documents, homoglyphic edit distance offers a nine percentage point accuracy advantage over FuzzyChinese, illustrating the extensibility advantages of self-supervised methods. The accuracy rates are rather low, but this must be interpreted in the context of the dataset, which only includes paired records where the OCR differs.

Figure 3 provides an error analysis for the synthetic record linkage exercise. The ground truth string is shown in the first column, PaddleOCR is used to OCR the query (column 2) and EasyOCR is used to OCR the key and provides the correct match (column 3). The matches selected from the key by different string matching methods are shown in columns (4) through (7).

Panel A shows cases where homoglyphic edit distance selects an incorrect match. This typically occurs when the OCR’ed text has a similar visual appearance to another firm in the index, showing the limits of homoglyphs to fully close the OCR information bottleneck. Panel B shows cases where

(1) Ground Truth String	(2) PaddleOCR Recognition	(3) EasyOCR Recognition (Correct Match)	(4) Homoglyphic Match	(5) Levenshtein Match	(6) Simstring Cosine Match	(7) FuzzyChinese Stroke Match
Panel A: Homoglyphic Matching Error Cases						
有楽町	有楽田	有業町	有馬日	馬田	有明町原田	三楽町
율치	율치	율기	운치	백치	가치	용이
西阳呈	西阳呈	丐阻三	酉阳寺	西沿湾	西阳夕村	酉阳寺
陳金灯	陳金小	陳金燈	陳金火	陳金呈	陳金)	王小金
Panel B: Homoglyphic Matching Correct Cases						
たかだけ	たかだナ	たかだけ	たかだけ	たせだむ	た	かでなひこう じょう
양사동	양사동	양사돈	양사돈	양사전	#사동	용이
石涌	石涌	石浦	石浦	石船	槎涌	槎涌
陳淑汝	陳淑女	陳淑汝	陳淑汝	陳淑麗	曾淑女	林淑女

Figure 3: **Error analysis.** Panel A shows representative errors from homoglyphic matching. Panel B shows representative cases that homoglyphic matching gets correct. The ground truth string is shown in column (1). PaddleOCR is used to OCR the query images (column (2)) and EasyOCR is used to OCR their corresponding keys (column (3)). Columns (4) through (7) give the selected match to the query using different string matching methods, with the correct match shown in column (3). Bold characters differ from the query.

homoglyphic edit distance selects a correct match, avoiding the wrong strings chosen by other methods through exploiting character visual similarity.

5 Extending Homoglyphs

While this study focuses on the modern CJK script, HOMOGLYPH can be extended to any character set. As a proof of concept, we explore its extensibility to ancient Chinese characters. Like other early forms of human writing, ancient Chinese scripts are highly pictorial relative to modern characters.

Using an existing database of grouped ancient characters from different archaeological sites and periods that correspond to the same concept (Academia Sinica et al., 2023), we contrastively learn a metric space where the representations of different views of ancient characters denoting the same concept are nearby. We train on 25,984 character views, as well as the corresponding modern augmented fonts. The dataset includes characters from the Shang Dynasty (1600 BC-1045 BC), the Western Zhou (1045 BC-771 BC), the Spring and Autumn Warring States Era (770 BC-221 BC), and the Qin-Han Dynasties (221 BC - circa third century).³ To illustrate homoglyphs, we create a reference set for the Shang Dynasty, randomly choosing one character for each concept.

³We exclude images from the Shuowen Jiezi - a book on ancient characters - limiting to the most reliable character renders, which were drawn from archaeological sites.



















	Example Character	Character Inner Product Similarity Rank				
		1	2	3	4	5
1						
	律	律	律	律	律	律
	Writing	Law	Learning	Thriving/ Feudal/ Abundance	Morning	Holding
2						
	尹	伊	君	井	丑	荔
	Middle or high-level official	Name of prominent high-level official	Middle or high-level official, later referring to lord/monarch	Joining hands together/ arch/ surrounding	A raising hand	Joining/ Helping/ Assisting
3						
	史	史	史	史	史	史
	History/ Historian	Tying up	Conquest	Central (shows prisoner to be executed in city center)	Searching	Governmental Official

Figure 4: **Ancient Homoglyphs.** This figure shows homoglyph sets constructed for ancient Chinese, with the descendant modern Chinese character and a description of the character’s ancient meaning.

Figure 4 shows representative examples of homoglyphs, consisting of a character and its five nearest neighbors. The modern character descendant - taken from the database - as well as a short description of the ancient concept are provided. The description draws upon Li (2012) as well.

The homoglyph sets are able to capture related abstract concepts noted in the archaeological lit-

erature. The first line shows that the concepts of writing, law, learning, and morning (“recording the sun”) are homoglyphs, and the second line shows that characters for different types of officials are homoglyphs, as are characters denoting “joining.” The final line shows that history and government official are homoglyphs - underscoring the central role of the government in constituting history - as are characters denoting conquest, tying up, and city center (denoted by a prisoner to be executed by the government, which occurred in the city center).

Not all concepts within each set are related, but many of the connections above have been noted in an archaeological literature examining how ancient peoples conceptualized the world (*e.g.* Wang (2003)). That these meanings can be captured using *vision* transformers is a fascinating illustration of the relationship between images, written language, and meaning in ancient societies.

6 Limitations

Using homoglyphs for string matching inherits the well-known limitations of string matching. In some cases, OCR destroys too much information for record linkage to be feasible with the resulting strings. Even with clean OCR, sometimes language understanding is necessary to determine the correct match. Homoglyphs do not address other types of string substitutions, like those that result from enumerator misspellings, although in principle a similar contrastive approach could also be developed to quantify other types of string substitutions.

More sophisticated methods have been developed as alternatives to string matching. For example, Ventura et al. (2015) use a random forest classifier trained on labeled data to disambiguate authors of U.S. patents, applying clustering to the resulting dissimilarity scores to enforce transitivity. Arora et al. (2023) use multimodal methods that combine the image crops of entities and their OCR and also develop a vision-only OCR free linkage method. Bayesian methods have also been used, *e.g.* Sadinle (2014, 2017). They offer the advantage of uncertainty quantification - another well-known limitation of string matching - but do not scale well.

While these methods can offer advantages, they are not always applicable. Researchers may lack access to the original document images, or may lack the compute or technical resources to process images, limiting the use of OCR-free or multimodal approaches. Language models are unlikely to be

useful in linking individual names, a common application. Labeled data may be infeasibly costly to create at a sufficient scale for training supervised models. Finally, researchers in disciplines like social science often lack familiarity with machine learning methods, but most are familiar with off-the-shelf string matching packages. String matching methods are also cheap to scale to massive datasets. Simple string matching algorithms are often preferred by practitioners and can be the most suitable tool given the constraints.

7 Conclusion

Homoglyphic edit distance significantly improves string matching accuracy on OCR’ed documents, by integrating information about character similarity from purely self-supervised vision transformers. It can be implemented using a simple, off-the-shelf string matching package.⁴ Learning homoglyphs through self-supervised vision transformers is highly extensible, including to low resource settings and settings with many characters. By improving record linkage in such settings - where hand-crafted features used to improve record linkage are not available - research on important questions requiring linked data can become more representative of the diversity of human societies.

⁴Package available at <https://pypi.org/project/HomoglyphsCJK/>.

Supplementary Materials

S-1 HOMOLYPH Model Details

S-1.1 Encoder

For both of our applications, we use a DINO pre-trained (Caron et al., 2021) vision transformer (ViT) as the encoder. Our implementation of the ViT comes from the Pytorch Image Models library (timm) (Wightman, 2019). Specifically, we use the `vit_base_patch16_224.dino` model that corresponds to the official DINO-pretrained ViT-base model with a patch size of 16 and with input resolution of 224^2 . The pretrained checkpoint does not have a classification head.

S-1.2 Loss function

We use Supervised Contrastive loss (Khosla et al., 2020) as our training objective, as implemented in the PyTorch Metric Learning library (Musgrave et al., 2020), where the temperature parameter is set to 0.1.

S-1.3 Data Augmentation

We deploy several image augmentations, using transformations provided in the Torchvision library (TorchVision, 2016). These include Affine transformation (only slight translation and scaling allowed), Random Color Jitter, Random Autocontrast, Random Gaussian Blurring, and Random Grayscale. Additionally, we pad the character to make the image square while preserving the aspect ratio of the character render. We do not use common augmentations like Random Cropping or Center Cropping, to avoid destroying too much information.

For augmenting the skeleton of the rendered character itself, we use a variety of digital fonts to render the images. We use 27 fonts for Simplified Chinese, 17 fonts for Traditional Chinese (for both string matching and ancient Chinese), 62 fonts for Korean, and 14 fonts for Japanese.

S-2 Application-specific details

S-2.1 Record Linkage

S-2.1.1 Data

For each script, the dataset consists of images of characters from the corresponding script rendered with different fonts and augmented during training. The number of characters for each script seen during training is given in Table S-1. Each character

Script	Training	Inference
Japanese	17,963	17,963
Simplified Chinese	6,621	7,806
Traditional Chinese	8,415	8,628
Korean	3,686	3,729
Total	36,685	38,126

Table S-1: **Training and Inference Sizes.** This table shows the training and inference sizes for different language scripts.

can be considered a "class" to which its digital renders belong. Characters do not need to be seen during training to be considered at inference time, an advantage if users wish to expand the homoglyph sets (*e.g.* because an OCR engine uses a different character set). We illustrate this empirically by expanding the character set to characters covered by the three OCR engines we explore that were not included in our character ranges used initially for training.

S-2.1.2 Batching

Without hard-negative mining

Let \mathcal{B} denote the batch size. A batch consists of m views of $\frac{\mathcal{B}}{m}$ classes sampled without replacement. When all the views for a class are utilized, all images are replaced and the sampling process without replacement starts again. "Views" of a character are augmented digital renders using the fonts and transformations described above.

One training epoch is defined as seeing all characters and their m views exactly once.

With hard-negative mining

We find k nearest neighbors of each character (or class) on a checkpoint trained without hard negatives. We do this by rendering all characters with a "reference font - Noto Serif CJK font (Tc/Sc/Jp/Ko)" depending upon the script and finding k nearest neighbors using the above checkpoint.

We create batches as before, but this time, randomly intersperse all hard negative sets (of size k) in the batches.

One training epoch is now defined as seeing all characters and their m views and additionally, all characters and their hard negative sets (composed of $k - 1$ neighbors) and their m views exactly once.

Table S-2 contains the number of epochs we trained each model for.

Model	lr	weight decay	T_0	T_mult	Epochs
Japanese - (No HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	1	2	100
Japanese - (HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	1	2	30
Simplified Chinese - (No HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	1	2	30
Simplified Chinese - (HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	1	2	30
Traditional Chinese - (No HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	1	2	30
Traditional Chinese - (HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	1	2	30
Korean - (No HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	1	2	60
Korean - (HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	1	2	30
Ancient Chinese - (No HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	300	1	200
Ancient Chinese - (HN) distance	2e-5	5e-3	300	3	24

Table S-2: **Training Hyperparameters.** This table reports the training hyperparameters used for the models. The lr stands for learning rate, weight decay represents the weight decay factor, T_0 is the number of steps until the first restart of the learning rate scheduler, T_mult denotes the factor by which T_0 is multiplied at each restart, and Epochs indicates the total number of training epochs. Parameters not mentioned here use PyTorch defaults. HN denotes offline hard-negative mining.

S-2.1.3 Model Validation

We split the characters into an 80-10-10 train-val-test set. We embed the validation images and find the nearest neighbor among the embeddings of digital renders of the universe of characters in the script, rendered with the reference font described above. The top-1 retrieval accuracy is used as the validation metric for the selection of the best checkpoint. We see a peak validation accuracy of 90% for Japanese, 98% for Korean, 91% for Traditional Chinese, and 91% for Simplified Chinese.

S-2.1.4 Other training details

CJK glyphs are similar across the scripts. To converge faster, for the rest of the languages, we initialize the weights of the encoder with the checkpoint used for the HOMOGLYPH encoder for Japanese - the script with the largest number of characters. We use AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) as the optimizer and Cosine Annealing with Warm Restarts (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2016) as the learning rate schedule. We use the standard Pytorch implementation for both. The relevant hyperparameters are listed in Table S-2. We stop training the models once the validation accuracy stagnates and the checkpoint with the best validation accuracy is chosen as the encoder for each script.

S-2.2 Homoglyph Sets

We allow for the expansion of the character set beyond what is seen in training because different OCR engines use different character dictionaries (a list of characters supported by the engine). We take the union of characters from the character dictionaries of PaddleOCR, EasyOCR, and EfficientOCR. For each script, we render all its characters using the script’s reference font and embed them using the script-specific HOMOGLYPH encoder. For each character, we then find 800-nearest neighbours (measured by Cosine Similarity between the embeddings) among the set of all renders in the reference set. We store these as a look-up dictionary that contains, for each character in a script, its 800 neighbors and its Cosine Similarity with all of them. This look-up dictionary is used in our modified Levenshtein distance implementation to modify the substitution cost. The dictionaries are available in our GitHub repository (Yang et al., 2023).

Table S-1 contains the number of characters that were used to prepare these sets for each script.

S-2.3 Implementing the Modified Levenshtein distance

We use a standard algorithm to calculate Levenshtein distance that uses dynamic programming (Wagner and Fischer, 1974). The space and time complexity of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(mn)$ where m and n are the lengths of the two strings that are being compared.

We modify this algorithm by switching the standard substitution cost λ between two characters a and b with $\lambda * (1 - \text{CosineSimilarity}(u(a), u(b)))$. Here $u(a)$ and $u(b)$ are the embeddings of the HOMOGLYPH encoder for the script to which a and b belong. λ is a tunable hyperparameter but for simplicity, we fix it as 1 for the results shown in the paper. We also fixed the addition and deletion cost as 1 but in the implementation provided in our package and our GitHub repository, the costs are tunable hyperparameters.

S-2.4 Ancient Chinese Homoglyphs

S-2.4.1 Data

The source database (Academia Sinica et al., 2023) from which we collect the ancient Chinese character crops contains 5,024 concepts, comprised of 25,984 character renderings. Each of these concepts is mapped to a modern character. This en-

ables us to insert digital renders of these modern characters using the same fonts as above (for traditional Chinese) to create more variation. A "class" in this case comprises a character cluster - with both ancient crops and modern digital renders forming the positive samples for a class.

We slightly modify the data augmentation scheme for this application to account for the wide variation in writing styles across centuries. We allow for a slight (-10 to $+10$ degree) rotation and also add more transformations tailored to this use case - Random Equalize, Random Posterize, Random Solarize, Random Inversion and Random Erase (randomly erase 0-5% of the image). We apply all augmentations to the digital renders but only apply Random Affine transformation and Random Inversion to the ancient crops.

S-2.4.2 Batching

We use the same sampling and batching process as we did for the modern homoglyph models. The only difference is in how the hard-negative sets are defined. Instead of one nearest neighbor per concept, for each ancient crop within a concept cluster, we find k nearest neighbors. This gives us as many nearest neighbor sets (hard-negative sets) as ancient crops in our dataset. This allows us to account for the fact that the homoglyphs of a character may differ across different historical periods, spanning millennia.

S-2.4.3 Model Validation

We split the character clusters into train and validation sets (90-10). We then transfer modern renders of the characters from the validation set to the train set. After this, we randomly transfer 50% of validation images to training. Only ancient characters remain in the validation set. We then make a reference set by embedding all the modern renders of our character (using the reference font Noto Serif CJK Tc). We use top-1 accuracy as our validation metric which is defined as the proportion of correct retrievals of the corresponding modern render to each ancient image in the validation set. During training, the model reached a peak validation accuracy of 50% demonstrating the difficult nature of this task. We use this metric for selecting the best checkpoint for our encoder.

S-2.4.4 Other training details

We again use the AdamW optimizer and Cosine Annealing with Warm Restarts as the learning rate

schedule. Relevant Hyperparameters are listed in Table S-2. We stop training when validation accuracy stagnates.

S-2.4.5 Creation of Ancient Chinese Homoglyphs

The creation of homoglyph sets is analogous to the case of modern characters. Instead of using digital renders from a particular font as the "reference set", we look at the five nearest neighbors of ancient characters within a period. We illustrate homoglyphs using The Shang Dynasty period (1600 BC-1045 BC), the most ancient.

References

- Ran Abramitzky, Leah Boustan, Katherine Eriksson, James Feigenbaum, and Santiago Pérez. 2021. Automated linking of historical data. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 59(3):865–918.
- Institute of History Academia Sinica, Philology, and Institute of Information Science Academia Sinica. 2023. [Xiaoxuetang yanbian database](#).
- Daron Acemoglu, Ufuk Akcigit, and William Kerr. 2016. Networks and the macroeconomy: An empirical exploration. *Nber macroeconomics annual*, 30(1):273–335.
- Daron Acemoglu, Vasco M Carvalho, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi. 2012. The network origins of aggregate fluctuations. *Econometrica*, 80(5):1977–2016.
- Abhishek Arora, Xinmei Yang, Shao Yu Jheng, and Melissa Dell. 2023. Linking representations with multimodal contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03464*.
- Dominick Bartelme and Yuriy Gorodnichenko. 2015. Linkages and economic development. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Olivier Binette and Rebecca C Steorts. 2022. (almost) all of entity resolution. *Science Advances*, 8(12):eabi8021.
- Jacob Carlson, Tom Bryan, and Melissa Dell. 2023. Efficient ocr for building a diverse digital history. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02737*.
- Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. 2021. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.14294*.
- Xinlei Chen and Kaiming He. 2021. Exploring simple siamese representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15750–15758.
- Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, and Kaiming He. 2021. An empirical study of training self-supervised vision transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.02057*.
- Yongkun Du, Zhineng Chen, Caiyan Jia, Xiaoting Yin, Tianlun Zheng, Chenxia Li, Yuning Du, and Yu-Gang Jiang. 2022. Svtr: Scene text recognition with a single visual model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.00159*.
- Halbert L Dunn. 1946. Record linkage. *American Journal of Public Health and the Nations Health*, 36(12):1412–1416.
- Glenn Ellison, Edward L Glaeser, and William R Kerr. 2010. What causes industry agglomeration? evidence from coagglomeration patterns. *American Economic Review*, 100(3):1195–1213.
- Geonames. 2023. [Geonames](#).
- Jean-Bastien Grill, Florian Strub, Florent Alché, Corentin Tallec, Pierre H Richemond, Elena Buchatskaya, Carl Doersch, Bernardo Avila Pires, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, et al. 2020. Bootstrap your own latent: A new approach to self-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07733*.
- Albert O Hirschman. 1958. *The strategy of economic development*. Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, Conn.
- Matthew A Jaro. 1989. Advances in record-linkage methodology as applied to matching the 1985 census of tampa, florida. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(406):414–420.
- Jinji Koshinjo. 1954. *Nihon shokuinrokj*. Jinji Koshinjo.
- Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2019. Billion-scale similarity search with gpus. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 7(3):535–547.
- kfcd. 2015. chaizi. <https://github.com/kfcd/chaizi>.
- Prannay Khosla, Piotr Teterwak, Chen Wang, Aaron Sarna, Yonglong Tian, Phillip Isola, Aaron Maschiot, Ce Liu, and Dilip Krishnan. 2020. Supervised contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.11362*.
- Nathan Lane. 2022. Manufacturing revolutions: Industrial policy and industrialization in south korea. Available at SSRN 3890311.
- Vladimir I Levenshtein et al. 1966. Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals. In *Soviet physics doklady*, volume 10, pages 707–710. Soviet Union.
- Xueqin Li, editor. 2012. *Zi Yun (The Origin of Characters)*. Tianjin Ancient Works Publishing House, Tianjin.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2016. [SGDR: stochastic gradient descent with restarts](#). *CoRR*, abs/1608.03983.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. [Decoupled weight decay regularization](#).
- Lijun Lyu, Maria Koutraki, Martin Krickl, and Besnik Fetahu. 2021. [Neural ocr post-hoc correction of historical corpora](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:479–483.
- Kevin Musgrave, Serge Belongie, and Ser-Nam Lim. 2020. [Pytorch metric learning](#).
- Gunnar Myrdal and Paul Sitohang. 1957. Economic theory and under-developed regions. *Regional Studies*.
- Thi Tuyet Hai Nguyen, Adam Jatowt, Mickael Coustaty, and Antoine Doucet. 2021. [Survey of post-ocr processing approaches](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 54(6).

- Paul Novosad. 2018. Masala merge. <https://github.com/paulnov/masala-merge>.
- Naoaki Okazaki and Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2010. Simple and efficient algorithm for approximate dictionary matching. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling 2010)*, pages 851–859.
- Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. 2018. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Poul Nørregaard Rasmussen. 1956. *Studies in intersectoral relations*, volume 15. E. Harck.
- Mauricio Sadinle. 2014. Detecting duplicates in a homicide registry using a bayesian partitioning approach. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 8(4):2404–2434.
- Mauricio Sadinle. 2017. Bayesian estimation of bipartite matchings for record linkage. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(518):600–612.
- Zejiang Shen, Ruochen Zhang, Melissa Dell, Benjamin Charles Germain Lee, Jacob Carlson, and Weining Li. 2021. Layoutparser: A unified toolkit for deep learning based document image analysis. *International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*, 12821.
- Baoguang Shi, Xiang Bai, and Cong Yao. 2016. An end-to-end trainable neural network for image-based sequence recognition and its application to scene text recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(11):2298–2304.
- Jeffrey M Silbert. 1970. The world's first computerized criminal-justice information-sharing system-the new york state identification and intelligence system (nysis). *Criminology*, 8:107.
- Ian C Simpson, Petroula Mousikou, Juan Manuel Montoya, and Sylvia Defior. 2013. A letter visual-similarity matrix for latin-based alphabets. *Behavior research methods*, 45:431–439.
- Taiwan Ministry of Economic Affairs. 2023. [Registered factory directory](#).
- Teikoku Koshinjo. 1957. *Teikoku Ginko Kaisha Yoroku*. Teikoku Koshinjo.
- TorchVision. 2016. Torchvision: Pytorch's computer vision library. <https://github.com/pytorch/vision>.
- Daniel van Strien., Kaspar Beelen., Mariona Coll Ardanuy., Kasra Hosseini., Barbara McGillivray., and Giovanni Colavizza. 2020. [Assessing the impact of ocr quality on downstream nlp tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence - Volume 1: ARTIDIGH.*, pages 484–496. INSTICC, SciTePress.
- Samuel L Ventura, Rebecca Nugent, and Erica RH Fuchs. 2015. Seeing the non-stars:(some) sources of bias in past disambiguation approaches and a new public tool leveraging labeled records. *Research Policy*, 44(9):1672–1701.
- Robert A. Wagner and Michael J. Fischer. 1974. [The string-to-string correction problem](#). *J. ACM*, 21(1):168–173.
- Guowei Wang. 2003. Shishi (deciphering "history"). In *Guantan Gjilin*. Hebei Education Publishing House, Shijiazhuang.
- Ross Wightman. 2019. [Pytorch image models](https://github.com/rwightman/pytorch-image-models). <https://github.com/rwightman/pytorch-image-models>.
- William E Winkler. 1990. *String comparator metrics and enhanced decision rules in the Fellegi-Sunter model of record linkage*. ERIC.
- Xinmei Yang, Abhishek Arora, Shao-Yu Jheng, and Melissa Dell. 2023. Codebase for quantifying character similarity with vision transformers. <https://github.com/dell-research-harvard/Quantifying-Character-Similarity>.
- znwang25. 2020. [fuzzychinese](https://github.com/znwang25/fuzzychinese). <https://github.com/znwang25/fuzzychinese>.