

# Block-level Text Spotting with LLMs

Ganesh Bannur, Bharadwaj Amrutur

Indian Institute of Science

## Abstract

Text spotting has seen tremendous progress in recent years yielding performant techniques which can extract text at the character, word or line level. However, extracting blocks of text from images (block-level text spotting) is relatively unexplored. Blocks contain more context than individual lines, words or characters and so block-level text spotting would enhance downstream applications, such as translation, which benefit from added context. We propose a novel method, BTS-LLM (**B**lock-level **T**ext **S**potting with **LLMs**), to identify text at the block level. BTS-LLM has three parts: 1) detecting and recognizing text at the line level, 2) grouping lines into blocks and 3) finding the best order of lines within a block using a large language model (LLM). We aim to exploit the strong semantic knowledge in LLMs for accurate block-level text spotting. Consequently if the text spotted is semantically meaningful but has been corrupted during text recognition, the LLM is also able to rectify mistakes in the text and produce a reconstruction of it.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Text Spotting at Different Levels

Text spotting is the term used to describe techniques which extract text present in natural images (as opposed to document images). There are two types of techniques for text spotting: 1) end-to-end and 2) pipelined. End-to-end techniques consist of a single text spotting model or jointly trained pipeline which can both detect and recognize text. Pipelined techniques break the task down into text detection and text recognition which are solved by separate models. Currently both end-to-end and pipelined state-of-the-art techniques work at the character, word or line level while block-level text spotting has remained relatively unexplored. We propose a technique which can extract text from natural images at the block level. Figure 1 shows the difference between the four levels of text spotting.

Recently end-to-end approaches have gained popularity since using a single model for detection and recognition allows for information sharing between the tasks, which improves results. However we choose a pipelined approach for two




Figure 1: The four levels of text spotting




Figure 2: A set of lines identified as being part of the same block are highlighted in the image. The first part of the pipeline will identify the bounding box and the corresponding text of each line. Based on their bounding boxes there are two ways to order these lines, which are shown as the two possibilities for the array `blocks`. The correct order is the one on top however if we were to simply read left-to-right in the image we would pick the bottom order. To know which one to pick it becomes important to read the text and decide which order makes more sense.

reasons: 1) Using a pipelined approach allows us to use the Unified Detector from [17] which enables the first step in creating blocks from lines (described in Section 3.1). 2) There are instances showing that pipelined approaches may still perform better than end-to-end approaches. An example is the ICDAR Competition on Hierarchical Text Detection and Recognition [16] in which all the top submissions were pipelined.

## 1.2 The Challenge of Block-level Text Spotting

Using its pipelined approach, BTS-LLM is able to extract the following: 1) The bounding box of every line, 2) The corresponding text of every line and 3) The grouping of lines into blocks. The next step is to find the text of each block. Since the lines are already grouped into blocks, the main task in creating the text for each block is ordering the lines. Figure 2 demonstrates the challenge of ordering the lines.

As Figure 2 shows, when ordering lines it is important to understand the mean-

ing of the text in addition to understanding the arrangement of bounding boxes. This presents two challenges: 1) The text identified has an extremely broad scope since it can be part of any scene image and 2) Any method to identify the correct order would need to understand both the arrangement of bounding boxes and the meaning of text, which presents a complex spatio-linguistic task. LLMs are able to understand an extremely wide scope of text. They have also been shown to be able to perform generic reasoning in textual and visual modalities [6] and have been shown to perform well on 2D spatial reasoning [21]. Therefore we propose to use an LLM to perform the ordering as it can meet the challenges.

### 1.3 Benefits of Incorporating an LLM

The last step in text spotting is scene text recognition (STR), which "reads" the text. STR is not purely a vision task but rather a vision-language task. Semantic knowledge can be used to augment the visual features and improve STR results. Recent work in STR has focused on improving the language modeling capabilities in STR models and has consequently improved text recognition performance [3]. While language models (LMs) have improved STR results, they are constrained by their size and training data. The LMs used in STR are small and are only trained on the text labels seen in STR datasets, thus limiting their semantic knowledge. In recent years language modelling has been disrupted by the rise of LLMs. We posit that STR could benefit from the significantly larger model size and more general training data of LLMs. While BTS-LLM uses an LLM to order lines within a block, the vast semantic and world knowledge embedded in LLMs could also improve its text spotting results.

### Contributions

Our contributions are as follows:

- We provide a pipelined approach for block-level text spotting.
- We incorporate an LLM into text spotting. We posit that this improves text spotting quality by allowing for reconstructing semantically meaningful text that has been corrupted during text recognition.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Block-level Detection, Recognition and Spotting

#### 2.1.1 Techniques For Scene Text

The techniques closest to our work fall under this category. [24, 15] propose block-level text spotting techniques. [24] has a block-level detector followed by a block-level recognition model which can directly recognize the text in a block. In [24] the block-level training dataset is heuristically created from line-level

datasets by merging lines into blocks based on Intersection-over-Union (IoU) values. [17] propose a block-level text detection technique in which lines are detected and grouped into blocks. [15] builds upon [17] and proposes a block-level text spotting technique which performs line-level spotting and then groups lines into blocks. However the order of lines inside a block is not determined in both [17] and [15]. [25] proposes a block-level text detection technique. They detect individual text units (usually words), group them into blocks and predict the reading order within each block.

### 2.1.2 Block-level Text Detection For Documents

Over the years, there has been a lot of interest in identifying and extracting blocks of text within structured documents. Early works usually used statistical techniques to create text blocks by clustering word or line bounding boxes [8]. Recent approaches apply deep learning architectures (usually graph convolutional networks) on bounding boxes to create blocks [14, 22]. Most block-level detection techniques for documents focus on only the bounding boxes and ignore the actual text in words or lines. The Unified Detector from [17], which we use to detect blocks, is inspired by the field of block-level text detection for documents.

### 2.1.3 Block-level Text Recognition For Handwritten Text

There has been a substantial amount of work done in recognizing blocks of handwritten text [4, 5, 9, 26, 10]. Most of the work done for handwritten text is specifically in block-level recognition. The focus has been on recognizing text in a cropped image of a single paragraph or in an image of a full page of handwritten text (usually without anything else, such as images, on the page). The text to be recognized is generally on a plain background and with blocks consisting of a column of lines.

## 2.2 Reading Order Detection

BTS-LLM uses an LLM to order lines within a block, that is, it finds the reading order of the lines. While there are no reading order detection techniques for scene text, the document domain has seen an evolution of reading order detection techniques over time. Reading order detection started with geometric methods which applied graph sorting [1] or optimization [19] algorithms on the bounding boxes of text blocks. Techniques then evolved to use learning algorithms to adapt to new classes of documents by learning the domain specific layout knowledge for each new class of documents [7, 18, 20]. Others have also tried to impose document-agnostic generic constraints on text blocks to narrow down and find a reading order [11]. Recent techniques have used deep learning architectures which incorporate both layout and textual information to find the reading order [23]. However block-level text spotting involves scene text which is out of domain for these document techniques. Scene text is also a more complex




Figure 3: The pipeline of BTS-LLM is as follows. An input image is given to the Text Detection+Grouping Model. This model performs line-level text detection and finds the bounding boxes of all the lines in the image. It then groups lines in close proximity into blocks. In the figure, the lines detected are numbered from 1 to 8 and the grouping is shown in the array `blocks`. The detected regions are given to the Text Recognition Model which recognizes the line of text in each region. Finally, for every block, the texts recognized and the bounding boxes of the lines are given to the LLM which outputs the text for the block.

domain than documents for reading order detection due to the free structure of text in scenes.

### 3 Method

Figure 3 shows the overall pipeline of BTS-LLM. The two main parts of the pipeline are: 1) Line-level text spotting with grouping (covered in Section 3.1) and 2) Creating blocks using an LLM (covered in Section 3.2). The pipeline utilizes pre-existing state-of-the-art techniques as its components.

### 3.1 Line-level Text Spotting with Grouping

As shown in Figure 3, the first model in the pipeline is the Text Detection+Grouping Model which takes an input image and does two things: 1) It performs line-level text detection and identifies the bounding boxes around each line in the image. 2) It groups lines which are in close proximity as being part of the same block. The image shows 8 lines numbered 1 to 8 whose grouping is shown in the array `blocks`. Lines 1 and 2 are in close proximity and so are grouped as being part of the same block and similarly for the other lines. The model used for text detection+grouping is the Unified Detector from [17] (note that blocks are called paragraphs in [17]).

Next the image of each line is preprocessed and given to the Text Recognition Model which recognizes the text in the cropped image. The PARSeq model from [3] is used for text recognition. Preprocessing includes the following steps performed for each bounding box:


1. The image is rotated to align the rectangular bounding box with the axes. If the box is rotated by  $\leq 45^\circ$  then it is rotated back to align with the x-axis. Otherwise it is rotated to align with the y-axis. This may result in the images of some lines being rotated by  $90^\circ$ , however as Tables 6, 7 and 8 show, PARSeq is robust to rotation.
2. The rotated image is cropped to the bounding box.
3. The cropped image is split horizontally into parts that maintain the input aspect ratio of the text recognition model (for PARSeq the aspect ratio is  $\text{height} \times \text{width} = 32 \times 128$ ). This is done since any input image is first converted to this aspect ratio before being fed into the model. If the actual aspect ratio of the image varies a lot from the input aspect ratio then the text in the image appears squished and the accuracy of the model decreases. This is prevented by having each part maintain the input aspect ratio. Each part is then fed into the model separately and the strings recognized from each part are concatenated to get the text for the line.

Since the model released in [3] cannot recognize spaces, we retrained it to recognize spaces. Tables containing results from the retrained model are given in Appendix A.


Finally, this part of the pipeline outputs the following: 1) the bounding box of every line, 2) the corresponding text of every line and 3) the grouping of lines into blocks.

### 3.2 Creating Blocks using an LLM

At this point in the pipeline, the lines have already been recognized and grouped into blocks. The main task in obtaining the text for each block is ordering the lines. As detailed in Section 1.2, we use an LLM for this task. Using an LLM for a task requires the formulation of a prompt. Before discussing the prompt it



(a) Category 1



(b) Category 2

Figure 4: We assume that blocks fall into one of two categories

is necessary to discuss an assumption. We assume that all blocks encountered fall into two categories, which are illustrated in Figure 4.

1. *Category 1: Blocks for which the meaningful order is the correct order*  
 If there is a meaningful order then we do not look at bounding boxes and assume that the meaningful order is the correct order. In other words, we prioritize semantics over spatial arrangement. There may be rare cases in which this is not true and the meaningless order is the correct order. For example, if in Figure 4a the line "TO LOVE CYCLING" was above the line "20 REASONS" the correct order would be "TO LOVE CYCLING 20 REASONS" but BTS-LLM would give "20 REASONS TO LOVE CYCLING" since it is the meaningful order.
2. *Category 2: Blocks for which none of the orders are meaningful*  
 If none of the orders are meaningful then the lines are ordered based on bounding boxes. In other words, we use spatial arrangement when semantics fail.

In the corner case when more than one order is meaningful, the LLM will decide which one to choose.



Having made this assumption the task can be described as follows: "For every block, if there is a meaningful order of lines then output that order. Otherwise use the bounding boxes to order the lines". The prompt needs to encode this if-else construct. The best way to do this and also specify the task very precisely was to formulate the prompt as code and make the LLM predict the output of this code. However we cannot write code for subtasks such as finding a meaningful order of lines. Instead we interleave code with natural language instructions, taking advantage of 1) the LLM's ability to understand code and follow the precise constructs, and 2) its ability to perform tasks specified in natural language. The prompt is formulated in two parts: 1) Function definition for the function `your_task`, which defines the task by interleaving code and natural language. 2) Function call for `your_task` with the inputs passed as function arguments, which prompts the LLM to produce the output of `your_task` on those inputs. Python is used for code since it has the least amount of extraneous characters (for example semicolons at the end of each line in C/C++/Java) and is one of the more readable general purpose languages. The prompt given to the LLM is given in Figure 5. The LLM is executed with this prompt for every block to get the corresponding text. An additional detail of the prompt is the order in which lines are given as function arguments. To keep the order consistent, the lines are first ordered either top-to-bottom-left-to-right or left-to-right-top-to-bottom using a heuristic-based geometric ordering algorithm which orders using bounding boxes. The lines are then passed as arguments in this order.

Our approach to prompt design is similar in spirit to [13]. In [13] ambiguous tasks are specified as function calls whose function name describes the task ([13] gives the example of `detect_sarcasm(string)`). In our approach, however, ambiguous tasks (such as finding a meaningful order) are directly specified in natural language. Empirically this could have two benefits: 1) It is clearer for the LLM which parts are code (which must be executed precisely) and which parts are ambiguous tasks (which must be answered using general knowledge and reasoning). 2) Describing ambiguous tasks with natural language allows for a better description of the task rather than inferring the task from a function name. Note that in [13] it is actually the LLM which produces the text which interleaves code and natural language following which only the ambiguous parts are executed by an LLM.

### Additional Aspects of using an LLM

The first consideration is the values of bounding box coordinates provided in the prompt. To decrease the numerical values of the coordinates they are translated such that the minimum x and y coordinates among all bounding boxes in a block are 0. Having smaller numbers makes it easier for the LLM to perform numerical reasoning as there is a higher chance of small numbers occurring in the training data of the LLM, making them "in-distribution" and improving the LLM's performance on them. For the same reason, the coordinates are

---

<sup>1</sup><https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5-turbo>

System Prompt

```
Give the best possible answer and nothing else.
```

User Prompt

```
def your_task(list of strings with corresponding bounding boxes):
    if meaningful sentence can be formed using strings:
        form most meaningful sentence
    else:
        form best spatial ordering of strings using bounding boxes
        spatial ordering is based on x coordinates or y coordinates or both depending on which has most variance
        return single string with spaces between input strings

your_task(
    String: '<text of line 1>' Bounding Box: [[x0,0, y0,0] [x0,1, y0,1] [x0,2, y0,2] [x0,3, y0,3]]
    String: '<text of line 2>' Bounding Box: [[x1,0, y1,0] [x1,1, y1,1] [x1,2, y1,2] [x1,3, y1,3]]
    ...
)
```

Figure 5: The prompt provided to the LLM. BTS-LLM uses GPT-3.5 Turbo which requires a system prompt. For other LLMs which do not have a system prompt, it can be appended before the user prompt. The system prompt given was empirically found to be the best for two reasons: 1) It suppresses extraneous output. 2) It forces GPT-3.5 Turbo to always give an answer (the best possible one, given the input). Finally, leaving the system prompt blank was seen to severely decrease the quality of outputs. GPT-3.5 Turbo is accessed via the API<sup>1</sup> with `temperature=0`.

kept as integers and are not normalized to  $[0, 1]$  since small (0 to  $\approx 1000$  for bounding box coordinates) positive integers have a higher chance of occurring in the training data than decimals. Keeping numbers in-distribution is important since the transformer architecture of LLMs suffers from length generalization in numerical and reasoning tasks [2].

The second consideration is the context length of the LLM. If the prompt exceeds the context length then BTS-LLM does not use the LLM to order lines but rather defaults to using the heuristic-based geometric ordering mentioned previously. The lines are ordered either top-to-bottom-left-to-right or left-to-right-top-to-bottom based on only their bounding boxes.

Finally, LLMs, being probabilistic next token predictors, are prone to mistakes due to the sampling method used. Sampling mistakes can affect the length of the generated output. To curtail this problem, if the length of the LLM's output is less than half or more than double the expected length then BTS-LLM defaults to using the heuristic-based geometric ordering mentioned previously. The expected output length for a block is the length of the string formed by concatenating the line texts with spaces inserted between them. BTS-LLM uses GPT-3.5 Turbo with `temperature=0` to 1) make outputs more deterministic and 2) focus the LLM on the input data rather than generating new text. This makes it even more important to impose bounds on output length since the problem

of text degeneration and repetitive outputs are exacerbated at low temperature settings [12] (this is true for both temperature and nucleus sampling provided by the GPT-3.5 Turbo API; see Figure 9 in [12]).

## 4 Evaluation

### 4.1 Dataset

For evaluation, we create a block-level text spotting dataset using the validation set from the Hiertext dataset [17] (the test set has not been released). The Hiertext dataset is a line-level dataset however it provides grouping of lines into blocks. We manually ordered the lines in each block to create the block-level dataset. Blocks for which the reading order was not apparent to a human were not considered for evaluation.

### 4.2 Metrics

The quality of the text recognized for each block is measured by finding the similarity between the predicted string and ground truth string for each block. To gain a comprehensive understanding we use a wide variety of similarity metrics. The metrics used are:

- *Learned Metrics*: Sentence BERT (cosine similarity between Sentence BERT embedding of prediction and ground truth), BERTScore, BLEURT. These metrics capture semantic similarity between predictions and ground truth. We use these metrics to judge the semantic likeness between predicted and ground truth strings.
- *String Similarity Metrics*: Normalized Levenshtein distance, Jaro-Winkler similarity, Ratcliff-Obershelp similarity. These traditional string similarity metrics capture the character-level likeness between predicted and ground truth strings.

### 4.3 Protocol

We are interested in comparing the predicted text for a block with the ground truth and are not interested in measuring the text detection quality (see [17] for an evaluation of Unified Detector, BTS-LLM’s text detector). Hence each predicted bounding box is matched to the ground truth bounding box with which it has the maximum IoU. Since one ground truth bounding box can have multiple predicted bounding boxes matched with it, we need to find the part of the ground truth string corresponding to each predicted string in order to compare the two. For each predicted string, we find its best fuzzy substring match in the ground truth string (using the algorithm in Appendix B). The best fuzzy substring match of a string `query` in a string `corpus` is defined as the substring of `corpus` which has the lowest Levenshtein distance from

| <i>Metric</i>                     | <i>Result</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Sentence Transformer ↑            | 0.7407        |
| BERTScore ↑                       | 0.7862        |
| BLEURT ↑                          | 0.6123        |
| Jaro-Winkler Similarity ↑         | 0.8502        |
| Ratcliff-Obershelp Similarity ↑   | 0.7870        |
| Normalized Levenshtein Distance ↓ | 0.2614        |

Table 1: Results of BTS-LLM on our block-level text spotting dataset. ↑ indicates that higher is better and ↓ indicates that lower is better.

query. Metrics are then calculated using the predicted string and its best fuzzy substring match.

#### 4.4 Results

The results<sup>2</sup> of BTS-LLM on our block-level text spotting dataset are given in Table 1. The Hiertext dataset is a challenging dataset for text spotting due to its high text density (see Section 3.2 in [17]), yet BTS-LLM performs well on both learned metrics and string similarity metrics. Some qualitative results are shown in Figure 6.

## 5 Conclusion

We proposed a new technique, BTS-LLM, which incorporates an LLM into the pipeline for block-level text spotting. BTS-LLM was evaluated on our block-level text spotting dataset using both learned metrics (that measure semantic likeness) and string similarity metrics (that measure character-level likeness). It was seen to perform well on both types of metrics on our challenging block-level dataset.


Incorporating an LLM into text spotting allows it to correct mistakes made during text recognition and reconstruct semantically meaningful text that was corrupted during recognition. The semantic and world knowledge contained in an LLM is vast, much larger than any text spotting model. Hence, incorporating it has the potential to improve the quality of text spotting which would consequently enhance performance on downstream tasks. For future work, the impact of the quality improvements provided by an LLM could be quantified by measuring the improvement in results on downstream tasks such as scene text VQA.

---

<sup>2</sup>GPT-3.5 Turbo used when evaluating BTS-LLM was accessed on 2023-10-20



WHEN EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER FOUNDED SPECIAL OLYMPICS IN 1968, SHE ENVISIONED A PROGRAM OF ATHLETIC COMPETITION FOR PEOPLE WITH MENTAL RETARDATION THAT SIDELINED PREJUDICE AND SUBSTITUTED OPPORTUNITY AND UNDERSTANDING. THROUGH HER ADVOCACY, SHE HAS BROUGHT TO MILLIONS OF LIVES WHAT ALL PEOPLE DESERVE: A CHANCE TO EXPERIENCE SELF-WORTH, A CHANCE TO CONNECT WITH THEIR FELLOW MAN, A CHANCE TO LIVE A LIFE WITHOUT WALLS.



Designed for a sloping terrain, here is a home that is practical and different. For example, notice how every room is easy to reach from any part of the house. Also, notice how the laundry is a part of the kitchen and how the multi-use room can be included as living room area separated by a folding curtain as desired. Garage is located under the bedrooms.

Figure 6: Examples outputs from BTS-LLM on images from the Hiertext dataset. For readability, only the text recognized for the biggest block in each image is given.

## References

- [1] Marco Aiello and Arnold MW Smeulders. “Bidimensional relations for reading order detection”. In: University of Groningen, Johann Bernoulli Institute for Mathematics and . . . , 2003.
- [2] Pranjal Awasthi and Anupam Gupta. “Improving length-generalization in transformers via task hinting”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00726* (2023).
- [3] Darwin Bautista and Rowel Atienza. “Scene text recognition with permuted autoregressive sequence models”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer. 2022, pp. 178–196.
- [4] Théodore Bluche. “Joint line segmentation and transcription for end-to-end handwritten paragraph recognition”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [5] Théodore Bluche, Jérôme Louradour, and Ronaldo Messina. “Scan, attend and read: End-to-end handwritten paragraph recognition with mdlstm attention”. In: *2017 14th IAPR international conference on document analysis and recognition (ICDAR)*. Vol. 1. IEEE. 2017, pp. 1050–1055.
- [6] Sébastien Bubeck et al. “Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712* (2023).
- [7] Michelangelo Ceci et al. “A data mining approach to reading order detection”. In: *Ninth International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR 2007)*. Vol. 2. IEEE. 2007, pp. 924–928.
- [8] Su Chen, Robert M Haralick, and Ihsin T Phillips. “Extraction of text lines and text blocks on document images based on statistical modeling”. In: *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology* 7.4 (1996), pp. 343–356.
- [9] Jonathan Chung and Thomas Deltel. “A computationally efficient pipeline approach to full page offline handwritten text recognition”. In: *2019 International conference on document analysis and recognition workshops (ICDARW)*. Vol. 5. IEEE. 2019, pp. 35–40.
- [10] Denis Coquenot, Clément Chatelain, and Thierry Paquet. “SPAN: a simple predict & align network for handwritten paragraph recognition”. In: *International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*. Springer. 2021, pp. 70–84.
- [11] Stefano Ferilli et al. “Abstract argumentation for reading order detection”. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM symposium on Document engineering*. 2014, pp. 45–48.
- [12] Ari Holtzman et al. “The curious case of neural text degeneration”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09751* (2020).
- [13] Chengshu Li et al. “Chain of code: Reasoning with a language model-augmented code emulator”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04474* (2023).
- [14] Shuang Liu et al. “Unified line and paragraph detection by graph convolutional networks”. In: *International Workshop on Document Analysis Systems*. Springer. 2022, pp. 33–47.

- [15] Shangbang Long et al. “Hierarchical text spotter for joint text spotting and layout analysis”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2024, pp. 903–913.
- [16] Shangbang Long et al. “ICDAR 2023 Competition on Hierarchical Text Detection and Recognition”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09750* (2023).
- [17] Shangbang Long et al. “Towards end-to-end unified scene text detection and layout analysis”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 1049–1059.
- [18] Donato Malerba, Michelangelo Ceci, and Margherita Berardi. “Machine learning for reading order detection in document image understanding”. In: *Machine learning in document analysis and recognition*. Springer, 2008, pp. 45–69.
- [19] J-L Meunier. “Optimized XY-cut for determining a page reading order”. In: *Eighth International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR’05)*. IEEE. 2005, pp. 347–351.
- [20] Lorenzo Quirós and Enrique Vidal. “Reading order detection on handwritten documents”. In: *Neural Computing and Applications* 34.12 (2022), pp. 9593–9611.
- [21] Manasi Sharma. “Exploring and Improving the Spatial Reasoning Abilities of Large Language Models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01054* (2023).
- [22] Renshen Wang, Yasuhisa Fujii, and Ashok C Popat. “Post-ocr paragraph recognition by graph convolutional networks”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2022, pp. 493–502.
- [23] Zilong Wang et al. “LayoutReader: Pre-training of Text and Layout for Reading Order Detection”. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2021, pp. 4735–4744.
- [24] Jin Wei et al. “Textblock: Towards scene text spotting without fine-grained detection”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 2022, pp. 5892–5902.
- [25] Chuhui Xue et al. “Contextual Text Block Detection towards Scene Text Understanding”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer. 2022, pp. 374–391.
- [26] Mohamed Yousef and Tom E Bishop. “OrigamiNet: weakly-supervised, segmentation-free, one-step, full page text recognition by learning to unfold”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2020, pp. 14710–14719.

## A Results of Retrained PARSeq Model

When retraining PARSeq, the data, training code and training parameters from [3] were used without modification. Only two changes were made: 1) The space character was added to the vocabulary. 2) We skipped the preprocessing step of removing spaces in ground truth labels. Additionally, the autoregressive decoding scheme was used during inference. When comparing results of the

| <i>Dataset</i> | <i>Number of Samples</i> | <i>Accuracy</i> | <i>1 - NED</i> | <i>Confidence</i> | <i>Label Length</i> |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| IIT5k          | 3000                     | 95.27           | 98.28          | 96.71             | 5.23                |
| SVT            | 647                      | 95.36           | 98.59          | 95.65             | 5.88                |
| IC13_1015      | 1015                     | 97.34           | 99.05          | 97.20             | 5.32                |
| IC15_2077      | 2077                     | 85.27           | 94.57          | 91.42             | 5.43                |
| SVTP           | 645                      | 94.42           | 98.18          | 93.99             | 5.88                |
| CUTE80         | 288                      | 95.14           | 98.11          | 96.11             | 5.57                |
| Combined       | 7672                     | <b>92.77</b>    | 97.39          | 95.00             | 5.42                |

Table 2: Accuracy of retrained PARSeq with the 95 character vocabulary (94 character original vocabulary + space character). Compare this to Table 4 in [3].

| <i>Dataset</i> | <i>Number of Samples</i> | <i>Accuracy</i> | <i>1 - NED</i> | <i>Confidence</i> | <i>Label Length</i> |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| IIT5k          | 3000                     | 96.47           | 98.48          | 96.71             | 5.09                |
| SVT            | 647                      | 96.75           | 98.86          | 95.65             | 5.86                |
| IC13_1015      | 1015                     | 97.73           | 99.11          | 97.20             | 5.32                |
| IC15_2077      | 2077                     | 87.10           | 94.89          | 91.42             | 5.33                |
| SVTP           | 645                      | 94.88           | 98.29          | 93.99             | 5.87                |
| CUTE80         | 288                      | 95.83           | 98.18          | 96.11             | 5.53                |
| Combined       | 7672                     | <b>93.97</b>    | 97.59          | 95.00             | 5.33                |

Table 3: Accuracy of retrained PARSeq with the 63 character vocabulary (62 character original vocabulary + space character). Compare this to Table 4 in [3].

retrained PARSeq to the original, see PARSeq<sub>A</sub> with **Train data: R** in the original tables. Tables 2, 3 and 4 give the main results of the retrained PARSeq. Table 5 gives results on longer and more challenging datasets. Tables 6, 7 and 8 give results on rotated datasets.

## B Best Fuzzy Substring Match

The best fuzzy substring match of a string **query** in a string **corpus** is defined as the substring in **corpus** which has the least Levenshtein distance from **query**. The brute force method would be to calculate the Levenshtein distance between **query** and every substring in **corpus** and select the substring with the minimum distance. However this brute force approach is too slow and so our algorithm performs the search in two stages. A few preliminaries before describing the algorithm:

*Scan:* A scan moves a sliding window over the string being scanned and is parameterized by 1) window size and 2) step size (number of positions the window is moved in one step).

*Resolution of a scan:* A low resolution scan is one with a large step size and a



| <i>Dataset</i> | <i>Number of Samples</i> | <i>Accuracy</i> | <i>1 - NED</i> | <i>Confidence</i> | <i>Label Length</i> |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| IIT5k          | 3000                     | 97.70           | 99.28          | 96.71             | 5.09                |
| SVT            | 647                      | 97.37           | 99.08          | 95.65             | 5.86                |
| IC13_1015      | 1015                     | 98.42           | 99.51          | 97.20             | 5.32                |
| IC15_2077      | 2077                     | 89.22           | 96.28          | 91.42             | 5.33                |
| SVTP           | 645                      | 95.50           | 98.63          | 93.99             | 5.87                |
| CUTE80         | 288                      | 96.53           | 98.61          | 96.11             | 5.53                |
| Combined       | 7672                     | <b>95.24</b>    | 98.40          | 95.00             | 5.33                |

Table 4: Accuracy of retrained PARSeq with the 37 character vocabulary (36 character original vocabulary + space character). Compare this to Table 6 in [3].

| <i>Dataset</i> | <i>Number of Samples</i> | <i>Accuracy</i> | <i>1 - NED</i> | <i>Confidence</i> | <i>Label Length</i> |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| ArT            | 35149                    | 83.46           | 94.41          | 90.27             | 5.41                |
| COCOv1.4       | 9825                     | 79.28           | 92.47          | 83.59             | 5.90                |
| Uber           | 80382                    | 82.43           | 92.36          | 85.64             | 5.48                |
| Combined       | 125356                   | <b>82.47</b>    | 92.95          | 86.77             | 5.49                |

Table 5: Accuracy of retrained PARSeq on larger and more challenging datasets using the 37 character vocabulary (36 character original vocabulary + space character). Compare this to Table 5 in [3].

| <i>Dataset</i> | <i>Number of Samples</i> | <i>Accuracy</i> | <i>1 - NED</i> | <i>Confidence</i> | <i>Label Length</i> |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| IIT5k          | 3000                     | 97.70           | 99.28          | 96.71             | 5.09                |
| SVT            | 647                      | 97.37           | 99.08          | 95.65             | 5.86                |
| IC13_1015      | 1015                     | 98.42           | 99.51          | 97.20             | 5.32                |
| IC15_2077      | 2077                     | 89.22           | 96.28          | 91.42             | 5.33                |
| SVTP           | 645                      | 95.50           | 98.63          | 93.99             | 5.87                |
| CUTE80         | 288                      | 96.53           | 98.61          | 96.11             | 5.53                |
| Combined       | 7672                     | <b>95.24</b>    | 98.40          | 95.00             | 5.33                |

Table 6: Accuracy of retrained PARSeq on rotated versions of datasets using the 95 character vocabulary. Rotated by 90°. Compare this to Table 17 in Appendix J of [3].

| <i>Dataset</i> | <i>Number of Samples</i> | <i>Accuracy</i> | <i>1 - NED</i> | <i>Confidence</i> | <i>Label Length</i> |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| IIT5k          | 3000                     | 88.57           | 93.62          | 93.27             | 5.21                |
| SVT            | 647                      | 89.80           | 94.72          | 91.78             | 5.88                |
| IC13_1015      | 1015                     | 92.02           | 94.61          | 94.36             | 5.31                |
| IC15_2077      | 2077                     | 78.96           | 90.20          | 86.77             | 5.40                |
| SVTP           | 645                      | 83.72           | 90.46          | 87.04             | 5.84                |
| CUTE80         | 288                      | 87.50           | 92.28          | 93.28             | 5.51                |
| Combined       | 7672                     | <b>86.08</b>    | 92.60          | 91.00             | 5.40                |

Table 7: Accuracy of retrained PARSeq on rotated versions of datasets using the 95 character vocabulary. Rotated by 180°. Compare this to Table 17 in Appendix J of [3].

| <i>Dataset</i> | <i>Number of Samples</i> | <i>Accuracy</i> | <i>1 - NED</i> | <i>Confidence</i> | <i>Label Length</i> |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| IIT5k          | 3000                     | 86.87           | 94.38          | 89.79             | 5.17                |
| SVT            | 647                      | 86.40           | 94.68          | 87.43             | 5.85                |
| IC13_1015      | 1015                     | 90.25           | 95.05          | 91.76             | 5.31                |
| IC15_2077      | 2077                     | 77.27           | 90.84          | 83.93             | 5.36                |
| SVTP           | 645                      | 79.84           | 92.28          | 84.33             | 5.83                |
| CUTE80         | 288                      | 82.99           | 91.33          | 87.60             | 5.43                |
| Combined       | 7672                     | <b>83.94</b>    | 93.25          | 87.72             | 5.36                |

Table 8: Accuracy of retrained PARSeq on rotated versions of datasets using the 95 character vocabulary. Rotated by 270°. Compare this to Table 17 in Appendix J of [3].

```

def get_best_match(query, corpus, stage_1_factor=2, stage_2_factor=128):
    # Stage 1: Initial search with sliding window size=query_len, step size=query_len/stage_1_factor
    for idx in range(0, corpus_len-query_len, query_len/stage_1_factor):
        current_window = corpus[idx: idx+query_len]
        current_distance = levenshtein(current_window, query)
        if current_distance < min_distance:
            min_distance = current_distance
            closest_match = current_window
            set the current index as closest_match_idx

    # Extend the region by query_len/2 in both directions to account for errors
    left_boundary = closest_match_idx - query_len/2
    right_boundary = (closest_match_idx + query_len) + query_len/2
    narrowed_corpus = corpus[left_boundary: right_boundary]

    # Stage 2: Substrings of various lengths in the region are considered
    # substring_length is the length of substrings currently being considered
    for substring_length in range(query_len*2, query_len/2, -query_len/stage_2_factor):
        # Search with sliding window size=substring_length, step size=1
        for idx in range(0, narrowed_corpus_len-substring_length+1):
            current_window = narrowed_corpus[idx: idx+substring_length]
            current_distance = levenshtein(current_window, query)
            if current_distance < min_distance:
                min_distance = current_distance
                closest_match = current_window

    return closest_match, min_distance

```

Figure 7: Algorithm for finding the best fuzzy substring match of `query` in `corpus`. Written in Python-style pseudocode.

high resolution scan is one with a small step size.

Stage 1 is a low resolution scan over `corpus` to find the region in which the best match may exist. Stage 1 will quickly narrow down the region which needs to be searched in `corpus`. Stage 2 consists of multiple high resolution scans considering various window sizes over the narrowed down region. Stage 2 will perform a more thorough search in the narrowed down region to find the best match. The algorithm is not guaranteed to find the best match but it is empirically seen to find the best match in almost all normal strings<sup>3</sup>, while being significantly faster than a brute force approach.

The algorithm used to find the best fuzzy substring match is shown in Figure 7 as Python-style pseudocode. Apart from `query` and `corpus`, the arguments are:

- `stage_1_factor`: It decides the step size of the scan in Stage 1
- `stage_2_factor`: It decides the interval at which substring lengths will be considered in the multiple scans of Stage 2

<sup>3</sup>Abnormal strings are those with irregularities such as long sequences of whitespaces, a large number of repeating characters or character sequences, etc.