

# Toward building next-generation Geocoding systems: a systematic review

Zhengcong Yin<sup>1\*</sup>, Daniel W. Goldberg<sup>1</sup>, Binbin Lin<sup>1</sup>, Bing Zhou<sup>2</sup>,  
Diya Li<sup>1</sup>, Andong Ma<sup>3</sup>, Ziqian Ming<sup>4</sup>, Heng Cai<sup>1</sup>, Zhe Zhang<sup>1</sup>,  
Shaohua Wang<sup>5</sup>, Shanzhen Gao<sup>6</sup>, Joey Ying Lee<sup>7</sup>, Xiao Li<sup>8</sup>,  
Da Huo<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Geography, Texas A&M University, 797 Lamar St.,  
College Station, 77840, TX, USA.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University, 201 Old  
Main, University Park, 16802, PA, USA.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Metropolitan State  
University of Denver, Science Building 2014, Denver, 80217, CO, USA.

<sup>4</sup>Esri, Inc, 380 New York St., Redlands, 92373, CA, USA.

<sup>5</sup>State Key Laboratory of Remote Sensing and Digital Earth, Aerospace  
Information Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No.9  
Dengzhuang South Rd., Beijing, China.

<sup>6</sup>Department of Computer Information Systems, Virginia State  
University, 1 Hayden St., Petersburg, 23806, VA, USA.

<sup>7</sup>LABI Education, 143 Keelung Rd., Taipei, Taiwan.

<sup>8</sup>Transport Studies Unit, University of Oxford, South Parks Rd.,  
Oxford, OX1 3QY, United Kingdom.

<sup>9</sup>Department of Civil & Mineral Engineering, University of Toronto, 35  
St George St., Toronto, ON, Canada.

\*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): [yinzhengcong@tamu.edu](mailto:yinzhengcong@tamu.edu);

Contributing authors: [daniel.goldberg@tamu.edu](mailto:daniel.goldberg@tamu.edu); [bb2020@tamu.edu](mailto:bb2020@tamu.edu);

[bbz5159@psu.edu](mailto:bbz5159@psu.edu); [diya.li@tamu.edu](mailto:diya.li@tamu.edu); [anma@msudenver.edu](mailto:anma@msudenver.edu);

[zming@esri.com](mailto:zming@esri.com); [hengcai@tamu.edu](mailto:hengcai@tamu.edu); [zzhang@tamu.edu](mailto:zzhang@tamu.edu);

[wangshaohua@aircas.ac.cn](mailto:wangshaohua@aircas.ac.cn); [sgao@vsu.edu](mailto:sgao@vsu.edu); [humi@lazicorner.com](mailto:humi@lazicorner.com);

[xiao.li@ouce.ox.ac.uk](mailto:xiao.li@ouce.ox.ac.uk); [daniel.huo@utoronto.ca](mailto:daniel.huo@utoronto.ca);

## Abstract

Geocoding systems are widely used in both scientific research for spatial analysis and everyday life through location-based services. The quality of geocoded data significantly impacts subsequent processes and applications, underscoring the need for next-generation systems. In response to this demand, this review first examines the evolving requirements for geocoding inputs and outputs across various scenarios these systems must address. It then provides a detailed analysis of how to construct such systems by breaking them down into key functional components and reviewing a broad spectrum of existing approaches, from traditional rule-based methods to advanced techniques in information retrieval, natural language processing, and large language models. Finally, we identify opportunities to improve next-generation geocoding systems in light of recent technological advances.

**Keywords:** Geocoding, Systematic Review, Information Retrieval, Natural Language Processing, Large Language Models

## 1 Introduction

The geocoding process converts human-readable location descriptions into machine-readable geographic coordinates (Goldberg et al, 2007; Boscoe, 2008). The earliest known example dates back over two centuries, when a British doctor employed a dot map to visualize cholera cases (McLeod, 2000). In recent decades, geocoding has expanded beyond academic spatial analysis into widespread everyday applications (Yin et al, 2019b; Murray et al, 2011a; Rose et al, 2004; Rushton et al, 2006; Li et al, 2020; Yin et al, 2020; Cheng et al, 2024). This expansion has been driven by improved match rates and spatial accuracy resulting from better reference datasets, enhanced address models, and diverse data sources (Amelunxen et al, 2009; Vieira et al, 2008; Zandbergen, 2011), along with rapid technological advances in web services and GPS-enabled mobile devices. Consequently, geocoding services have become readily accessible for daily use, and spatial analyses increasingly depend upon accurate geocoded data (Rushton et al, 2006; Murray et al, 2011a).

Significant research efforts in academia and industry have targeted various aspects of the geocoding workflow, including address parsing (Christen et al, 2005; Mokhtari et al, 2019; Li et al, 2018), feature matching techniques (Ranzijn, 2013; Lin et al, 2020; Goldberg, 2011; Murray et al, 2011b), interpolation methods (Goldberg, 2008; Cayo and Talbot, 2003a; Bakshi et al, 2004), candidate ranking procedures (Goldberg and Cockburn, 2010; Knoblock et al, 2017), and the establishment of comprehensive evaluation frameworks (Goldberg et al, 2013; Christen et al, 2002). Additional studies have addressed the impact of geocoded data quality on subsequent spatial analyses (Zandbergen et al, 2012; Goldberg et al, 2013). Research on reverse geocoding has specifically emphasized reducing query latency (Ngo and Owen, 2014; Ma et al, 2016), integrating richer reference datasets (Searight et al, 2010), and improving the quality of output candidates (Hauff, 2013; Ye et al, 2011; Yu et al, 2003; Chen

et al, 2013). Previous review articles have also explored geocoding from various perspectives, including error sources and ongoing challenges (Goldberg et al, 2007), its implications for health-related research (Rushton et al, 2006), and applications within Location-Based Services (LBS) alongside considerations for privacy protection (Shin et al, 2012).

To inspire future advancements in geocoding techniques, this article begins by analyzing current demands for geocoding input and output. We then systematically decompose a geocoding system into key components based on their roles in the workflow, examining their underlying mechanisms and existing approaches. Finally, we identify research directions for the development of next-generation geocoding systems. This approach-oriented and component-based perspective sets our review apart from the prior literature. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 summarizes the variations in geocoding inputs, while Section 3 outlines the demands for geocoding outputs. Section 4 details the essential components for constructing geocoding systems. Section 5 identifies key opportunities for advancing geocoding techniques. Finally, Section 6 concludes with a summary of this survey.

## 2 Geocoding Input

Geocoding input reflects human understanding and description of locations. Table 1 summarizes several distinct location descriptions that have been used as geocoding input for various purposes and studies.

**Table 1** Location descriptions for different application scenarios

Application Scenarios	Description Patterns	Examples
Traffic accidents (Levine and Kim, 1998)	Distance/Topology related to intersections or landmarks	50 meters to the East of the intersection of Texas Ave. and Wellborn Rd.
Disease Outbreaks (Zinszer et al, 2010) Crime Analysis (Murray et al, 2011a) Exposure Risk Assessment (Rushton et al, 2006)	Residential Postal Address	209 Augsburg Ct., College Station TX 77843
Location Based Services (Tiwari et al, 2011)	Point of Interests (POI) Descriptions, Distance/Topology related to POIs	Eiffel Tower, Downtown Paris
Delivery <sup>1</sup>	Post Office Box + 2-5 Digit Number	PO Box 123456
Named Entity Recognition (NER) from Articles (Roberts et al, 2010)	Administration Regions (e.g., city, state)	The Statue of Liberty is in <i>New York Harbor in New York City</i> , in the United States.
Indoor Navigation (Di Flora et al, 2005)	Room Identifications + Building Identifications	Room SW160, Building E

<sup>1</sup><https://www.usps.com/manage/po-boxes.htm>

These variations can be explained by three factors. First, geocoding input describes where events or incidents often occur. Case reporting systems typically regulate the format of location descriptions during a data collection process. For instance, patients are required to provide their residential postal addresses upon hospital admission. Similarly, in Texas, the car crash report instructions <sup>1</sup> mandate that each crash location be described in relation to the nearest intersections, referenced landmarks, or highway segments. Second, geocoding input reflects human cognition of locations (Hu et al, 2019). For example, the region termed “downtown” does not physically exist on the earth but is defined by human activities, functions, and semantics (Gao et al, 2017). Such semantic descriptions frequently appear in daily communication, often containing abbreviations and aliases for locations (Goldberg, 2013). With the increasing prevalence of LBS such as ride-sharing and navigation in daily life (Al-Olimat et al, 2019; Tiwari et al, 2011), geocoding inputs now range from formatted postal addresses to vernacular points of interest (POI) descriptions (Melo and Martins, 2017; Goldberg, 2013). Third, geocoding inputs stem from how humans artificially encode spatial areas. Different encoding schemes use combinations of alphabets and digits to represent spatial partitions, which ultimately serve as geocoding inputs. The most common encoding method is postal codes, assigned based on regional delivery needs (Collins et al, 1998; Hurley et al, 2003). Similarly, room identification in buildings—encoding floor levels and segmentations based on arbitrary rules—functions as an input for indoor navigation scenarios.

These variations in input format and content pose significant challenges for geocoding systems. Moreover, three key linguistic complexities further complicate the geocoding process. The first challenge is the semantics and ambiguity of words. Similar to semantic issues, ambiguity is a well-known problem in geocoding and Geographic Information Retrieval (GIR) domains (Hu, 2018; Goldberg, 2013). The ambiguity between street direction prefixes and street names frequently appears in geocoding practice. For example, “N Main St.” could refer to a street named “North Main St.” or “Main St.” with a prefix of “North.” The second challenge is that geocoding input is error-prone. A study has categorized input errors into two types: semantic errors and syntax errors (Hutchinson, 2010). Semantic errors are the result of the substitution of words with similar meanings. For example, a user might input “Little River Rd” instead of “Small Creek Rd”. Despite their similar meanings, geocoding systems struggle to distinguish them based solely on pronunciation or string similarities. Syntax errors often stem from habitual typing habits. For instance, the city name or the state name is often omitted in an address description (Christen et al, 2005). This omission can affect the reference feature matching process, as the same street name can be found in many cities. Besides missing address elements, typographic errors frequently occur in geocoding input and are found to be sensitive to keyboard layout (Kukich, 1992; Gundel et al, 1993). Studies have identified the most frequent typographic error patterns in geocoding input as follows (Christen et al, 2002; Harries et al, 1999; Ranzijn, 2013; Christen et al, 2005; Damerou, 1964): (1) replacing one character, (2) deleting one character, (3) inserting one character, and (4) swapping two characters. Recently, a benchmark dataset simulating the aforementioned input

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/trf/crash\\_notifications/2023/cr100-v26.1.pdf](https://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/trf/crash_notifications/2023/cr100-v26.1.pdf)

errors has been published and utilized to evaluate address parsing techniques (Yin et al, 2023). The third challenge is the difference in languages and address systems across regions, countries, and cultures (Huang et al, 1996). For example, compared to United States postal addresses, the most noticeable difference in Chinese addresses is the absence of white-space delimiters. In terms of address components, the hierarchy of Chinese addresses starts from the highest administrative level, such as the State, and ends with the lowest geographic level, such as the House Number. In contrast, U.S. addresses begin with the House Number and end with the State (Li et al, 2018).

In a nutshell, the heterogeneity of geocoding input indicates that the next-generation geocoding system must be capable of handling input variations, and common input challenges such as typographic errors and semantic ambiguity need to be appropriately addressed to improve output quality of geocoding systems.

### 3 Geocoding Output

The key attributes of geocode outputs stem from three primary aspects: (1) geometry representations, (2) spatial accuracy, and (3) metadata description. These attributes collectively impact the usability and accuracy of geocoded data, influencing subsequent spatial analyses, interpretations, and decision-making processes.

#### 3.1 Geometry representations

In terms of geometry, outputs from geocoding systems can take the form of points, polygons, or line segments, which represent buildings, parcels or areas, and street networks in reality (Zandbergen, 2008). The final output geometries are determined by the underlying matching algorithms and reference datasets employed. For example, when city names are input into geocoding systems, the output can either be the polygon of the city boundary or the centroid of the city boundary. In cases where specific addresses (i.e., points) cannot be retrieved, commercial geocoding systems may revert to higher geographic levels (e.g., postal codes), resulting in boundaries of postal codes (Goldberg and Cockburn, 2010). This sensitivity to system-specific logic raises important questions and debates (Goldberg et al, 2007): Which geometry should be used as the output? Where is the optimal point to represent an entire city or postal code area? The answers to these questions often depend on the spatial resolution demands of subsequent studies. For instance, while using the centroid point of a county has been shown to be sufficient for indicating disparities across the entire country (Zou et al, 2018), it is not accurate for analyzing the accessibility of health service providers (McDonald et al, 2017).

#### 3.2 Spatial accuracy

Spatial accuracy in geocoding refers to the distance between geocoded locations and their corresponding ground-truth positions. It is the most critical metric for evaluating geocoding performance (Goldberg et al, 2013; Yin et al, 2019a; Goldberg and Cockburn, 2010; Zandbergen, 2008; Zhang et al, 2024), significantly influencing subsequent spatial analyses (Jacquez, 2012; Zandbergen et al, 2012). Previous studies indicate that

spatial accuracy requirements and tolerances vary depending on the specific applications of geocoded data. For example, certain cancer risk assessments require spatial errors of less than 50 meters (Washburn et al, 1994), whereas, exposure classification of Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) facilities can tolerate geocoding errors up to 1500 meters (Zhan et al, 2006). For studies linking census information with individual data, only a small portion (i.e., 5%) of geocoded data is affected by spatial error (Kravets and Hadden, 2007), while street geocoding techniques can result in spatial errors exceeding 200 meters (Zandbergen and Green, 2007). Nevertheless, regardless of the analytical scale or approach, spatial accuracy significantly impacts study conclusions, especially when geocoded locations fall near aggregation or classification boundaries (Schootman et al, 2005).

### 3.3 Metadata description

Descriptive metadata for geocoding systems are metrics that describe individual geocoded data or the performance of whole systems. The capability of metadata reporting is considered as a criteria to differentiate geocoding systems (Goldberg et al, 2013). Common individual geocode output metadata descriptions from different geocoding systems are listed in Table 2. These descriptions can be grouped as spatial and non-spatial.

**Table 2** Metadata Description for Geocodes

Name	Function	Is Spatial Description
Match rate	Percentage that the system is able to find a matched geocode	N
Match score	Customized score to indicate match quality for an output geocode	N
Match level	Geographic level that the system is able to match for an output geocode	Y
Geometry	Geometry of the output geocode	Y

Spatial descriptions are generally preferred over non-spatial ones, as non-spatial descriptions lack the precision necessary for accurately ranking candidates in spatial analyses. For instance, a geocoding system may report high match rates (a non-spatial measure) yet demonstrate low spatial accuracy (a spatial measure), depending on the underlying geocoding algorithm. Consequently, relying solely on non-spatial descriptions complicates the effective comparison of geocoding systems and hinders determining their suitability for spatial analysis tasks. However, existing efforts to enhance metadata descriptions of geocodes have mostly been insufficient for assessing the quality of individual geocode outputs. These efforts have primarily focused on modeling spatial error distributions across different environments (urban vs. rural)(Cayo and Talbot, 2003b), various geocoding techniques (street vs. address point)(Roongpiboonsopit and Karimi, 2010), diverse reference datasets (E911 vs. TIGER)(Vieira et al, 2008; Zandbergen, 2011), and their impacts on different studies(Oliver et al, 2005; Zimmerman and Li, 2010). Recent research has proposed using


spatial uncertainties—the area within which the true location is likely located—as new spatial metadata to describe geocode quality (Goldberg et al, 2010). However, few systems currently include this metadata due to the additional computational complexity required to calculate these uncertainties between reference data and candidate outputs (Goldberg and Cockburn, 2010; Goldberg et al, 2010).

In summary, the quality of geocoding outputs is closely linked to the specific needs of subsequent applications, particularly concerning geometric representation and spatial accuracy. At the same time, metadata descriptions should follow standardized criteria regardless of the intended application. A standardized spatial metric (e.g., spatial uncertainty) for each geocode is highly demanded and is worthy of further exploring. Together, these three attributes discussed in this section enable diverse applications to confidently interpret and effectively utilize geocoded data.

## 4 Geocoding Workflow and Components

The geocoding workflow integrates multiple sophisticated components, including natural language processing, probabilistic modeling, spatial feature matching, and candidate selection methodologies (Zandbergen, 2008). In this section, we first systematically decompose this intricate workflow into distinct, manageable sub-components, followed by an in-depth exploration of each constituent element essential to the functionality of a comprehensive geocoding system.

### 4.1 Geocoding Workflow



**Fig. 1** Geocoding workflow

Figure 1 illustrates the geocoding workflow, which can be broadly divided into two main parts: *geocoding textual retrieval* and *geocoding interpolation*. In the textual retrieval phase, a geocoding system segments the input description to create a query string, searches reference datasets, and ranks the matched candidates based on their matching scores. Therefore, we further divide this phase into three components: (1) data storage, (2) input parsing, and (3) retrieval. These three components in geocoding textual retrieval phase are closely linked: the retrieval algorithm dictates how reference data should be segmented and stored, and how input address description should be


parsed. In contrast, geocoding interpolation is a standalone component, focusing solely on deriving the final output coordinates using the geometry of retrieved reference data. In the following sections, we elaborate on the current research status of each component that formalize a geocoding system.

## 4.2 Geocoding Textual Retrieval

Table 3 summarizes the variations of three components (i.e., data storage, input parsing, and retrieval) in the geocoding textual retrieval phase as observed in the existing research literature.

**Table 3** Summary of Variations in Geocoding Textual Retrieval Components

Component	Variations
Data Storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Segmentation type:</b> Address component / Non-address component</li> <li>• <b>Data representation type:</b> Phonetic-based / (Sub) String-based / Dense vector-based</li> <li>• <b>Storage media type:</b> SQL-based / NoSQL-based / Binary file-based</li> </ul>
Input parsing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule-based</li> <li>• Statistic-based</li> <li>• Neural network-based</li> </ul>
Retrieval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule-based</li> <li>• Probabilistic-based</li> <li>• Machine learning-based</li> </ul>



**Fig. 2** The standard address components for U.S. addresses

### 4.2.1 Data storage

Data storage in existing geocoding systems can be summarized from three perspectives: segmentation type, data representation type, and storage media type.

**Segmentation type** refers to how we divide an entire address description record into several blocks for further processing and storage in the database. Here, we only provide a high-level abstraction of how segmentation of an address record is determined, as some string similarity algorithms—discussed later in this section—may



further refine certain portions of the address segmentation. At a high level, segmentation types can be categorized into address component-based and non-address component-based types. Address component-based segmentation divides each address record according to standard address components, as illustrated in Figure 2. In contrast, non-address component-based segmentation allows for the combination of these standard components. The choice of segmentation type depends on the retrieval methods employed in a geocoding system, which will be discussed in detail in Section 4.2.3. For example, if a geocoding system utilizes the *Per-attribute Score Ranking* method (Goldberg and Cockburn, 2010), which gives each address component a weighting score, each address record is more likely to be segmented according to individual address components. If combining house number, street base name, and street type can improve the quality of retrieved matching candidates, these three address components should be merged, necessitating the use of non-address component segmentation. In addition to segmenting address records, studies have introduced new fields to improve retrieval quality. For example, alias fields for city and state have been incorporated to account for abbreviations or outdated names commonly found in short messages (Zhang and Gelernter, 2014).

**Data representation type** refers to how each address record in the reference datasets is represented. It can be classified into three groups: (1) phonetic, (2) string, and (3) dense vector, each associated with a specific set of matching algorithms designed to enhance the accuracy of record matching within the dataset.

In the phonetic-based group, address descriptions are converted into alphanumeric-encoded strings using phonetic algorithms to handle misspellings based on pronunciation (Toutanova and Moore, 2002). A commonly used algorithm in geocoding systems is Soundex (Zandbergen, 2008; Goldberg and Cockburn, 2010). However, it is limited to English and sensitive to the position of typos (Zandbergen, 2008). To address these issues, the Double-Metaphone algorithm was introduced to accommodate non-English languages (Philips, 2000; Shrestha and Behrb, 2011). However, it still faces challenges, such as different words sharing the same encoding (Lisbach and Meyer, 2013).

The string-based group represents each address record as a string and employs string-based similarity algorithms to identify matching candidates. Various string-based similarity algorithms have been used in geocoding systems (Ranzijn, 2013; Yin, 2021; Santos et al, 2018). Depending on the particular algorithm, strings in each field may undergo modifications. For example, before calculating similarity, token-based algorithms such as  $q$ -gram algorithms (Li et al, 2008) first break strings into smaller segments, a pad version of  $q$ -gram algorithm (Keskustalo et al, 2003) add special padding characters to original strings. These string-based algorithms are typically used to match street-level descriptions and city names. Recently, Yin (2021) applied  $q$ -gram methods to postal codes, outperforming the traditional approach of matching only the first three digits. Thus, the ultimate representation of each address record is closely linked to the choice of string-based similarity algorithms for each address field.

The dense vector-based representation is an emerging string encoding approach, driven by recent advances in NLP and vector databases (Mikolov, 2013; Vaswani, 2017;

Han et al, 2023). This method converts address descriptions into dense vectors, effectively capturing semantic relationships between words to mitigate potential semantic errors in input data. Existing geocoding literature has explored their retrieval performance of various word embedding techniques, ranging from Word2Vec to transformers (Lin et al, 2020; Duarte and Oliveira, 2023b; Comber and Arribas-Bel, 2019).

It is important to note that not all address segments need to be represented in the same format, as the representation type is closely linked to the matching algorithms that tend to be used for this segment. The choice of algorithms to be used to match each field should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. This is because the performance of these matching algorithms depends heavily on the content and types of human errors present in each field. Additionally, the overall matching quality is influenced by matching/non-matching classifiers and the way a classifier utilizes the calculated similarity values, which will be discussed further in Section 4.2.3.

**Storage media type** refers to where and how reference datasets are stored, which can significantly impact the implementation of a geocoding system. Different databases offer varying levels of support for data models and query languages, influencing system performance and functionality. However, limited literature have conducted experiments on the comparison of geocoding performance resulting from a database or particular implementation. One reason could be proprietary concerns, especially for commercial geocoding systems. In this section, we provide a brief overview of storage media type used by geocoding systems, encouraging further research to explore this area in more depth. Historically, SQL-based databases have been dominant in geocoding fields (Goldberg, 2011; Xu et al, 2012). However, the key advantage of SQL-based databases—their ability to join fields from different tables based on specific conditions—is primarily used for processing reference datasets rather than querying matching candidates (Goldberg, 2008). To this end, recent researches has examined the scalability of NoSQL based database, with the document-oriented and easy data partitioning design (Clemens, 2020; Knoblock et al, 2017; Guo and Onstein, 2020). Since geocoding involves searching within a reference dataset, which is treated as a fixed resource pool, some geocoding systems convert the entire reference dataset into a binary file for more efficient search processing<sup>2</sup>. Due to potential commercial interests, limited research has been published on the performance of geocoding systems that utilize binary files as their reference dataset format. Establishing benchmarks for geocoding performance across different storage media could provide valuable insight for developing next-generation systems. Furthermore, the growing adoption of dense vectors for string matching and retrieval highlights a promising research direction—exploring the application of vector databases in geocoding.

## 4.2.2 Input address parsing

Geocoding address parsing (referred to as geocoding parsing) is a key focus in geocoding research due to its critical role in shaping how the query string is constructed and, ultimately, influencing the quality of output geocodes, in line with the geocoding “garbage in, garbage out” principle. This process involves the segmentation of input

---

<sup>2</sup>[https://help.precisely.com/r/Spectrum/global\\_geocoding/23.1/en-US/Spectrum-Global-Geocoding-Guide/Custom-Dataset-Builder/Building-a-Custom-Dataset-for-Geocoding-and-Typeahead](https://help.precisely.com/r/Spectrum/global_geocoding/23.1/en-US/Spectrum-Global-Geocoding-Guide/Custom-Dataset-Builder/Building-a-Custom-Dataset-for-Geocoding-and-Typeahead)

location descriptions and labeling of each token (Boscoe, 2008). The specific tokens used should depend on the geocoding system’s retrieval algorithm, namely how the reference data is segmented and how match candidates are ranked. Standard address components, as shown in Figure 2, are commonly used as target labels assigned to input address descriptions. It’s important to distinguish geocoding parsing from more general address parsers, which focus on identifying and extracting location descriptions from text and assigning entity labels (e.g., *LOC*). This broader task, known as toponym recognition or text geocoding, doesn’t require parsing the finer elements of addresses. Recent surveys by Hu et al (2023) and Melo and Martins (2017) provide comprehensive reviews on toponym recognition. However, to the best of the authors’ knowledge, few surveys have been published that thoroughly and specifically review geocoding address parsing techniques.

Existing geocoding parsing solutions can be categorized into three approaches: (1) rule-based, (2) statistical-based, and (3) neural network-based. Compared to statistical-based and neural network-based approaches, rule-based approaches take a “manual” approach, as they utilize the structure and hierarchy of defined address system schemas to create logic to assign labels to input address descriptions (Goldberg, 2013). For example, in the U.S. address system, transitions between address components- house numbers followed by street level descriptions and 5-digit postal code typically appears at the end of address description, are predictable. Current research on rule-based address parsers focuses on (1) abstracting address system hierarchies and (2) applying search algorithms (e.g., sliding window and heuristic search) and string-matching methods (e.g., edit distance) along with gazetteers to process addresses from various countries, including China, U.S., Turkey, and Japan (Zhang et al, 2010; Goldberg, 2008; Liu et al, 2002; Matci and Avdan, 2018). However, limitations of rule-based methods have also been pinpointed. Address systems differ across countries, cultures, and languages, requiring a unique abstraction of each country’s hierarchy. In countries without a well-defined address system, rule-based methods are not applicable. Additionally, these methods rely on lexicons to recognize address components, making them prone to “Out of Vocabulary” issues when user inputs vary in quality or description (Li et al, 2018).

To address these challenges, both statistical and neural network-based approaches have been developed, utilizing annotated training data to “learn” transitions between possible address components. Among the statistical methods, two popular models—Hidden Markov Models (HMMs) and Conditional Random Fields (CRFs)—are frequently applied for address parsing tasks (Christen et al, 2005; Sun, 2017). HMMs aim to maximize the joint probability between the observed sequence and states, assuming independence between each word and state, while CRFs improve on this by maximizing the conditional probability of labels given an observation sequence, using undirected graphical models. Initially used for NER tasks, both models have been extended to annotate address components. While most studies evaluate their performance across various countries’ address formats, further research seeks to enhance performance by integrating address system rules (Li et al, 2018), stochastic regular grammar-based scoring functions (Wang et al, 2016), and by reducing the amount of training data required (Craig et al, 2019).

Since address descriptions can be viewed as a sequence of data (i.e., text), it falls into the scope of Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), which aim to consider both the input for the current elements and preceding elements for each element in sequences. Among these RNN model architectures, Long Short-term Memory Networks (LSTMs), which introduces a memory-cell to capture long-range dependencies (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997), has shown advantages over traditional RNN models. Variations of LSTM models, including Bidirectional LSTM, attention-based LSTM, and hybrid LSTM-CRF models, have been developed and evaluated in NER tasks (Lample et al, 2016; Zhou et al, 2016; Chiu and Nichols, 2016). These LSTM-based architectures have inspired significant research into place name (LOC tag) recognition in various contexts (Wang et al, 2020; Cardoso et al, 2019). As noted earlier in this section, while address labeling and place name recognition both fall within the NER field and share certain similarities, their contextual sequences differ. Consequently, the performance of these models may not directly transfer to address labeling recognition and might require additional fine-tuning or evaluation. Although few studies have explicitly evaluated sequential neural networks for address labeling, these models have shown strong results. For example, Yassine et al (2021) used subword embeddings and an LSTM-based embedding layer with a sequence-to-sequence (Seq2Seq) model to build an address parser, achieving state-of-the-art performance across addresses from 20 countries.

More recently, LLMs, such as BERT (Devlin et al, 2018) and GPT (Generative Pre-trained Transformer) (Brown, 2020), have revolutionized the field of NLP. These LLMs are pre-trained on vast amounts of unstructured text data, enabling them to learn rich linguistic representations and capture complex language patterns. One way to fine-tuning LLMs to the specific address parsing task. For example, Li et al (2023) proposed a BERT-based model for address parsing called AddressBERT. They fine-tuned BERT on a large dataset of labeled address strings and achieved state-of-the-art performance in parsing addresses from multiple countries and languages. The model learns to identify and extract relevant address components based on the learned patterns and context. The other way is to leverage prompt engineering with generative AI. For instance, Yin et al (2023) benchmarked the performance of ChatGPT, with a specific prompt with just three address labels, using 230,000 U.S. address descriptions containing various input errors. The study showed that ChatGPT produced promising parsing results, compared to LSTM-based address parsers. Similarly, Huang et al (2024) employed a prompt-based approach using ChatLM to parse Chinese addresses. However, most of existing work focus on processing postal address alone, it would be more interesting to develop and evaluate an LLM-based parser that is capable of recognizing location descriptions embedded within more complex contexts, such as colloquial short-text sentences.

### 4.2.3 Retrieval

Retrieval aims to retrieve the most relevant matching candidates from the reference dataset based on the input address description. This process can be generalized by

the following equation.

$$\text{Matching score} = \text{Classifier}(\text{Similarity}) \quad (1)$$

where the retrieval process first identifies a set of matching candidates using string similarity methods, and it then applies a classifier function, which takes the calculated similarity value for each candidate as the input, to output matching scores that rank the candidates. Table 4 lists some distinct combinations of similarity calculation methods and classifiers used in existing geocoding literature. It’s worthy noting that

**Table 4** Comparison of Retrieval Techniques in Geocoding Systems

Geocoding System	Similarity	Classifier	Category
Goldberg and Cockburn (2010)	Phonetic and string similarity	Predefined weight	Deterministic
Li (2014)	Phonetic and string similarity	Probabilistic weight	Probabilistic
Comber and Arribas-Bel (2019)	Vector similarity	Random Forest + XGBoost	Machine learning
Rezaei Ghahroodi et al (2024)	String similarity	SVM	Machine learning
Lin et al (2020)	Vector similarity	ESIM	Machine learning
Duarte and Oliveira (2023a)	Pre-train model embedding	K-NN Similarity	Machine learning

all these similarity methods and classifier could be combined randomly. The detail of these similarity methods have been discussed in Section 4.2.1, as the choice of similarity calculation methods also has impacts on how data is segmented and stored in a database. Thus, in this section, we focus on classifiers utilized by different geocoding systems, as existing literature used it to determine the type for a geocoding system. Existing literature (Boscoe, 2008; Goldberg, 2013) mainly split the classifier into two groups: deterministic and probabilistic. We define a new category of *machine learning* for geocoding systems that employ a machine learning based classifier.

A deterministic classifier typically uses a predefined scoring mechanism to determine if matched candidates are found and rank these candidates. For example, Goldberg and Cockburn (2010) proposed a *Per-attribute Score Ranking* method to evaluate geocode candidates by assigning scores based on the match status of individual address components, each pre-assigned a weight reflecting its importance in determining a match. In addition to these address component scores, the method requires a minimum matching score to distinguish between match and no-match statuses. These empirically-determined score machisms limit its applicability to (1) address descriptions from other address systems and (2) matching field that differ from the scoring field.

Unlike a deterministic classifier, which uses empirically determined weights for each matching field, a probabilistic classifier assigns weights proportional to the frequency of each field in the reference datasets. One classic weight calculation method is known as the Fellegi and Sunter model (Fellegi and Sunter, 1969), which is widely used in

the domain of record linkage as follows (Sayers et al, 2015; Gu et al, 2003).

$$W_i = \ln \frac{m}{\mu} = \ln \frac{P(\gamma_i | M)}{P(\gamma_i | U)} \propto \ln \frac{N}{n} \quad (2)$$

where  $W_i$  denotes the weight for  $i$ th field,  $\gamma_i$  denotes the compared field  $\gamma_i$  agrees,  $m$  denotes the probability of the compared field agrees given that it is a true match  $M$  and  $\mu$  denotes the probability of the compared field agrees given that it is not a true match  $U$ . In geocoding practice (Sayers et al, 2015; Boscoe, 2008),  $P(\gamma_i | M)$  is assumed to be very close to 1, and  $P(\gamma_i | U)$  is typically approximated by the fraction of the number of records with the field  $\gamma_i$  and the number of records in collections. Later on, researchers started to adopt full-text document search engines (e.g., Elasticsearch<sup>3</sup>) to build geocoding systems (Clemens, 2015; Knoblock et al, 2017). Thus, two weight calculation methods: *Term Frequency - Inverse Document Frequency* (Equation 3) and *Best Match 25* (Equation 4), which are commonly used in IR, have been used as the classifier to rank geocoding match candidates.

$$TF-IDF(t, d, D) = TF(t, d) \cdot IDF(t, D) \quad (3)$$

$$BM25(t, d, D) = \sum_{t \in q} IDF(t) \cdot \frac{f_t \cdot (k_1 + 1)}{f_t + k_1 \cdot \left(1 - b + b \cdot \frac{|d|}{\text{avgdl}}\right)} \quad (4)$$

While TF-IDF and BM25 differ in their weight calculation methods, both prioritize terms that appear less frequently in reference datasets. In TF-IDF, the inverse document frequency (IDF) is calculated as  $IDF = \log \frac{N_D}{1+n_t}$ , where  $N_D$  is the total number of documents in the corpus  $D$ , and  $n_t$  is the number of documents containing the term  $t$ . In contrast, BM25 incorporates the absence of the term in the corpus and applies smoothing as follows:  $IDF = \log \frac{N_D - n_t + 0.5}{n_t + 0.5}$ . Regarding term frequency, TF-IDF directly uses the raw term frequency without adjustment, while BM25 introduces saturation to limit the dominance of frequently occurring terms, thereby preventing them from disproportionately influencing the relevance score. While both methods have been utilized in production geocoding systems, no systematic performance comparison has been conducted using a unified benchmark dataset and standardized metrics.

A machine learning classifier learns thresholds to discriminate similarity values to each comparison on the field in an address description using annotated matched and unmatched address pairs using machine learning algorithms. As shown in Table 4, these algorithms range from classical machine learning classification model to neural network-based approaches. Comber and Arribas-Bel (2019) combined Random Forest and XGBoost classifiers, using Word2Vec embeddings as input for matching U.K. addresses. This ensemble approach outperformed each classifier individually. Rezaei Ghahroodi et al (2024) compared the performance of linear and nonlinear Support Vector Machines (SVMs) for address matching in Iran, demonstrating that nonlinear SVMs outperformed their linear counterparts. This result aligns with the

---

<sup>3</sup><https://www.elastic.co/elasticsearch>

findings from Comber and Arribas-Bel (2019), which also reported superior performance of nonlinear classifiers compared to linear ones. With recent advances in NLP, Lin et al (2020) trained, using a corpus of Chinese addresses, a Word2Vec embedding model and an Enhanced Sequential Inference Model (ESIM) to predict match and unmatch labels for two addresses, outperforming traditional classifiers like Random Forest and SVM with the same Word2Vec embeddings. Instead of obtaining word embedding for segmented address components, Duarte and Oliveira (2023a) fine-tuned a pre-trained DistilBERT model to generate vector representations for a whole address description. They then retrieved the 10 most similar addresses and re-ranked them to derive the final output by processing these pairs through a transformer encoder. This approach achieved higher matching accuracy and shorter inference times compared to the BM25 method for matching Portuguese addresses.

### 4.3 Geocoding Interpolation

The purpose of geocoding interpolation is to derive the final output coordinates based on the geometric representations of the reference data given an input. Existing interpolation methods, which are tied to the geometry of reference datasets, can be categorized into three types: (1) linear interpolation, (2) area interpolation, and (3) point interpolation.

**Linear interpolation.** Linear interpolation calculates the output coordinates by linearly scaling the distance between known reference points (e.g., start/end point of a street segmentation). This method assumes that the change between the points follows a straight line, allowing the output coordinates to be estimated proportionally based on the input’s relative position along the line. While this is the most commonly used geocoding interpolation method due to the extensive coverage provided by line-based reference models (e.g., street centerlines), it may yield the least spatially accurate geocodes (Boscoe, 2008). The lower spatial accuracy in linear interpolation stems from several key assumptions, collectively known as the premise of parcel homogeneity (Dearwent et al, 2001). These assumptions include: (1) the existence of addresses, where parcel counts are solely based on house number ranges; (2) the uniform lot assumption, which presumes that all parcels on a street are of equal size; and (3) the parcel extension assumption, which assumes that parcels completely occupy a street without gaps at corners (Goldberg, 2008). In common linear reference datasets, such as USPS TIGER<sup>4</sup>, house numbers are often arbitrarily assigned to address ranges for privacy protection, even if they do not exist in reality. Consequently, the linear interpolation algorithm operates on the flawed concept of “coordinate difference per house number difference” without additional contextual information. Furthermore, geocoding systems often predefine the offset distance from a street centerline to a building without adjusting for local variations, introducing additional errors into the final output (Grubestic and Murray, 2004).

**Area interpolation.** Area interpolation uses polygon-based reference datasets to determine a geocoding output point from a given polygon. The main challenge with this method is accurately placing the point to best represent the entire area. Typically,

---

<sup>4</sup>[https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/data/tiger/tgrshp2017/TGRSHP2017\\_TechDoc\\_Ch4.pdf](https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/data/tiger/tgrshp2017/TGRSHP2017_TechDoc_Ch4.pdf)

there are three approaches to generating the output point: (1) bounding box, (2) centroid, and (3) weighted centroid (Goldberg, 2013). However, all these methods assume that the derived point accurately represents the building’s location within the polygon. While this assumption holds for small parcels, it often breaks down for larger parcels, especially in rural areas (Cayo and Talbot, 2003a). Additionally, for irregularly shaped parcels, such as those in "L" or "S" shapes, the centroid may not lie within the parcel boundaries (Goldberg and Cockburn, 2012).

**Point interpolation.** Address points, by definition, represent the actual locations of buildings, eliminating the need for interpolation to derive the final geocode (Zandbergen, 2008). As a result, this geocoding method is considered to produce the most accurate geocodes. However, reference datasets for address points, which are typically generated either by deriving centroids from building footprints or parcels, or through field collection using Global Positioning System (GPS) technology, are resource-intensive in terms of time and effort (Zandbergen, 2008; Goldberg and Cockburn, 2012). Thus, such datasets often have limited geographic coverage.

In summary, the spatial accuracy of these three methods is constrained by the available knowledge of building locations and distributions during geocoding interpolations. To address this limitation, one study incorporated auxiliary data, such as online records of building counts and parcel sizes (Bakshi et al, 2004), as well as population density (Schultz et al, 2007). A later study employed computer vision techniques to detect building rooftops from satellite imagery to determine building distributions and derive centroids for rooftop geocoding. While this approach reduced spatial errors for single-family house parcels, it proved less effective in complex building scenarios.

One future research direction could be an effective interpolation algorithm to leverage multiple data sources, such as building footprints and street view images, to enhance spatial reasoning for geocoding, particularly in areas with multiple buildings or along streets where house number distribution rules are unknown. Additionally, future interpolation methods must resolve geocoding inputs containing spatial expressions, such as distances from a reference point mentioned in Table 1. A recent study (Al-Olimat et al, 2019) made progress in this area by handling simple distances from POIs. However, further interpolation methods are needed to address more complex descriptions, such as distances related to road intersections or topology associated with highway segments.

## 5 Opportunities in Geocoding

In this section, building upon the methodologies, challenges, and emerging techniques discussed above, we now explore promising opportunities and directions for advancing next-generation geocoding systems. By synthesizing insights drawn from various geocoding perspectives, we outline pathways for innovation and improvement in future research and development.

### 5.1 Uniformed benchmark framework for geocoding

As observed in the previous sections, substantial improvements have been made in the input parsing, storage, and retrieval processes of geocoding workflows. However, a



major issue persists: their evaluation results are incomparable due to non-standardized datasets and metrics (Jacquez, 2012). In contrast, standardized annotated datasets, like those used in NLP tasks (e.g., NER), are readily available (Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder, 2003). Additionally, current geocoding evaluation datasets fail to fully reflect real-world input quality, leaving system performance uncertain when handling erroneous inputs. Geocoding inputs often include both syntactic and semantic errors (Hutchinson, 2010), but existing evaluations predominantly use simplistic misspellings and overlook more complex errors, such as semantic inaccuracies.

To address these limitations, we argue that (1) evaluation data should better represent real-world input quality to more accurately assess geocoding performance, and (2) datasets, metrics, and evaluation results should be standardized and made open-access to establish solid baselines for future research. Thus, a potential direction for future work is the creation of such a uniformed benchmark framework that enables ad-hoc evaluation of each sub-process in the geocoding workflow using standardized low-quality input datasets. Recently, Yin et al (2023) introduced a benchmark U.S. address dataset containing over 21 error categories observed in production geocoding services. Further efforts are needed to expand this dataset to have more error types and contain addresses covering a broader range of languages and format variations.

## 5.2 A continuously self-improving geocoding system

It is no secret that web search engines can improve the output by (1) continuously crawling web content to maintain the freshness of their reference datasets and provide the latest search results (Lewandowski, 2008), and (2) mining system logs such as input logs, feedback logs to find common input patterns and improve search and recommendation algorithms (Pan et al, 2015). We propose that the next-generation geocoding system should adhere to the principle of continuously updating its reference dataset, enhancing its retrieval capabilities, and retraining machine learning-based modules to ensure high-quality geocoding outputs. This is crucial for the following reasons. First, rapid urban development, such as new construction buildings, often leads to temporal inaccuracies in reference datasets, making them incomplete or outdated. Second, variations in the descriptions or abbreviations of place names, influenced by time and human cognition, can hinder search accuracy; using aliases for these place names has been shown to improve search outcomes, but manually collecting and updating aliases is inefficient. Third, machine learning modules within geocoding systems may experience performance degradation over time, a phenomenon known as model shifting (Chen et al, 2021). For example, input errors and variation patterns may deviate from those in the data used to train a machine learning-based address parser, leading to degraded model performance. To mitigate this issue, it is essential to periodically generate a new set of annotated training data and retrain the model to maintain optimal performance. Some works have made some progress in this direction. Yin et al (2019a) applied object detection techniques to geocoding, showing that it can help generate or update address reference data for an input as long as reference records are found for nearby parcels or buildings. Yin et al (2023) developed a framework to analyze input errors and variation patterns from geocoding system logs and generate low-quality geocoding inputs from these patterns. Clemens (2018) found that the frequency of

erroneous input has a Pareto distribution from logs, and the most frequent spelling variant is directly indexed to reference datasets to improve both the recall and the precision of query results. Future work should focus on designing system architectures and pipelines that facilitate periodic updates of reference datasets, reindexing of specific query fields, and model retraining. Additionally, a robust mechanism to determine the appropriate timing for these updates, along with a corresponding performance evaluation protocol, must be simultaneously developed to ensure the effectiveness of this self-improving mechanism.

### 5.3 Large Language Models for geocoding

As discussed earlier, LLMs have been applied to create geocoding address parsers, retrieval classifiers, and agents capable of performing geocoding tasks. With the ongoing advancements in LLMs and generative AI, their integration into next-generation systems is expected to bring even greater improvements. We foresee three potential paths for further exploration of LLMs in geocoding. The first path is to use LLM to better comprehend complex and colloquial location descriptions, particularly those involving topological relationships, as outlined in Section 2. These descriptions require parsers not only to recognize address components, but also to extract topological relationships embedded within the descriptions. Meanwhile, such descriptions require geocoding systems to perform more complex spatial interpolations to produce accurate outputs. This means that LLMs must translate the extracted topological relationships into specific spatial calculations. Emerging approaches with LLMs, such as chain-of-thought reasoning (Wei et al, 2022), present potential solutions to address this challenge, thus defining the second direction for further research. The last direction focuses on leveraging the LLMs’ multilingual and contextual understanding capabilities to overcome the challenges posed by linguistic and cultural diversity in address descriptions. Prior work, such as Yassine et al (2021), has demonstrated the effectiveness of using a single neural network architecture with sub-word embeddings to parse addresses across multiple nations. Building on this approach, researchers could explore novel vector representations of addresses, as well as address parsers and retrieval processes that function independently of specific address system rules, potentially paving the way for a universal address search system.

## 6 Conclusions

This survey has comprehensively summarized the input and output requirements essential for next-generation geocoding systems, critically examined current geocoding approaches, and highlighted key areas for future advancement. By emphasizing recent breakthroughs in IR, NLP, and LLMs, as well as discussing their promising applications in geocoding, this review seeks to inspire innovative methods and foster interdisciplinary collaboration. Furthermore, it provides a valuable reference for researchers and practitioners aiming to design advanced geocoding algorithms, workflows, and systems, thereby accelerating continued progress and innovation within the geocoding domain.

## References

- Al-Olimat HS, Shalin VL, Thirunarayan K, et al (2019) Towards geocoding spatial expressions. arXiv preprint arXiv:190604960
- Amelunxen C, et al (2009) An approach to geocoding based on volunteered spatial data. na
- Bakshi R, Knoblock CA, Thakkar S (2004) Exploiting online sources to accurately geocode addresses. In: Proceedings of the 12th Annual ACM International Workshop on Geographic Information Systems. ACM, New York, NY, USA, GIS '04, pp 194–203, <https://doi.org/10.1145/1032222.1032251>, URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1032222.1032251>
- Boscoe F (2008) The science and art of geocoding: tips for improving match rates and handling unmatched cases in analysis. In: Geocoding Health Data: The Use of Geographic Codes in Cancer Prevention and Control, Research and Practice. CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, p 95–110
- Brown TB (2020) Language models are few-shot learners. arXiv preprint arXiv:200514165
- Cardoso AB, Martins B, Estima J (2019) Using recurrent neural networks for toponym resolution in text. In: Progress in Artificial Intelligence: 19th EPIA Conference on Artificial Intelligence, EPIA 2019, Vila Real, Portugal, September 3–6, 2019, Proceedings, Part II 19, Springer, pp 769–780
- Cayo MR, Talbot TO (2003a) Positional error in automated geocoding of residential addresses. *International Journal of Health Geographics* 2(1):10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-072X-2-10>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-072X-2-10>
- Cayo MR, Talbot TO (2003b) Positional error in automated geocoding of residential addresses. *International Journal of Health Geographics* 2:10 – 10
- Chen H, Arefin MS, Chen Z, et al (2013) Place recommendation based on users check-in history for location-based services. *International Journal of Networking and Computing* 3(2):228–243
- Chen L, Cai T, Zaharia M, et al (2021) Did the model change? efficiently assessing machine learning api shifts. arXiv preprint arXiv:210714203
- Cheng Y, Yin Z, Li D, et al (2024) Assessing urban safety: A digital twin approach using streetview and large language models. In: 2024 IEEE 100th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2024-Fall), IEEE, pp 1–5
- Chiu JP, Nichols E (2016) Named entity recognition with bidirectional lstm-cnns. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 4:357–370

- Christen P, Churches T, et al (2002) Febrl-Freely extensible biomedical record linkage. Australian national University, Department of Computer Science
- Christen P, Belacic D, et al (2005) Automated probabilistic address standardisation and verification. In: Australasian Data Mining Conference
- Clemens K (2015) Geocoding with openstreetmap data. GEOProcessing 2015 p 10
- Clemens K (2018) Indexing spelling variants for accurate address search. In: International Conference on Geographical Information Systems Theory, Applications and Management, Springer, pp 73–87
- Clemens K (2020) Geocoding user queries. PhD thesis, Technische Universität Berlin
- Collins S, Haining R, Bowns I, et al (1998) Errors in postcode to enumeration district mapping and their effect on small area analyses of health data. *Journal of Public Health* 20(3):325–330
- Comber S, Arribas-Bel D (2019) Machine learning innovations in address matching: A practical comparison of word2vec and crfs. *Transactions in GIS* 23(2):334–348
- Craig H, Yankov D, Wang R, et al (2019) Scaling address parsing sequence models through active learning. In: Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems, pp 424–427
- Damerau FJ (1964) A technique for computer detection and correction of spelling errors. *Communications of the ACM* 7(3):171–176
- Dearwent SM, Jacobs RR, Halbert JB (2001) Locational uncertainty in georeferencing public health datasets. *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology* 11(4):329–334
- Devlin J, Chang MW, Lee K, et al (2018) Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805
- Di Flora C, Ficco M, Russo S, et al (2005) Indoor and outdoor location based services for portable wireless devices. In: 25th IEEE International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems Workshops, IEEE, pp 244–250
- Duarte AV, Oliveira AL (2023a) Improving address matching using siamese transformer networks. In: EPIA Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Springer, pp 413–425
- Duarte AV, Oliveira AL (2023b) Improving embeddings for high-accuracy transformer-based address matching using a multiple in-batch negatives loss. In: 2023 International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications (ICMLA), IEEE, pp 120–127

- Fellegi IP, Sunter AB (1969) A theory for record linkage. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 64(328):1183–1210
- Gao S, Janowicz K, Montello DR, et al (2017) A data-synthesis-driven method for detecting and extracting vague cognitive regions. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 31(6):1245–1271
- Goldberg DW (2008) A geocoding best practices guide. *The North American Association Of Central Cancer Registries*
- Goldberg DW (2011) Improving geocoding match rates with spatially-varying block metrics. *Trans GIS* 15:829–850
- Goldberg DW (2013) Geocoding techniques and technologies for location-based services. *Advanced location-based technologies and services* pp 75–106
- Goldberg DW, Cockburn MG (2010) Improving geocode accuracy with candidate selection criteria. *Transactions in GIS* 14(s1):149–176
- Goldberg DW, Cockburn MG (2012) The effect of administrative boundaries and geocoding error on cancer rates in california. *Spatial and Spatio-temporal Epidemiology* 3(1):39 – 54. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sste.2012.02.005>, URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877584512000081>, special Issue on Geocoding in the Health Sciences
- Goldberg DW, Wilson JP, Knoblock CA (2007) From text to geographic coordinates: the current state of geocoding. *URISA-WASHINGTON DC-* 19(1):33
- Goldberg DW, Wilson JP, Cockburn MG (2010) Toward quantitative geocode accuracy metrics. In: *ninth international symposium on spatial accuracy assessment in natural resources and environmental sciences*, pp 329–32
- Goldberg DW, Ballard M, Boyd JH, et al (2013) An evaluation framework for comparing geocoding systems. *International journal of health geographics* 12(1):50
- Grubestic TH, Murray AT (2004) Assessing positional uncertainty in geocoded data. In: *Proceedings of the 24th urban data management symposium*
- Gu L, Baxter R, Vickers D, et al (2003) Record linkage: Current practice and future directions. *CSIRO Mathematical and Information Sciences Technical Report* 3:83
- Gundel JK, Hedberg N, Zacharski R (1993) Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* pp 274–307
- Guo D, Onstein E (2020) State-of-the-art geospatial information processing in nosql databases. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* 9(5):331

- Han Y, Liu C, Wang P (2023) A comprehensive survey on vector database: Storage and retrieval technique, challenge. arXiv preprint arXiv:231011703
- Harries KD, et al (1999) Mapping crime: Principle and practice. Tech. rep., US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice
- Hauff C (2013) A study on the accuracy of flickr’s geotag data. In: Proceedings of the 36th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval, ACM, pp 1037–1040
- Hochreiter S, Schmidhuber J (1997) Long short-term memory. *Neural computation* 9(8):1735–1780
- Hu X, Zhou Z, Li H, et al (2023) Location reference recognition from texts: A survey and comparison. *ACM Computing Surveys* 56(5):1–37
- Hu Y (2018) Geo-text data and data-driven geospatial semantics. *Geography Compass* 12(11):e12404
- Hu Y, Deng C, Zhou Z (2019) A semantic and sentiment analysis on online neighborhood reviews for understanding the perceptions of people toward their living environments. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 109(4):1052–1073
- Huang C, Chen S, Li Z, et al (2024) Geoagent: To empower llms using geospatial tools for address standardization. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024, pp 6048–6063
- Huang CR, Chen KJ, Chang LL (1996) Segmentation standard for chinese natural language processing. In: Proceedings of the 16th conference on Computational linguistics-Volume 2, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp 1045–1048
- Hurley SE, Saunders TM, Nivas R, et al (2003) Post office box addresses: a challenge for geographic information system-based studies. *Epidemiology* 14(4):386–391
- Hutchinson MJ (2010) Developing an agent-based framework for intelligent geocoding. PhD thesis, Curtin University
- Jacquez GM (2012) A research agenda: does geocoding positional error matter in health gis studies? *Spatial and spatio-temporal epidemiology* 3(1):7–16
- Keskustalo H, Pirkola A, Visala K, et al (2003) Non-adjacent digrams improve matching of cross-lingual spelling variants. In: International symposium on string processing and information retrieval, Springer, pp 252–265
- Knoblock CA, Joshi AR, Megotia A, et al (2017) Automatic spatio-temporal indexing to integrate and analyze the data of an organization. In: Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGSPATIAL Workshop on Smart Cities and Urban Analytics, ACM, p 7

- Kravets N, Hadden WC (2007) The accuracy of address coding and the effects of coding errors. *Health & place* 13 1:293–8
- Kukich K (1992) Techniques for automatically correcting words in text. *ACM Comput Surv* 24:377–439
- Lample G, Ballesteros M, Subramanian S, et al (2016) Neural architectures for named entity recognition. arXiv preprint arXiv:160301360
- Levine N, Kim KE (1998) The location of motor vehicle crashes in honolulu: a methodology for geocoding intersections. *Computers, environment and urban systems* 22(6):557–576
- Lewandowski D (2008) A three-year study on the freshness of web search engine databases. *Journal of Information Science* 34(6):817–831
- Li C, Lu J, Lu Y (2008) Efficient merging and filtering algorithms for approximate string searches. In: 2008 IEEE 24th International Conference on Data Engineering, IEEE, pp 257–266
- Li D, Chaudhary H, Zhang Z (2020) Modeling spatiotemporal pattern of depressive symptoms caused by covid-19 using social media data mining. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 17(14):4988
- Li L, Wang W, He B, et al (2018) A hybrid method for chinese address segmentation. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 32(1):30–48
- Li M, Liu Z, Li G, et al (2023) Enex-fp: A bert-based address recognition model. *Electronics* 12(1):209
- Li Z (2014) Region-based dynamic weighting probabilistic geocoding. Master’s thesis, Texas A&M University
- Lin Y, Kang M, Wu Y, et al (2020) A deep learning architecture for semantic address matching. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 34(3):559–576
- Lisbach B, Meyer V (2013) *Linguistic identity matching*. Springer
- Liu CL, Koga M, Fujisawa H (2002) Lexicon-driven segmentation and recognition of handwritten character strings for japanese address reading. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 24(11):1425–1437
- Ma M, Zhong Z, Guo N, et al (2016) An efficient reverse geocoding method based on global subdivision model. In: *Geoinformatics, 2016 24th International Conference on*, IEEE, pp 1–9
- Matci DK, Avdan U (2018) Address standardization using the natural language process for improving geocoding results. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*

- McDonald YJ, Goldberg DW, Scarinci IC, et al (2017) Health service accessibility and risk in cervical cancer prevention: comparing rural versus nonrural residence in new mexico. *The Journal of Rural Health* 33(4):382–392
- McLeod KS (2000) Our sense of snow: the myth of john snow in medical geography. *Social science & medicine* 50(7-8):923–935
- Melo F, Martins B (2017) Automated geocoding of textual documents: A survey of current approaches. *Transactions in GIS* 21(1):3–38
- Mikolov T (2013) Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. arXiv preprint arXiv:13013781
- Mokhtari S, Mahmoodi A, Yankov D, et al (2019) Tagging address queries in maps search. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp 9547–9551
- Murray AT, Grubestic TH, Wei R, et al (2011a) A hybrid geocoding methodology for spatio-temporal data. *Transactions in GIS* 15(6):795–809
- Murray AT, Grubestic TH, Wei R, et al (2011b) A hybrid geocoding methodology for spatio-temporal data. *Transactions in GIS* 15(6):795–809
- Ngo NB, Owen RN (2014) Expediting reverse geocoding with a bounding region. US Patent 8,660,793
- Oliver MN, Matthews KA, Siadaty M, et al (2005) Geographic bias related to geocoding in epidemiologic studies. *International Journal of Health Geographics* 4(1):29
- Pan W, Zhong H, Xu C, et al (2015) Adaptive bayesian personalized ranking for heterogeneous implicit feedbacks. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 73:173–180
- Philips L (2000) The double metaphone search algorithm. *C/C++ users journal* 18(6):38–43
- Ranzijn B (2013) A geocoding algorithm based on a comparative study of address matching techniques. Master’s thesis, Erasmus Universiteit
- Rezaei Ghahroodi Z, Ranji H, Rezaee A (2024) Address matching using machine learning methods: An application to register-based census. *Statistical Journal of the IAOS (Preprint)*:1–16
- Roberts K, Bejan CA, Harabagiu S (2010) Toponym disambiguation using events. In: *Twenty-Third International FLAIRS Conference*



- Roongpiboonsopit D, Karimi HA (2010) Quality assessment of online street and rooftop geocoding services. *Cartography and Geographic Information Science* 37(4):301–318
- Rose KM, Wood JL, Knowles S, et al (2004) Historical measures of social context in life course studies: retrospective linkage of addresses to decennial censuses. *International journal of health geographics* 3(1):27
- Rushton G, Armstrong MP, Gittler J, et al (2006) Geocoding in cancer research: a review. *American journal of preventive medicine* 30(2):S16–S24
- Santos R, Murrieta-Flores P, Martins B (2018) Learning to combine multiple string similarity metrics for effective toponym matching. *International journal of digital earth* 11(9):913–938
- Sayers A, Ben-Shlomo Y, Blom AW, et al (2015) Probabilistic record linkage. *International journal of epidemiology* 45(3):954–964
- Schootman M, Jeffe D, Kinman E, et al (2005) Evaluating the utility and accuracy of a reverse telephone directory to identify the location of survey respondents. *Annals of epidemiology* 15(2):160–166
- Schultz A, Beyer K, Rushton G (2007) Using ZIP® codes as geocodes in cancer research. In: *Geocoding Health Data*. CRC Press, p 37–67, <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780849384332.ch3>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1201%2F9780849384332.ch3>
- Searight KR, Logan DJ, Freddie JBI, et al (2010) Reverse geocoding system using combined street segment and point datasets. US Patent 7,668,651
- Shin KG, Ju X, Chen Z, et al (2012) Privacy protection for users of location-based services. *IEEE Wireless Communications* 19(1):30–39
- Shrestha S, Behrb FJ (2011) Implementation of full text search for opengeocoding.org. *AGSE 2011* p 81
- Sun W (2017) Chinese named entity recognition using modified conditional random field on postal address. In: *2017 10th International Congress on Image and Signal Processing, BioMedical Engineering and Informatics (CISP-BMEI)*, IEEE, pp 1–6
- Tiwari S, Kaushik S, Jagwani P, et al (2011) A survey on lbs: system architecture, trends and broad research areas. In: *International Workshop on Databases in Networked Information Systems*, Springer, pp 223–241
- Tjong Kim Sang EF, De Meulder F (2003) Introduction to the CoNLL-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition. In: *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural Language Learning at HLT-NAACL 2003*, pp 142–147, URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W03-0419>

- Toutanova K, Moore RC (2002) Pronunciation modeling for improved spelling correction. In: Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp 144–151
- Vaswani A (2017) Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*
- Vieira V, Fraser A, Webster T, et al (2008) Accuracy of automated and e911 geocoding methods for rural addresses. *Epidemiology* 19(6):S352
- Wang J, Hu Y, Joseph K (2020) Neurotrp: A neuro-net toponym recognition model for extracting locations from social media messages. *Transactions in GIS* 24(3):719–735
- Wang M, Haberland V, Yeo A, et al (2016) A probabilistic address parser using conditional random fields and stochastic regular grammar. In: 2016 IEEE 16th International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW), IEEE, pp 225–232
- Washburn EP, Orza MJ, Berlin JA, et al (1994) Residential proximity to electricity transmission and distribution equipment and risk of childhood leukemia, childhood lymphoma, and childhood nervous system tumors: systematic review, evaluation, and meta-analysis. *Cancer Causes & Control* 5(4):299–309
- Wei J, Wang X, Schuurmans D, et al (2022) Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35:24824–24837
- Xu S, Flexner S, Carvalho V (2012) Geocoding billions of addresses: toward a spatial record linkage system with big data. *GIScience in the Big Data Age* 13
- Yassine M, Beauchemin D, Laviolette F, et al (2021) Leveraging subword embeddings for multinational address parsing. In: 2020 6th IEEE Congress on Information Science and Technology (CiSt), IEEE, pp 353–360
- Ye M, Janowicz K, Mülligann C, et al (2011) What you are is when you are: the temporal dimension of feature types in location-based social networks. In: Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems, ACM, pp 102–111
- Yin Z (2021) Systematic approaches to improving geocoding and reverse geocoding systems. PhD thesis, Texas A&M University
- Yin Z, Ma A, Goldberg DW (2019a) A deep learning approach for rooftop geocoding. *Transactions in GIS* 23(3):495–514
- Yin Z, Zhang C, Goldberg DW, et al (2019b) An nlp-based question answering framework for spatio-temporal analysis and visualization. In: Proceedings of the 2019 2nd International Conference on Geoinformatics and Data Analysis, ACM, pp 61–65

- Yin Z, Goldberg DW, Hammond TA, et al (2020) A probabilistic framework for improving reverse geocoding output. *Transactions in GIS* 24(3):656–680
- Yin Z, Li D, Goldberg DW (2023) Is chatgpt a game changer for geocoding-a benchmark for geocoding address parsing techniques. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGSPATIAL International Workshop on Searching and Mining Large Collections of Geospatial Data*, pp 1–8
- Yu S, Spaccapietra S, Cullot N, et al (2003) User profiles in location-based services: Make humans more nomadic and personalized. In: *Proc. of the International Workshop on Next Generation Geospatial Information*, no. LBD-CONF-2003-009 in *NG2I 2003*, pp 1–6
- Zandbergen PA (2008) A comparison of address point, parcel and street geocoding techniques. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 32(3):214–232
- Zandbergen PA (2011) Influence of street reference data on geocoding quality. *Geocarto International* 26(1):35–47
- Zandbergen PA, Green JW (2007) Error and bias in determining exposure potential of children at school locations using proximity-based gis techniques. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 115(9):1363
- Zandbergen PA, Hart TC, Lenzer KE, et al (2012) Error propagation models to examine the effects of geocoding quality on spatial analysis of individual-level datasets. *Spatial and spatio-temporal epidemiology* 3 1:69–82
- Zhan FB, Brender JD, Lima ID, et al (2006) Match rate and positional accuracy of two geocoding methods for epidemiologic research. *Annals of epidemiology* 16 11:842–9
- Zhang W, Gelernter J (2014) Geocoding location expressions in twitter messages: A preference learning method. *Journal of Spatial Information Science* 2014(9):37–70
- Zhang Xy, Lv G, Li B, et al (2010) Rule-based approach to semantic resolution of chinese addresses. *Journal of Geo-Information Science* 12(1):9–16
- Zhang Z, Li D, Zhang Z, et al (2024) Mining spatiotemporal mobility patterns using improved deep time series clustering. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* 13(11):374
- Zhou P, Shi W, Tian J, et al (2016) Attention-based bidirectional long short-term memory networks for relation classification. In: *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pp 207–212
- Zimmerman DL, Li J (2010) The effects of local street network characteristics on the positional accuracy of automated geocoding for geographic health studies.

International journal of health geographics 9(1):10

Zinszer K, Jauvin C, Verma A, et al (2010) Residential address errors in public health surveillance data: A description and analysis of the impact on geocoding. *Spatial and Spatio-temporal Epidemiology* 1(2-3):163–168

Zou L, Lam NS, Shams S, et al (2018) Social and geographical disparities in twitter use during hurricane harvey. *International Journal of Digital Earth* pp 1–19