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## Text collections

Contemporary collection: The published Acts of Parliament(1989-1995) of The Netherlands As 'Staten-Generaal Digitaal'(SGD)

Historical collection: The 'Database Digital Daily
Newspaper'(DDD) (1918-1946) In old Dutch spelling 'De Vires-Te Winkel'

## OCR systems

## Commercial: <br> Abbyy FineReader, Nuance OmniPage

Open-source:<br>previously named Tesseract, now called OCRopus



- TWC02: one year newspaper corpus, covering 2002 (born-digital)
- SGD: StatenGeneraal Digital
- Het Volk: a newspaper in the DDD


## Exact values

Table 1. Corpora Statistics: Corpus, language (CD: Contemporary Dutch, HD: Historical Dutch), origin: born-digital (BD) or OCRed (OCR), number of word tokens, number of word types, type-token ratio (TTR)

| Corpus | Lang. | Origin | Tokens | Types | TTR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| TWC2 | CD | BD | $92,793,519$ | 914,026 | $0.985 \%$ |
| SGD | CD | OCR | $125,209,007$ | $1,156,998$ | $0.924 \%$ |
| DDD | HD | OCR | $7,950,950$ | $1,535,529$ | $19.31 \%$ |



- TWC02: one year newspaper corpus, covering 2002 (born-digital)
- SGD: StatenGeneraal Digital
- Het Volk: a newspaper in the DDD


## Example for word 'regeering'

Table 2. Twenty variants (multiple non-contiguous errors) for the focus word 'regeering' produced by apparent random substitutions of the focus word's last character(s), besides the recurring substitution of an 'e' by 'c'


# Insertion, Deletion, Substitution 

Insertion: 'regeering' $\rightarrow$ 'regeeriing'
Deletion: 'regeering' $\rightarrow$ 'regeerng'
Substitution: 'regeering' $\rightarrow$ 'regecring'

## Transposition, Multi-C, Multi-NC

Transposition: 'regeering' $\rightarrow$ 'regeeirng'
Multi-C: multiple contiguous error 'regeering' $\rightarrow$ 'regeermg'

Multi-NC: multiple non-contiguous error 'regeering' $\rightarrow$ 'rcgecring'

## Statistics

Table 3. SGD 1989-1995: overview and statistics per LD of error-types encountered in a sample of 5,047 non-word variants

| Category | LD 1 | LD 2 | LD 3 | LD 4 | LD 5 5 | LD 6 | LD 7 | Total | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| deletion | 221 | 10 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 235 | 4.66 |
| insertion | 1,980 | 27 | 6 | 11 |  |  |  | 2,024 | 40.10 |
| substition | 1,065 | 49 | 37 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 1,155 | 22.89 |
| transposition |  | 26 |  |  |  |  |  | 26 | 0.52 |
| multi-C |  | 722 | 30 | 10 | 1 | 1 |  | 779 | 15.46 |
| multi-NC |  | 303 | 271 | 101 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 710 | 14.09 |
| run-on words | 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67 | 1.33 |
| split word | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32 | 0.63 |
| TOTAL | 3,380 | 1,138 | 347 | 126 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 5,047 |  |
| $\%$ | 66.98 | 22.55 | 6.88 | 2.50 | 0.46 | 0.14 | 0.04 |  | 100.00 |

## Statistics

Table 4. DDD 'Het Volk' 1918: overview and statistics per LD of error-types encountered in a sample of 3,799 non-word variants

| Category | LD 1 | LD 2 | LD 3 | LD 4 | LD 5 5 | LD 6 6 | Total | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| deletion | 31 | 27 | 1 | 12 |  |  | 71 | 1.87 |
| insertion | 133 | 25 | 3 | 4 |  |  | 165 | 4.34 |
| substition | 575 | 276 | 109 | 2 |  |  | 962 | 25.32 |
| transposition |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.08 |
| multi-C |  | 203 | 193 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 412 | 10.85 |
| multi-NC |  | 810 | 1,277 | 77 | 15 | 3 | 2,182 | 57.44 |
| run-on words | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.05 |
| split word | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.05 |
| TOTAL | 743 | 1,344 | 1,583 | 104 | 17 | 4 | 3,799 |  |
| $\%$ | 19.56 | 35.38 | 41.67 | 2.74 | 0.45 | 0.11 |  | 100.0 |

## TICCL

Unsupervised, scalable, fully automatic - no training, largely language-independent.

## Anagram Hashing

Use a bad hashing function to get all word strings in the corpus, that have the same subset of characters.

Assign them a large number as index

## Nummerical value for a word string

For characters use ISO Latin-1 code value

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{A} \rightarrow 41 \rightarrow 65 \\
\mathrm{Z} \rightarrow 5 \mathrm{~A} \rightarrow 90 \\
\mathrm{a} \rightarrow 61 \rightarrow 97 \\
\mathrm{z} \rightarrow 7 \mathrm{a} \rightarrow 122
\end{gathered}
$$

## Example

> 'regeering' $=$ $114^{\wedge} 5$ $+101^{\wedge} 5$ $+103^{\wedge} 5$ $+101^{\wedge} 5$ $+101^{\wedge} 5$ $+114^{\wedge} 5$ $+105^{\wedge} 5$ $+110^{\wedge} 5$ $+103^{\wedge} 5$$\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { large number }\end{aligned}$

## Anagrams

Anagrams will be identified through their common numerical value produced by the bad hash function. These are called 'angram hash'.

The unique numerical values are called 'anagram values' (AV) and 'anagram keys'

## AnagramValueAlphabet

This Alphabet contains singel values that refer to a single, a combination of two or three characters (more are possible)

a-zA-Z<br>aa, ab,ba, ...<br>aaa, aab, aba, baa, ...

## FocusWordAlphabet

Contains all AnagramValues present in the focus word

## How it works

## For substitutions:

Substract value from FocusWordAlphabet Add value from AnagramValueAlphabet

## Example

## Focus word 'regeering' <br> Minus AV 'e' <br> Plus AV 'c'

OCR-errors: 'rcgeering', 'regcering' and 'regecring'

## Insertions

## Also substitution:

Subtract zero
Add a value from AnagramValueAlphabet

## Deletions

Also substitution:
Subtract vlaue from FocusWordAlphabet Add zero

## Transposition

The value doesn't change

## Execution

The system do all substitutions for all values of AnagramValueAlphabet and all values of
FocusWordAlphabet for a FocusWord and so it retrieves all focus word variants up to LD 3

## Normalization

Up to now the SGD had 187 different characters
All text is lowercased
All punctuation marks, except hyphens and apostrophes, are rewritten as a '2'

All numbers are rewritten as a ' 3 '
Uppercased diacritic characters are rewritten as '4' (Ö,Ü,Ä)
Lowercased diacritic characters are rewritten as '5' (ö,ü,ä)
After normalization there are 32 characters left

## Result

It returns the variants in pairs:
(focusword, retrieved variant)

Table 5. Overview of the SGD and DDD focus words and their observed numbers of variants which constitute the evaluation sets. Capitalized words are proper names

| Focus sGD | \# | Focus 'Het Volk' | $\#$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Achtienribbe-Buijs | 23 | Amsterdam | 307 |
| Amsterdam | 43 | Annexionisten | 20 |
| Bolkestein | 18 | België (Belgium) | 104 |
| Jorritsma-Lebbink | 33 | Bismarck | 10 |
| Nieuwenhoven | 22 | Compiègne | 3 |
| Rotterdam | 47 | Hindenburg | 32 |
| Wolffensperger | 25 | Nederlandsche (Dutch) | 572 |
| belasting (tax) | 36 | Posthuma | 264 |
| belastingen (taxes) | 56 | Richthofen | 7 |
| belastingplichtige (taxable person) | 41 | Trotzky | 45 |
| belastinglichtigen (taxable persons) | 37 | Wilhelmina | 42 |
| doelstelling (aim) | 82 | Zeeuwsch-Vlaanderen | 19 |
| doelstellingen (aims) | 58 | belasting (tax) | 102 |
| evaluatie (evaluation) | 44 | belastingen (taxes) | 34 |
| faciliteiten (facilities) | 27 | distribueeren (to distribute) | 52 |
| goedkeuring (approval) | 36 | eenheidsworst (unity sausage) | 21 |
| inkomstenbelasting (income tax) | 81 | regeering (government) | 1468 |
| motorrijtuigenbelasting (motor vehicle tax) | 70 |  |  |
| studiefinanciering (study financing) | 93 |  |  |
| vennootschapsbelasting (corporate tax) | 52 |  |  |

## Evaluation

# True Positives, False Positives, False Negatives 

Recall, Precision

F-score

Table 6. Overview of the SGD performance scores

| Measured at | Items retrieved | At LD |  |  | Cumul. to LD |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LD | TP | FN | FP | R | P | F | CR | CP | CF |
| LD 1 | 466 | 4 | 7 | 0.991 | 0.985 | 0.988 | 0.991 | 0.985 | 0.988 |
| LD 2 | 284 |  | 129 | 1.000 | 0.688 | 0.815 | 0.995 | 0.847 | 0.915 |
| LD 3 | 106 | 1 | 525 | 0.991 | 0.168 | 0.287 | 0.994 | 0.564 | 0.720 |
| LD 4 | 11 | 11 | 133 | 0.500 | 0.076 | 0.133 | 0.982 | 0.522 | 0.682 |
| LD 5 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 0.143 | 0.043 | 0.067 | 0.975 | 0.515 | 0.674 |

Table 7. Overview of the DDD performance scores

| Measured at | Items retrieved |  |  | At LD |  |  | Cumul. to LD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LD | TP | FN | FP | R | P | F | CR | CP | CF |
| LD 1 | 380 | 6 | 4 | 0.984 | 0.990 | 0.987 | 0.984 | 0.990 | 0.987 |
| LD 2 | 1112 | 9 | 114 | 0.992 | 0.907 | 0.948 | 0.990 | 0.927 | 0.957 |
| LD 3 | 1558 | 3 | 613 | 0.998 | 0.718 | 0.835 | 0.994 | 0.807 | 0.891 |
| LD 4 | 25 | 9 | 46 | 0.735 | 0.352 | 0.476 | 0.991 | 0.798 | 0.884 |

