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ABSTRACT

Optical Character Recognition (OCR) is a tool in computational technology that allows a recognition of printed characters by manipulating photoelectric devices and computer software. It runs by converting images or texts that are scanned beforehand into machine-readable and editable texts. There are various numbers of OCR tools in the market for commercial and research use, which are obtainable for free or restrained with purchases. An OCR tool is able to enhance the accuracy of the results which as well relies on pre-processing and subdivision of algorithms. This study intents to investigate the performances of OCR tools in converting the Parliamentary Reports of Hansard Malaysia for developing the Malaysian Hansard Corpus (MHC). By comparing four OCR tools, the study has converted ten reports of Parliamentary Reports which contains a number of 62 pages to see the conversion accuracy and error rate of each conversion tool. In this study, all of the tools are manipulated to convert Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) files into Plain Text File (txt). The objective of this study is to give an overview based on accuracy and error rate of how each OCR tools essentially works and how it can be utilized to provide assistance towards corpus building. The study indicates that each tool possesses a variety of accuracy and error rates to convert the whole documents from PDF into txt or plain text files. The study proposes that a step of corpus building can be made easier and manageable when a researcher understands the way an OCR tool works in order to choose the best OCR tool prior to the outset of the corpus development.
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1. Introduction

Optical Character Recognition (OCR) is a tool in computational technology. It enables a recognition of printed or written characters by manipulating photoelectric devices and computer software. OCR runs by converting images or texts that are scanned heretofore into machine-readable and editable texts. There are various numbers of OCR tools in the market for commercial and research use, which are obtainable for free or restrained with purchases. An OCR tool is able to increase the accuracy of the results which relies on pre-processing and subdivision of algorithms. The existence of OCR has assisted machine translation and enabled its users to convert
files from images or PDF into their desired output formats namely plain texts, Microsoft word format and many more.

An OCR tool is competent to work in academic or non-academic sphere. It is capable in assisting human to recognise texts or characters from image or scanned texts into editable and machine-readable to further exploit or analyse the texts. According to Davenport and Kirby (2016), machines still have disadvantages compared to human being in term of the capability to elucidate unstructured information or data better regardless of being smart and advanced. This is supported by Islam et al., (2017) who stated that the brain of a human has the ability to indisputably recognise characters or texts from various sources including an image which machines could not efficiently do. Due to the inadequacy of machine’s capability, increasing number of studies have been put forward to convert images to machine-readable and editable format. According to Herceg et al., (2005), improved exactitude or accurateness in the OCR is able correspond to the better accomplishment of machine translation in regards to corpus development. According to Afli et al., (2016), previous research on OCR error connections can be encompassed into three main categories which include (i) the enhancement of visual and linguistics approach by utilising scanned images, (ii) the integration of OCR system outputs in choosing the most accurate OCR tool, and (iii) correction of OCR output (post-processing technique). In our case of corpus development, the right selection of converter is crucial as it will enhance the process of a corpus development, especially when it involves high-volume documents. According to Richter et al., (2018), the conversion’s rate of error would critically enhance the usability the document for further analysis.

A corpus is defined as a collection of written or spoken and machine-readable text. A corpus file needs to be editable and in plain text format to be further processed. A plain text is defined as “the intelligible form of an encrypted text or of its elements.” (Merriam-webster’s Dictionary, 2019). Our corpus is a raw (plain) corpus with no mark up or annotation. To create the corpus, we need to convert all PDF to txt format in high volumes. Each of the files has approximately 60-160 pages. In our case, we have retrieved 3,511 files from Malaysian Hansard portal which archived the Malaysian Parliamentary Reports from 1959 (Parliament 1) until the last download in March 2018 (Parliament 13) to develop the Malaysian Hansard Corpus (Imran et al., 2018). Since the amount of files to be converted are in higher volume, it requires a compatible and reliable converter to suit the needs of the research as well as to expedite the output.

The core objective of this research is to compare the performance of selected OCR tools to find the most suitable and reliable tool in converting PDF to txt data to develop a Malay diachronic and specialised corpus (the Malaysian Hansard Corpus). According to Cambridge Dictionary (2018), diachronic means something that is related to changes or evolution, especially the one that is related to language. Initially, the study started with a number of OCR software to be tested and utilised. Following the pilot conversion of the data, 4 converters were selected for further analyses.

2. Basic Criteria in selecting the OCR Tools for the Study

There are certain criteria set in the study to determine the selection of the commercial OCR tools available in the market. The selection of commercial OCR is due to its availability and user-friendly trait it possesses. The first phase includes a general search on the web to resolve for a list of OCR tools. Subsequently, the list of selected OCR tools was shortlisted based on reviews or rating on the net. Nield et al., (2019) for example, reviewed and compared some excellent commercial OCR tools on the market.

In addition to that, a pilot study was done using all of the shortlisted OCR tools based on pre-set parameters to meet the needs of the study. The tested OCR tool should be able to convert multiple pages at a time, possesses the ability to do conversion for big number of files. The process was undertaken to meet the need of the study and to adapt with the conversion process of our files. The application of all tools was made based on their trial versions. Based on the pilot study, 4 OCR tools were found out to suit the criteria of the research with the ability to convert multiple documents at a higher volume at a time. Thus, this paper compares 4 different types of OCR tools those are (i) 4Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate, (ii) PDF to Text, (iii) Readiris Corporate 17 and
(iv) ABBYY FineReader 14. Brief introduction of each of the selected converters will be explained in the following sections.

2.1 4Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate

4Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate (4Videosoft Studio, 2018) is a professional converter to convert PDF files to Image, Text, Word, Excel, PowerPoint, ePub, HTML and many others (TXT, Word, RTF, JPEG, PNG, GIF, BMP, PCX, TGA, TIFF). It provides four interface languages: English, Japanese, French and German. It is able to convert multiple files in high speed and great quality. This software is also compatible with most gadgets like iPhone, PSP and other portable audio and video players.

![4Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate Interface](image)

**Figure. 1.** The Interface of 4Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate

2.2 PDF to Text

PDF to Text (Media4x, 2019) is an online and free software to covert PDF files into other output formats. It is able to speedily convert multiple files (up to 20 files per conversion). Results can easily be downloaded in a ZIP file. This online OCR tool supports 14 languages including Indonesian. This online OCR tool possesses other functions which include the ability to unlock, rotate, compress and merge PDF files other than multiple-format converting functions. The data submitted online will be removed after a subsequent hour of upload and conversion.
2.3 Readiris Corporate 17

Readiris Corporate 17 (IRIS S.A, 2018) is a PDF and OCR publishing software. It enables conversion from PDF’s, images, and texts in a various output format. Other than normal conversions, this software could also convert files into audio format like mp3 and wav as it has voice annotation and read-aloud functions. Its’ other functions include creating and editing PDF files, putting annotations and comments, splitting, merging and compressing PDF files, importing and scanning from computers. It also recognises excel, numbers and calculation tables. This software supports 128 languages in its system.
2.4 ABBYY FineReader 14

ABBYY FineReader 14 (ABBYY, 2018) is claimed to be the most powerful OCR software that is available on the market for providing fast and precise text recognition (Kimari, 2018). According to Heliński, Kmieciak and Parkoła (2012), FineReader is found out to be marginally more accurate on characters level as compared to Tesseract, an optical character recognition engine in term of cleaned data. It is also capable to operate high volume data and correct labourious tasks. This OCR software supports 192 recognition languages. It also supports input formats like PDF, image formats and editable formats like DOC(X), XLS(X), PPT(X), VSD(X), HTML, RTF, TXT, ODT, ODS, ODP.

![ABBYY FineReader 14 interface](image)

Figure 4. The interface of ABBYY FineReader 14

2.5 Comparative Analysis

Based on the investigation on the four selected OCR tools, the comparisons are divided into several key features. The features include the availability online or downloadable version, the ability to recognise multiple languages, the ability to convert in bundles or multiple files and pages, and the fees of subscriptions or purchases. The comparison of the features can be seen in Table 1.

| OCR Tool                  | Online | Download | Multi-language recognition | Multiple files conversion/bundled | Multiple pages conversion | Fee                           |
|--------------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 4Videosoft PDF Converter  |        | ✔        | 4 basic languages            | ✔                                |                           | Free (limited access) Fees applicable |
| Ultimate                 |        |          |                              |                                  |                           |                               |
| PDF to Text              | ✔      |          | Not mentioned                | ✔                                | (up to 20)                | free                          |
| Readiris Corporate 17    | ✔      |          | Various                      |                                  |                           | Free (limited access) Fees applicable |
| ABBYY FineReader (14)     | ✔      |          | Various                      | ✔                                |                           | Free (limited access) Fees applicable |

Table 1. General comparison of Selected OCR software
3. Methodology

In general, there are 3,511 PDF files from Malaysian Parliamentary Report from the House of Representative. The total files cover Parliament 1 (1959) to Parliament 13 (2018) (Imran et al., 2018). Parliament 1 has become the main focus of this study. The selection of Parliament 1 was due to its general characteristics. Typically, there are several reporting formats for different Parliamentary Debates in Malaysia. This is due to the evolution of language and the shift in policy throughout the 60 years of parliamentary sessions held in Malaysia. Parliamentary Reports in Parliament 1 have consistent structure and formatting. The reports come in English and Old Malay language and the report has two columns each in one page. There are noteworthy noises from the documents that were scanned beforehand before being archived in the Malaysian Hansard Portal. The spelling of the Old Malay is different from the contemporary one which is similar to English characters. The sample of the PDF documents that should be converted can be seen in figure 5 and 6.

![Figure 5. Front Page of the Malaysian Hansard](source)

Figure 5 shows the front page of the Parliamentary Debates of House of Representative (Dewan Rakyat). Typically, all of the front page has coat of arms of Malaya/ Malaysia with the date, day, and volume, no of issue, the title, and contents. The very first parliamentary proceeding (Parliament 1) was convened from 1959-1964. It was officially conducted in English language thus the official reporting was done in English. Nevertheless, the speakers were free to use Malay with the permission from the Speaker.
Figure 6 shows the middle page of the Parliamentary Debates of House of Representative. The verbatim reporting was reported purely on the exact words of the spoken reports or debates uttered by the Member of Parliament (henceforth MP). Hence, both English and Old Malay spellings can be easily seen on one page of the report. On the other hand, the middle pages of the Hansard reports also have two columns each. Each page stereotypically has the date and page number. In total, there are 182 files in Parliament 1 which cover five penggal or sessions. Each session consistently has two Mesyuarat (Meeting). In each Meeting, there are a different number of reports which denote the day of parliamentary proceedings. The division of reports can be seen in Table 2.

| Penggal (Session) | Mesyuarat (Meeting) | Number of Reports |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1                 | M1                  | 10                |
|                   | M2                  | 2                 |
| 2                 | M1                  | 40                |
|                   | M2                  | 6                 |
| 3                 | M1                  | 24                |
|                   | M2                  | 22                |
| 4                 | M1                  | 34                |
|                   | M2                  | 4                 |
| 5                 | M1                  | 32                |
|                   | M2                  | 8                 |
| TOTAL             |                     | 182               |

For the purpose of this study, 10 samples from 182 PDF files (5.49 percent) were taken to understand the structure of each report. Each sample was taken from the first report in all Meetings. The selection of sample is based on the likelihood or random sampling by Riffe et al., (2005). According to Riffe et al., (2005), an individual item in a particular population has an equivalent chance to be chosen as a sample. In addition to that, a study on efficient sampling on five years’ issues of consumer magazines by Riffe, Lacy and Fico (1998) proves that a selection of one document that is randomly being selected in each year, is more structured and has higher precision compared to selecting a random bigger number from overall documents. In the case of
big sample size, the study also applies the framework set by Somer (2010). Somer (2010) randomly selected 1200 files out of 42,463 newspapers articles to do content analysis which is equal to 2.83 percent of the total population. Due to that, a random sampling was chosen to be applied in this study in choosing the file samples from the parliamentary reports.

3.1 Measure for Recognition Performance through Error Recognition
The study utilises measure for recognition performance by Alexandrov (2003). The model underlines four types of errors in recognition process of an OCR which include (i) substitution, (ii) deletion, (iii) rejection and (iv) addition. Substitution occurs when one character is recognised as another. Substitution normally occurs for structurally adjacent characters. Deletion on the other hand, occurs when a character is being ignored as the OCR recognises it as noise. Rejection happens when the system could not distinguish a symbol or uncertain of the recognition. Addition transpires when the OCR recognises one symbol as two, or when noise is being distinguished as a character or characters. According to the measures for recognition performance by Alexandrov (2003), there are several calculation that can be made. The measures include the global error rate, rejection rate, recognition rate and the level of reliability of the OCR systems.

3.1.1 The main measure: Global Rate
The main measure of this study is the main global rate or $G_{err}$. $G_{err}$ is determined based on number of committed errors and number of characters in the text.

$$G_{err} = 100 \left( \frac{ne}{nc} \right)$$

3.1.2 Rejection Rate
Rejection rate or $G_{rej}$, is the measure of the registered errors which include the deletions, substitutions and additions. It can be calculated based on the following formula.

$$G_{rej} = 100 \left( \frac{nr}{nc} \right)$$

3.1.3 Recognition Rate
Table 3 shows the formula of recognition performance and its indicators. Recognition rate is frequently used for describing the efficacy of an OCR system. The equation is as follows:

$$G_{rec} = 100 \left( \frac{nc - nr - ne}{nc} \right)$$

Table 3. The formula’s Indicator for Recognition Performance

| No | Formula | Indicator                  |
|----|---------|----------------------------|
| 1  | $ne$    | Number of committed errors |
| 2  | $nc$    | Number of all characters in the text. |
| 3  | $nr$    | Number of rejections       |

3.1.4 Level of Reliability
Level of reliability shows the reliability of the overall results subsequent to the above measures. The equation is as follows:

$$G_{rel} = 100 \left( \frac{nc - nr - ne}{nc - nr} \right) = \frac{G_{rec}}{G_{rec} - G_{err}}$$

The aim of the measurement is to maximise $G_{rec}$ and to minimise $G_{err}$. Generally, total percentage of the recognition based on $G_{rec} + G_{err}$. In order to see the types of errors in
recognition process of each OCR, the whole excerpt of required texts was copied to Microsoft Word to mark the errors based on (i) substitution, (ii) deletion, (iii) rejection and (iv) addition. The excerpt starts from the page no (1301) and ends with the beginning of the new page (1303). The errors were then marked according to colours to determine the errors. Yellow was tagged for substitution, red for deletion, blue for rejection and grey was tagged for addition. The tagging of the errors can be seen in the figure 7:

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 7.** The sample of colour-coded tagging on OCR’s recognition process

### 4.0. Results and Discussions

The results and discussions will be distributed according to the conversion results and the error of recognition results.

#### 4.1. The Conversion Results

The following section will show the output of the conversion process.

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 8.** 4videosoft’s conversion (front page)
Figure 9. 4videosoft’s conversion (middle page)

Figure 8 and 9 show the sample of conversion results from 4videosoft. The converter is able to convert from PDF to plain text format including the noise. Some of the noises are converted to ‘■’, ‘r’ or ‘•’. Based on Figure 10 however, it could be seen that the conversions are not precise for Malay words. The word Menteri (minister) for example, has been converted to MSntSri instead of Menteri. The word bérkhéndak-kan (equals to English word ‘want’) has been converted to bërkehendakkan instead of berkehendakkan. The other example is Enche’ (English word: Mr.) which is converted into £ache instead of Enche’.

Figure 10. PDF to Text’s conversion

Figure 10 depicts the sample of conversion from PDF to Text. The converter identified the next page of the PDF and marked with the arrow symbol in target text (plain text file). There are also errors in spelling. For instance, the word pegawai is converted into P~gawai instead of pegawai. There are also characters like ‘#’, ‘~’ and ‘•’
Figure 11 shows the conversion result from ABBYY FineReader 14. Based on the conversion result, it can be seen that the converter also identified noise from the scanning of the PDF to certain characters like “k”, “i”, “■” and “•”. The character recognition was caused by the original marks on PDF files that were previously scanned from papers earlier.

Figure 12 also depicts the conversion result from ABBYY FineReader 14. As the conversion language was also set to French and German, the converter was able to identify the Old Malay spellings with diacritics and hyphens. The word mëminta with acute ê for example, was converted into mêminta with umlaut ê.

4.2 Error Recognition Results

Table 4 shows the ratio of human recognition of errors based on the OCR’s conversion of ABBYY FineReader 14, Readiris Corporate 17, Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate and PDF to Text. The result is presented based on the ratio from ten samples. Based on the table, it can be seen that the converters have different character recognition on the same PDF file. PDF to Text has the highest substitution while ABBYY FineReader 14 has the lowest. Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate has 0.7 deletion for the characters while PDF to Text has the highest deletion of 2.3.
FineReader 14 gives no deletion to the conversion while PDF to Text has the highest rejection of 30.5. Readiris Corporate 17 gives the highest addition to the file (43.6) while ABBYY FineReader 14 gives only 2.0. Table 5 shows the performance of the 4 OCR tools based on its measures for recognition performance model by Alexandrov (2003).

Table 4. Ratio of the Human Recognition of Errors based on OCR’s Total Sample’s Conversion

| Tool                          | No of characters | Substitution | Deletion | Rejection | Addition |
|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|
| ABBYY FineReader (14)         | 4143.4           | 36.5         | 0.7      | 0.3       | 2.0      |
| Readiris Corporate 17         | 4187.8           | 37.4         | 0.9      | 12.6      | 43.6     |
| Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate | 4214.4         | 38.8         | 0.9      | 1.9       | 4.8      |
| PDF to Text                   | 4160.7           | 44.0         | 2.3      | 30.5      | 34.1     |

Table 5. The Performance of OCR Tools based on Measures for Recognition Performance Model

| Tool                          | Global error rate | Rejection rate | Recognition rate | Level of Reliability |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| ABBYY FineReader (14)         | 0.9533            | 0.0072         | 99.0394          | 99.0466              |
| Readiris Corporate 17         | 2.2566            | 0.3009         | 97.4426          | 97.7366              |
| 4Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate | 1.1010          | 0.0451         | 98.8539          | 98.8985              |
| PDF to Text                   | 2.6654            | 0.7330         | 96.5847          | 97.3149              |

Figure 13. The Performance of OCR Tools based on Measures for Recognition Performance Model (Recognition Rate and Level of Reliability)
Based on figure 13 and 14, it can be seen that ABBYY FineReader produces the least global error rate followed by 4Videosoft PDF Converter Ultimate, Readiris Corporate 17 and PDF to Text. ABBYY FineReader shows no rejection rate while PDF to Text has the highest rejection rate of all the tested OCR tools. ABBYY FineReader also has the highest recognition rate while PDF to Text has the lowest. High recognition rate shows that the OCR tool is capable to recognise many different characters compared to the others. Finally, ABBYY FineReader 14 is found out to have the highest level of reliability (99.1669) while PDF to Text has the lowest level of reliability of all of the converter with reliability rate of 97.0142.

5. Conclusion
This study has studied the performance of four different types of OCR tools in the case of developing the Malaysian Hansard Corpus in regard to converting a file of multiple language at a time. Based on the exploratory finding, ABBYY FineReader 14 has the highest and most reliable performance based on Measures for Recognition Performance Model by Alexandrov (2003). The present results are significant as this performance of OCR test has enabled researchers to further perform the conversion of files in larger volumes to meet their individual needs. This analyses from the study may be useful to choose the most efficient converter in corpus development, especially towards utilising machine-translation approach to develop a diachronic corpus like the Malaysian Hansard Corpus.
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