



BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG COOPERATIVE  
STATE UNIVERSITY KARLSRUHE

T2\_3300  
BACHELOR'S THESIS

# Wordgrid: Extending Chargrid with Word-level Information

Timo I. Denk

Author	Timo I. Denk (timo.denk@sap.com)
Student ID, course	1441403, TINF16B1
Course of studies	Computer Science
Company	SAP SE (Berlin, Germany)
Supervisors	Dr. Christian Reisswig (christian.reisswig@sap.com) <i>SAP Deep Learning Center of Excellence</i> PD Dr. Markus Reischl (markus.reischl@kit.edu) <i>Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)</i>
Date of submission	September 2, 2019

## Abstract

Chargrid is a recently proposed approach to understanding documents with 2-dimensional structure. It represents a document with a grid, thereby preserving its spatial structure for the processing model. Text is embedded in the grid with one-hot encoding on character level. With Wordgrid we extend Chargrid by employing a grid on word level.

For embedding words with semantically meaningful vectors, we propose a novel method for estimating dense word vectors, called word2vec-2d. It is a fork of word2vec that is trained on 2D document corpora rather than 1D text sequences. The notion of context is redefined to be the variably-sized set of words that are spatially located within a certain distance to the center word.

BERTgrid, our most enhanced Wordgrid version, uses contextualized word piece vectors. The concrete vector chosen for a position in the grid is retrieved from the hidden representations of a BERT language model. This model has access to the neighboring text, as opposed to mapping every symbol 1:1 to its corresponding representation, irrespective of position and contextual meaning.

Both new methods benefit greatly from unsupervised pre-training. We apply them to two proprietary SAP invoice datasets, a large unlabeled and a smaller labeled one. The task is key-value extraction, e.g. determining the invoice date or vendor name. The best Wordgrid model improves over the Chargrid baseline by a margin of 0.91 percentage points; BERTgrid achieves even better performance, 3.73 percentage points above Chargrid.

**Keywords:** 2D document understanding, embedding, contextualization

**Author’s Declaration.** Unless otherwise indicated in the text or references, or acknowledged above, this thesis is entirely the product of my own scholarly work. The use of *we* as a subject is a stylistic choice and refers to me. This thesis has not been submitted either in whole or part, for a degree at this or any other university or institution.

Berlin, Germany; August 28, 2019

Timo I. Denk

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Embedding in 1D NLP . . . . .	5
2.2	2D Document Understanding . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Prerequisites</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1	Chargrid: Towards Understanding 2D Documents . . . . .	13
3.2	Word2vec: Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space	16
3.3	BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding . . . . .	18
<b>4</b>	<b>Novel Methods</b>	<b>22</b>
4.1	Word2vec-2d: Word2vec for 2D Corpora . . . . .	22
4.2	Document Understanding with Wordgrid . . . . .	25
4.2.1	2D Document Representation with Wordgrid . . . . .	26
4.2.2	Non-contextualized Embedding . . . . .	27
4.2.3	BERTgrid: Contextualized Embedding . . . . .	29
4.2.4	Combining Chargrid and Wordgrid . . . . .	32
<b>5</b>	<b>Application: Information Extraction from Invoices</b>	<b>35</b>
5.1	Concur Travel and Expense Management . . . . .	35
5.2	Invoice Datasets . . . . .	37
5.3	Evaluation Measure . . . . .	40
5.4	Implementation Details . . . . .	41
<b>6</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>47</b>
6.1	Experiments . . . . .	48
6.2	Model Complementarity . . . . .	51
<b>7</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Future Work</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>60</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>61</b>

## Figures

1	Chargrid network architecture . . . . .	14
2	Word2vec CBOW model . . . . .	17
3	BERT model architecture . . . . .	19
4	Serialization of a 2D document . . . . .	23
5	Context in 2D vs. 1D . . . . .	24
6	Visualization of Chargrid and Wordgrid for a sample invoice . . . . .	26
7	Invoice serialization methods . . . . .	28
8	BERTgrid creation pipeline . . . . .	30
9	Model complementarity Venn diagrams . . . . .	34
10	Concur “New Expense” user interface . . . . .	36
11	Dataset ground truth . . . . .	36
12	Spatial distribution of invoice fields . . . . .	38
13	Word piece box size histograms . . . . .	39
14	Word piece count per invoice histogram . . . . .	40
15	Comparison of convergence speed . . . . .	49
16	Model complementarity on the line item description field . . . . .	51
17	Model complementarity on the line item quantity field . . . . .	52
18	Model complementarity on the vendor address field . . . . .	52

## Tables

1	Comparison of embedding in 1D and 2D . . . . .	12
2	Comparison of Wordgrid with non-contextualized and contextualized embedding . . . . .	32
3	Main results . . . . .	48
4	Embedding choice results for plain Wordgrid . . . . .	50
5	Chargrid-Wordgrid combination method results . . . . .	51

## Listings

1	Distance between two bounding boxes . . . . .	24
2	Wordgrid pre-processing function . . . . .	43
3	BERTgrid pre-processing function . . . . .	45

# 1 Introduction

The digitalization of industry processes and consumer interaction comes with the transition away from paper documents for information carriage to digital representations. Instead of sending letters or printing files, it gets increasingly common to use digital information processing. A substantial set of processes, however, still relies on printed documents. When they interface with digital systems, the information must be digitalized. This repetitive task can be done by humans entering the information manually. Recently, there has been a tendency to automate such processes using computer programs that are capable of *understanding* the documents to a degree that allows them to extract the needed information accurately.

A common way of processing physical documents with computer programs is scanning them to retrieve a digital representation, namely an image. In the second step it is common to detect and recognize the individual characters with an optical character recognition (OCR) engine. While the digital representation contains character-level information at this stage, the desired information is still to be extracted. The difficulty of the extraction task, which is the third step, depends on the type of document that is being processed: standardized formats can be tackled with rule-based systems that would search for instance for characters at a pre-defined spatial position in the document. With more heterogeneous inputs the understanding gets more difficult and requires a certain degree of intelligence.

An example for the aforementioned document processing is the information extraction from invoices in travel expense report systems. Customers report the expenses they had, testified with an uploaded photo or scan of the invoice they received (e.g. from the hotel they stayed at). For validation purposes, fields like the invoice vendor, date, and amount must be extracted from the filed document.

SAP's document understanding pipeline *Chargrid*, recently proposed by [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#), is a method for solving the information extraction (third) step in the processing procedure. It relies solely on the information provided by the OCR engine, in that it constructs a tensor representation from it, where the spatial information of the original document is preserved. This tensor serves as the input to a convolutional neural network (CNN), trained to predict bounding boxes and segmentation masks for the fields to be extracted from the document. The choice of the input tensor is one of the key components of *Chargrid*: Compared to a raw image, as retrieved from a scan, it is a much more compact representation of a document that enables the machine learning (ML) model to learn how to extract the desired fields more easily.

Chargrid’s information extraction is sometimes erroneous and below human-level performance. As part of the constant effort to improve the quality of Chargrid’s key-value extraction, we extend it with word-level information. That is, we modify the input representation to embed words or sub-words of the original document rather than individual characters. In a second advancement, we lift the representation richness to a higher level by using so called *contextualized embeddings*. That means we construct a given spatial position of the input tensor not only based on the word that is located at the corresponding position in the invoice, but also based on its neighborhood, also known as *context*. We show that the new representations improve the extraction performance of the ML model significantly and lead to convergence after fewer training steps.

In the field of natural language processing (NLP), commonly used input representations are subject to change: The popular word2vec embedding computation algorithms by Mikolov et al. (2013) slowly made way for more advanced, contextualized embeddings such as ELMo (Peters et al. (2018)) or BERT (Devlin et al. (2018)). The transition came with significant improvements in performance. The best performing models on common NLP benchmarks are using contextualized embeddings to represent the input text sequences. Another aspect that has changed, is the level on which input is being embedded: word piece embedding or variants of it prevail over character- and word-level embedding, recently.

The NLP tasks in GLUE and other popular NLP benchmarks consist of word sequences where the words are arranged in one dimension. The position of a word within the input can be stored as its index in the sequence. Our document understanding problem differs fundamentally in that its input symbols (characters, words, or word pieces) are positioned within a 2-dimensional document, i.e. each symbol is associated with an  $x$ - and a  $y$ -coordinate. Because the recent, popular NLP research focuses almost exclusively on the 1-dimensional domain, we see our work as an important and successful transfer of non-character-level embedding and contextualization from 1D to 2D.

Another tendency in the NLP research community is the utilization of large unlabeled corpora for pre-training. An example is OpenAI’s GPT-2 model (Radford et al. (2019)) which is pre-trained on “slightly over 8 million documents for a total of 40 GB of text”. Research has shown that extensive pre-training aids a model’s performance on smaller tasks. From a practical point of view, pre-training is often particularly useful when there is limited labeled, but abundant unlabeled data available.

In SAP’s concrete situation, the subsidiary Concur, a travel and expense management service provider, processes more than 100k invoice documents per day. Processing means information about the invoice, such as its date, the total

amount, or the list of line items, are being extracted. The automation of the invoice field extraction has several business benefits for Concur: most notable are faster processing of documents, processing with fewer errors and difficulties, and cost savings. Concur’s mode of operation leads to the accumulation of large amounts of unlabeled invoices, which we seek to leverage for training our invoice field extraction system by pre-training models on it.

This Bachelor’s thesis was written as part of a cooperative integrated degree program between the Cooperative State University Karlsruhe (DHBW) and SAP. The respective department at SAP is the Deep Learning Center of Excellence, located in Berlin, Germany. It is a team of data scientists who perform ML prototype development as well as ML research. An ongoing project of the department is the enhancement and extension of the invoice parsing system Chargrid, on top of which this work is building.

This work was inspired by a suggestion made in the original Chargrid paper ([Katti et al. \(2018\)](#)) to represent a document on word level rather than character level. The goal was to improve the information extraction performance on the invoice task. The thesis is a combination of research and practical application as the developed methods are applicable to 2D document understanding in general, despite being motivated by and validated on the invoice key-value extraction task.

Listed below are the main scientific and economic contributions made within the scope of this Bachelor’s thesis:

- **Word2vec-2d**: Lifting of the word2vec method ([Mikolov et al. \(2013\)](#)) from 1D to 2D. While word2vec is being applied to corpora of sequential text, word2vec-2d uses a novel notion of context allowing it to operate on corpora comprised of 2D documents.
- Development of **Wordgrid**; an extension of Chargrid ([Katti et al. \(2018\)](#)) enriched with word-level embedding.
- **Contextualization in 2D**: Introduction of contextualized 2D document representations, which greatly profit from unsupervised pre-training on large, unlabeled document datasets.
- **Implementation** of the new methods and integration into the existing Chargrid code base at SAP.
- **Improvement** of the existing SAP invoice parsing system by a significant margin of 3.73 percentage points.

The remainder of this work is structured as follows: Section 2 positions this work with respect to other research. It discusses related tendencies in the re-

search community and sheds light on current methodologies and similarities between 1D NLP and 2D document understanding. In Section 3 we recapitulate the previous work required to understand our research, namely the document understanding pipeline Chargrid, the word2vec model for word embedding computation, and the language representation model BERT. That section may be skipped by readers familiar with the matter. Section 4 introduces our novel methods. It is split into the presentation of word2vec-2d in Section 4.1 and Wordgrid (both non-contextualized and contextualized) in Section 4.2. The concrete application of our research to information extraction from invoices is discussed in Section 5. There, we also define the evaluation measure (Section 5.3) associated to the invoice application and used in most experiments, and discuss noteworthy implementation details (Section 5.4). The listing of results (Section 6) is followed by its discussion (Section 7). Suggestions for future work are discussed in Section 8. Section 9 draws a conclusion wrapping the work.

The mathematical notation used throughout the document is the one defined in the “Notation” chapter in Goodfellow et al. (2016). Most importantly sets use the  $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{C}$  font, and vectors, tensors, and matrices are bold, e.g.  $\mathbf{v}$  or  $\mathbf{M}$ . When indexing a scalar entry in a matrix the letter is not written in bold, e.g.  $M_{i,j}$ .

## 2 Background

The work on Wordgrid is centered around the representation of 2D documents for subsequent processing with a neural network. It therefore touches the aspects embedding/representation and 2D document understanding. There is plenty of work on embedding in 1D natural language processing (NLP) contrasting relatively little research on the analogous aspects in 2D.

This section is split into two parts: First, we recapitulate and analyze the recent (roughly since 2014) research in the field of embedding for 1D NLP. We mainly name and discuss two key aspects of embedding that are relevant for this work: (1) Different embedding levels, i.e. whether to embed characters, words, or word pieces; (2) embedding choices, i.e. how embedding vectors can be chosen, where we put particular focus on the distinction of non-contextualized and contextualized embedding. After that we do the same analysis for the field of 2D document understanding and examine how current approaches tackle the problem.

We point out that the 2D domain is lacking behind the 1D domain in terms of embedding levels and embedding choices. This suggests that transferring successful methods from 1D to 2D would open up a field of new methods. Those might, analogous to the improvements made in the 1D domain, improve 2D document understanding. In general, the processing of natural language with 2D information attached to it has received little attention. Neither are there widespread, publicly available benchmarks/datasets, nor are many papers being published. Also, the terminology *2D document understanding* itself was introduced just recently by [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#); a tantamount term is *document intelligence*. This is in stark contrast to the rich history and strong presence of *normal*, 1D NLP.

### 2.1 Embedding in 1D NLP

In the field of NLP, embedding refers to the method of representing a symbol with a vector. A symbol is commonly a character, word, or word piece. Sentences or larger chunks of text can also be embedded, however, this is not of relevance here. The embedded representation of natural language is then processable by ML models. Over the past years, different ways of embedding were developed and usage patterns shifted. In this section, we shed light on the developments, name relevant work, and put it into the context of our research.

**Embedding Levels.** A basic NLP task is text classification. A model is asked to predict a class for a given piece of text, e.g. whether or not a movie review

is positive. Neural text classification models operating on different embedding levels were developed. [Zhang et al. \(2015\)](#) was the first to show that character-level CNNs can solve text classification task comparably well. In their case, characters are embedded with 70-dimensional one-hot encoded vectors. The authors show that the CNN is able to *learn to understand the language*, by looking at character sequences, to an extent sufficient to solve the classification tasks. [Kim \(2014\)](#) trains a CNN on a text classification tasks but chooses to embed the sentences on word level. The results are also comparably good.

[Devlin et al. \(2018\)](#) use word pieces: Words are split into parts and those parts are then embedded. Smaller or well known words might not be split at all, for instance the sentences

```
How are you doing? Extraordinarily well!
```

would be split<sup>1</sup> into

```
how, are, you, doing, ?, extra, ##ord, ##ina, ##rily, well, !,
```

where commas separate tokens. The longer word `Extraordinarily` would be split into four word pieces. Another example are the German words

```
Äußerst solides Halbwissen!
```

which are tokenized to the word pieces

```
au, ##ße, ##rst, solid, ##es, hal, ##b, ##wi, ##ssen, !.
```

The aforementioned embedding levels have individual advantages and disadvantages: Character-level embedding is universal in that every character can be embedded (for languages similar to English or German in nature) and anything can be learned, if dataset and model capacity are sufficiently large. Conversely, word-level embedding typically requires fewer training samples for the processing neural model to converge, because information about the language is already given to the model. The model does not need to learn that the consecutive characters `h, e, r, e`, zoned by spaces, belong together and mean “here”; instead it can learn directly that `here` means “here”. In addition, semantically similar words may be grouped. Furthermore, the sequence length is reduced by a significant factor (approximately five for English; see [Bochkarev et al. \(2012\)](#)) when embedding on word level. Models such as recurrent neural networks (RNNs) or models with attention are known to work better and are more time performant with shorter sequences (see Section 10.7 in [Goodfellow et al. \(2016\)](#)).

The main problem of word-level embedding is the handling of out-of-vocabulary words. A fixed-size vocabulary cannot contain all words of a natural language,

---

<sup>1</sup>Using tokenizer and vocabulary from the BERT repository at <https://github.com/google-research/bert>

for some languages like German that is by definition, as new words can be constructed by concatenating other ones. Depending on the task, spelling mistakes can also occur which make an embedding impossible or wrong. This problem was mitigated by [Lample et al. \(2016\)](#) with a word-level embedding that is a combination of a normal word-level lookup table and a pooled, fixed-size embedding computed from the characters of the given word using a character-level CNN.

Word pieces are currently the most successful approach, see [Yang et al. \(2019\)](#). They have the benefit of shortening the sequence relative to character-level embedding, while being able to embed most words simply by splitting them into chunks.

**Embedding Choices.** Let  $V$  denote the number of different symbols that can be embedded;  $N$  is the dimensionality of the embedding. The simplest way of embedding a symbol is to use a one-hot encoding. Here,  $V = N$  and the embedding for the  $i$ th word in the vocabulary is a vector that is all-zero except for the  $i$ th dimension where it is defined to be 1. While being simple, one-hot embedding is impractical for large  $V$ . Also, prior knowledge cannot be injected in the vectors as they are all orthogonal to each other.

Alternatively,  $N$  can be set to a value of choice and the  $V \times N$  embedding matrix can be generated randomly. While the embedding still does not carry any prior information, this method is simple and  $N$  can be chosen freely. [Kocmi and Bojar \(2017\)](#) experiment with different random initializations and achieve best results by sampling from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.01)$  or  $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.001)$ .

Since [Mikolov et al. \(2013\)](#) introduced word2vec, efficient methods for estimation of word representations in vector space, embedding with semantic meaning has become very popular, see e.g. GloVe ([Pennington et al. \(2014\)](#)) and FastText ([Bojanowski et al. \(2017\)](#)). Instead of pointing into random directions, these methods compute embeddings which carry semantic meaning: Vectors of similar<sup>2</sup> words have a high cosine similarity. Downstream models, i.e. the ones operating on the embedding, achieve better scores and converge faster, thanks to the prior information held in the embedding. [Kim \(2014\)](#) finds embedding with semantics to be superior over random embedding. While  $N = 400$  is a common choice for word2vec and its variants, there is also research by [Yin and Shen \(2018\)](#) investigating mathematically what the optimal dimensionality for embedding spaces is.

Embeddings computed with word2vec, GloVe, or FastText have an important

---

<sup>2</sup>Similarity refers to similar usage in the word’s language, e.g. “king” and “prince” are similar. The words “goes” and “goals” are not similar in this sense, as they appear in different contexts.

shortcoming: Single words can have different meanings which humans identify based on the context. The named models, however, map a word to exactly one vector (conceivable as a hash map). They are non-contextualized. For example, it would be desirable to embed the word “May” differently in the following two example sentences: (1) “May I visit you?”, (2) “In May 2020 you can!”. In (1), “May” refers to the enquirer asking for permission. In stark contrast, (2) uses “May” to refer to the month. With *contextualized embedding* methods, the words would be embedded differently. A model would produce the embedding vector for each occurrence of “May” dynamically based on the context.

Contextualized embedding was introduced by [Peters et al. \(2018\)](#) with ELMo, where the embedding vector is a concatenation of the hidden state of a forward and backward neural language model; more specifically two Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM; [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber \(1997\)](#)) networks reading the neighboring words (context) from left and right, respectively. Recent extensions of ELMo are OpenAI’s GPT ([Radford et al. \(2018\)](#)), and version two of it [Radford et al. \(2019\)](#)), Google’s BERT [Devlin et al. \(2018\)](#) which uses Transformers ([Vaswani et al. \(2017\)](#)), the very recent BERT generalization XLNet ([Yang et al. \(2019\)](#)), and RoBERTa ([Liu et al. \(2019b\)](#)). The enumerated research has constantly pushed the state-of-the-art on challenging 1D NLP tasks, e.g. [Wang et al. \(2018\)](#). Also on comparably simple text classification tasks, BERT-based models like XLNet outperform older methods such as the CNN approaches [Zhang et al. \(2015\)](#) (character-level) and [Kim \(2014\)](#) (word-level with word2vec) by a considerable margin.

Both, non-contextualized word embedding methods (e.g. word2vec, GloVe) and contextualized ones (e.g. ELMo, BERT) have in common that they require a large corpus of data, to be pre-trained on the target language. The training objectives are similar. Word2vec-based methods try to predict a word based on its context with a fully-connected neural network with a single hidden layer. The context size is commonly below 20; the parameter count is  $2 \times N \times V$ . Contextualized models like BERT in turn are trained on a language modeling task. They predict a word based on a much larger context (up to 512 words) and other auxiliary tasks. They have significantly more capacity; BERT-Large for instance has 340M parameters.

**Pre-processing.** Before embedding natural language it is common to apply some pre-processing to it. The following list is composed from several chapters of [Manning et al. \(2008\)](#) which describe pre-processing in the context of search queries. Common types of pre-processing are (1) lowercasing, where all characters are converted to lowercase, (2) removal of stop words, i.e. “extremely common words which would appear to be of little value”, (3) removal of dia-

critics, e.g. *Señorita* becomes *Senorita*, (4) stemming and lemmatization “reduce inflectional forms and sometimes derivationally related forms of a word to a common base form”, e.g. *goes* is converted to *go*.

The listed pre-processing methods are particularly important when dealing with fixed-sized embedding vocabularies on word level. They tend to lower the number of out-of-vocabulary words. With word piece embedding pre-processing is less important.

**Power of Embedding.** Embedding has proven to be a very useful concept. The best solutions researchers can find for challenging NLP benchmarks are relying heavily on the chosen type of embedding. That is mainly for two reasons: First, with semantic embedding information can be encoded in the text representation. [Conneau et al. \(2017\)](#) have shown that word embedding spaces, learned from text corpora of different languages, can even be aligned without any supervision from parallel data, to allow for word translation. This work endorses how powerful embedding spaces are. Second, the embedding computation is unsupervised, i.e. it works with unlabeled corpora. These are available excessively on the internet in sizes so large that even models like the GPT-2 do not overfit on the train data of 40GB text despite having more than 1.5B parameters (see [Radford et al. \(2019\)](#)).

## 2.2 2D Document Understanding

We define the term *2D document* to be a document with textual information which is partly contained in the spatial arrangement of the text: Words are not positioned in a 1D sequence but in a 2-dimensional coordinate system. Human readers are guided by font sizes, positioning of text boxes, and the like. Document understanding, also referred to as document intelligence, deals with the information extraction from such documents.

Examples for 2D documents are presentation slides, layout-rich websites, posters, cover pages, flyers, and invoices. Concrete tasks could be key-value extraction from invoices ([Katti et al. \(2018\)](#)), election poster classification, or vision-based web page rank estimation ([Denk and Güner \(2019\)](#)). Many more are conceivable.

**Previous Work.** A decent share of NLP research and benchmarks focuses on serialized text, where spatial information does not exist. The transfer to 2D poses new requirements to the ML models that perform the understanding. At the same time, the representation of a document is a choice left to the data

scientist. In the following we look at multiple 2D document understanding methods with special focus on their embedding choices. The list is sorted in temporal order (old to recent):

- [Esser et al. \(2012\)](#), **Automatic Indexing**: The authors work with a database of templates where a template defines the graphical structure of a certain type of document, including the positions of fields of interest. New documents are assigned to a template and (after OCR application) fields are extracted based on it. The method is rule-based and works well on documents that can be clustered into groups of homogeneous layout.
- [Schuster et al. \(2013\)](#), **Intellix**: Similar to Automated Indexing, Intellix performs a document classification first and applies rule-based information extraction in a second step. They make the assumption that “a large number of interesting fields [...] are always placed at the same position within documents of the same template”. Depending on the domain this assumption does not hold unless the number of templates is very large.
- [Palm et al. \(2017\)](#), **CloudScan**: In contrast to Automatic Indexing and Intellix, CloudScan does not use templates as it is the first work in this enumeration that is using a neural network. The document is processed sequentially by an  $n$ -grammer. Each  $n$ -gram is classified by an LSTM which reads the invoice lines from left to right on word level. Words are embedded in a trainable, 500-dimensional embedding space. Initially the embedding is randomly initialized.
- [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#), **Chargrid**: Chargrid preserves the 2D structure of the input document by converting it into a 3-axes tensor, where characters are embedded along the depth axis with 54-dimensional one-hot encoding. This tensor is then processed by a CNN predicting bounding boxes and segmentation masks. The application of a CNN is similar to [Zhang et al. \(2015\)](#) where the CNN is also operating on character level so the lower level convolutional layers are presumably learning to recognize words relevant for the task.
- [Liu et al. \(2019a\)](#), **Graph Convolution (GC)**: The authors convert a 2D document into a graph of text segments. Each node in the graph corresponds to one text segment and is attributed with the text as well as its 2D position. The graph is fully connected and the edges’ attributes include the visual distance of the two text segments. An LSTM is used to convert the text in each node into a feature vector. It works on word level with word2vec embedding. For the node classification they use a graph convolutional network.

- [Zhao et al. \(2019\)](#), **CUTIE**: The authors use an approach very similar to Chargrid/Wordgrid. Scans are processed with an OCR engine and the text is split into word pieces; the vocabulary size is 20,000. The word pieces are embedded into a 128-dimensional vector space, presumably randomly initialized and tuned during training. The word piece tensor is processed by a CNN.

The enumeration of 2D document understanding methods shows a tendency from rule-based systems to neural ones (CNNs, LSTMs). The neural methods embed on character (Chargrid), word (CloudScan and Graph Convolution), or word piece level (CUTIE). Note though, that only Chargrid, Graph Convolution, and CUTIE make the 2D information accessible to the processing neural network.

It is hard to rank the listed work because it is commonly evaluated on proprietary datasets and tasks. However, it is certain that rule-based systems cannot deal with heterogeneous document layouts without an enormous rule base. Consequently, Automatic Indexing and Intellix are not applicable in such cases. The rule-based approach was replaced by the neural CloudScan method. All following work is neural too. At the current stage of research there is a lack of methods that can gain performance improvements from unlabeled data. The general objective is the overall information extraction performance as today’s state-of-the-art is below human level performance.

CUTIE by [Zhao et al. \(2019\)](#) uses the same concept as Chargrid except on word piece level, which is in turn close to this work which experiments with word and word piece level. There are, however, two fundamental differences that distinguish Wordgrid from CUTIE: (1) our embedding space is not necessarily randomly initialized, we introduce word2vec-2d, and (2) we propose a contextualized Wordgrid.

**Transfer from 1D to 2D.** After analyzing the recent work on embedding in 1D NLP (Section 2.1) and 2D document understanding (above) we draw the lines between the two fields. Specifically, we hypothesize that the 2D domain could benefit from the recent advancements made in the 1D domain which have pushed the state-of-the-art there.

Table 1 compares the embedding methods used in 1D NLP and 2D document understanding. The comparison shows that there is a lack of research on 2D document understanding which use semantically rich embedding to represent the document. The existing methods (Chargrid and CUTIE) use either one-hot or random embedding<sup>3</sup>. This not only requires more training data, but also has

<sup>3</sup>We acknowledge that the Graph Convolution work *is* using semantically rich embedding,

Embedding	1D	2D
One-hot	Character-level models	Chargrid
Random	Rarely used	CUTIE, Wordgrid (ours)
Non-contextual.	word2vec, GloVe, FastText	Wordgrid w/ word2vec-2d (ours)
Contextualized	ELMo, GPT, BERT, XLNet	BERTgrid (ours)

Table 1: Comparison of embedding in classical 1D NLP and 2D document understanding. One-hot embedding is only applicable on character level as the vector size equals the number of distinct symbols and the latter is too large on word level. Random embedding is commonly used with fine-tuning so the embedding is eventually being learned. Non-contextualized embedding used to be the de-facto standard in 1D NLP, where each symbol (word or word piece) is mapped to a semantically meaningful vector representation. The recent invention of contextualized embedding was followed by its broad adoption. Our novel methods cast embedding methods from 1D to 2D by filling three cells in the right-most column.

the significant disadvantage that unlabeled 2D data is hard to use. Pre-training on unlabeled data is, however, a huge part of the success of (non-)contextualized methods in the 1D domain, e.g. word2vec or BERT. That is where we position our research on word2vec-2d and Wordgrid/BERTgrid.

In terms of embedding levels CUTIE is the only work which uses word piece embedding – the level used by the best models in NLP. Chargrid relies on its CNN to learn the meaning of words and the methods CloudScan and Graph Convolution cannot deal with out-of-vocabulary words.

To the best of our knowledge the only research casting from 1D NLP to 2D is the Image Transformer work by [Parmar et al. \(2018\)](#). Opposed to us, in 2D they work with images and not with 2D documents/text anymore. They mitigate the problem of attending over too many spatial locations in an image by restricting the attention area of a Transformer block to a local neighborhood. Nevertheless, thanks to the Transformer block stacking, the receptive field grows faster than the one of CNNs would in a comparable setup.

By bringing more meaningful word-piece-level embedding to the 2D document understanding domain, we expect to see significant performance improvements analogous to the 1D successes of ELMo and BERT. Furthermore, we make unlabeled data more usable. In particular in business applications, unlabeled documents are often readily and plentifully available, while manual annotation is rather expensive.

---

however, it processes the vectors with a 1D architecture, namely an LSTM.

### 3 Prerequisites

This section summarizes selected previous research that is needed to understand the novel methods suggested in this thesis. It assumes the reader is familiar with the fundamentals of ML, in particular neural networks, convolutional layers, embedding, backpropagation, and gradient descent. [Goodfellow et al. \(2016\)](#) is a comprehensive reference.

The content of this section is taken mainly from five papers, namely the Chargrid paper by [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#), the original word2vec paper by [Mikolov et al. \(2013\)](#) and an explanation of word2vec’s parameter updates ([Rong \(2014\)](#)), and the work by [Devlin et al. \(2018\)](#) on BERT, which is grounded on the Transformer ([Vaswani et al. \(2017\)](#)). Credit for the content of this section goes to the respective authors of the named papers. Readers may either read the original publications or the summary provided in the following.

#### 3.1 Chargrid: Towards Understanding 2D Documents

Chargrid is a 2D document understanding pipeline proposed by [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#). Instead of serializing a document into a 1D text sequence, the proposed method, named Chargrid, preserves the spatial structure of the document by representing it as a sparse 2D grid of characters. In this section we repeat the most important points of the method.

Let  $\mathbb{C}$  denote the set of all characters and let a document be

$$\mathbb{D} := \{(c_i, x_i, y_i, w_i, h_i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}, \quad (1)$$

consisting of  $n$  characters  $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$  positioned at  $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{N}$  with width  $w_i \in \mathbb{N}$  and height  $h_i \in \mathbb{N}$ . The documents can be retrieved from scans with an OCR engine or from PDFs directly. Different documents may contain different numbers of characters.

The Chargrid tensor  $\mathbf{C} \in \{0, 1\}^{w \times h \times d}$  is constructed from a document of size  $w \times h$  according to

$$\mathbf{C}_{x,y,:} := \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_{\text{cg}}(c_i) & \text{if } x_i \leq x \leq x_i + w_i \wedge y_i \leq y \leq y_i + h_i \\ \mathbf{0}_d & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

with the character one-hot embedding function  $\mathbf{e}_{\text{cg}} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^d$ . In cases where several character bounding boxes enclose the coordinate  $x, y$ , the one with the bounding box center closest to  $x, y$  is chosen.




Figure 1: Network architecture for document understanding, the chargrid-net. Each convolutional block in the network is represented as a box. The height of a box is a proxy for feature map resolution while the width is a proxy for the number of output channels.  $C$  corresponds to the number of *base* channels, which in turns corresponds to the number of output channels in the first encoder block.  $d$  denotes dilation rate. Figure source: [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#)

Intuitively,  $C$  can be understood as a representation of  $\mathbb{D}$  which preserves the spatial positions of characters and uses the depth dimension to encode *which* character there is at the given position. At places where there is no character in the document, the Chargrid tensor contains zeros (referred to as *background*). Raw data and Chargrid are compared on the left-hand side of Figure 1. The different embedding vectors are encoded with colors. Note that lines, colors, and any information other than the characters are not contained in the Chargrid anymore.

The Chargrid representation  $C$  is the input to a fully convolutional neural network which performs semantic segmentation and bounding box regression. The former is implemented as a probability distribution over all target classes for each pixel  $x, y$  in the input. The bounding box regression is needed to distinguish a plurality of instances of the same class and to group entity predictions e.g. into the same invoice line item. The network architecture is depicted in Figure 1.

The network is trained on a loss composed of three equally weighted terms

$$l_{\text{total}} := l_{\text{seg}} + l_{\text{boxmask}} + l_{\text{boxcoord}}, \quad (3)$$

described in greater detail in the following.

First, for each pixel the model outputs a probability distribution over all classes, denoted by  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times h \times l}$  where  $l$  is the number of labels. The ground truth  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$  has the same shape as  $\mathbf{P}$  but is a one-hot encoding of the correct class.

$$l_{\text{seg}} := - \sum_{x=1}^w \sum_{y=1}^h \sum_{c=1}^l \hat{Y}_{x,y,c} \log P_{x,y,c} \quad (4)$$

is the cross entropy loss for segmentation (e.g. [Ronneberger et al. \(2015\)](#); [Long et al. \(2014\)](#)).

Second, for each pixel the model outputs a binary probability distribution indicating whether it assumes a bounding box to be present in the ground truth. Let the model's prediction be  $\mathbf{P}^{\text{box}}$  and the binary ground truth label be  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^{\text{box}}$ , then

$$l_{\text{boxmask}} := - \sum_{x=1}^w \sum_{y=1}^h \left( \hat{Y}_{x,y}^{\text{box}} \log(P_{x,y}^{\text{box}}) + (1 - \hat{Y}_{x,y}^{\text{box}}) \log(1 - P_{x,y}^{\text{box}}) \right) \quad (5)$$

is the binary cross entropy loss for box masks.

Third, for each pixel the model outputs a single bounding box, represented by four coordinates. Recall the Huber loss

$$L_{\delta}(y, \hat{y}) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(y - \hat{y})^2 & \text{if } |y - \hat{y}| < \delta \\ \delta(y - \hat{y}) - \frac{1}{2}\delta & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Let  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times h \times 4}$  be the bounding box regression output of the model where the last dimension holds x-coordinate, y-coordinate, width, and height. Further, let  $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$  be the corresponding ground truth which is only defined at places where there is a bounding box present in the image, i.e. where  $Y_{x,y}^{\text{box}} = 1$ .

$$l_{\text{boxcoord}} := \sum_{x=1}^w \sum_{y=1}^h \left[ \hat{Y}_{x,y}^{\text{box}} = 1 \right] \sum_{d=1}^4 L_{\delta}(B_{x,y,d}, \hat{B}_{x,y,d}) \quad (7)$$

is the Huber loss for box coordinate regression, see [Ren et al. \(2015\)](#), where  $[\cdot]$  is the indicator function which is 1 if the enclosed boolean expression is true, 0 otherwise. In the equation it ensures only the bounding box predictions made at places where there is a bounding box in the ground truth are being used for training. In the actual implementation we predict the offset relative to a so called *anchor box* easing the regression task.

## 3.2 Word2vec: Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space

In this section we recapitulate the word2vec models by Mikolov et al. (2013) and focus on the aspects relevant for our work. The mathematical formulations are taken from Rong (2014).

Word2vec are two models for computing continuous vector representations of words from large, unlabeled data sets. In other words, given some corpus of text, the algorithms compute a vector representation for each of the words of a vocabulary. The vocabulary is commonly chosen to contain the top- $V$  most frequently occurring words in the corpus.

The vector representations are helpful for downstream tasks because they carry semantic meaning after training. For instance vectors of synonyms are expected to point into a very similar direction in the vector space, i.e. have a high cosine similarity. Therefore, a model processing them will be likely to interpret them in a similar fashion. Alternatives such as random embedding or one-hot encoding of words do not feature the aforementioned advantages.

The two word2vec models are called *continuous bag-of-words* (CBOW) and *skip-gram*. They are conceptually similar. We focus on CBOW in the following as it is faster than skip-gram and was the method used in our experiments.

The objective of CBOW is to predict a word based on its context. Given for example the (fairly small) corpus *the car is driving down the street* the model would be trained to predict the word *driving* based on *car is down the*. Also it would try to predict *down* based on *is driving the street*, and so on. In the example the model has access to the two adjacent words on both sides. These words are referred to as *context* and two is the *window size*.

For simplicity we select only one word from the context, i.e. the model tries to predict the center word based on *some* word in the surrounding context. Let  $\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W}' \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times N}$  be two weight matrices, where  $V$  is the vocabulary size,  $N$  is the embedding dimensionality, and the  $i$ th row of  $\mathbf{W}$  is the vector representation  $\mathbf{v}_{w_i}$  for the  $i$ th word  $w_i$  in the vocabulary:

$$\mathbf{v}_{w_i}^\top := \mathbf{W}_{i,:} \quad (8)$$

Likewise  $\mathbf{v}'_{w_i}$  is the vector representation for  $w_i$  in  $\mathbf{W}'$ .

For a given context word  $w_c$  the algorithm computes a score

$$u_j := \mathbf{v}_{w_j} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{w_c} \quad (9)$$




Figure 2: Word2vec CBOV model with only one word in the context. Figure source: [Rong \(2014\)](#)

for each word in the vocabulary. The scores are normalized with softmax to retrieve a probability distribution

$$\Pr(w_j | w_c) = \frac{e^{u_j}}{\sum_{i=1}^V e^{u_i}} = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{v}'_{w_j} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{w_c})}{\sum_{i=1}^V \exp(\mathbf{v}'_{w_i} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{w_c})} =: y_j. \quad (10)$$

Note that both,  $\mathbf{W}$  and  $\mathbf{W}'$  contain a vector representation for each word, so  $\mathbf{v}'_{w_i}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{w_i}$  are two different vectors belonging to the same vocabulary word.

Verbally explained, Equation 10 computes a probability distribution over all vocabulary words based on a single given context word  $w_c$ . It does so by computing the dot product of the vector representations of context and vocabulary word, and normalizing it to retrieve a probability distribution. A given combination of context and vocabulary word will have a high value for  $y_i$  if the two vectors  $\mathbf{v}'_{w_j}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{w_c}$  point into a similar direction. The vector magnitude matters as well.

The mathematical formulations from above can be interpreted as a neural network, see Figure 2. The input is a one-hot encoded version of the context word, the hidden layer is its vector representation  $\mathbf{v}_{w_c}$  and the output layer yields the probabilities for all vocabulary words. The hidden layer's activation function is linear and the output layer uses a softmax.

In order to learn meaningful values for the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W}')$ , the neural network is being trained with stochastic gradient descent (SGD). The training objective (for a single training sample) is to maximize Equation 10 for the actual output word  $w_O$ :

$$\max \Pr(w_O | w_c) = \max \log \Pr(w_O | w_c). \quad (11)$$

The maximum is over all possible parameterizations for  $\theta$ . The logarithm is taken to break the fraction (Equation 10) up into a subtraction, convert the multiplication of the multi-word context case into a sum, and improve numerical stability. The resulting loss function is

$$E := -\log \Pr(w_O | w_c), \quad (12)$$

from which the parameter updates can be derived with backpropagation, see Rong (2014).

In the case of a multi-word context, the equations remain the same except the model seeks to maximize the probability

$$\Pr(w_O | w_{-s}, w_{-s+1}, \dots, w_{-1}, w_{+1}, \dots, w_{s-1}, w_s), \quad (13)$$

where  $s$  is the windows size and  $w_i$  is the  $i$ th word in the right context of a particular occurrence of  $w_O$  in the corpus and  $w_{-i}$  is the  $i$ th word in the left context of  $w_O$ . Given the corpus example from above (the car is driving down the street) and the output word driving, the model would maximize

$$\Pr(\text{driving} | \text{car, is, down, the}), \quad (14)$$

with  $s = 2$ . Note that this is just a single example from the corpus. Analogously, the model maximizes all other words in the sequence given their contexts:  $\Pr(\text{down} | \text{is, driving, the, street})$ ,  $\Pr(\text{the} | \dots)$ ,  $\Pr(\text{is} | \dots)$ , etc.

### 3.3 BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding

When the Transformer model was published by Vaswani et al. (2017) it was revolutionary: It dropped recurrent and convolutional architectures to instead rely solely on attention mechanisms in the sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) domain. In seq2seq the input to a model is a variably-sized sequence of input symbols (e.g. words) which is mapped to an also variably-sized sequence of output symbols. Seq2seq models are being applied to many NLP tasks, for instance translation. Let  $n$  denote the length of the input and  $m$  the length of the output sequence.

Vaswani et al. (2017) use an embedding layer which maps a 1D sequence of  $n$  input symbols to a sequence of vectors. Subsequently, the individual symbols in the sequence are enriched with a position-dependent *positional encoding*. The positional encoding is simply being added to the symbol embedding. The resulting vector sequence serves as the input to the model. Positional encodings allow




Figure 3: The BERT model architecture: A sequence of word pieces  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  is converted into embedding vectors  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  which is combined with the corresponding positional encodings  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ . The resulting inputs traverse  $l$  layers of Transformer blocks  $T$ . The arrows interconnecting the blocks indicate the information flow of BERT’s bidirectional attention.

the model to *attend* to words relative<sup>4</sup> to themselves. The details of attention are not relevant at this point, but the special property of the positional encoding is. In short: The vector sequence fed into the model is computed as the sum of a positional encoding and a symbol embedding (e.g. word embedding).

The Transformer architecture itself consists of Transformer *blocks*. Each block (in the Transformer encoder) is a function

$$\mathbf{b}_l : \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{\text{model}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{\text{model}}} \quad (15)$$

which converts a  $n \times d_{\text{model}}$  matrix to another matrix of the same shape. The Transformer paper uses  $d_{\text{model}} \in \{512, 1024\}$ . Let  $T_{l,\cdot}$  denote the output of the  $l$ th transformer block.

While we refer the interested reader to Vaswani et al. (2017) to read about the block internals, the key points we want to make here are that the Transformer processes sequences and encodes them with an embedding that is composed of position and symbol, and that the Transformer consists of stacked Transformer blocks. By the time it was published it achieved state-of-the-art performance on translation tasks.

<sup>4</sup>This post explains mathematically why the *relative* attention works with the chosen positional encoding which is based on trigonometric functions: <https://timodenk.com/blog/linear-relationships-in-the-transformers-positional-encoding/>

Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) by [Devlin et al. \(2018\)](#) builds on top of the Transformer. Instead of using an encoder-decoder architecture it consists of  $l \times n$  Transformer blocks converting a sequence of  $n$  input symbols into a sequence of  $n$  output vectors.  $l$  denotes the number of stacked blocks, also called layers<sup>5</sup>. Figure 3 illustrates the BERT architecture’s grid-like structure.

The Transformer is *pre-trained* in an unsupervised fashion on two tasks simultaneously. The training data is a corpus of natural language, e.g. retrieved from Wikipedia. The two tasks are:

1. **Task #1 Masked Language Model (MLM):** The MLM objective asks the model to predict the words in a sentence that were masked out. Given for instance the sentence `mens sana in corpore sano`<sup>6</sup>, a random word would be replaced with a mask token: `mens sana [MASK] corpore sano`. The stack of Transformer blocks processes the word sequence where `in` is masked out and outputs a probability distribution over all vocabulary words. The loss is formulated such that the model learns to infer potentially fitting words given the rest of the sequence that was not masked. It boils down to the same negative log-likelihood loss used by `word2vec` (Equation 12).

The actual MLM formulation is slightly more complicated (multiple words are being masked out simultaneously, sometimes they are replaced with random words, sometimes just kept as-is). In essence the MLM task trains the model to infer missing words based on their context. Solving this task might seem easy, it does, however, require some *understanding* of language. In fact language models were shown to be very performant on a variety of different tasks when pre-trained long enough on the MLM task, see [Radford et al. \(2019\)](#) “Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners”.

2. **Task #2: Next Sentence Prediction:** Given two sentences the model is asked to classify whether they appeared in the corpus next to each other or not. For example the first sentence might be `the man went to the store` and the second sentence could be `he bought a liter of milk` in which case the ground truth would be “is next” because the second sentence did indeed follow the first sentence in the corpus. If the second sentence was `cats land on their feet` the model should output “not next”.

---

<sup>5</sup>Technically, the term layer is ambiguous here: Each block itself is made up of several fully connected layers. Still, the BERT terminology refers the that group of layers (a block) as a layer.

<sup>6</sup>Latin phrase meaning *a healthy mind in a healthy body*.

BERT uses word pieces and embeds them with initially random initialization. The positional encodings from the Transformer are used too, however, they are not learned and not initialized from periodic functions.

Trained on the two mentioned tasks, BERT models learn something about the language used in the domain of the corpus. They learn to *model* language. In order to predict missing words, information about the context is passed between the Transformer blocks (see arrows in Figure 3). The internal representations  $T$  contain this *contextualized information*. It is therefore common to use these contextualized word vectors to embed language for other models. Note that, as opposed to word2vec and similar methods, there is no more 1:1 correspondence between entries of the vocabulary and vectors. A symbol's vector representation is computed dynamically based on the context.

When published in October 2018, BERT achieved state-of-the-art performance on a range of 1D NLP benchmarks, including the GLUE dataset [Wang et al. \(2018\)](#), Stanford Question Answering Dataset (SQuAD; [Rajpurkar et al. \(2018\)](#)), and Situations With Adversarial Generations (SWAG; [Zellers et al. \(2018\)](#)). Since then it has been the basis of future work such as TransformerXL ([Dai et al. \(2019\)](#)), XLNet ([Yang et al. \(2019\)](#)), and most recently RoBERTa ([Liu et al. \(2019b\)](#)).

## 4 Novel Methods

In this section we present the research contributions made as part of this Bachelor’s thesis.

The first is an adaptation of word2vec that makes it applicable to 2D documents, see Section 4.1. We redefine the word2vec notion of context, so an output word is being predicted based on *surrounding* words in a 2D sense, as opposed to words to its left and right within a 1D sequence.

The second is Wordgrid (formally introduced in Section 4.2.1), a Chargrid-based method for representing 2D documents on word level with 2D context preservation. For Wordgrid there are several possible choices for non-contextualized symbol embedding, which we name in Section 4.2.2. One of them is the aforementioned word2vec-2d. We bring contextualized embedding from the 1D domain to the 2D document domain in form of a contextualized Wordgrid, see Section 4.2.3. The contextualization allows for document representations more powerful than the ones possible with the non-contextualized Chargrid. In Section 4.2.4, we suggest ways of combining Chargrid and Wordgrid and a measure for the complementarity.

### 4.1 Word2vec-2d: Word2vec for 2D Corpora

Word2vec by Mikolov et al. (2013) is a method for estimating word representations in vector space. A summary of the aspects relevant for understanding our advancement can be found in Section 3.2. Word2vec operates on text corpora that are sequential in nature. That means a corpus is an array of words, where each word has a 1D position. The documents processed by Chargrid/Wordgrid, however, are 2-dimensional, which is motivating the advancement of word2vec to work with 2D data as well. We dub the new method word2vec-2d.

**Motivation.** To clarify what the limitation of word2vec in its vanilla form is, suppose one wanted to train vector representations on a corpus of patent cover pages (examples of 2D documents). In a first step, one would construct a vocabulary by retrieving the top  $V$  most frequently occurring words from the patent corpus (words like “patent”, “number”, “date”, or “abstract” would likely be among them). After constructing the vocabulary, one would continue by feeding the documents into the word2vec algorithm. But this one requires the data to be a long sequence of words. The patent cover pages would need to be *serialized*, e.g. by reading them line-by-line into a string. Figure 4 shows how words can be taken out of context when serializing a 2D document: Labels that are above the word they refer to, are in a different line and will end up in




Figure 4: Line-by-line serialization of a 2D document. It is apparent that due to the 2D arrangements in the document (left) some words in the serialized, 1D representation (right) are taken out of context. For instance the `Date of Patent:` is pulled away from the `June 17, 1997` to which it belongs semantically.

an entirely different position in the 1D sequence.

While the `word2vec` algorithm can without doubt operate on serialized versions of 2D documents, it is presumably less performant at capturing the semantics. Motivated by this assumption we introduce `word2vec-2d`, which operates directly on the 2D document, so the serialization step becomes unnecessary.

**Word2vec-2d.** Let  $\mathbb{V} = \{w_1, \dots, w_V\}$  denote the vocabulary constructed from the corpus. The corpus  $\mathbb{C} = \{\mathbb{D}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$  consists of  $N$  documents. Each of which is a set of words alongside with their spatial position

$$\mathbb{D}^{(i)} := \left\{ \left( w^{(j)}, \underbrace{x_{\min}^{(j)}, y_{\min}^{(j)}, x_{\max}^{(j)}, y_{\max}^{(j)}}_{\text{bounding box } \mathbf{b}^{(j)}} \right) \mid j \in \{1, \dots, N^{(i)}\} \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where  $N^{(i)}$  denotes the number of words in the  $i$ th document,  $w^{(j)}$  is the  $j$ th word in the  $i$ th document, and the remaining four scalars in the tuple are the word’s bounding box  $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$ .

We define a **radial context** surrounding a given word  $w^{(j^*)}$  as a function  $c_r$ , which maps from a word of a given document to a set of words from the same document. The output set is what we define to be the context of the argument. The function is

$$c_r(w^{(j^*)}) := \left\{ w^{(j)} \in \mathbb{D}^{(i)} \mid d(\mathbf{b}^{(j^*)}, \mathbf{b}^{(j)}) \leq r, j \neq j^* \right\} \quad (17)$$

with  $w^{(j^*)} \in \mathbb{D}^{(i)}$ ,  $d$  being a distance measure between two bounding boxes, and  $r$  being the radius, i.e. our variant of the `word2vec` window size for 2D.  $w \in \mathbb{D}$  is short for “there is a 5-tuple in  $\mathbb{D}$  where the first element, i.e. the word, is  $w$ ”.



Figure 5: Comparison of different notions of context in word2vec-2d (left) vs. word2vec (right) on the same document. In both cases  $w^{(j^*)} = \text{June}$  (red and bold). In word2vec-2d the context words are the ones which lay partly within a circle with flat sides around  $w^{(j^*)}$ . In word2vec  $w^{(j^*)}$ 's context are the  $s$  words to its left and right. The context is blue and italic. Note that in the example, the word2vec-2d context of June includes the word Date, which is desirable. Normal word2vec (with line-by-line serialization) is not able to capture this dependence.

The intuition behind Equation 17 is that for a given center word  $w^{(j^*)}$  it returns a set containing all words that lay within a certain distance  $r$  around the center word. The returned context words belong to the same document as the center word. Figure 5 visualizes how the new context definition can potentially capture semantics of 2D documents better than the normal word2vec methods.

The notion of **distance** is generic at this point. Possible implementations of  $d$  are the distance of two bounding box centers or the minimum distance between the bounding boxes' edges. We use the latter; Listing 1 is a C implementation.

```

1 int bbox_dist(struct bbox a, struct bbox b) {
2     struct bbox r;
3     int inner_width, inner_height, min_distance;
4
5     r.xmin = min(a.xmin, b.xmin);
6     r.ymin = min(a.ymin, b.ymin);
7     r.xmax = max(a.xmax, b.xmax);
8     r.ymax = max(a.ymax, b.ymax);
9
10    inner_width = (r.xmax-r.xmin) - (a.xmax-a.xmin) - (b.xmax-b.xmin);
11    inner_height = (r.ymax-r.ymin) - (a.ymax-a.ymin) - (b.ymax-b.ymin);
12
13    inner_height = max(0, inner_height);
14    inner_width = max(0, inner_width);
15    return inner_width + inner_height;
16 }

```

Listing 1: The function `bbox_dist` computes the minimum L1 distance between two bounding boxes `a` and `b`. If the bounding boxes overlap, the minimum distance is defined to be zero (line 13 and 14).

The adjusted **training objective**  $E_{2D}$  of word2vec-2d uses the context definition from Equation 17 in the loss function of the original word2vec (Equation 12). With  $w_O$  being a center word, the loss for one sample is

$$E_{2D} := -\log \Pr(w_O \mid c_r(w_O)). \quad (18)$$

Both word2vec’s CBOW and skip-gram model can be used with the word2vec-2d notion of context.

Word2vec-2d can be summarized as follows: It is a modification of the notion of context so a word is predicted based on<sup>7</sup> neighboring words in a 2-dimensional sense. Hence, word2vec-2d is more applicable to documents with rich 2D structure. The parameter update rules are the word2vec ones, see Rong (2014).

## 4.2 Document Understanding with Wordgrid

Wordgrid is our adaption of Chargrid. We use a different representation method for the input document: Instead of embedding the individual characters in a grid arrangement, Wordgrid embeds on word level. The embedding is not one-hot, but dense, and can potentially be contextualized. The latter means a word’s embedding in the grid may also depend on its context (e.g. neighboring words). We also introduce a method where both Chargrid and Wordgrid are combined. While the changes suggested with Wordgrid do not require any modification of the network architecture (depicted in Figure 1), a combination of both Chargrid and Wordgrid does.

Wordgrid differs from Chargrid in the following aspects:

- **Representation level** (Section 4.2.1): Wordgrid embeds on word level rather than character level. When referring to Wordgrid embedding words, we also include word pieces.
- **Embedding type** (Section 4.2.2): Wordgrid works with dense embedding, e.g. randomly initialized or word2vec/word2vec-2d pre-trained.
- **Contextualization** (Section 4.2.3): The contextualized Wordgrid, dubbed *BERTgrid*, can embed the same word with different vectors in different locations, depending on the surrounding context.
- **Combination of representation levels** (Section 4.2.4): Wordgrid can be used as a hybrid, where character- and word-level information is combined.

---

<sup>7</sup>This applies for CBOW; with skip-gram the context is predicted based on the center word.




Figure 6: Visualization of Chargrid (b) and Wordgrid (c) computed for a sample invoice (a). Each symbol (character or word) has a unique color representing its embedding vector. Note that two identical characters/words will have the same color at any location in the document. It is visually apparent that Chargrid embeds on a more fine-grained level than Wordgrid.

In the following, let

$$\mathbf{C} \in \{0, 1\}^{w \times h \times d_c} \quad (19)$$

denote the Chargrid tensor for some document, introduced in Section 3.1.  $w$  and  $h$  are the document representation’s width and height, respectively. The embedding depth of Chargrid is denoted by  $d_c$ .

#### 4.2.1 2D Document Representation with Wordgrid

Wordgrid represents a 2D document as a Tensor  $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times h \times d}$  where the vector at  $\mathbf{W}_{x,y,:}$  is an embedding of the word at the spatial location  $(x, y)$  in the original document.  $w$  and  $h$  denote width and height,  $d$  is the tensor depth, i.e. the embedding dimensionality. Figure 6 visualizes the difference between Chargrid and Wordgrid. With Wordgrid the area where a word lies is filled with the same embedding vector; Chargrid does the same on a more fine-grained level, namely on character level.

Formally, let  $\mathbb{W} = \{w_1, \dots, w_V\}$  be the set of all words, where  $V$  is the vocabulary size. Analogous to Section 4.1, we define a document to consist of words and their bounding boxes

$$\mathbb{D}^{(i)} := \left\{ \left( w^{(j)}, \underbrace{x_{\min}^{(j)}, y_{\min}^{(j)}, x_{\max}^{(j)}, y_{\max}^{(j)}}_{\text{bounding box } \mathbf{b}^{(j)}} \right) \mid j \in \{1, \dots, N^{(i)}\} \right\}, \quad (20)$$

where  $N^{(i)}$  denotes the number of words in the  $i$ th document,  $w^{(j)} \in \mathbb{W}$  is the  $j$ th word in the  $i$ th document, and the remaining four scalars in the tuple are the word’s bounding box  $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$ .  $w \in \mathbb{D}$  is short for “there is a 5-tuple in  $\mathbb{D}$  where the first element, i.e. the word, is  $w$ ”.

Using an embedding function  $\mathbf{e}_{\text{fixed}} : \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  we construct Wordgrid for a document  $\mathbb{D}^{(i)}$  as

$$\mathbf{W}_{x,y,:}^{(i)} := \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_{\text{fixed}}(w^{(j)}) & \text{if } x_{\min}^{(j)} \leq x \leq x_{\max}^{(j)} \wedge y_{\min}^{(j)} \leq y \leq y_{\max}^{(j)} \\ \mathbf{0}_d & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Verbally explained, the fixed word embedding for  $w_j$  is chosen at  $(x, y)$ , if the word’s bounding box encloses  $(x, y)$ . Otherwise the tensor contains zeros (indicating “background”). The formulation assumes that no two bounding boxes overlap.

Our formulation admits embedding fine-tuning: Gradients of the downstream model’s loss with respect to  $\mathbf{W}$  can be backpropagated into the embedding function. There they can be used to update parameters, e.g. a word embedding matrix.

#### 4.2.2 Non-contextualized Embedding

The embedding function uses a dictionary  $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{(V+1) \times d}$  holding the word embedding vectors. We define the first row  $\mathbf{D}_{0,:}$  to hold the placeholder vector that is used to embed out-of-vocabulary words. Parameterized by the dictionary, the fixed embedding function is

$$\mathbf{e}_{\text{fixed}}(w^{(j)}; \mathbf{D}) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{D}_{j,:} & \text{if } j \leq V \\ \mathbf{D}_{0,:} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

$\mathbf{D}$  can be initialized in different ways. In all listed initialization schemes the embedding dimensionality  $d$  can be chosen freely.

**Random Initialization.** The simplest is a random initialization where for all  $i, j$

$$D_{i,j}^{(\text{rand})} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), \quad (23)$$

e.g. with  $\sigma^2 = 0.001$ , following [Kocmi and Bojar \(2017\)](#). The random initialization does not carry any semantic information which is why it is commonly used in combination with embedding training so the embedding space is incrementally adjusted using the gradient of the loss with respect to  $\mathbf{D}$ . Wordgrid




Figure 7: Comparison of three invoice serialization methods. The colors indicate the ordering of the words: blue is early in the sequence, yellow is closer to the end. The raw order as output by the OCR engine (a) differs slightly from (b) in the two column layout area at the top of the invoice.

in combination with this initialization mode is identical to the input document representation proposed by [Zhao et al. \(2019\)](#).

**Initialization from Word2vec.** Here the embedding dictionary is initialized from vectors computed by word2vec (see Section 3.2) or a method of the same kind. The word2vec algorithm itself requires a corpus of data to be trained on, where available options can be split into two categories: (1) data from other domains and (2) the 2D documents which are input to the model. The former is relatively simple to use as there are many pre-trained word2vec embeddings available, which were computed e.g. on Wikipedia text. For (2) the word2vec algorithm is not directly applicable since it needs a sequential text corpus. 2D documents, however, are 2-dimensional in nature and must therefore be serialized.

The best method of serializing a 2D document depends on the domain. Line-by-line serialization is often applicable. In Figure 7 we compare three different serialization methods on examples from the invoice domain. After serialization, word2vec can be used to train an embedding to initialize  $\mathbf{D}$  from.

Despite capturing some semantic meaning, the word2vec embedding is seemingly incongruous in the 2D domain. Unless 1D corpora exist, which contain domain-specific language that is close to the one used in the 2D documents, the vector’s semantics are not matching the target domain when using (1). The serialization (2) on the other hand removes some semantics from structured documents. Consequently, the word2vec model is trained on a new domain.

Word2vec computes vectors for words in the corpus. To initialize  $\mathbf{D}_0$ , we choose

the element-wise average of the other vectors in the embedding space:

$$D_{0,i} := \frac{1}{V} \sum_{j=1}^d D_{j,i}. \quad (24)$$

It is important to normalize the embedding space because the magnitudes of the vectors produced by the original word2vec implementation can be large, e.g.  $\|\mathbf{D}_{i,:}\| > 10$  to provide an order of magnitude, which harms the proper functioning of weight decay, because weights of the subsequent layer can easily be small since their input is disproportionately large. The vectors can either be normalized jointly or individually, in which case information is only carried in the vectors’ directions. We choose to do the former and scale all vectors, so the values in  $\mathbf{D}$  follow roughly a normal distribution with  $\sigma^2 = 0.001$ , as in the random initialization.

**Word2vec-2d.** Word2vec-2d (see Section 4.1) allows for training of word vectors on 2D documents. It is therefore intuitively a more applicable choice for Wordgrid.

The embedding space initialization remains the same as with word2vec: The vectors output by the word2vec-2d algorithm are used as rows in  $\mathbf{D}$ . Vector normalization and placeholder vector initialization are also equivalent to word2vec.

### 4.2.3 BERTgrid: Contextualized Embedding

For BERTgrid, a variant of Wordgrid, we redefine the embedding function  $\mathbf{e}$  to have access to the *context*. The new embedding function

$$\mathbf{e}\left(w^{(j)}, \mathbb{D}^{(i)}\right) \quad (25)$$

differs from the fixed one (Equation 22) in that it has access to the entire document that the given word  $w^{(j)}$  belongs to. The document is the word’s context (or a superset of it, depending on the definition of context).

With  $\mathbf{e}_{\text{fixed}}$  there is a 1:1 correspondence between the vocabulary and the embedding space. The contextualized embedding function, however, is much more powerful, because it can choose a word’s vector representation at a given position depending on its context, e.g. adjacent words or the absolute position within the invoice.

We reify the generic definition from above by providing a concrete description of an implementation of  $\mathbf{e}$  using a BERT (Devlin et al. (2018)) model. It assumes




Figure 8: Visualization of the BERTgrid creation pipeline. The thick boxes are parameterized functions (here neural networks), ovals indicate pure functions. The two datasets are on the left-hand side, one is unlabeled and the other one is labeled.

there is a dataset of unlabeled 2D documents available, as well as a 2D document understanding target task. BERTgrid is constructed from contextualized vectors, retrieved from a BERT model, giving BERTgrid its name. The steps are written down in the enumeration below and are additionally visualized in Figure 8.

1. A pre-trained BERT model is downloaded.<sup>8</sup> The model might have been pre-trained on an entirely different task, but some information transfer to the target domain might be possible anyways<sup>9</sup>. The downloaded model comes with a BERT configuration and a vocabulary. For the official models the vocabulary contains word pieces.
2. A dataset of 2D documents from the target domain is serialized, pre-processed, and tokenized. The serialization is the same as the one needed to train word2vec on 2D documents. Let  $\text{serialize}(\mathbb{D})$  denote a serialization function which outputs a sequence of  $|\mathbb{D}|$  words, given a document.

<sup>8</sup>Pre-trained BERT models are available online. For instance in the official BERT repository’s pre-trained models section: <https://github.com/google-research/bert#pre-trained-models>

<sup>9</sup>We make this assumption because we saw a faster convergence of BERT language models on invoice data when they were initialized with weights pre-trained on Wikipedia data.

3. The downloaded BERT weights are pre-trained on the serialized dataset of 2D documents until convergence. When speaking of *pre-training* we use the BERT terminology where it refers to training the BERT model on the loss described in the BERT paper, while *fine-tuning* is the propagation of gradients into the BERT model from a target task. So at this stage we pre-train a BERT model that is initialized from a checkpoint with pre-trained weights.
4. The trained BERT model is inferred with the labeled 2D documents of the target task, for which they must be serialized first (like the unlabeled documents above). Each serialized document is fed into the BERT model, which computes internal representations that carry semantic meaning and depend on the context. For each word the corresponding hidden layer activations (e.g. from the last or second to last hidden layer) are being extracted.

Let the BERT model fixed feature vector extraction function be denoted by

$$\text{bert}_l : \mathbb{V}^{|\mathbb{D}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{D}| \times d_{\text{model}}}, \quad (26)$$

where  $l$  is indicating which layer to extract the features from and  $d_{\text{model}}$  is the size of the hidden representation.

5. The contextualized embedding function yields the BERT activations of the given word in the given invoice:

$$\mathbf{e}(w^{(j)}, \mathbb{D}^{(i)}) = \left( \text{bert}_l \circ \text{serialize}(\mathbb{D}^{(i)}) \right)_{j,:}. \quad (27)$$

The embedding for the  $j$ th word in a document is computed by serializing the document and feeding it into a BERT model. From the activation matrix the row is chosen that corresponds to the word at the  $j$ th position in the serialized sequence.

Analogous to the non-contextualized Wordgrid, the embedding model (BERT) can be fine-tuned on the target task. In order to do so, the gradients must be backpropagated into the BERT model which requires it to be inferred online. Note that this is computationally very costly as a BERT model itself can already fill the RAM of a modern GPU at a relatively low batch size.

Table 2 compares some aspects of the non-contextualized Wordgrid with the contextualized BERTgrid. We acknowledge the fact that the contextualized embedding vectors are computed on a 1-dimensional representation of the input document. The corresponding equivalent in the non-contextualized section is the construction of a Wordgrid with vectors from word2vec, trained on serialized documents. While by definition (Equation 25) the contextualized embedding

	Non-contextualized	Contextualized
	Section 4.2.2	Section 4.2.3
<b>Embedding function</b>	$e_{\text{fixed}}(w^{(j)}; \mathcal{D})$	$e(w^{(j)}, \mathbb{D}^{(i)})$
<b>Serialized pre-training</b>	word2vec	BERT
<b>Pre-training on 2D data</b>	word2vec-2d	-
<b>Fine-tuning</b>	$\mathcal{D}$ update w/ gradients	Gradient propag. to BERT
<b>Embedding computation</b>	offline (fast)	online (slow)

Table 2: Comparison of Wordgrid with non-contextualized and contextualized embedding

function has access to all the bounding boxes of the words in the document, the flow described above does not make full use of it because of the application of the serialize function.

#### 4.2.4 Combining Chargrid and Wordgrid

Chargrid and Wordgrid/BERTgrid can be combined to provide the model with information on both, character and word level. We suggest and discuss several combination methods:

- **Concat:** Concatenation is a straightforward method of combining  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$ . The model is provided the tensor  $\mathbf{X}^{(\text{concat})} \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times h \times (d_c + d)}$  defined as

$$\mathbf{X}_{x,y,:}^{(\text{concat})} := \left[ \mathbf{C}_{x,y,:} \quad \mathbf{W}_{x,y,:} \right], \quad (28)$$

where  $\left[ \cdot \right]$  denotes vector concatenation. For the network to use information from both tensors, it is desirable to scale the embedding magnitudes relative to the depth of the respective tensor so neither is predominant.

- **Add:** If  $d = d_c$ ,  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$  can be added element-wise:

$$X_{x,y,z}^{(\text{add})} := C_{x,y,z} + W_{x,y,z}. \quad (29)$$

- **Pre-process:** Both tensors can be processed separately by two functions  $f_{\theta_1}, g_{\theta_2}$  with trainable parameters. The resulting tensors can then be concatenated or added (if the dimensionalities match). One configuration we experimented with was to define  $f$  and  $g$  to be one or more  $1 \times 1$  convolutions with the same number of output channels.

For the one-hot encoded Chargrid, applying a  $1 \times 1$  convolution corresponds to choosing a dense embedding for the characters. Wordgrid in turn is being compressed into a lower-dimensional vector space, assuming the  $1 \times 1$  convolution has fewer output than input channels.

- **Parallel U-net:** We duplicate the first  $n$  blocks of the encoder U-net (the first  $n$  blue rectangles in the encoder in Figure 1) to process  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$  separately. At a later stage in the U-net, namely after  $n$  blocks, we merge the outputs of both  $n$ th blocks by adding them together. For the skip connections from encoder to decoder we add the hidden representations of the two parallel branches.

Intuitively, this method is motivated by the different *information levels* of Chargrid and Wordgrid. While the first convolutional layers of the network are expected to learn to recognize words, when sliding spatially across  $\mathbf{C}$ , the Wordgrid tensor already contains word-level information. Merging the representations at a later stage introduces a bias, making the network process them independently at first.

Another way of looking at the tensors is their frequency: Wordgrid contains larger areas with the same values than Chargrid, as can be seen very well in Figure 6. The OctConv by Chen et al. (2019) looks at natural images in the same way and splits the processing into two branches, one for high- and one for low-frequency information.

**Model Complementarity.** Alongside with the combination methods we suggest a way of determining which information a combination method actually uses. Is Chargrid the primary source of information for the model or is Wordgrid being used much more? Our model complementarity method helps answering such questions by visualizing the usage in a Venn diagram with three sets: documents that Chargrid-based models perform well on ( $\mathbb{C}$ ), documents that Wordgrid-based model perform well on ( $\mathbb{W}$ ), and documents on which a model using a combination of both performs well on ( $\mathbb{B}$ ). First off, “performing well on” means the model using Chargrid/Wordgrid/both has a high extraction accuracy on the fields of that particular document. Second,  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbb{W}$  are typically not identical. While the intersection is not empty (some documents are presumably *easy* and can be solved by both models) there is a decent amount of documents which either Chargrid-models or Wordgrid-models understand correctly. A requirement to any combination method is that it makes the information contained in both Chargrid and Wordgrid accessible to the model so the resulting  $\mathbb{B}$  should overlap with both  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbb{W}$  as much as possible.

Let  $a_d^{(M)} \in [0, 1]$  be the accuracy of a model  $M \in \{\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{B}\}$  on the  $d$ th sample in the set of documents. To mitigate noise, caused by the random weight initialization and stochastic gradient computations,  $\mathbf{a}^{(M)}$  can be computed as a performance average across multiple training steps and training runs (of the same model).

Given two models  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  we define the fuzzy sets of *correctly* processed




Figure 9: Sample Venn diagrams showing the model complementarity of  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$ , and  $M_3$ . Suppose  $M_3$  is a combination of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ . In (a)  $M_3$  is able to capture aspects from both,  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ . It exploits the complementarity of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  by performing well on most fields that *either* performs good at. In (b)  $M_3$  additionally performs well on a new fields that neither  $M_1$  nor  $M_2$  was able to achieve high accuracies on alone. (c) illustrates a skewed model where  $M_3$  is mainly good at fields on which  $M_1$  is good as well.

documents as  $\mathbb{M}_1$  and  $\mathbb{M}_2$ . Note that the documents belong partly to the sets depending on the value of  $\mathbf{a}^{(M)}$ . Based on the fuzzy set theory (see e.g. [Beg and Ashraf \(2009\)](#)) we can calculate

$$|\mathbb{M}_1| = \sum_{d=1}^n a_d^{(M_1)} \quad (30)$$

$$|\overline{\mathbb{M}}_1| = \sum_{d=1}^n (1 - a_d^{(M_1)}) = n - |\mathbb{M}_1| \quad (31)$$

$$|\mathbb{M}_1 \cap \mathbb{M}_2| = \sum_{d=1}^n \min(a_d^{(M_1)}, a_d^{(M_2)}) \quad (32)$$

$$|\mathbb{M}_1 \cup \mathbb{M}_2| = \sum_{d=1}^n \max(a_d^{(M_1)}, a_d^{(M_2)}) \quad (33)$$

$$|\mathbb{M}_1 \setminus \mathbb{M}_2| = |\mathbb{M}_1 \cap \overline{\mathbb{M}}_2| = \sum_{d=1}^n \min(a_d^{(M_1)}, 1 - a_d^{(M_2)}) \quad (34)$$

Intuitively,  $|\mathbb{M}_1|$  is a measure for the overall performance of model  $M_1$ .  $|\mathbb{M}_1 \cap \mathbb{M}_2|$  is a measure for the negative complementarity of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ .  $|\mathbb{M}_1 \setminus \mathbb{M}_2|$  indicates how much  $M_1$  improves over  $M_2$ ; and  $|\mathbb{M}_1 \setminus \mathbb{M}_2| + |\mathbb{M}_2 \setminus \mathbb{M}_1|$  is the measure of model complementarity.

An ideal model  $M_3$  combines  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  and achieves performances close to  $|\mathbb{M}_1 \cup \mathbb{M}_2|$ .  $M_3$  could even exceed the union by combining the capabilities of both models to achieve high accuracies on samples that neither could solve alone. Figure 9 shows example Venn diagrams.

## 5 Application: Information Extraction from Invoices

In this section we briefly explain where SAP’s subsidiary Concur is processing invoices (Section 5.1). Afterwards we describe the two datasets we are using (Section 5.2) and the task associated with them, namely key-value extraction from invoices. We then formulate in Section 5.3 what the evaluation measure for that task is. Lastly, we elaborate on implementation details (Section 5.4). That is mostly about how the existing Chargrid code base was extended as part of this work. Focus is on the interesting/relevant implementation details, so the descriptions are not exhaustively naming all the changes that were made.

### 5.1 Concur Travel and Expense Management

SAP’s subsidiary Concur<sup>10</sup> is a travel and expense management service provider. Travelers who have had expenses visit the tool and claim them back so their company can reimburse. Concur is the provider of the proprietary invoice data that we use. Concur users across the globe upload invoices which Concur stores in its systems.

When creating a new expense in the Concur system, the user is asked to upload the corresponding receipt(s); shown in the screenshot in Figure 10. In a manual workflow, the information entered in the amount field would be checked against the invoice line items and prices by a human. Likewise the date of the transaction would be expected to be around the same time the invoice was filed and the line item description should match the expense type. This process requires human workers and would be both inefficient and impractical because of the sheer volume of uploaded documents.

In Concur’s application, SAP’s 2D document understanding system is employed to extract the needed information from the invoice so the expense validation can be automated and payments to the claimer can be made faster. Only in case of mismatches humans are asked to manually perform the work. Concur automatically processes more than 100k invoices per day.

Invoice processing is only one application of 2D document understanding where information must be extracted from invoices. It has motivated the initial development of Chargrid.





Figure 10: When creating a new expense, users can attach the corresponding receipt(s) to it. The screenshot shows the “New Expense” user interface. Information is manually entered on the left-hand side, the *proof* for the claim is on the right.



(a) Invoice

(b) Labels

(c) Bounding boxes

Figure 11: Dataset ground truth sample. Each text field detected by the OCR engine in the original invoice (a) is annotated with a label (b). Most text is labeled as “other” (here indicated by the white color). Rows and columns are additionally annotated with bounding boxes (c).

## 5.2 Invoice Datasets

We use two SAP proprietary datasets, in the following referred to as the “labeled dataset” and the “700k invoices dataset”. Both datasets were provided by Concur and contain invoices.

**700k Invoices Dataset.** The dataset consists of approximately 700k scans of invoices. An OCR engine was applied to each sample so the invoices are available as images and 2D text data. Despite not being labeled the dataset has value because of its size. It allows for the pre-training of language models and word vector representations.

The invoices are from different vendors. The layouts and positions of fields vary a lot across the dataset. Figure 12 illustrates the heterogeneity of the invoice layouts. Some invoices span across multiple pages. Languages are mixed, the majority, however, is English. The OCR data is about 17 GB in size.

Note that Chargrid by Katti et al. (2018) is not utilizing the 700k dataset at all. One objective of this work was to use the information contained in it to achieve better performance on the actual information extraction task.

**Labeled Dataset.** The dataset consists of 12k invoices split into 10k for training, 1k for validation, and 1k for testing. For each invoice the OCR data is available.

Like in the 700k invoice dataset, invoices are from a variety of different vendors and the sets of vendors contained in training, validation, and testing samples are disjoint. Most vendors occur only once or twice so the invoice layouts are very heterogeneous. Languages are mixed, with the majority being English. Figure 12 illustrates the heterogeneity of the invoice layouts.

Besides being smaller, the labeled dataset differs from the 700k invoices dataset in that each sample comes with segmentation and bounding box labels. Figure 11 shows the ground truth for a sample invoice. The dataset was labeled by human annotators who marked invoice fields and drew bounding boxes. Labeling is rather costly and it would not be financially feasible to label the 700k dataset as well. We distinguish two kinds of fields: (1) *header fields* and (2) *line item fields*.

The former includes invoice number, invoice date, invoice amount, vendor name, and vendor address. Each of these fields is annotated once per invoice.

The line item fields can exist multiple times per invoice. Line items are the

---

<sup>10</sup><https://www.concur.com>




Figure 12: Spatial distribution of two invoice fields over the invoice: Invoice amount (a) and line item quantity (b). This depicts the variation in the invoice layouts contained in our dataset. Figure source: [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#)

items that are commonly listed on an invoice, in the example in Figure 11 there are four line items. For each line item the field’s line item description, line item quantity, and line item amount are annotated. Invoices do not necessarily contain them all in which cases only the present ones are labeled.

**Invoice Corpora Specifics.** Both invoice datasets share some characteristics that distinguish them from other common NLP datasets. In the following we list them and discuss the implications for models operating on the corpora.

The invoices have different languages, hence a vocabulary must contain words from all languages. However, when following the standard approach of constructing the vocabulary based on the word frequency, i.e. choosing the top  $V$  most frequently occurring words to be a part of it, the imbalance of languages can lead to important keywords of a rare language to not make it into the vocabulary. If for instance only 10% of the invoices are German, the word “Straße” might not make it into the vocabulary, despite its importance for recognizing and extracting the vendor address field. This could harm performance on the German invoices significantly. Word piece embedding mitigates this problem significantly as it typically does not have out-of-vocabulary problems.

Without any pre-processing applied to it, the invoices of the 1k validation dataset contain 56,998 distinct words (and a total of 217,489). The language of the invoices is very different from other corpora such as Wikipedia. A GloVe ([Pennington et al. \(2014\)](#)) embedding pre-trained on Wikipedia with a vocabulary size of 400k can only embed 7k of the 57k distinct words of the invoices. After transforming the words to lowercase and removal of special characters the




Figure 13: Histograms of the word piece box sizes in the validation dataset after tokenization with the BERT (Devlin et al. (2018)) tokenizer. The document size is  $256 \times 336$  (width $\times$ height). Width ( $x_{\max} - x_{\min}$ ) and height ( $y_{\max} - y_{\min}$ ) of the bounding boxes are used as defined in Equation 20. In (b) it can be clearly seen that few different font sizes exist.

number of distinct words drops to 40k out of which 14k can be embedded with the pre-trained GloVe embedding. The high percentage of out-of-vocabulary words renders embeddings pre-trained on Wikipedia or similar corpora unapplicable. The most frequently occurring words after lowercasing are

l (#3084), invoice (#2367), to (#2367), of (#1814), date (#1678), total (#1540), the (#1505), no (#1330), and (#1092), amount (#1005), 000 (#977), number (#966), st (#961), de (#938), i (#913), a (#907), for (#884), due (#883), tax (#857), payment (#789), po (#771), medical (#769), jude (#746), account (#741), 2 (#736),

where the numbers in brackets indicate the occurrence count out of 210k words. The difference between the language used in invoices and normal, spoken language poses a challenge to embedding words in invoices.

In the 2D domain different properties of the dataset can be analyzed which do not exist in 1D: Figure 13 shows the histograms of word piece bounding boxes heights and widths of the labeled invoices validation dataset. The size of the Wordgrid should be chosen as small as possible so that bounding boxes of the symbols (words or word pieces) are small but do not overlap or fall into the same pixel yet.

Figure 14 shows the distribution of invoice lengths in terms of word pieces. With a maximum sequence length of 512, a BERT model can embed more than 76% of the invoices entirely.




Figure 14: Histogram of the number of word pieces per invoice on the validation set. Few outliers beyond 1k are sliced off.

### 5.3 Evaluation Measure

We did not modify the evaluation measure introduced in the Chargrid paper, because it is applicable to Wordgrid alike. In the following we recite the content of Section 4.3 from [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#) with minor supplementation.

For evaluating our model, we would like to measure how much work would be saved by using the extraction system, compared to performing the field extraction manually. To capture this, we use a measure similar to the word error rate [Prabhavalkar et al. \(2017\)](#) used in speech recognition or translation tasks.

For a given field, we count the number of insertions, deletions, and modifications of the predicted instances (pooled across the entire test set) to match the ground truth instances. Evaluations are made on the string level. We compute this measure as

$$1 - \frac{\#[\text{insertions}] + \#[\text{deletions}] + \#[\text{modifications}]}{N}, \quad (35)$$

where  $N$  is the total number of instances occurring in the ground truth of the entire test set. This measure can be negative, meaning that it would be less work to perform the extraction manually. The best value it can achieve is 1, corresponding to flawless extraction.

In our present case, the error caused by the OCR engine does not affect this measure, because the same errors are present in the prediction and in the ground

truth and are not considered a mismatch.

We extract a range of fields from an invoice and compute the measure from Equation 35 for each. To condense the reporting even more, an `all_fields` metric is used which is defined to be the average extraction performance on all fields across a single invoice.

## 5.4 Implementation Details

**Word2vec-2d.** We forked Mikolov’s word2vec C-implementation<sup>11</sup> and modified it according to the specification of word2vec-2d from Section 4.1. The script takes a corpus and outputs word vectors trained on it.

Originally the input corpus was a simple text file where each document was a single line and the words were space-separated. A line would look like that: `United States Patent No.: Patent [...]`. In the word2vec-2d implementation we represent each 2D document in an individual line as well, however, a word is always followed by four space-separated integer values which correspond to its bounding box. For example: `United 20 5 50 15 States 55 5 100 15 Patent 200 5 230 15 [...]`. The word2vec parser and data structures were adjusted to account for the additional information encoded in the input file.

While iterating over the corpus the context of a word is needed to compute the gradient of the weight matrices. In Mikolov’s implementation the context is computed on the fly as the  $s$  words to the left and to the right of the center word. In our case the computation of a context is more complex: For each document we compute a distance matrix between any two words. A word’s context are all words which have a distance below the defined radius. The distance function is shown in Listing 1. For each word we pre-compute its context before starting the actual training so it is quickly accessible in the main training loop. Memory-wise this comes at a noticeable yet bearable cost.

Given a center word and its neighbors, e.g. `Left3 Left2 Left1 Center Right1 Right2 Right3`, word2vec randomly resizes the window size  $s$  to any integral value  $s'$ ;  $1 \leq s' \leq s$ . The center word’s vector representation can therefore be updated with either `Left1 Center Right1`, `Left2 Left1 Center Right1 Right2`, or all words ( $s' = s$ ). We port this method to 2D as follows. A center word’s context is sorted by distance in ascending order. Let  $s$  be the number of words within radius of the center word. We choose a random number  $1 \leq s' \leq s$  like Mikolov’s code and interpret it as selecting the  $s'$  words that are closest to the center word for computing the gradient. That

---

<sup>11</sup><https://github.com/tmikolov/word2vec>

way the measure of choosing closer words more often is ported from 1D to 2D.

Mikolov’s implementation is multi-threaded and optimized for efficiency. We left the multi-threading aspects as-is, so our implementation is benefiting from the performant implementation too. Likewise we did not need to modify the gradient computation.

Assessing the quality of a computed word embedding is naturally hard. Mikolov et al. (2013) use a word similarity task. Due to the nature of our invoice dataset we cannot use an open benchmark (words would not be contained, semantics are different) so we see no option other than evaluating the embeddings output by word2vec-2d qualitatively. For that we use TensorFlow’s embedding projector<sup>12</sup> and look at similar words and clusters in the embedding space manually to make an assessment.

**Chargrid Code Base.** We build on top of the existing Chargrid code base which is the basis of Katti et al. (2018). Unless indicated otherwise, the implementation details named there apply to us as well. During the research phase of this thesis the code was modified and extended and the following paragraphs explain a few selected, preliminary aspects of it.

Chargrid and Wordgrid are both implemented in Python using the TensorFlow (TF) framework. Given the labeled invoice dataset (invoice images, extracted OCR text, and labels) a model can be trained by following these steps: (1) generate data, (2) compute class and bound box weights, and (3) start the training.

1. **Generate data:** The data generation script loads the OCR data and applies Chargrid-specific pre-processing to it, e.g. removal of unknown characters, lower-casing, and such. It then generates a Chargrid representation from the OCR data, i.e. a grayscale PNG file (similar to Figure 6 (b)) with values  $\in \{0, \dots, 255\}$ , where each value identifies the character at the given position. It is a way of representing the Chargrid tensor (Equation 19). The advantage of converting the OCR data into a PNG image is greater performance during training as PNGs can be loaded without much CPU time consumption. The storage overhead of using PNGs is comparably small because the images contain many large areas of equal color which are being encoded efficiently by run-length encoding.
2. **Compute weights:** The script feeds the generated data through a model and determines the occurrence frequency of individual classes. It computes a weight factor for each class used during training to counteract class

---

<sup>12</sup><https://projector.tensorflow.org/>

imbalance. Modification of this step is not needed in this work.

- 3. Training:** The training script uses the `tf.estimator` API. It constructs the model graph (which we modify) and trains the model weights iteratively. Every other e.g. 5k steps it evaluates the model performance on validation data. When training on a particular sample, the OCR image is loaded and scaled down to the desired size on GPU. It is then fed into the Chargrid network (depicted in Figure 1). The outputs combined with the ground truth yield a loss which is backpropagated to update the model weights.

The dataset is provided to the TF Estimator with the `tf.data` API. The data cannot be held in RAM at once, so the initial TF dataset consists of strings pointing to the files of the individual invoices. While training, samples are being loaded on the fly; pre-fetching is being used.

**Wordgrid Pipeline.** We use the notation from Equation 8. Given an embedding space  $D$  we read the OCR data and apply pre-processing to the individual words, see Listing 2. Instead of writing the Wordgrid tensor  $W$  from Equation 21 into a file we store the index  $i \in 1, \dots, V$  of the word  $w_i$ . By using three channels of the PNG,  $V$  is limited to  $2^{24}$  which is more than necessary. The fourth channel is still usable, for instance if parallel storage of Wordgrid and Chargrid is needed.

```
1 import re
2
3 def preprocess(s: str) -> str:
4     s = s.lower() # lower case
5     s = ''.join(e for e in s if e.isalnum()) # remove special chars
6     s = re.sub(r"[0-9]+", "1", s) # replace numbers, e.g. "123" -> "1"
7     return s
```

Listing 2: Wordgrid pre-processing function

In the training script we use the indices stored in the PNG file as well as  $D$  to construct  $W$  before feeding it into the model. This step is implemented to run on GPU. In the model code  $W$  is then fed into the model as a replacement of  $C$ .

In order to not store  $D$  as a constant in the TensorFlow graph we use a `tf.train.Scaffold`. This allows us to use embedding dictionaries exceeding the maximum size of 2 GB. Also, the embedding loading is lazy, i.e. it will not happen prior to being needed.

**BERTgrid Pipeline.** Given both, the 700k and the labeled invoice dataset, the procedure for training a BERT model is described in the following. It has

a structure similar to the steps enumerated in Section 4.2.3 but describes the implementation details. We use several scripts from the BERT repository which can be found there<sup>13</sup>.

1. We serialize the 700k invoices so each of them is a 1D sequence of words. The invoices are available as OCR files and we read them in the order output by the OCR (as opposed to sorting by bounding box coordinates; see Figure 7). The resulting sequences of words are written into a text file line-by-line. Each word is pre-processed with the function from Listing 3.
2. We use the `create_pretraining_data.py` script from the repository to convert the text files into TF Records. The script expects a vocabulary file for which we choose the one associated with the “BERT-Base, Uncased”<sup>14</sup> model in the repository. We do not use casing (i.e. all words are converted to lowercase) as we do not expect the casing to carry important semantic meaning in our task. The maximum sequence length is set to 512, justified by the histogram in Figure 14. We randomly mask word pieces with a probability of 15% but at most 77 at a time.
3. Pre-training is started with the `run_pretraining.py` script to which the TF Records generated in the previous step are passed. We use the BERT configuration file and pre-trained weights from “BERT-Base, Uncased”. In summary that is a 12-layer, 768-hidden representation size, 12 attention head, 110M parameter BERT model which was pre-trained on Wikipedia. It converges on the 700k dataset after approximately 2M steps with a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  for the first 1M and  $4 \times 10^{-5}$  for the next 1M steps. We use a batch size of 10 on a Nvidia V-100 GPU, fully utilizing its memory. The pre-training script stores checkpoints of the trained model.
4. Next we serialize the labeled invoices in the same fashion as we serialized the 700k invoices. We use the `extract_features.py` script to extract fixed feature vectors for the serialized invoices. Again the maximum sequence length is set to 512 which leads to around 20% of the invoices being embedded only partially. We experiment with exporting the last and the second to last hidden layer. By default the official script exports the vectors in JSON format, we found however, that using pickle could reduce the size by a factor of two so we modified the script slightly. The output is one pickle file for each invoice which contains a sequence of contextualized feature vectors. We decided against storing the plain BERTgrid tensors

---

<sup>13</sup><https://github.com/google-research/bert>

<sup>14</sup>Model and vocabulary download link: [https://storage.googleapis.com/bert\\_models/2018\\_10\\_18/uncased\\_L-12\\_H-768\\_A-12.zip](https://storage.googleapis.com/bert_models/2018_10_18/uncased_L-12_H-768_A-12.zip)

because their size would be about  $256 \times 336 \times 768 \times 4$  (BERTgrid spatial width  $\times$  height  $\times$  feature vector size  $\times$  four bytes per float32) 250 MB per invoice.

5. Training a model requires the on-the-fly construction of the BERTgrid tensor. We load the pickle files exported in the previous step dynamically once an invoice is contained in the current batch. We then serialize the OCR data, tokenize it and match it with the vectors stored in the pickle file. This algorithm was implemented on CPU and is therefore relatively slow. To improve performance we used the pre-fetching feature of the `tf.data` API to keep the CPU busy constructing BERTgrids for the upcoming batches while the GPU trains on the current batch. To lower the memory requirements towards the GPU and to increase performance we added an option to use BERTgrid with 16 bit floating point precision (instead of 32 bit) which casts back to 32 bit precision after the first convolutional layer where the internal representation is already much smaller and it can be afforded.

```
1 import string
2
3 def preprocess_bert(s: str) -> str:
4     s = ''.join(c for c in s if c in string.printable)
5     s = s.lower() # lower case
6     s = s.replace(" ", "") # remove whitespace
7     s = s.replace("|||", "") # remove separator char sequence
8     return s
```

Listing 3: BERTgrid pre-processing function

The flow described above does not admit gradient backpropagation into the BERT model because the extraction of contextualized feature vectors (BERT inference) happens offline. Updating the BERT weights on the downstream task (the labeled invoice dataset in our case) is called *fine-tuning*. We decided not to fine-tune because it simplifies the pipeline, requires less GPU memory, and fine-tuning a model as large as BERT on a dataset with merely 10k labeled samples seems likely to result in overfitting.

By the time of submission of this thesis the BERTgrid pipeline was not productized yet. Hence, no inference mode was implemented. Next we describe how BERTgrid could be used in an inference setting. It is worth mentioning that the sheer size of a BERT model makes it hardly usable for inference in many applications.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>During the internship I had the chance to attend a talk on BERT by the inventor Jacob Devlin at Google's office in Berlin during which he remarked that Google does not use BERT for inference in production, because it was too costly and slow. Instead they fit a smaller *student model* to match the outputs of a BERT model and use it as a faster, more light-weight opt-in replacement for the large model instead.

Given an invoice scan and trained weights of a BERT and Wordgrid model, during inference an OCR engine would be applied first to retrieve the word positions. This is done just as with Chargrid. For BERTgrid the OCR output would then be serialized, pre-processed, and tokenized to be subsequently fed into the BERT model. The extracted feature vectors can be held in RAM and are passed on to the Wordgrid code which constructs BERTgrid therefrom and forwards it to the neural network.

It would be useful to monitor the average number of tokens comprising the invoices. A shift of the values shown in the histogram in Figure 14 would inevitably lead to a deterioration of extraction accuracy, because the BERT model only processes sequences of maximum length 512. Similarly, it seems reasonable to monitor and detect and shift in bounding box sizes (Figure 13).

## 6 Results

In the following we present the results of our new methods. Since the dataset is proprietary, the baseline we compare to is our previously best model, namely Chargrid (see also the “Experiments and Results” section in [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#)). The discussion of the results is separated from the pure reporting and can be found in the subsequent section. Unless indicated otherwise, the performance is measured according to the evaluation measure introduced in Section 5.3.

Shortly summarized, the Chargrid model – our baseline to compare to – achieves an averaged extraction accuracy of  $0.6176 \pm 0.0072$ . The best Wordgrid model combines Chargrid with word2vec-2d word vectors and has an accuracy of  $0.6267 \pm 0.0033$ , improving upon the baseline by 0.0091. The contextualized version, BERTgrid, is even better with an absolute performance of  $0.6548 \pm 0.0058$  which is 0.0373 above the baseline.

This section is split into two parts: First, we list the results of our experiments with Wordgrid with different embedding choices, BERTgrid, and combination methods. Second, we show the results of our model complementarity analysis which we ran for Chargrid, Wordgrid, and combination methods.

All trainings were run on an Nvidia DGX-1 machine equipped with eight Nvidia Tesla V-100 GPUs with 16 GB RAM each. The machine has two 20-core Intel Xeon CPUs and 500 GB of RAM. The hyperparameter configuration is the same as in [Katti et al. \(2018\)](#) unless pointed out otherwise. We train with a batch size of six.

We use the U-net architecture shown in Figure 1 for all experiments except the main results (Table 3). That is because we have a (not yet published) CU-net architecture (see [Tang et al. \(2018\)](#)) in use internally, which performs better. Results on the U-net are transferrable to the new architecture, except everything is typically a notch better (around 0.02 for Chargrid models).

We compute the reported scores as follows: If we ran multiple trainings, we average the reported performances at each step. Otherwise we use the single training run that is available as-is. We then slide a windows of size 20k steps over the (averaged) curve and compute the performance for each position of the window as the mean of the part of the curve that is within the window. Since we run a validation every other 5k steps, this corresponds to averaging five consecutively reported results. Out of these performances we use the maximum as the model’s performance measure. The dataset used is the validation set of the labeled invoice dataset. We typically train for either 800k or 400k steps depending on how fast the model converges.

When reporting the results in tables, we use the following abbreviations for

Header fields	all_fields	Amount	Number	Date	VName	VAddress
[Chargrid]	0.6176	0.9142	0.8390	0.8574	0.4091	0.4510
[C+Wordgrid]	0.6267	0.9053	0.8430	0.8699	0.4163	0.4672
[C+BERTgrid]	<b>0.6548</b>	<b>0.9238</b>	<b>0.8625</b>	<b>0.8846</b>	<b>0.4722</b>	<b>0.5018</b>
Line items	all_fields	Descr	Quantity	TotalPr	ItemQuote	VatRate
[Chargrid]	0.5659	0.5240	0.6697	0.7288	0.1907	0.2655
[C+Wordgrid]	0.5764	0.5226	0.6612	0.7325	0.2507	0.3238
[C+BERTgrid]	<b>0.6042</b>	<b>0.5529</b>	<b>0.7318</b>	<b>0.7366</b>	<b>0.2948</b>	<b>0.3405</b>

Table 3: Main results on all header (top) and line item fields (bottom); CU-net architecture. [C+BERTgrid], the model with contextualization, is consistently outperforming both, the baseline and a Wordgrid variant.

header field names in the column headers: `all_fields` the mean performance across all fields, including header fields and line item fields; `Amount` the amount stated on the invoice; `Number` the invoice number/identifier; `Date` the date the invoice was issued; `VName` the vendor name, e.g. “Denk Development” in Figure 6; `VAddress` the address that belongs to the vendor.

For line item fields, the ones that can occur multiple times, we use: `all_fields` the mean performance across all line item fields (excluding header fields); `Descr` the line item description; `Quantity` the line item quantity; `TotalPr` the total price of the line item; `ItemQuote` additional information about a line item; `VatRate` the VAT rate of the line item, i.e. what tax percentage applies.

## 6.1 Experiments

**Main Results.** In Table 3 we show the main results achieved by three models we compare with each other:

- [Chargrid] the best Chargrid model available; the neural network architecture is an advancement of the one presented in Section 3.1, namely a CU-net.
- [C+Wordgrid] a combination of Chargrid and Wordgrid. For combining, the “Parallel U-net” method is chosen (see Section 4.2.4) where we replicate the first CU-net block. Wordgrid is using vectors from word2vec-2d pre-training with  $r = 9$ .
- [C+BERTgrid] a combination of Chargrid and BERTgrid. We combine the vectors as in [C+Wordgrid]. The BERT model is pre-trained for 2M steps, feature vectors from the second to last hidden layer are used, the floating point precision of BERTgrid is 16 bit, the entire vector is used ( $d_{\text{model}} = 768$ ).

[C+BERTgrid] achieves the best performance by a considerable margin. On `all_fields`, the mean across all fields, it outperforms the [Chargrid] baseline




Figure 15: Comparison of the convergence of three different models over the first 400k steps (we trained until 800k); CU-net architecture. The error intervals indicates the standard deviation across four training runs (for each model).

by 0.0373. There is not a single field on which we see a deterioration in performance when using [C+BERTgrid]. The most significant improvement can be observed on the line item field `ItemQuote`, where [C+BERTgrid] is better by 0.1041. On the header fields, [C+BERTgrid] pushes the performance by 0.0631 on the Vendor Name (`vName`) field.

[C+Wordgrid] outperforms the [Chargrid] baseline as well, albeit at a smaller margin of 0.0091. It is noteworthy that we see a performance loss on the fields `Amount`, `Descr`, `Quantity`, and `TotalPr`.

We also observe that both [C+Wordgrid] and [C+BERTgrid] converge faster than [Chargrid]. *Faster* is measured in terms of the number of weight updates (aka. training steps), not wall-clock time. Figure 15 shows the convergence of the three models on `all_fields` over the first 400k steps. [C+Wordgrid] converges by far the fastest and starts to saturate after about 100k steps. It breaks the accuracy of 0.6 after 60k steps; [C+BERTgrid] after 95k steps and [Chargrid] much later after 215k steps.

Header fields	all_fields	Amount	Number	Date	VName	VAddress
[rand]	0.5247	0.8750	0.7098	0.7854	0.3199	0.3219
[w2v]	0.5838	0.8998	0.7561	0.8408	<b>0.4053</b>	0.4178
[w2v-2d-3]	0.5821	<b>0.9100</b>	<b>0.7596</b>	0.8468	0.3645	0.4071
[w2v-2d-9]	<b>0.5898</b>	0.8964	0.7589	<b>0.8470</b>	0.3889	<b>0.4204</b>
Line items	all_fields	Descr	Quantity	TotalPr	ItemQuote	VatRate
[rand]	0.4766	0.4647	0.4566	0.6892	0.1374	0.1343
[w2v]	0.5353	<b>0.4939</b>	0.6130	0.7050	<b>0.2434</b>	0.1787
[w2v-2d-3]	0.5336	0.4887	0.6311	<b>0.7183</b>	0.1754	<b>0.1940</b>
[w2v-2d-9]	<b>0.5451</b>	0.4929	<b>0.6527</b>	0.7075	0.2093	<b>0.1940</b>

Table 4: Embedding choice results for plain Wordgrid on all header (top) and line item fields (bottom); U-net architecture

**Embedding Choices.** We run experiments comparing Wordgrid variants with different choices for the non-contextualized embedding dictionary, see Section 4.2.2. All embedding spaces have a dimensionality of  $d = 32$  and the vocabulary size is  $V = 40,000$ . The embedding dictionary initializations we use are:

- [rand] random embedding, initialized from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.01)$ .
- [w2v] semantic embedding, pre-trained with word2vec on the 700k invoice dataset; cbow method, window size 4, negative sampling 25, 100 iterations on 50 threads, minimum count of 50 for the vocabulary words, vocabulary reduced to 40k in a post-processing step.
- [w2v-2d-3] semantic embedding, pre-trained with word2vec-2d (see Section 4.1) on the 700k invoice dataset, with context radius  $r = 3$ , cbow, negative sampling 25, for 150 iterations, minimum count of 50 for the vocabulary words, vocabulary reduced to 40k in a post-processing step.
- [w2v-2d-9] semantic embedding, same as [w2v-2d-3] except the radius is set to  $r = 9$ .

Table 4 lists the results for the different embedding methods on all fields. Note that the values are generally lower than the ones in Table 3 because we use the U-net architecture and do not provide the model with character-level information (no combination). [rand] consistently performs worst; on all\_fields (also for line items) the novel word2vec-2d with  $r = 9$ , [w2v-2d-9], dominates. On all fields but VName, Descr, and ItemQuote word2vec-2d is better than word2vec.

**Combination Methods.** In Table 5 we report the results achieved by different combination methods for Chargrid and Wordgrid as described in Section 4.2.4. In addition we want to state that the outputs of the two  $1 \times 1$  convolutions used in [1x1conv] are being added and that [par-b1] uses the first

Header fields	all_fields	Amount	Number	Date	VName	VAddress
[concat]	0.6020	0.9144	0.8398	0.8702	0.4040	0.4385
[1x1conv]	0.6005	0.9054	0.8398	0.8631	0.4011	<b>0.4572</b>
[par-b1]	<b>0.6113</b>	<b>0.9225</b>	<b>0.8437</b>	<b>0.8816</b>	<b>0.4151</b>	0.4434
Line items	all_fields	Descr	Quantity	TotalPr	ItemQuote	VatRate
[concat]	0.5437	<b>0.4860</b>	0.6561	0.7109	0.1860	0.2493
[1x1conv]	0.5421	0.4663	0.6579	0.7193	<b>0.2071</b>	<b>0.3053</b>
[par-b1]	<b>0.5547</b>	0.4689	<b>0.6753</b>	<b>0.7345</b>	0.1876	0.2993

Table 5: Chargrid-Wordgrid combination method results on all header (top) and line item fields (bottom); U-net architecture




Figure 16: Model complementarity on the line item description field (`Descr`). All three combination methods are showing similar patterns at Chargrid/Wordgrid usage.

U-net block in parallel and adds the results, yielding the input to the second block.

As measured by `all_fields`, the combination method `[par-b1]` leads to the best results. On some fields, `[concat]` or `[1x1conv]` perform better.

## 6.2 Model Complementarity

We apply the model complementarity definition (see Section 4.2.4) to Chargrid ( $M_1$ ), Wordgrid ( $M_2$ ), and combination methods ( $M_3$ ). The raw results of the latter can be found in Table 5.

Exemplary, we pick three fields and show the Venn diagrams for them for each combination method. Figure 16 for the `Descr` field, on which `[concat]` performs best. Figure 17 for `Quantity`, where `[par-1b]` is the strongest, and Figure 18 for `VAddress` on which `[1x1conv]` yields the best results.

The complementarity analysis suggests that the weakness of `[concat]` and `[1x1conv]` lies in their inability to use the information from both, Chargrid and Wordgrid. While they do on some fields, they tend to rely more on the Chargrid input on others, thereby losing performance compared to `[par-1b]`.




Figure 17: Model complementarity on the line item quantity field (`Quantity`). All three combination methods use C and W in a balanced way. `[par-b1]` performs best because it captures more of the samples in the intersection of C and W than `[1x1conv]`. `[concat]` is weaker at using all Wordgrid information.




Figure 18: Model complementarity on the vendor address field (`vAddress`). We observe a clear imbalance in information usage for `[concat]` which leans towards C and away from W. `[par-b1]` performs best at covering both, C and W.

## 7 Discussion

Our novel Wordgrid method pushes the state-of-the-art performance on SAP’s proprietary invoice dataset. Its first variant, the non-contextualized grid of word vectors, achieves better extraction accuracies when combined with Chargrid than plain Chargrid. The conceptually fundamentally different BERTgrid is even better and sets a new state-of-the-art for key-value extraction from invoices. Our methods were both motivated by recent advancements in 1D NLP. By applying them to a 2D problem we have successfully shown that the field of 2D document understanding can benefit from methods cast from 1D to 2D. Specifically, the usage of contextualized embedding for 2D document representation leads to performance gains analogous to the contextualized embedding of text sequences in 1D NLP.

Due to the lack of publicly available 2D document understanding benchmarks, we were unable to compare our method to other published approaches. We do, however, hypothesize that the performance boost seen on the invoice problem translates to other 2D document understanding problems as well. We assume word2vec-2d and Wordgrid are both beneficial in other areas as well. Key-value extraction from invoices can be seen as a representative benchmark as invoices rely heavily on 2D structure. A human reader would search for the vendor name at the top of a document first, possibly printed in a larger font size. Line items are typically positioned in the middle, arranged in a tabular layout. These properties of invoices support our assumption that Wordgrid is indeed an advancement of 2D document understanding methods in general.

**Embedding Choices.** Experiments with different embedding initializations show that semantic meaning improves the downstream model’s performance considerably. Most likely due to the lack of prior, semantic information, random embedding ([rand]) is left far behind word2vec and word2vec-2d. The information of the 700k invoices dataset is in some sense contained in the non-random embedding spaces and is presumably responsible for the gains in accuracy.

The novel word2vec-2d method performs better than word2vec, which we see as support for our assumption that the representation quality of vectors computed by word2vec suffers from serialization of 2D documents. By circumventing the serialization, word2vec-2d calculates embedding spaces which are semantically meaningful for 2D documents.

The radius hyperparameter  $r$  of word2vec-2d does influence the quality of the embedding: We observe differences between the embedding space trained with  $r = 9$  (better) and the one trained with  $r = 3$ . Other than performing grid search, the hyperparameter can be tuned by computing the average context

size, i.e. the average cardinality of the set in Equation 17, across the training data. A domain expert can make an assessment of how many words typically belong to the semantic context of a word in a document and choose  $r$  based on that. As a second option, the 2D documents can be inspected visually and distances between semantically distinct sections can be measured. The radius should be chosen to be lower.

**Combination Methods.** We consistently see the combination of Chargrid and Wordgrid/BERTgrid to perform better than plain Wordgrid/BERTgrid. Naturally, neural networks are good at handling additional information and weighing the importance of input channels. The difficulty of combining Chargrid and Wordgrid (this includes BERTgrid) lies in making both information as *accessible* to the model as possible. Our model complementarity method shows that parallel processing of Chargrid and Wordgrid with subsequent addition is most beneficial. Intuitively, this seems reasonable as the semantic level on which information is contained in the tensors differs a lot. The parallel U-net branches can presumably convert both representations to a similar level, using several stacked convolutional layers.

We observe that all combination methods lose some accuracy on fields which Chargrid and/or Wordgrid worked well on. These areas are red, dark yellow, and green in the Venn diagrams, Figure 16, Figure 17, and Figure 18. Despite the gain on new fields (blue shaded areas at the bottom), this loss is a clear indicator for sub-optimal combination. None of the proposed combination methods uses the complementarity of Chargrid and Wordgrid to its full extent.

The most promising combination method is [par-1b]. Not only because it achieves the best results quantitatively, but also because it has no bias towards Chargrid or Wordgrid. On the other hand, [concat] is making it hard for the downstream model to use all available information. The [1x1conv] method is somewhere in between. That supports our assumption that some parallel processing is necessary, because the  $1 \times 1$  convolution is in some sense, albeit being just one layer deep, a parallel U-net branch too.

**Drawbacks of Wordgrid.** The performance gains of Wordgrid come at a cost. There are several disadvantages and requirements associated with Wordgrid which we elaborate on in the following.

Unless used in combination with random embedding, Wordgrid requires data for embedding pre-training. While the labeled dataset can be used, it may often be too small. In business applications, this requirement might be less of a problem as unlabeled data is commonly available in abundance. It does, however, set

Chargrid apart from Wordgrid which works solely with a labeled dataset.

With Wordgrid, the overall wall-clock duration of a training increases. We measure the training speed in seconds elapsed per 100 update steps (the lower the better). Numbers reported are approximate and for the U-net architecture. For Chargrid the number of seconds per 100 steps is 31, Wordgrid with a static embedding function is a bit higher at 38. Contextualized embedding is very costly: The full-size BERTgrid model needs 277. For reference, training such a BERTgrid model for 800k steps (which is about where it converges on the invoice task) takes about 26 days. The training speed can be increased to 100 by cutting the spatial size along  $x$  and  $y$  direction in half. It can be further improved to 56 by reducing the floating point precision to 16 bit and slicing off half of the contextualized vector. The long training times of BERTgrid pose a serious challenge in terms of rapid experimenting. We have not benchmarked inference times of Wordgrid but assume them to be similarly higher.

In particular with BERTgrid, the overall training pipeline gets more complex. That is due to the evaluation of the contextualized embedding function which is way more complex than the fixed embedding function which can be implemented as a simple dictionary lookup. For computing a contextualized vector, inference of a BERT model must be run, which can be done offline or online. In the offline case (which we have implemented), the contextualized feature vectors must be matched with the current invoice’s OCR data to construct the BERTgrid tensor on-the-fly. In the online case an entire BERT model must be held in RAM.

The usage of Wordgrid typically increases the number of model parameters. The Chargrid network has 20.3M parameters, using Wordgrid with concatenation results in 23.8M. The full-size BERTgrid model (full depth and full spatial size) has 26.6M parameters. Additional parameters forced us to reduce the batch size from 7 to 6, which is a relatively small sacrifice.

The pre-trained BERT models are limited to a maximum sequence length of 512. That is a strong limitation of the BERT pipeline we use, which in our case is only not very pronounced because the document lengths coincidentally lay mostly below it (see Figure 14). For applications with larger 2D documents, the BERT model would need to be applied several times, similar to Dai et al. (2019).

**Effectiveness of Unsupervised Pre-training.** Unsupervised pre-training is in huge parts responsible for the performance improvements of Wordgrid. When comparing for instance the two Wordgrid training runs with random embedding ([rand]) and word2vec ([w2v]) embedding we see significant differences in performance. On a technical level, both are very similar: A word in the

invoice is mapped to one of 40k corresponding embedding vectors. The only difference are the values of these vectors: the word2vec ones carry semantic meaning. The resulting performance increase of 0.0591 is remarkable and credit goes solely to the word2vec pre-training. BERTgrid can be seen in a similar way. Even though it does not map 1:1 from word to vector anymore, it improves the performance of the Chargrid network just by providing it with semantically meaningful, contextualized input representations.

Based on these findings we conclude that unsupervised pre-training is an integral part of the effectiveness of Wordgrid and BERTgrid. The latter profits even more from pre-training, because it can capture much more complex lingual rules and dependencies in its neural language model, than the small-sized word2vec embedding space can. Consequently, the size of the unlabeled corpus must be larger too. In our case the 700k invoices dataset is sufficiently large.

**Effectiveness of Contextualization.** It was previously well known that contextualization is very beneficial in 1D NLP. Our results show that this translates to 2D: Our best model uses contextualized embedding.

## 8 Future Work

While working on Wordgrid we have touched several aspects that potentially qualify as subjects of future work. We describe them in this section.

**Using BERT-2D End-to-end.** The BERT model was shown to be very successful on a range of different tasks. After pre-training on sufficiently large data, its feature vectors are often contextually rich enough such that a single layer alone can perform classification very well. Hence, we believe instead of feeding contextualized word piece vectors into a Chargrid network, the entire Chargrid network could be replaced by a BERT-2D model altogether. For that, two bigger changes must be made to BERT: (1) 2D contextualized embedding and (2) sparse input representation.

While we have arranged the Transformer blocks in a sequential order in Figure 3, in reality the information about a word’s position in the sequence is only provided to the network in the positional encoding. The Transformer blocks in a BERT model attend to *all* blocks irrespective of their position. We therefore suggest using a two-dimensional positional encoding where a word piece embedding is a composition of (a) a randomly initialized, trainable vector (lookup table), (b) a positional encoding for the  $x$  axis, and (c) a positional encoding for the  $y$  axis. Whether or not to use trainable or non-trainable (e.g. sinusoidal as in Vaswani et al. (2017)) positional encodings would need to be determined empirically.

In 1D NLP a sentence is a sequence of words and there are no *gaps* in between words. 2D documents, like invoice, differ as they have blank background (see Figure 6). The Chargrid network is provided symbols and background alike, for BERT, however, this seems impractical because there would be too many input symbols. The computational complexity of attention grows in  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  with  $n$  being the number of inputs. Having too many inputs is therefore unaffordable which is also why the BERT model caps the maximum sequence length at 512. By feeding only the Wordgrid cells into the BERT model where there is a word (or word piece) present, we represent a 2D document in a much sparser way and will be unlikely to reach the computational limits.

Mathematically described, BERT-2D processes a document as defined in Equation 20 as follows. Let  $e_{2D} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a function computing a positional encoding vector for any given  $x, y$ -coordinate tuple. Further, let  $e_{\text{fixed}}$  be a non-contextualized embedding function as defined in Equation 22. The input to the first Transformer block  $\mathbf{b}_1$  (see Equation 15) is a sequence of length  $N^{(i)}$ , where

for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, N^{(i)}\}$  position

$$\mathbf{X}_{j,:} := \mathbf{e}_{2D} \left( \frac{x_{\max}^{(j)} + x_{\min}^{(j)}}{2}, \frac{y_{\max}^{(j)} + y_{\min}^{(j)}}{2} \right) + \mathbf{e}_{\text{fixed}}(w^{(j)}) \quad (36)$$

is a combination of positional encoding and word embedding vector. The tensor  $\mathbf{X}$  is processed as in normal BERT models by several stacked Transformer blocks. The last layer could be modified to match the Chargrid network, i.e. have two branches, for segmentation and bounding boxes, respectively. The model could then be trained with the Chargrid loss, see Equation 3.

**Pre-training on 2D Data.** Several methods are available for pre-training on our invoice datasets. Word2vec works with serialized 2D documents and was used to produce a fixed lookup table with non-contextualized word vectors. With our word2vec-2d we allowed for pre-training on non-serialized 2D documents and produced non-contextualized embeddings as well. For the contextualized embedding we suggested to use a BERT model and pre-train it on serialized 2D documents. There is, however, no published method for pre-training models, capable of computing contextualized embedding vectors, on raw 2D data, i.e. without serialization. This lack of methods is apparent in Table 2 where there is a gap in the ‘‘Contextualized’’-‘‘Pre-training on 2D data’’ cell. We suggest two ways of filling that gap: (1) using the Chargrid network as a denoising autoencoder (DAE) and (2) casting BERT to 2D.

The Chargrid (and equivalently Wordgrid) network (Figure 1) is a CNN which converts, among other things, a tensor of spatial extent  $w \times h$  into a segmentation mask of the same spatial size. In DAE (Vincent et al. (2008)) mode, the bounding box regression part of the network is discarded and the segmentation mask depth is set to equal the input depth. The model is then a function  $\mathbf{f}_{\text{DAE}} : \mathbb{R}^{w \times h \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{w \times h \times d}$ . The training objective is, given a Wordgrid  $\mathbf{X}$  and a *corrupted* version  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  of it, to reconstruct the original from it:

$$L_{\text{DAE}} := \left\| \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{f}_{\text{DAE}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \right\|. \quad (37)$$

The corrupted version of the input can be computed in many different ways, e.g. by randomly masking out words or replacing them. The contextualized feature vector could then be extracted from an internal representation of  $\mathbf{f}_{\text{DAE}}$ .

Casting BERT (Devlin et al. (2018)) to 2D is very similar to the DAE. The BERT model is also reconstructing the document from a corrupted version, however, the loss is only computed for the places at which the input was corrupted. By default, BERT cannot cope with 2D input so the BERT-2D version would need to be used, which is described above.

**Wordgrid Tuning Aspects.** Multiple aspects of Wordgrid and BERTgrid, which we assume have potential to improve the performance further, could not be tuned and experimented with during the time period granted for carrying out this work. We briefly name them in the following.

It is common to use contextualized feature vectors from a BERT model by combining several hidden layers, e.g. adding the last three hidden layers. In our experiments we only used either the last or the second to last hidden layer for performance reasons. Making more information accessible to the neural network is likely aiding performance.

We compute contextualized feature vectors offline (the procedure is described in Section 5.4) and are therefore unable to backpropagate gradients into the BERT model while training on the Chargrid objective (Equation 3). Fine-tuning the BERT model, however, is likely beneficial.

The radius  $r$  of word2vec-2d (used in Equation 17) is a hyperparameter that is harder to choose intuitively than the window size of word2vec. That is because it depends strongly on the nature of the 2D document dataset. A grid search for choosing the optimal radius should be ran for the given dataset.

Our model complementarity analyses of combination methods of Chargrid and Wordgrid have shown that the combining model is not capable of using all information that either Chargrid or Wordgrid (set union) provide. Better ways of combining the two tensors should therefore be searched for.

The invoice datasets we train on contain documents of different languages. Naturally, character-level models struggle less with different languages than word-level models, so the improvements of Wordgrid might be even stronger when training language-specific models. For that the subset of e.g. English-only invoices would be used for pre-training (word vectors) and model training.

As pointed out in Section 2.2, there are no common benchmarks for 2D document understanding. That is in strong contrast to 1D NLP. Future work could create a synthetic dataset to evaluate the different existing methods and to make them more comparable. Also, the existence of a benchmark makes the field naturally more competitive and fosters innovation.

## 9 Conclusion

Following up on the last sentence of the Chargrid paper (Katti et al. (2018)) – “[...] it may be interesting to use word embeddings rather than 1-hot encoded characters, i.e. a wordgrid, as 2D text input representation.” – we have developed Wordgrid, an enhancement of Chargrid. Wordgrid’s grid consists of word-level information in form of word embedding vectors. It inherits Chargrid’s property of preserving the information contained in the spatial arrangement of words in the input document. In contrast to Chargrid, however, Wordgrid can contain more prior information, e.g. when using embeddings carrying semantic information, from which the downstream model benefits.

The 1D NLP domain has seen recent advancements in the field of text representation. While non-contextualized embedding had been the standard choice for state-of-the-art models for some time, it has been replaced by the recently developed method of contextualized embedding. Motivated by the advancements, we successfully transferred these inventions from the sequential text (1D) domain to 2D document understanding, specifically, by using a novel method called word2vec-2d which trains non-contextualized embeddings on unlabeled 2D document corpora. Second, we use contextualized vector representations for words in BERTgrid, eschewing the 1:1 mapping from symbol to representation that Chargrid uses. Instead, word representations are computed with dependence on their neighboring words (context).

Both methods, word2vec-2d and BERTgrid, benefit from the availability of large amounts of unlabeled data. While Chargrid relied explicitly on expensively labeled data, our new methods utilize unlabeled data for pre-training, leading to faster convergence on the supervised task with a higher eventual performance. Again, this is analogous to the 1D domain where pre-training on language modeling tasks has become the de-facto standard.

We expect to see future work in the field of 2D document understanding to borrow ideas from 1D NLP. The methodologies which are successful there can, when ported appropriately, potentially benefit the 2D world as well.

Since implementing the new inventions and incorporating them into the Chargrid code base, SAP’s invoice processing models have been achieving a considerably higher performance. Using non-contextualized embedding has led to relative performance improvements of 0.91 percentage points relative to SAP’s best Chargrid model. Contextualization has yielded even greater extraction results on the invoice task with a relative increase of 3.73 percentage points with respect to Chargrid.

## References

- Ismat Beg and Samina Ashraf. Similarity measures for fuzzy sets. *Applied and Computational Mathematics*, 8:192–202, 03 2009. URL <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228744370>.
- Vladimir V. Bochkarev, Anna V. Shevlyakova, and Valery D. Solovyev. Average word length dynamics as indicator of cultural changes in society. *CoRR*, abs/1208.6109, 2012. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.6109>.
- Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. Enriching word vectors with subword information. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:135–146, 2017.
- Yunpeng Chen, Haoqi Fan, Bing Xu, Zhicheng Yan, Yannis Kalantidis, Marcus Rohrbach, Shuicheng Yan, and Jiashi Feng. Drop an octave: Reducing spatial redundancy in convolutional neural networks with octave convolution. *CoRR*, abs/1904.05049, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.05049>.
- Alexis Conneau, Guillaume Lample, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Ludovic Denoyer, and Hervé Jégou. Word translation without parallel data. *CoRR*, abs/1710.04087, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.04087>.
- Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime G. Carbonell, Quoc V. Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Transformer-xl: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context. *CoRR*, abs/1901.02860, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1901.02860>.
- Timo I. Denk and Samed Güner. Vision-based page rank estimation with graph networks. Technical report, May 2019. URL <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334824445>.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *CoRR*, abs/1810.04805, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>.
- Daniel Esser, Daniel Schuster, Klemens Muthmann, Michael Berger, and Alexander Schill. Automatic indexing of scanned documents: a layout-based approach. In *Document Recognition and Retrieval XIX*, volume 8297, page 82970H. International Society for Optics and Photonics, 2012.
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016. <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>.

- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997. URL <https://www.bioinf.jku.at/publications/older/2604.pdf>.
- Anoop R. Katti, Christian Reisswig, Cordula Guder, Sebastian Brarda, Steffen Bickel, Johannes Höhne, and Jean Baptiste Faddoul. Chargrid: Towards understanding 2d documents. *CoRR*, abs/1809.08799, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1809.08799>.
- Yoon Kim. Convolutional neural networks for sentence classification. *CoRR*, abs/1408.5882, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1408.5882>.
- Tom Kocmi and Ondrej Bojar. An exploration of word embedding initialization in deep-learning tasks. *CoRR*, abs/1711.09160, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.09160>.
- Guillaume Lample, Miguel Ballesteros, Sandeep Subramanian, Kazuya Kawakami, and Chris Dyer. Neural architectures for named entity recognition. *CoRR*, abs/1603.01360, 2016. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.01360>.
- Xiaojing Liu, Feiyu Gao, Qiong Zhang, and Huasha Zhao. Graph convolution for multimodal information extraction from visually rich documents. *CoRR*, abs/1903.11279, 2019a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1903.11279>.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *CoRR*, abs/1907.11692, 2019b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11692>.
- Jonathan Long, Evan Shelhamer, and Trevor Darrell. Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation. *CoRR*, abs/1411.4038, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4038>.
- Christopher D. Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schütze. *Introduction to Information Retrieval*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ISBN 0521865719, 9780521865715.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1301.3781>.
- Rasmus Berg Palm, Ole Winther, and Florian Laws. Cloudscan - A configuration-free invoice analysis system using recurrent neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1708.07403, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1708.07403>.

- Niki Parmar, Ashish Vaswani, Jakob Uszkoreit, Lukasz Kaiser, Noam Shazeer, and Alexander Ku. Image transformer. *CoRR*, abs/1802.05751, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.05751>.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D. Manning. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, 2014. URL <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D14-1162>.
- Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Deep contextualized word representations. *CoRR*, abs/1802.05365, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.05365>.
- Rohit Prabhavalkar, Tara N. Sainath, Yonghui Wu, Patrick Nguyen, Zhifeng Chen, Chung-Cheng Chiu, and Anjali Kannan. Minimum word error rate training for attention-based sequence-to-sequence models. *CoRR*, abs/1712.01818, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1712.01818>.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018. URL [https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/openai-assets/research-covers/language-unsupervised/language\\_understanding\\_paper.pdf](https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/openai-assets/research-covers/language-unsupervised/language_understanding_paper.pdf).
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. 2019. URL [https://d4mucfpksywv.cloudfront.net/better-language-models/language\\_models\\_are\\_unsupervised\\_multitask\\_learners.pdf](https://d4mucfpksywv.cloudfront.net/better-language-models/language_models_are_unsupervised_multitask_learners.pdf).
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. Know what you don’t know: Unanswerable questions for squad. *CoRR*, abs/1806.03822, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1806.03822>.
- Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross B. Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster R-CNN: towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. *CoRR*, abs/1506.01497, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.01497>.
- Xin Rong. word2vec parameter learning explained. *CoRR*, abs/1411.2738, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.2738>.
- Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. *CoRR*, abs/1505.04597, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.04597>.

- Daniel Schuster, Klemens Muthmann, Daniel Esser, Alexander Schill, Michael Berger, Christoph Weidling, Kamil Aliyev, and Andreas Hofmeier. Intellix-end-user trained information extraction for document archiving. In *2013 12th International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*, pages 101–105. IEEE, 2013.
- Zhiqiang Tang, Xi Peng, Shijie Geng, Yizhe Zhu, and Dimitris N. Metaxas. CUNET: Coupled u-nets. *CoRR*, abs/1808.06521, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1808.06521>.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *CoRR*, abs/1706.03762, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762>.
- Pascal Vincent, Hugo Larochelle, Yoshua Bengio, and Pierre-Antoine Manzagol. Extracting and composing robust features with denoising autoencoders. In *ICML*, 2008.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *CoRR*, abs/1804.07461, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1804.07461>.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime G. Carbonell, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V. Le. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. *CoRR*, abs/1906.08237, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.08237>.
- Zi Yin and Yuanyuan Shen. On the dimensionality of word embedding. *CoRR*, abs/1812.04224, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.04224>.
- Rowan Zellers, Yonatan Bisk, Roy Schwartz, and Yejin Choi. SWAG: A large-scale adversarial dataset for grounded commonsense inference. *CoRR*, abs/1808.05326, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1808.05326>.
- Xiang Zhang, Junbo Jake Zhao, and Yann LeCun. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. *CoRR*, abs/1509.01626, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.01626>.
- Xiaohui Zhao, Zhuo Wu, and Xiaoguang Wang. CUTIE: learning to understand documents with convolutional universal text information extractor. *CoRR*, abs/1903.12363, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1903.12363>.