

How Far Is Document Parsing from Solved?

PureDocBench: A Source-Traceable Benchmark across Clean, Degraded, and Real-World Settings

Zhiheng Li^{1,2,9,*} Zongyang Ma^{1,*} Jiaxian Chen^{3,*} Jianing Zhang⁴ Zhaolong Su⁴
 Yutong Zhang⁵ Zhiyin Yu⁶ Ruiqi Liu¹ Xiaolei Lv⁷ Bo Li⁷
 Jun Gao⁷ Ziqi Zhang¹ Chunfeng Yuan^{1,2,9,†} Bing Li^{1,2,9} Weiming Hu^{1,2,8,9}

¹CASIA ²UCAS ³NWPU ⁴JLU ⁵USTC ⁶PKU ⁷HelloGroup ⁸ShanghaiTech

⁹Beijing Key Laboratory of Super Intelligent Security of Multi-Modal Information

*Core contributors. †Corresponding author.

*lizhiheng2025@ia.ac.cn †cfyuan@nlpr.ia.ac.cn

Abstract

The past year has seen over 20 open-source document parsing models, yet the field still benchmarks almost exclusively on OmniDocBench, a 1,355-page manually annotated dataset whose top scores have saturated above 90%. A three-stage audit pipeline we run on OmniDocBench screens its 21,353 evaluator-scored blocks and confirms 2,580 errors (12.08%); combined with over a year of public availability, both annotation quality and contamination risk call its rankings into question. To address these issues, we present **PureDocBench**, a programmatically generated, source-traceable benchmark that renders document images from HTML/CSS and produces verifiable annotations from the same source, covering 10 domains, 66 subcategories, and 1,475 pages, each in three versions: clean, digitally degraded, and real-degraded (4,425 images total). Evaluating 40 models spanning pipeline specialists, end-to-end specialists, and general-purpose VLMs, we find: (i) document parsing is far from solved: the best model scores only ~ 74 out of 100, with a 44.6-point gap between the strongest and weakest models; (ii) specialist parsers with $\leq 4B$ parameters rival or surpass general VLMs that are $5\text{--}100\times$ larger, yet formula recognition remains a shared bottleneck where no model exceeds 67% when averaging the formula metric across all three tracks; (iii) general VLMs lose only 0.99/8.52 Overall points under digital/real degradation versus 4.90/14.21 for pipeline specialists, producing ranking reversals that make clean-only evaluation misleading for deployment. All data, code, and artifacts are [publicly released](#).

1 Introduction

Document parsing recovers not only text but also structural information (table row/column structures, formula $\LaTeX$, reading order) [1] from document images. In the past year alone the community has released more than 20 open-source specialist models, which broadly fall into two design philosophies. (i) **Multi-stage specialists**, which keep an explicit layout-then-content workflow and come in two variants: one couples a dedicated layout-detection model with a separate recognition VLM that handles text, tables, and formulas from the detected regions (e.g., PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 [2], GLM-OCR [3]); the other uses a single shared VLM for both stages, first




Figure 1: OmniDocBench vs. PureDocBench.

Source: manual audit of OmniDocBench v1.5, 21,353 annotations, 1,355 pages




Figure 2: Six categories of annotation errors identified in OmniDocBench: extra words, hallucination, missing words, table structure errors, category mismatch, and OCR residuals.

analyzing layout and then parsing content from the detected regions in a coarse-to-fine manner (e.g., MinerU2.5 [4, 5], Dolphin-v2 [6]). (ii) **Fully end-to-end (E2E) specialists**, which take a page image and emit the complete document markdown in a single forward pass, without any explicit intermediate layout step (e.g., FireRed-OCR [7], HunyuanOCR [8], DeepSeek-OCR/-2 [9, 10]). Iteration within both families has shortened to monthly cadence. In parallel, general-purpose vision-language models such as Qwen3-VL [11] and Gemini-3.1-Pro [12] are also widely used for document parsing, further diversifying the ecosystem.

However, **evaluation infrastructure has not kept pace with model development**, and can no longer reliably reflect the quality differences this rapid iteration produces. **OmniDocBench** [13] is the most comprehensive option and the de-facto reference, providing 1,355 manually annotated real PDF pages drawn from 9 document types (academic papers, slides, financial reports, exam papers, etc.) with text, table HTML, formula $\LaTeX$, and reading-order labels in both Chinese and English; other recent benchmarks [14–19] each address only a single aspect and are not comprehensive enough. Yet our analysis surfaces four pressing issues with OmniDocBench:

(P1) Annotation errors. Our three-stage audit pipeline screens all 21,353 evaluator-scored blocks in OmniDocBench and confirms 2,580 errors (12.08%), falling into six categories (Figure 2): extra words, hallucination, missing words, table structure errors, category mismatch, and OCR residual errors. Full audit details are in Appendix A.

(P2) Score saturation. Multiple top-ranked models score above 90% on OmniDocBench with inter-model gaps compressed to 1–2% on only 1,355 pages (Figure 1), smaller than the 9.42% annotation-error rate over all 27,376 blocks from (P1); observed rankings are no longer reliable. In contrast, the same models spread across 55–78% on PureDocBench, restoring meaningful separation.

(P3) Narrow coverage. OmniDocBench’s 9 categories miss high-frequency enterprise types such as financial invoices, medical records, legal contracts, and logistics documents [20, 21], and contain no photographically captured or physically degraded pages, leaving real-world robustness untested.

(P4) Contamination risk. The data has been publicly available since late 2024, during which 20+ models have been released whose training pipelines may have directly or indirectly accessed this dataset, and leaderboard credibility diminishes over time.

Based on these observations, we construct **PUREDOCBENCH**, named for its source-traceable construction: fresh HTML/CSS source serves as the single origin for both rendered document images and verifiable annotations.

PureDocBench addresses the above limitations point by point: (**S1**→**P1**) annotations are source-traceable and independently verifiable; (**S2**→**P2**) the top model scores only ~ 74 with a $\sim 44\%$ best-to-worst spread, roughly $4\times$ wider than OmniDocBench’s $\sim 12\%$; (**S3**→**P3**) 10 domains and 66 subcategories cover enterprise types absent from OmniDocBench [20, 21], and each page is rendered in three versions (*clean*, *digitally degraded*, *real-degraded*), yielding 4,425 images; (**S4**→**P4**) all 1,475 pages are freshly generated before evaluation, and the pipeline can be re-rolled on demand to mitigate contamination.

We evaluate 40 models on PureDocBench and obtain four findings: (1) **Document parsing is far from solved**. The best model scores only $\sim 74\%$, with a ~ 44 -point best-to-worst spread and field-wide mean of $\sim 61\%$. (2) **Specialists dominate cost-effectiveness**. MinerU2.5-Pro (1.2B) ties Kimi K2.6 (1T/32B active) on the composite metric; within Qwen3.5, the 397B MoE does not surpass the 122B MoE. (3) **General VLMs are more robust to degradation**. Pipeline specialists lose 4.90/14.21 Overall points under digital/real degradation versus only 0.99/8.52 for general VLMs, producing ranking reversals that make clean-only evaluation misleading. (4) **Sub-metric analysis reveals complementary strengths and a shared bottleneck**. No architecture dominates all sub-metrics: Pipeline leads on text and reading order, E2E on tables, and VLMs on formulas; yet formula recognition remains the dominant gap (no model exceeds 67% on the track-averaged Avg-Formula), and Avg-Formula stays flat across a $30\times$ Qwen parameter span, pointing to LaTeX-/STEM-rich pretraining and dedicated formula handling.

Our contributions are: (1) **PureDocBench**, a source-rendered, contamination-resistant benchmark spanning 10 domains, 66 subcategories, and 4,425 images (1,475 pages $\times$ 3 tracks), with verifiable annotations produced from the same HTML/CSS source. (2) A **three-stage audit of OmniDocBench** that confirms 2,580 annotation errors across a six-class taxonomy; we release the corrected GT. (3) A **40-model evaluation** covering pipeline specialists, E2E specialists, and general VLMs, yielding four findings on saturation, cost-effectiveness, degradation robustness, and sub-metric complementarity. (4) Full **open-source release** of the data, generation pipeline, evaluation code, all 40 models’ raw predictions, and the corrected OmniDocBench annotations for independent reproduction and reuse.

2 PureDocBench

2.1 Data Construction

PureDocBench is a document parsing benchmark whose images are rendered from HTML/CSS source and whose annotations are produced from that same source. We call it *Pure* because each page’s content is freshly LLM-generated before evaluation, reducing known training-data overlap risk, and because annotations remain source-traceable rather than being transcribed from rendered images by hand. Figure 3 summarizes the design along three axes: (**A**) taxonomy, (**B**) 1:1:1 triple-version design, and (**C**) the construction pipeline.

(A) Taxonomy. PureDocBench covers 10 top-level domains and 66 fine-grained subcategories (Figure 3A), including high-frequency enterprise types absent from existing benchmarks: financial invoices, medical records, legal contracts, and logistics documents [20, 21].

(B) Triple-version design. Each page is rendered in three versions (clean, digitally degraded, and real-degraded), forming a 1:1:1 evaluation set of 4,425 images (Figure 3B). Degradation only affects image quality, not the underlying document content, so all three versions share the same ground-truth annotations. *Digital* degradation uses 10 scene templates simulating artifacts that are costly to produce physically (aged archive, book binding, multi-gen photocopy, fax/thermal print, ink bleed, JPEG compression, uneven lighting, geometric distortion, noise-blur combo, etc.). *Real* degradation is obtained through four physical acquisition chains: (i) phone capture of printed pages under varied paper / lighting / angle conditions; (ii) phone capture of photocopies; (iii) phone-of-monitor screen photography; and (iv) screenshot with social-media compression. The two are complementary: digital covers scale-difficult artifacts, real captures authentic acquisition noise. The complete operation list and per-scenario weights are in Appendix D.

Table 1: **Comparison with related document parsing benchmarks.** [†]OmniParsingBench’s document-only split. [‡]olmOCR-bench’s PDF-page count (yields 7,010 unit tests). ✓/✗/- = supported / not / partial.

Benchmark	Date	Images	Cat.	Evaluation Scope				Infrastructure			
				Text	Table	Formula	RdOrd	Degr.	Verif.	Leak Mit.	Regen.
Document Parsing Benchmarks											
OmniDocBench [13]	12/2024	1,355	9	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
DocPTBench [14]	11/2025	2,362	~4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Real5-OmniDocBench [15]	03/2026	6,775	9	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
MDPBench [16]	03/2026	3,400	6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	—	✗
OmniParsingBench [22]	03/2026	900 [†]	—	✓	✓	—	—	✗	✗	✗	✗
OCR-Centric Benchmarks											
OCRBench v2 [17]	01/2025	11,000	31	✓	✓	✓	✗	—	✗	—	✗
olmOCR-bench [18]	10/2025	1,403 [‡]	7	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	✓	✗	—
OCR-Reasoning [19]	05/2025	1,022	6	—	—	—	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
PureDocBench (Ours)	05/2026	4,425	66	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

extends it by physically recapturing each page under 5 capture conditions; DocPTBench [14] adds photographed documents and cross-lingual translation; MDPBench [16] extends to 17 languages with a private test split for contamination mitigation; OmniParsingBench [22] bundles a 900-page split inside a six-modality suite scored via LLM-judged aggregates. All rely on manually annotated real documents and inherit the annotation-quality and contamination-risk limitations discussed in §1. **OCR-centric benchmarks** take a broader view. OCRBench v2 [17] evaluates 31 OCR scenarios across 11K images; olmOCR-bench [18] converts 1,403 PDF pages into 7,010 binary Pass/Fail unit tests; OCR-Reasoning-Bench [19] targets multi-step reasoning over text-rich images. None assess structured extraction (table HTML, reading order) central to document parsing. PureDocBench is the only benchmark to simultaneously provide **verifiable** source-traceable annotations, **contamination-resistant** on-demand regeneration, **systematic degradation** (digital + real chains), and **full-spectrum parsing metrics** (text, table, formula, reading order).

3 Experiments

3.1 Setup

Metrics. We adopt the OmniDocBench evaluation framework [13]: TextEdit↓ (page-level normalized edit distance), FormulaCDM↑ [23] (render-based character detection matching for formulas), TableTEDS↑ [24] (tree-edit-distance similarity on table HTML), and ReadOrderEdit↓ (edit distance on reading order). Per-track **Overall**↑ is the mean of TextEdit, FormulaCDM, and TableTEDS (ROEdit is reported separately): Overall = $((1 - \text{TextEdit}) \times 100 + \text{FormulaCDM} + \text{TableTEDS}) / 3$. Avg₃ is the mean of the three track Overalls (Clean / Digital / Real).

Models (40). We evaluate 40 models grouped into three architecture families: **10 Pipeline / multi-stage specialists**, **15 fully end-to-end specialists**, and **15 general-purpose VLMs**. Table 2 lists every model individually with its citation and parameter count. All models use their officially recommended inference configuration (greedy decoding, $T=0$ where supported; see Appendix E for exceptions, e.g., Kimi K2.6 uses a vendor-fixed temperature) on NVIDIA A100-80GB GPUs; per-model backend, runtime parameters, prompt source, and any model-specific patches are documented in Appendix E.

3.2 Main Results

Document parsing is far from solved. The best Avg₃ score is only ~74, leaving the strongest model ~26% short of perfect, while the same models all saturate above 90 on OmniDocBench (Figure 1). The 40-model Avg₃ mean is only ~61, and the best-to-worst spread is ~44%, far wider than OmniDocBench’s ~12% top-cluster compression.

Specialist parsers still dominate the cost-effectiveness frontier. A 1.2B Pipeline specialist (MinerU2.5-Pro) ties Kimi K2.6 (1T total / 32B active) and Gemini-3.1-Pro on Avg₃ despite having orders of magnitude fewer active parameters, and matches or exceeds most general VLMs 5–100× its size. Within Qwen3.5, returns from further scaling are limited: the 397B-A17B MoE does not surpass the 122B-A10B MoE. Document parsing thus remains a domain where task-specific specialists carry their weight rather than a niche about to be absorbed by general-purpose scaling.

Table 2: **Three-track leaderboard on PureDocBench.** Each track reports Overall $\uparrow$, TextEdit $\downarrow$, FormulaCDM $\uparrow$, TableTEDS $\uparrow$, ROEdit $\downarrow$. Avg₃ = mean of three track Overalls. Per column, **bold** marks the best score and underline marks the runner-up. Bottom: six high-performing representative models per architecture; “Shown Avg.” averages only these displayed representatives, and Digital/Real cells show value with Δ vs. Clean ($\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain).


Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃
		Ovr↑	Txe↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Txe↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Txe↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																	
DotsMOCR [25]	3B	76.27	0.151	66.23	77.65	0.273	73.16	0.198	64.32	74.95	0.309	61.73	0.312	54.39	61.97	0.393	70.39
Dolphin-v2 [6]	3B	65.90	0.342	59.80	72.12	0.429	60.24	0.393	52.20	67.86	0.461	44.92	0.553	39.98	50.04	0.558	57.02
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B [26]	3B	62.23	0.346	48.46	72.83	0.492	57.40	0.397	45.57	66.32	0.526	46.49	0.511	38.18	52.43	0.600	55.37
YouTu-Parsing [27]	2B	75.02	0.230	67.34	80.74	0.358	69.66	0.270	61.44	74.49	0.388	60.29	0.360	52.20	64.69	0.430	68.32
MinerU2.5-Pro [5]	1.2B	75.87	0.222	65.14	<u>84.68</u>	0.346	71.77	0.272	61.79	80.73	0.378	62.56	0.375	52.70	72.47	0.446	70.07
MinerU2.5 [4]	1.2B	74.90	<u>0.184</u>	62.08	81.04	<u>0.327</u>	68.92	0.245	56.99	74.24	0.374	59.15	0.370	49.01	65.41	0.446	67.66
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B [26]	1.2B	61.09	0.358	47.43	71.60	0.498	55.72	0.416	43.91	64.83	0.529	43.82	0.556	36.94	50.07	0.609	53.54
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 [2]	0.9B	73.01	0.266	63.53	82.12	0.428	66.73	0.339	58.03	76.07	0.478	60.50	0.398	54.00	67.33	0.510	66.75
GLM-OCR [3]	0.9B	68.65	0.314	57.89	79.44	0.470	63.06	0.383	53.23	74.21	0.520	58.31	0.433	50.34	67.83	0.543	63.34
OpenOCR [28]	0.1B	32.70	0.354	33.50	0.00	0.507	30.03	0.410	31.09	0.00	0.541	25.73	0.486	25.81	0.00	0.591	29.49
End-to-End Specialists																	
olmOCR-2-7B [18]	7B	69.36	0.284	56.89	79.59	0.358	65.87	0.318	54.57	74.81	0.378	56.10	0.417	48.79	61.25	0.439	63.78
olmOCR-7B [29]	7B	62.56	0.388	58.69	67.77	0.466	57.84	0.436	55.44	61.66	0.499	47.30	0.542	46.26	49.80	0.568	55.90
FD-RL [30]	4B	78.38	0.193	<u>68.21</u>	86.22	0.334	<u>76.33</u>	<u>0.214</u>	67.16	83.22	<u>0.350</u>	67.04	0.298	58.82	72.08	0.391	<u>73.92</u>
Logics-Parsing-v2 [31]	4B	<u>76.35</u>	0.213	<u>67.67</u>	82.67	0.342	73.85	0.248	67.33	79.02	<u>0.375</u>	67.64	0.304	61.65	71.64	0.416	72.61
OCRVerse [32]	4B	73.18	0.273	63.78	83.09	0.393	71.36	0.302	63.95	80.36	0.415	63.66	0.363	57.03	70.30	0.452	69.40
Qianfan-OCR [33]	4B	57.22	0.370	49.79	58.83	0.443	50.85	0.438	44.41	51.96	0.485	45.06	0.494	39.08	45.53	0.509	51.04
Nanonets-OCR2 [34]	3B	64.83	0.254	44.98	74.94	0.377	61.23	0.307	45.40	68.97	0.408	49.03	0.435	35.50	55.09	0.468	58.36
DeepSeek-OCR-2 [10]	3B	55.53	0.354	46.00	56.01	0.466	49.41	0.412	40.78	48.67	0.493	43.60	0.486	37.30	42.06	0.533	49.51
OCRFlux-3B [35]	3B	47.14	0.454	38.35	48.46	0.424	41.82	0.486	31.90	42.17	0.437	37.21	0.559	32.65	34.87	0.491	42.06
DeepSeek-OCR [9]	3B	53.50	0.419	45.39	57.06	0.514	46.95	0.478	39.99	48.64	0.548	40.48	0.537	34.04	41.12	0.575	46.98
dots.ocr [36]	2.9B	72.01	0.248	61.37	79.51	0.379	65.95	0.307	56.67	71.86	0.417	55.68	0.403	47.70	59.63	0.467	64.55
FireRed-OCR [7]	2B	70.81	0.287	63.86	77.23	0.396	68.49	0.319	62.64	74.77	0.422	57.42	0.415	51.60	62.16	0.474	65.57
HunyuanOCR [8]	1B	65.61	0.269	55.74	68.02	0.382	61.49	0.308	51.62	63.68	0.400	54.58	0.421	48.30	57.54	0.459	60.56
UniRec-0.1B [37]	0.1B	58.91	0.422	51.31	67.60	0.526	52.42	0.501	48.37	59.04	0.578	34.44	0.658	30.97	38.16	0.685	48.59
OpenDoc-0.1B [38]	0.1B	60.28	0.411	53.09	68.86	0.519	52.46	0.501	48.41	59.04	0.577	44.27	0.547	38.46	49.06	0.603	52.00
General VLMs: Qwen3.5 [39]																	
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	69.12	0.233	65.26	65.40	0.366	68.34	0.244	63.91	65.53	0.376	62.70	0.287	60.70	56.12	0.399	66.72
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	76.14	0.226	67.96	83.03	0.375	76.34	0.220	<u>67.82</u>	<u>83.21</u>	0.366	<u>69.85</u>	0.281	62.19	<u>75.44</u>	0.401	74.11
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	68.40	0.232	64.94	63.45	0.374	68.04	0.245	64.78	63.86	0.379	60.59	0.310	59.68	53.07	0.419	65.68
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	72.07	0.227	66.36	72.51	0.362	70.73	0.236	64.61	71.17	0.367	65.92	<u>0.283</u>	61.23	64.82	<u>0.390</u>	69.57
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	73.87	0.254	67.60	79.39	0.388	73.34	0.260	67.00	79.01	0.396	65.45	0.332	60.91	68.59	0.437	70.89
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	73.45	0.276	69.96	78.02	0.410	72.53	0.281	68.88	76.78	0.412	63.47	0.380	61.27	67.17	0.477	69.82
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	66.24	0.348	62.84	70.70	0.473	65.22	0.350	58.30	72.36	0.477	55.92	0.440	50.99	60.79	0.521	62.46
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	60.77	0.376	54.39	65.54	0.500	59.28	0.386	54.22	62.22	0.510	47.93	0.498	44.60	48.98	0.557	55.99
General VLMs: Qwen3-VL [11]																	
Qwen3-VL-8B	8B	72.44	0.261	65.10	78.35	0.411	72.03	0.266	64.88	77.82	0.409	62.73	0.342	55.55	66.81	0.448	69.07
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	72.04	0.262	65.10	77.17	0.418	70.84	0.272	63.54	76.13	0.425	59.61	0.378	55.15	61.47	0.480	67.50
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	66.37	0.300	59.04	70.03	0.439	65.81	0.314	60.25	68.52	0.448	54.09	0.428	51.05	53.99	0.511	62.09
General VLMs: Other																	
Kimi K2.6 [40]	1T/32B	72.32	0.303	66.93	80.30	0.466	69.95	0.322	64.69	77.31	0.475	68.02	0.335	<u>62.44</u>	75.14	0.481	70.10
Step3-VL [41]	10B	53.65	0.496	53.41	57.16	0.509	52.74	0.516	53.62	56.15	0.529	45.06	0.579	45.42	47.66	0.573	50.48
MiniCPM-V-4.5 [42]	8B	51.81	0.439	45.97	53.36	0.481	49.38	0.461	42.79	51.50	0.489	37.59	0.583	32.01	39.06	0.552	46.26
Gemini-3.1-Pro [12]	—	70.04	0.306	65.63	75.08	0.409	69.28	0.322	65.81	74.24	0.417	71.98	0.300	68.62	77.26	0.386	70.43
Pipeline / Multi-stage																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
DotsMOCR	76.27	73.16 $\downarrow$ 3.11	61.73 $\downarrow$ 14.54														
MinerU2.5-Pro	75.87	71.77 $\downarrow$ 4.10	62.56 $\downarrow$ 13.31														
YouTu-Parsing	75.02	69.66 $\downarrow$ 5.36	60.29 $\downarrow$ 14.73														
MinerU2.5	74.90	68.92 $\downarrow$ 5.98	59.15 $\downarrow$ 15.75														
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	73.01	66.73 $\downarrow$ 6.29	60.50 $\downarrow$ 12.52														
GLM-OCR	68.65	63.06 $\downarrow$ 5.59	58.31 $\downarrow$ 10.34														
Shown Avg.	73.95	68.88 $\downarrow$ 5.07	60.42 $\downarrow$ 13.53														
End-to-End Specialists																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
FD-RL	78.38	76.33 $\downarrow$ 2.05	67.04 $\downarrow$ 11.34														
Logics-Parsing-v2	76.35	73.85 $\downarrow$ 2.50	67.64 $\downarrow$ 8.71														
OCRVerse	73.18	71.36 $\downarrow$ 1.82	63.66 $\downarrow$ 9.52														
FireRed-OCR	70.81	68.49 $\downarrow$ 2.32	57.42 $\downarrow$ 13.39														
dots.ocr	72.01	65.95 $\downarrow$ 6.06	55.68 $\downarrow$ 16.33														
olmOCR-2-7B	69.36	65.87 $\downarrow$ 3.49	56.10 $\downarrow$ 13.26														
Shown Avg.	73.35	70.31 $\downarrow$ 3.04	61.26 $\downarrow$ 12.09														
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	76.14	76.34 $\uparrow$ 0.20	69.85 $\uparrow$ 6.29														
Qwen3.5-9B	73.87	73.34 $\downarrow$ 0.53	65.45 $\downarrow$ 8.42														
Kimi K2.6	70.04	69.28 $\downarrow$ 0.76	71.98 $\uparrow$ 1.94														
Gemini-3.1-Pro	72.32	69.95 $\downarrow$ 2.37	68.02 $\downarrow$ 4.30														
Qwen3.5-4B	73.45	72.53 $\downarrow$ 0.92	63.47 $\downarrow$ 9.98														
Qwen3-VL-4B	72.04	70.84 $\downarrow$ 1.20	59.61 $\downarrow$ 12.43														
Shown Avg.	72.98	72.05 $\downarrow$ 0.93	66.40 $\downarrow$ 6.58														

(a) Per-metric headroom (12 models; FD-RL = E2E baseline)


Metric	Top12 mean	Spread	FD-RL	Best	Best model	Avg ₃ lift
Avg-Text ↑	72.07	12.00	76.50	77.97	DotsMOCR	+7.83
Avg-Table ↑	75.92	9.17	80.51	80.56	Qwen3.5-122B	+6.50
Avg-Formula ↑	62.81	10.67	64.73	66.70	Qwen3.5-4B	+11.76
Avg-ROE ↓	0.392	0.108	0.358	0.325	DotsMOCR	--
Avg ₃ ↑	70.27	8.54	73.92	74.11	Qwen3.5-122B	+26.08

(b) Architecture profiles (top-4 mean; wins = champions in c)

Arch.	Best model	Text ↑	Table ↑	Formula ↑	ROE ↓	Avg ₃ ↑ ±sd	Wins
Pipeline	DotsMOCR	73.42	74.42	59.47	0.372	69.1 ± 1.1	2/5
E2E	FD-RL	71.43	76.90	62.81	0.397	70.4 ± 3.2	1/5
VLM	Qwen3.5-122B	71.35	76.44	66.14	0.406	71.3 ± 1.7	2/5
VLM-Pipe	+3.7 pp	-2.07	+2.02	+6.67	+0.034	+2.21	--



(c) Per-model heatmap (border = champion)



(d) Qwen family scaling (11 models)

Figure 4: **Diagnostic 2×2 panel.** (a) Per-metric headroom: Top-12 mean/spread, FD-RL baseline, champion, and Avg₃ lift if each sub-metric reached 100. (b) Architecture profiles (top-4 mean) with within-group Avg₃ ± std and per-group column-champion count from (c). (c) Per-model heatmap of 12 representative models on 5 sub-metrics; black-bordered cells mark column champions. (d) Grouped bars of Avg-Text/Avg-Table/Avg-Formula across 11 Qwen models (dense, MoE, VL families); dashed line marks the Avg-Formula ceiling at ~67.

Avg-Formula is the largest single gap. We take FD-RL [30] (the 4B E2E specialist that tops Clean and ranks second on Avg₃ in Table 2) as the reference model. Its distance to a perfect 100 decomposes as 23.5% on Avg-Text, 19.5% on Avg-Table, and 35.3% on Avg-Formula (Figure 4a); Avg-Formula alone accounts for 45% of the missing points. The pattern holds field-wide: across all 40 evaluated models the best Avg-Text is 77.97 and the best Avg-Table is 80.56, yet no model exceeds 67 on the track-averaged Avg-Formula (individual clean-track FormulaCDM scores can reach ~70, but averaging across clean, digital, and real tracks caps every model below 67).

Takeaway 1. Closing the formula gap calls for LaTeX-/STEM-rich pretraining and dedicated formula tokenizers. FormulaCDM [23] also has known limits (zero credit for non-compiling LaTeX, positional rather than semantic matching), so render- or semantic-equivalence metrics are a useful complement.

No single architecture dominates all sub-metrics. At the architecture level (Figure 4b, top-4 mean), Pipeline leads on Avg-Text (73.42) and reading order (Avg-ROE 0.372), E2E leads on Avg-Table (76.90), and general VLMs lead on Avg-Formula (66.14) and Avg₃ (71.31). The VLM Avg₃ lead comes entirely from a +6.7% Avg-Formula edge over Pipeline, not any text or table advantage.

Takeaway 2. Architectures have complementary, not interchangeable, strengths: Pipelines can close most of their headroom by upgrading the formula module alone, while VLMs benefit most from stronger text and reading-order pretraining.

Models with similar Avg₃ can have different weak spots. The per-model heatmap (Figure 4c) shows that even models with similar Avg₃ have markedly different sub-metric profiles: its five column champions split 2/1/2 across the three groups, and Qwen3-VL-4B (67.50) and MinerU2.5 (67.66) sit within 0.2% on Avg₃ yet differ by 5% on Avg-Formula and nearly 4% on Avg-Text; FireRed-OCR (65.57) vs. HunyuanOCR (60.56) reverses the pattern (HunyuanOCR slightly better on text but ~8% behind on formula and table). Avg₃ alone obscures these trade-offs.




Figure 5: **Case study 1: academic (structured lab report)**. MinerU2.5-Pro output (Avg₃ 70.07) with three failure modes annotated (E1–E3: subscript/superscript recognition, sidebar note symbol, recognition failure).

Takeaway 3. For deployment, pick the model whose per-metric profile matches the workload’s dominant content type, not the highest Avg₃.

Within Qwen3.5, the three sub-metrics scale at different rates. The Qwen3.5 dense series shows three different trends with parameter count (Figure 4d): **Avg-Text** rises steadily (68.77 → 71.80 → 75.13 → 75.77 from 4B to 122B-A10B); **Avg-Table** is non-monotonic (73.99 → 75.66 → 69.50 → 80.56), with 27B trailing 9B by 6%; **Avg-Formula** stays roughly flat (66.70 → 65.17 → 64.07 → 66.00), with the 4B model the family maximum despite being 30× smaller than 122B-A10B. Panel (d) shows the same ~67 Avg-Formula ceiling across all three Qwen families.

Takeaway 4. For document parsing, scale is not the lever; data and training are. Avg-Formula stays flat across a 30× parameter span and three Qwen families, so closing remaining sub-metric gaps requires LaTeX-/STEM-rich pretraining, not larger backbones.

3.4 Case Study

The preceding sub-metric analysis reveals where models struggle in aggregate; we now zoom in on individual documents to show *how* those failures manifest in practice (Figures 5 and 6).

Case 1: academic (structured lab report). The reference page is a University of Michigan physics lab report on vibration measurement and damping ratio estimation, containing formula blocks (purple), sidebar annotation notes with arrows (green), and a multi-row data table (red). We feed this page to MinerU2.5-Pro (1.2B; Avg₃ 70.07), the highest-Avg₃ Pipeline specialist. Despite strong aggregate scores, three systematic failure modes emerge. **E1, subscript/superscript recognition error:** subscripts and superscripts are misrecognized—e.g., $\times$ is dropped, m^3 becomes m^3 , and natural frequency f_n is garbled into raw LaTeX tokens with exponent sign loss. **E2, sidebar note symbol error:** arrow symbols in the sidebar annotations are converted to plain text or incorrect text (e.g., “→good agreement with FE model” becomes “errors good agreement with FE model”), destroying the annotation semantics. **E3, recognition failure:** an entire document section (student information block) is silently dropped from the output, making the omission invisible without side-by-side comparison against the reference.

Case 2: business (product specification table). The reference is an IGBT module datasheet comprising a product header (manufacturer and model), a multi-section feature/parameter table grouped by category (Features, IGBT, Absolute Max, Diode), and technical symbols with engineering units. We test Logics-Parsing-v2 (Avg₃ 76.35), the second-ranked model on PureDocBench. Three




Figure 6: **Case study 2: business (product specification table).** Logics-Parsing-v2 output (Avg₃ 76.35) with three failure modes (E1–E3: header metadata omission, reading order error, technical symbol recognition error).

failure modes appear. **E1, header metadata omission:** the product header block—containing the power semiconductor brand and product model—is entirely absent from the reconstruction; downstream users would not know which component the datasheet describes. **E2, reading order error:** tables are preserved but placed in the wrong section order (e.g., Features and IGBT rows are mixed with AbsoluteMAX, and a footer WARNING is relocated into the main body), breaking the logical grouping that engineers rely on. **E3, technical symbol recognition error:** engineering symbols are silently mutated (e.g., $L_{\sigma} \leq 15 \text{ nH}$ rendered as $L_{\sigma} \leq 15 \text{ mH}$ —a $10^6 \times$ unit error that could cause specification misinterpretation in safety-critical applications).

Three observations emerge. First, failure modes are domain-specific: STEM pages concentrate on notation fidelity and formula formatting, while business pages concentrate on structural integrity and metadata completeness, reinforcing that model selection should be workload-driven. Second, several failures (Case 1 E2/E3, Case 2 E1) are *silent* under Avg₃ because the current sub-metrics do not penalize sidebar semantics or block-level completeness. Third, both cases involve Avg₃-leading models (MinerU2.5-Pro 4th, Logics-Parsing-v2 2nd), showing that leaderboard rank alone does not guarantee correct reproduction of complex documents. Appendix C presents two additional case studies (finance and certificate domains) that exhibit further failure patterns including annotation contamination, formula semantic loss, and seal recognition failure.

4 Conclusion, Limitations, and Future Work

Conclusion. PureDocBench constructs a source-rendered benchmark covering 10 domains, 66 subcategories, and 1:1:1 triple-track images. Evaluating 40 models reveals that document parsing is far from saturated (Avg₃ spread 44.6%, mean ~ 61); specialist parsers with $\leq 4\text{B}$ parameters match general VLMs on clean data yet lag in robustness; and ranking reversals between clean and degraded settings confirm that clean-only evaluation misleads real-world deployment decisions. The source-rendered design supports continuous regeneration and can be re-rolled on demand to reduce contamination risk as model release cycles shorten. All data, code, and model predictions are publicly available to support community reuse, reproducible evaluation, and future model development.

Limitations and Future Work. Three limitations point to concrete future directions. (i) The evaluation metrics inherited from OmniDocBench ignore typographic emphasis, block-level completeness, and layout fidelity; developing richer metrics that separate recognition noise, semantic omission, structural drift, and reading-order failure is a natural next step. (ii) Source-rendered generation cannot cover long-tail scenarios such as handwritten notes, historical scans, or heavily damaged physical documents; complementing PureDocBench with authentic-document benchmarks remains necessary for those modes, especially for deployment settings where physical acquisition artifacts dominate. (iii) The current benchmark is predominantly Chinese–English; extending the generation pipeline to additional languages, scripts, and underrepresented domains will further improve wider applicability.

References

- [1] Lei Cui, Yiheng Xu, Tengchao Lv, and Furu Wei. Document AI: Benchmarks, models and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.08609*, 2021.
- [2] Cheng Cui, Ting Sun, Suyin Liang, Tingquan Gao, Zelun Zhang, Jiaxuan Liu, Xueqing Wang, Changda Zhou, Hongen Liu, Manhui Lin, Yue Zhang, Yubo Zhang, Yi Liu, Dianhai Yu, and Yanjun Ma. PaddleOCR-VL-1.5: Towards a multi-task 0.9B VLM for robust in-the-wild document parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.21957*, 2026.
- [3] Shuaiqi Duan, Yadong Xue, Weihang Wang, Zhe Su, Huan Liu, Sheng Yang, Guobing Gan, Guo Wang, Zihan Wang, Shengdong Yan, et al. GLM-OCR technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.10910*, 2026.
- [4] Junbo Niu, Zheng Liu, Zhuangcheng Gu, Bin Wang, Linke Ouyang, Zhiyuan Zhao, Tao Chu, Tianyao He, Fan Wu, Qintong Zhang, et al. MinerU2.5: A decoupled vision-language model for efficient high-resolution document parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22186*, 2025.
- [5] Bin Wang, Tianyao He, Linke Ouyang, Fan Wu, Zhiyuan Zhao, Tao Chu, Yuan Qu, Zhenjiang Jin, Weijun Zeng, Ziyang Miao, et al. MinerU2.5-Pro: Pushing the limits of data-centric document parsing at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.04771*, 2026.
- [6] Hao Feng, Wei Shi, Ke Zhang, Xiang Fei, Lei Liao, Dingkan Yang, Yongkun Du, Xuecheng Wu, Jingqun Tang, Yang Liu, Hong Chen, and Can Huang. Dolphin-v2: Universal document parsing via scalable anchor prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.05384*, 2026.
- [7] Hao Wu, Haoran Lou, Xinyue Li, Zuodong Zhong, Zhaojun Sun, Phellon Chen, Xuanhe Zhou, Kai Zuo, Yibo Chen, Xu Tang, et al. FireRed-OCR technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.01840*, 2026.
- [8] Hunyuan Vision Team, Pengyuan Lyu, Xingyu Wan, Gengluo Li, Shangpin Peng, Weinong Wang, Liang Wu, Huawen Shen, Yu Zhou, Canhui Tang, Qi Yang, et al. HunyuanOCR technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.19575*, 2025.
- [9] Haoran Wei, Yaofeng Sun, and Yukun Li. DeepSeek-OCR: Contexts optical compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.18234*, 2025.
- [10] Haoran Wei, Yaofeng Sun, and Yukun Li. DeepSeek-OCR 2: Visual causal flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.20552*, 2026.
- [11] Shuai Bai, Yuxuan Cai, Ruizhe Chen, Keqin Chen, Xionghui Chen, Zesen Cheng, Lianghao Deng, Wei Ding, Chang Gao, Chunjiang Ge, et al. Qwen3-VL technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21631*, 2025.
- [12] Gemini Team. Gemini 3.1 Pro: A smarter model for your most complex tasks. <https://blog.google/innovation-and-ai/models-and-research/gemini-models/gemini-3-1-pro/>, February 2026. Google Blog post.
- [13] Linke Ouyang, Yuan Qu, Hongbin Zhou, Jiawei Zhu, Rui Zhang, Zhiyuan Zhao, Bin Wang, et al. OmniDocBench: Benchmarking diverse PDF document parsing with comprehensive annotations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2025.
- [14] Yongkun Du, Pinxuan Chen, Xuye Ying, and Zhineng Chen. DocPTBench: Benchmarking end-to-end photographed document parsing and translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.18434*, 2025.
- [15] Changda Zhou, Ziyue Gao, Xueqing Wang, Tingquan Gao, Cheng Cui, Jing Tang, and Yi Liu. Real5-OmniDocBench: A full-scale physical reconstruction benchmark for robust document parsing in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.04205*, 2026.
- [16] Zhang Li, Zhibo Lin, Qiang Liu, Ziyang Zhang, Shuo Zhang, Zidun Guo, Jiajun Song, Jiarui Zhang, Xiang Bai, and Yuliang Liu. MDPBench: A benchmark for multilingual document parsing in real-world scenarios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.28130*, 2026.

- [17] Ling Fu, Zhebin Kuang, Jiajun Song, Mingxin Huang, Biao Yang, Yuzhe Li, Linghao Zhu, Qidi Luo, Xinyu Wang, Hao Lu, Zhang Li, Guozhi Tang, Bin Shan, Chunhui Lin, Qi Li, et al. OCRBench v2: An improved benchmark for evaluating large multimodal models on visual text localization and reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.00321*, 2025.
- [18] Jake Poznanski, Luca Soldaini, and Kyle Lo. olmOCR 2: Unit test rewards for document OCR. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.19817*, 2025.
- [19] Mingxin Huang, Yongxin Shi, Dezhi Peng, Songxuan Lai, Zecheng Xie, and Lianwen Jin. OCR-Reasoning Benchmark: Unveiling the true capabilities of MLLMs in complex text-rich image reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.17163*, 2025.
- [20] Fortune Business Insights. Intelligent document processing market size, share & industry analysis. Technical Report FBI108590, Fortune Business Insights, 2026. Available at <https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/intelligent-document-processing-market-108590>. Accessed: 2026-05-07.
- [21] Grand View Research. Intelligent document processing market size report, 2030. Technical Report GVR-4-68040-023-3, Grand View Research, 2025. Available at <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/intelligent-document-processing-market-report>. Accessed: 2026-05-07.
- [22] Xin An, Jingyi Cai, Xiangyang Chen, Huayao Liu, Peiting Liu, Peng Wang, Bei Yang, Xiuwen Zhu, et al. Logics-parsing-omni technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.09677*, 2026.
- [23] Bin Wang, Fan Wu, Linke Ouyang, Zhuangcheng Gu, Rui Zhang, Renqiu Xia, Bo Zhang, and Conghui He. Image over text: Transforming formula recognition evaluation with character detection matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.03643*, 2024.
- [24] Xu Zhong, Elaheh ShafieiBavani, and Antonio Jimeno Yepes. Image-based table recognition: Data, model, and evaluation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020.
- [25] Handong Zheng, Yumeng Li, Kaile Zhang, Liang Xin, Guangwei Zhao, Hao Liu, Jiayu Chen, Jie Lou, Qi Fu, Rui Yang, et al. Multimodal OCR: Parse anything from documents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.13032*, 2026.
- [26] Zhang Li, Yuliang Liu, Qiang Liu, Zhiyin Ma, Ziyang Zhang, Shuo Zhang, Biao Yang, Zidun Guo, Jiarui Zhang, Xinyu Wang, and Xiang Bai. MonkeyOCR: Document parsing with a structure-recognition-relation triplet paradigm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05218*, 2025.
- [27] Kun Yin, Yunfei Wu, Bing Liu, Zhongpeng Cai, Xiaotian Li, Huang Chen, Xin Li, Haoyu Cao, Yinsong Liu, Deqiang Jiang, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, Qianyu Li, Antai Guo, Yanzhen Liao, Yanqiu Qu, Haodong Lin, Chengxu He, and Shuangyin Liu. Youtu-parsing: Perception, structuring and recognition via high-parallelism decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.20430*, 2026.
- [28] Yongkun Du, Zhineng Chen, and Yu-Gang Jiang. OpenOCR: An open-source toolkit for general-OCR research and applications. <https://github.com/Topdu/OpenOCR>, 2024.
- [29] Jake Poznanski, Aman Rangapur, Jon Borchardt, Jason Dunkelberger, Regan Huff, Daniel Lin, Christopher Wilhelm, Kyle Lo, and Luca Soldaini. olmOCR: Unlocking trillions of tokens in PDFs with vision language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18443*, 2025.
- [30] Yufeng Zhong, Lei Chen, Zhixiong Zeng, Xuanle Zhao, Deyang Jiang, Liming Zheng, Jing Huang, Haibo Qiu, Peng Shi, Siqi Yang, and Lin Ma. Reading or reasoning? format decoupled reinforcement learning for document OCR. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.08834*, 2026.
- [31] Logics-MLLM Team. Logics-Parsing-v2. <https://huggingface.co/Logics-MLLM/Logics-Parsing-v2>, 2026. Hugging Face model card; accessed 2026-05-07.
- [32] Yufeng Zhong, Lei Chen, Xuanle Zhao, Wenkang Han, Liming Zheng, Jing Huang, Deyang Jiang, Yilin Cao, Lin Ma, and Zhixiong Zeng. OCRVerse: Towards holistic OCR in end-to-end vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.21639*, 2026.

- [33] Daxiang Dong, Mingming Zheng, Dong Xu, Chunhua Luo, Bairong Zhuang, Yuxuan Li, Ruoyun He, Haoran Wang, Wenyu Zhang, Wenbo Wang, et al. Qianfan-OCR: A unified end-to-end model for document intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.13398*, 2026.
- [34] Souvik Mandal, Ashish Talewar, Siddhant Thakuria, Paras Ahuja, and Prathamesh Juvatkar. Nanonets-OCR2: A model for transforming documents into structured markdown with intelligent content recognition and semantic tagging. <https://huggingface.co/nanonets/Nanonets-OCR2-3B>, 2025. Hugging Face model card.
- [35] ChatDOC Team. OCRFlux-3B. <https://huggingface.co/ChatDOC/OCRFlux-3B>, 2025. Hugging Face model card.
- [36] Yumeng Li, Guang Yang, Hao Liu, Bowen Wang, and Colin Zhang. dots.ocr: Multilingual document layout parsing in a single vision-language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.02498*, 2025.
- [37] Yongkun Du, Zhineng Chen, Yazhen Xie, Weikang Bai, Hao Feng, Wei Shi, Yuchen Su, Can Huang, and Yu-Gang Jiang. UniRec-0.1B: Unified text and formula recognition with 0.1B parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.21095*, 2025.
- [38] Yongkun Du, Zhineng Chen, Yazhen Xie, Weikang Bai, Hao Feng, Wei Shi, Yuchen Su, Can Huang, and Yu-Gang Jiang. OpenDoc-0.1B: An ultra-lightweight document parsing system. <https://github.com/Topdu/OpenOCR/blob/main/docs/opendoc.md>, 2025.
- [39] Qwen Team. Qwen3.5: Towards native multimodal agents. <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen3.5>, February 2026. Model card citation; accessed 2026-05-07.
- [40] Kimi Team. Kimi K2.6. <https://platform.kimi.com/docs/guide/kimi-k2-6-quickstart>, 2026. Kimi API documentation.
- [41] Ailin Huang, Chengyuan Yao, Chunrui Han, Fanqi Wan, Hangyu Guo, Haoran Lv, Hongyu Zhou, Jia Wang, Jian Zhou, Jianjian Sun, et al. STEP3-VL-10B technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.09668*, 2026.
- [42] Tianyu Yu, Zefan Wang, Chongyi Wang, Fuwei Huang, Wenshuo Ma, Zihui He, Tianchi Cai, Weize Chen, Yuxiang Huang, Yuanqian Zhao, et al. MiniCPM-V 4.5: Cooking efficient MLLMs via architecture, data, and training recipe. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.18154*, 2025.

A OmniDocBench Annotation Audit

A.1 Motivation and Methodology

OmniDocBench [13] contains 27,376 annotated content blocks across 1,355 pages. Of these, 6,023 blocks fall under classes the OmniDocBench evaluator does not score (e.g., page header, page footer, page number, and other layout-only regions); the remaining **21,353 evaluator-scored blocks** form the audit-target population. Within the scored subset our audit confirmed 10,088 correct, 2,580 in error, and left 8,685 blocks in an automatically screened default-OK bucket (Figure 8a): these blocks matched both reference OCR witnesses after normalization and were not manually revised. The 2,580 confirmed errors translate to 2,676 block-level revision edits in the corrected GT (some blocks require multiple edits, e.g., several character substitutions in one cell), of which 2,632 affect official scores and concentrate on 431 affected pages (31.8% of all pages), as illustrated in Figure 7. To avoid single-model confirmation bias, we employed **dual-model cross-validation**: two independently trained systems (MinerU2.5-Pro [5] and PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 [2]) served as independent witnesses. All string comparisons were performed after OmniDocBench’s official normalization (Unicode NFKC, whitespace merging, case folding).

Figure 7 expands the audit into an evaluator-aware workflow. We first mirrored the official scoring semantics, retaining only categories that enter Text, Display Formula, Table, or Reading Order metrics; this yields 18,542 scorable text blocks, 1,050 isolated formulas, 512 tables, and 1,249 figure regions requiring special handling. We then cropped each block, ran the two OCR witnesses in parallel, and compared their outputs with the GT. Blocks where the GT agreed with both witnesses were treated as low-risk; model disagreement or joint disagreement with the GT triggered escalation. Escalated cases were inspected by humans against page evidence, with Claude Vision used as an assistant rather than a replacement for human judgment. A dedicated figure-recovery pass then restored hidden scorable content from figure regions by relabeling them into the correct evaluator bucket when appropriate. Finally, we produced a full audited GT, matched affected-page subsets for original and corrected annotations, and revision logs, then re-ran the unchanged official evaluator to isolate the effect of GT content alone.




Figure 7: Evaluator-aware audit pipeline applied to OmniDocBench v1.5. The workflow starts from the official scoring semantics, filters the 27,376 annotated blocks to 21,353 evaluator-scored audit targets, performs dual-OCR cross-checking with MinerU2.5-Pro and PaddleOCR-VL-1.5, escalates OCR/GT conflicts for human adjudication assisted by Claude Vision, recovers hidden scorable text from figure regions through relabeling, and emits the audited GT artifacts used for re-running the unchanged official evaluator. The 2,676 block-level revisions fix the 2,580 confirmed errors in Figure 8; 2,632 revisions affect official scores and are concentrated on the 431-page affected subset (31.8% of all pages).

(a) Audit disposition (27,376 blocks)			(b) Error taxonomy (2,580 confirmed errors)			
Disposition	Count	Frac.	Category	Subtype	Count	Frac.
Confirmed GT correct	10,088	36.85%	Content	Char. substitution	1,883	72.98%
Confirmed GT error	2,580	9.42%	Content	Complex difference	638	24.73%
Excluded (non-scored)	6,023	22.00%	Content	Extra / Trunc. / Format	11	0.43%
Unchecked (default OK)	8,685	31.72%	Category	Figure mislabel	48	1.86%
Total	27,376	100.00%	Total		2,580	100.00%

Figure 8: Audit summary. (a) Disposition of OmniDocBench’s 27,376 annotated blocks; the 9.42% confirmed-error rate is over all blocks and rises to 12.08% when restricted to the 21,353 scored blocks. (b) Taxonomy of the 2,580 confirmed errors: text-content errors dominate at $\sim 98\%$, with character substitution alone accounting for nearly three quarters.

A.2 Error Taxonomy

Character substitution (73.0%) dominates: visually or phonetically similar characters are swapped (e.g., “l”/“i”, “rn”/“m” in Latin; visually similar Chinese characters differing by a single stroke), strongly suggesting residual OCR noise from the original annotation pipeline. Complex differences (24.7%) involve structural deviations such as inconsistent formula formatting or different LaTeX representations. Category errors (1.8%) are text regions mislabeled as `figure`, making their content invisible to evaluation scripts. Text blocks account for 93.4% of all errors.

A.3 Representative Cases

Latin character substitution. GT records “*Submlsslon*” where the source PDF clearly shows “*Submission*”: the “l”/“i” pair was swapped, a classic OCR failure on serif fonts. Both audit models correctly transcribed “Submission”. **Chinese character substitution.** GT contains a meaningless two-character compound where the source reads a common word meaning “to promote”; the two characters differ by a single stroke. **Complex differences in tables.** GT records “−15.4%” as “−0.154”, penalizing models that faithfully reproduce the source percentage format.

A.4 Impact on Evaluation and Persistence Across Releases

We applied all corrections to produce a corrected version of the GT and re-evaluated four models. We also checked, against the latest publicly released OmniDocBench at the time of writing, whether our 2,580 confirmed errors had been fixed independently.

Despite the public release of an updated GT version, 98% of our confirmed errors remain unchanged, underscoring the need for systematic third-party auditing infrastructure beyond ad-hoc maintainer fixes.

The corrected annotations and complete audit logs (per-block decisions and model outputs) are released as supplementary material.

B Dataset-Level Comparison with OmniDocBench

This appendix profiles PureDocBench alongside OmniDocBench on dimensions that are schema-compatible across the two benchmarks: scale, taxonomy, image-level visual statistics, annotation/content complexity, and image-embedding diversity. We restrict the comparison to fields that exist in both releases or that have a faithful equivalent; metrics that depend on benchmark-specific schema (e.g., subcategory distribution, real-degraded variants) are reported one-sidedly with that limitation flagged. The two resources are *complementary*: OmniDocBench supplies authentic-document samples with rich per-page formula density, while PureDocBench supplies a balanced 10-domain, 66-subcategory taxonomy, larger and denser pages, a controlled degradation axis, and source-traceable annotations.

(a) Re-evaluation on corrected GT
($\Delta\%$ vs. original)

Model	TextEdit ↓			TableTEDS ↑			ROEdit ↓		
	orig.	corr.	$\Delta\%$	orig.	corr.	$\Delta\%$	orig.	corr.	$\Delta\%$
MinerU2.5-Pro	0.037	0.036	-4.0	0.908	0.911	+0.3	0.041	0.041	0.0
MinerU2.5	0.045	0.044	-2.3	0.841	0.843	+0.3	0.043	0.043	-0.5
FireRed-OCR	0.102	0.102	+0.3	0.774	0.776	+0.3	0.103	0.103	+0.2
Logics-Parsing-v2	0.042	0.041	-3.3	0.852	0.854	+0.2	0.044	0.044	+0.6

(b) Persistence in latest
OmniDocBench release

Error status	Count	Frac.
Unchanged	2,528	98.0%
Modified, still wrong	39	1.5%
Correctly fixed	13	0.5%
Total	2,580	100.0%

Figure 9: Re-evaluation impact and persistence of the audit. **(a)** Four models scored on the original OmniDocBench GT vs. our corrected GT; $\Delta\%$ reports relative change. Three of four models gain on TextEdit (-2.3% to -4.0%); all four show small TableTEDS improvements; reading-order metrics are essentially unchanged. **(b)** Status of our 2,580 confirmed errors in the latest publicly released OmniDocBench at the time of writing: 98% remain unchanged.

OmniDocBench vs PureDocBench

Reviewer evidence: scale, taxonomy, per-page complexity, visual distribution, degradation coverage




Figure 10: Reviewer-facing dashboard comparing OmniDocBench and PureDocBench. **B** lists per-page medians and ratios for text/content length, table density, and formula density; **A** shows per-domain page counts; **C** shows Cohen's d for visual statistics on the clean track (positive = PureDocBench higher); **D** plots PureDocBench clean→digital→real for entropy, brightness, whitespace, and sharpness. Formula density is reported as complementary evidence rather than as headline.

Scale and taxonomy. OmniDocBench provides 1,355 annotated pages spanning 9 top-level categories. PureDocBench provides 1,475 ground-truth pages organized into 10 top-level domains and 66 fine-grained subcategories, with each ground-truth page rendered in three versions (clean, digital, real) for 4,425 total images. The Shannon entropy of PureDocBench's subcategory distribution is 6.025

bits, against a uniform upper bound of 6.044 bits (99.7% of the maximum), so the 66 subcategories are very close to evenly populated. OmniDocBench does not expose a comparable subcategory field, so subcategory balance is reported one-sidedly.

Image-level visual profile. On the schema-compatible *clean* track, using the released image dimensions, PureDocBench pages are larger and denser than OmniDocBench’s: median image area is 16.06 MP vs 5.94 MP ($2.70\times$), median horizontal text bands per page is 51.6 vs 28.0, image entropy is 3.82 vs 3.23, and white-pixel ratio is 64.5% vs 72.6% (i.e., PureDocBench pages carry less whitespace). Appendix I additionally reports a normalized visual-statistics view used by its validity dashboard, where the corresponding area statistic is 12.32 MP vs 3.74 MP; the two views use different measurement pipelines and should not be read as the same field. PureDocBench additionally provides a real-degraded track that OmniDocBench structurally lacks: after physical print-and-recapture, brightness drops to 172.6, white-pixel ratio falls to 18.0%, entropy rises to 6.05, and sharpness drops to 1,634, supplying a controlled clean→digital→real axis (Figure 10D).

Annotation and content complexity. PureDocBench’s pages carry roughly $2\text{--}3\times$ more annotated content per page than OmniDocBench’s: median text characters 1,960 vs 896 ($2.19\times$), median total content characters 3,078 vs 1,151 ($2.67\times$), and P90 elements per page 129 vs 38 ($3.39\times$). The gap is most pronounced on tables: the table-page rate is 78.6% vs 25.9% ($3.04\times$), and on those pages PureDocBench carries 3.25 vs 1.46 tables ($2.23\times$), 24.87 vs 14.65 rows per table ($1.70\times$), and 130.63 vs 81.17 cells per table ($1.61\times$). For formulas the two benchmarks are deliberately *complementary*, not strictly comparable: page rates are nearly identical (15.1% vs 14.8%), but OmniDocBench packs more formulas onto its formula pages (6.74 vs 3.67 per page), reflecting its stronger STEM-paper bias. We do not interpret PureDocBench as stronger on the formula axis.

Image-embedding diversity. We embed all clean PureDocBench pages and all OmniDocBench pages with CLIP ViT-B/32 and project them to a joint 2D PCA space (Figure 11). PureDocBench’s convex-hull area in joint PCA-2D is 0.431 vs OmniDocBench’s 0.390 ($1.10\times$). Mutual coverage at cosine distance ≤ 0.30 is 98.4% for PureDocBench→OmniDocBench (nearly every PureDocBench page has a near-neighbor in OmniDocBench) but only 87.4% for OmniDocBench→PureDocBench (over 10% of OmniDocBench pages lie in regions PureDocBench does not currently cover, e.g., handwritten notes, scanned newspapers). Mean pairwise cosine distance, however, is higher on OmniDocBench (0.403 vs 0.287), as is mean nearest-neighbor distance (0.111 vs 0.094): individual OmniDocBench pages are visually more disparate from each other, while PureDocBench achieves a wider *envelope* through balanced taxonomic sampling rather than through sparse outliers. The two pictures are consistent: PureDocBench extends the joint footprint, and OmniDocBench retains some unique authentic-document modes that PureDocBench does not yet replicate.

Takeaway. PureDocBench and OmniDocBench occupy overlapping but non-coincident regions of the document space. OmniDocBench remains the canonical source of authentic-document samples with rich STEM-style formula density; PureDocBench contributes a balanced, finer-grained taxonomy, denser pages, a controlled degradation axis, and source-traceable annotations. We recommend reporting on both for comprehensive document-parsing evaluation rather than treating PureDocBench as a replacement.

C Additional Case Studies

This appendix extends the two main-body case studies (§3.4) with two additional failure analyses covering different domains, models, and error patterns.

Case 3: finance (actuarial valuation report). The reference page is an actuarial valuation report containing handwritten reviewer annotations (red “Check” marks, margin notes), structured section headings, and actuarial formulas with mathematical qualifiers. We test DotsMOCR (3B; Avg₃ 70.39), the highest-ranked Pipeline specialist on Clean. Three failure modes emerge (Figure 12). **E1, annotation contamination error:** handwritten reviewer notes (e.g., “Check”, underlines) are incorrectly inserted into the main body text, mixing editorial markup with document content. **E2, main text omission:** important body text sections and their associated headings are silently omitted from the reconstructed output. **E3, formula semantic error:** key mathematical qualifiers are lost or

CLIP ViT-B/32 image embeddings, joint PCA-2D
 Filled regions = convex hulls; X marks each dataset's centroid in joint PCA-2D space




Figure 11: **CLIP ViT-B/32 embedding comparison.** All OmniDocBench pages ($n=1,355$) and all PureDocBench clean pages ($n=1,475$), projected to a joint 2D PCA space. Dashed polygons show the convex hull per dataset; PureDocBench’s hull area is $1.10\times$ OmniDocBench’s. Reciprocal coverage at cosine distance ≤ 0.30 is 98.4% (PureDocBench→OmniDocBench) vs 87.4% (OmniDocBench→PureDocBench).




Figure 12: **Case study 3: finance (actuarial valuation report).** DotsMOCR output with three failure modes (E1–E3: annotation contamination, main text omission, formula semantic error).

flattened—e.g., the actuarial notation ${}_t\hat{V}(\bar{A}_x)$ is reduced to $\hat{V}(Ax)$, dropping the subscript t and the bar over A , which changes the formula’s semantic meaning.

Case 4: certificate (Chinese product quality certificate). The reference is a Chinese product quality inspection certificate containing structured form tables, a product specification area, and a red official seal at the bottom. We test PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 (0.9B; Avg₃ 66.75), the Pipeline specialist with strong Chinese document support. Three failure modes appear (Figure 13). **E1, table structure error:** the form table layout is incorrectly reconstructed, with cell boundaries misaligned and merged cells split or misassigned. **E2, character-level error:** individual characters are misrecognized in domain-specific model numbers—e.g., “TMC6-600M” becomes “THE 600M” and “IP55-IC41” becomes “IP65-IC41”, corrupting critical product identifiers. **E3, recognition failure:** the official




Figure 13: **Case study 4: certificate (Chinese product quality certificate).** PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 output with three failure modes (E1–E3: table structure error, character-level error, recognition failure).

seal area at the bottom of the certificate is entirely missing from the output, discarding authentication information that is essential for document validity.

D Degradation Parameter Details

Released degradation tracks. The released dataset keeps the three image tracks as parallel directory trees: clean pages under `images/`, digital degradation under `degraded_v2_merged/`, and physical recapture under `real_degraded/`. All three tracks are GT-preserving: the file identity is mapped back to the same clean-page annotation, so differences in score isolate image-condition robustness rather than content changes. The digital generation manifest records `source=images`, `output=degraded_v2`, `severity=moderate`, `severity_val=0.6`, and zero generation failures. The ten digital scene families are first materialised separately under `degraded_v2/<scene>/` with a per-image JSON parameter log under `degraded_v2/params/<scene>/`; the evaluation track `degraded_v2_merged/` then selects exactly one scene version per clean page and records the provenance in `degraded_v2_merged/scene_mapping.json`. This mapping is intentionally explicit: each evaluated digital image can be traced to its source clean page, scene name, generated PNG, and parameter JSON.

Digital scenes and operations. The digital track covers ten GT-preserving scene profiles spanning archival aging, bound-book scans, multi-generation copy chains, fax/thermal pages, low-quality printing, ink bleed, heavy compression, uneven lighting, geometric distortion, and noise–blur mixtures. These correspond to the release scene identifiers `aged_archive`, `book_binding`, `multi_gen_copy`, `fax_thermal`, `low_quality_print`, `ink_bleed`, `heavy_compression`, `uneven_lighting`, `geometric_distort`, and `noise_blur_combo`. Each scene composes low-level OpenCV / NumPy operations such as paper grain, yellowing, foxing spots, faded ink, page curl, binding shadow, bleed-through, photocopier contrast, dirty-drum streaks, thermal/fax binarization, printer banding, ink dilation, JPEG compression, down-up sampling, lighting gradients, vignetting, perspective warp, lens distortion, rotation, Gaussian noise, motion blur, and warm/cool color shift. To avoid confounding content with image quality, no operation changes the underlying HTML source or GT ordering. The scene release is balanced by construction: round-robin assignment yields 147–148 pages per digital scene in the released `degraded_v2` tree, and the merged track stores the selected scene for every clean page.

Physical recapture and ablations. The real-degraded track is built from physical or screen-mediated recaptures of the rendered pages rather than synthetic filters. Filenames encode the acquisition condition after the `__real_` marker, e.g. `phone/screen/screenshot` source, paper state such as `flat`, `creased`, `bent`, `cover`, or `photocopy`, lighting such as `normal`, `low-light`, `flash`, `shadow`, `outdoor`, or `screen`, and view geometry such as `top-down`, `oblique`, `handheld`, or `screenshot`. The mapping files in the real-degraded evaluation workspace map each recaptured file back to the original clean relative path, again allowing the same GT to score all tracks. In addition to the released digital and real tracks, we keep an ablation generator that decomposes the degradation process into **15 fundamental**

operations over a four-stage causal pipeline (*Print* $\rightarrow$ *Paper* $\rightarrow$ *Capture* $\rightarrow$ *Digital*). Figure 14 lists these operations and their concrete parameter values at $s = 0.7$ (single-factor ablation) and $s = 1.0$ (peak stress). Figure 15 summarizes the higher-level capture scenarios and their dominant operation weights; these figures document the controllable design space used for sensitivity analysis, while `degraded_v2_merged/` is the canonical digital track used in the main benchmark.

E Model Inference Configurations

This appendix documents the inference framework, runtime parameters, and model-specific patches used to produce the predictions scored in Table 2. The released inference toolkit keeps one standalone runner per model under `tools/model_infer/`; optional free-form prompts under `prompts/`; per-model YAML manifests under `configs/models/`; frozen environment records under `repro/envs/`; and stdout/stderr logs under `logs/`. The YAML manifest records the Python executable, `LD_LIBRARY_PATH`, model-weight path, backend, decoding parameters, and post-processing notes. Full predictions are stored separately for the clean, digital, and real tracks under `predictions/`, `predictions_degraded/`, and `predictions_real_degraded/`. Each runner accepts the same interface, with a dataset directory and prediction root, recursively scans image files, and writes one Markdown file per input image stem.

Input normalization and decoding policy. All local inference jobs were run on a 4 $\times$ NVIDIA A100-80GB server. Before inference, pages are copied to a flat input workspace and resized with aspect ratio preserved so the long side is at most about 1024 pixels; the preparation metadata for the clean full run records all 1,475 images written to `images_max1024/`. The same resizing policy is used for the digital and real tracks to avoid model-specific failures on ultra-high-resolution screenshots while keeping the evaluated content identical. We use deterministic decoding throughout: one sample per image, `temperature=0`, and each model’s official chat template or SDK endpoint. Output normalization is deliberately minimal: wrappers strip Markdown fences, obvious end-of-text tokens, and model-specific structural sentinels when those are introduced by the official decoder, but do not repair missing content or inject GT-derived structure.

Backend taxonomy. Models are dispatched through the backend supported by their official release rather than through a single reimplementation. Most promptable VLM/OCR models use vLLM chat/generate runners in the `glmocr_vllm_nightly` or `deepseekocr2_vllm_nightly` environments (`bfloat16`, `trust_remote_code=true`, one image per prompt, greedy decoding). Models whose official route exposes custom transformers methods or incompatibilities with vLLM use HuggingFace runners; DeepSeek-OCR-2 is pinned to its official-compatible transformers 4.46.3 environment and is executed through multi-shard `-shard/-num-shards` jobs. PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 uses the Paddle doc_parser SDK. GLM-OCR runs a two-process pipeline: a layout/parser process crops regions and a separately served GLM-OCR VLM instance reads the crops. API-only systems are called through their vendor endpoints with the same deterministic setting. These choices mirror official inference paths and are captured in the per-model YAML manifests.

Model-specific execution paths. For standard vLLM models, the default configuration uses `max_tokens=8192`, single-image prompts, and a GPU-memory budget near 0.92 unless Table 3 lists an exception. MinerU2.5 / MinerU2.5-Pro use the official two-step `MinerUClient` flow: first decode layout tokens, then decode content for each region, finally serializing the blocks as reading-order Markdown. DotsMOCR, Dolphin-v2, Logics-Parsing-v2, OCRFlux-3B, OCRVerse, FireRed-OCR, FD-RL, Nanonets-OCR2, olmOCR, HunyuanOCR, Step3-VL, MiniCPM-V, Qwen-family checkpoints, Gemini, Kimi, and Qianfan consume the page image and a short extraction instruction and emit a full-page Markdown-like prediction. Some official runners require small, documented patches for stable reproduction: e.g. lowering GPU-memory utilization for models that OOM at the default budget, disabling reasoning/thinking mode for Step3-VL and MiniCPM-V, placing Step3 weights on local shared memory to avoid mount corruption, and filling only failed empty outputs from model-side fallback JSON when a pipeline backend produced an empty Markdown file. No patch uses GT text.

Per-model deviations from the vLLM default. Table 3 lists models that deviate from the default vLLM configuration in one or more parameters. Cells left blank match the default; “GMU” is GPU memory utilization, “mm_len” is multimodal context length.

15 fundamental degradation operations across 4 sequential pipeline stages

Operation	Mechanism	Default ($s = 0.7$)	Peak ($s = 1.0$)
Stage 1: Print Simulation			
ink_bleed	Dilate ink mask, blend toward dark gray	$k = 2$ px, blend up to 42%	$k = 3$ px, blend up to 60%
toner_variation	Low-frequency Gaussian density modulation	ink $\times (1 \pm 0.19)$	ink $\times (1 \pm 0.24)$
Stage 2: Paper Condition			
paper_aging	Warm yellow tint blended over the page	$\alpha = 0.24$	$\alpha = 0.30$
stains	Soft Gaussian-blurred ellipse stains	4 stains, α up to 0.27	6 stains, α up to 0.36
wrinkles	Faint blurred line shading	4 lines, amp ± 18	6 lines, amp ± 23
fold_lines	Strong folds with local shading dip	2 folds, dip 31	2 folds, dip 40
Stage 3: Capture Simulation			
skew	Affine rotation around the page center	± 3.1 deg	± 4.0 deg
perspective	Random 4-corner projective warp	shift up to 3.1% of $\min(h,w)$	shift up to 4.0% of $\min(h,w)$
uneven_lighting	Linear lighting gradient across page	$\pm 24\%$ (clipped to $[.70, 1.30]$)	$\pm 35\%$ (clipped to $[.70, 1.30]$)
defocus_blur	Gaussian blur (k odd, $k \leq 15$)	$k = 7$ px	$k = 11$ px
motion_blur	Directional 1D averaging kernel	$k = 4$ px	$k = 7$ px
Stage 4: Digitization Artifacts			
resolution_loss	Down-then-upsample (effective DPI loss)	scale = 0.72x	scale = 0.60x
jpeg_compression	JPEG encode-decode round trip	quality = 42	quality = 30 (floor 15)
sensor_noise	Per-pixel Gaussian noise on RGB	$\sigma = 14$	$\sigma = 20$
color_shift	Random warm/cool channel bias	R / B $\pm 7\%$ / $\pm 5\%$	R / B $\pm 10\%$ / $\pm 8\%$

Figure 14: **The 15 fundamental degradation operations** across the 4-stage pipeline, each with its mechanism, default value at $s = 0.7$ (single-op ablation strength), and peak value at $s = 1.0$ (hard track). Operations within a stage compose in a fixed canonical order; stage colors are reused as family stripes in Figure 15.

10 capture scenarios (operations are mixed with per-scene weights)

Scenario	Description	Strength	Top-3 operations (weight in mixture)
Scanner-based (3)			
flatbed_scan	Clean flatbed scan	0.22 - 0.56	scanner_banding(.28), uneven_lighting(.18) resolution_loss(.18)
archival_scan	Aged / yellowed scan	0.30 - 0.74	paper_aging(.55), bleed_through(.40) stains(.36)
bound_manual_scan	Book scan, gutter shadow	0.28 - 0.76	binding_shadow(.58), bleed_through(.26) border_crop(.22)
Photocopy chain (2)			
office_copy_scan	Print-copy-scan chain	0.30 - 0.78	resolution_loss(.48), photocopy_mottle(.42) sharpen_halo(.42)
harsh_photocopy	Multi-gen copy / fax wear	0.34 - 0.84	photocopy_mottle(.58), resolution_loss(.34) toner_variation(.28)
Phone-camera capture (5)			
mobile_capture	Handheld phone capture	0.34 - 0.84	perspective(.46), shadow_glare(.42) page_warp(.34)
glossy_phone_capture	Glossy glare / color cast	0.32 - 0.82	shadow_glare(.62), color_shift(.34) perspective(.34)
low_light_phone	Low light, blur, noise	0.44 - 1.00	sensor_noise(.58), shadow_glare(.54) defocus_blur(.42)
folded_receipt_capture	Wrinkled / folded receipt	0.34 - 0.90	fold_lines(.58), page_warp(.46) wrinkles(.42)
thermal_receipt_capture	Faded thermal receipt	0.30 - 0.88	thermal_fade(.62), fold_lines(.26) perspective(.20)

Figure 15: **The 10 capture-context scenarios** with overall strength range and top-3 contributing operations; per-scene weights are the mixing coefficients before the global strength is sampled. Family stripes match the stage colors of the operations in Figure 14.

Table 3: **Inference configurations** that differ from the default vLLM-chat setup. The default is single-image greedy decoding with `temperature=0`, `max_tokens=8192`, and GPU memory utilization near 0.92.

Deviation class	Models	Backend / setting	Reproducibility note
R1. Memory budget	DotsMOCR; dots.ocr; olmOCR-2-7B; olmOCR-7B-0825	vLLM chat; GPU lowered from 0.92 to 0.85	Prevents run instability on long or dense pages without changing the prompt, model weights, or decoding rule.
R2. Staged decoding	MinerU2.5; MinerU2.5-Pro	Official two-stage <code>MinerUClient</code> ; <code>mm_len</code> 16,384 / 8,192	The released runner first decodes layout tokens and then decodes each region’s content; the Pro variant keeps the official 8,192 position cap.
R3. Cascade / SDK	GLM-OCR; PaddleOCR-VL-1.5; OpenOCR; YouTu-Parsing	Model-specific SDK or cascade: PP-DocLayoutV3 crops → GLM-OCR VLM; Paddle <code>doc_parser</code> ; OpenOCR <code>detect-recognize</code> ; HF custom processor	Used when the official model release does not expose a plain vLLM chat path or when the shipped parser is a multi-module pipeline.
R4. HF shard runners	DeepSeek-OCR; DeepSeek-OCR-2	Official HF <code>.infer</code> doc mode; 24 shards; <code>base=1024</code> ; image size 640 / 768; crop enabled	DeepSeek-OCR-2 is pinned to <code>transformers 4.46.3</code> ; newer versions change the <code>LlamaAttention</code> signature used by the release code.
R5. Reasoning toggles	MiniCPM-V-4.5; Step3-VL-10B	vLLM <code>generate/chat</code> ; <code>enable_thinking=False</code> ; GPU 0.88 / 0.90; <code>max_seqs 2 / 32</code>	Disables default chain-of-thought style decoding so outputs remain comparable full-page transcriptions. Step3 weights are served from local shared memory for stable reads.
R6. Vendor APIs	Gemini-3.1-Pro; Kimi K2.6	Official REST endpoints; <code>temperature=0</code> where supported. Kimi K2.6 uses a vendor-fixed temperature (the API rejects user-specified values); <code>thinking</code> is disabled to obtain direct transcription output.	Closed-weight systems are evaluated through their public API route using the same page image and extraction instruction as local promptable models.

Per-model prompts. Table 4 lists the verbatim user prompt sent to each model alongside the page image. Each row is one distinct prompt: the bold tag is our short label, the indented monospace block is the verbatim prompt text (or its model-card description), and the small italic line lists every evaluated model that uses that prompt. Pipeline backends invoke a structured SDK and take no free-text user prompt.

Table 4: **Prompt families** used for promptable models. The exact prompt files are released under prompts/; pipeline systems use structured SDK calls and therefore have no free-text user prompt.

Family	Instruction sent with image	Model coverage
Default	<i>“Transcribe the visible text in markdown reading order.”</i>	FD-RL; FireRed-OCR; DotsMOCR
Default+	<i>“Extract the main content from the document in the image, keeping the original structure. Convert all formulas to LaTeX and all tables to HTML.”</i>	OCRVerse; dots.ocr; OCRFlux-3B; Step3-VL; MiniCPM-V-4.5; Qianfan-OCR; Qwen, Kimi, Gemini families
Dolphin	<i>“Extract the main content from the document image, preserving reading order and structure. Use Markdown. Convert formulas to LaTeX and tables to HTML.”</i>	Dolphin-v2
MinerU	<i>“Extract the document content and preserve structure. Return markdown-compatible text blocks in reading order.”</i>	MinerU2.5; MinerU2.5-Pro, via official two-pass MinerUClient
olmOCR	<i>“Attached is one page of a document that you must process. Just return the plain text representation of this document as if you were reading it naturally. Convert equations to LaTeX and tables to HTML... Return your output as markdown, with front matter for primary_language, rotation, table, and diagram flags.”</i>	olmOCR-2-7B; olmOCR-7B
Nanonets	<i>“Extract the text from the above document... Return tables in HTML, equations in LaTeX. Wrap watermarks in <watermark> and page numbers in <page_number>.”</i>	Nanonets-OCR2
DeepSeek	<code><image>< grounding >Convert the document to markdown.</code>	DeepSeek-OCR; DeepSeek-OCR-2
Mode tag	QwenVL HTML	Logics-Parsing-v2
No prompt	<i>Structured SDK or model-card processor consumes the page image directly.</i>	PaddleOCR-VL-1.5; GLM-OCR; OpenOCR / UniRec-0.1B; YouTu-Parsing

A 50-page sanity-check rerun confirmed that swapping the **Default** and **Default+** variants on the same model changes Avg₃ by less than 0.1% on every model we tested, so the small wording differences across the cluster are not a confound for the reported numbers.

Reproducibility note. Two model weight loads required /dev/shm placement (Step3-VL-10B, MiniCPM-V-4.5) because the production cfs-fuse mount silently corrupted large safetensors shards on read; this is a deployment-environment quirk and does not affect evaluation results. The DeepSeek-OCR-2 transformers version is hard-pinned to 4.46.3 because 4.49+ changes the LlamaAttention forward signature and breaks the released model code. Both repro/envs/ freeze files capture these constraints.

F Cost-Effectiveness and Throughput Analysis

A leaderboard score is not, by itself, a deployment decision. In production document parsing, a model is attractive only if it combines high reconstruction quality with affordable serving: small or sparse active parameters, stable official tooling, good page throughput, and limited prompt/decoding overhead. We therefore read Table 2 through four practical proxies: Avg₃ quality, degradation drop from Clean to Real, active parameter scale, and observed throughput whenever the runner produced comparable A100 logs. We do not convert these into dollar prices, because closed API pricing, batching policy, and queue latency are not controlled by the benchmark; instead, the goal is to identify Pareto-useful systems.

Paddle sits on the practical frontier. PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 is not the raw-score champion, but it is one of the clearest deployment sweet spots in the benchmark. At only 0.9B parameters, it reaches 66.75 Avg₃, essentially matching the much larger Qwen3.5-397B-A17B (66.72), exceeding GLM-OCR (63.34), FireRed-OCR (65.57), dots.ocr (64.55), and most 3–7B end-to-end OCR specialists. Its table reconstruction is especially competitive: TableTEDS reaches 82.12 / 76.07 / 67.33 on Clean / Digital / Real, which is one reason it stays useful on business, publishing, academic, and technical documents even when its formula score is not the best. More importantly, the Paddle stack is prompt-free or near prompt-free, SDK-driven, and measured in our A100 logs at roughly 15–25 pages/min depending on the input-resolution setting, compared with the common 3–4 pages/min band for many vLLM-based document VLMs. This makes Paddle a strong default candidate when

the goal is not to win a single leaderboard cell, but to parse many pages reliably under a fixed GPU budget.

Table 5: Representative quality-throughput trade-offs. Throughput is reported only as a coarse A100 log range because different backends use different batching, preprocessing, and SDK paths. “Score throughput” multiplies Avg₃ by pages/min and should be read as a rough deployment proxy, not a new benchmark metric.

Model	Params	Avg ₃	Observed speed	Score throughput	Deployment reading
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	66.75	15–25 img/min	10.0–16.7	Best speed-quality balance among high-scoring local systems; strong table parser; mature Paddle SDK path.
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	70.07	3–4 img/min	2.1–2.8	Higher raw score and strong tables, but two-stage decoding is slower and operationally heavier.
MinerU2.5	1.2B	67.66	3–4 img/min	2.0–2.7	Similar parameter scale to Paddle, but lower throughput in our logs.
FD-RL	4B	73.92	~3 img/min	~2.2	Local raw-score leader, but uses a larger VLM-style decoder and has lower throughput per GPU.
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	72.61	vLLM tier	–	Strong robust accuracy; cost is closer to 4B E2E serving than to lightweight pipeline serving.
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B / 10B	74.11	API / MoE	–	Best Avg ₃ , but serving cost and availability depend on a much larger general VLM stack.
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	70.89	API / VLM tier	–	Strong smaller general VLM; still about 10× Paddle’s active parameter scale.
Gemini-3.1-Pro	–	70.43	vendor API	–	Excellent Real-track robustness, but cost and reproducibility are controlled by an external API.
GLM-OCR	0.9B	63.34	cascade / service	–	Small and competitive, yet the layout-plus-service pipeline has more moving parts than Paddle’s parser route.
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	49.51	fast crop runner	–	Can be fast in the official crop path, but full-benchmark quality is not on the same Pareto frontier.

Per-model cost-effectiveness reading. Table 6 gives a compact per-model interpretation of the same trade-off. The “cost proxy” column uses the most reproducible information available for each system: active parameters for open or MoE models, backend class for API systems, and runner type for pipeline/cascade systems. It should not be read as a strict dollar estimate. The main pattern is stable: high-quality specialists below 4B remain highly competitive, and Paddle is the most attractive model when throughput is part of the objective.

Table 6: **Per-model cost-effectiveness interpretation.** Avg₃ is copied from Table 2. Cost proxy combines parameter scale and serving path; throughput is listed only when we have comparable local logs or a clear backend class.

Model	Family	Params	Avg ₃	Cost proxy	Efficiency reading
DotsMOCR	Pipeline	3B	70.39	vLLM specialist	Strong quality, but Paddle offers similar practical utility with smaller scale and higher measured throughput.
Dolphin-v2	Pipeline	3B	57.02	vLLM specialist	Useful baseline, but not a deployment frontier point on this benchmark.
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	Pipeline	3B	55.37	recognition-heavy	Moderate quality; cost-effectiveness is limited by both score and parser completeness.
YouTu-Parsing	Pipeline	2B	68.32	official parser	Good specialist baseline; less transparent throughput record than Paddle in our logs.
MinerU2.5-Pro	Pipeline	1.2B	70.07	two-stage SDK	High-score compact specialist; attractive when quality matters more than throughput.
MinerU2.5	Pipeline	1.2B	67.66	two-stage SDK	Good compact specialist, but slower than Paddle under comparable A100 runs.
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	Pipeline	1.2B	53.54	recognition-heavy	Small but below the quality band needed for broad deployment.
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	Pipeline	0.9B	66.75	15–25 img/min	Best high-throughput local option; especially compelling for table-heavy bulk parsing.
GLM-OCR	Pipeline	0.9B	63.34	cascade service	Small and useful, but requires a layout-service cascade and scores lower than Paddle.

Model	Family	Params	Avg ₃	Cost proxy	Efficiency reading
OpenOCR	Pipeline	0.1B	29.49	tiny detector-recognizer	Very cheap, but quality is far below the end-to-end parsing frontier.
olmOCR-2-7B	E2E	7B	63.78	7B VLM	Solid but not parameter-efficient relative to 0.9–1.2B specialists.
olmOCR-7B	E2E	7B	55.90	7B VLM	Higher serving cost without matching the stronger specialist scores.
FD-RL	E2E	4B	73.92	~3 img/min	Best local raw score; strong choice when accuracy outweighs throughput.
Logics-Parsing-v2	E2E	4B	72.61	4B VLM	Excellent quality/robustness, but heavier than Paddle for high-volume serving.
OCRVerse	E2E	4B	69.40	4B VLM	Good balanced E2E system; cost sits above compact pipeline specialists.
Qianfan-OCR	E2E	4B	51.04	4B VLM	Does not justify its serving cost on this benchmark.
Nanonets-OCR2	E2E	3B	58.36	3B VLM	Useful mid-tier parser, but not on the efficiency frontier.
DeepSeek-OCR-2	E2E	3B	49.51	fast crop runner	Fast official path, but quality limits deployment value here.
OCRFlux-3B	E2E	3B	42.06	3B VLM	Low score despite moderate serving cost.
DeepSeek-OCR	E2E	3B	46.98	3B VLM	Older variant; lower score than the current compact frontier.
dots.ocr	E2E	2.9B	64.55	3B VLM	Competitive, but Paddle is faster and slightly stronger overall.
FireRed-OCR	E2E	2B	65.57	~3 img/min	Good 2B specialist; Paddle has higher throughput and similar score.
HunYuanOCR	E2E	1B	60.56	1B VLM	Small and usable, but quality trails Paddle/GLM.
UniRec-0.1B	E2E	0.1B	48.59	tiny recognizer	Attractive footprint, but not enough structural fidelity.
OpenDoc-0.1B	E2E	0.1B	52.00	tiny recognizer	Better than OpenOCR but still below deployment-grade quality for complex pages.
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	VLM	397B / 17B	66.72	large MoE API	Similar Avg ₃ to Paddle at much larger active scale.
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	VLM	122B / 10B	74.11	large MoE API	Best score; premium option when API cost and latency are acceptable.
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	VLM	35B / 3B	65.68	MoE API	Good active-parameter efficiency, but no clear advantage over Paddle in score or serving simplicity.
Qwen3.5-27B	VLM	27B	69.57	large VLM	Strong quality, but much larger than specialist alternatives.
Qwen3.5-9B	VLM	9B	70.89	mid-size VLM	Strong general-purpose trade-off, still far heavier than Paddle.
Qwen3.5-4B	VLM	4B	69.82	4B VLM	Efficient among general VLMs; specialist pipelines remain competitive.
Qwen3.5-2B	VLM	2B	62.46	2B VLM	Reasonable small VLM baseline, but not better than Paddle/GLM.
Qwen3.5-0.8B	VLM	0.8B	55.99	0.8B VLM	Similar scale to Paddle but much lower parsing quality.
Qwen3-VL-8B	VLM	8B	69.07	8B VLM	Good general VLM; heavier than compact document specialists.
Qwen3-VL-4B	VLM	4B	67.50	4B VLM	Close to Paddle in score, but without Paddle’s parser-specific throughput advantage.
Qwen3-VL-2B	VLM	2B	62.09	2B VLM	Useful but below the specialist frontier.
Kimi K2.6	VLM	1T / 32B	70.10	vendor API	Robust and strong, but cost and reproducibility are externally controlled.
Step3-VL	VLM	10B	50.48	10B VLM	Too low for its scale on document parsing.
MiniCPM-V-4.5	VLM	8B	46.26	8B VLM	Compact for a general VLM, but not cost-effective on this benchmark.
Gemini-3.1-Pro	VLM	–	70.43	vendor API	Very strong Real-track robustness, but serving economics are opaque.

Takeaway. If the objective is *maximum score*, FD-RL, Logics-Parsing-v2, and Qwen3.5-122B-A10B are natural choices. If the objective is *large-volume parsing under a fixed GPU budget*, PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 is the more practical headline: it delivers a competitive 66.75 Avg₃, strong table reconstruction, small active scale, deterministic SDK-style execution, and the highest observed local page throughput among the high-scoring systems we logged. This is precisely the kind of trade-off that a score-only leaderboard would understate.

G Full Per-Category Results

PureDocBench pages are organized into ten top-level domains: *academic*, *education*, *legal_gov*, *business*, *finance*, *medical*, *publishing*, *technical*, *logistics*, and *certificate*, with 180/138/151/160/212/200/100/110/120/104 pages respectively (sum: 1,475). For each (model, category, track) triple we recompute Overall as $((1 - \text{TextEdit}) \times 100 + \text{FormulaCDM} + \text{TableTEDS})/3$ on the subset of samples in that category, and treat the entry as defined only when all three components exist (i.e. the category contains at least one text page, one formula sample, and one table sample). Per-category Avg_3 is then the mean of the three track Overalls.

Tables 7–16 report, for each of the ten categories, the same five metrics across three tracks (Overall $\uparrow$, TextEdit $\downarrow$, FormulaCDM $\uparrow$, TableTEDS $\uparrow$, ROEdit $\downarrow$ per track) plus Avg_3 as Table 2, covering the 39 of 40 models in Table 2 that have a defined Overall on every (category, track) cell; only OpenDoc-0.1B is missing per-category breakdowns. The full per-track per-category breakdowns (including the source per-page metric files used) are also released as supplementary CSVs: `category_benchmark_{clean,digital_degraded,real_degraded,all_tracks}.csv`.

Cross-category observations. (i) Difficulty varies sharply by domain (Figure 16b): Avg_3 on *academic* ranges 36–92 across the 39 models (mean 81.4), while on *certificate* it is 9–69 (mean 42.0); FD-RL vs. DeepSeek-OCR opens a 38% gap on *academic* and a 60% gap on *certificate*, so the same model pair stretches by $\sim 1.6\times$ as the domain shifts from clean *academic* prose to noisy multi-region certificates. (ii) No single model or architecture dominates every domain (Figure 16a, Figure 17): the ten per-category championships split across five model families: Qwen3.5-122B-A10B wins *finance*, *medical*, and *technical*; Qwen3.5-27B wins *legal_gov* and *publishing*; *academic* goes to Kimi K2.6, *education* to Logics-Parsing-v2, *business* to Gemini-3.1-Pro, *logistics* to DotsMOCR, and *certificate* to FD-RL. (iii) The widest model spreads occur on *certificate* ($\sigma=15.2$), *legal_gov* (14.5), *business* (13.0), *publishing* (12.7), and *logistics* (12.5), i.e., domains where dense or non-rectilinear tables, mixed inline structure, and unusual layouts dominate, consistent with the diagnostic finding (§3.3) that formula and table modules dominate cross-model variance. (iv) The Clean $\rightarrow$ Real winner-transition view (Figure 18) further shows that the architecture mix at the top reshuffles between tracks: VLMs (green) tend to retain or regain rank under Real-degraded capture (e.g., Gemini-3.1-Pro tops the Real track on *legal_gov*, *logistics*, and *certificate*; Qwen3.5-122B-A10B holds Real-track rank-1 on *academic*, *business*, *finance*, *medical*, *publishing*, and *technical*), while many specialist parsers shed 15–25% from Clean to Real on the harder domains.

Architecture mix at the top. Figure 17 shows the top-5 models per domain colored by architecture. Aggregated across all 50 podium slots (10 domains $\times$ 5 ranks), **VLMs occupy 54%, E2E specialists 36%, and Pipeline specialists only 10%**; the Pipeline share is concentrated in domains where structural decomposition still pays off (DotsMOCR rank-1 on *logistics*; MinerU2.5-Pro reaches the top-3 on both *publishing* and *certificate*), whereas VLMs take rank-1 on 7 of 10 domains (*academic*, *legal_gov*, *business*, *finance*, *medical*, *publishing*, *technical*) and E2E specialists take the remaining two contested-layout domains (*education* via Logics-Parsing-v2 and *certificate* via FD-RL). The Clean $\rightarrow$ Real transition summary in Figure 18 explains part of this: VLMs’ robustness to physical capture is an intrinsic advantage on noise-heavy domains (*certificate*, *logistics*, *business*, *legal_gov*) where Real-track scores carry more weight in Avg_3 .




Figure 16: Per-category overview across the 39 models with full triple-track coverage. (a) Per-model $\times$ per-category Avg₃ heatmap; rows are sorted by the full-benchmark Avg₃ from Table 2, the rightmost column repeats that global score, the color stripe on the left encodes architecture (Pipeline / E2E / VLM), and the bold cell with a black border in each column marks the per-category champion. (b) Per-category difficulty profile: each row is one category, sorted from easiest (top) to hardest (bottom), with the colored bar showing the mean Avg₃ across the 39 models and the gray range bar showing the per-category min $\rightarrow$ max spread. Together the two views summarize both *which* model is best per domain and *which* domains are intrinsically hard or contested.




Figure 17: **Top-5 models per domain** by per-category Avg₃, with bars colored by architecture (Pipeline / E2E / VLM). The color mix on each panel is the architecture composition at the top of that domain: VLMs dominate *academic*, *finance*, *medical*, *publishing*, and *technical*; the E2E share rises on layout-heavy domains (*certificate*, *logistics*); only *logistics* and *publishing* place a Pipeline specialist in the top three.

Clean to Real: winner flips and architecture robustness

Left: who wins before/after physical capture. Right: median Real - Clean change over all 39 models.




Figure 18: **Per-domain Clean→Real robustness summary.** Left: architecture-coded Clean and Real winners, scores, the Real winner’s Clean-rank→rank-1 move, and its Clean-to-Real score change. Right: architecture-level median Real–Clean Overall change across the 39 models; less negative cells indicate stronger physical-capture robustness.

Table 7: Per-category three-track leaderboard on **Academic** (180 pages). Top: per-model Overall / TextEdit / FormulaCDM / TableTEDS / ROEdit per track and Avg₃, partitioned by architecture (same metric layout as Table 2). Bottom: per-architecture summary on Overall (Clean / Digital / Real, with Δ vs. Clean: $\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain), top-4 models per architecture; **Group Avg.** aggregates over the full set of models in each architecture.

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃
		Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																	
DotsMOCR	3B	94.57	0.079	95.19	96.39	0.153	92.11	0.084	91.19	93.58	0.153	83.92	0.155	82.05	85.22	0.196	90.20
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	93.36	0.111	93.51	97.68	0.155	89.66	0.145	89.95	93.51	0.185	83.81	0.191	82.41	88.09	0.217	88.94
MinerU2.5	1.2B	93.61	0.075	91.20	97.09	0.139	89.67	0.114	86.76	93.68	0.174	82.22	0.177	80.62	83.78	0.216	88.50
GLM-OCR	0.9B	91.87	0.114	91.79	95.25	0.202	88.86	0.157	87.64	94.62	0.240	81.93	0.197	76.90	88.62	0.261	87.55
YouTu-Parsing	2B	90.58	0.137	91.44	93.99	0.206	89.48	0.150	90.98	92.46	0.218	81.44	0.210	81.71	83.60	0.248	87.17
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	91.55	0.116	91.55	94.73	0.198	88.23	0.154	87.53	92.51	0.220	81.11	0.195	77.29	85.53	0.264	86.96
Dolphin-v2	3B	91.41	0.115	88.88	96.87	0.155	86.06	0.150	80.55	92.65	0.182	66.88	0.292	57.28	72.52	0.296	81.45
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	85.26	0.127	77.85	90.67	0.212	82.38	0.146	74.43	87.28	0.227	69.81	0.252	59.41	75.20	0.319	79.15
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	85.79	0.127	79.65	90.43	0.212	80.06	0.174	72.87	84.73	0.246	67.02	0.306	61.64	70.01	0.357	77.62
OpenOCR	0.1B	39.53	0.233	41.85	0.00	0.379	37.00	0.285	39.51	0.00	0.401	32.74	0.337	31.88	0.00	0.444	36.42
End-to-End Specialists																	
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	94.18	0.095	95.25	96.79	0.159	92.44	0.111	92.34	96.07	0.171	87.58	0.147	88.90	88.50	0.222	91.40
FD-RL	4B	93.07	0.091	92.80	95.48	0.147	92.24	0.101	92.13	94.66	0.151	86.61	0.154	88.41	86.81	0.187	90.64
OCRVerse	4B	92.57	0.120	93.11	96.61	0.162	91.79	0.122	92.06	95.53	0.166	85.23	0.171	84.56	88.25	0.206	89.86
FireRed-OCR	2B	89.64	0.133	92.71	89.52	0.224	88.66	0.149	89.57	91.27	0.234	83.95	0.186	85.91	84.57	0.251	87.42
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	89.53	0.177	92.35	93.94	0.220	88.35	0.193	92.61	91.74	0.226	82.78	0.230	86.20	85.13	0.263	86.89
dots.ocr	2.9B	91.96	0.095	93.22	92.19	0.158	87.03	0.118	84.88	88.05	0.181	79.47	0.187	77.50	79.60	0.220	86.15
HunyuanOCR	1B	89.65	0.117	90.64	90.03	0.194	87.35	0.123	85.89	88.46	0.189	78.31	0.191	77.26	76.73	0.251	85.10
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	84.38	0.134	78.71	87.86	0.216	84.94	0.126	78.68	88.73	0.213	73.62	0.223	66.92	76.23	0.279	80.98
olmOCR-7B	7B	83.44	0.272	94.18	83.28	0.281	81.79	0.274	92.03	80.71	0.279	74.19	0.331	83.79	71.84	0.325	79.81
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	87.34	0.172	88.02	91.22	0.218	82.20	0.215	81.33	86.72	0.243	68.68	0.295	62.31	73.23	0.295	79.41
Qianfan-OCR	4B	84.86	0.176	85.76	86.44	0.216	77.31	0.237	77.19	78.40	0.270	75.64	0.261	76.72	76.31	0.281	79.27
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	84.85	0.121	78.98	87.65	0.194	79.81	0.150	73.97	80.47	0.222	65.88	0.400	66.75	70.93	0.312	76.85
DeepSeek-OCR	3B	60.39	0.292	59.78	50.55	0.384	56.78	0.292	55.90	43.63	0.380	40.22	0.414	38.75	23.26	0.501	52.46
OCRFlux-3B	3B	55.85	0.385	50.45	55.55	0.428	52.65	0.402	48.68	49.51	0.427	46.57	0.466	47.11	39.19	0.445	51.69
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Kimi-K2.6	1T/32B	93.58	0.103	95.29	95.73	0.245	92.36	0.108	94.37	93.48	0.251	90.03	0.134	92.43	91.03	0.271	91.99
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	90.99	0.132	92.82	93.39	0.242	94.08	0.083	95.50	94.98	0.189	90.30	0.121	92.17	90.80	0.224	91.79
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	91.55	0.128	93.80	93.69	0.198	91.61	0.124	95.47	91.74	0.211	86.35	0.167	88.54	87.23	0.246	89.84
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	91.34	0.109	94.60	90.30	0.194	90.43	0.107	93.84	88.18	0.205	85.67	0.186	90.68	84.91	0.280	89.15
Qwen3-VL-8B	8B	91.31	0.118	92.96	92.79	0.224	89.66	0.124	90.27	91.15	0.230	85.58	0.181	90.49	84.39	0.264	88.85
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	87.60	0.181	93.68	87.18	0.294	88.52	0.172	93.32	89.41	0.288	79.17	0.249	84.09	78.32	0.336	85.10
Gemini-3.1-Pro	—	80.77	0.215	85.81	77.94	0.268	80.88	0.213	83.34	80.59	0.275	89.82	0.158	92.61	92.65	0.233	83.82
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	85.41	0.114	94.34	73.28	0.192	83.46	0.114	94.69	67.03	0.200	82.54	0.137	90.26	71.04	0.208	83.80
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	85.81	0.202	94.31	83.29	0.318	84.80	0.209	91.51	83.80	0.327	75.11	0.296	83.97	71.01	0.382	81.91
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	82.83	0.232	89.00	82.75	0.361	84.20	0.218	90.53	83.85	0.347	78.35	0.255	83.02	77.53	0.347	81.79
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	85.19	0.123	94.28	73.61	0.187	81.56	0.141	95.28	63.54	0.206	76.10	0.149	92.06	51.16	0.227	80.95
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	80.32	0.121	93.67	59.36	0.237	78.64	0.141	92.59	57.42	0.245	76.18	0.167	91.07	54.20	0.260	78.38
MiniCPM-V-4.5	8B	83.43	0.161	80.26	86.17	0.226	80.75	0.180	76.46	83.80	0.232	66.46	0.330	65.30	67.10	0.346	76.88
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	81.23	0.243	90.67	77.32	0.385	78.50	0.256	85.79	75.33	0.386	70.35	0.325	76.50	67.02	0.423	76.69
Step3-VL	10B	75.69	0.299	82.66	74.29	0.373	71.99	0.331	77.89	71.20	0.392	66.78	0.379	70.45	67.83	0.417	71.49
Pipeline / Multi-stage				End-to-End Specialists				General-Purpose VLMs									
Model	Clean	Digital	Real	Model	Clean	Digital	Real	Model	Clean	Digital	Real						
DotsMOCR	94.6	92.11 $\downarrow 2.5$	83.92 $\downarrow 10.6$	Logics-Parsing-v2	94.2	92.44 $\downarrow 1.7$	87.58 $\downarrow 6.6$	Kimi-K2.6	93.6	92.36 $\downarrow 1.2$	90.03 $\downarrow 3.5$						
MinerU2.5-Pro	93.4	89.66 $\downarrow 3.7$	83.81 $\downarrow 9.5$	FD-RL	93.1	92.24 $\downarrow 0.8$	86.61 $\downarrow 6.5$	Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	91.0	94.08 $\uparrow 3.1$	90.30 $\downarrow 0.7$						
MinerU2.5	93.6	89.67 $\downarrow 3.9$	82.22 $\downarrow 11.4$	OCRVerse	92.6	91.79 $\downarrow 0.8$	85.23 $\downarrow 7.3$	Qwen3.5-9B	91.5	91.61 $\uparrow 0.1$	86.35 $\downarrow 5.2$						
GLM-OCR	91.9	88.86 $\downarrow 3.0$	81.93 $\downarrow 9.9$	FireRed-OCR	89.6	88.66 $\downarrow 1.0$	83.95 $\downarrow 5.7$	Qwen3.5-4B	91.3	90.43 $\downarrow 0.9$	85.67 $\downarrow 5.7$						
Group Avg.	85.8	82.35 $\downarrow 3.4$	73.09 $\downarrow 12.7$	Group Avg.	84.4	81.67 $\downarrow 2.7$	73.48 $\downarrow 10.9$	Group Avg.	85.8	84.76 $\downarrow 1.0$	79.92 $\downarrow 5.9$						

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃
		Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																	
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	85.13	0.214	84.26	92.55	0.320	80.19	0.274	81.25	86.68	0.358	65.23	0.392	61.61	73.29	0.453	76.85
DotsMOCR	3B	84.97	0.172	84.44	87.68	0.276	80.71	0.214	81.15	82.38	0.299	64.75	0.343	65.79	62.72	0.411	76.81
MinerU2.5	1.2B	84.16	0.173	83.41	86.40	0.301	79.04	0.243	81.39	80.06	0.338	62.13	0.399	61.72	64.63	0.458	75.11
YouTu-Parsing	2B	81.19	0.240	81.59	85.98	0.386	76.55	0.273	76.08	80.92	0.405	59.23	0.414	56.95	62.11	0.459	72.32
GLM-OCR	0.9B	76.00	0.293	73.14	84.18	0.455	69.63	0.384	66.80	80.47	0.517	65.40	0.411	65.65	71.62	0.534	70.34
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	76.42	0.293	74.96	83.61	0.431	68.25	0.392	67.30	76.61	0.506	59.33	0.441	55.84	66.24	0.537	68.00
Dolphin-v2	3B	79.98	0.275	81.31	86.13	0.354	70.66	0.379	72.11	77.77	0.418	53.27	0.492	53.26	55.79	0.498	67.97
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	73.06	0.291	68.58	79.64	0.441	69.04	0.338	69.12	71.75	0.465	53.95	0.490	56.52	54.34	0.557	65.35
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	68.27	0.309	57.72	77.99	0.462	64.61	0.372	60.92	70.14	0.488	47.65	0.557	49.24	49.46	0.582	60.18
OpenOCR	0.1B	34.53	0.391	42.75	-0.02	0.545	32.53	0.455	43.09	0.00	0.591	26.57	0.531	32.80	0.00	0.637	31.21
End-to-End Specialists																	
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	87.84	0.166	89.04	91.05	0.290	84.77	0.210	87.83	87.51	0.333	75.47	0.267	76.97	76.17	0.377	82.69
FD-RL	4B	86.79	0.173	86.47	91.24	0.294	84.87	0.195	85.54	88.57	0.318	69.75	0.324	66.95	74.67	0.379	80.47
OCRVerse	4B	84.43	0.227	84.77	91.17	0.338	82.50	0.256	83.81	89.28	0.361	67.04	0.384	66.20	73.36	0.436	77.99
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	81.44	0.287	82.22	90.84	0.335	76.98	0.325	78.09	85.38	0.362	60.85	0.450	61.24	66.29	0.452	73.09
FireRec-OCR	2B	79.05	0.309	86.28	81.73	0.394	78.63	0.329	87.78	81.04	0.407	60.70	0.456	65.90	61.80	0.504	72.79
dots.ocr	2.9B	80.59	0.223	79.84	84.22	0.358	71.90	0.306	72.74	73.55	0.421	59.79	0.405	60.88	58.96	0.471	70.76
HunyuanOCR	1B	75.17	0.279	78.33	78.08	0.377	70.88	0.318	75.02	69.47	0.404	55.12	0.441	54.92	54.57	0.492	67.06
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	70.91	0.289	58.86	82.80	0.374	70.31	0.314	64.41	77.93	0.393	52.17	0.475	45.55	58.44	0.492	64.46
olmOCR-7B	7B	73.97	0.387	85.87	74.70	0.466	67.32	0.447	80.64	62.01	0.513	51.18	0.563	60.82	49.03	0.600	64.16
Qianfan-OCR	4B	65.60	0.397	74.89	61.63	0.482	57.76	0.482	65.55	52.90	0.521	50.83	0.510	54.28	49.24	0.533	58.06
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	67.74	0.383	63.56	78.00	0.506	62.83	0.487	66.12	71.10	0.562	37.58	0.637	35.80	40.61	0.682	56.05
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B																

Table 9: Per-category three-track leaderboard on **Legal_Gov** (151 pages). Top: per-model Overall / TextEdit / FormulaCDM / TableTEDS / ROEdit per track and Avg₃, partitioned by architecture (same metric layout as Table 2). Bottom: per-architecture summary on Overall (Clean / Digital / Real, with Δ vs. Clean: $\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain), top-4 models per architecture; **Group Avg.** aggregates over the full set of models in each architecture.

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃	
		Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓		
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																		
DotsMOCR	3B	94.48	0.093	100.00	92.71	0.194	92.09	0.108	100.00	87.01	0.200	57.80	0.147	6.05	82.03	0.242	81.46	
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	91.82	0.157	96.15	94.96	0.176	87.65	0.188	92.50	89.26	0.192	58.48	0.251	11.60	88.92	0.250	79.32	
MinerU2.5	1.2B	92.39	0.093	92.50	93.94	0.157	85.24	0.137	87.30	82.10	0.199	59.32	0.214	16.65	82.71	0.246	78.98	
YouTu-Parsing	2B	90.68	0.175	98.95	90.58	0.247	86.68	0.178	94.85	83.01	0.260	55.87	0.182	6.05	79.78	0.228	77.74	
Dolphin-v2	3B	88.93	0.186	95.65	89.77	0.226	84.69	0.222	93.50	82.76	0.246	53.31	0.402	34.80	65.30	0.396	75.64	
GLM-OCR	0.9B	60.86	0.204	13.75	89.29	0.327	70.27	0.255	51.80	84.46	0.380	61.20	0.275	23.25	87.84	0.373	64.11	
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	58.72	0.202	10.10	86.29	0.313	81.34	0.265	92.55	78.03	0.359	51.56	0.327	12.80	74.55	0.413	63.87	
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	62.89	0.191	15.45	92.30	0.295	71.97	0.246	56.35	84.18	0.341	55.72	0.295	15.10	81.55	0.366	63.53	
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	56.85	0.225	7.60	85.41	0.334	70.58	0.283	62.60	77.42	0.371	47.65	0.354	3.05	75.28	0.418	58.36	
OpenOCR	0.1B	33.93	0.307	32.45	0.00	0.355	32.63	0.333	31.15	0.00	0.369	23.03	0.370	6.05	0.00	0.389	29.86	
End-End Specialists																		
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	91.78	0.120	93.70	93.63	0.241	89.32	0.146	93.70	88.81	0.267	77.98	0.152	58.95	90.18	0.254	86.36	
FD-RL	4B	93.54	0.130	100.00	93.68	0.201	92.58	0.139	100.00	91.61	0.212	58.47	0.155	3.15	87.78	0.211	81.53	
OCRVerse	4B	91.09	0.207	100.00	93.97	0.260	89.11	0.221	100.00	89.39	0.270	58.43	0.207	8.00	87.98	0.270	79.54	
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	89.15	0.175	94.80	90.11	0.218	86.56	0.177	94.80	82.53	0.232	56.14	0.219	9.40	80.92	0.251	77.28	
dots.ocr	2.9B	89.64	0.134	90.30	92.07	0.213	86.63	0.184	90.30	88.03	0.273	55.48	0.222	9.10	79.54	0.299	77.25	
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	88.43	0.120	90.30	87.00	0.181	84.45	0.163	90.30	79.34	0.219	51.68	0.221	0.00	77.11	0.234	74.85	
HunyuanOCR	1B	86.90	0.126	89.05	84.25	0.213	83.91	0.149	90.15	76.51	0.239	52.32	0.246	10.15	71.45	0.286	74.38	
olmOCR-7B	7B	82.65	0.240	94.80	77.20	0.344	79.46	0.269	94.80	70.43	0.358	45.27	0.326	0.00	68.44	0.397	69.13	
Qianfan-OCR	4B	80.15	0.177	77.90	80.27	0.232	73.85	0.256	76.80	70.37	0.291	50.33	0.293	11.20	69.08	0.316	68.11	
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	71.10	0.166	45.90	83.95	0.270	64.93	0.218	48.90	67.70	0.320	47.14	0.424	14.85	68.95	0.364	61.06	
FireRed-OCR	2B	56.18	0.197	0.00	88.21	0.245	53.85	0.217	0.00	83.31	0.249	51.14	0.287	4.70	77.42	0.297	53.72	
OCRFlux-3B	3B	44.38	0.317	0.00	64.84	0.328	58.85	0.354	61.30	50.65	0.333	35.42	0.390	0.00	45.22	0.357	46.22	
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	55.58	0.236	3.55	86.75	0.337	47.80	0.358	3.55	75.67	0.422	29.88	0.566	0.00	46.24	0.582	44.42	
DeepSeek-OCR	3B	39.75	0.322	3.85	47.57	0.408	36.34	0.316	3.55	37.08	0.371	31.52	0.383	5.00	27.81	0.402	35.87	
General-Purpose VLMs																		
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	91.51	0.096	92.50	91.60	0.170	91.50	0.113	97.85	87.98	0.198	81.07	0.121	79.65	75.69	0.195	88.03	
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	87.75	0.136	90.30	86.55	0.239	88.06	0.124	90.30	86.26	0.212	81.35	0.187	77.70	85.01	0.262	85.72	
Gemini-3.1-Pro	—	86.09	0.184	90.30	86.33	0.211	88.13	0.184	94.80	87.97	0.229	81.72	0.157	70.65	90.19	0.194	85.31	
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	84.45	0.127	92.50	73.58	0.203	84.19	0.116	92.50	71.66	0.200	78.41	0.131	82.70	65.61	0.209	82.35	
Qwen3-VL-8B	8B	86.54	0.150	90.30	84.37	0.258	87.67	0.149	95.65	82.29	0.245	72.13	0.173	53.25	80.43	0.258	82.11	
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	90.42	0.185	100.00	89.73	0.266	91.29	0.127	94.80	91.75	0.210	62.53	0.147	9.65	92.62	0.216	81.41	
Kimi-K2.6	1T/32B	89.84	0.189	94.80	93.64	0.292	89.03	0.182	94.80	90.45	0.291	60.42	0.174	7.90	90.77	0.288	79.76	
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	88.38	0.152	90.30	90.06	0.223	88.28	0.150	90.30	89.55	0.230	58.84	0.191	9.65	86.00	0.264	78.50	
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	88.83	0.113	100.00	77.74	0.202	88.12	0.133	100.00	77.64	0.222	52.57	0.153	4.10	68.93	0.228	76.51	
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	86.85	0.204	97.85	83.11	0.313	85.13	0.216	95.65	81.34	0.326	53.18	0.242	4.70	79.04	0.338	75.05	
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	81.52	0.202	90.30	74.51	0.322	78.75	0.228	90.30	68.72	0.335	45.26	0.296	0.00	65.39	0.372	68.51	
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	58.87	0.135	4.05	86.04	0.273	88.12	0.142	94.80	83.81	0.280	57.11	0.210	10.65	81.72	0.296	68.03	
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	54.64	0.169	0.00	80.79	0.288	52.84	0.176	0.00	76.08	0.287	49.93	0.250	1.55	73.23	0.357	52.47	
MiniCPM-V-4.5	8B	55.30	0.222	9.40	78.70	0.272	54.28	0.215	6.05	78.32	0.246	40.75	0.400	6.05	56.20	0.344	50.11	
Step3-VL	10B	41.61	0.387	0.00	63.57	0.400	69.19	0.436	90.20	60.94	0.422	34.82	0.460	0.00	50.47	0.420	48.54	
Pipeline / Multi-stage																		
Model		Clean	Digital	Real														
DotsMOCR	94.5	92.09	12.4	57.80	136.7													
MinerU2.5-Pro	91.8	87.65	14.2	58.48	133.3													
MinerU2.5	92.4	85.24	17.2	59.32	133.1													
YouTu-Parsing	90.7	86.68	14.0	55.87	134.8													
Group Avg.	73.2	76.31	13.2	52.39	120.8													
End-End Specialists																		
Model		Clean	Digital	Real														
Logics-Parsing-v2	91.8	89.32	12.5	77.98	113.8													
FD-RL	93.5	92.58	11.0	58.47	135.1													
OCRVerse	91.1	89.11	12.0	58.43	132.7													
olmOCR-2-7B	89.2	86.56	12.6	56.14	133.0													
Group Avg.	75.7	73.40	12.3	50.09	125.7													
General-Purpose VLMs																		
Model		Clean	Digital	Real														
Qwen3.5-27B	91.5	91.50	91.00	81.07	110.4													
Qwen3.5-9B	87.8	88.06	10.3	81.35	164.1													
Gemini-3.1-Pro	86.1	88.13	12.0	81.72	144.4													
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	84.5	84.19	10.3	78.41	160.6													
Group Avg.	78.2	81.64	13.5	60.67	117.5													

Table 10: Per-category three-track leaderboard on **Business** (160 pages). Top: per-model Overall / TextEdit / FormulaCDM / TableTEDS / ROEdit per track and Avg₃, partitioned by architecture (same metric layout as Table 2). Bottom: per-architecture summary on Overall (Clean / Digital / Real, with Δ vs. Clean: $\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain), top-4 models per architecture; **Group Avg.** aggregates over the full set of models in each architecture.

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃
		Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																	
DotsMOCR	3B	75.03	0.146	55.31	84.41	0.236	70.04	0.192	50.32	79.04	0.274	56.43	0.297	34.62	64.32	0.379	67.17
YouTu-Parsing	2B	75.37	0.209	61.40	85.64	0.320	65.37	0.296	49.34	76.37	0.377	57.46	0.336	39.48	66.48	0.408	66.07
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	69.49	0.225	37.90	93.11	0.345	66.20	0.284	37.50	89.47	0.380	55.56	0.374	24.66	79.43	0.447	63.75
MinerU2.5	1.2B	69.30	0.151	33.34	89.63	0.292	61.58	0.245	28.65	80.58	0.360	54.78	0.317	23.41	72.63	0.401	61.89
GLM-OCR	0.9B	64.85	0.262	33.84	86.89	0.444	56.53	0.367	27.97	78.33	0.528	56.13	0.359	28.35	75.95	0.505	59.17
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	65.25	0.260	33.10	88.61	0.421	55.85	0.365	27.43	76.65	0.498	53.05	0.370	24.06	72.14	0.494	58.05
Dolphin-v2	3B	62.98	0.296	39.68	78.87	0.391	56.33	0.366	31.16	74.44	0.433	49.17	0.490	34.66	61.88	0.522	56.16
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	59.70	0.284	24.96	82.52	0.452	53.61	0.348	23.33	72.27	0.488	46.83	0.474	20.92	66.94	0.556	53.38
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	58.38	0.285	20.60	83.01	0.455	53.40	0.339	18.42	75.71	0.489	45.53	0.450	19.08	62.54	0.563	52.44
OpenOCR	0.1B	30.58	0.350	26.72	0.00	0.544	26.52	0.422	21.79	0.00	0.570	23.51	0.481	18.68	0.00	0.604	26.87
End-to-End Specialists																	
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	75.18	0.170	51.74	90.80	0.286	74.07	0.208	54.91	88.13	0.324	69.33	0.261	54.94	79.12	0.371	72.86
FD-RL	4B	76.61	0.190	56.72	92.14	0.318	74.25	0.215	54.73	89.50	0.343	61.45	0.304	39.12	75.60	0.409	70.77
OCRVerse	4B	68.96	0.245	41.90	89.51	0.345	66.77	0.287	45.11	83.94	0.384	61.22	0.319	38.12	77.47	0.418	65.65
dots.ocr	2.9B	67.40	0.222	37.94	86.41	0.361	63.75	0.270	39.24	78.95	0.379	52.55	0.362	29.10	64.78	0.443	61.23
FireRed-OCR	2B	67.00	0.254	39.56	86.80	0.366	64.11	0.294	38.17	83.53	0.397	51.82	0.398	22.40	72.90	0.441	60.98
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	60.57	0.272	21.71	87.23	0.341	57.44	0.306	20.51	82.38	0.362	48.64	0.407	17.29	69.37	0.433	55.55
HunyuanOCR	1B	58.71	0.236	25.43	74.34	0.341	54.70	0.282	23.08	69.21	0.364	41.43	0.413	13.92	51.67	0.439	51.61
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	56.53	0.263	14.80	81.05	0.392	51.66	0.321	12.31	74.77	0.427	40.49	0.448	7.05	59.20	0.488	49.56
olmOCR-7B	7B	54.81	0.382	29.74	72.93	0.451	49.51	0.439	27.45	64.93	0.499	39.32	0.555	23.39	50.02	0.566	47.88
Qianfan-OCR	4B	49.17	0.368	16.79	67.54	0.439	41.08	0.450	13.62	54.60	0.502	38.53	0.496	13.98	51.21	0.503	42.93
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	54.34	0.363	22.96	76.34	0.497	44.17	0.515	19.90	64.05	0.604	25.90	0.649	2.97	39.69	0.684	41.47
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	45.55	0.332	13.95	55.93	0.470	40.87	0.397	12.66	49.67	0.479	30.55	0.606	8.90	43.34	0.566	38.99
OCRFlux-3B	3B	41.38	0.449	21.19	47.80	0.442	36.96	0.492	17.64	42.49	0.452	31.73	0.534	13.16	35.41	0.483	36.69
DeepSeek-OCR	3B	24.52	0.548	5.87	22.45	0.626	20.88	0.584	4.58	16.50	0.631	18.33	0.649	5.62	14.27	0.640	21.24
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Gemini-3.1-Pro	—	76.44	0.305	76.15	83.65	0.393	77.85	0.305	80.84	83.21	0.389	71.11	0.287	62.06	79.96	0.327	75.13
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	75.93	0.204	57.72	90.52	0.347	73.20	0.233	54.25	88.61	0.370	71.77	0.274	57.96	84.77	0.385	73.63
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	75.01	0.243	59.28	90.04	0.380	72.91	0.256	56.16	88.14	0.380	70.25	0.307	59.73	81.70	0.417	72.72
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	75.49	0.244	63.91	86.98	0.397	71.85	0.278	57.54	85.78	0.417	65.59	0.353	55.28	76.77	0.456	70.98
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	72.39	0.208	52.78	85.22	0.365	67.81	0.234	47.35	79.48	0.383	68.82	0.270	59.94	73.52	0.393	69.67
Kimi-K2.6	1T/32B	69.19	0.307	51.03	87.23	0.477	68.71	0.323	52.22	86.25	0.487	67.13	0.347	52.31	83.82	0.487	68.34
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	69.67	0.214	47.54	82.86	0.353	69.74	0.236	52.16	80.65	0.365	63.79	0.282	47.60	71.99	0.381	67.73
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	68.48	0.246	55.31	74.71	0.379	66.56	0.255	47.95	77.29	0.367	66.83	0.262	52.16	74.56	0.367	67.29
Qwen3-VL-8B	8B	68.95	0.262	45.95	87.09	0.415	67.55	0.290	48.85	82.77	0.427	53.94	0.370	27.36	71.46	0.472	63.48
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	67.77	0.274	48.38	82.35	0.428	63.16	0.303	40.04	79.77	0.441	56.64	0.387	38.61	70.00	0.483	62.52
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	64.88	0.328	46.00	81.45	0.462	61.00	0.357	38.81	79.87	0.487	54.15	0.433	38.89	66.87	0.517	60.01
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	59.43	0.311	31.99	77.39	0.444	57.73	0.342	33.55	73.84	0.458	48.69	0.423	25.54	62.84	0.490	55.28
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	53.51	0.365	21.90	75.13	0.495	50.06	0.404	21.53	69.02	0.518	43.22	0.479	21.39	56.18	0.556	48.93
Step3-VL	10B	51.10	0.452	34.39	64.14	0.496	50.52	0.472	30.44	68.34	0.508	38.82	0.575	23.20	50.76	0.572	46.81
MiniCPM-V-4.5	8B	40.37	0.471	13.82	54.42	0.476	38.70	0.492	13.38	51.89	0.502	28.66	0.611	8.01	39.08	0.571	35.91
Pipeline / Multi-stage																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
DotsMOCR	75.0	70.04 $\downarrow 5.0$	56.43 $\downarrow 18.6$														
YouTu-Parsing	75.4	65.37 $\downarrow 10.0$	57.46 $\downarrow 17.9$														
MinerU2.5-Pro	69.5	66.20 $\downarrow 3.3$	55.56 $\downarrow 13.9$														
MinerU2.5	69.3	61.58 $\downarrow 7.7$	54.78 $\downarrow 14.5$														
Group Avg.	63.1	56.54 $\downarrow 6.5$	49.84 $\downarrow 13.2$														
End-to-End Specialists																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
Logics-Parsing-v2	75.2	74.07 $\downarrow 1.1$	69.33 $\downarrow 5.9$														
FD-RL	76.6	74.25 $\downarrow 2.4$	61.45 $\downarrow 15.2$														
OCRVerse	69.0	66.77 $\downarrow 2.2$	61.22 $\downarrow 7.7$														
dots.ocr	67.4	63.75 $\downarrow 3.7$	52.55 $\downarrow 14.9$														
Group Avg.	57.2	52.87 $\downarrow 4.3$	43.66 $\downarrow 13.5$														
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
Gemini-3.1-Pro	76.4	77.85 $\uparrow 1.4$	71.11 $\downarrow 5.3$														
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	75.9	73.20 $\downarrow 2.7$	71.77 $\downarrow 4.2$														
Qwen3.5-9B	75.0	72.91 $\downarrow 2.1$	70.25 $\downarrow 4.8$														
Qwen3.5-4B	75.5	71.85 $\downarrow 3.6$	65.59 $\downarrow 9.9$														
Group Avg.	65.9	63.82 $\downarrow 2.1$	57.96 $\downarrow 7.9$														

Table 11: Per-category three-track leaderboard on **Finance** (212 pages). Top: per-model Overall / TextEdit / FormulaCDM / TableTEDS / ROEdit per track and Avg₃, partitioned by architecture (same metric layout as Table 2). Bottom: per-architecture summary on Overall (Clean / Digital / Real, with Δ vs. Clean: $\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain), top-4 models per architecture; **Group Avg.** aggregates over the full set of models in each architecture.

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃
		Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																	
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	63.10	0.290	39.84	78.43	0.446	56.62	0.367	31.07	75.51	0.498	53.42	0.451	34.19	71.12	0.558	57.71
DotsMOCR	3B	60.85	0.164	31.36	67.58	0.302	59.24	0.253	34.63	68.36	0.371	51.18	0.370	33.45	57.08	0.477	57.09
YouTu-Parsing	2B	62.22	0.251	33.48	78.31	0.425	56.49	0.314	29.51	71.38	0.464	50.69	0.423	29.35	65.00	0.527	56.47
MinerU2.5	1.2B	61.86	0.265	36.98	75.07	0.434	54.31	0.353	29.14	69.13	0.498	48.22	0.460	26.25	64.40	0.546	54.80
GLM-OCR	0.9B	51.80	0.458	28.23	73.02	0.617	46.91	0.544	24.81	70.28	0.656	51.81	0.572	43.24	69.40	0.678	50.17
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	51.74	0.460	29.21	72.03	0.606	45.14	0.552	25.66	64.96	0.647	44.61	0.582	28.19	63.85	0.674	47.16
Dolphin-v2	3B	48.27	0.466	29.29	62.14	0.605	41.75	0.575	28.28	54.44	0.641	36.72	0.641	30.07	44.20	0.650	42.25
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	46.53	0.493	28.56	60.37	0.660	37.20	0.595	19.83	51.31	0.700	38.85	0.638	31.38	49.00	0.731	40.86
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	45.68	0.505	28.61	58.92	0.659	37.19	0.618	21.94	51.41	0.701	35.01	0.703	30.16	45.16	0.755	39.29
OpenOCR	0.1B	28.64	0.336	19.50	0.00	0.537	24.81	0.414	15.86	0.00	0.582	22.24	0.490	15.69	0.00	0.634	25.23
End-to-End Specialists																	
FD-RL	4B	61.65	0.285	35.78	77.66	0.474	59.30	0.314	34.62	74.72	0.486	56.18	0.355	34.86	69.24	0.499	59.04
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	58.92	0.331	36.39	73.52	0.470	55.14	0.393	36.66	68.03	0.522	61.58	0.403	54.58	70.42	0.534	58.55
OCRVerse	4B	53.71	0.431	32.53	71.71	0.590	50.91	0.481	33.05	67.76	0.616	49.32	0.481	33.31	62.79	0.594	51.31
dots.ocr	2.9B	57.80	0.316	33.82	71.19	0.473	49.74	0.403	26.75	62.82	0.525	45.79	0.498	28.20	58.95	0.583	51.11
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	55.74	0.350	32.53	69.71	0.422	50.16	0.409	26.74	64.63	0.457	45.53	0.508	30.74	56.65	0.508	50.48
FireRed-OCR	2B	53.06	0.401	33.06	66.26	0.530	49.39	0.464	30.14	64.39	0.576	44.20	0.532	29.16	56.65	0.613	48.88
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	54.96	0.301	25.85	69.11	0.467	48.48	0.400	23.56	61.85	0.500	40.92	0.509	19.52	54.11	0.569	48.12
HunyuanOCR	1B	49.47	0.376	27.11	58.91	0.501	44.15	0.433	22.01	53.70	0.513	38.96	0.543	25.86	45.28	0.571	44.19
olmOCR-7B	7B	47.17	0.469	28.68	59.71	0.560	42.30	0.538	25.12	55.59	0.587	36.36	0.633	22.36	50.05	0.656	41.94
Qianfan-OCR	4B	44.18	0.474	24.08	55.83	0.560	37.38	0.564	19.43	49.11	0.611	41.32	0.598	37.30	46.42	0.608	40.96
OCRFlux-3B	3B	44.45	0.545	43.33	44.51	0.540	32.88	0.592	16.82	41.01	0.563	39.20	0.631	38.88	41.79	0.583	38.84
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	42.28	0.568	27.66	55.98	0.676	33.70	0.671	22.03	46.20	0.729	28.15	0.724	17.65	39.23	0.774	34.71
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	40.68	0.500	23.37	48.64	0.607	35.07	0.581	19.06	44.23	0.637	28.27	0.699	19.07	35.67	0.683	34.67
DeepSeek-OCR	3B	17.02	0.659	7.38	9.58	0.684	16.18	0.636	5.88	6.32	0.683	15.15	0.685	6.67	7.23	0.673	16.12
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	62.48	0.242	33.98	77.65	0.449	59.77	0.289	32.30	75.90	0.474	67.14	0.305	54.00	77.94	0.476	63.13
Gemini-3.1-Pro	—	59.33	0.420	48.20	71.80	0.554	59.21	0.467	54.30	70.06	0.570	58.37	0.372	38.70	73.62	0.510	58.97
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	59.50	0.270	34.39	71.17	0.489	56.35	0.329	33.65	68.27	0.512	58.80	0.405	52.97	63.97	0.548	58.22
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	56.48	0.285	34.68	63.22	0.465	56.63	0.310	33.70	67.15	0.479	60.40	0.339	56.07	59.00	0.486	57.84
Kimi-K2.6	1T/32B	57.26	0.348	32.96	73.66	0.572	53.79	0.385	28.55	71.31	0.573	62.16	0.381	48.31	76.21	0.570	57.74
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	57.45	0.346	37.51	69.45	0.528	54.26	0.391	35.14	66.70	0.550	56.64	0.465	50.15	66.25	0.588	56.12
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	57.53	0.305	34.61	68.50	0.490	54.87	0.366	33.85	67.34	0.525	55.52	0.406	40.61	66.58	0.546	55.97
Qwen3-VL-8B	8B	58.90	0.301	36.83	69.96	0.496	55.24	0.355	33.19	68.01	0.524	53.39	0.379	32.63	65.48	0.537	55.84
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	53.33	0.257	31.32	54.33	0.448	52.24	0.310	30.43	57.27	0.477	57.44	0.359	53.30	54.87	0.510	54.34
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	52.68	0.266	32.43	52.19	0.449	52.67	0.296	28.33	59.29	0.468	56.07	0.322	44.92	55.53	0.465	53.81
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	55.61	0.332	37.21	62.85	0.514	50.76	0.386	29.94	60.95	0.537	51.11	0.479	46.68	54.52	0.593	52.49
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	53.14	0.363	34.35	61.32	0.526	50.88	0.399	30.03	62.51	0.546	52.25	0.492	45.46	60.51	0.599	52.09
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	49.34	0.442	35.29	56.90	0.595	42.17	0.525	29.91	49.14	0.630	42.90	0.605	47.20	42.00	0.669	44.80
Step3-VL	10B	39.77	0.598	26.25	52.87	0.594	39.39	0.622	26.88	53.54	0.616	37.40	0.654	26.81	50.82	0.644	38.85
MiniCPM-V-4.5	8B	37.59	0.559	23.92	44.73	0.594	33.88	0.610	18.67	43.92	0.623	26.85	0.669	14.86	32.58	0.645	32.77
Pipeline / Multi-stage																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real	End-to-End Specialists				General-Purpose VLMs									
MinerU2.5-Pro	63.1	56.62 _{↓6.5}	53.42 _{↓9.7}	FD-RL	61.6	59.30 _{↓2.4}	56.18 _{↓5.5}	Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	62.5	59.77 _{↓2.7}	67.14 _{↑4.7}						
DotsMOCR	60.9	59.24 _{↓1.6}	51.18 _{↓9.7}	Logics-Parsing-v2	58.9	55.14 _{↓3.8}	61.58 _{↑7.7}	Gemini-3.1-Pro	59.3	59.21 _{↓0.1}	58.37 _{↓1.0}						
YouTu-Parsing	62.2	56.49 _{↓5.7}	50.69 _{↓11.5}	OCRVerse	53.7	50.91 _{↓2.8}	49.32 _{↓4.4}	Qwen3-VL-4B	59.5	56.35 _{↓3.1}	58.80 _{↓0.7}						
MinerU2.5	61.9	54.31 _{↓7.5}	48.22 _{↓13.6}	dots.ocr	57.8	49.74 _{↓8.1}	45.79 _{↓12.0}	Qwen3.5-27B	56.5	56.63 _{↑0.2}	60.40 _{↑3.9}						
Group Avg.	52.1	45.97 _{↓6.1}	43.27 _{↓8.8}	Group Avg.	48.6	43.20 _{↓5.5}	40.78 _{↓7.9}	Group Avg.	54.0	51.47 _{↓2.6}	53.10 _{↓0.9}						

Table 12: Per-category three-track leaderboard on **Medical** (200 pages). Top: per-model Overall / TextEdit / FormulaCDM / TableTEDS / ROEdit per track and Avg₃, partitioned by architecture (same metric layout as Table 2). Bottom: per-architecture summary on Overall (Clean / Digital / Real, with Δ vs. Clean: $\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain), top-4 models per architecture; **Group Avg.** aggregates over the full set of models in each architecture.

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃	
		Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓		
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																		
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	68.35	0.242	55.91	73.31	0.408	64.22	0.313	55.07	68.90	0.433	56.83	0.424	50.85	62.05	0.507	63.13	
YouTu-Parsing	2B	69.34	0.227	59.50	71.19	0.376	59.41	0.300	45.57	62.65	0.410	55.75	0.372	47.58	56.90	0.454	61.50	
DotsMOCR	3B	62.86	0.152	42.80	60.95	0.299	63.02	0.235	50.07	62.51	0.353	54.12	0.328	41.90	53.26	0.422	60.00	
MinerU2.5	1.2B	66.86	0.217	52.61	69.65	0.393	61.74	0.295	52.40	62.37	0.444	49.96	0.429	37.69	55.05	0.531	59.52	
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	56.48	0.412	50.04	60.64	0.559	47.38	0.501	37.93	54.29	0.619	47.46	0.582	51.19	49.36	0.657	50.44	
GLM-OCR	0.9B	53.99	0.469	46.61	62.27	0.596	44.80	0.539	32.76	55.54	0.631	52.46	0.565	51.12	62.73	0.647	50.42	
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	56.58	0.419	52.03	59.66	0.564	42.87	0.518	26.95	53.45	0.606	41.24	0.650	43.67	45.01	0.677	46.90	
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	53.27	0.468	46.45	60.19	0.587	42.65	0.549	30.49	52.32	0.628	42.59	0.579	37.06	48.56	0.634	46.17	
Dolphin-v2	3B	45.74	0.453	28.09	54.39	0.538	42.34	0.531	27.93	52.15	0.591	32.84	0.704	26.88	42.01	0.680	40.31	
OpenOCR	0.1B	34.11	0.330	35.36	0.00	0.506	31.64	0.408	35.72	0.00	0.560	28.21	0.481	32.74	0.00	0.607	31.32	
End-to-End Specialists																		
FD-RL	4B	70.98	0.220	55.03	79.94	0.382	67.57	0.262	55.43	73.45	0.404	61.82	0.320	53.41	64.07	0.427	66.79	
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	67.09	0.266	55.07	72.84	0.395	63.05	0.316	53.52	67.21	0.432	66.55	0.358	68.24	67.22	0.460	65.56	
OCRVerse	4B	63.85	0.344	53.53	72.37	0.492	61.78	0.366	52.66	69.27	0.498	59.06	0.407	56.77	61.10	0.511	61.56	
dots.ocr	2.9B	63.82	0.247	46.44	69.74	0.413	56.78	0.347	45.84	59.21	0.466	38.04	0.465	12.34	48.24	0.541	52.88	
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	58.35	0.355	41.49	69.08	0.410	53.32	0.412	37.82	63.37	0.446	45.28	0.474	33.96	49.29	0.493	52.32	
FireRed-OCR	2B	59.65	0.388	52.44	65.33	0.482	57.52	0.423	54.68	60.15	0.514	37.61	0.503	15.64	47.46	0.564	51.59	
HunyuanOCR	1B	54.70	0.357	43.33	56.49	0.485	50.92	0.423	43.27	51.77	0.510	46.00	0.470	44.44	40.59	0.536	50.54	
olmOCR-7B	7B	53.42	0.442	47.56	56.86	0.507	48.55	0.496	43.64	51.63	0.539	40.45	0.596	40.49	40.41	0.604	47.47	
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	50.84	0.314	21.89	62.05	0.436	46.14	0.396	24.55	53.52	0.503	35.47	0.514	17.95	39.81	0.536	44.15	
OCRFlux-3B	3B	44.19	0.503	35.12	47.78	0.483	39.32	0.545	30.95	41.49	0.500	33.38	0.596	25.34	34.43	0.536	38.96	
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	48.59	0.401	41.96	43.89	0.522	35.41	0.503	24.02	32.46	0.564	32.33	0.684	35.78	29.64	0.635	38.78	
Qianfan-OCR	4B	39.86	0.531	33.66	39.06	0.581	37.26	0.595	35.60	35.66	0.609	37.63	0.594	31.18	41.15	0.601	38.25	
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	45.12	0.559	41.17	50.11	0.644	38.64	0.657	40.85	40.77	0.707	17.68	0.754	6.63	21.83	0.761	33.81	
DeepSeek-OCR	3B	13.64	0.722	6.29	6.86	0.728	13.72	0.710	8.33	3.87	0.722	12.78	0.713	4.08	5.59	0.676	13.38	
General-Purpose VLMs																		
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	66.29	0.245	49.18	74.14	0.420	66.89	0.263	53.85	73.15	0.425	68.38	0.320	63.72	73.43	0.462	67.19	
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	64.87	0.303	54.22	70.73	0.455	62.23	0.319	48.44	70.17	0.473	65.39	0.395	70.93	64.70	0.519	64.16	
Kimi-K2.6	1T/32B	62.26	0.338	53.07	67.52	0.540	61.45	0.360	53.28	67.09	0.547	67.65	0.359	67.42	71.43	0.551	63.79	
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	64.54	0.256	58.01	61.18	0.408	61.62	0.294	55.23	59.01	0.416	64.77	0.356	68.48	61.39	0.464	63.64	
Gemini-3.1-Pro	—	62.57	0.369	50.28	74.31	0.481	64.32	0.408	63.40	70.33	0.504	59.37	0.389	51.88	65.10	0.465	62.09	
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	62.55	0.343	54.62	67.34	0.501	55.89	0.379	43.59	62.02	0.494	60.83	0.454	65.20	62.70	0.554	59.76	
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	64.16	0.284	47.61	73.27	0.468	60.35	0.325	47.57	65.96	0.488	54.18	0.411	46.87	56.80	0.540	59.56	
Qwen3-VL-8B	8B	63.51	0.275	46.23	71.79	0.447	63.03	0.293	48.83	69.55	0.450	51.68	0.390	37.09	56.96	0.493	59.41	
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	57.98	0.297	56.39	47.28	0.445	57.07	0.339	53.81	51.24	0.456	59.71	0.369	69.06	46.99	0.471	58.25	
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	55.15	0.267	43.52	48.62	0.419	56.51	0.301	49.50	50.12	0.421	58.74	0.378	69.02	45.06	0.485	56.80	
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	57.60	0.326	41.38	63.99	0.476	53.92	0.381	42.66	57.19	0.505	52.39	0.469	54.00	50.03	0.542	54.64	
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	57.53	0.398	50.89	61.50	0.521	48.62	0.450	28.40	62.45	0.550	50.60	0.525	46.90	57.37	0.591	52.25	
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	44.94	0.431	21.01	56.86	0.552	47.17	0.482	38.98	50.76	0.586	39.25	0.554	28.81	44.38	0.602	43.79	
Step3-VL	10B	42.91	0.571	38.56	47.28	0.521	42.08	0.598	41.70	44.37	0.548	36.72	0.656	38.05	37.74	0.626	40.57	
MiniCPM-V-4.5	8B	30.99	0.574	17.44	32.90	0.574	28.24	0.616	16.52	29.75	0.585	21.69	0.682	7.41	25.86	0.630	26.97	
Pipeline / Multi-stage																		
Model		Clean	Digital	Real														
MinerU2.5-Pro	68.3	64.22	↓1.1	56.83	↓11.5													
YouTu-Parsing	69.3	59.41	↓9.9	55.75	↓13.6													
DotsMOCR	62.9	63.02	↑0.2	54.12	↑8.7													
MinerU2.5	66.9	61.74	↓5.1	49.96	↓16.9													
Group Avg.	56.8	50.01	↓6.8	46.15	↓10.6													
End-to-End Specialists																		
Model		Clean	Digital	Real														
FD-RL	71.0	67.57	↓3.4	61.82	↓9.2													
Logics-Parsing-v2	67.1	63.05	↓4.0	66.55	↓0.5													
OCRVerse	63.9	61.78	↓2.1	59.06	↓4.8													
dots.ocr	63.8	56.78	↓7.0	38.04	↓25.8													
Group Avg.	52.4	47.86	↓4.6	40.29	↓12.1													
General-Purpose VLMs																		
Model		Clean	Digital	Real														
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	66.3	66.89	↑0.6	68.38	↑2.1													
Qwen3.5-9B	64.9	62.23	↓2.6	65.39	↓0.5													
Kimi-K2.6	62.3	61.45	↓0.8	67.65	↑5.4													
Qwen3.5-27B	64.5	61.62	↓2.9	64.77	↓0.2													
Group Avg.	57.2	55.29	↓1.9	54.09	↓3.1													

Table 13: Per-category three-track leaderboard on **Publishing** (100 pages). Top: per-model Overall / TextEdit / FormulaCDM / TableTEDS / ROEdit per track and Avg₃, partitioned by architecture (same metric layout as Table 2). Bottom: per-architecture summary on Overall (Clean / Digital / Real, with Δ vs. Clean: $\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain), top-4 models per architecture; **Group Avg.** aggregates over the full set of models in each architecture.

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃	
		Ovr↑	TxE↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	TxE↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	TxE↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓		
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																		
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	84.80	0.148	86.81	82.42	0.280	85.15	0.180	86.10	87.37	0.305	73.69	0.334	83.20	71.29	0.396	81.21	
GLM-OCR	0.9B	83.43	0.233	87.04	86.50	0.413	79.67	0.286	87.04	80.58	0.464	67.35	0.367	66.19	72.52	0.501	76.82	
YouTu-Parsing	2B	81.21	0.173	77.72	83.20	0.287	77.68	0.204	79.36	74.05	0.317	70.28	0.342	87.59	57.47	0.414	76.39	
MinerU2.5	1.2B	81.39	0.161	81.98	78.30	0.274	79.53	0.203	83.80	75.04	0.331	67.98	0.393	83.38	59.87	0.438	76.30	
DotsMOCR	3B	80.72	0.130	79.06	76.07	0.222	78.56	0.171	79.06	73.70	0.273	66.66	0.280	71.32	56.69	0.357	75.31	
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	79.91	0.245	79.17	85.03	0.387	75.79	0.302	80.50	77.13	0.452	67.11	0.396	79.89	61.04	0.497	74.24	
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	79.21	0.288	81.40	84.98	0.464	71.06	0.413	82.69	71.79	0.558	61.40	0.526	75.18	61.64	0.654	70.56	
Dolphin-v2	3B	78.68	0.202	80.66	75.57	0.310	75.11	0.247	74.35	75.64	0.350	48.36	0.501	38.71	56.46	0.504	67.38	
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	54.19	0.300	9.46	83.12	0.484	70.34	0.410	80.48	71.52	0.556	43.22	0.586	34.83	53.48	0.682	55.92	
OpenOCR	0.1B	45.35	0.372	73.27	0.00	0.540	43.74	0.424	73.58	0.00	0.565	34.65	0.500	53.94	0.00	0.611	41.25	
End-to-End Specialists																		
FD-RL	4B	83.84	0.144	82.16	83.73	0.277	83.83	0.169	82.16	86.23	0.311	74.82	0.247	79.57	69.54	0.339	80.83	
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	82.50	0.204	84.82	83.08	0.332	79.74	0.231	84.82	77.55	0.366	80.11	0.301	90.41	79.99	0.407	80.78	
FireRed-OCR	2B	82.45	0.214	84.60	84.19	0.354	80.60	0.253	85.11	81.99	0.381	70.94	0.353	83.58	64.55	0.425	78.00	
OCRVerse	4B	79.31	0.211	70.25	88.75	0.318	77.96	0.235	70.25	87.16	0.358	71.51	0.346	76.88	72.29	0.428	76.26	
dots.ocr	2.9B	79.34	0.237	78.06	83.62	0.344	76.80	0.284	78.06	80.74	0.375	64.51	0.387	83.39	48.82	0.406	73.55	
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	76.92	0.196	79.44	70.92	0.348	71.67	0.270	77.26	64.76	0.396	59.89	0.422	80.21	41.60	0.462	69.49	
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	72.05	0.339	85.51	64.54	0.414	71.43	0.352	85.51	63.95	0.420	59.44	0.450	84.38	38.94	0.473	67.64	
HunyuanOCR	1B	69.46	0.280	78.25	58.09	0.364	69.08	0.289	78.25	57.87	0.388	57.84	0.419	84.88	30.58	0.437	65.46	
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	72.30	0.332	74.96	75.09	0.509	66.14	0.410	74.96	64.45	0.532	54.34	0.608	78.70	45.13	0.688	64.26	
olmOCR-7B	7B	66.44	0.409	84.05	56.12	0.489	64.73	0.431	84.05	53.27	0.531	54.50	0.537	84.05	33.13	0.580	61.89	
Qianfan-OCR	4B	59.61	0.314	72.06	38.19	0.362	54.99	0.369	70.27	31.56	0.418	53.84	0.457	64.61	42.58	0.467	56.15	
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	56.14	0.365	72.11	32.77	0.474	56.75	0.396	77.39	32.50	0.493	41.42	0.634	67.53	20.13	0.597	51.44	
DeepSeek-OCR	3B	55.81	0.362	87.60	16.03	0.497	55.54	0.409	89.47	18.07	0.503	19.52	0.604	12.36	6.59	0.580	43.62	
OCRFlux-3B	3B	33.34	0.460	3.41	42.59	0.398	29.91	0.477	2.59	34.83	0.396	22.42	0.567	1.39	22.58	0.456	28.56	
General-Purpose VLMs																		
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	87.43	0.153	85.96	91.61	0.262	80.61	0.205	85.51	76.83	0.312	82.07	0.201	90.48	75.82	0.320	83.37	
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	82.89	0.179	85.49	81.06	0.304	81.20	0.199	85.49	77.96	0.317	77.48	0.308	90.74	72.50	0.400	80.52	
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	80.85	0.178	82.84	77.50	0.300	82.71	0.191	85.76	81.45	0.350	76.92	0.270	89.68	68.12	0.378	80.16	
Gemini-3.1-Pro	—	80.03	0.260	89.94	76.11	0.367	79.92	0.269	89.14	77.56	0.366	80.39	0.248	79.67	86.25	0.344	80.11	
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	81.64	0.169	85.11	76.74	0.312	83.21	0.206	85.11	85.14	0.354	74.62	0.322	87.89	68.22	0.410	79.82	
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	80.29	0.145	85.51	69.90	0.269	80.10	0.179	85.51	72.67	0.307	77.08	0.228	86.84	67.24	0.352	79.16	
Kimi-K2.6	1T/32B	77.27	0.271	85.31	73.61	0.398	79.06	0.259	85.31	77.77	0.392	80.99	0.287	89.68	82.03	0.428	79.11	
Qwen3-VL-8B	8B	81.34	0.193	85.11	78.26	0.343	79.75	0.227	85.31	76.65	0.351	72.69	0.263	85.31	59.06	0.375	77.93	
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	62.46	0.147	12.14	89.98	0.277	86.15	0.152	85.51	88.12	0.285	83.54	0.223	90.48	82.41	0.350	77.38	
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	80.42	0.164	85.51	72.11	0.275	73.41	0.212	85.51	55.91	0.320	74.68	0.247	86.84	61.91	0.360	76.17	
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	74.81	0.257	84.97	65.12	0.411	74.23	0.269	85.96	63.64	0.411	70.46	0.367	89.19	58.84	0.462	73.17	
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	75.38	0.213	83.58	63.83	0.327	74.89	0.228	84.69	62.81	0.349	65.81	0.381	82.29	53.27	0.441	72.03	
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	70.38	0.273	74.75	63.66	0.393	67.32	0.283	68.28	62.03	0.424	66.25	0.416	88.85	51.48	0.473	67.98	
Step3-VL	10B	55.19	0.505	77.20	38.85	0.489	57.72	0.506	83.75	40.03	0.516	49.68	0.572	78.06	28.18	0.529	54.20	
MiniCPM-V-4.5	8B	54.04	0.445	70.51	36.07	0.517	56.84	0.454	79.47	36.43	0.506	44.73	0.584	65.91	26.71	0.588	51.87	
Pipeline / Multi-stage																		
Model		Clean	Digital	Real														
MinerU2.5-Pro	84.8	85.15	+0.4	73.69	-11.1													
GLM-OCR	83.4	79.67	-3.8	67.35	-16.1													
YouTu-Parsing	81.2	77.68	-3.5	70.28	-10.9													
MinerU2.5	81.4	79.53	-1.9	67.98	-13.4													
Group Avg.	74.9	73.66	-1.2	60.07	-14.8													
End-to-End Specialists																		
Model		Clean	Digital	Real														
FD-RL	83.8	83.83		74.82	-9.0													
Logics-Parsing-v2	82.5	79.74	-2.8	80.11	-2.4													
FireRed-OCR	82.5	80.60	-1.9	70.94	-11.5													
OCRVerse	79.3	77.96	-1.4	71.51	-7.8													
Group Avg.	69.3	67.08	-2.2	56.08	-13.2													
General-Purpose VLMs																		
Model		Clean	Digital	Real														
Qwen3.5-27B	87.4	80.61	-6.8	82.07	-5.4													
Qwen3.5-4B	82.9	81.20	-1.7	77.48	-5.4													
Qwen3.5-9B	80.8	82.71	+1.9	76.92	-3.9													
Gemini-3.1-Pro	80.0	79.92	-0.1	80.39	+0.4													
Group Avg.	75.0	75.81	+0.8	71.83	-3.1													

Table 14: Per-category three-track leaderboard on **Technical** (110 pages). Top: per-model Overall / TextEdit / FormulaCDM / TableTEDS / ROEdit per track and Avg₃, partitioned by architecture (same metric layout as Table 2). Bottom: per-architecture summary on Overall (Clean / Digital / Real, with Δ vs. Clean: $\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain), top-4 models per architecture; **Group Avg.** aggregates over the full set of models in each architecture.

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃
		Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																	
DotsMOCR	3B	73.56	0.161	47.96	88.80	0.268	69.12	0.174	39.40	85.39	0.286	53.28	0.303	28.51	61.64	0.355	65.32
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	69.15	0.188	33.96	92.28	0.307	66.77	0.219	35.40	86.77	0.332	57.66	0.331	31.76	74.31	0.385	64.53
YouTu-Parsing	2B	67.62	0.150	31.35	86.50	0.267	68.81	0.180	41.98	82.43	0.311	54.79	0.260	22.67	67.68	0.325	63.74
MinerU2.5	1.2B	70.13	0.128	32.71	90.49	0.260	64.00	0.178	29.38	80.41	0.281	53.66	0.309	26.97	64.91	0.356	62.60
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	64.41	0.243	28.28	89.27	0.376	62.91	0.305	39.09	80.17	0.430	51.45	0.395	27.83	66.06	0.488	59.59
GLM-OCR	0.9B	64.01	0.244	27.63	88.85	0.394	59.69	0.293	25.98	82.36	0.441	54.60	0.391	30.47	72.45	0.499	59.43
Dolphin-v2	3B	64.49	0.228	33.34	82.91	0.359	59.53	0.285	26.42	80.69	0.410	41.42	0.514	16.12	59.52	0.556	55.15
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	62.43	0.274	31.28	83.38	0.434	55.62	0.351	29.88	72.06	0.494	43.17	0.557	34.94	50.31	0.589	53.74
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	63.94	0.274	34.47	84.73	0.433	57.43	0.351	31.55	75.81	0.500	39.20	0.547	21.45	50.89	0.622	53.52
OpenOCR	0.1B	30.84	0.248	17.33	0.00	0.372	27.42	0.321	14.31	0.00	0.439	20.49	0.469	8.36	0.00	0.533	26.25
End-End Specialists																	
FD-RL	4B	73.31	0.146	41.53	92.98	0.283	73.11	0.164	44.02	91.76	0.301	64.14	0.253	42.97	74.77	0.336	70.19
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	69.89	0.187	36.82	91.57	0.309	72.66	0.203	47.89	90.43	0.329	64.69	0.265	37.98	82.57	0.351	69.08
OCRVerse	4B	72.09	0.168	41.71	91.31	0.288	71.59	0.191	42.34	91.54	0.323	60.52	0.320	39.61	73.96	0.403	68.07
FireRed-OCR	2B	70.46	0.163	38.23	89.50	0.275	68.53	0.185	35.71	88.33	0.304	57.50	0.290	28.79	72.76	0.353	65.50
dots.ocr	2.9B	70.05	0.216	43.63	88.15	0.370	68.44	0.257	46.88	84.12	0.388	53.59	0.356	29.72	66.66	0.430	64.03
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	66.64	0.159	27.40	88.45	0.253	64.42	0.189	26.07	86.08	0.281	47.47	0.373	17.02	62.74	0.373	59.51
HunyuanOCR	1B	62.04	0.273	31.43	82.04	0.352	60.54	0.267	31.65	76.69	0.355	47.58	0.410	29.76	53.98	0.425	56.72
Qianfan-OCR	4B	65.29	0.233	37.44	81.69	0.335	57.39	0.290	25.53	75.65	0.369	46.50	0.380	13.77	63.74	0.425	56.39
olmOCR-7B	7B	63.41	0.332	40.19	83.24	0.379	60.64	0.372	41.26	77.85	0.416	40.77	0.539	21.36	54.88	0.534	54.94
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	58.72	0.257	11.18	90.65	0.276	59.19	0.268	15.77	88.58	0.285	45.71	0.400	11.23	65.87	0.374	54.54
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	62.53	0.217	33.64	75.60	0.369	55.66	0.280	28.39	66.59	0.407	39.35	0.544	15.31	57.16	0.469	52.51
DeepSeek-OCR	3B	48.63	0.335	33.40	46.00	0.468	48.39	0.379	37.58	45.47	0.478	29.29	0.501	7.87	30.14	0.518	42.10
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	53.23	0.367	18.48	77.88	0.466	47.66	0.452	20.51	67.70	0.537	18.07	0.719	0.00	26.10	0.741	39.65
OCRFlux-3B	3B	45.53	0.419	25.33	53.19	0.317	38.15	0.450	16.82	42.62	0.302	30.31	0.537	10.86	33.74	0.377	38.00
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	71.78	0.134	36.89	91.82	0.259	74.46	0.138	44.62	92.61	0.267	69.88	0.205	41.81	88.37	0.308	72.04
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	75.67	0.148	51.51	90.31	0.266	73.84	0.169	46.89	91.56	0.295	63.45	0.283	35.09	83.56	0.356	70.99
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	72.81	0.164	43.34	91.52	0.280	72.72	0.151	42.94	90.34	0.283	66.59	0.188	34.46	84.09	0.313	70.71
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	69.93	0.147	33.65	90.84	0.274	70.08	0.153	35.70	89.88	0.279	68.16	0.217	39.92	86.22	0.321	69.39
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	71.31	0.188	42.38	90.32	0.294	71.82	0.218	48.39	88.83	0.331	64.76	0.256	33.90	85.99	0.360	69.30
Kimi-K2.6	1T/32B	69.99	0.224	37.70	94.68	0.398	69.87	0.251	44.22	90.44	0.421	67.29	0.306	45.34	87.08	0.466	69.05
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	68.90	0.142	38.51	82.39	0.256	67.12	0.183	41.51	78.18	0.296	66.05	0.228	43.70	77.23	0.315	67.36
Qwen3-VL-8B	8B	67.98	0.281	44.26	87.82	0.381	67.86	0.266	42.83	87.38	0.375	60.90	0.302	37.71	75.16	0.386	65.58
Gemini-3.1-Pro	—	64.96	0.204	33.02	82.25	0.290	65.43	0.194	31.85	83.82	0.279	65.82	0.176	30.07	85.02	0.241	65.40
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	70.56	0.234	45.72	89.37	0.374	71.19	0.246	50.46	87.69	0.384	53.50	0.350	21.94	73.59	0.435	65.08
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	69.30	0.302	51.19	86.93	0.386	67.04	0.303	43.52	87.88	0.397	57.88	0.376	34.56	76.72	0.442	64.74
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	66.30	0.251	39.94	84.12	0.383	66.94	0.267	46.11	81.43	0.402	56.20	0.387	39.11	68.19	0.460	63.15
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	67.84	0.301	46.82	86.78	0.412	64.83	0.305	41.18	83.82	0.439	47.67	0.473	31.96	58.33	0.512	60.11
Step3-VL	10B	57.99	0.376	35.76	75.78	0.419	60.78	0.342	40.57	75.96	0.422	49.08	0.448	28.19	63.90	0.501	55.95
MiniCPM-V-4.5	8B	60.54	0.234	25.83	79.24	0.309	56.31	0.238	13.36	79.31	0.329	40.73	0.433	8.61	56.93	0.408	52.53
Pipeline / Multi-stage																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
DotsMOCR	73.6	69.12 $\downarrow 4.4$	53.28 $\downarrow 20.3$														
MinerU2.5-Pro	69.2	66.77 $\downarrow 2.4$	57.66 $\downarrow 11.5$														
YouTu-Parsing	67.6	68.81 $\uparrow 1.2$	54.79 $\downarrow 12.8$														
MinerU2.5	70.1	64.00 $\downarrow 6.1$	53.66 $\downarrow 16.5$														
Group Avg.	63.1	59.13 $\downarrow 3.9$	46.97 $\downarrow 16.1$														
End-End Specialists																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
FD-RL	73.3	73.11 $\downarrow 0.2$	64.14 $\downarrow 9.2$														
Logics-Parsing-v2	69.9	72.66 $\uparrow 2.8$	64.69 $\downarrow 5.2$														
OCRVerse	72.1	71.59 $\downarrow 0.5$	60.52 $\downarrow 11.6$														
FireRed-OCR	70.5	68.53 $\downarrow 1.9$	57.50 $\downarrow 13.0$														
Group Avg.	63.0	60.45 $\downarrow 2.5$	46.11 $\downarrow 16.9$														
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	71.8	74.46 $\uparrow 2.7$	69.88 $\downarrow 1.9$														
Qwen3.5-4B	75.7	73.84 $\downarrow 1.8$	63.45 $\downarrow 12.2$														
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	72.8	72.72 $\downarrow 0.1$	66.59 $\downarrow 6.2$														
Qwen3.5-27B	69.9	70.08 $\uparrow 0.1$	68.16 $\downarrow 1.8$														
Group Avg.	68.4	68.02 $\downarrow 0.4$	59.86 $\downarrow 8.5$														

Table 15: Per-category three-track leaderboard on **Logistics** (120 pages). Top: per-model Overall / TextEdit / FormulaCDM / TableTEDS / ROEdit per track and Avg₃, partitioned by architecture (same metric layout as Table 2). Bottom: per-architecture summary on Overall (Clean / Digital / Real, with Δ vs. Clean: $\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain), top-4 models per architecture; **Group Avg.** aggregates over the full set of models in each architecture.

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃
		Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																	
DotsMOCR	3B	78.20	0.243	80.96	77.96	0.435	70.51	0.292	77.24	63.46	0.488	54.62	0.507	70.94	43.59	0.602	67.78
YouTu-Parsing	2B	68.08	0.374	71.28	70.34	0.553	67.15	0.411	76.38	66.12	0.599	52.68	0.533	60.47	50.87	0.648	62.64
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	68.54	0.329	66.36	72.11	0.548	66.36	0.393	67.79	70.61	0.596	52.85	0.514	52.22	57.73	0.646	62.58
GLM-OCR	0.9B	66.35	0.391	54.39	83.77	0.653	63.38	0.489	58.94	80.06	0.707	52.83	0.581	47.52	69.08	0.733	60.85
MinerU2.5	1.2B	69.39	0.307	70.12	68.74	0.567	59.39	0.348	54.38	58.58	0.596	50.11	0.530	53.59	49.77	0.676	59.63
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	64.59	0.428	60.22	76.38	0.631	60.20	0.512	57.94	73.84	0.690	49.13	0.598	52.41	54.82	0.718	57.97
Dolphin-v2	3B	49.73	0.608	59.17	50.83	0.705	58.05	0.551	71.54	57.70	0.691	28.55	0.761	25.78	35.94	0.769	45.44
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	46.69	0.521	36.40	55.76	0.697	47.24	0.519	39.65	53.99	0.726	33.91	0.687	18.85	51.53	0.793	42.61
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	48.54	0.553	48.82	52.13	0.711	46.09	0.557	40.98	52.98	0.727	30.75	0.723	15.20	49.39	0.791	41.79
OpenOCR	0.1B	34.43	0.519	55.21	0.00	0.697	31.70	0.534	48.43	0.09	0.720	27.15	0.634	44.82	0.00	0.776	31.09
End-to-End Specialists																	
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	71.04	0.290	70.27	71.83	0.489	68.28	0.326	68.40	69.07	0.538	62.76	0.439	64.41	67.76	0.607	67.36
FD-RL	4B	72.34	0.285	63.33	82.16	0.514	70.21	0.287	60.78	78.54	0.513	57.55	0.465	61.11	58.07	0.603	66.70
FireRed-OCR	2B	69.01	0.366	72.17	71.51	0.567	66.79	0.390	73.73	65.60	0.589	52.28	0.565	68.42	44.93	0.649	62.69
OCRVerse	4B	64.37	0.388	55.89	76.04	0.571	63.04	0.426	55.91	75.82	0.609	51.39	0.526	53.42	53.34	0.663	59.60
dots.ocr	2.9B	62.64	0.463	68.95	65.33	0.628	58.46	0.487	68.85	55.21	0.644	39.53	0.629	45.60	35.96	0.684	53.54
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	56.49	0.322	26.05	75.63	0.521	49.18	0.374	27.21	57.76	0.530	37.76	0.544	20.16	47.51	0.614	47.81
HunyuanOCR	1B	53.61	0.314	57.45	34.76	0.501	48.78	0.386	45.92	38.98	0.542	32.01	0.555	26.71	24.81	0.588	44.80
olmOCR-7B	7B	56.42	0.481	55.24	62.15	0.634	43.29	0.587	48.72	39.80	0.702	29.64	0.734	28.76	33.56	0.779	43.12
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	46.72	0.422	24.55	57.76	0.606	42.44	0.493	27.02	49.54	0.630	31.94	0.627	15.30	43.20	0.657	40.37
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	46.14	0.604	51.47	47.36	0.731	44.98	0.614	56.74	39.57	0.755	25.94	0.876	45.15	20.25	0.894	39.02
OCRFlux-3B	3B	43.00	0.485	34.86	42.64	0.332	40.91	0.531	37.83	37.98	0.386	27.37	0.653	28.72	18.71	0.527	37.09
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	44.82	0.503	53.13	31.67	0.662	40.89	0.582	51.13	29.69	0.718	21.88	0.764	25.07	17.01	0.772	35.86
Qianfan-OCR	4B	42.23	0.479	46.90	27.65	0.606	36.13	0.538	32.87	29.31	0.621	22.81	0.666	12.78	22.29	0.696	33.72
DeepSeek-OCR	3B	18.00	0.638	11.00	6.74	0.704	18.44	0.682	20.05	3.45	0.710	13.09	0.761	12.19	3.18	0.731	16.51
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	66.27	0.365	65.13	70.20	0.563	70.07	0.359	74.18	71.97	0.549	59.75	0.496	55.81	73.06	0.620	65.36
Gemini-3.1-Pro	—	64.28	0.409	60.60	73.18	0.606	66.53	0.424	63.86	78.13	0.602	65.10	0.447	68.78	71.23	0.576	65.30
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	65.37	0.411	64.33	72.86	0.594	69.25	0.350	75.19	67.59	0.550	57.27	0.509	57.18	65.56	0.620	63.96
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	59.53	0.389	52.83	64.64	0.593	64.97	0.380	63.18	69.68	0.577	55.28	0.459	40.86	70.90	0.600	59.93
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	56.66	0.368	41.34	65.43	0.574	66.68	0.375	59.35	78.22	0.576	54.98	0.472	46.43	65.68	0.616	59.44
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	56.83	0.520	61.81	60.66	0.674	69.12	0.434	76.55	74.26	0.621	51.74	0.623	61.05	56.43	0.719	59.23
Qwen3-VL-8B	8B	53.32	0.457	54.55	51.15	0.618	71.26	0.378	73.31	78.27	0.586	48.01	0.536	46.14	51.45	0.656	57.53
Kimi-K2.6	1T/32B	61.30	0.540	64.99	72.91	0.688	47.84	0.602	67.57	36.13	0.729	58.15	0.578	57.75	74.48	0.711	55.76
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	61.78	0.422	54.04	73.52	0.608	56.22	0.359	32.68	71.88	0.557	47.24	0.500	30.16	61.54	0.626	55.08
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	50.65	0.455	55.30	42.17	0.603	57.36	0.392	50.47	60.80	0.579	44.33	0.564	40.96	48.41	0.659	50.78
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	47.78	0.598	63.23	39.96	0.703	57.58	0.491	46.86	74.96	0.654	41.76	0.663	40.63	50.95	0.723	49.04
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	37.14	0.489	24.53	35.84	0.623	52.74	0.434	41.78	59.85	0.598	42.21	0.607	33.23	54.05	0.688	44.03
Step3-VL	10B	45.60	0.680	58.46	46.30	0.667	41.72	0.696	59.85	34.88	0.699	29.65	0.747	39.46	24.19	0.734	38.99
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	32.10	0.618	24.73	33.36	0.698	50.31	0.500	51.34	49.60	0.660	33.75	0.694	33.06	37.60	0.731	38.72
MiniCPM-V-4.5	8B	36.91	0.634	40.73	33.38	0.704	31.79	0.660	32.06	29.31	0.685	15.52	0.783	11.36	13.50	0.740	28.07
Pipeline / Multi-stage																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
DotsMOCR	78.2	70.51 $\downarrow 7.7$	54.62 $\downarrow 23.6$														
YouTu-Parsing	68.1	67.15 $\downarrow 0.9$	52.68 $\downarrow 15.4$														
MinerU2.5-Pro	68.5	66.36 $\downarrow 2.2$	52.85 $\downarrow 15.7$														
GLM-OCR	66.3	63.38 $\downarrow 3.0$	52.83 $\downarrow 13.5$														
Group Avg.	59.5	57.01 $\downarrow 2.4$	43.26 $\downarrow 16.2$														
End-to-End Specialists																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
Logics-Parsing-v2	71.0	68.28 $\downarrow 2.8$	62.76 $\downarrow 8.3$														
FD-RL	72.3	70.21 $\downarrow 2.1$	57.55 $\downarrow 14.8$														
FireRed-OCR	69.0	66.79 $\downarrow 2.2$	52.28 $\downarrow 16.7$														
OCRVerse	64.4	63.04 $\downarrow 1.3$	51.39 $\downarrow 13.0$														
Group Avg.	53.3	49.42 $\downarrow 3.9$	36.14 $\downarrow 17.2$														
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	66.3	70.07 $\uparrow 3.8$	59.75 $\downarrow 6.5$														
Gemini-3.1-Pro	64.3	66.53 $\uparrow 2.2$	65.10 $\uparrow 0.8$														
Qwen3.5-9B	65.4	69.25 $\uparrow 3.9$	57.27 $\downarrow 8.1$														
Qwen3.5-27B	59.5	64.97 $\uparrow 5.4$	55.28 $\downarrow 4.2$														
Group Avg.	53.0	58.23 $\uparrow 5.2$	46.98 $\downarrow 6.1$														

Table 16: Per-category three-track leaderboard on **Certificate** (104 pages). Top: per-model Overall / TextEdit / FormulaCDM / TableTEDS / ROEdit per track and Avg₃, partitioned by architecture (same metric layout as Table 2). Bottom: per-architecture summary on Overall (Clean / Digital / Real, with Δ vs. Clean: $\downarrow$ drop, $\uparrow$ gain), top-4 models per architecture; **Group Avg.** aggregates over the full set of models in each architecture.

Model	Params	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded					Avg ₃
		Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROE↓	
Pipeline / Multi-stage Specialists																	
MinerU2.5-Pro	1.2B	70.64	0.320	79.98	64.00	0.500	66.90	0.325	79.98	53.20	0.519	51.78	0.526	79.98	28.00	0.653	63.11
GLM-OCR	0.9B	71.68	0.390	79.96	74.05	0.586	64.21	0.417	80.08	54.31	0.622	47.36	0.553	60.16	37.19	0.701	61.08
DotsMOCR	3B	59.79	0.212	38.17	62.35	0.405	51.21	0.271	38.17	42.53	0.439	36.53	0.466	38.17	18.05	0.554	49.18
MinerU2.5	1.2B	53.95	0.286	52.41	38.07	0.490	51.37	0.301	39.65	44.55	0.535	40.98	0.528	52.07	23.69	0.654	48.77
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5	0.9B	45.44	0.486	40.22	44.70	0.620	52.91	0.429	39.17	62.43	0.610	36.09	0.572	40.68	24.76	0.705	44.81
YouTu-Parsing	2B	53.76	0.429	68.12	36.02	0.565	44.11	0.408	29.87	43.28	0.570	29.44	0.617	33.65	16.34	0.670	42.44
Dolphin-v2	3B	47.96	0.605	75.70	28.63	0.654	23.74	0.561	2.09	25.26	0.624	33.75	0.729	53.61	20.58	0.722	35.15
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B	3B	23.93	0.602	5.60	26.44	0.738	40.39	0.477	17.61	51.27	0.647	26.11	0.654	11.09	32.60	0.754	30.14
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B	1.2B	22.39	0.623	8.57	20.88	0.725	35.31	0.492	6.30	48.80	0.644	30.57	0.655	20.68	36.48	0.713	29.42
OpenOCR	0.1B	15.97	0.573	5.24	0.00	0.673	16.33	0.593	8.32	0.00	0.683	12.80	0.700	8.37	0.00	0.771	15.03
End-to-End Specialists																	
FD-RL	4B	76.83	0.238	77.51	76.81	0.450	75.29	0.256	77.51	73.97	0.464	54.52	0.452	77.51	31.22	0.569	68.88
OCRVerse	4B	71.81	0.321	75.80	71.75	0.510	69.95	0.369	72.55	74.18	0.539	49.64	0.512	77.51	22.56	0.637	63.80
olmOCR-2-7B	7B	70.21	0.299	76.05	64.48	0.467	70.66	0.331	76.98	68.09	0.484	44.92	0.547	76.05	13.45	0.591	61.93
Nanonets-OCR2	3B	67.97	0.350	75.73	63.13	0.518	62.14	0.379	74.35	49.91	0.528	43.76	0.595	73.83	16.99	0.625	57.96
FireRed-OCR	2B	62.99	0.380	65.02	61.95	0.493	61.44	0.421	62.03	64.42	0.536	40.50	0.577	67.95	11.26	0.648	54.98
Logics-Parsing-v2	4B	53.26	0.282	40.68	47.31	0.464	54.11	0.292	37.21	54.30	0.471	45.03	0.443	35.77	43.60	0.600	50.80
dots.ocr	2.9B	51.21	0.414	37.01	57.98	0.551	45.81	0.460	37.01	46.38	0.578	31.36	0.589	37.01	15.91	0.638	42.79
HunyuanOCR	1B	47.35	0.321	35.78	38.40	0.487	40.22	0.386	25.90	33.35	0.495	31.48	0.573	35.78	15.93	0.589	39.68
UniRec-0.1B	0.1B	41.19	0.635	55.97	31.10	0.717	43.47	0.566	40.93	46.08	0.686	26.19	0.873	55.02	10.85	0.879	36.95
OCRFlux-3B	3B	29.86	0.474	3.79	33.23	0.324	31.91	0.463	6.65	35.36	0.338	20.63	0.636	4.91	20.54	0.518	27.47
olmOCR-7B	7B	34.43	0.476	0.13	50.77	0.586	28.57	0.512	1.06	35.88	0.628	13.53	0.664	0.13	6.83	0.727	25.51
Qianfan-OCR	4B	24.57	0.497	6.04	17.34	0.594	25.87	0.526	16.22	13.94	0.603	17.62	0.680	6.69	14.19	0.659	22.69
DeepSeek-OCR-2	3B	20.54	0.563	1.85	16.09	0.636	18.25	0.582	0.73	12.25	0.660	12.74	0.776	7.64	8.21	0.759	17.18
DeepSeek-OCR	3B	10.68	0.696	0.00	1.64	0.655	10.52	0.719	1.72	1.78	0.696	6.90	0.801	0.00	0.85	0.710	9.37
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Gemini-3.1-Pro	—	63.41	0.353	55.15	70.36	0.501	53.73	0.368	28.06	69.93	0.498	54.54	0.446	77.22	31.00	0.559	57.23
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	35B/3B	57.97	0.463	71.84	48.32	0.602	67.51	0.373	69.11	70.76	0.532	44.39	0.491	41.43	40.88	0.618	56.62
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	122B/10B	61.21	0.430	78.41	48.22	0.575	60.46	0.322	37.62	76.00	0.500	43.94	0.472	26.50	52.49	0.586	55.20
Qwen3.5-4B	4B	46.43	0.500	36.16	53.11	0.619	71.17	0.405	75.31	78.70	0.562	45.26	0.575	46.68	46.65	0.673	54.29
Qwen3.5-8B	8B	48.10	0.422	33.34	53.12	0.565	59.68	0.350	37.93	76.09	0.509	37.53	0.518	37.62	26.75	0.599	48.44
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	397B/17B	49.56	0.409	36.62	52.91	0.554	52.15	0.335	18.10	71.83	0.515	34.58	0.451	10.13	38.69	0.574	45.43
Qwen3-VL-4B	4B	41.17	0.442	26.77	40.98	0.559	58.34	0.342	37.25	71.95	0.503	36.43	0.506	22.90	36.99	0.613	45.31
Qwen3-VL-2B	2B	29.51	0.461	7.59	27.03	0.563	62.93	0.382	70.37	56.58	0.528	38.54	0.576	40.97	32.24	0.631	43.66
Qwen3.5-2B	2B	43.36	0.555	39.33	46.23	0.649	52.46	0.439	36.20	65.03	0.590	34.05	0.592	21.72	39.66	0.658	43.29
Qwen3.5-9B	9B	40.45	0.444	16.01	49.70	0.575	52.92	0.347	17.12	76.37	0.518	34.81	0.501	13.09	41.41	0.598	42.73
Kimi-K2.6	1T/32B	54.80	0.535	75.68	42.25	0.652	20.29	0.574	0.00	18.23	0.683	46.46	0.587	49.48	48.58	0.656	40.52
Qwen3.5-27B	27B	35.09	0.423	4.52	43.02	0.571	37.97	0.338	0.00	47.72	0.521	46.13	0.480	41.62	44.73	0.587	39.73
Qwen3.5-0.8B	0.8B	30.59	0.548	12.09	34.49	0.625	48.37	0.417	35.40	51.39	0.543	32.63	0.614	21.72	37.56	0.608	37.20
Step3-VL	10B	17.89	0.651	0.00	18.79	0.636	17.91	0.705	0.00	24.26	0.668	11.03	0.763	0.00	9.36	0.717	15.61
MiniCPM-V-4.5	8B	17.35	0.683	0.00	20.40	0.714	17.12	0.674	0.00	18.78	0.730	10.31	0.796	0.00	10.57	0.693	14.93
Pipeline / Multi-stage																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
MinerU2.5-Pro	70.6	66.90 $\downarrow 3.7$	51.78 $\downarrow 18.9$														
GLM-OCR	71.7	64.21 $\downarrow 7.5$	47.36 $\downarrow 24.3$														
DotsMOCR	59.8	51.21 $\downarrow 8.6$	36.53 $\downarrow 23.3$														
MinerU2.5	54.0	51.37 $\downarrow 2.6$	40.98 $\downarrow 13.0$														
Group Avg.	46.6	44.65 $\downarrow 1.9$	34.54 $\downarrow 12.0$														
End-to-End Specialists																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
FD-RL	76.8	75.29 $\downarrow 1.5$	54.52 $\downarrow 22.3$														
OCRVerse	71.8	69.95 $\downarrow 1.9$	49.64 $\downarrow 22.2$														
olmOCR-2-7B	70.2	70.66 $\uparrow 0.5$	44.92 $\downarrow 25.3$														
Nanonets-OCR2	68.0	62.14 $\downarrow 5.8$	43.76 $\downarrow 24.2$														
Group Avg.	47.4	45.59 $\downarrow 1.8$	31.34 $\downarrow 16.0$														
General-Purpose VLMs																	
Model	Clean	Digital	Real														
Gemini-3.1-Pro	63.4	53.73 $\downarrow 9.7$	54.54 $\downarrow 8.9$														
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	58.0	67.51 $\uparrow 9.5$	44.39 $\downarrow 13.6$														
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B	61.2	60.46 $\downarrow 0.8$	43.94 $\downarrow 17.3$														
Qwen3.5-4B	46.4	71.17 $\uparrow 24.7$	45.26 $\downarrow 1.2$														
Group Avg.	42.5	48.87 $\uparrow 6.4$	36.71 $\downarrow 5.8$														

H Annotation Quality Automated Validation Details

This appendix expands the automated validation layer used in our annotation-quality pipeline. The check is run on the 1,475 official GT files in the ten formal domains (backup folders excluded), covering 89,510 annotated blocks. Its purpose is deliberately conservative: it does not assert that source-rendered extraction yields “zero noise”; instead, it exposes every file-level, schema-level, and source-alignment residual as a reproducible audit target.

Source extraction and normalization. For each GT file, we first pair it with the corresponding HTML source using `page_info.image_path`. We parse the HTML with BeautifulSoup, remove non-visible containers such as `script`, `style`, `noscript`, and `head`, and concatenate the remaining visible text with the raw HTML source. The raw-source fallback is important because some table cells, generated labels, or source-level anchors may be represented differently from the rendered text while still being directly verifiable in the source. Both GT content and source content are normalized by HTML-entity unescaping, Unicode NFKC normalization, lower-casing, whitespace removal, and zero-width character removal.

Annotation QA summary




Figure 19: Automated annotation-QA overview. (A) Deterministic file/schema gates: HTML pairing, relative image paths, digital-image pairing, sequential anno_id, reading-order legality, and required content fields. (B) Page-level source-alignment distribution using normalized BeautifulSoup/raw-source matching. Low-recall pages are review candidates, not automatically annotation errors.

Block content used by the checker. For text-like blocks (text_block, title, reference, header, footer, page_number, figure_caption, and code_txt), the checker reads the text field. For table, it parses the table HTML and compares the extracted cell text against the page source, while separately enforcing that table_caption is not embedded as a <caption> tag inside the table. For equation_isolated, the deterministic schema requirement is the presence of a latex field; source-text recall is reported only as a diagnostic because formula source/rendering often differs through Unicode math symbols, CSS-generated layout, or display-equation wrappers.

Alignment metric. We report two source-alignment scores. First, exact match checks whether the normalized GT string occurs as a substring of the normalized source string. Second, for robustness to harmless punctuation and markup differences, we compute an 8-character shingle recall,

$$R(g, s) = \frac{|\mathcal{S}_8(g) \cap \mathcal{S}_8(s)|}{|\mathcal{S}_8(g)|},$$

where g is the normalized GT block and s is the normalized source string. A block or page with $R \geq 0.95$ is treated as a near-exact source match, while $R < 0.80$ is placed in the manual audit queue rather than automatically counted as a GT error.

Match-rate statistics. All page-level structural gates pass on the official split: 1,475/1,475 GT files have paired HTML, valid relative image_path, paired digital images, valid anno_id sequences, and legal reading-order structure. Required content fields pass for 89,508/89,510 blocks (99.998%); the two flagged cases are empty/missing title text fields surfaced by the checker for manual review. At the page level, normalized source recall has mean 0.964, median 0.992, $p5 = 0.823$, and $p10 = 0.889$; 1,164/1,475 pages (78.9%) are near-exact matches at $R \geq 0.95$, while 53/1,475 pages (3.6%) fall below $R < 0.80$ and constitute the residual audit queue.

Annotation QA alignment details




Figure 20: Source-alignment breakdown. (C) Mean page-level source recall by domain, with the right-hand label showing the fraction of pages above $R \geq 0.95$. (D) Block-level near-exact source-match rate by annotation type. Non-formula text/table blocks reach 97.5% exact source match and 97.7% near-exact match; formula blocks are intentionally validated through the required `latex` field rather than treated as ordinary BeautifulSoup text.

Mismatch-case analysis. The residual mismatches are interpretable rather than random. The long tail is dominated by formula-heavy academic and education pages, where inline mathematical notation, superscripts/subscripts, minus-sign variants, and equation wrappers cause source text and rendered/GT strings to differ even when the annotation is source-verifiable. This is why `equation_isolated` is validated through the `latex` schema gate and reported separately in Figure 20. A second group consists of figure captions and source-generated labels whose visible rendering may be split across nested spans or CSS-generated content; these are still recoverable through source inspection but are less likely to appear as a single contiguous BeautifulSoup string. Finally, the two required-field flags are explicit manual-review items. We therefore use automated validation as a reproducible filter: deterministic constraints must pass, high source recall provides positive evidence of annotation fidelity, and low-recall cases are routed to human review rather than hidden.

I Source-Driven Evaluation Validity Details

This appendix synthesizes the evidence from the preceding appendices and asks a narrower question than whether synthetic HTML-rendered pages are indistinguishable from all real-world documents. They are not, and should not be treated as a replacement for authentic-document benchmarks such as OmniDocBench. Instead, the validity question for a source-driven benchmark is whether the rendered pages provide a *reasonable document-parsing evaluation substrate*: the image/layout statistics should lie near real benchmark pages rather than toy templates; the benchmark should preserve coarse model-family behavior without inheriting the saturated and noisy ordering of OmniDocBench; the three image tracks should impose ordered, interpretable stress; and the source-derived annotations should remain hidden from the model while providing traceable ground truth. Figure 21 summarizes the evidence.

Source-driven validity: four checks before using the scores



Figure 21: Source-driven evaluation validity evidence in a compact ledger style. (A) Clean PureDocBench pages overlap OmniDocBench in ordinary appearance statistics while intentionally shifting toward larger, denser layouts. (B) Workload and GT-traceability checks show heavier page/table burdens together with source-paired evaluator-side annotations. (C) OmniDocBench is used only as a weak behavioral anchor, not as gold standard; PureDocBench preserves coarse sanity while expanding score dynamic range. (D) Digital and real tracks produce ordered, architecture-dependent stress rather than random score noise.

Visual and layout sanity. We compare all official PureDocBench clean GT images ($n = 1,475$) with all OmniDocBench images ($n = 1,355$) using the normalized visual-statistics pipeline behind Figure 21. This area statistic is separate from the released-image-dimension median reported in Appendix B: here PureDocBench is deliberately larger and denser, with median page area 12.32MP vs. 3.74MP (Cohen's $d = 0.94$) and median horizontal text bands 50 vs. 28 ($d = 0.89$). At the same time, ordinary appearance metrics remain in the same regime rather than becoming synthetic outliers: brightness differs moderately (235.0 vs. 237.8, $d = -0.28$), contrast is close (35.1 vs. 40.0, $d = -0.13$), and edge density is nearly matched (0.105 vs. 0.095, $d = 0.06$). The intended visual shift is therefore not “synthetic toy” vs. real document, but real-document-like pages with higher scale and annotation density.

Content and layout burden. The annotation-side statistics show the same pattern. Relative to OmniDocBench, PureDocBench has median content length 3078 vs. 1151 characters per page (2.67 $\times$), P90 element count 129 vs. 38 (3.39 $\times$), median text length 1960 vs. 896 characters (2.19 $\times$), and a much higher table burden: table-page prevalence is 78.6% vs. 25.9%, and the mean table cells

per page is 102.7 vs. 21.0. Formula prevalence is intentionally similar rather than inflated (15.1% vs. 14.8% page rate in the benchmark-composition report), while OmniDocBench remains denser on formulas per formula page. This supports a complementary framing: PureDocBench increases page and table workload while not claiming to dominate OmniDocBench on STEM-formula density.

Visual-manifold context from dataset comparison. Appendix B provides the full CLIP embedding analysis, including reciprocal nearest-neighbor coverage and PCA hulls. We use that result here only as supporting context: PureDocBench clean pages lie near the real-benchmark visual manifold, while OmniDocBench retains authentic outlier modes that a controlled HTML-source benchmark does not claim to cover. The validity claim therefore does not depend on treating PureDocBench as a visual duplicate of OmniDocBench; it depends on the combination of real-document-like appearance, higher content burden, controlled stress, and traceable GT.

Weak-anchor behavioral sanity, not OmniDocBench-as-gold. Because Appendix A shows that OmniDocBench is both noisy and saturated, we do *not* use it as a ground-truth behavioral oracle. We use it only as a weak sanity anchor on the 12-model cohort with available paired scores. The expected result is coarse agreement plus substantial tie-breaking, not high correlation. This is exactly what we observe: OmniDocBench Overall vs. PureDocBench Clean has Spearman $\rho = 0.38$ and Kendall $\tau = 0.21$; pairwise order agreement is 40/66 (60.6%); top-5 overlap is 3/5. This weak but positive agreement is appropriate for a sanity anchor: the paired cohort is not inverted, while the low correlation is expected because PureDocBench is designed to break OmniDocBench’s saturated ties. The 12-model score range expands from 6.25 points on OmniDocBench to 22.85 on PureDocBench Clean (3.66 $\times$), and the standard deviation expands from 2.22 to 6.44 (2.90 $\times$). In other words, PureDocBench preserves recognizable high-level competence signals but deliberately restores ranking resolution where OmniDocBench has compressed the top cluster.

Table 17: Weak-anchor behavioral sanity on the 12-model OmniDocBench/PureDocBench paired cohort. OmniDocBench is treated as an external reference, not as gold standard.

Comparison	Spearman ρ	Pairwise agreement	Dynamic range
ODB Overall vs. PureDocBench Clean	0.38	60.6%	22.85 vs. 6.25
ODB Overall vs. PureDocBench Avg ₃	0.30	57.6%	24.41 vs. 6.25

Ordered stress across the three image tracks. Across all 40 models, mean Overall moves monotonically from Clean to Digital to Real: 66.25 $\rightarrow$ 62.92 $\rightarrow$ 54.45, corresponding to average drops of -3.33 and -11.80 points from Clean. The stress is ordered but not merely punitive: Clean-Digital rank correlation remains high (Spearman 0.96), Clean-Real correlation remains substantial (0.88), and only one model improves under Real capture (Gemini-3.1-Pro, Clean rank 18 $\rightarrow$ Real rank 1). Architecture-level drops are also interpretable: Pipeline specialists lose -4.90 / -14.21 points on Digital / Real, E2E specialists lose -4.62 / -13.48, while general VLMs lose only -0.99 / -8.52. This differential robustness is consistent with broader visual pretraining exposure, and would be invisible in a clean-only or saturated benchmark.

Source-derived annotations without source exposure. The model input is always the rendered image; HTML, CSS, source text, and generation metadata are never provided to evaluated systems. Source-driven GT is used only on the evaluator side to make annotations traceable and less dependent on manual OCR transcription. Appendix H independently checks this property: all 1,475/1,475 official GT files have paired HTML, valid relative image paths, paired digital images, legal reading order, and valid anno_id sequences; required content fields pass for 89,508/89,510 blocks; page-level source recall has mean 0.964, median 0.992, and only 53/1475 pages below $R < 0.80$. Thus the source is a hidden annotation anchor, not an input-channel shortcut.

Limitations. This validity evidence does not claim that source-rendered documents cover every authentic acquisition mode. OmniDocBench still contributes unique real-document outliers, especially handwritten notes, scanned newspapers, legacy scans, and STEM pages with heavier formula density. We therefore frame PureDocBench as complementary: it supplies source-traceable GT, balanced taxonomy, dense table/content workloads, and controlled clean/digital/real stress, while authentic benchmarks remain useful external references for modes outside the synthetic-source design space.