

WeVisDoc: From Coverage to Capability for Robust End-to-End Document Parsing

Hao Yu*, Kang Liu*, Linnan Zhao*, Jiabo Zhan*, Chong Sun†, Chen Li‡, Jing LYU
WeChat Vision, Tencent Inc.

Abstract

Document parsing converts document images into structured content and requires reliable performance across diverse layouts and acquisition conditions. Yet training corpora are biased toward common document types and clean digital pages, while expanding coverage alone does not specify how to address a parser’s remaining weaknesses. We present WeVisDoc, a two-stage data-centric framework for robust end-to-end document parsing. Stage I broadens semantic, structural, and appearance coverage through heterogeneous data and structure-preserving degradation synthesis. Stage II uses a held-out probe to measure the Stage I parser’s residual errors within fixed visual-structural clusters. These diagnostics guide targeted data construction and reallocation of the target-token budget. WeVisDoc-4B achieves an Overall score of 95.38 on OmniDocBench v1.6 and a mean Overall score of 75.54 across the three PureDocBench tracks, ranking first among the compared end-to-end parsers in all four settings. Compared with Stage I, Stage II improves Overall scores for the 2B and 4B models on both benchmarks, with larger gains on the degraded PureDocBench tracks, including a 4.03-point gain for the 4B model on the Real Degraded track.

 **Project Page:** <https://tencent.github.io/WeVisDoc>

 **GitHub:** <https://github.com/Tencent/WeVisDoc>

 **WeVisDoc-4B:** <https://huggingface.co/Tencent/WeVisDoc-4B>

 **WeVisDoc-2B:** <https://huggingface.co/Tencent/WeVisDoc-2B>




Figure 1 WeVisDoc-4B leads the compared end-to-end parsers across all four reported settings. Bars show scores on OmniDocBench v1.6 and the three PureDocBench robustness tracks; WeVisDoc-2B delivers top-tier end-to-end performance at half the parameter count.

*Equal contribution. †Project leader. ‡Corresponding author.

1 Introduction

Document parsing maps a document image to structured text while preserving textual content, element types, structural organization, and reading order. Modern parsers either decode an entire page directly [3, 20] or combine global layout understanding with regional recognition [12, 37]. Despite rapid architectural progress, reliable parsing remains challenging because documents vary simultaneously in language, layout, content density, element composition, and acquisition condition. These variations produce distinct failure modes that extend beyond character recognition. Benchmarks such as OmniDocBench [39] and PureDocBench [27] evaluate complementary aspects of this variation and underscore the importance of training-data composition alongside parser architecture.

Recent work has therefore devoted substantial effort to improving document training data. Large-scale curation, annotation repair, and controllable synthesis broaden linguistic and structural diversity [19, 23, 51, 53]. Degradation pipelines expand appearance variation for training [16], while source-aligned acquisition tracks measure robustness under such variation [27]. Model-aware strategies in document parsing and language-model pretraining use output divergence, proxy mixture search, or representation-space diagnostics to prioritize training data or optimize data mixtures [5, 7, 61]. A central challenge for refinement is to distinguish weaknesses that reflect missing data support from those associated with insufficient exposure to patterns already represented in the training distribution.

Expanding empirical support and increasing exposure to existing support are distinct interventions. Collecting, retrieving, or synthesizing records expands empirical support, whereas replaying or reweighting existing records changes their exposure. For autoregressive parsers, we characterize the supervised optimization budget in terms of loss-bearing target tokens rather than record count because records vary substantially in target length. Residual error alone is also insufficient evidence of a coverage deficit: it may arise from unreliable targets, low visual observability, decoding failure, or model limitations that additional nearby examples cannot resolve. Effective allocation therefore requires an explicit assessment of whether the relevant training support is absent.

We organize document-data scaling into two stages: coverage construction followed by capability-aware refinement. The first stage establishes broad training support; the second diagnoses residual weaknesses, validates targeted additions, and reallocates supervised exposure over the revised pool. We introduce WeVisDoc, a two-stage data-centric framework that implements this procedure for document parsing, with a separate target-token budget for each stage.

Stage I constructs broad, validated coverage from approximately 40 million records spanning supervision granularities, layouts, languages, data sources, and acquisition conditions. It combines heterogeneous supervision, executable page synthesis, and source-conditioned appearance generation using unified parsing targets and annotation-quality checks. Source-aware balancing limits domination by large corpora, while appearance variants expand visual coverage without being treated as additional semantic support. Stage II then refines the parser according to its residual weaknesses. A diagnostic probe, disjoint from training, hard-example mining, and final evaluation, measures residual parsing errors. Together with audits of existing support, these measurements guide the choice between adding validated data and increasing exposure to available records. Validated additions, Stage I replay, and separately audited hard examples form a refinement pool of approximately 5 million records, with all exposure counted against a fixed Stage II target-token budget.

We instantiate WeVisDoc from Qwen3-VL-Instruct [1] at 2B and 4B scales, keeping the backbone, output serialization, and autoregressive objective fixed within each scale. Figure 1 compares the resulting models with five representative end-to-end systems on OmniDocBench v1.6 and the three PureDocBench tracks. On OmniDocBench v1.6, the final 2B and 4B models achieve Overall scores of 95.06 and 95.38, respectively; their corresponding Avg₃ scores on PureDocBench are 73.86 and 75.54. The 4B model ranks first among the compared end-to-end parsers in all four settings, while the 2B model remains competitive with half as many parameters. The complete Stage II protocol improves both benchmarks at both scales, with larger gains on degraded pages than on clean pages. These stage-wise results are consistent with the benefit of the complete refinement protocol, particularly under degraded acquisition conditions; because Stage II combines several interventions, they do not identify the effect of residual-aware allocation in isolation.

2 Related Work

2.1 Parsing Architectures

Generative document parsers convert document images into structured text, providing a common output interface for text, tables, and formulas. Early image-to-sequence methods, including Donut [20], Pix2Struct [22], and Nougat [3], established this direction through document understanding, screenshot pretraining, and scientific page conversion. More recent systems improve how page information is represented and encoded: SmolDocling [36] uses DocTags to express content and structure, while DeepSeek-OCR [54] and DeepSeek-OCR 2 [55] explore visual context compression and semantic reordering of visual tokens, respectively.

Another line of work uses page layout to organize regional recognition. Dolphin [12] and MonkeyOCR [26] decompose parsing into structural analysis and content recognition, while MinerU2.5 [37] and PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 [5] combine page-level layout analysis with high-resolution regional processing. PaDoc [59] connects parallel regional decoding with shared full-page visual context. These approaches explore different ways to coordinate global structure and local recognition. WeVisDoc adopts end-to-end parsing and studies how training-data coverage and allocation improve a parser within the same backbone architecture at each model scale.

2.2 Data Coverage and Curation for Document Specialists

The coverage and quality of supervision shape which document patterns a specialist can learn. Vary [53] emphasizes dense document perception, including non-English content; mPLUG-DocOwl 1.5 [17] combines structural supervision with text localization across diverse visual domains; and dots.ocr [25] uses multilingual data to jointly learn layout, content, and relations. Together, these works highlight complementary dimensions of document supervision. Benchmarks such as OmniDocBench [39] make this diversity visible through evaluation across heterogeneous pages and element types.

Recent data-centric systems make corpus construction an explicit part of parser development. MinerU2.5-Pro [51] combines diversity-aware sampling with annotation verification and repair. DocHumming [23] and Infinity-Parser2 [19] broaden supervision through layout composition and controllable rendering, respectively, while Infinity-Parser [49] pairs a curated parsing corpus with layout-aware reinforcement learning. These efforts motivate broad, reliable coverage, but effective training also requires deciding which patterns need additional data or greater exposure. WeVisDoc connects these decisions through two stages: broad coverage construction followed by refinement guided by the trained parser’s remaining weaknesses.

2.3 Robustness to Document Degradation

Beyond content and layout diversity, document parsers must remain reliable under degradations introduced by scanning, photography, and reproduction. Document unwarping methods such as DewarpNet [6] and UVDoc [48] correct geometric distortions to recover a flat view before recognition. Data augmentation offers a complementary route: Augraphy [16] simulates artifacts from printing, scanning, and related processes to expose models to degraded document images during training.

Recent parsing studies evaluate how document degradation affects parsing quality. PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 [5] and DocHumming [23] cover geometric distortions and degradation in photographed or screen-mediated documents. PureDocBench [27] evaluates aligned clean and degraded views using a common source-derived target. For supervised parser training, degraded views provide valid supervision only when their content remains readable and consistent with the target. WeVisDoc incorporates degradation-based augmentation into Stage I coverage, validating degraded image-target pairs and controlling their training exposure to improve robustness while preserving semantic and structural supervision.

2.4 Model-Aware Data Allocation

Data selection and weighting seek to use finite training budgets more effectively. Curriculum learning [2] organizes exposure by difficulty, while DoReMi [57] and Nemotron-CLIMB [7] use proxy models to optimize domain or cluster mixtures. Rho-1 [28] instead selects tokens according to excess loss relative to a reference

model. At the sample level, Core-Set [43], JTT [29], and LESS [56] prioritize representation coverage, initial-model errors, and gradient similarity to target examples, respectively. These methods provide complementary ways to decide where training effort should be spent.

Document-specific methods increasingly connect such decisions to diagnosed parsing weaknesses. Uncertainty-Aware Cluster Sampling [5] uses stochastic-output divergence to allocate samples across visual clusters. MinerU2.5-Pro [51] and PaddleOCR-VL-1.6 [61] combine data grouping and model feedback with targeted data expansion or annotation repair, while HunyuanOCR-1.5 [24] turns long-tail weaknesses into data-construction requirements. Training feedback can also shape optimization directly: Infinity-Parser [49] and FD-RL [65] use reinforcement learning with document-specific rewards. Together, these approaches motivate connecting model diagnosis to both data construction and subsequent training.

WeVisDoc combines broad coverage with model-aware refinement in two-stage supervised training. Stage I trains the parser on diverse document content, structures, and degradations. Stage II uses the resulting model’s remaining weaknesses to guide further data construction and training. We measure page and component errors against ground-truth targets on a diagnostic probe disjoint from training, hard-example mining, and final evaluation, and aggregate them over representation-space groups. Combined with checks on existing data coverage, these signals guide targeted additions and exposure allocation under a fixed budget of supervised output tokens. Pool expansion and exposure reallocation are therefore separate interventions in supervised model training. Within each model scale, training updates model parameters while preserving the backbone architecture, output serialization, and autoregressive objective.

3 Method

Our method first builds broad data coverage, then adds data and adjusts training to address remaining parsing errors. Section 3.1 defines the task and training objective; Sections 3.2 and 3.3 describe the two stages, and Section 3.4 gives the experimental configuration.

3.1 Task Formulation and Method Overview

Unified document parsing. Document parsing converts document images into readable text while preserving their structure and reading order. For record i , the input image x_i may contain a complete page, a text crop, a mixed-content region, an isolated formula, or a table. Its target y_i represents the visible content in reading order: text uses Markdown, formulas use LaTeX, and tables use HTML. Full pages and mixed-content regions combine these representations in one sequence; crops use the corresponding format for the content they contain.

A parser with parameters θ models the target sequence $y_i = (y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,T_i})$ autoregressively:

$$p_{\theta}(y_i | x_i) = \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} p_{\theta}(y_{i,t} | x_i, y_{i,<t}). \quad (1)$$

where T_i is the target length, t indexes its tokens, and $y_{i,<t}$ denotes the preceding tokens. The same parser and output formats apply to pages, regions, and components. During evaluation, the target is represented as a decoded, normalized string.

Supervision and training exposure. Let $m_{i,t} \in \{0,1\}$ indicate whether target position t contributes to training. The effective target length L_i and summed negative log-likelihood $\ell_i(\theta)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} L_i &= \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} m_{i,t} > 0, \\ \ell_i(\theta) &= - \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} m_{i,t} \log p_{\theta}(y_{i,t} | x_i, y_{i,<t}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Only target tokens included in the loss count toward L_i ; input tokens, padding, and discarded target positions do not. For a record-sampling distribution q , where $q(i)$ is the probability of drawing record i , the training

objective, normalized by supervised target length, is

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta; q) = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{i \sim q}[\ell_i(\theta)]}{\mathbb{E}_{i \sim q}[L_i]}. \quad (3)$$

This defines loss per supervised token rather than an equal average of per-record losses. Long pages contribute more supervised tokens per sampled record than short components, so pool size and record-sampling probability do not directly determine training exposure. Section 3.2.1 describes how desired token shares are converted into record-sampling probabilities.

From coverage to capability. Starting from pretrained parameters θ_0 , Stage I produces checkpoint θ_1 by sampling from distribution q_1 under a supervised-token budget B_1 . It establishes broad parsing capability across content, layouts, languages, and acquisition conditions, with appearance augmentation adding visual variation while keeping the content readable (Section 3.2).

Stage II diagnoses the remaining errors of θ_1 , separates annotation errors from verified model errors, and adds supervision for insufficiently covered patterns. It then trains under a revised distribution q_2 and token budget B_2 to obtain θ_2 . The revised mixture assigns more training tokens to examples with verified model errors while retaining Stage I examples to reduce forgetting. Sections 3.3.1–3.3.4 describe verification, diagnosis, targeted additions, and rebalancing. Both stages use Equation 3; Stage II freezes the visual encoder and updates the language model (Section 3.4).

3.2 Stage I: Broad-Coverage Data Construction

Stage I builds a pool of approximately 40 million records by combining data sources, converting annotations, filtering low-quality data, and generating new examples. *Supervision conversion* turns source annotations into training pairs for complete pages, regions, or components (Section 3.2.1). Coverage spans document domains, layouts, output structures, languages, and acquisition conditions, with these attributes tracked separately. Figure 2 summarizes the construction process.

3.2.1 Data Sources and Coverage

Diverse data sources. The corpus combines open-source datasets, in-house collections, targeted web and PDF crawling, and generated documents. Public datasets provide broad OCR coverage and reusable annotations for articles, books, forms, receipts, tables, and formulas. In-house collections add production documents and acquisition conditions underrepresented in benchmarks. Targeted crawling adds examples from underrepresented domains and patterns, including educational material, newspapers, handwriting, and mixed-language pages.

Real documents preserve the relationships among content, layout, fonts, and visual effects introduced during capture or scanning. Synthetic data systematically vary structures that are rare in collected sources. Source information keeps collected and synthetic data separately traceable for analysis. Appearance variants remain linked to their source page, separating visual augmentation from new document content.

Source and generation metadata support split construction, deduplication (removing or grouping repeated content), source-aware sampling, and error analysis.

Page, region, and component supervision. The corpus includes complete pages, pure-text crops, mixed-content regions, isolated tables, and isolated formulas. Full pages teach global reading order and relations among text, tables, formulas, and captions. Text crops preserve recognition resolution for small or densely packed characters; mixed-content regions retain local interactions, such as formulas with explanations or figures with captions.

Tables and formulas receive dedicated supervision for their structural requirements. HTML tables encode cell content and structure, including row and column spans. LaTeX formulas encode symbols, operator hierarchy, and grouping. Component records provide more training on these structures.

Supervision conversion uses each source’s most informative reliable annotation. Verified page elements and reading order yield a Markdown target and, where valid, corresponding text, mixed-region, table, or formula




Figure 2 Stage I data construction. Collected sources are normalized through multi-model labeling, while general synthesis generates exact semantic and structural targets. Both data sources enter a shared clean pool. Appearance augmentation is then applied according to the source to form the Stage I mixture.

crops. Sources containing only table or formula annotations use the corresponding component representation without invented page context. Crops receive only visible-content targets, normalized consistently with their page-level counterparts. Source and conversion identifiers link derived records, keeping page, region, and component targets consistent and limiting repeated exposure from one page.

Before training-specific sampling, roughly 40% of records provide full-page supervision, 25% text or mixed regions, 25% isolated tables, and 10% isolated formulas.

Diverse document layouts. Layout coverage includes single- and multi-column pages, changing column counts, sidebars, floating elements, footnotes, and forms with field-based reading order. Handwritten notes, posters, and presentation material add layouts without a regular grid. These examples require local grouping and reading-order inference beyond a fixed top-to-bottom template.

Density and scale vary within each layout family, from sparse title pages to dense academic or legal documents. Tables may occupy a full page or be embedded in prose. Layout labels and component statistics support coverage analysis and batching, while all inputs retain the shared output representation.

Image sources and languages. Acquisition coverage spans born-digital pages, scans, photographs, screenshots, and screen recaptures, introducing variations in geometry, illumination, resolution, noise, and compression. Languages include Simplified Chinese, English, Traditional Chinese, and mixed-language pages.

Quality checks remove corrupt or unreadable images and route uncertain targets to annotation review. Image hashes detect exact duplicates; normalized visual embeddings identify near duplicates under source-aware thresholds. Deduplication precedes supervision conversion, and derived views retain their duplicate-group identity so repeated content does not overstate data coverage or dominate training.

These attributes guide source-aware sampling and later residual analysis.

Source allocation and token accounting. To retain source diversity without letting large sources dominate, we balance sources using their available supervised-token counts. Let s index data sources and $\mathcal{I}_s$ contain the eligible record indices from source s after filtering and duplicate control. Using L_i from Section 3.1, we define

$$M_s = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_s} L_i, \quad \omega_s = \frac{M_s^\rho}{\sum_{s'} M_{s'}^\rho}, \quad 0 \leq \rho \leq 1. \quad (4)$$

where M_s counts the supervised tokens in eligible records once, and ω_s is the desired source token share. The index s' runs over nonempty sources. Setting $\rho = 1$ follows available token counts; $\rho = 0$ gives equal shares; intermediate values reduce the influence of large sources.

Token shares require length correction to become record-sampling probabilities. A stream is a subset sampled for a particular role, such as clean pages or hard examples. For G nonempty streams indexed by g , with h a summation index, let $q^{(g)}(i)$ be the within-stream record probability, $\bar{L}_g = \sum_i q^{(g)}(i) L_i$ its mean target length, and $v_g \geq 0$ its desired token share, with $\sum_g v_g = 1$. The resulting record-sampling distribution is

$$q(i) = \sum_{g=1}^G \alpha_g q^{(g)}(i), \quad \alpha_g = \frac{v_g / \bar{L}_g}{\sum_{h=1}^G v_h / \bar{L}_h}. \quad (5)$$

The stream-selection probability α_g yields expected token share $\alpha_g \bar{L}_g / \sum_{h=1}^G \alpha_h \bar{L}_h = v_g$. Thus a stream of shorter targets requires more record draws to supply the same token share.

For source balancing, stream g corresponds to source s , with $v_g = \omega_s$; the resulting sampler is q_{clean} . Records have one sampling role per mixture. Duplicate-group caps limit repeated exposure, and actual token shares are monitored against planned shares.

3.2.2 Unified Expert Annotation and Difficulty Assessment

The Stage I pool combines converted source labels with model-generated annotation. Both are mapped to common element categories and representations. Categories identify content such as text, headings, tables, and formulas; page and region instead describe how much of a document the input contains. Text symbols, whitespace, and equivalent markup are normalized consistently, with shared HTML-table, LaTeX-formula, and reading-order Markdown conventions.

When source labels are incomplete, inconsistent, or unavailable, we obtain candidate targets from three expert systems. The expert parsers are MinerU2.5-Pro [51], PaddleOCR-VL-1.6 [61], and dots.mocr [63]. The multi-model labeling branch in Figure 2 shows how normalized agreement determines whether a target enters Stage I directly, requires review, or becomes a difficult candidate for Stage II.

Multi-model joint annotation and difficulty control. Expert outputs first undergo common normalization and representation-specific syntax checks. Let m, n index expert parsers and $\tilde{y}_i^{(m)}, \tilde{y}_i^{(n)}$ be their normalized predictions for image x_i : candidate annotations for y_i , not verified references. Their normalized edit distance (NED) is

$$d_i^{(m,n)} = \frac{\text{ED}(\tilde{y}_i^{(m)}, \tilde{y}_i^{(n)})}{\max\{1, |\tilde{y}_i^{(m)}|, |\tilde{y}_i^{(n)}|\}}. \quad (6)$$

Here ED is character-level Levenshtein distance and $|\cdot|$ counts characters. High-confidence annotation requires predictions from all three experts, with every pair's NED below the annotation-agreement threshold δ_{ann} (ann denotes annotation).

Agreement is combined with HTML/LaTeX parseability and structural checks. Converted source ground truth remains preferred when valid; otherwise a valid representative of agreeing expert outputs is selected.

If two experts agree and the third differs, the agreed output requires image-based review before inclusion in training. If all three differ, the record is withheld from ordinary Stage I supervision and reviewed by a

stronger multimodal model and human reviewers for possible Stage II use. Missing predictions or unresolved disagreements likewise require review: agreement alone does not establish correctness.

Confidence concerns target reliability; difficulty concerns visible content, characterized by structural complexity, component density, and expert disagreement. Reliable records are stratified into Easy, Medium, and Hard levels according to these attributes; the strata guide Stage I sampling and Stage II hard-example mining. Corrupt images, invalid markup, incorrect reading order, severe repetition, and duplicates are filtered or reviewed. Hashes, visual embeddings, recognized content, and layout support duplicate control. Unresolved image–target disagreements enter the audit in Section 3.3.1.

3.2.3 Broad-Coverage Data Synthesis

Broad-coverage synthesis creates executable page programs—structured specifications that produce both a page image and its target—for combinations rarely found in collected data. Content and structure are generated before appearance augmentation in Section 3.2.4. Related work also uses compositional synthesis for controllable full-page supervision [23].

Compositional document programs. A page program specifies content dependencies, language, layout, reading order, elements, and visual style. Its source and random state permit regeneration. Joint semantic and rendering constraints require consistent table structure, formulas compatible with their explanations, and visible content.

Source and structural metadata identify underrepresented combinations after duplicate control. The annotation review in Section 3.2.2 identifies uncertain targets, while generator-family limits prevent a few templates from dominating.

Programs establish semantic relations before layout: claims connect to evidence, line items to totals, and concepts to equations. These relations determine headings, tables, caption attachment, and cross-region reading order. Content and style vary within the resulting constraints.

Dual compilation from semantic HTML. Semantic HTML is the executable intermediate representation. Each block becomes a Document Object Model (DOM) node with an element type and unique identifier; CSS controls its visual layout. One compilation path renders the image and node geometry, while another traverses the same tree to produce element labels, reading-order Markdown, HTML tables, and source LaTeX. Shared identifiers align image regions and structured targets, yielding exact supervision from the generating source.

Generated pages undergo the same normalization, validation, and duplicate control as collected data. Failed rendering, clipped content, invalid tables or formulas, and unreadable text are rejected. Complexity and expert disagreement characterize difficulty, with program-level caps preserving diversity. Figure 3 shows representative outputs.

3.2.4 Appearance Degradation and Augmentation

Appearance augmentation follows source-specific acquisition paths: born-digital pages may be resized or recaptured, paper documents printed or scanned, and historical material affected by aging. Applied to collected pages and the clean synthesis in Section 3.2.3, it expands acquisition coverage while retaining valid semantic targets. We group compatible degradation operators by acquisition path into operator families, each specifying the operation order and parameter ranges. This organization draws on document-image augmentation and source-aware robustness comparisons [16, 27].

An acquisition scenario combines compatible operator families, their parameters, and their physical order. For example, a photocopied photograph passes through paper and ink formation, device reproduction, and camera capture. Source media constrain valid paths; content density, symbol size, formula strokes, and table-rule width constrain severity.

A transformed view retains its source target only while all supervised content remains visible and readable. Views that lose content are rejected or assigned visible-content crop targets following Section 3.2.1.



Figure 3 Representative pages produced by general data synthesis. The gallery spans a structured technical report, an equation-rich educational page, and a long-form scholarly page, illustrating joint variation in semantic context, element composition, page density, typography, and layout organization.

Paper, copying, and transmission effects. Paper texture, aging, stains, and ink fading or bleeding simulate changes to the paper and print. Printing, photocopying, and scanning introduce halftone patterns, blur, stripes, and contrast loss, while digital transmission adds resizing, re-encoding, and compression artifacts. Effects are scaled to resolution and stroke width, preserving relevant differences among text, formulas, and table rules.

Physical acquisition. Surface maps and constrained meshes vary perspective, page curvature, and creases, following document-unwarping representations [6, 48]. Illumination follows the sampled geometry to produce spatially consistent shadows and exposure variation. Screen recapture models the display-to-camera sampling chain, producing moiré and colored edges; camera effects also include motion or depth-dependent blur.

Difficulty and observability control. Content retention and local legibility determine admission; expert disagreement indicates difficulty but does not establish target validity. Variants retain their clean page’s duplicate-group identity, so semantic-support statistics count the source once while sampling controls variant exposure. Figure 4 illustrates the transformations.

Stage I combines the clean-data sampler q_{clean} from Section 3.2.1 with validated appearance variants. The degraded stream samples a clean record and a transformation that preserves its target. The desired degraded-token share is selected by internal validation; Equation 5 converts the clean and degraded shares into record-selection probabilities, defining q_1 . Duplicate-group caps limit repeated views, and actual token exposure is monitored separately from record draws.

The resulting parser θ_1 supports the Stage II diagnosis of whether remaining weaknesses require replay, new collection, or targeted synthesis.

3.3 Stage II: Capability Diagnosis and Targeted Refinement

Stage II constructs an approximately 5M-record refinement pool around the weaknesses of θ_1 . *Residual error* is parsing error remaining after Stage I; *replay* is continued training on high-quality Stage I examples. We call a record high-error when its page- or component-level error exceeds the review threshold; because this may reflect annotation errors or unreadable content, refinement verifies target reliability before treating it as a hard example.




Figure 4 Representative appearance transformations. Each cell shows the source page on the left and the transformed view on the right: (a–b) paper, copying, and transmission effects, and (c–d) physical acquisition effects.

Diagnosis combines document-level errors with component metrics that reveal failures occupying little page area. The photographed contract in Figure 12(b), for example, contains formulas missing from the Stage I output despite readable surrounding text. Record-level mining selects verified hard examples; group-level analysis identifies recurring errors with insufficient data coverage. Figure 5 links diagnosis (Section 3.3.2) to targeted construction (Section 3.3.3) and allocation.

Each model scale is diagnosed with its frozen Stage I checkpoint. Hard examples come from training-pool mining or separately audited annotation candidates. A held-out allocation probe, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{probe}}$, estimates group-level weaknesses and is excluded from training, mining, and final benchmark evaluation. Pages and derived crops stay within the same content split. Targets must pass image–target correspondence, format, and structural checks; Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 describe verification and group-level aggregation.

3.3.1 Hard-Example Mining and Verification

Document-level mining. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\text{mine}}$ be the analysis sample from the Stage I training pool, disjoint in content from $\mathcal{D}_{\text{probe}}$. Annotation candidates withheld in Section 3.2.2 follow a separate verification queue; they are not Stage I training records. Both routes exclude probe and benchmark content.

For a full-page image x_i , let $\hat{y}_i$ be the Stage I prediction and y_i the reliable full-page target. Both are reading-order Markdown strings containing text, HTML tables, and LaTeX formulas. Their complete-page error is $d_{i,\text{page}} = \text{NED}(\hat{y}_i, y_i)$, using Equation 6. This compares complete serialized content and reading order, not an average of element scores. The score selects review candidates rather than certifying hard examples, and scores are recomputed for each Stage I checkpoint.

The representation in Section 3.3.2 groups related failures for review. Training-pool scores select hard examples; held-out probe errors determine allocation across document groups.

Component-level mining. Whole-page NED includes tables and formulas, but a small failed region can




Figure 5 Stage II data construction. A disjoint allocation probe determines cluster-level residual priorities, while training-pool mining supplies a separately audited hard-example stream. Verified retrieval and targeted page-program synthesis then add examples for underrepresented patterns before training tokens are allocated according to residual errors under a fixed budget.

contribute little to the page score. We therefore examine text, tables, and formulas separately; figures and charts are excluded from these component metrics. For record i , let c denote a component type and let $y_{i,c}$ and $\hat{y}_{i,c}$ denote its reference and predicted content. The corresponding error is

$$e_{i,c} = \begin{cases} \text{NED}(\hat{y}_{i,c}, y_{i,c}), & c = \text{text}, \\ 1 - \text{TEDS}_{[0,1]}(\hat{y}_{i,c}, y_{i,c}), & c = \text{table}, \\ 1 - \text{CDM}_{[0,1]}(\hat{y}_{i,c}, y_{i,c}), & c = \text{formula}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The subscript $[0, 1]$ indicates a similarity score expressed on the unit scale. Tree-Edit-Distance-based Similarity (TEDS) [64] measures table content and tree structure, while Character Detection Matching (CDM) [50] compares rendered formulas through character detection and matching. Subtracting either similarity from one makes all three metrics increase with error. Component correspondence and aggregation follow a consistent type-specific evaluation protocol. Reading-order consistency is evaluated with the serialized page target, while Equation 7 characterizes localized errors for text, tables, and formulas.

Separate page and component thresholds retrieve review candidates; they do not certify target correctness. For allocation, $e_i(\theta_1) \in [0, 1]$ summarizes record i 's available page and component errors under checkpoint θ_1 . The scoring protocol is fixed across groups and applied to the held-out probe. Component channels remain available separately to reveal weaknesses hidden by the combined score.

High-error audit. High-error candidates are checked for three other possible causes of error. Incorrect targets may omit content, misorder regions, or contain invalid markup. OCR-EDR's rendering-aware diagnosis and repair uses DocEDR to compare the image, editable target, and rendered output [62]; repairs must remain structurally valid and visually consistent. Repetitive or outputs that fail to stop receive a decoding-failure label. Content that cannot be read because of cropping, blur, occlusion, or low resolution is excluded from hard-example training but may still help assess robustness.

Human reviewers and a stronger multimodal model verify difficult image–target pairs and structured outputs.

The model supplies a second interpretation, not automatic ground truth; unresolved disagreements require review or exclusion. Accepted records retain scores, checkpoint, error type, verification route, and target revision.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the verified hard set. A record is included only if the mining checkpoint still makes substantial errors against the final reliable target. If repair removes the apparent error, the record may enter ordinary supervision but not hard-example oversampling. Duplicate and exposure caps limit repeated templates and decoding failures.

3.3.2 Visual-Structural Clustering and Coverage Diagnosis

Clustering groups Stage I records by visual structure and component composition to reveal recurring failures. These groups are described after fitting using content, language, layout, and acquisition metadata.

Visual-structural representation. Each clustering record is a complete page or supervised region, with features describing its actual input content. Let h_i be the unit-length embedding of x_i from a frozen SigLIP2 encoder [47]. Its clustering feature is

$$z_i = \left[\text{PCA}(h_i); \eta_{\text{str}} \tilde{b}_i \right]. \quad (8)$$

Here PCA denotes principal component analysis, which reduces the visual embedding dimension; brackets and the semicolon denote concatenation. The normalized metadata vector $\tilde{b}_i$ describes component composition, content density, language, layout, acquisition condition, and target length. The subscript str denotes structural metadata, whose weight $\eta_{\text{str}} \geq 0$ controls its contribution relative to the image embedding.

The transform is fitted on a Stage I dataset after deduplication; records retain input-granularity metadata and source-page links. A cluster center is the mean feature of its fitting records. Features are grouped by squared distance to centers, with groups split further when their features vary widely. After fitting, clusters are indexed by k and their centers and transform are frozen. Training, probe, and new records are assigned to the nearest center without refitting.

Coverage and residual diagnosis. Before targeted additions, p_k^{rec} denotes the fraction of deduplicated fitting records assigned to cluster k ; here, a record is a sampling unit that may be a page or a derived crop. Coverage priority combines the negative logarithm of the cluster’s record fraction with its within-cluster feature dispersion. Small or diffuse clusters are flagged for coverage review, while residual error is measured separately on reliable probe records.

Errors from the held-out allocation probe provide complementary evidence. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\text{probe},k}$ contain the probe records assigned to cluster k whose image–target pairs pass the reliability checks in Section 3.3.1. Their record errors $e_i(\theta_1)$ are defined in that section. Let $w_i > 0$ be the fixed evaluation weight of record i . Equal weights summarize the observed probe; sampling-correction weights instead summarize a specified reference population. Let $\bar{R}$ denote the weighted mean error over all reliable probe records. For a nonempty group, its raw and stabilized residuals are

$$R_k = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{probe},k}} w_i e_i(\theta_1)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{probe},k}} w_i}, \quad (9)$$

$$R_k^{\text{sh}} = \gamma_k R_k + (1 - \gamma_k) \bar{R}.$$

The superscript sh denotes shrinkage toward the pooled mean. The support coefficient is $\gamma_k = n_k^{\text{eff}} / (n_k^{\text{eff}} + \lambda_{\text{sh}})$, where $\lambda_{\text{sh}} > 0$ controls pooling strength and n_k^{eff} is the effective (eff) probe count: the square of the sum of weights divided by the sum of squared weights within the group. With equal weights it is simply the record count. Small groups rely more heavily on the pooled estimate; empty groups use $\bar{R}$ as a prior, not as an observed group-specific error. At least one reliable probe record is required.

Let g_k be the stabilized residual after subtracting its across-cluster mean, dividing by its across-cluster standard deviation with a positive numerical floor, and clipping to a fixed symmetric interval. A positive value indicates above-average estimated error. For a group without local probe evidence, this value reflects the pooled prior rather than a measured parsing weakness. Applying the same aggregation and stabilization separately to each component channel reveals concentrated text, table, or formula errors. Let D_k^{elem} be the

largest positive standardized component residual, or zero when none is positive; elem denotes element-level error. Only channels with reliable probe support are used; prior-based estimates are distinguished from locally observed failures.

Priorities for data review combine standardized coverage priority, overall residual g_k , and component residual D_k^{elem} through a nonnegative weighted sum. The ranking guides review rather than automatic inclusion in training. New data require an audited failure pattern and insufficient existing supervision; groups with enough data but persistent errors may instead need more training. Rare groups without local probe evidence remain coverage-audit candidates.

Representative failures turn group priorities into data requests, such as Chinese mathematical text, nested tables, or cross-region reading relations. Requests are met through real-data retrieval or targeted synthesis (Section 3.3.3), with additions passing supervision, reliability, and duplicate checks before reassignment. Figure 6 shows two example clusters.




Figure 6 Representative groups obtained by global unsupervised clustering. Handwritten pages share ruled-paper texture, stroke organization, and free-form annotation patterns, whereas colorful textbooks are grouped by section frames, worked examples, exercise blocks, diagrams, and illustrated explanations.

3.3.3 Residual-Driven Targeted Data Synthesis

Targeted synthesis generates examples for verified requests from Section 3.3.2 using the page-program family in Section 3.2.3. It focuses on structures the model still parses poorly rather than broad coverage.

Requests specify failed element relations, layouts, or language combinations. Candidates are rendered, validated, and assigned using the frozen representation and cluster centers from Section 3.3.2; after rendering, each candidate is re-encoded and assigned to the nearest frozen cluster center. Priority guides construction, while content and style variation preserve diversity. When the generator cannot meet a request, new real data or an extended generator is needed, with the same validation checks.

Page programs for difficult element families. Formula programs combine inline notation, display equations, derivations, piecewise expressions, and explanations with consistent variable meanings, including Chinese mathematical text. Table programs vary borders, nested headers, merged cells, and mixed cell content.

Cross-element programs connect captions, notes, references, and equations. Layout controls vary columns, density, adjacency, and reading order, while content and style diversity prevent repeated templates.

Co-generated supervision and cluster validation. The semantic-HTML compiler jointly produces the image, element regions and categories, reading-order Markdown, HTML tables, and source LaTeX. Examples are accepted only when their targets match the visible content, they contain the requested structure, and they address the identified weakness. Fixed-cluster assignment alone does not establish that the target difficulty has been reproduced.

Synthetic records retain source information and program identifiers, with family-, program-, and duplicate-group caps. Their contribution can therefore be distinguished from new real data, hard examples, and replay. Figure 7 illustrates representative constructions.




Figure 7 Representative targeted constructions for diagnosed low-coverage capabilities: (a) formula-rich composition, (b) table-rich composition, (c) multi-region examination structure, and (d) dense newspaper structure.

3.3.4 Training Rebalancing after Targeted Data Addition

Validated additions retain their assignments to the fixed cluster centers. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\text{res}}$ be the residual-stream pool: eligible Stage I replay records, newly collected records, and validated targeted synthesis. Records assigned to the separately controlled hard stream are excluded from this pool for that sampling role.

For each cluster k , sum the effective target lengths L_i of its records in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{res}}$ and normalize by the pool total. The resulting fraction, p_k^{tok} , is its natural token share after data addition (tok denotes tokens). It differs from the pre-addition record fraction p_k^{rec} used for coverage diagnosis. Let $\mathcal{K}_+$ be the set of clusters with a positive number of eligible target tokens. Empty clusters keep their identities and frozen centers but receive no allocation; they are not merged or refitted.

The proposed training token share combines the updated pool composition with the standardized residual g_k defined in Section 3.3.2:

$$\tilde{v}_k = \frac{(p_k^{\text{tok}})^{\alpha_{\text{nat}}} \exp(\beta_{\text{alloc}} g_k)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_+} (p_j^{\text{tok}})^{\alpha_{\text{nat}}} \exp(\beta_{\text{alloc}} g_j)}, \quad k \in \mathcal{K}_+. \quad (10)$$

Here $\tilde{v}_k$ is the unconstrained token-share proposal. The nonnegative coefficients α_{nat} and β_{alloc} weight the natural token share (nat) and residual-driven allocation (alloc), respectively. To prevent extreme changes, we choose the closest distribution satisfying relative exposure bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^* &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_+} v_k \log \frac{v_k}{\tilde{v}_k}, \\ \text{subject to } &\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_+} v_k = 1, \quad \vartheta_{\min} p_k^{\text{tok}} \leq v_k \leq \vartheta_{\max} p_k^{\text{tok}}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The vector $\mathbf{v}$ contains candidate token shares, and $\mathbf{v}^*$ is the selected distribution. The objective is Kullback–Leibler divergence from the proposal. The lower and upper multipliers satisfy $0 \leq \vartheta_{\min} \leq 1 \leq \vartheta_{\max}$, so the natural token-share vector is feasible. These bounds limit each cluster’s training share, while Stage I replay provides broad supervision to reduce forgetting.

Within the residual-stream pool (pool), let $q_k^{\text{pool}}(i)$ be the conditional record sampler for cluster k , after source, program-family, and duplicate-group exposure limits. Equation 5 converts v_k^* and the mean target lengths of these samplers into record-selection coefficients α_k^{pool} . Let q_{hard} sample verified hard records from $\mathcal{H}$. Its desired token share is $\lambda_{\text{hard}} \in [0, 1]$, and the same length correction gives the hard-stream selection probability α_{hard} . The two levels of sampling are

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\text{residual}}(i) &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_+} \alpha_k^{\text{pool}} q_k^{\text{pool}}(i), \\ q_2(i) &= (1 - \alpha_{\text{hard}}) q_{\text{residual}}(i) + \alpha_{\text{hard}} q_{\text{hard}}(i). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here q_{residual} samples the rebalanced pool and q_2 is the Stage II distribution introduced in Section 3.1. When both streams contribute, α_{hard} equals λ_{hard} only if their mean effective target lengths are equal. Actual token shares are monitored separately from the planned shares.

Reallocation holds the Stage II token budget B_2 fixed, not the cumulative training of both checkpoints. Stage-wise experiments assess the complete Stage II training procedure rather than isolating rebalancing under equal total training budgets.

The process combines diagnosis, targeted additions, fixed-center reassignment, and bounded rebalancing; Section 3.4.1 describes how training exposure is recorded. Figure 8 shows the allocation shifts across page elements, layouts, and acquisition conditions.

3.4 Experimental Setup and Controls

We use matched model and optimization settings for the two-stage method. Comparisons within each model scale assess complete training protocols rather than isolating the effects of individual data changes.

3.4.1 Training Stages and Data Allocation

Stage I uses the approximately 40M-record broad-coverage pool; Stage II uses the approximately 5M-record refinement pool with high-quality Stage I replay. Before training, records undergo quality checks, cross-source deduplication, and benchmark-overlap screening. Pages and derived views share a content-group identity for split assignment. The allocation probe is excluded from training, mining, and final evaluation, while the mining sample belongs to the training split.

Stage I broad-coverage training. Stage I jointly updates the visual encoder and language model using the page- and component-level supervision in Section 3.2. Source and appearance shares are specified in target tokens included in the loss and converted to record probabilities with Equation 5. Optimization follows Equation 3, with training shares tracked by input granularity and limits on repeated sampling from each duplicate group. The resulting checkpoint initializes diagnosis and the controlled Stage II comparisons.

Stage II capability refinement. Stage II combines verified hard examples, targeted real and synthetic additions, and broad replay. Hard examples originate from training-pool mining or separately reviewed annotation candidates and are assessed against final targets. Additions address audited gaps in Stage I coverage.




Figure 8 Equal-budget cluster rebalancing. (a) Page-element cluster support, (b) layout and structural difficulty, and (c) appearance and acquisition conditions before and after residual-aware allocation. Gray dashed and green solid profiles denote the pre- and post-rebalancing mixtures, respectively; the light-gray unit contour denotes uniform support. Within each panel, expected target-token support is normalized to a mean of 1.0, and the values in the two profiles have the same sum.

Additions and replay form the residual stream; records assigned to the separately capped hard stream are excluded from that sampling role. Equations 10–12 define rebalancing and stream combination, with Equation 5 providing token-to-record conversion. Sampling roles change exposure without changing targets.

Pool sizes count unique eligible records and exclude the probe; repeated draws do not increase these counts. The budgets B_1 and B_2 instead constrain supervised target tokens consumed in each stage.

Exposure. Training logs record source, input-granularity, and duplicate-group identifiers, target shares and sampling probabilities, replay and augmentation policies, and total token budgets. Planned and actual token shares are tracked alongside record-draw counts to distinguish corpus size from training exposure.

3.4.2 Backbones, Output Representation, and Training Controls

WeVisDoc uses 2B and 4B Qwen3-VL-Instruct backbones [1]. Both scales retain the native dynamic-resolution vision transformer (ViT), autoregressive large language model (LLM), tokenizer, and positional encoding, and neither introduces an external document detector, OCR engine, table parser, or specialized decoder.

Training targets and predictions share the representations in Section 3.1: reading-order Markdown, HTML tables, and LaTeX formulas. Crops retain their visible-content representation. Training normalization remains separate from benchmark-specific scoring conversion.

Table 1 reports the shared optimization settings used for the 2B and 4B runs and labels only the settings that differ by stage. Stage I updates the full model, whereas Stage II freezes the visual encoder and refines the language model from a Stage I checkpoint of the same model size. The different device and accumulation configurations preserve a global batch of 512 sequences at both scales.

Here β_1 and β_2 are AdamW’s first- and second-moment decay rates, and ϵ provides numerical stabilization.

3.4.3 Inference and Evaluation

Training-pool inference supports error analysis and hard-example mining; the separate allocation probe estimates group residuals (Section 3.3.2). Thresholds and mixture settings are calibrated on pre-specified training-pool folds, not final benchmarks. These diagnostic results guide data construction and are not an additional evaluation set.

Table 1 Training settings for the reported checkpoints. Stage-specific settings are labeled explicitly; all unlabeled settings are shared by Stage I and Stage II.

Item	Setting
Initialization	Stage I: Qwen3-VL-Instruct; Stage II: corresponding Stage I checkpoint
Trainable modules	Stage I: ViT and LLM Backbone; Stage II: LLM Backbone only (ViT frozen)
Optimizer	Fused AdamW, $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.95$, $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$
Learning rate	5×10^{-6} , cosine decay, 500-step warmup
Weight decay / gradient clip	0.1 / 1.0
Global batch size	512
Sequence length	8,192
Numerical and systems setup	bfloat16, gradient checkpointing, FlashAttention, DeepSpeed ZeRO-2

Public-benchmark inference is performed only after the dataset contents and training configuration are fixed. Across reported benchmarks, models of the same scale use the common document-parsing system prompt reproduced in Appendix A, together with a shared image-preprocessing policy and deterministic decoding configuration. Predictions are generated directly in the shared parsing representation without external reranking or content-level correction, and each benchmark is scored with its official protocol under the same evaluator for every controlled variant. For robustness, we repeat inference three times for each checkpoint and report the mean benchmark scores.

4 Experiments

We evaluate WeVisDoc at two complementary levels. First, we compare the final 2B and 4B models with existing systems on OmniDocBench v1.6 and PureDocBench. Second, we assess the aggregate effect of capability-aware refinement through Stage I–Stage II comparisons at both model scales and examine the corresponding changes in representative predictions from each benchmark split.

4.1 Evaluation Setup

OmniDocBench v1.6: coverage under document diversity. OmniDocBench v1.6 [39] contains 1,651 document pages spanning diverse document types, layouts, languages, and combinations of text, formulas, tables, and reading-order structures. We use this benchmark to assess document parsing under heterogeneous, naturally occurring content and layout conditions.

PureDocBench: paired degradation robustness. PureDocBench [27] complements annotation-based evaluation with source-derived ground truth. Its audit found 2,580 confirmed annotation errors among 21,353 evaluator-scored blocks in OmniDocBench v1.5; this finding does not estimate the error rate of v1.6, but it motivates evaluation against independently generated, exactly traceable targets. PureDocBench comprises 1,475 HTML/CSS source pages from 10 domains and 66 subcategories. Each source is rendered into aligned *Clean*, *Digital Degraded*, and *Real Degraded* views that share the same ground truth; the latter two tracks cover ten synthetic degradation scenarios and four physical or screen-mediated acquisition pipelines, respectively.

Metrics. Both benchmarks report TextEdit↓, FormulaCDM↑, TableTEDS↑, and ROEdit↓, together with an Overall score. Equation 13 defines Overall as the arithmetic mean of text accuracy, FormulaCDM, and TableTEDS:

$$\text{Overall} = \frac{100(1 - \text{TextEdit}) + \text{FormulaCDM} + \text{TableTEDS}}{3}. \quad (13)$$

ROEdit is reported separately and does not enter Overall. Equation 14 defines the PureDocBench mean Overall across the three tracks:

$$\text{Avg}_3 = \frac{\text{Overall}_{\text{clean}} + \text{Overall}_{\text{digital}} + \text{Overall}_{\text{real}}}{3}. \quad (14)$$

Baselines. We compare against three complementary classes of document parsing systems: general-purpose VLMs, pipeline-based parsers, and specialized end-to-end OCR models. This grouping separates general

multimodal scale, modular parsing, and document-specific end-to-end specialization. The end-to-end group includes FD-RL [65], which uses format-decoupled reinforcement learning. Among the baselines, a superscript * denotes a result produced with our evaluation pipeline under the stated benchmark protocol; unmarked results are taken from previous work.

4.2 Main Results

Table 2 reports the OmniDocBench v1.6 comparison. WeVisDoc-4B establishes a new state of the art among the compared end-to-end specialists, achieving 95.38 Overall and improving the previous leading result by 0.64 points. It also leads this series in TextEdit (0.036), FormulaCDM (96.81), TableTEDS_S (95.34), and ROEdit (0.125). WeVisDoc-2B delivers top-tier end-to-end performance with 95.06 Overall, together with 95.94 FormulaCDM, 93.03 TableTEDS, and 95.26 TableTEDS_S. These results place both scales on the leading end-to-end parsing frontier, with the 4B model setting the strongest aggregate result. Because OmniDocBench uses annotation-derived ground truth, this comparison is conditioned on the frozen v1.6 benchmark and evaluator revisions.

Table 2 Comparison of document parsing results on OmniDocBench v1.6. We report Overall together with text, formula, table, and reading-order metrics; our results are means over three inference runs. A superscript * marks baseline results obtained with our evaluation pipeline, whereas unmarked baseline results are taken from previous work [24, 61]. Bold and underlining highlight the two leading results within each model series. Baseline rows are ordered by Overall from low to high; our models are reported separately at the end of the end-to-end series.

Model Type	Model	Size	Overall $\uparrow$	Text ^{Edit} $\downarrow$	Formula ^{CDM} $\uparrow$	Table ^{TEDS} $\uparrow$	Table ^{TEDS-S} $\uparrow$	ROEdit $\downarrow$
General-purpose VLMs	InternVL3.5-241B [52]	241B	83.76	0.130	89.95	74.35	79.78	0.215
	Kimi K2.5 [46]	1T	84.53	0.107	83.50	80.76	84.00	0.211
	GPT-5.2 [38]	–	86.59	0.114	88.21	82.95	87.93	0.193
	Qwen3-VL-235B [1]	235B	89.78	<u>0.063</u>	92.55	83.07	86.75	0.166
	Gemini 3 Flash [9]	–	92.62	0.066	95.16	<u>89.29</u>	93.51	0.172
	Gemini 3 Pro [14]	–	<u>92.91</u>	0.064	95.99	89.15	<u>92.96</u>	<u>0.165</u>
	Ovis2.6-30B-A3B [32]	30B	93.70	0.035	<u>95.17</u>	89.44	92.40	0.135
Pipeline-based systems	Dolphin-1.5 [12]	0.3B	86.52	0.094	87.49	81.43	84.82	0.167
	MonkeyOCR-pro-3B [26]	3B	88.57	0.074	88.74	84.35	88.62	0.189
	Dolphin-v2 [13]	3B	89.50	0.069	91.01	84.40	87.44	0.150
	OpenDoc-0.1B [10]	0.1B	90.67	0.049	93.02	83.88	87.45	0.140
	MinerU2.5 [37]	1.2B	93.04	0.045	95.77	87.88	91.47	0.130
	Youtu-Parsing [21]	2.5B	93.74	0.044	93.63	92.02	95.00	0.116
	PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 [5]	0.9B	94.93	0.038	96.89	91.67	94.37	0.130
	GLM-OCR [11]	0.9B	95.22	0.044	97.18	92.83	95.39	0.133
	MinerU2.5-Pro [51]	1.2B	95.75	0.036	97.45	93.42	95.92	0.120
	PaddleOCR-VL-1.6 [61]	0.9B	96.33	0.033	97.49	94.76	97.11	0.127
End-to-end specialists	Nanonets-OCR2* [34]	3B	83.20	0.108	80.35	80.10	85.26	0.211
	OCRFlux-3B* [4]	3B	83.31	0.126	88.75	73.78	77.98	0.217
	POINTS-Reader [30]	3B	83.37	0.096	85.72	73.98	77.40	0.198
	Nanonets-OCR-s [33]	3B	83.61	0.108	81.46	80.18	84.51	0.213
	olmOCR-2-7B* [41]	7B	85.51	0.106	88.84	78.32	82.81	0.223
	olmOCR [40]	7B	85.74	0.139	88.10	83.00	87.17	0.216
	DeepSeek-OCR* [54]	3B	86.31	0.077	84.71	81.87	86.07	0.171
	OCRVerse [66]	4B	88.60	0.063	89.61	82.44	86.27	0.163
	UniRec-0.1B* [10]	0.1B	88.91	0.088	92.14	83.40	86.79	0.146
	DeepSeek-OCR 2 [55]	3B	90.25	0.050	91.84	83.89	87.75	0.144
	dots.ocr [25]	3B	90.77	0.048	89.95	87.18	90.58	0.138
	FD-RL* [65]	4B	91.21	0.055	92.92	86.22	90.92	0.145
	HunyuanOCR [45]	1B	92.03	0.048	88.60	92.37	93.99	0.138
	dots.mocr* [63]	3B	92.57	0.042	92.09	89.78	92.92	0.133
	FireRed-OCR [44]	2B	93.26	<u>0.037</u>	95.44	88.04	91.06	0.131
	Logics-Parsing-v2 [31]	4B	93.33	0.041	95.65	88.42	91.98	0.137
	Qianfan-OCR [8]	4B	93.90	0.040	95.08	90.53	93.31	0.130
	Unlimited-OCR [58]	3B-A0.5B	93.92	0.042	95.79	90.16	93.32	<u>0.129</u>
	HunyuanOCR-1.5 [24]	1B	94.74	0.039	94.50	93.67	94.71	<u>0.129</u>
	WeVisDoc (Ours)	2B	95.06	0.038	<u>95.94</u>	93.03	95.26	0.130
	WeVisDoc (Ours)	4B	95.38	0.036	96.81	92.95	95.34	0.125

Table 3 reports the PureDocBench comparison. WeVisDoc-4B establishes the highest reported Avg₃ at 75.54, exceeding the leading broad-domain baseline, Qwen3.5-122B-A10B, by 1.43 points. It also achieves

the highest Overall scores on Clean (79.81) and Digital Degraded (77.74), while its 69.08 on Real Degraded advances the previous end-to-end state of the art by 1.44 points. WeVisDoc-2B delivers top-tier end-to-end performance with 73.86 Avg₃, including 79.36 on Clean and 76.62 on Digital Degraded. Scaling from 2B to 4B yields gains of 0.45, 1.12, and 3.48 points on Clean, Digital Degraded, and Real Degraded, respectively, indicating that additional capacity is most beneficial under stronger appearance shifts.

Table 3 Three-track leaderboard on PureDocBench. Each track reports Overall (Ovr), TextEdit (TxEd), FormulaCDM (FCM), TableTEDS (TDS), and ROEdit; our results are means over three inference runs. Avg₃ is the mean of the three track-level Overall scores. A superscript * marks baseline results obtained with our evaluation pipeline, whereas unmarked baseline results are taken from previous work [27]. Bold and underlining highlight the two leading results within each model series. Baseline rows are ordered by Avg₃ from low to high; our models are reported separately at the end of the end-to-end series.

Model	Params	Avg ₃	Clean					Digital Degraded					Real Degraded				
			Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROEdit↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROEdit↓	Ovr↑	Tx↓	FCM↑	TDS↑	ROEdit↓
General VLMs																	
MiniCPM-V-4.5 [60]	8B	46.26	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
Step3-VL [18]	10B	50.48	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
Qwen3.5-0.8B [42]	0.8B	55.99	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
Qwen3-VL-2B [1]	2B	62.09	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
Qwen3.5-2B [42]	2B	62.46	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
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B [42]	35B-A3B	65.68	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
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B [42]	397B-A17B	66.72	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
Qwen3-VL-4B [1]	4B	67.50	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
Qwen3-VL-8B [1]	8B	69.07	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
Qwen3.5-27B [42]	27B	69.57	72.07	0.227	66.36	72.51	0.362	70.73	0.236	64.61	71.17	0.367	65.92	0.283	61.23	64.82	0.390
Qwen3.5-4B [42]	4B	69.82	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
Kimi-K2.6 [35]	1T-A32B	70.10	72.32	0.303	66.93	80.30	0.466	69.95	0.322	64.69	77.31	0.475	68.02	0.335	62.44	75.14	0.481
Gemini-3.1-Pro [15]	—	70.43	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
Qwen3.5-9B [42]	9B	70.89	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
Qwen3.5-122B-A10B [42]	122B-A10B	74.11	76.14	0.226	67.96	83.03	0.375	76.34	0.220	67.82	83.21	0.366	69.85	0.281	62.19	75.44	0.401
Pipeline-based Systems																	
OpenDoc-0.1B [10]	0.1B	52.34	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
MonkeyOCR-pro-1.2B [26]	1.2B	53.54	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
MonkeyOCR-pro-3B [26]	3B	55.37	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
Dolphin-v2 [13]	3B	57.02	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
GLM-OCR [11]	0.9B	63.34	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
Dolphin-1.5* [12]	0.3B	64.15	72.51	0.260	62.78	80.75	0.383	65.37	0.347	57.96	72.83	0.441	54.59	0.459	46.93	62.75	0.507
PaddleOCR-VL-1.5 [5]	0.9B	66.75	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
PaddleOCR-VL-1.6* [61]	0.9B	66.98	72.15	0.263	64.80	77.92	0.422	67.17	0.314	61.53	71.35	0.455	61.63	0.383	56.44	66.71	0.500
MinerU2.5 [37]	1.2B	67.66	74.90	0.184	62.08	81.04	0.327	68.92	0.245	56.99	74.24	0.374	59.15	0.370	49.01	65.41	0.446
Youtu-Parsing [21]	2.5B	68.32	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
MinerU2.5-Pro [51]	1.2B	70.07	75.87	0.222	65.14	84.68	0.346	71.77	0.272	61.79	80.73	0.378	62.56	0.375	52.70	72.47	0.446
End-to-End Specialists																	
OCRFflux-3B [4]	3B	42.06	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
DeepSeek-OCR [54]	3B	46.98	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
UniRec-0.1B [10]	0.1B	48.59	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
POINTS-Reader* [30]	3B	49.24	53.78	0.405	55.27	46.53	0.542	51.24	0.431	52.49	44.38	0.544	42.69	0.517	41.60	38.14	0.575
DeepSeek-OCR 2 [55]	3B	49.51	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
Qianfan-OCR [8]	4B	51.04	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
olmOCR [40]	7B	55.90	62.56	0.388	58.69	67.77	0.466	57.84	0.366	55.44	61.66	0.499	47.30	0.542	46.26	49.80	0.568
Nanonets-OCR2 [34]	3B	58.36	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
HunyuanOCR [45]	1B	60.56	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
Unlimited-OCR* [58]	3B-A0.5B	62.76	71.28	0.248	62.68	75.95	0.374	63.62	0.317	54.91	67.71	0.418	53.39	0.440	46.89	57.22	0.470
olmOCR-2-7B [41]	7B	63.78	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
dots.ocr [25]	3B	64.55	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
Nanonets-OCR-s* [33]	3B	65.37	71.26	0.271	62.20	78.65	0.388	66.56	0.307	58.31	72.09	0.409	58.28	0.417	53.63	62.87	0.467
FireRed-OCR [44]	2B	65.57	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
HunyuanOCR-1.5* [24]	1B	68.79	73.98	0.243	68.69	77.55	0.391	70.81	0.271	66.68	72.87	0.407	61.59	0.365	57.50	63.81	0.461
OCRVerse [66]	4B	69.40	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
dots.mocr [63]	3B	70.39	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
Logics-Parsing-v2 [31]	4B	72.61	76.35	0.213	67.67	82.67	0.342	73.85	0.248	67.33	79.02	0.375	67.64	0.304	61.65	71.64	0.416
FD-RL [65]	4B	73.92	78.38	0.193	68.21	86.22	0.334	76.33	0.214	67.16	83.22	0.350	67.04	0.298	58.82	72.08	0.391
WeVisDoc (Ours)	2B	73.86	79.36	0.214	71.63	87.79	0.347	76.62	0.247	70.74	83.84	0.370	65.60	0.361	58.90	74.05	0.437
WeVisDoc (Ours)	4B	75.54	79.81	0.213	71.90	88.81	0.340	77.74	0.241	71.31	85.99	0.361	69.08	0.336	63.14	77.64	0.416

4.3 Effect of Stage II Capability-Aware Refinement

We assess the aggregate effect of the complete capability-refinement stage by comparing the checkpoints obtained after broad-coverage Stage I training with their Stage II continuations at both model scales. Within each scale, the backbone, output representation, and evaluation protocol are held constant. Stage II nevertheless combines continued optimization, residual-aware allocation, curated hard examples, targeted additions, and replay, so this comparison does not isolate the contribution of any individual component. Accordingly, “stage-wise ablation” in Table 4 refers to comparing the model before and after the complete Stage II protocol rather than to a component-wise ablation. Each entry is the mean of the three reported inference runs.

Table 4 Stage-wise ablation at both model scales. Values are Overall scores averaged over three inference runs; Avg₃ is the mean over the three PureDocBench tracks. Gains are computed as Stage II minus Stage I using the displayed two-decimal scores.

Scale	Training stage	OmniDocBench↑	PureDocBench			
			Clean↑	Digital Degraded↑	Real Degraded↑	Avg ₃ ↑
2B	Stage I: broad coverage	93.50	78.90	74.24	63.23	72.12
2B	Stage II: capability-aware refinement	95.06	79.36	76.62	65.60	73.86
	Gain	+1.56	+0.46	+2.38	+2.37	+1.74
4B	Stage I: broad coverage	94.22	79.32	75.19	65.05	73.19
4B	Stage II: capability-aware refinement	95.38	79.81	77.74	69.08	75.54
	Gain	+1.16	+0.49	+2.55	+4.03	+2.35

At both scales, Stage II improves OmniDocBench Overall and all three PureDocBench tracks. The 2B model gains 1.56 points on OmniDocBench and 1.74 points in Avg₃, while the 4B model gains 1.16 and 2.35 points, respectively. Improvements are largest on Digital Degraded (+2.38 and +2.55 for 2B and 4B) and Real Degraded (+2.37 and +4.03). Clean performance changes by only +0.46 at 2B and +0.49 at 4B. This pattern is consistent with the intended emphasis of Stage II on distributional tails and acquisition-induced appearance shifts, but the stage-wise comparison does not isolate residual-aware allocation from the other Stage II interventions.

Stage-wise qualitative comparisons that localize representative structural and recognition errors are provided in [Appendix B.1](#). In particular, Figure 12(b) shows the correction of a name transcription error and the restoration of formula serialization in a photographed Chinese contract. Additional end-to-end predictions across general, formula-rich, table-rich, and scanned or photographed documents are provided in [Appendix B.2](#).

5 Conclusion and Future Work

We have presented WeVisDoc, a data-centric framework for specializing end-to-end document parsers through semantic coverage, structure-preserving degradation, and capability-aware refinement. Instantiated at 2B and 4B scales, WeVisDoc achieves Overall scores of 95.06 and 95.38 on OmniDocBench v1.6 and Avg₃ scores of 73.86 and 75.54 on PureDocBench. The 4B model establishes state-of-the-art performance among the compared end-to-end parsers across all four settings, while the 2B model delivers top-tier performance at half the parameter count. Stage-wise comparisons show consistent gains after the complete capability-refinement stage, although they do not isolate its individual interventions. Together, these results support treating the training mixture as a measurable interface between corpus coverage and model capability rather than as a static collection of datasets.

The current evidence remains bounded by benchmark coverage and by the fidelity of synthetic degradations. Although the 4B model establishes a new end-to-end state of the art on Real Degraded pages, handwriting, historical scans, severely damaged documents, and broader acquisition conditions remain insufficiently measured. Residual rebalancing also depends on the probe set, representation model, clustering choices, and evaluator, and introduces additional computation. Future work will therefore prioritize broader authentic acquisition data, more stable and interpretable capability estimation, and lower-cost mixture updates, alongside evaluation across additional languages and document domains. High-stakes deployment should continue to pair model outputs with provenance controls and appropriate human review.

References

- [1] 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.
- [2] Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. Curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 41–48, 2009.
- [3] Lukas Blecher, Guillem Cucurull Preixens, Thomas Scialom, and Robert Stojnic. Nougat: Neural optical understanding for academic documents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [4] ChatDOC Team. OCRFlux-3B. <https://huggingface.co/ChatDOC/OCRFlux-3B>, 2025. Hugging Face model card.
- [5] Cheng Cui, Ting Sun, Suyin Liang, Tingquan Gao, Zelun Zhang, Jiaxuan Liu, Xueqing Wang, Changda Zhou, Hongen Liu, Manhui Lin, et al. PaddleOCR-VL-1.5: Towards a multi-task 0.9b VLM for robust in-the-wild document parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.21957*, 2026.
- [6] Sagnik Das, Ke Ma, Zhixin Shu, Dimitris Samaras, and Roy Shilkrot. DewarpNet: Single-image document unwarping with stacked 3D and 2D regression networks. In *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 131–140. IEEE, 2019.
- [7] Shizhe Diao, Yu Yang, Yonggan Fu, Xin Dong, Dan Su, Markus Kliegl, Zijia Chen, Peter Belcak, Yoshi Suhara, Hongxu Yin, et al. Nemotron-CLIMB: Clustering-based iterative data mixture bootstrapping for language model pre-training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 38, 2025. doi: 10.52202/085713-0865.
- [8] Daxiang Dong, Mingming Zheng, Dong Xu, Chunhua Luo, Bairong Zhuang, Yuxuan Li, Ruoyun He, Haoran Wang, Wenyu Zhang, Wenbo Wang, Yicheng Wang, Xue Xiong, Ayong Zheng, Xiaoying Zuo, Ziwei Ou, Jingnan Gu, Quanhao Guo, Jianmin Wu, Dawei Yin, and Dou Shen. Qianfan-ocr: A unified end-to-end model for document intelligence, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.13398>.
- [9] Tulsee Doshi. Gemini 3 Flash: Frontier intelligence built for speed. <https://blog.google/products-and-platforms/products/gemini/gemini-3-flash/>, December 2025. Google Blog post, on behalf of the Gemini team.
- [10] 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.
- [11] Shuaiqi Duan, Yadong Xue, Weihan Wang, Zhe Su, Huan Liu, Sheng Yang, Guobing Gan, Guo Wang, Zihan Wang, Shengdong Yan, Dexin Jin, Yuxuan Zhang, Guohong Wen, Yanfeng Wang, Yutao Zhang, Xiaohan Zhang, Wenyi Hong, Yukuo Cen, Da Yin, Bin Chen, Wenmeng Yu, Xiaotao Gu, and Jie Tang. Glm-ocr technical report, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.10910>.
- [12] Hao Feng, Shu Wei, Xiang Fei, Wei Shi, Yingdong Han, Lei Liao, Jinghui Lu, Binghong Wu, Qi Liu, Chunhui Lin, et al. Dolphin: Document image parsing via heterogeneous anchor prompting. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 21919–21936, 2025.
- [13] 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. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.05384>.
- [14] Gemini Team. A new era of intelligence with Gemini 3. <https://blog.google/products-and-platforms/products/gemini/gemini-3/>, November 2025. Google Blog post.
- [15] 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.
- [16] Alexander Groleau, Kok Wei Chee, Stefan Larson, Samay Maini, and Jonathan Boarman. Augraphy: A data augmentation library for document images. In *International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*, pages 384–401. Springer, 2023.
- [17] Anwen Hu, Haiyang Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Liang Zhang, Bo Zhang, Ji Zhang, Qin Jin, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. mPLUG-DocOwl 1.5: Unified structure learning for OCR-free document understanding. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 3096–3120, 2024.

- [18] Ailin Huang, Chengyuan Yao, Chunrui Han, Fanqi Wan, Hangyu Guo, Haoran Lv, Hongyu Zhou, Jia Wang, Jian Zhou, Jianjian Sun, Jingcheng Hu, Kangheng Lin, Liang Zhao, Mitt Huang, Song Yuan, Wenwen Qu, Xiangfeng Wang, Yanlin Lai, Yingxiu Zhao, Yinmin Zhang, Yukang Shi, Yuyang Chen, Zejia Weng, Ziyang Meng, Ang Li, Aobo Kong, Bo Dong, Changyi Wan, David Wang, Di Qi, Dingming Li, En Yu, Guopeng Li, Haiquan Yin, Han Zhou, Hanshan Zhang, Haolong Yan, Hebin Zhou, Hongbo Peng, Jiaran Zhang, Jiashu Lv, Jiayi Fu, Jie Cheng, Jie Zhou, Jisheng Yin, Jingjing Xie, Jingwei Wu, Jun Zhang, Junfeng Liu, Kaijun Tan, Kaiwen Yan, Liangyu Chen, Lina Chen, Mingliang Li, Qian Zhao, Quan Sun, Shaoliang Pang, Shengjie Fan, Shijie Shang, Siyuan Zhang, Tianhao You, Wei Ji, Wuxun Xie, Xiaobo Yang, Xiaojie Hou, Xiaoran Jiao, Xiaoxiao Ren, Xiangwen Kong, Xin Huang, Xin Wu, Xing Chen, Xinran Wang, Xuelin Zhang, Yana Wei, Yang Li, Yanming Xu, Yeqing Shen, Yang Peng, Yue Peng, Yu Zhou, Yusheng Li, Yuxiang Yang, Yuyang Zhang, Zhe Xie, Zhewei Huang, Zhenyi Lu, Zhimin Fan, Zihui Cheng, Daxin Jiang, Qi Han, Xiangyu Zhang, Yibo Zhu, and Zheng Ge. Step3-vl-10b technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2601.09668*, 2026.
- [19] Zuming Huang, Jun Huang, Kexuan Ren, Baode Wang, Weizhen Li, Jianming Feng, Yu Wang, Yichen Yao, Shijun Lin, Yige Tang, et al. Infinity-Parser2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.07836*, 2026.
- [20] Geewook Kim, Teakgyu Hong, Moonbin Yim, JeongYeon Nam, Jinyoung Park, Jinyeong Yim, Wonseok Hwang, Sangdoo Yun, Dongyoon Han, and Seunghyun Park. OCR-free document understanding transformer. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 498–517. Springer, 2022.
- [21] Tencent Youtu Lab. Youtu-parsing: Perception, structuring and recognition via high-parallelism decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.20430*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.20430>.
- [22] Kenton Lee, Mandar Joshi, Iulia Raluca Turc, Hexiang Hu, Fangyu Liu, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Urvashi Khandelwal, Peter Shaw, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. Pix2Struct: Screenshot parsing as pretraining for visual language understanding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 18893–18912. PMLR, 2023.
- [23] Gengluo Li, Pengyuan Lyu, Chengquan Zhang, Huawen Shen, Liang Wu, Xingyu Wan, Gangyan Zeng, Han Hu, Can Ma, and Yu Zhou. Towards real-world document parsing via realistic scene synthesis and document-aware training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 23709–23719, 2026.
- [24] Gengluo Li, Xingyu Wan, Shangpin Peng, Weinong Wang, Hao Feng, Yongkun Du, Binghong Wu, Zheng Ruan, Zhiqiong Lu, Liang Wu, et al. HunyuanOCR-1.5: Making lightweight OCR VLMs faster and better. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.04884*, 2026.
- [25] 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.
- [26] Zhang Li, Yuliang Liu, Qiang Liu, Zhiyin Ma, Ziyang Zhang, Shuo Zhang, Biao Yang, Zidun Guo, Jiarui Zhang, Xinyu Wang, et al. MonkeyOCR: Document parsing with a structure-recognition-relation triplet paradigm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05218*, 2025.
- [27] Zhiheng Li, Zongyang Ma, Jiaxian Chen, Jianing Zhang, Zhaolong Su, Yutong Zhang, Zhiyin Yu, Ruiqi Liu, Xiaolei Lv, Bo Li, et al. How far is document parsing from solved? PureDocBench: A source-traceable benchmark across clean, degraded, and real-world settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.07492*, 2026.
- [28] Zhenghao Lin, Zhibin Gou, Yeyun Gong, Xiao Liu, Yelong Shen, Ruochen Xu, Chen Lin, Yujiu Yang, Jian Jiao, Nan Duan, et al. Rho-1: Not all tokens are what you need for pretraining. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, 2024. doi: 10.52202/079017-0914.
- [29] Evan Z Liu, Behzad Haghgoo, Annie S Chen, Aditi Raghunathan, Pang Wei Koh, Shiori Sagawa, Percy Liang, and Chelsea Finn. Just train twice: Improving group robustness without training group information. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6781–6792. PMLR, 2021.
- [30] Yuan Liu, Zhongyin Zhao, Le Tian, Haicheng Wang, Xubing Ye, Yangxiu You, Zilin Yu, Chuhan Wu, Xiao Zhou, Yang Yu, and Jie Zhou. Points-reader: Distillation-free adaptation of vision-language models for document conversion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.01215*, 2025.
- [31] Logics-MLLM Team. Logics-Parsing-v2. <https://huggingface.co/Logics-MLLM/Logics-Parsing-v2>, 2026. Hugging Face model card.
- [32] Shiyin Lu, Yang Li, Yu Xia, Yuwei Hu, Shanshan Zhao, Yanqing Ma, Zhichao Wei, Yinglun Li, Lunhao Duan, Jianshan Zhao, Yuxuan Han, Haijun Li, Wanying Chen, Junke Tang, Chengkun Hou, Zhixing Du, Tianli Zhou,

- Wenjie Zhang, Huping Ding, Jiahe Li, Wen Li, Gui Hu, Yiliang Gu, Siran Yang, Jiamang Wang, Hailong Sun, Yibo Wang, Hui Sun, Jinlong Huang, Yuping He, Shengze Shi, Weihong Zhang, Guodong Zheng, Junpeng Jiang, Sensen Gao, Yi-Feng Wu, Sijia Chen, Yuhui Chen, Qing-Guo Chen, Zhao Xu, Weihua Luo, and Kaifu Zhang. Ovis2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2508.11737*, 2025.
- [33] Souvik Mandal, Ashish Talewar, Paras Ahuja, and Prathamesh Juvatkar. Nanonets-ocr-s: A model for transforming documents into structured markdown with intelligent content recognition and semantic tagging, 2025.
- [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] Moonshot AI. Kimi-K2.6. <https://huggingface.co/moonshotai/Kimi-K2.6>, 2026. Hugging Face model card.
- [36] Ahmed Nassar, Matteo Omenetti, Maksym Lysak, Nikolaos Livathinos, Christoph Auer, Lucas Morin, Rafael Teixeira de Lima, Yusik Kim, A Said Gurbuz, Michele Dolfi, et al. SmolDocling: An ultra-compact vision-language model for end-to-end multi-modal document conversion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 21972–21983, 2025.
- [37] 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. In *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 6: Industry Track)*, pages 13–42. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2026. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.acl-industry.3.
- [38] OpenAI. Introducing GPT-5.2. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-gpt-5-2/>, December 2025. OpenAI Blog post.
- [39] Linke Ouyang, Yuan Qu, Hongbin Zhou, Jiawei Zhu, Rui Zhang, Qunshu Lin, Bin Wang, Zhiyuan Zhao, Man Jiang, Xiaomeng Zhao, et al. OmniDocBench: Benchmarking diverse PDF document parsing with comprehensive annotations. In *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 24838–24848. IEEE, 2025.
- [40] Jake Poznanski, Jon Borchardt, Jason Dunkelberger, Regan Huff, Daniel Lin, Aman Rangapur, Christopher Wilhelm, Kyle Lo, and Luca Soldaini. olmOCR: Unlocking Trillions of Tokens in PDFs with Vision Language Models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.18443>.
- [41] Jake Poznanski, Luca Soldaini, and Kyle Lo. olmocr 2: Unit test rewards for document ocr, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.19817>.
- [42] Qwen Team. Qwen3.5: Towards native multimodal agents, February 2026. URL <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen3.5>.
- [43] Ozan Sener and Silvio Savarese. Active learning for convolutional neural networks: A core-set approach. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [44] Xiaohongshu Inc. Super Intelligence Team. Firered-ocr technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.01840*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.01840>.
- [45] Hunyuan Vision Team, Pengyuan Lyu, Xingyu Wan, Gengluo Li, Shangpin Peng, Weinong Wang, Liang Wu, Huawei Shen, Yu Zhou, Canhui Tang, Qi Yang, Qiming Peng, Bin Luo, Hower Yang, Xinsong Zhang, Jinian Zhang, Houwen Peng, Hongming Yang, Senhao Xie, Longsha Zhou, Ge Pei, Binghong Wu, Rui Yan, Kan Wu, Jieneng Yang, Bochao Wang, Kai Liu, Jianchen Zhu, Jie Jiang, Linus, Han Hu, and Chengquan Zhang. HunyuanOCR Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.19575*, 2025.
- [46] Kimi Team, Tongtong Bai, Yifan Bai, Yiping Bao, S. H. Cai, Yuan Cao, Ziwei Chai, Y. Charles, H. S. Che, Cheng Chen, Guanduo Chen, Huarong Chen, Jia Chen, Jianlong Chen, Jun Chen, Kefan Chen, Liang Chen, Ruijue Chen, Xinhao Chen, Yanru Chen, Yanxu Chen, Yicun Chen, Yimin Chen, Yingjiang Chen, Yuankun Chen, Yujie Chen, Yutian Chen, Zhirong Chen, Ziwei Chen, Dazhi Cheng, Yean Cheng, Minghan Chu, Jialei Cui, Jiaqi Deng, Muxi Diao, Hao Ding, Mengfan Dong, Mengnan Dong, Yuxin Dong, Yuhao Dong, Angang Du, Chenzhuang Du, Dikang Du, Lingxiao Du, Yulun Du, Yu Fan, Shengjun Fang, Qiulin Feng, Yichen Feng, Garimugai Fu, Kelin Fu, Hongcheng Gao, Tong Gao, Yuyao Ge, Shangyi Geng, Chengyang Gong, Xiaochen Gong, Zhuoma Gongque, Qizheng Gu, Xinran Gu, Yicheng Gu, Longyu Guan, Shuhao Guan, Yuanying Guo, Xiaoru Hao, Dailan He, Tianhong He, Weiran He, Wenyang He, Yibo He, Yunjia He, Chao Hong, Hao Hu, Jiaxi Hu, Yangyang Hu, Zhenxing Hu, Ke Huang, Ruiyuan Huang, Weixiao Huang, Zhiqi Huang, Chaobo Jia, Tao

- Jiang, Zhejun Jiang, Xinyi Jin, Yu Jing, Guokun Lai, Aidi Li, C. Li, Cheng Li, Fang Li, Guanghe Li, Guanyu Li, Haitao Li, Haoyang Li, Jia Li, Jingwei Li, Junxiong Li, Lincan Li, Mo Li, Weihong Li, Wentao Li, Xinhao Li, Xinhao Li, Yang Li, Yanhao Li, Yiwei Li, Yuxiao Li, Zhaowei Li, Zhaoxi Li, Zheming Li, Weilong Liao, Jiawei Lin, Xiaohan Lin, Yibo Lin, Zhishan Lin, Zichao Lin, Cheng Liu, Chenyu Liu, Hongzhang Liu, Liang Liu, Shaowei Liu, Shudong Liu, Shuran Liu, Tianwei Liu, Tianyu Liu, Weizhou Liu, Xiangyan Liu, Yangyang Liu, Yanming Liu, Yibo Liu, Yuanxin Liu, Zhengying Liu, Zhongnuo Liu, Enzhe Lu, Haoyu Lu, Zhiyuan Lu, G. Luo, Junyu Luo, Tongxu Luo, Yashuo Luo, Long Ma, Shaoguang Mao, Yuan Mei, Xin Men, Fanqing Meng, Zhiyong Meng, Yibo Miao, Mingqing Ni, Kun Ouyang, Siyuan Pan, Bo Pang, Yuchao Qian, Ruoyu Qin, Zeyu Qin, Jiezhong Qiu, Bowen Qu, Zeyu Shang, Youbo Shao, Tianxiao Shen, Zhennan Shen, Juanfeng Shi, Lidong Shi, Shengyuan Shi, Feifan Song, Pengwei Song, Tianhui Song, Xiaoxi Song, Hongjin Su, Jianlin Su, Zhaochen Su, Lin Sui, Jinsong Sun, Junyao Sun, Tongyu Sun, Flood Sung, Yunpeng Tai, Chuning Tang, Heyi Tang, Xiaojuan Tang, Zhengyang Tang, Jiawen Tao, Shiyuan Teng, Chaoran Tian, Pengfei Tian, Bowen Wang, Chensi Wang, Chuang Wang, Congcong Wang, Dingkun Wang, Dinglu Wang, Dongliang Wang, Feng Wang, Hailong Wang, Haiming Wang, Hao Wang, Hengzhi Wang, Huaqing Wang, Hui Wang, Jiahao Wang, Jinhong Wang, Jiuzheng Wang, Kaixin Wang, Linian Wang, Qibin Wang, Shengjie Wang, Shuyi Wang, Si Wang, Wei Wang, Xiaochen Wang, Xinyuan Wang, Yao Wang, Yejie Wang, Yipu Wang, Yiqin Wang, Yucheng Wang, Yuzhi Wang, Zhaoji Wang, Zhaowei Wang, Zhengtao Wang, Zhexu Wang, Zifan Wang, Zihan Wang, Zizhe Wang, Chu Wei, Ming Wei, Chuan Wen, Zichen Wen, Chengjie Wu, Haoning Wu, Junyan Wu, Rucong Wu, Wenhao Wu, Yuefeng Wu, Yuhao Wu, Yuxin Wu, Zijian Wu, Chenjun Xiao, Jin Xie, Xiaotong Xie, Yuchong Xie, Bowei Xing, Boyu Xu, Jianfan Xu, Jing Xu, Jinjing Xu, L. H. Xu, Lin Xu, Suting Xu, Weixin Xu, Xinbo Xu, Xinran Xu, Yangchuan Xu, Yichang Xu, Yuemeng Xu, Zelai Xu, Ziyao Xu, Junjie Yan, Yuzi Yan, Guangyao Yang, Hao Yang, Junwei Yang, Kai Yang, Ningyuan Yang, Xiaofei Yang, Xinlong Yang, Xinyu Yang, Ying Yang, Yi Yang, Yi Yang, Zhen Yang, Zhilin Yang, Zonghan Yang, Haotian Yao, Dan Ye, Haoran Ye, Wenjie Ye, Zhuorui Ye, Peng Yebo, Bohong Yin, Chengzhen Yu, Longhui Yu, Tao Yu, Tianxiang Yu, Enming Yuan, Mengjie Yuan, Xiaokun Yuan, Yang Yue, Weihao Zeng, Dunyuan Zha, Haobing Zhan, Dehao Zhang, Hao Zhang, Jin Zhang, Puqi Zhang, Qiao Zhang, Rui Zhang, Xiaobin Zhang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Y. Zhang, Yadong Zhang, Yangkun Zhang, Yichi Zhang, Yizhi Zhang, Yongting Zhang, Yu Zhang, Yushun Zhang, Yutao Zhang, Yutong Zhang, Zheng Zhang, Chenguang Zhao, Feifan Zhao, Jinxiang Zhao, Shuai Zhao, Xiangyu Zhao, Xuanle Zhao, Yikai Zhao, Zijia Zhao, Huabin Zheng, Ruihan Zheng, Shaojie Zheng, Tengyang Zheng, Junfeng Zhong, Longguang Zhong, Weiming Zhong, M. Zhou, Runjie Zhou, Xinyu Zhou, Zaida Zhou, Jinguo Zhu, Liya Zhu, Xinhao Zhu, Yuxuan Zhu, Zhen Zhu, Jingze Zhuang, Weiyu Zhuang, Ying Zou, and Xinxing Zu. Kimi k2.5: Visual agentic intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2602.02276*, 2026.
- [47] Michael Tschannen, Alexey Gritsenko, Xiao Wang, Muhammad Ferjad Naeem, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Nikhil Parthasarathy, Talfan Evans, Lucas Beyer, Ye Xia, Basil Mustafa, et al. SigLIP 2: Multilingual vision-language encoders with improved semantic understanding, localization, and dense features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14786*, 2025.
- [48] Floor Verhoeven, Tanguy Magne, and Olga Sorkine-Hornung. UVDoc: Neural grid-based document unwarping. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2023 Conference Papers*, pages 1–11, 2023.
- [49] Baode Wang, Biao Wu, Weizhen Li, Meng Fang, Zuming Huang, Jun Huang, Yanjie Liang, Haozhe Wang, Ling Chen, Wei Chu, and Yuan Qi. Infinity-Parser: Layout-aware reinforcement learning with high-quality document parsing dataset. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026*, pages 1647–1667. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2026. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.findings-acl.82. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2026.findings-acl.82/>.
- [50] Bin Wang, Fan Wu, Linke Ouyang, Zhuangcheng Gu, Rui Zhang, Renqiu Xia, Botian Shi, Bo Zhang, and Conghui He. Image over text: Transforming formula recognition evaluation with character detection matching. In *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 19681–19690. IEEE, 2025.
- [51] 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.
- [52] Weiyun Wang, Zhangwei Gao, Lixin Gu, Hengjun Pu, Long Cui, Xingguang Wei, Zhaoyang Liu, Linglin Jing, Shenglong Ye, Jie Shao, Zhaokai Wang, Zhe Chen, Hongjie Zhang, Ganlin Yang, Haomin Wang, Qi Wei, Jinhui Yin, Wenhao Li, Erfei Cui, Guanzhou Chen, Zichen Ding, Changyao Tian, Zhenyu Wu, Jingjing Xie, Zehao Li, Bowen Yang, Yuchen Duan, Xuehui Wang, Zhi Hou, Haoran Hao, Tianyi Zhang, Songze Li, Xiangyu Zhao, Haodong Duan, Nianchen Deng, Bin Fu, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Conghui He, Botian Shi, Junjun He, Yingdong Xiong, Han Lv, Lijun Wu, Wenqi Shao, Kaipeng Zhang, Huipeng Deng, Biqing Qi, Jiaye Ge, Qipeng Guo,

- Wenwei Zhang, Songyang Zhang, Maosong Cao, Junyao Lin, Kexian Tang, Jianfei Gao, Haian Huang, Yuzhe Gu, Chengqi Lyu, Huanze Tang, Rui Wang, Haijun Lv, Wanli Ouyang, Limin Wang, Min Dou, Xizhou Zhu, Tong Lu, Dahua Lin, Jifeng Dai, Weijie Su, Bowen Zhou, Kai Chen, Yu Qiao, Wenhai Wang, and Gen Luo. Internvl3.5: Advancing open-source multimodal models in versatility, reasoning, and efficiency, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.18265>.
- [53] Haoran Wei, Lingyu Kong, Jinyue Chen, Liang Zhao, Zheng Ge, Jinrong Yang, Jianjian Sun, Chunrui Han, and Xiangyu Zhang. Vary: Scaling up the vision vocabulary for large vision-language models. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 408–424. Springer, 2024.
- [54] Haoran Wei, Yaofeng Sun, and Yukun Li. Deepseek-ocr: Contexts optical compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.18234*, 2025.
- [55] Haoran Wei, Yaofeng Sun, and Yukun Li. Deepseek-ocr 2: Visual causal flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.20552*, 2026.
- [56] Mengzhou Xia, Sadhika Malladi, Suchin Gururangan, Sanjeev Arora, and Danqi Chen. LESS: Selecting influential data for targeted instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 54104–54132. PMLR, 2024.
- [57] Sang Michael Xie, Hieu Pham, Xuanyi Dong, Nan Du, Hanxiao Liu, Yifeng Lu, Percy S Liang, Quoc V Le, Tengyu Ma, and Adams Wei Yu. DoReMi: Optimizing data mixtures speeds up language model pretraining. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:69798–69818, 2023.
- [58] Youyang Yin, Huanhuan Liu, YY, Qunyi Xie, Chaorun Liu, Shiqi Yang, Shaohua Wang, Zhanlong Liu, Hao Zou, Jinyue Chen, Shu Wei, Jingjing Wu, Mingxin Huang, Zhen Wu, Guibin Wang, Tengyu Du, and Lei Jia. Unlimited ocr works, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.23050>.
- [59] Hao Yu, Jiabo Zhan, Kang Liu, Linnan Zhao, Dongxu Yue, Rui Chen, Jinglin Wang, Chong Sun, Chen Li, Jing Lyu, et al. PaDoc: Layout-grounded parallel decoding for document parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.06146*, 2026.
- [60] Tianyu Yu, Zefan Wang, Chongyi Wang, Fuwei Huang, Wenshuo Ma, Zhihui 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. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.18154>.
- [61] Zelun Zhang, Hongen Liu, Suyin Liang, Yubo Zhang, Yiqing Xiang, Jiaxuan Liu, Ting Sun, Manhui Lin, Yue Zhang, Changda Zhou, et al. PaddleOCR-VL-1.6: Expanding the frontier of document parsing with under-optimized region refinement and progressive post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.03264*, 2026.
- [62] Linnan Zhao, Kang Liu, Hao Yu, Jiabo Zhan, Chong Sun, and Chen Li. OCR-EDR: Rendering-aware diagnosis and repair for closed-loop OCR improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.03445*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.03445>.
- [63] 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.
- [64] Xu Zhong, Elaheh ShafieiBavani, and Antonio Jimeno Yepes. Image-based table recognition: Data, model, and evaluation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 564–580. Springer, 2020.
- [65] 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. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 33164–33173, 2026.
- [66] 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.

A Document Parsing System Prompt

The following fixed system prompt is used for document-parsing training and inference across all controlled variants.

You are an AI assistant specialized in converting PDF images to Markdown format. Please follow these instructions for the conversion:

1. Text Processing:

- Accurately recognize all text content in the PDF image without guessing or inferring.
- Convert the recognized text into Markdown format.
- Maintain the original document structure, including headings, paragraphs, lists, etc.

2. Mathematical Formula Processing:

- Convert all mathematical formulas to LaTeX format.
- Enclose inline formulas with $\text{\textbackslash}(\text{\textbackslash})$. For example: This is an inline formula $\text{\textbackslash}(E = mc^2 \text{\textbackslash})$
- Enclose block formulas with $\text{\textbackslash}[\text{\textbackslash}]$. For example: $\text{\textbackslash}[\frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} \text{\textbackslash}]$

3. Table Processing:

- Convert tables to HTML format.
- Wrap the entire table with `<table>` and `</table>`.

4. Figure Handling:

- Ignore figure content in the PDF image. Do not attempt to describe or convert images.

5. Output Format:

- Ensure the output Markdown document has a clear structure with appropriate line breaks between elements.
- For complex layouts, try to maintain the original document's structure and format as closely as possible.

Please strictly follow these guidelines to ensure accuracy and consistency in the conversion. Your task is to accurately convert the content of the PDF image into Markdown format without adding any extra explanations or comments.

B Qualitative Case Studies

B.1 Stage-wise Comparisons

For qualitative analysis, pages are ranked within each benchmark split by the Stage II per-page Overall score, averaged over the same three inference runs. We scan each ranking in descending order and retain three pages with a Stage I Overall below 70, subject to the additional requirement that the scored discrepancy be attributable to a localized and unambiguous error mechanism. The displayed prediction for each stage is taken from its median-scoring run. The resulting examples complement the aggregate comparison by separating recurrent structural failures from isolated recognition errors; they are not intended to estimate error prevalence.

Figures 9, 10, 11, and 12 present the twelve stage-wise examples. Across these cases, Stage II corrects several failure modes: omitted tabular regions, column-major reading order, unpaired field–value labels, omitted diagram and peripheral content, page-wide or local overuse of table markup, loss of mathematical serialization, and cross-document hallucination. Residual numeric and character-level transcription errors remain in the Real Degraded examples, showing that stronger structural recovery does not eliminate recognition errors under physical acquisition conditions. These observations are consistent with the larger aggregate gains on the degraded PureDocBench tracks in Table 4.

Input

Stage I Prediction

Stage II Prediction

(a) Table coverage




Fig. 10.3 Solved sudoku puzzle.

10.4 Hybrid Optimization

Hybrid methods may be required to solve particularly difficult real-world optimization problems. Implementation of hybrid methods typically requires non-trivial scripting

...

Overall: 65.87 → 99.22 TableTEDS: 0.333 → 1.000

```
<table><tr><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>9</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>1</td><td>9</td><td>8</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>5</td><td>9</td><td>7</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>6</td><td>8</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>7</td><td>9</td><td>1</td><td>7</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>9</td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>7</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>7</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>9</td><td>6</td><td>3</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>7</td><td>9</td></tr></table>
```

...

```
<tr><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>9</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>1</td><td>9</td><td>8</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>5</td><td>9</td><td>7</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>6</td><td>8</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>7</td><td>9</td><td>1</td><td>7</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>9</td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>7</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>7</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>9</td><td>6</td><td>3</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>7</td><td>9</td></tr></table>
```

Fig. 10.3 Solved sudoku puzzle.

10.4 Hybrid Optimization

...

(b) Diagram coverage



语气的概述

语气可以分为陈述语气、祈使语气和虚拟语气。虚拟语气又有七种基本结构。

一 陈述语气

陈述语气表示所说的话是陈述事实、提出想法。

...

语气的概述

语气可以分为陈述语气、祈使语气和虚拟语气。虚拟语气又有七种基本结构。

陈述语气

祈使语气

语气

动词原形

动词的过去式

had + 过去分词

虚拟语气

should + 动词原形


...

一 陈述语气

...

Overall: 58.98 → 100.00 TextEdit: 0.410 → 0.000

(c) Peripheral text coverage



企业依赖复杂、多层和互通的架构

案例: 半导体、计算机和电子产品以及通讯设备

戴尔

2019年收入: 900亿美金

...

联想

2019年收入: 510亿美金

...

资料来源: 彭博供应链数据库; 麦肯锡全球研究所分析

图E3 即使在同一个行业中, 企业也可能有非常不同的供应链结构和显著的重叠

企业依赖复杂、多层和互通的架构

案例: 半导体、计算机和电子产品以及通讯设备

戴尔

2019年收入: 900亿美金

...

联想

2019年收入: 510亿美金

...

资料来源: 彭博供应链数据库; 麦肯锡全球研究所分析

全球价值链中的风险、韧性和再平衡

9

Overall: 67.66 → 100.00 TextEdit: 0.323 → 0.000

Highlighted source regions localize the comparison. Displayed text preserves the model serialization; red type marks literal error spans, and ellipses mark omitted spans.

Figure 9 OmniDocBench v1.6. Stage I omits the Sudoku grid in (a), drops a semantic hierarchy in (b), and misses peripheral title and footer text in (c); Stage II restores the corresponding structure and coverage.





Figure 10 PureDocBench Clean. Stage I collapses page hierarchy in (a), reads a 3-column pickup grid in column-major order in (b), and omits both carotid hemodynamics tables in (c). Stage II restores the document hierarchy, intended reading order, and measurement grids.

Input	Stage I Prediction	Stage II Prediction
(a) Formula serialization 	<pre> ... ## 5.2 LOTO 与 Permit-to-Work 执行检修、换模、开盖、进入防护罩内作业前，必须进行 Lockout / Tagout。 ... Downtime Risk Downtime Risk = Fault Frequency × Recovery Time 用于决定异常响应是否升级为 maintenance escalation 或生产会议通报项。 ## 5.3 班组 KPI 与 Toolbox Meeting ... </pre>	<pre> ... ### 5.2 LOTO 与 Permit-to-Work 执行检修、换模、开盖、进入防护罩内作业前，必须进行 Lockout / Tagout。 ... #### Downtime Risk \$\$\$Downtime\ Risk = Fault\ Frequency \times Recovery\ Time\$\$\$ 用于决定异常响应是否升级为 maintenance escalation 或生产会议通报项。 ### 5.3 班组 KPI 与 Toolbox Meeting ... </pre>
	Overall: 65.28 → 98.70 FormulaCDM: 0.000 → 1.000	
(b) Table-boundary recovery 	<pre> ... <tr><td>Diluted EPS</td><td>2</td><td>\$3.28</td><td></td></tr> \$2.54</td><td>\$1.25</td><td>+29.1%</td></tr> ... <tr><td colspan="5">NOTE: This consolidated statement of operations reflects combined performance across all operating segments including: ... <tr><td colspan="5">AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATION: This Consolidated Statement of Operations, including all notes and supplementary schedules, has been audited . . .</td></tr> <td>Chief Financial Officer</td><td>Controller</td><td><td></td></tr> <td>Chief Executive Officer</td><td><td></td></tr> ... </pre>	<pre> ... <tr><td>Diluted EPS</td><td>2</td><td>\$3.28</td><td></td></tr> \$2.54</td><td>\$1.25</td><td>+29.1%</td></tr> ... </table> NOTE: This consolidated statement of operations reflects combined performance across all operating segments including: ... AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATION: This Consolidated Statement of Operations, including all notes and supplementary schedules, has been audited ... Chief Financial Officer ... Controller ... Chief Executive Officer ... </pre>
	Overall: 51.76 → 98.59 TextEdit: 0.862 → 0.027	
(c) Field-value pairing 	<pre> Device Model 设备型号: Current FW 当前固件: Target FW 目标固件: Build Date 构建日期: Architecture 架构: Image Size 镜像大小: GW-IoT-4200 Edge Gateway v4.1.8 (build 20250911) v4.2.1 (build 20260401) 2026-04-01 08:30:00 UTC ARMv8-A Cortex-A72 48.7 MB ... </pre>	<pre> Device Model 设备型号: GW-IoT-4200 Edge Gateway Current FW 当前固件: v4.1.8 (build 20250911) Target FW 目标固件: v4.2.1 (build 20260401) Build Date 构建日期: 2026-04-01 08:30:00 UTC Architecture 架构: ARMv8-A Cortex-A72 Image Size 镜像大小: 48.7 MB ## [NEW] 新增功能 / New Features ... </pre>
	Overall: 57.25 → 92.47 TextEdit: 0.428 → 0.075	

 Highlighted source regions localize the comparison. Displayed text preserves the model serialization; **red type** marks literal error spans, and ellipses mark omitted spans.

Figure 11 PureDocBench Digital Degraded. Stage I loses display-math serialization in (a), extends a table across non-tabular notes in (b), and splits metadata labels from their values in (c). Stage II restores formula serialization and table boundaries and re-pairs the firmware fields.


Input

Stage I Prediction

Stage II Prediction

(a) Cross-document hallucination

Overall: 31.43 → 94.13 TextEdit: 0.681 → 0.057



```
## THE FINANCIAL CHRONICLE
...
Vol. 02171, No. 69
...
S&P 500 3,738.92 +42.18 (+0.75%)
...
1. 2017年, 公司与上海浦东发展银行股份有限公司
签订了《关于使用部分闲置募集资金进行现金管理的协议》。
...
The Ground Truth image displays a single, solid horizontal line.
According to Rule 2 (UNDERSCORE & LINE RULES), this is a
stylistic or background line, not a placeholder underscore.
...


$$\therefore m = \frac{3}{11}$$

...
```

```
## THE FINANCIAL CHRONICLE
Vol CXIV, No 20
Sunday, March 17, 2025
New York London Hong Kong Tokyo Frankfurt
DJIA 42,186.57 · 287.41 (+0.65%)
S&P 500 3,738.92 +42.18 (+0.74%)
...
## Fed Holds Rates Steady, Signals Two Cuts Remain on Table
for 2025
Powell cites "unusually elevated uncertainty" from tariff policies;
dot plot unchanged from December projections
BY JAMES WHITFIELD AND SARAH CHEH | FEDERAL
RESERVE CORRESPONDENTS
WASHINGTON — The Federal Reserve held its benchmark
interest rate unchanged at 4.25%-4.50% on Wednesday, as
widely expected
...
```

(b) Text and formula recovery

Overall: 64.61 → 97.70 FormulaCDM: 0.024 → 1.000



```
...
第一条 各方基本信息
<table>
...
<tr><td>乙方(受让方)</td><td colspan="3">
深圳前海汇智投资合伙企业(有限合伙)</td></tr><tr><td>
统一社会信用代码</td><td>91440300MA5FP7TN8K</td>
<td>执行事务合伙人</td><td>林露铭</td></tr>
...
</table>
...
## 第七条 违约责任
7.1 任何一方违反本协议项下的义务、陈述或保证的, ...
违约金 = 股权转让总对价 × 10% + 逾期付款金额 × 0.05% ×
逾期天数
...
```


```
...
第一条 各方基本信息
<table>
...
<tr><td>乙方(受让方)</td><td colspan="3">
深圳前海汇智投资合伙企业(有限合伙)</td></tr><tr><td>
统一社会信用代码</td><td>91440300MA5FP7TN8K</td>
<td>执行事务合伙人</td><td>林嘉铭</td></tr>
...
</table>
...
## 第七条 违约责任
7.1 任何一方违反本协议项下的义务、陈述或保证的, ...

$$\text{违约金} = \text{股权转让总对价} \times 10\% + \text{逾期付款金额} \times 0.05\% \times \text{逾期天数}$$

...
```

(c) Section serialization

Overall: 67.08 → 96.66 TextEdit: 0.648 → 0.056



```
...
二、直接死亡原因链 Cause of Death Chain
<table><tr><td>1a 直接原因</td><td>
感染性休克、多器官功能衰竭(MOF) Septic shock with multiple
organ failure</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>↑ 由于 due
to</td></tr><tr><td>1b 前因</td><td>
重症肺炎(多重耐药菌感染) Severe pneumonia ...</td></tr>
...
</table>
三、讨论发言记录
<table><tr><td>汇报医师:李明 住院医师</td></tr>
...
...
```

```
...
## 二、直接死亡原因链 Cause of Death Chain
1a 直接原因 感染性休克、多器官功能衰竭(MOF) ...
↑ 由于 due to
1b 前因 重症肺炎(多重耐药菌感染) ...
↑ 由于 due to
1c 根因 社区获得性肺炎, 免疫功能低下 ...
II 促进因素 2型糖尿病(20年, HbA1c 9.8%) ...
...
## 三、讨论发言记录
汇报医师: 李明 住院医师
...
感染科会诊意见: 王教授 主任医师
...
ICU主治: 陈副主任医师
...
```

 Highlighted source regions localize the comparison. Displayed text preserves the model serialization; **red type** marks literal error spans, and ellipses mark omitted spans.

Figure 12 PureDocBench Real Degraded. Stage I diverges into unrelated Chinese disclosure text and repeated mathematics in (a), loses formula serialization in (b), and overtubularizes a clinical form in (c). Stage II restores page-consistent newspaper content, mathematical serialization, and linear section structure, while localized recognition errors remain under physical acquisition conditions.

B.2 Results across Document Scenarios

Figures 13, 14, 15, and 16 show the model’s predictions across diverse document scenarios. Each comparison contains the input, the complete predicted Markdown, and its rendering; a display-only transcription correction is disclosed in the corresponding caption.

Across these scenarios, the model preserves reading order while representing tables with HTML and mathematical expressions with LaTeX.







Input	Predicted Markdown	Rendered Output
	$\int_{\log 3}^0 \frac{1}{e^t + 1} dt$	
	$\begin{aligned} a &= \frac{-\frac{r_2}{10} + \frac{(2K_2-3)r_2}{10K_2}}{\frac{r_2^2}{80} - \frac{9c_1r_2^2}{80} + \frac{(2-3/K_2)r_2}{100}} \\ b &= \frac{(2K_2-3)r_2}{100K_2} - \frac{(1-4K_2)r_2^2}{80K_2^2} + \frac{(3/K_2-2)(2K_2-3)r_2^2}{100K_2} \\ c &= \frac{-9c_1r_2^3}{800} + \frac{9c_1(2-3/K_2)r_2^2}{800} + \frac{(2K_2-3)r_2^2}{1000K_2} \\ &\quad - \frac{9c_1(2K_2-3)r_2^2}{800K_2} - \frac{(2-3/K_2)(2K_2-3)r_2^2}{1000K_2} + \frac{(2-3/K_2)(1-4K_2)r_2^2}{800K_2^2} \end{aligned}$	
	$\begin{aligned} E[Y'(\theta)Y'(\theta)] &= (\tau+1)^2 \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{m+1/2} \Sigma(\theta) ^{1/2}} \right)^{2\tau} \frac{1}{(2\tau+1)^{1/2+1/2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\Delta_{\tau}^{\top} \Delta_{\tau}^{\top} + (2\tau+1) \text{trace} \left(\Sigma(\theta)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \mu(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right)^{\top} \frac{\partial \mu(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{trace} \left(\Sigma(\theta)^{-1} \frac{\partial \Sigma(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \Sigma(\theta)^{-1} \frac{\partial \Sigma(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{m+1/2} \Sigma(\theta) ^{1/2}} \right)^{2\tau} \frac{1}{(1+\tau)^{m+1/2}} \Delta_{\tau}^{\top} \Delta_{\tau}^{\top} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\tau+1)^2 K^{1/2}(\theta)} \end{aligned}$	

Figure 13 Qualitative examples on formula-rich documents. Each row shows the input, the predicted Markdown and its rendered output.

Rendered Output

第1课时 圆柱的表面积(第1、2课时)

例题1

(1) 计算下面各圆柱的表面积。(单位: cm)

(2) 如图, 圆柱的高是10 cm, 底面直径是10 cm。求这个圆柱的表面积。

例题2

(1) 计算下面各圆柱的表面积。(单位: cm)

(2) 如图, 圆柱的高是10 cm, 底面直径是10 cm。求这个圆柱的表面积。

例题3

(1) 计算下面各圆柱的表面积。(单位: cm)

(2) 如图, 圆柱的高是10 cm, 底面直径是10 cm。求这个圆柱的表面积。

第5课时 练习课(第3、4课时)

知识准备

1. 填空。

(1) 一个圆柱的高不变, 底面半径扩大到原来的2倍, 它的底面积扩大到原来的()倍, 侧面积扩大到原来的()倍。

(2) 圆柱的侧面积等于底面周长乘高。如果圆柱的底面周长是10 cm, 高是5 cm, 那么它的侧面积是() cm²。

2. 选择。

(1) 工人师傅使用下面的滚筒刷在墙上各自滚涂一周, 刷侧面的面积最大的是()。

(2) 一个圆柱的侧面展开后是一个正方形, 这个圆柱的底面直径与高的比是()。

A. 1: π B. π : 1
C. 1: 2π D. 2π : 1

(3) 把一个圆柱的侧面展开后得到一个长方形, 长是9.42 cm, 宽是3 cm, 求这个圆柱的侧面积。(单位: cm²)

A. 28.26 B. 28.26 π
C. 14.13 D. 14.13 π

知识准备

1. 填空。

(1) 一个圆柱的高不变, 底面半径扩大到原来的2倍, 它的底面积扩大到原来的()倍, 侧面积扩大到原来的()倍。

(2) 圆柱的侧面积等于底面周长乘高。如果圆柱的底面周长是10 cm, 高是5 cm, 那么它的侧面积是() cm²。

2. 选择。

(1) 工人师傅使用下面的滚筒刷在墙上各自滚涂一周, 刷侧面的面积最大的是()。

(2) 一个圆柱的侧面展开后是一个正方形, 这个圆柱的底面直径与高的比是()。

A. 1: π
B. π : 1
C. 1: 2π
D. 2π : 1

3. 北京天安门广场的面积有20 000平方米, 大约相当于天安门城楼占地面积的100倍。天安门城楼占地面积大约是多少平方米?

() Where are you, Leo?
 () Yes. What time is it in Beijing?
 () It's 9:20 p.m. It's time to go to bed. I have to go to bed before 9:30.
 () Yes in Sydney.

四、听录音，填写。

听录音，完成填空。

This is a photo of my family.

My father and I sit on the ch. 

Father helps me with my homework. 

My brother is in a toy car. 

"Chen!" shouts my mother. "Don't play with the cat." 

() Where are you, Leo?
 () Yes. What time is it in Beijing?
 () It's 9:20 p.m. It's time to go to bed. I have to go to bed before 9:30.
 () Yes in Sydney.

四、听录音，填写。

听录音，完成填空。

This is a photo of my family.

My father and I sit on the ch. 

Father helps me with my homework. 

My brother is in a toy car. 

"Chen!" shouts my mother. "Don't play with the b. d. It's i y you!"

五、听录音，完成任务。

听录音，完成相应任务。

A. 听录音，勾出正确的选项。

1. It's _____. It's time to get up. ☐ 6:00 a.m. ☐ 6:30 a.m.

2. What vegetables are on the farm?

tomatoes	potatoes	green beans	carrots
☐	☐	☐	☐

3. What animals are on the farm?

horses	pigs	sheep	cows
☐	☐	☐	☐

4. It's 12 o'clock. It's time for _____. ☐ dinner ☐ lunch

5. 将第一题表格中填错了的句子改正。正确的写“T”，错误的写“F”。

() The farm is small but nice.

() It's 7:30 a.m. It's time to feed the sheep.

() There are 13 horses on the farm.

() Where are you, Leo?
 () Yes. What time is it in Beijing?
 () It's 9:20 p.m. It's time to go to bed. I have to go to bed before 9:30.
 () I'm in Sydney.

四、听录音，填写。

听录音，完成填空。

This is a photo of my family.

My father and I sit on the ch. 

Father helps me with my homework. 

My brother is in a toy car. 

"Oh no!" shouts my mother. "Don't play with the b. d. It's i h y you!"

五、听录音，完成任务。

听录音，完成相应任务。

A. 听录音，勾出正确的选项。

1. It's _____. It's time to get up. ☐ 6:00 a.m. ☐ 6:30 a.m.

2. What vegetables are on the farm?

tomatoes	potatoes	green beans	carrots
☐	☐	☐	☐

3. What animals are on the farm?

horses	pigs	sheep	cows
☐	☐	☐	☐

4. It's 12 o'clock. It's time for _____. ☐ dinner ☐ lunch

5. 将第一题表格中填错了的句子改正。正确的写“T”，错误的写“F”。

() The farm is small but nice.

() It's 7:30 a.m. It's time to feed the sheep.

() There are 13 horses on the farm.

() Where are you, Leo?
 () Yes. What time is it in Beijing?
 () It's 9:20 p.m. It's time to go to bed. I have to go to bed before 9:30.
 () I'm in Sydney.

四、听录音，填写。

听录音，完成填空。

This is a photo of my family.

My father and I sit on the ch. 

Father helps me with my homework. 

My brother is in a toy car. 

"Oh no!" shouts my mother. "Don't play with the b. d. It's i h y you!"

五、听录音，完成任务。

听录音，完成相应任务。

A. 听录音，勾出正确的选项。

1. It's _____. It's time to get up. ☐ 6:00 a.m. ☐ 6:30 a.m.

2. What vegetables are on the farm?

tomatoes	potatoes	green beans	carrots
☐	☐	☐	☐

3. What animals are on the farm?

horses	pigs	sheep	cows
☐	☐	☐	☐

4. It's 12 o'clock. It's time for _____. ☐ dinner ☐ lunch

5. 将第一题表格中填错了的句子改正。正确的写“T”，错误的写“F”。


() The farm is small but nice.

() It's 7:30 a.m. It's time to feed the sheep.


() There are 13 horses on the farm.

33

Input



Predicted Markdown



Rendered Output









Figure 15 Qualitative examples on scanned and photographed documents. Each row shows the input, the predicted Markdown and its rendered output.

Input

Methods	D>MA	MA>D	D>MS	MS>D	MA>MS	MS>MA
	R1	mAP	R1	mAP	R1	mAP
LOMO	27.2	8.0	12.3	4.8	-	-
EOLMA	35.8	14.8	17.1	8.3	-	-
EOLMA	40.9	-	-	-	-	-
UML	34.5	12.4	18.5	7.3	-	-
PUL	45.5	20.5	30.0	16.4	-	-
CAMEL	54.5	26.3	-	-	-	-
MMFA	-	-	45.3	24.7	-	-
PTGAN	38.6	-	27.4	-	11.8	3.3
SPGAN	51.5	22.8	41.1	22.3	-	-
SPGAN+LMP	57.7	26.7	46.4	26.2	-	-
TJ-AIDL	58.2	26.5	44.3	23.0	-	-
M2M-GAN (Ours)	59.1	29.6	52.0	29.8	36.8	11.9
M2M-GAN+LMP (Ours)	63.1	30.9	54.6	31.6	35.5	10.5

Predicted Markdown

<table> <tr> <td>rowspan="2">Methods</td> <td><colspan="2">D>MA</td> <td><colspan="2">MA>D</td> <td><colspan="2">D>MS</td> <td><colspan="2">MS>D</td> <td><colspan="2">MA>MS</td> <td><colspan="2">MS>MA</td> </tr> <tr> <td><colspan="2">R1</td> <td><colspan="2">mAP</td> <td><colspan="2">R1</td> <td><colspan="2">mAP</td> <td><colspan="2">R1</td> <td><colspan="2">mAP</td> <td><colspan="2">R1</td> <td><colspan="2">mAP</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LOMO</td> <td>27.2</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>12.3</td> <td>4.8</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EOLMA</td> <td>35.8</td> <td>14.8</td> <td>17.1</td> <td>8.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EOLMA</td> <td>40.9</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UML</td> <td>34.5</td> <td>12.4</td> <td>18.5</td> <td>7.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PUL</td> <td>45.5</td> <td>20.5</td> <td>30.0</td> <td>16.4</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CAMEL</td> <td>54.5</td> <td>26.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MMFA</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>45.3</td> <td>24.7</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PTGAN</td> <td>38.6</td> <td>-</td> <td>27.4</td> <td>-</td> <td>11.8</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>10.2</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPGAN</td> <td>51.5</td> <td>22.8</td> <td>41.1</td> <td>22.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPGAN+LMP</td> <td>57.7</td> <td>26.7</td> <td>46.4</td> <td>26.2</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TJ-AIDL</td> <td>58.2</td> <td>26.5</td> <td>44.3</td> <td>23.0</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M2M-GAN (Ours)</td> <td>59.1</td> <td>29.6</td> <td>52.0</td> <td>29.8</td> <td>36.8</td> <td>11.9</td> <td>61.1</td> <td>37.5</td> <td>31.9</td> <td>10.8</td> <td>57.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M2M-GAN+LMP (Ours)</td> <td>63.1</td> <td>30.9</td> <td>54.6</td> <td>31.6</td> <td>35.5</td> <td>10.5</td> <td>61.7</td> <td>37.2</td> <td>32.2</td> <td>9.7</td> <td>60.8</td> </tr> </table>

Rendered Output

Methods	D>MA	MA>D	D>MS	MS>D	MA>MS	MS>MA
	R1	mAP	R1	mAP	R1	mAP
LOMO	27.2	8.0	12.3	4.8	-	-
EOLMA	35.8	14.8	17.1	8.3	-	-
EOLMA	40.9	-	-	-	-	-
UML	34.5	12.4	18.5	7.3	-	-
PUL	45.5	20.5	30.0	16.4	-	-
CAMEL	54.5	26.3	-	-	-	-
MMFA	-	-	45.3	24.7	-	-
PTGAN	38.6	-	27.4	-	11.8	3.3
SPGAN	51.5	22.8	41.1	22.3	-	-
SPGAN+LMP	57.7	26.7	46.4	26.2	-	-
TJ-AIDL	58.2	26.5	44.3	23.0	-	-
M2M-GAN (Ours)	59.1	29.6	52.0	29.8	36.8	11.9
M2M-GAN+LMP (Ours)	63.1	30.9	54.6	31.6	35.5	10.5

Sunday, March 11th, 2018						
PROEHLIF PARK						
4517 JESSUP GROVE RD						
GREENSBORO, NC 27410						
NAME	CL	HIGH SCHOOL	CLASS	HEIGHT	JERSEY	TEAM
Brian Fries	Senior	Reidsville High School	2021	5'11"	4	4
Shakel Moore	Senior	Piedmont Classical	2019	6'0"	21	4
John Michael Wright	Senior	Northwest Temple Academy	2019	6'1"	28	4
Jackson Gammons	High Point	Calvary Day School	2019	6'2"	45	4
Aj McKee	Charlotte	Independence High School	2019	6'3"	52	4
Jalen Barr	Charlotte	Olympic	2019	6'4"	69	4
Dillon Harrison	Marion	Comenius School	2019	6'5"	76	4
Williams Oneyodi	Raeford	Fayetteville Academy	2019	6'6"	93	4
Gavin Rains	Trinity	Wheatmore High School	2019	6'7"	100	4
Ben Beeker	Hendersonville	Hendersonville	2019	6'9"	117	4
Jalen Benjamin	Raleigh	Leesville Road High School	2019	5'11"	5	5
Riley Adams	Cary	Cape Fear Christian High School	2019	6'0"	20	5
Justin Wright	Greenville	Farmville Central High School	2020	6'1"	29	5
Jackson Gabriel	Denver	Lincoln Charter	2019	6'2"	44	5
Caleb Mills	Arden	Ashville Christian	2019	6'3"	53	5
Jaden Springer	Charlotte	Rocky River High School	2020	6'4"	68	5
Donte Johnson	Snow Hill	Greene Central	2019	6'5"	77	5
Noah Allred	Colfax	Northwest Guilford	2021	6'6"	92	5
Imajae Dodd	Waltontown	Greene Central High	2019	6'7"	101	5
Beau Maye	Huntersville	Hough High School	2020	6'9"	116	5
Jalen Cone	Kernersville	Walkertown High School	2020	5'11"	6	6
Lawrence Frost	Raleigh	Athens Drive High School	2020	6'0"	19	6
Lee Langstaff	Asheville	Carolina Day School	2020	6'1"	30	6
Ford Cooper	Matthews	Carmel Christian School	2020	6'2"	43	6
Christian Hampton	Greensboro	Northwest Guilford	2020	6'3"	54	6
DeMarcus Johnson	Mooreville	Lake Norman High School	2019	6'4"	67	6
Jace McKenney	Southport	South Brunswick High School	2019	6'5"	78	6
Matthew Smith	Matthews	Independence High School	2019	6'6"	91	6
Jaden Seymour	Charlotte	Northside Christian	2020	6'7"	102	6
Patrick Williams	Charlotte	West Charlotte	2019	6'8"	115	6

Sunday, March 11th, 2018

#NCTOP80

PROEHLIF PARK

4517 JESSUP GROVE RD

GREENSBORO, NC 27410

<table> <tr> <td>rowspan="2">Methods</td> <td><colspan="2">D>MA</td> <td><colspan="2">MA>D</td> <td><colspan="2">D>MS</td> <td><colspan="2">MS>D</td> <td><colspan="2">MA>MS</td> <td><colspan="2">MS>MA</td> </tr> <tr> <td><colspan="2">R1</td> <td><colspan="2">mAP</td> <td><colspan="2">R1</td> <td><colspan="2">mAP</td> <td><colspan="2">R1</td> <td><colspan="2">mAP</td> <td><colspan="2">R1</td> <td><colspan="2">mAP</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LOMO</td> <td>27.2</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>12.3</td> <td>4.8</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EOLMA</td> <td>35.8</td> <td>14.8</td> <td>17.1</td> <td>8.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EOLMA</td> <td>40.9</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UML</td> <td>34.5</td> <td>12.4</td> <td>18.5</td> <td>7.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PUL</td> <td>45.5</td> <td>20.5</td> <td>30.0</td> <td>16.4</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CAMEL</td> <td>54.5</td> <td>26.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MMFA</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>45.3</td> <td>24.7</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PTGAN</td> <td>38.6</td> <td>-</td> <td>27.4</td> <td>-</td> <td>11.8</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>10.2</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPGAN</td> <td>51.5</td> <td>22.8</td> <td>41.1</td> <td>22.3</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPGAN+LMP</td> <td>57.7</td> <td>26.7</td> <td>46.4</td> <td>26.2</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TJ-AIDL</td> <td>58.2</td> <td>26.5</td> <td>44.3</td> <td>23.0</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M2M-GAN (Ours)</td> <td>59.1</td> <td>29.6</td> <td>52.0</td> <td>29.8</td> <td>36.8</td> <td>11.9</td> <td>61.1</td> <td>37.5</td> <td>31.9</td> <td>10.8</td> <td>57.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M2M-GAN+LMP (Ours)</td> <td>63.1</td> <td>30.9</td> <td>54.6</td> <td>31.6</td> <td>35.5</td> <td>10.5</td> <td>61.7</td> <td>37.2</td> <td>32.2</td> <td>9.7</td> <td>60.8</td> </tr> </table>

Sunday, March 11th, 2018

#NCTOP80

PROEHLIF PARK

4517 JESSUP GROVE RD

GREENSBORO, NC 27410

NAME	CITY	HIGH SCHOOL	CLASS	HEIGHT	JERSEY	TEAM
Brian Fries	Reidsville	Reidsville High School	2021	5'11"	4	4
Shakel Moore	Cameron	Piedmont Classical	2019	6'0"	21	4
John Michael Wright	Fayetteville	Northwest Temple Academy	2019	6'1"	28	4
Jackson Gammons	High Point	Calvary Day School	2019	6'2"	45	4
Aj McKee	Charlotte	Independence High School	2019	6'3"	52	4
Jalen Barr	Charlotte	Olympic	2019	6'4"	69	4
Dillon Harrison	Marion	Comenius School	2019	6'5"	76	4
Williams Oneyodi	Raeford	Fayetteville Academy	2019	6'6"	93	4
Gavin Rains	Trinity	Wheatmore High School	2019	6'7"	100	4
Ben Beeker	Hendersonville	Hendersonville	2019	6'9"	117	4
Jalen Benjamin	Raleigh	Leesville Road High School	2019	5'11"	5	5
Riley Adams	Cary	Cape Fear Christian High School	2019	6'0"	20	5
Justin Wright	Greenville	Farmville Central High School	2020	6'1"	29	5
Jackson Gabriel	Denver	Lincoln Charter	2019	6'2"	44	5
Caleb Mills	Arden	Ashville Christian	2019	6'3"	53	5
Jaden Springer	Charlotte	Rocky River High School	2020	6'4"	68	5
Donte Johnson	Snow Hill	Greene Central	2019	6'5"	77	5
Noah Allred	Colfax	Northwest Guilford	2021	6'6"	92	5
Imajae Dodd	Waltontown	Greene Central High	2019	6'7"	101	5
Beau Maye	Huntersville	Hough High School	2020	6'9"	116	5
Jalen Cone	Kernersville	Walkertown High School	2020	5'11"	6	6
Lawrence Frost	Raleigh	Athens Drive High School	2020	6'0"	19	6
Lee Langstaff	Asheville	Carolina Day School	2020	6'1"	30	6
Ford Cooper	Matthews	Carmel Christian School	2020	6'2"	43	6
Christian Hampton	Greensboro	Northwest Guilford	2020	6'3"	54	6
DeMarcus Johnson	Mooreville	Lake Norman High School	2019	6'4"	67	6
Jace McKenney	Southport	South Brunswick High School	2019	6'5"	78	6
Matthew Smith	Matthews	Independence High School	2019	6'6"	91	6
Jaden Seymour	Charlotte	Northside Christian	2020	6'7"	102	6
Patrick Williams	Charlotte	West Charlotte	2019	6'8"	115	6

Figure 16 Qualitative examples on table-rich documents. Each row shows the input, the predicted Markdown and its rendered output. The school-name typo in the roster is manually corrected for display.