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Abstract
We describe and evaluate a prototype system for recognising person and place names in digitised records of British parliamentary proceedings from the late 17th and early 19th centuries. The output of an OCR engine is the input for our system and we describe certain issues and errors in this data and discuss the methods we have used to overcome the problems. We describe our rule-based named entity recognition system for person and place names which is implemented using the LT-XML2 and LT-TT2 text processing tools. We discuss the annotation of a development and testing corpus and provide results of an evaluation of our system on the test corpus.

1. Introduction
In this paper we describe how we have applied text processing techniques to historical texts from the BOPCRIS 18th Century Parliamentary Publications project (http://www.bopcris.ac.uk/18c/) which makes digitised parliamentary records widely accessible via the web. Pages from the records are first scanned and then converted to text using optical character recognition (OCR) technology so that they can be indexed and searched. The results of search are displayed back to the user in the form of highlighting of terms in the jpeg images of the pages. The premises behind the research reported here is that more sophisticated indexing and search may be possible if particular types of terms can be automatically identified in the documents. Our role has been to apply text processing and named entity recognition (NER) techniques for the automatic recognition of person and place names. We have experience of building both rule-based NER systems (Mikheev et al., 1999a; Mikheev et al., 1999b) and ones which are machine-learning-based (Alex et al., 2006; Finkel et al., 2005; Hachey et al., 2005; Nissim et al., 2004). For the initial prototype described here we decided to use rule-based methods. In part this decision was taken to avoid the cost of annotation of training data, but it was also taken because it was not obvious that machine-learning methods would lend themselves to this data. Developing a rule-based system has allowed us to explore what is rather unusual and problematic data, as discussed in the next section.

2. The Parliamentary records data
We have used two sets of data from the Journals of the House of Lords, an early set from 1685 to 1691 and a later set from 1814 to 1817. The two sets were OCRed at different times using different processors and, in fact, the quality of the OCR of the earlier documents is better because the process was specialised to Old English and it deals properly with the ‘f’-like realisation of ‘s’ that occurs in both sets. In general, OCR quality is erratic and there is a tendency for unusual non-alphabetic characters to appear, as illustrated in Figure 1. Problems also arise with the use of quotation marks. The texts are densely populated with quotations and every line of a quotation is preceded by a double quote mark, as in Figure 2. These quote marks frequently interfere with the natural flow of words in a named entity and special steps are needed to deal with them. Moreover, the OCR has problems identifying these double quotes and outputs them as a wide range of non-standard characters. In addition, the OCR system has problems with layout and is frequently unable to distinguish marginal notes from the main body of the text, giving rise to discontinuous sequences of words which could confound a NER system—Figure 3 shows an example of this problem. Although these are English texts, there are frequent portions in Latin, especially in the 1685-1691 data, and OCR seems to be poorer on these sections than on the English sections.

Figure 1: OCR errors in the 1814–1817 data set

Figure 2: Use of quotation marks

Figure 3: An example of OCR output
Aside from OCR issues, the Parliamentary data is difficult in other respects and it is unclear whether the character-based features which work well in machine-learning NER systems would carry over well to this data. A major concern is the different use of word-initial capitals where common nouns are more likely to be capitalised than not (see for example, Figures 2 and 3). The presence or absence of capitalisation is a highly significant feature for machine-learning NER systems and a German-style initial capitalisation of nouns can significantly impact on performance. In CoNLL 2003 (Sang and De Meulder (2003)) NER systems were trained and tested on data from English and German. The highest f-score achieved for German was 72.41 as compared to 88.76 for English and the different capitalisation is likely to be the main reason for this difference. A further issue concerns part-of-speech (POS) tagging. The peculiar nature of our data means that a modern English POS tagger is unlikely to perform well on it, and this in turn would have an impact on the quality of a machine-learning NER system. These considerations meant that we had concerns about whether a machine-learning approach would achieve a high-level of accuracy on the BOPCRIS data. For this reason, and because of the costs of annotation of training material, we decided to pursue rule-based techniques.

### 3. Data annotation

Although a rule-based approach does not require annotated training data, gold standard annotated material is necessary for development and testing. We therefore annotated samples of data from the 1814–1817 and the 1685–1691 data sets, using guidelines developed specifically for the task. In total 91 files from the 1814–1817 set were annotated. There are 136,646 words in these 91 files and 2,751 person names and 2,021 location names were annotated. The data was split into two sets, devtest and test (45 and 46 documents respectively). The devtest set was created for system development and could therefore be seen by developers. The test set was created for formal evaluation. The lowest score is for location names in the 1685–1691 set: this may in part be due to data sparseness in this set, as there were only 164 location names annotated in the 46 test files as opposed to 2,021 location names in the corresponding 1814–1817 test set. A further problem with the 1685–1691 set was that one annotator systematically annotated names within the marginal notes while the other did not. This was discovered after IAA was calculated and was subsequently rectified. The test sets used for evaluation contain arbitrated versions of the doubly annotated files.

### 4. The prototype system

The NER tagger system developed for this project was implemented using in-house XML tools. Over the past few years we have developed a suite of tools for generic XML manipulation (LTXML, Thompson et al. (1997)) as well as NLP specific XML tools (LT TTT, Grover et al. (2000)). More recently we have developed significantly improved upgrades of these tools, LT-XML2 and LT-TTT2 (http://www.ltg.ed.ac.uk/software/ltxml2).
The input to the system is an XML format output by the OCR process. The first step in the processing pipeline converts this to a more suitable format and performs transformations such as conversion to utf-8, separation of trailing punctuation and white space from word elements and addition of ids to word elements. Each word element in the original has coordinate information associated with it in the attributes l (left) and t (top) and size information in the attributes h (height) and w (width). This information is preserved and is used to calculate new information such as the location of newline white space. We also attempt to deal with the problem of marginal notes: as described above, the material in the right-hand margin is frequently intermingled with the preceding column. We use the coordinate information to try to identify word elements which are located in the margin and add to them the attribute marginal='true'. This attribute is later used by the named entity recognition component to filter marginal words out of names.

The NER tagger is implemented as a sequence of calls to the LTG's LT-XML2 programs, in particular the XML transduction program *lxtransduce*. This program operates on an XML input file to add person and place name mark-up as defined by rules in grammar files. For person names there are rules for, amongst others, monarchs, earls, lords, dukes, churchmen, and common people. The rules access a variety of lexicons including ones listing male and female christian names and surnames, as well as more specialist lexicons such as one which lists place names which are also christian names, and surnames, as well as more specialist lexicons such as one which lists place names which are also earldoms (e.g. “Warwick”).

Place name recognition is done near the end of the NER tagging pipeline and is slightly interleaved with person name recognition. After all the specialist rules for dukes etc. have applied, a first set of place name rules are used to identify very high confidence place names, such as “Town of London”. Then a general purpose person name grammar operates to find common names such as “Mr. Stratford” before a general purpose place name grammar finishes the process. Because of this incremental approach to adding mark-up, the specialist lexicons, such as the one for place names which are earldoms, are used first to ensure that an example such as “Earl of Warwick” is recognised as a person name.

Before the entity rules are applied, a grammar to identify possible ‘noise’ is used. This marks marginal notes, quotation marks, unusual characters etc. as noise so that the entity grammar rules can permit noise to occur in the middle of an entity. At the end of the NER tagging pipeline the noise mark-up is removed since it has now served its purpose.

The NER tagger outputs a file which is the same as the pre-processed input file except that additional entity mark-up has been added. This is then converted to a ‘standoff’ file containing a list of all the entities found in the page, as shown in the small example in Figure 4. Here the *regions* element lists regions which correspond to the word elements from the original input file and which have inherited their h, l, t and w attributes. This output format is designed to enable highlighting of entities in the page image through a process of mapping from the regions in the OCR XML format to regions in the image.

5. Evaluation

We have evaluated the system both on the devtest set (from the 1814–1817 data) as well as on the blind test sets from the two time periods. The results are shown in Table 2 where precision (P), recall (R) and f-score (F) are shown. The scores on the 1814–1817 sets are reasonable for a first prototype produced within a limited time span, especially when we consider the historical nature of the data and the fact that it comes from a noisy OCR source. Recognition performs better for person names than for location names and this may reflect the fact that person name recognition is more dependent on finding patterns in the text while location name recognition is more dependent on gazetteer resources: the former is more resistant to OCR error than the latter. To illustrate, consider the string ‘Earl of Shagefiury’ (Earl of Shaftesbury). The rules can identify this as a person name, even though the OCR has mangled ‘Shaftesbury’, because the ‘Earl of capitalised-word’ pattern can still match. If the string ‘Shagefiury’ appeared on its own as a place name, however, a look-up against the gazetteer would fail and the name would be missed. Solutions to this problem lie either in better OCR technology or in fuzzy look-up techniques.

The results for the 1814–1817 data are shown in Table 2 where precision (P), recall (R) and f-score (F) are shown. The scores on the 1814–1817 sets are reasonable for a first prototype produced within a limited time span, especially when we consider the historical nature of the data and the fact that it comes from a noisy OCR source. Recognition performs better for person names than for location names and this may reflect the fact that person name recognition is more dependent on finding patterns in the text while location name recognition is more dependent on gazetteer resources: the former is more resistant to OCR error than the latter. To illustrate, consider the string ‘Earl of Shagefiury’ (Earl of Shaftesbury). The rules can identify this as a person name, even though the OCR has mangled ‘Shaftesbury’, because the ‘Earl of capitalised-word’ pattern can still match. If the string ‘Shagefiury’ appeared on its own as a place name, however, a look-up against the gazetteer would fail and the name would be missed. Solutions to this problem lie either in better OCR technology or in fuzzy look-up techniques.

The results for the 1814–1817 data are shown in Table 2 where precision (P), recall (R) and f-score (F) are shown. The scores on the 1814–1817 sets are reasonable for a first prototype produced within a limited time span, especially when we consider the historical nature of the data and the fact that it comes from a noisy OCR source. Recognition performs better for person names than for location names and this may reflect the fact that person name recognition is more dependent on finding patterns in the text while location name recognition is more dependent on gazetteer resources: the former is more resistant to OCR error than the latter. To illustrate, consider the string ‘Earl of Shagefiury’ (Earl of Shaftesbury). The rules can identify this as a person name, even though the OCR has mangled ‘Shaftesbury’, because the ‘Earl of capitalised-word’ pattern can still match. If the string ‘Shagefiury’ appeared on its own as a place name, however, a look-up against the gazetteer would fail and the name would be missed. Solutions to this problem lie either in better OCR technology or in fuzzy look-up techniques.
included in the rules or lexicons but it appears frequently in the 1685–1691 set. Thus ‘Vicemomes Weymouth’ is not recognised as a person name and ‘Weymouth’ is then incorrectly identified as a location. OCR interpretation of layout also seems to be a contributing factor. For example, a column which is a list of bishop’s names of the form ‘Epus. Durham.’ is wrongly recognised as two columns with ‘Epus.’ and ‘Durham.’ separated. This means that the relevant person name rule doesn’t fire and the instance of ‘Durham’ is recognised incorrectly as a location. (This problem does not affect the recall of person name recognition as the annotators did not attempt to mark-up names when the columns were severely mangled.)

Further error analysis of the 1814-1817 devtest data reveals a number of problems, many arising from the OCR process. One source of problems is words broken into more than one w element, e.g., “Sonderland” was broken into <w>Sonde</w> <w>l</w>and the OCR process also creates bad paragraph breaks in the middle of names, which prevents them from being detected. For example, there is a paragraph split after “Neal” in the name “Sir Neal O’Donel”. Note that the OCR output also contains sentence mark-up but this is so unreliable that we discard it.

6. Conclusions and future directions

The evaluation results are promising and we intend to improve performance by continuing to develop the rules and lexicons. In addition to continued development, there are other questions and extensions that it would be useful to consider. The main problem is clearly the low quality of the OCR output and it would be fruitful to explore methods of separating the main text and the marginal notes more clearly. In addition the recognition of individual characters is very noisy and it might be interesting to explore ways of correcting this. One route would be to pursue machine-learning methods to perform automatic correction of the OCR output. This would require a collection of parallel data which had been both OCRed and retyped to use as training material and would utilise automatic alignment methods of the kind used in machine translation systems. Due to limited time and resources we confined our attention to person and place names. However, it would be interesting to extend the system to other entities such as organisations and dates. Further extensions to relation and event extraction could also be implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1814–1817 DevTest</th>
<th>1814–1817 Test</th>
<th>1685–1691 Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>71.94</td>
<td>72.29</td>
<td>72.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>81.81</td>
<td>79.56</td>
<td>80.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.47</td>
<td>76.42</td>
<td>76.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: NER Tagger Evaluation Results (%)
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