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Abstract

Machine learning approaches achieve high accuracy for text recognition and are therefore increasingly used for the transcription of handwritten historical sources. However, using machine learning in production requires a streamlined end-to-end machine learning pipeline that scales to the dataset size, and a model that achieves high accuracy with few manual transcriptions. In addition, the correctness of the model results must be verified. This paper describes our lessons learned developing, tuning, and using the Occode end-to-end machine learning pipeline for transcribing 7.3 million rows with handwritten occupation codes in the Norwegian 1950 population census. We achieve an accuracy of 97% for the automatically transcribed codes, and we send 3% of the codes for manual verification. We verify that the occupation code distribution found in our result matches the distribution found in our training data which should be representative for the census as a whole. We believe our approach and lessons learned are useful for other transcription projects that plan to use machine learning in production. The source code is available at: https://github.com/uit-hdl/rhd-codes

Introduction

Over the last decades we have witnessed a boom in digitization of historical documents, and many national archives are developing services where the public can easily access the cultural heritage. For example, in the Norwegian state budget for 2019, 140 million NOK were allocated to the National Archive of Norway. About half of the budget is assigned for further development of the Digital Archive, who store and distribute digitized historical documents. This will increase the number and also the availability of digitized historical documents. However, there is an increasing demand from the research community to have these documents in a data format suitable for data analysis based research. Over the last couple of decades, this demand has yielded development of more time and cost efficient systems. Of particular interest for our project is the development of automatic text recognition of population data, typically characterized as handwritten documents with a tabular structure. These sources form the basis in the construction of the Norwegian Historical Population Register (HPR) (http://www.rhd.uit.no/nhdc/hpr.html).
HPR will include the records of 9,7 million people who lived in Norway in the period from 1801 to 1964. We are building life trajectories across multiple generations by linking individual and contextual attributes derived from population censuses and church records. In HPR, we have over 10 million manually transcribed person entities from 19th and early 20th century population censuses, and professional transcribers and volunteers have manually transcribed approximately 20 million person entries from the church books. Selected columns in the church books for manual transcription have currently been outsourced through an agreement between the National Archives of Norway and three commercial genealogy companies. We expect these to be finalized by the end of 2021. However, we still have an enormous amount of data awaiting transcription and integration into HPR, and an automatization will undoubtedly be both time- and cost efficient.

Handwritten text recognition (HTR) methods have gained increased attention over the past two decades, and different approaches have been proposed for both online and offline automatic and semi-automatic transcription of handwritten text, character and/or digit recognition (Ghosh & Maghari, 2017; Liu et al., 2003; Plamondon & Srihari 2000; Bottou et al., 1994). We describe an offline solution to automatically transcribe handwritten single and multi-digit numbers from the Norwegian full count 1950 population census. This was the last census where the information was aggregated in a manual fashion, and it is therefore an important bridge to the later electronic censuses. The census manuscripts have been scanned by the National Archives of Norway. The questionnaires include two stippled rows for each individual registered (Figure 1). In the first row the enumerator registered the characteristics of each person, divided into 26 columns, while the second row was kept blank. This row was strictly reserved for the statistical preparation of the census, and Statistics Norway had greyed out the row and typed a warning message: “Skriv ikke på denne linjen” (Do not write on this line). The second row consists of numbers written with a coloured pencil (usually red), by either employees at Statistics Norway or their liaisons in the different Norwegian counties. These numbers represent codes for family position, de facto/de jure residency, marital status, occupation, and education.

Handwritten digit recognition is a textbook example in machine learning, with numerous tutorials available for different machine learning frameworks. The MNIST dataset of 70,000 handwritten single digits (Lecun et al., 1998) (http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/) was an early benchmark dataset in machine learning, that was used in many research papers ten years ago, and the best algorithms achieve almost perfect accuracy today (for example (Ciresan, Meier, Schmidhuber, 2012) has a 0.23% error rate). There are numerous solutions for automatic detection of numbers in images, for example to read street numbers in images. However, existing solutions trained on MNIST and other modern datasets may not work well for historical data since the digits in these are written in many other ways (Kusetogullari et al., 2019).
To implement a transcription solution, we must first select software libraries, services, or tools that achieve high accuracy for our census data. The digit recognition can be implemented and trained from scratch using a deep learning framework such as Keras (https://keras.io/) or PyTorch (https://pytorch.org/). We can tailor the digit recognition for our data by implementing a model that takes into account that our codes always have a specified number of digits and that they are written in most cases using a red pencil. However, implementing a model from scratch requires machine learning expertise, and in addition a labeled training dataset. It is therefore easier to use a cloud service for handwriting recognition such as Microsoft Azure Computer Vision API (https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/services/cognitive-services/computer-vision), or Google Cloud Vision (https://cloud.google.com/vision). Their models are pre-trained using a very big dataset, but it is possible that accuracy with respect to a few digits will suffer due to the model being general for all handwritten text. Also, the cloud services often have a cost per image transcribed. Finally, there are standalone tools that convert handwriting to text such as Evernote (https://evernote.com/) and Microsoft OneNote (https://www.onenote.com/). But they are also generalized to recognize all text, and since they are designed to work on one page at a time, it will be challenging to customize these for the recognition of millions of images.

In this paper we describe our Occode machine learning pipeline for tabular data transcription, and our experiences using it in a production setting. We address three challenges. First, we implemented an end-to-end pipeline for image cutting, image cleaning, transcription, and verification. This pipeline ensures reproducible and scalable processing of the image data. Second, we tune the model to achieve the high accuracy and few manual transcriptions required to transcribe the 2,3 million for 3-digit occupation codes in the Norwegian 1950 census. We achieve an accuracy of 97% for the automatically transcribed codes with 3% sent to manual validation and correction. Third, we propose methods for verifying the correctness of the transcribed results. We do not find systematic errors in the transcribed results. The transcribed results will be implemented in the Norwegian Historical Population register.
Methods

Occode: An end-to-end machine learning pipeline for transcription of tabular datasets

![Diagram](diagram.png)

*Figure 2: The occode end-to-end machine learning pipeline for transcription.*

We have developed an end-to-end machine learning pipeline for transcription of tabular data (Figure 2). First a splitter program divides the scanned questionnaire tables into individual cells (Figure 1). The cell contents are stored as separate images. The images from one column comprise a dataset. A dataset typically contains millions of small images. To avoid cutting text written outside the cell boundary box, the splitter program extends the cell boundary if it detects pixels of certain colors on one of the cell borders.

We implement a workflow for labeling a randomly selected subset of the images in a dataset. The human transcriber is shown images in a Graphical User Interface (GUI) and is asked to label them. The GUI may simply show an image and record the user’s input, but it may also use a clustering or classification method and ask the user to select the images not belonging to the class. The result is a labeled dataset where each image is labeled by one or more persons.

We develop or adapt a machine learning model for each column that we want to transcribe. The model may be provided by a cloud service, a machine learning framework or library, or an open source code repository. We may also develop a new model from scratch. To achieve the best results we use the labeled dataset, that is split into a training set and a test set. We ensure that the model is trained with the same distribution of values as in the full dataset. We can also reuse a labelled dataset to train a model for another column, for example if both columns are numerical. But it is often necessary to adjust the images used for the training to ensure that they reflect the value distribution of the new column.

Each image has to go through a selection of preprocessing steps to make sure they are all as uniform and equal as possible before being sent to the model for training. First the images get
converted to grayscale and assigned the correct data type, then they are resized to a standard height and width. After these steps the model is trained, and its performance can be evaluated on the testing set. Finally, we can use the trained model to transcribe the full dataset for the column, and then verify the quality of the transcribed data.

Occupation codes in the Norwegian 1950 population census

The 1950 census comprises 801,000 double sided questionnaires, resulting in about 1.6 million scanned images. The image sizes are large rectangular formats (29.7x70.7cm) with high resolution (8,500x3,600 pixels). We use our splitter program (described below) to generate a dataset for the occupation codes column. We successfully split 92.83% (714,904 out of 770,094) of the questionnaires. The result is 7,342,113 images, of which 5,021,637 are empty rows and 2,320,476 images have codes or invalid text. We call the 2.3 million images the full dataset.

Labeled training datasets

We created a 3-digit occupation codes training dataset based on a 2% random sample extracted by Statistics Norway after the completion of the census enumeration. Of the split images, 36,065 images are in the 2% sample and therefore used in our 2% training dataset. These were manually transcribed by the Norwegian Historical Data Center. Each image was labeled by one transcriber.

We also created a 3x1-digit training dataset where we split the 3-digit code numbers into single digits. We use a simple approach for segmentation by fitting a three-component mixture of normal distributions to a normalized histogram describing the marginal ink density on the x-axis. If an image does not contain three modes, the image is skipped, since it does not identifiably contain the expected number of digits. We discarded 795 3-digit images that our method did not split into 1-digit images. The resulting 1-digit training set consists of 102,809 images. We label these using the 3-digit labels.

Finally, we created a third random sample training set by randomly selecting 30,000 images from the 2,3 million full dataset. We used our predictions from a model trained on the 2% training set to predict labels that were then manually validated or corrected by one of ten transcribers.

Verification dataset

We created and labeled a 3,000 image verification dataset by randomly selecting 3,000 images that are not in any of the training datasets. We manually verified that we had at least 80 unique classes in the set, and that all images have a 3-digit code.

Machine learning models for multi-digit classification

We considered several models for our occupation code transcription. First, a pre-trained model using the Microsoft Azure Compute Vision application programming interface (API). Although
the service is easy to use, the accuracy of the model was not high enough for our 3-digit codes. Second, the custom Azure Custom Vision API (version 1.1 preview) allowed us to create classifiers from scratch. However, limits on the number of images that can be used to re-train the model reduced the performance of the model, and a limitation of 50 different classes in Custom Vision API made it impractical for our purpose. We therefore decided to develop and train our model from scratch using our own training data.

We developed three models in Keras (https://keras.io/), and trained them using labeled 3-digit occupation code images. The first model (3x1-digit model) splits the code into three separate digits and then classifies each separately using a single-digit classifier trained on single digit images. The second and third models (3-digit and 3-digit-sequential model) are trained on labeled 3-digit occupation codes. We tuned the models by testing different hyper-parameters.

The 3x1-digit model consists of 4 convolution layers with a pooling layer in between each convolution layer, filter sizes starting at 32 and increasing to 128 for the last two layers, kernel size of 3x3, with a ReLU activation function. Two fully connected layers with filters 512 and 10 calculate the final classification into the correct class 0-9. The model utilizes Sparse categorical cross entropy and the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 1e-04.

The 3-digit model is similar to the 3x1-digit model, but it has an additional convolution and pooling layer with a filter size of 256. There is also another fully connected layer with filter size 256, and the output is from 0-264 instead of 0-9. This model uses sparse categorical cross entropy and the Adam optimizer, and has a learning rate of 0.001.

The architecture of the 3-digit-sequential model consists of a combination of CNN and RNN. It has 2 convolutional layers, filter sizes of 32 and 64, with pooling layers in between. Then a fully connected layer with filter size 64, and a 20% dropout layer. 2 LSTM layers make up the RNN part of the network, before a final fully connected output layer that classifies the input into 1 of the 13 possible characters that can make up our 3-digit sequence. The model uses the CTC loss function (Graves et al., 2006), and performs Sequence-to-Sequence classification instead of the One-to-One classification as the two previous models. The model therefore splits an image into time-steps and performs classification for each time-step. In addition to the 10 digits, there is also a class ‘B’ for empty images, ‘T’ for images containing text, n, and the pseudo-blank ‘-’, spacing character that is a built-in feature of the CTC loss function. This model also uses the Adam optimizer.

Results

We have three main requirements for the machine learning model:

1. The accuracy of the automatic transcription should be similar to human level performance: 97%.
2. The number of images sent to manual validation and correction should be less than 100,000 (4.31% of the valid code images).
3. In the resulting automatically and manually transcribed occupation codes, the distribution of the codes for each occupation should match the distribution found in our training data which should be representative for the census as a whole.

The first and second goal are in conflict, since a higher accuracy requires more manual transcription. We can tune this trade-off by adjusting the confidence required for a code to be automatically transcribed. The third requirement is to ensure that the model does not systematically introduce errors into the transcribed data.

In the results description, we include negative results since we believe these provide useful lessons learned in how to discover, analyze, and solve common challenges when deploying a machine learning model into production.

Decision analysis to choose model

Before applying the model to transcribe the occupation codes, we need to choose between the 3x1-digit model, 3-digit model, or the 3-digit-sequential model. We start by comparing the 3x1-digit and 3-digit models since they use a similar deep learning architecture.

The 3-digit and 3x1-digit models output vectors of confidence scores for each class. We use these scores to make a decision about which class the image should be classified as. For our purpose a decision takes the form “assign to a given image the class k if the confidence in k is above the threshold t.” If there is no k for which the confidence is higher than t the model can’t discriminate between classes and the image must be sent to manual transcription. For the 3x1-digit model this decision is made three times, once for each digit. If it is the case that any one of these numbers could not be classified, the whole code cannot be classified and must be sent to manual transcription. Hence the choice of a t is a tradeoff between error and manual transcription cost: a higher t leads to fewer model-induced errors but also leads to more images sent to manual transcription.

Although the confidence output by our models takes the form of a probability, we don’t expect this number to be neither calibrated nor interesting in itself. What is interesting is how many images must be sent to manual validation and correction to achieve a certain (lack of) errors. We expect a human transcriber to make an error in no more than 3% of the images. Since we expect to transcribe most images automatically, the relative error from manual validation and correction should be negligible. Figure 3 shows the errors from the 3-digit and 3x1-digit models as a function of how many images must be sent to manual validation and correction.

It is clear that the 3-digit model is better than the 3x1-digit model for almost any decision we could make. Part of this is because a certain proportion of images do not split cleanly into three single-digit numbers and hence must be sent directly to manual validation and correction (or otherwise be dealt with outside the 3x1-digit model). However, were these images splittable and not counted against the proportion sent to manual validation and correction, the 3-digit model would still be better for almost any decision.
Figure 3: 3-digit model is both cheaper and more accurate for the 2% training set.

Model performance does not transfer to the full dataset

We tested the 3-digit model using a k-fold cross validation using a 80-20 split of the 2% training dataset into training and test. Our results show that the model achieves the required accuracy while keeping the number of images sent to manual labeling low (Figure 3). We therefore used the model to transcribe all 3-digit occupation codes (except those in the 2% training set). To validate the results we plotted the distribution of classes in the training set against the distribution of classes in the classification results. Our results show a significant difference in the distributions (Figure 4) since the model overestimates the frequency of some of the larger classes (they appear above the diagonal line), and it underestimates the frequency of over half of the smaller classes (they are under the line). The model performance therefore does not transfer to the full dataset. This can be due to the model being overfit to the training data, or the training data not being representative of the full dataset.

We could not find any errors in our code, or data leaks, so we decided to test the representativeness of the 2% training dataset. We therefore randomly selected the same number of code images as in the 2% training dataset (36,065) from the full dataset. We used both datasets to train a binary classification model using 80% of the images in each set labeled either as 2% or full. We then used the remaining 20% to test if the model could distinguish between the two datasets. Our results show that the model achieves an F1 score of 0.86 for the 2% labeled images, and an F1 score of 0.88 for the full labeled images. These results indicate that the predictions done by the binary model were not random, and therefore that the 2% images differ from the full dataset images even if the differences are not visible to the human eye. We therefore labeled a new training dataset using the randomly selected images (the random sample training set described above). However, the 3-digit model trained on the random sample training dataset did not achieve the same performance as when trained on the 2% training set (precision = 0.54 and recall = 0.52 vs. precision = 0.91 and recall = 0.92 for respectively the 2% training and random sample training dataset). We therefore decided to implement the new 3-digit-sequential model.
Figure 4: Confidence scores for validation set vs full dataset. The diagonal line symbolizes an even distribution.

New sequential model performance transfers to full dataset

The 3-digit-sequential model (described above) achieves much better performance on the verification and test sets with a precision of 0.95 and recall of 0.95 for the validation set, and 0.96 precision and 0.96 recall for the testing set (90-10 split into train and test, no cross validation). The model performance also transfers to the full dataset (Figure 5). The distribution of classes is similar, except for the smallest classes. These small classes however only make up approximately 0.5% of the total dataset (Figure 6, left). The model performance is therefore good enough to be used for automatic transcription of the full dataset.

We believe the 3-digit-sequential model has three main advantages over the 3-digit model. First, the model handles blank or invalid images better, the full census consists of 7,342,113 images, of which 5,021,637 are blanks with the remaining 2,320,476 images having codes or invalid text, therefore this ability to properly handle blank and text images are very useful. The 3-digit model blank was not trained to classify blank and invalid images, since we assumed these would be accurately removed during data cleaning. However, many blank images have a diagonal line. The sequential model handles such noise in the images since they span all time steps of the image. Second, the sequential model reduces the number of classes from 328 to 13, and thereby also the class imbalance problem (Figure 6).
**Figure 5:** The class distribution found in the training set is on the X-axis, and the distribution found in the predictions for the full dataset is on the Y-axis. The diagonal line symbolizes an equal distribution.

**Figure 6:** Left: Cumulative distribution of 3-digit codes in our 2% training set. The codes are sorted by most frequent first, and the x-axis shows the number of codes included in the cumulative distribution. Only 264 of 328 valid codes are in the training set. We assume the remaining codes have low frequency. Right: The distribution of single digits, blanks, and text in the random sample training set.

**Decision analysis to select confidence threshold**

We need to find the best trade-off between the effort for manual verification and correction and transcription errors for the 3-digit-sequential model. We use the confidence scores output from the model for each of the characters in the 3-digit code. Our policy is to send images to manual validation and correction if one of the confidence scores is lower than the threshold. The largest
reduction in errors is when manually correcting the first 3%-4%. This corresponds to a confidence threshold of .65 (Figure 7). Further improvement gets more and more costly when we send images that did not pass the threshold value to manual validation and correction since the total error decreases (Figure 8). The rate at which it does so however, slows down once we send more than approximately 4%. We therefore set the confidence threshold to 65%. This results in 68,000 images (2.93%) being sent to manual verification and correction, and the estimated accuracy is 97%.

**Figure 7:** Expected manual verification and correction for different decisions for the 3-digit-sequential model.

**Figure 8:** Total error rate per proportion sent to manual validation and correction, 3-digit-sequential model.
Evaluation of errors

To evaluate the type of errors produced by the model we use the 3,000 images in the verification dataset. We manually checked the images in the dataset and found that 131 images had been misclassified. The model often misclassified the numbers 1 and 4, or 2 and 8, since these have distinctive features in common, for example the somewhat leaning vertical “stem”, or the swooping top loop of the numbers mentioned above. We also find that many errors are caused by noise in the images. For example, extra writing added to correct mistakes (Figure 9, left), or the code in the image is unintelligible for both humans and the model (Figure 9, middle). In addition, for some images the human transcriber was wrong, but the model still correctly predicted the code (Figure 9, right).

We also used the verification dataset to calculate how many of the images sent to manual verification and correction were correct (Figure 10). Using these results we estimate that for the full dataset, 68,000 images (2.93%) will be sent to manual verification and correction using our 65% threshold. Of these 30,138 images (44.3%) are correctly labeled and 37,862 images (55.7%) are incorrectly labeled.

Figure 9: Examples of misclassified images. Left: an image where the original code has been crossed out and a new one has been entered. Middle: a code that is very hard to read. Right: the human transcriber labeled this image as “533” but the model correctly predicted “555” (the “hat” of the 5s have all been shifted slightly up and to the right, which is not apparent for those unfamiliar with the dataset).

Figure 10: Verification dataset errors that will be sent to manual verification and correction based on threshold confidences.
Discussion

Lessons learned

We used \textit{Occode} to transcribe the 2.3 million occupation codes in the Norwegian 1950 census. We learned that data processing and data management is very time consuming compared to the development of the machine learning model. We believe our end-to-end pipeline will reduce these efforts. We also learned that pretrained machine learning models did not work well for our data, so we had to label our own data and train our own model.

We learned that although a randomly chosen, but frequently used training dataset, had wear and tear on the book pages that introduced artifacts to the images that are not visible for the human eye but that still significantly influence a deep learning model. The performance achieved for this training dataset did therefore not transfer to the full dataset. We believe this shows the additional challenges of using machine learning in production for large datasets.

A more advanced deep learning architecture however worked well for a truly representative training dataset, and the model performance also transferred to the full dataset. We achieved an accuracy (97\%) with a manual verification and correction rate (3\%) low enough for being useful for production. We have described our analysis for choosing, tuning, and evaluating our models.

Comparison to related work

Methods to automatically recognize tables in historical documents, include machine learning algorithms (Laven et al., 2005) and bottom-up techniques starting from low level features such as table lines to extract the structure. A bottom-up technique was deployed on a historical French population census (not dated in the publication), where the main goal was to extract first and last names in addition to relation to head of household information, for archival indexing. An automation rate of 80\% was chosen, i.e. rejecting pages with damage etc. to minimize the recognition error rate, ranging between 5.5 to 21\%, depending on the page quality (Sibade et al., 2011). Based on recurrent and convolutional neural networks trained on a large amount of data, Nion et al. have automatically transcribed nine different columns\(^1\) from the 1930 US Census, with a 70 per cent automation rate and an error rate between 10 to 26 per cent (Nion et al., 2013).

Being able to identify the tabular structure of the census questionnaires and extracting the relevant columns were a problem we also faced, but instead of utilizing a machine learning approach to solve it, we instead created a script to recognize all horizontal and vertical lines in the image, creating a set of x-y coordinates where these lines intersect. Using these coordinates we are able to extract the individual cells from the columns we are interested in. Using this method we were able to extract cells from 93\% of all questionnaires, though we were not able to

\(^1\) first and last names, relationship to the head of the family, sex, race, age, marital status, birth place, mother’s and father’s birth place, and immigration year
automatically detect which cells contained relevant text, and which cells did not. This issue, however, was solved through the use of the CTC loss function that is employed as part of the training process for the model.

Using machine learning to recognize handwritten text in historical documents is shown to be challenging since these have overlapping characters across adjacent text lines, show-through and bleed-trough, lack of a standard notation, paper texture, aging, handwriting style, type of pen (dip pen, pencil, ball pen). Models trained on datasets with modern handwriting therefore give poor performance rate when applied on historical documents (Romero et al., 2012; Kusetogullari et al., 2019). For that reason, most handwritten text recognition systems focus on the unique characteristics of a specific historical document with a common layout and style, and develop a system that is used to transcribe just these documents (for example: Thorvaldsen et al., 2015).

In our solution, we started out with a training set that had been created by Statistics Norway in such a way as to be representative for the census as a whole. To the human eye these images did not appear any different to the images from the full census. However, during the course of the project we began to suspect that there were some differences between these training set images and the remaining images from the census. After creating a binary machine learning model that was trained on the two image sets, it was able to tell the two sets apart. This lends credence to Romero et al.’s assertion that the condition of historical documents is likely to have deteriorated over time, at least for documents and images that have been in frequent use. Our solution was to create a new training set chosen by random from the full census where the condition of these images were much more similar.

Recently, there have been some successful approaches to develop generic systems for historical data transcription. (Toledo et al., 2019) uses known contexts structures, instead of out-of-vocabulary words so their method does not depend on specific words appearing in training sets. This methodology works well with typical 17th and 18th century parish registers where baptism, funeral and marriage events were registered in books without any tabular structure, but with an expectation that certain information follow each other, like the first and last name. Similarly, (Moysset et al., 2015) describe a context driven model specialized for text line detection, and (Chen et al., 2017) a method for generic page segmentation. While the majority of literature on line segmentation focuses on detection of the imaginary text lines, i.e. empty lines between lines of actual text, our pre-processing focuses on visible lines, typically found in tabular documents.

We attempted to create a generic solution for digit recognition in images, but we were hampered by the formatting of the cell extraction from the full census pages. Creating and reading the coordinates used for cell extraction is heavily dependent on having them correctly formatted. However, once we come to the part of the pipeline where cell images have been created, the remaining parts of the pipeline (image preprocessing, model creation and training, and result analysis) is much more generic and should be easy to use by others.
Future work

We plan to split the *random sample training* set to single-digit numbers and use these to train one-digit models that we can use for the 5 single-digit codes in the Norwegian 1950 census (Supplementary Table 1). We will ensure that the occurrence of the digits in the training set is similar to the distribution in the census data. We believe achieving the necessary performance for these columns is easier than for the occupation codes since there are fewer classes. For the 2 and 3 digit columns we will create a training dataset and then implement a training dataset similar to the 3-digit-sequential model.

We also plan to evaluate the transferability of our approach to a non-digit column, using the birthplace column from the Norwegian 1950 census. About 2.5 million cells have already been transcribed, including 5,600 different geographical locations.\(^2\) We will use this very large dataset to train and test a deep learning model similar to the Keras 3-digit model. By gradually reducing the training dataset size we can estimate how many labelled images are necessary to transcribe other text fields with a given accuracy.

We plan to improve the provenance data management of *Occode*. We plan to use a *big table* (Chang, *et al.* 2008) design to keep track of the data. It is a flexible data structure that can easily be changed by for example adding new columns. Currently we implement the design using a combination of directory structures in a file system, databases, and meta-data files. However, we plan to unify the data management in a big table service provided as a cloud service in future work. This will make data management easier, improve the performance of data processing, and reduce the storage overhead.

We plan to move our data and machine learning pipeline to a commercial cloud platform. A cloud platform enables elastically allocating, and paying for the resources needed to transcribe a column. Commercial clouds also provide data lakes ([https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/solutions/data-lake/](https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/solutions/data-lake/)) and columnar storage systems (similar to BigTable) that we believe are well suited to our data management needs. They also provide big data processing frameworks such as Spark (Zaharia *et al.*, 2016) and U-SQL ([https://docs.microsoft.com/en-us/u-sql/](https://docs.microsoft.com/en-us/u-sql/)) that we believe are well suited to especially implement pipelines such as *Occode*. Finally, we plan to utilize computer vision, natural language processing, and other machine learning cloud services to implement transcription for other fields in the 1950 census and other sources.

Limitations

Our splitter program splits 93% of the questionnaires. We believe most of the remaining can be split by iteratively tuning the line detection threshold of the split program, or by replacing the

\(^2\) A 2 per cent sample is manually transcribed, while the remaining have been semi-automatically transcribed by using a GUI for editing similar pictures. The 2.5 million transcribed cells include 65,000 entries registered as “ditto” and 23,000 entries registered with a quotation mark.
splitter program with for example an object detection and segmentation algorithm such as Detectron2 (https://github.com/facebookresearch/detectron2).

The distribution of occupation codes displayed in Figure 6 (left), shows a long-tailed distribution, meaning that a relatively large proportion of different occupations have few people. Although our automated transcription archives high accuracy, it performs a lower accuracy for these rare occupation codes. We assume that the manual validation and correction will detect some of the errors, but not all. The two main limitations are 1) in cases where the machine has transcribed the rare code with the code of one of the biggest classes - a not uncommon scenario, and 2) some of the smallest classes are too small for even being in the training sets. The first issue is more or less impossible to solve, but the latter can be solved with more training data. This is however a question of time and cost efficiency.

We have shown that the distribution of classes in the automatically transcribed dataset is similar, except for the smallest classes. Official statistics from the 1950 census include ‘Population by Principal Occupation in the Rural and Town Municipalities and Counties’ and ‘A Survey of Statistics on Occupation Detailed Figures for the whole Country’, and our initial plan was to compare our resulting dataset with the official statistics. However, it proved difficult. The statistics presented in these reports were all constructed based on a combination of individual characteristics and groups of occupational codes that to some extent was not congruent with the code book used in the statistical preprocessing of the census. Instead, further evaluation of the transcribed results can be done by linking the results with data for the same person in other sources.

Conclusion

We have described our design and implementation of the Occode machine learning pipeline for transcription of historical population censuses. We have used it to automate the transcription of 2.3 million handwritten occupation codes in the Norwegian 1950 population census. Our evaluation shows that it satisfies our three requirements: (i) the accuracy is 97%, (ii) only 3% of the codes requires manual verification, and (iii) the distribution of codes is correct, except for the smallest classes. The transcribed results will be implemented in the Norwegian Historical Population register.

We believe our approach and lessons learned are useful for other transcription projects that plan to use machine learning in production. The pipeline source code is open source and available at: https://github.com/uit-hdl/rhd-codes. We have also published our labelled training dataset for the 3-digit occupation codes: https://doi.org/10.18710/OYIH83 (2% dataset) https://doi.org/10.18710/7JWAZX (random dataset). We have uploaded the source code at time of publication, trained model, and confidence scores produced by model: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.14573325. The automatically transcribed codes will be included into the Norwegian Historical Population Register.
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### Supplementary materials

**Supplementary Table 1: Other columns with numeric codes in the Norwegian 1950 census.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Number of digits</th>
<th>Valid range</th>
<th>Distribution source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position in household</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Central statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Central statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Central statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Central statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500 codes</td>
<td>Central statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Central statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>163 codes</td>
<td>Central statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>01-50</td>
<td>Central statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>