

DocFormerv2: Local Features for Document Understanding

Srikar Appalaraju¹*, Peng Tang¹, Qi Dong¹, Nishant Sankaran¹, Yichu Zhou²†, R. Manmatha¹
¹ AWS AI Labs ² School of Computing at University of Utah

{srikara, tangpen, qdon, nishsank, manmatha}@amazon.com, flyaway@cs.utah.edu

Abstract

We propose *DocFormerv2*, a multi-modal transformer for Visual Document Understanding (VDU). The VDU domain entails understanding documents (beyond mere OCR predictions) e.g., extracting information from a form, VQA for documents and other tasks. VDU is challenging as it needs a model to make sense of multiple modalities (visual, language and spatial) to make a prediction. Our approach, termed *DocFormerv2* is an encoder-decoder transformer which takes as input - vision, language and spatial features. *DocFormerv2* is pre-trained with unsupervised tasks employed asymmetrically i.e., two novel document tasks on encoder and one on the auto-regressive decoder. The unsupervised tasks have been carefully designed to ensure that the pre-training encourages local-feature alignment between multiple modalities. *DocFormerv2* when evaluated on nine datasets shows state-of-the-art performance over strong baselines e.g. *TabFact* (4.3%), *InfoVQA* (1.4%), *FUNSD* (1%). Furthermore, to show generalization capabilities, on three VQA tasks involving scene-text, *DocFormerv2* outperforms previous comparably-sized models (such as *GIT2*, *PaLi* and *Flamingo*) on some tasks. Extensive ablations show that due to its pre-training, *DocFormerv2* understands multiple modalities better than prior-art in VDU.

1. Introduction

Documents have become ubiquitous carriers of information, including forms, tables, invoices, and other structured documents. Many such documents require visual and layout understanding to make sense (just the text string is insufficient). Visual Document Understanding (VDU) is the task of leveraging machine learning techniques to comprehend such scanned documents, such as PDFs or images. Popular VDU tasks include Document and Tables VQA [9, 49], sequence labeling for key-value identification in forms [27], entity extraction [58], and document classification [19].




Figure 1: **Visual Document Understanding.** Snippet of a document receipt from DocVQA [48]. VDU tasks could include a model asked to predict "SOLD TO" address (VQA) or predict all relations ("SOLD TO" → <address>, "SHIP TO" → <address>) or asked to infer info from table (at the top).

While modern deep-learning based OCR models [41] have proven to be effective in extracting text from documents, the naive approach of linearizing the OCR-text and feeding it to a language model is sub-optimal. This is because the content of a document is presented according to a visual layout and structure that must be taken into account for accurate understanding. Naively linearizing the text from left-to-right will result in sub-optimal performance as the semantic meaning alters based on layout, as shown in Figure 1 - Table 6.5 has experiments demonstrating this. Instead, VDU requires a multi-modal approach that can comprehend text and visual features in the context of a document's 2D layout.

Multi-modal training in general entails feature alignment. Specific to vision-language learning this means aligning a piece of text with an arbitrary span of pixels in visual space [1–3, 5, 10, 18, 21, 31, 37, 54, 64]. How those features are aligned makes a big difference. In VDU, a majority of the tasks require *local and layout-relative* understanding of the document. For example, in document VQA, semantic labeling or entity extraction, a model needs to make sense of text in-relation to where the text is placed in a document. E.g.: "1" when placed at the top-right/bottom-left of a document is to be interpreted as a page-number vs as a number when placed anywhere else.

Based on this domain understanding of VDU and its challenges, we present *DocFormerv2* (DFv2) which is an encoder-decoder multi-modal transformer. In this work, we meticulously devise two novel unsupervised pre-training

*Corresponding author.

†Work conducted during an internship at Amazon.

Model	Year	Conf.	Arch.	Input Mod.	Vision Branch
LayoutLMv1 [66]	2020	KDD	E	T + S	-
DocFormerv1 [2]	2021	ICCV	E	T + V + S	Resnet50
LayoutLMv2 [67]	2021	ACL	E	T + V + S	ResNeXt 101
SelfDoc [39]	2021	CVPR	E	-	-
LayoutLMv3 [25]	2022	ACM	E	T + V + S	Linear
BROS [22]	2022	AAAI	E	T + S	-
XYLayoutLM [16]	2022	CVPR	E	T + V + S	ResNeXt 101
FormNet [33]	2022	ACL	E	-	-
ERNIE-Layout [52]	2022	EMNLP	E	T + V + S	F-RCNN
LiLT [63]	2022	ACL	E	T + S	-
XDoc [8]	2022	EMNLP	E	T	-
TILT [53]	2021	ICDAR	E + D	T + V + S	U-Net
DocFormerv2 (ours)	2023	-	E + D	T + V + S	Linear

Table 1: **VDU Related Work:** In this table, a summary of VDU prior art is presented with their architecture (E: Encoder, D: Decoder), the input (T: text, V: vision, S: spatial features), the vision features branch and core idea behind the work.




Figure 2: **VDU Paradigms:** Broad state of Visual Document Understanding (VDU) approaches. In **a)** E-only LayoutLM [66] and variants. **b)** E+D but only language-task TILT [53]. **c)** Ours

tasks with the objective of incorporating local semantic information of a document into the model. These pre-training tasks impart the ability to the model to accurately locate relevant information within the document. We also depart from VDU prior-art [53, 60] as we introduce a novel asymmetrical method of pre-training. i.e., multi-task pre-training on encoder (two tasks) and decoder (one task). We propose two novel pre-training tasks on encoder with the intent to enrich the encoder with local semantic information. The tasks aid in by fusing and aligning multi-modal input and generating efficient representations for the decoder. We show that these pre-training tasks are necessary for effective VDU (see §5). Furthermore, we demonstrate that a simplified linear visual layer is sufficient to encapsulate visual features, simplifying the architecture from previous VDU research [39, 53, 67] which required specific visual encoders [13, 20, 44].

Experimentally we demonstrate that DocFormerv2 achieves state-of-the-art performance on five VDU tasks. In addition, we demonstrate the versatility of DocFormerv2 by utilizing its pre-trained model and fine-tuning it on text-VQA tasks from a completely different domain. Our approach yields superior performance on three distinct text-VQA datasets, surpassing comparable models and in some

datasets much bigger models like GIT2 [64], PaLi [10] and Flamingo [1]. Therefore, the primary contributions of this paper are as follows:

- Asymmetrical method of pre-training for VDU: Two novel tasks on the encoder which encourage local multi-modal feature collaboration (*Token-to-Line* task and *Token-to-Grid* task) and one on the decoder §3.2.
- Simplified Visual branch: DocFormerv2 is end-to-end trainable and it does not rely on a pre-trained object detection network for visual features simplifying its architecture. On five varied downstream VDU tasks, DocFormerv2 achieves state of the art results §4.
- We also show DocFormerv2 versatility by fine-tuning it on a totally different domain - text-VQA datasets without changing the pre-training. DocFormerv2 beats strong baselines and achieves state-of-the-art numbers on three text-VQA datasets amongst similar model sizes. Selectively, on Text-VQA it out-performs much larger models like PaLi-3B +6.8%, PaLi-15B +1.5% and Flamingo [1] (+9.9%) (106x DocFormerv2 size in the num. of parameters) by absolute accuracy §4.5.

Furthermore, we conducted comprehensive ablation experiments to demonstrate the advantages of our pre-training tasks, the model’s resilience to input noise, and the efficacy of the simplified visual branch.

2. Related Work

VDU research has attracted considerable attention over the past few years [2, 8, 15, 16, 23, 25, 33, 36, 38, 39, 52, 53, 60, 63, 65–67, 70]. Prominent published research papers in this area are catalogued in Table 1. As can be observed, the research focus has been lopsided towards encoder-only models. While TILT [53] proposed a encoder-decoder transformer for VDU, they only train it on one pre-training task (masked language modeling) and also use a bulky visual CNN. Our approach DocFormerv2, not only simplifies the architecture by not using a separate visual module (CNN or Transformer based) and has multiple unsupervised pre-training tasks.

3. Approach

3.1. Architecture

DocFormerv2 (DFv2) is a multi-modal encoder-decoder transformer architecture (see fig. 3). Three variations of DFv2 are designed - small, base and large variants (see table 2). DFv2 takes multi-modal inputs, the image of the document I , text T extracted by an OCR model along with OCR bounding box co-ordinates as spatial features $\bar{S}$. DFv2 has




Figure 3: **DocFormerv2 Pre-train Architecture**. After pre-train, the two prediction heads (token-to-line and grid) on encoder are removed, rest of the architecture remains the same for down-stream tasks. Read section 3.1 for more details on T_s and V_s . All components are end-to-end trainable. Best viewed in color.

a unified multi-modal encoder where the multi-modal features fuse and align with the help of novel pre-training tasks (see §3.2).

Visual features: DFv2 has a simplified visual branch contrary to most VDU prior-art (fig. 2). DFv2 consumes a flattened image sequence as visual input. Specifically, let $v \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times h \times w}$ be the image of a document. A simple $V = \text{linear}(\text{conv}_{2 \times 2}(v))$ is used to create an image embedding. The weights are randomly initialized for pre-training. As documents tend to have lots of white-space, the linear down-sampling layer gives an opportunity for the model to only keep relevant visual features. Based on our ablation experiments (see §12), this simple approach gives better results than using expensive image encoders such as Swin, ViT [13,44,57] or bulky object-detection networks like FRCNN variants [56] as was used in VDU prior-art [2,53,68]. Since transformer layers are permutation-invariant, a learnable 2D-positional encoding P_s is also computed. Finally, $V_s = V + P_s$.

Language features: Let t be the predicted text extracted via an OCR model for a document image. DFv2 uses a sentence-piece sub-word tokenizer [32] to get tokens t_{tok} . A maximum sequence limit s is applied during training and testing, so if the number of OCR tokens is greater than s , the rest is ignored. If the sequence length is less than s , the sequence is padded. The OCR tokens t_{tok} are sent to a learnable embedding layer W_t to create a text embedding $T = W_t(t_{tok})$.

Spatial features: For each OCR word t_i , the OCR model

model	dim	ff	# attn. H	# layers (E,D)	# params
small	512	2048	8	6,6	66M
base	768	3072	12	12,12	232M
large	1024	4096	16	24,24	750M

Table 2: **DocFormerv2 variants**: dim is embedding dimensionality. ff is output dim of feed-forward layer. E is encoder and D is decoder. attn. H is attention heads.

predicts its bounding-box location in the normalized form $b_i = (x_1, y_1, x_3, y_3)$. This information is encoded using four learnable spatial embedding layers - W_x for encoding a word horizontal spatial information x_i , W_y for the vertical coordinate y_i , W_h for word height h_i and W_w for the width w_i . The spatial features not only encode the location of a word in the document but also provides cues about a word’s font-size and thereby its importance in a document (via h_i and w_i). Specifically, spatial features $\bar{S} = W_x(x_1, x_3) + W_y(y_1, y_3) + W_h(y_3 - y_1) + W_w(x_3 - x_1)$. Finally, $T_s = T + \bar{S}$.

Other features: T_s and V_s features are different modalities (fig. 3). As the model has no idea it is being fed multi-modal input, another learnable embedding W_m is used to provide cues to the model about the multi-modal input. A modality-embedding W_m learns nuances of different modalities, which generates M_v embedding for visual modality and M_t for text. Finally, $\bar{T} = T_s + M_t$ and $\bar{V} = V_s + M_v$. $\bar{T}$ and $\bar{V}$ are concatenated in the sequence dimension to form the input sequence to the DFv2 encoder.



Figure 4: Token-to-Line




Figure 5: Token-to-Grid 4x4

3.2. Unsupervised Document Pre-training

In DocFormerv2 we follow the now well established practice of unsupervised pre-training followed by downstream task fine-tuning. Furthermore, with the intent of eliciting the maximum benefit from unsupervised pre-training, we designed the pre-training tasks as a close proxy for downstream tasks. We now describe the two novel pre-training tasks employed on the encoder and the language modeling task on decoder. All three tasks are performed at the same time and the final loss is a linear combination of all three losses for each iteration.

Encoder Token-to-Line Task: We share the intuition that for VDU tasks local feature semantic alignment is important. Most of the related information for key-value prediction in a form or VQA is either on the same line or adjacent lines of a document e.g., see fig. 4, in order to predict the value for "TOTAL" (box a), the model has to look in the same line (to its right - "\$4.32" box d). We teach the model the relative position information between tokens. For implementation, we randomly pick two language tokens and ask the model to predict the number of lines between them. Furthermore, as a document could have an arbitrary number of lines of text, the task is quantized. i.e., there are only three labels: $\{0, 1, 2\}$. All token pairs that are more than 2 lines apart are labelled as 2 because distant tokens are not likely related and the model should learn to ignore them. Assume that a, b, c, d (fig. 4) are lines. Let F be the DFv2 encoder head function trying to predict a label for this task. then:

$$F(a, d) = 0; F(a, b) = 1; F(b, c) = 2 \quad (1)$$

Based on the ablation (table 10), this task gives +2.2% benefit on DocVQA task. The loss for this task is tracked as L_{tol} .

Encoder Token-to-Grid Task: Different semantic information is concentrated in different regions of the document. For example, a) In a financial document, the top block contains the header, the middle block contains information to

be filled and the bottom block typically contains footer elements/instructions. b) Page numbers are typically at the top or the bottom. c) In a receipt/invoice the company name is typically at the top. The content of a document is presented according to a visual layout and structure that must be taken into account for accurate understanding. Based on this intuition, this task pairs language semantics with the location (visual, spatial or both) in a document. Specifically, the document is virtually divided into a $m \times n$ grid. Each OCR token is assigned a grid number and DFv2 is tasked with predicting the grid number for each token. For each OCR token t_i , its top-left location (x_1, y_1) is used to determine its grid-number g_i . Grids are in raster-scan order, so if a particular token falls on the boundary of multiple grids, the scan-order is used to disambiguate. If a token falls on the boundary of normalized image co-ordinates, they are ignored for prediction. See fig. 5 for viz. Specifically, we have:

$$g_i = \lfloor \frac{x_1}{\Delta_x} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{y_1}{\Delta_y} \rfloor \cdot m,$$

where Δ_x and Δ_y are the widths and heights of each grid, respectively, and m is the number of grids in a row. The loss L_{tog} .

Decoder Language Modeling: Since VDU predictions are in the language domain, language understanding forms an important component of DFv2 pre-training. We do the denoising masked language modeling popularized by T5 [55]. During pre-training, not only are the input tokens randomly MASKED it's spatial features (mentioned in §3.1) are also masked. Masking the spatial features $\bar{S}$ for the masked tokens makes the grid prediction and line prediction hard because the model does not have 2D-position information of the masked tokens. It has to infer from other available context. The loss for this operation is denoted L_{dlm} .

Final pre-training loss: The final loss is a linear combination of all three pre-training losses i.e., $L_{final} = k * L_{tol} + l * L_{tog} + m * L_{dlm}$, where k, l, m are empirically determined.

Downstream Tasks: Once pre-training is done, we remove the token-to-line and token-to-grid linear prediction heads. The rest of the pre-trained model is fine-tuned on the respective downstream train data.

4. Experiments

Implementation details: Following prior-art [2, 5, 25, 53, 66, 68] we use the Industrial Document Library (IDL)¹ dataset for pre-training. The IDL is a collection of industry documents hosted by UCSF. It hosts millions of documents publicly disclosed from various industries like tobacco, drug, food etc. The data from the website amounts to about 13M documents, translating to about 70M pages of various document images. We further extracted OCR

¹<https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/>

for each document. Data was cleaned and about 6M documents were pruned, the resulting 64M document images and OCR-text (with spatial co-ordinates) is used for unsupervised pre-training. The data distribution for IDL 64M is presented in supplemental section.

Downstream experiments: The model is fine-tuned on the provided training set and numbers are reported on the corresponding validation/test set. No dataset specific hyperparameter tuning is done. This is an advantage of our approach and we believe that the numbers may be higher if dataset specific fine-tuning is done. Details about fine-tuning datasets are in the supplemental section. We used Pytorch [51] and the Huggingface library [61].

Evaluation Metrics: A dataset specific evaluation metric is adopted. For DocVQA [49], InfoVQA [47], ST-VQA [7], Average Normalized Levenshtein Similarity (ANLS) [6] is used. ANLS measures the similarity between the predicted results and ground truth and ranges from (0,100). For FUNSD [27], CORD [58] F1-score is used. For TextVQA [59] and OCR-VQA [50] accuracy is used. In all metrics, higher the better.

4.1. Table VQA

TabFact [9, 70]: This dataset studies table understanding and fact verification with semi-structured evidence over tables collected from Wikipedia. Entailed and refuted statements corresponding to a single row or cell were prepared by the authors of TabFact [9]. This task poses challenges due to the complex linguistic and spatial reasoning involved. In Table 3, we can see that DocFormerv2 outperforms prior art by a large margin (+4.3%).

Model	pre-train data	#param	TabFact Acc. (%)
<i>methods based on only text / (text + spatial) features:</i>			
T5 _{large} [55]	-	750M	58.9
T5 _{large} +U [70]	-	750M	76.0
T5 _{large} +2D [70]	-	750M	58.0
T5 _{large} +2D+U [70]	-	750M	78.6
<i>methods based on image + text + spatial features:</i>			
LayoutLMv3 _{large} [25]	11M	368M	78.1
UDOP [60]	11M	794M	78.9
DocFormerv2 _{large}	64M	750M	83.2 (+4.3%)

Table 3: **Comparison on Table VQA Datasets** [70]: Our work, DocFormerv2 outperforms the previous state of the art.

4.2. Document VQA

DocVQA [49] and InfographicsVQA [47] are datasets for the document VQA task. DocVQA [49] focuses on VQA for real-world industry documents and requires that the model understand images, texts, tables, forms, *etc.* InfographicsVQA [47] focuses on VQA for infographics and requires that the model understand plots/graphs, texts, lay-

out, figures. A model needs to reason multi-modally to generate an answer for this data. Please see the supplemental for data statistics and samples.

Model	pre-train data	#param	DocVQA test ANLS (%)	InfoVQA test ANLS (%)
<i>methods based on only image:</i>				
Donut _{base} [30]	13M	143M	67.5	11.5
Pix2Struct _{large} [34]	80M	1.3B	76.6	40.0
<i>methods based on only text / (text + spatial) features:</i>				
T5 _{large} [55]	-	750M	70.4	36.7
T5 _{large} +U [70]	-	750M	76.3	37.1
T5 _{large} +2D [70]	-	750M	69.8	39.2
T5 _{large} +2D+U [70]	-	750M	81.0	46.1
<i>methods based on image + text + spatial features:</i>				
LayoutLMv3 _{large} [25]	11M	368M	83.4	45.1
UDOP [60]	11M	794M	84.7	47.4
LayoutLMv2 _{large} [67]	11M	426M	86.7	-
TILT _{large} [53]	1.1M	780M	87.05	-
DocFormerv2 _{large}	64M	750M	87.2	-
DocFormerv2 _{large} [†]	64M	750M	87.84 (+0.79%)	48.8 (+1.4%)

Table 4: **Comparison on Document VQA Datasets** [47, 49]: Our work, DocFormerv2 outperforms the previous state of the art. [†] indicates training with extra document VQA data.

Following common practice [53, 67, 70], we train DocFormerv2 on the combination of the training and validation sets and do evaluation on the test set for each dataset. In addition, we also follow [53, 67] to train DocFormerv2 on an extra document VQA dataset with 850k question-answer pairs and then fine-tune on DocVQA/InfographicsVQA for higher accuracy.

DocFormerv2 outperforms (Table 4) the previous state of the art for document VQA even without using any extra document VQA pre-training data. After pre-training on the extra data, DocFormerv2 surpasses the previous state of the art by 0.79% on DocVQA and 1.4% on InfographicsVQA, which confirms the effectiveness of our approach.

4.3. Sequence Labeling Task

We study the performance of DocFormerv2 on the semantic entity-labeling task (i.e., group tokens which belong to the same class). We test the model on FUNSD dataset [27], which is a forms dataset containing 199 noisy documents (149 images for train, 50 images for test). There are four classes: *question*, *answer*, *header*, and *other*. We measure entity-level performance using F1 score (Table 5). The input sequence to Docformerv2 includes individual texts as prompts and all document texts as context, and the decoder sequence contains the entity texts and predicted labels. Docformerv2 achieves 88.89% F1 score (Table 5), and outperforms the existing methods without using entity box priors in pretraining and finetuning (grayed models in the table).

Model	#param	Precision	Recall	F1
<i>methods based on only image:</i>				
Dessur _{base} [11]	127M	-	-	65.0
<i>methods based on only text / (text + spatial) features:</i>				
BERT _{base} [12]	109M	54.69	61.71	60.26
RoBERTa _{base} [42]	125M	63.49	69.75	66.48
UniLMv2 _{base} [4]	125M	63.49	69.75	66.48
LayoutLMv1 _{base} [66]	113M	76.12	81.55	78.66
BROS _{base} [22]	139M	80.56	81.88	81.21
BERT _{large} [12]	340M	61.13	70.85	65.63
RoBERTa _{large} [42]	355M	67.80	73.91	70.72
UniLMv2 _{large} [4]	355M	67.80	73.91	70.72
LayoutLMv1 _{large} [66]	343M	75.36	80.61	77.89
StructuralLM _{large} [36]	355M	83.52	86.81	85.14
FormNet [33]	217M	85.21	84.18	84.69
<i>methods based on image + text + spatial features:</i>				
LayoutLMv1 _{base} [66]	160M	76.77	81.95	79.27
LayoutLMv2 _{base} [67]	200M	80.29	85.39	82.76
LayoutLMv2 _{large} [67]	426M	83.24	85.19	84.20
DocFormer _{base} [2]	183M	80.76	86.09	83.34
DocFormer _{large} [2]	536M	82.29	86.94	84.55
SelfDoc [39]	-	-	-	83.36
UDoc [15]	272M	-	-	<u>87.93</u>
StrucText [40]†	107M	85.68	80.97	83.09
LayoutLMv3 _{base} [25]*	133M	77.39	81.65	79.46
LayoutLMv3 _{large} [25]*	368M	81.35	83.75	82.53
LayoutLMv3 _{base} [25]○	133M	89.55	91.65	90.29
LayoutLMv3 _{large} [25]○	368M	92.19	92.10	92.08
UDOP [60]○	794M	-	-	91.62
DocFormerv2 _{base}	232M	89.15	87.6	88.37
DocFormerv2 _{large}	750M	89.88	87.92	88.89

Table 5: **FUNSD comparison:** DocFormerv2 does better than models its size and compares well with even larger models. † does not use standard train/test split, and the results are not directly compared with others. ○ use OCR lines (not word box) as 2D position for words, and use entity boxes as 2D position for each word during finetuning and test, and thus the results are not directly comparable. * are results by using the word boxes as 2D position for each word as other competitors do.

4.4. Entity Extraction Task

We evaluate DocFormerv2 for the entity extraction task on the CORD dataset. CORD [58] consists of 1000 receipts (800/100/100 images for train/val/test). It defines 30 fine-grained fields under 4 coarse-grained categories. To extract all entities, in the input sequence, we add a question of “What are entities of <CLASS>?” in front of all text context tokens. The output of the decoder includes all entities which are separated by a separator token. Following the standard evaluation metric for entity extraction, we measure entity-level performance using F1 score. Docformerv2 (Table 6) achieves 97.7% F1 score, and outperforms existing methods. Docformerv2 enables multiple entities decoding in an auto-regressive way which shows that the model is able to learn both intra-entity and inter-entity structures.

4.5. Generalization Experiments - Scene-Text VQA

In this section, we show the strength of DocFormerv2 on a different task - Text-VQA. Unlike document under-

Model	#param	Precision	Recall	F1
<i>methods based on only text / (text + spatial) features:</i>				
BERT _{base} [12]	109M	88.33	91.07	89.68
UniLMv2 _{base} [4]	125M	89.87	91.98	90.92
SPADE [26]	-	-	-	91.50
LayoutLMv1 _{base} [66]	113M	94.37	95.08	94.72
BROS _{base} [22]	139M	95.58	95.14	95.36
BERT _{large} [12]	340M	88.86	91.68	90.25
RoBERTa _{large} [42]	355M	-	-	93.80
UniLMv2 _{large} [4]	355M	91.23	92.89	92.05
LayoutLMv1 _{large} [66]	343M	94.32	95.54	94.93
FormNet [33]	345M	98.02	96.55	<u>97.28</u>
<i>methods based on image + text + spatial features:</i>				
LayoutLMv2 _{base} [67]	200M	94.53	95.39	94.95
LayoutLMv2 _{large} [67]	426M	95.65	96.37	96.01
TILT _{base} [53]○	230M	-	-	95.11
TILT _{large} [53]○	780M	-	-	96.33
DocFormer _{base} [2]	183M	96.52	96.14	96.33
DocFormer _{large} [2]	536M	97.25	96.74	96.99
UDoc [15]	272M	-	-	96.86
LayoutLMv3 _{base} [25]*	133M	92.92	94.31	93.61
LayoutLMv3 _{large} [25]*	368M	96.78	96.78	96.78
LayoutLMv3 _{base} [25]○	133M	-	-	96.56
LayoutLMv3 _{large} [25]○	368M	-	-	97.46
UDOP [60]○	794M	-	-	97.58
DocFormerv2 _{base}	232M	97.51	96.10	96.80
DocFormerv2 _{large}	750M	97.71	97.70	97.70

Table 6: **CORD dataset [58] comparison.** We present entity-level Precision, Recall, F1 on test set. ○ use OCR lines (not word box) as 2D position for words, and use entity boxes as 2D position for each word during finetuning and testing, and thus the results are not directly comparable. * are results by using the word boxes as 2D position for each word as the other competitors do.

Model	pre-train data	#param	Val Acc. (%)	Test Acc. (%)
Blk+CNN+W2V	-	-	-	48.3
M4C [24]	-	200M	63.5	63.9
LaAP [17]	-	-	63.8	64.1
LaTr _{base} [5]	64M	311	67.5	67.9
GIT _{base}	10M	129M	57.3	57.5
GIT _{large}	20M	347M	62.4	62.9
GIT	800M	681M	67.8	<u>68.1</u>
GIT2† [64]	12.9B	5.1B	-	70.3
DocFormerv2 _{base}	64M	232M	69.7	70.3
DocFormerv2 _{large}	64M	750M	71.1	71.5 (+3.4%)

Table 7: **Comparison on OCR-VQA [50]:** DocFormerv2 is better than the previous SOTA by (+3.4%). **Bold** indicates best and underline indicates the previous state of the art. GIT2 †: uses extra VQA data (aggregation of 8 VQA datasets).

standing which focuses on document images, the Text-VQA task answers questions for natural images with scene text. We fine-tune our *document* pre-trained models on three Text-VQA datasets. We emphasize that no image-text pre-training was performed on DocFormerv2, it was merely fine-tuned on the respective Text-VQA training dataset. Three popular Text-VQA datasets are used - OCR-VQA

Model	pre-train data	#param	Val Acc. (%)	Test Acc. (%)
M4C [24]	-	200M	47.8	-
LaAP [17]	-	-	41.0	41.4
SA-M4C [28]	-	200M	45.4	44.6
SMA	-	-	44.6	45.5
SceneGate [46]	-	-	42.4	44.0
SC-Net [14]	-	-	44.8	45.7
LOGOS [45]	-	-	51.5	51.1
TAP + TAG [62]	-	-	53.6	53.7
TAP [69]	-	200M	54.7	54.0
TAP Two-Stage [35]	-	200M	55.9	55.3
Flamingo [1]	2.3B★	80B	57.1	54.1
PreSTU [29]	13M	237M	-	56.3
LaTr _{base} [5]	64M	311M	58.0	58.9
LaTr _{base} [†] [5]	64M	311	59.5	59.6
LaTr _{large} [†] [5]	64M	856M	61.0	61.6
GIT _{base}	10M○	129M	18.8	-
GIT _{large}	20M○	347M	37.5	-
GIT	800M○	681M	59.9	59.8
GIT2+ [64]	12.9B○	5.1B	68.4	67.3
PaLi-3B [10]	1.6B○	3B	58.8	-
PaLi-15B [10]	1.6B○	15B	64.1	-
PaLi-17B [10]	1.6B○	17B	70.5	73.1
DocFormerv2 _{base} [†]	64M	232M	61.6	60.0
DocFormerv2 _{large} [†]	64M	750M	65.6	64.0 (+2.4%)

Table 8: **Comparison on TextVQA [59]**: [†] indicates the model used the combination of ST-VQA and TextVQA training sets to train the model. GIT2 +: extra data used (aggregation of 8 VQA datasets) ★: video-text data. ○: proprietary image-text data. Grey rows shows models which are much bigger (# parameters $\geq 3x$ DFv2_{large} parameters) and use large amounts of external data. DFv2_{large} still outperforms Flamingo (+9.9%), Pali-3B (+6.8%) and Pali-15B (+1.5%) models.

Model	pre-train data	#param	Val ANLS (%)	Test ANLS (%)
M4C [24]	-	200M	47.2	46.2
LaAP [17]	-	-	49.7	48.5
SA-M4C [28]	-	200M	51.2	50.4
SceneGate [46]	-	-	52.5	51.6
LOGOS [45]	-	-	58.1	57.9
TAP [69]	-	200M	59.8	59.7
TAP + TAG [62]	-	-	62.0	60.2
PreSTU [29]	13M	237M	-	65.5
LaTr _{base} [5]	64M	311M	67.5	66.8
LaTr _{base} [†] [5]	64M	311M	68.3	68.4
LaTr _{large} [†] [5]	64M	856M	70.2	69.6
GIT _{base}	10M○	129M	20.7	-
GIT _{large}	20M○	347M	44.6	-
GIT	800M○	681M	69.1	69.6
DocFormerv2 _{base} [†]	64M	232M	70.1	68.4
DocFormerv2 _{large} [†]	64M	750M	72.9	71.8 (+2.2%)

Table 9: **Comparison on ST-VQA [7]**: [†] indicates the combination of the ST-VQA and TextVQA training sets is used.

[50], TextVQA [59] and ST-VQA [7], each with strong baselines from the vision-language community (as is stan-

dard practice by Text-VQA we mean any scene text VQA dataset while TextVQA refers to a specific dataset). Please see the supplemental for a dataset breakdown. For OCR-VQA, we fine-tune our models on the training set and do evaluation on the validation and test sets. For TextVQA and ST-VQA, following the previous state-of-the-art methods [5, 69], we fine-tune our models on the combination of the TextVQA and ST-VQA training sets and do evaluation on the validation and test sets of each dataset. Tables 7, 8, 9 show that our large size model outperforms the comparably sized previous state-of-the-art method LaTr [5] by +3.4%, +2.4% and +2.2% on the OCR-VQA, TextVQA, and ST-VQA test sets respectively. These results show that our method generalizes beyond document understanding tasks.

Analysis: Surprisingly, on OCR-VQA, DocFormerv2_{large} even performs better than GIT2 [64] which is a 5.1B size model (vs. 750M for DocFormerv2_{large}) and uses 12.9B data for pre-training (vs. 64M for DocFormerv2_{large}). On TextVQA, DocFormerv2 does better than several vision-language models which are much bigger and have been pre-trained on much more data. On the test set, it is (+9.9%) better than Flamingo (which at 80B has 106x the number of parameters). On the validation set, it is better than PaLi-3B and 15B (+2.2%, +6.8%) respectively. GIT2 and PaLi-17B do perform better than it. (GIT2 also uses 8 VQA datasets to train). DocFormerv2 gets this performance without any natural image-text pre-training. We present this as evidence that DocFormerv2 is a good approach to solving this problem with a much smaller model and much less data.

5. Ablation Experiments

Ablation of DFv2 novel pre-training tasks: Table 10 shows DFv2 ablation on the proposed novel pre-training tasks and multi-modal training. The denoising language modeling task and spatial features mentioned in §3.1 are applied to all architectures. Note, this ablation was performed on DFv2-small with 1M doc pre-training.

Model Ablation	Datasets DocVQA (ANLS)
baseline B	69
B + V	70.5 (+1.5)
B + V + L	71.2 (+2.2)
B + V + G	71.7 (+2.7)
B + V + L + G	73.0 (+4.0)

Table 10: **DocFormerv2 Pre-training Tasks Ablation:** Impact of three pre-training tasks on four downstream tasks over baseline. **B:** baseline, **V:** only with Visual features §3.1, **L:** with Token-to-Line prediction pre-training §3.2, **G:** with Token-to-Grid prediction pre-training §3.2.

Pre-training Impact or Better Approach? DFv2 was pre-trained with 64M documents whereas prior-art like Lay-outLMv2 [67] was pre-trained with only 11M documents.

Model	# pre-train data	Datasets	
		FUNSD	CORD
LayoutLMv2 _{base} [67]	11M	82.7	94.9
DocFormerv2 _{base}	11M	86.1 (+3.4%)	96.2 (+1.3%)
DocFormerv2 _{base}	64M	87.9 (+5.2%)	96.8 (+1.9%)
DocFormerv2 _{base} [†]	64M	88.3 (+5.6%)	96.8 (+1.9%)

Table 11: **DocFormerv2 Pre-training Data Ablation:** Impact of training with different # of pre-training data on various downstream tasks. The F1 scores are reported. [†] indicates the combination of the ST-VQA and TextVQA training sets is used.

In order to see if DFv2 benefits come from more pre-training data or a better approach, we ablate. Table 11 shows that DFv2_{base} is superior to LayoutLMv2_{base} when pre-trained on the same quantity of data. We also see DFv2 improve in performance as more pre-training data is provided (64M). The table shows that the novel DFv2 asymmetric pre-training approach is a superior VDU approach.

Robustness to OCR errors. DFv2 consumes OCR text which can have errors. Since it also has a generative decoder, in theory it is robust to certain distortions and noise from OCR-text. To quantify the degree of robustness, we conduct a study using the FUNSD dataset and artificially introduce noise/typographical errors to the input words, simulating OCR errors. Specifically, for every character in the text, we randomly replace it with an erroneous character with a probability p , limiting to a maximum of 1 character error per word. We then evaluate the performance of the DocFormerv2_{base} and LayoutLMv2_{base} models on the error injected text to observe their resilience to such noise. From Figure 6, we see that for increasing amount of injected OCR errors. Specifically, 20% OCR errors only decreases the performance by -1.68% whereas an encoder-only model decreases by a wide margin -9.84%. This shows the benefit of our approach (in having a generative decoder)




Figure 6: **Induced OCR Error Ablation.** F1 score performance evaluated on FUNSD for varying orders of injected OCR errors.

Varying Image Tokens. Concatenating the image tokens along with the text tokens is a simple and intuitive approach for the model to learn to jointly capture multi-modal information. However, since we are limited on the total number of tokens we can use, it begs the question - what is a suitable proportion of vision-to-text tokens to be used for this design? We perform ablations in this regard to measure the performance obtained by finetuning the model on FUNSD




Figure 7: **Image token length ablation.** Effect on model performance w.r.t variation of the proportion of vision tokens to text tokens provided as input to the model. 128 works best and was used as the final model design.




Figure 8: **Token-to-Grid Ablation.** How different grid sizes used for the Token-to-Grid pre-training task affects model performance on DocVQA. 4x4 seems best and was used for all final pre-training.

dataset with varying ratios of vision tokens to text tokens. Figure 7 shows that 128 image tokens appears to provide the best performance compared to the other settings.

Do we need a separate Image encoder? We investigate if DocFormerv2’s way of consuming visual features is optimal for VDU. Instead of using linear features, we use Swinv2 [43] and pre-train this setup on 1M documents. When fine-tuned on DocVQA we observe that the setup with Swinv2 as visual backbone, substantially underperforms our approach by (+4.3%). For this task, the complex visual features from Swinv2 are less beneficial than our simple linear features.

Model	image encoder	DocVQA [49] eval ANLS (%)
baseline	-	69.0
DocFormerv2 _{small}	Swinv2 _{small} [43]	66.2
DocFormerv2 _{small}	Linear (ours)	70.5 (+4.3%)

Table 12: **Image Encoder Ablation:** All models pre-trained on 1M docs from IDL. Swinv2 too was pre-trained and fine-tuned.

Correct grid size for Token-to-Grid pre-training? In §3.2, we presented the novel Token-to-Grid pre-training task. In this pre-training ablation §10 this task was observed to provide benefits. Here the appropriate virtual grid-size is empirically determined. From Fig. 8, 4x4 grid seems optimal. Smaller or asymmetric grid structures (4x1) seem to cause harm. On the other end, if the grid is too granular (12x12, 8x8), the performance seems to hurt as well. All models pre-trained on DFv2_{small} and 1M documents from IDL, with the Vision and Token-to-line enabled.

6. Conclusion

Our work DocFormerv2 highlights the importance of two novel pre-training tasks and the efficacy of enriching encoder representations with local semantic information via pre-training tasks. We perform experiments on eight varied datasets (five on VDU and three on scene-text VQA)

achieving state-of-the-art numbers on all datasets. Based on ablations, we also show the various design choices and its impact on downstream performance.

References

- [1] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katie Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, Roman Ring, Eliza Rutherford, Serkan Cabi, Tengda Han, Zhitao Gong, Sina Samangooei, Marianne Monteiro, Jacob Menick, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andy Brock, Aida Nematzadeh, Sahand Sharifzadeh, Mikolaj Binkowski, Ricardo Barreira, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Karen Simonyan. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.14198, 2022. 1, 2, 7
- [2] Srikar Appalaraju, Bhavan Jasani, Bhargava Urala Kota, Yusheng Xie, and R Manmatha. Docformer: End-to-end transformer for document understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 993–1003, 2021. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6
- [3] Srikar Appalaraju, Yi Zhu, Yusheng Xie, and István Fehérvári. Towards good practices in self-supervised representation learning. *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS Self-Supervision Workshop 2020)*, 2020. 1
- [4] Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Furu Wei, Wenhui Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaodong Liu, Yu Wang, Songhao Piao, Jianfeng Gao, Ming Zhou, and Hsiao-Wuen Hon. Unilmv2: Pseudo-masked language models for unified language model pre-training, 2020. 6
- [5] Ali Furkan Biten, Ron Litman, Yusheng Xie, Srikar Appalaraju, and R Manmatha. Latr: Layout-aware transformer for scene-text vqa. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16548–16558, 2022. 1, 4, 6, 7
- [6] Ali Furkan Biten, Ruben Tito, Andres Mafla, Lluís Gomez, Marçal Rusinol, Minesh Mathew, CV Jawahar, Ernest Valveny, and Dimosthenis Karatzas. Icdar 2019 competition on scene text visual question answering. In *2019 International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR)*, pages 1563–1570, 2019. 5
- [7] Ali Furkan Biten, Ruben Tito, Andres Mafla, Lluís Gomez, Marçal Rusinol, Ernest Valveny, CV Jawahar, and Dimosthenis Karatzas. Scene text visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 4291–4301, 2019. 5, 7
- [8] Jingye Chen, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Changrong Zhang, and Furu Wei. Xdoc: Unified pre-training for cross-format document understanding. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022. 2
- [9] Wenhui Chen, Hongmin Wang, Jianshu Chen, Yunkai Zhang, Hong Wang, SHIYANG LI, Xiyu Zhou, and William Yang Wang. Tabfact: A large-scale dataset for table-based fact verification. *ArXiv*, abs/1909.02164, 2019. 1, 5
- [10] Xi Chen, Xiao Wang, Soravit Changpinyo, A. J. Piergiovanni, Piotr Padlewski, Daniel M. Salz, Sebastian Goodman, Adam Grycner, Basil Mustafa, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Joan Puigcerver, Nan Ding, Keran Rong, Hassan Akbari, Gaurav Mishra, Linting Xue, Ashish V. Thapliyal, James Bradbury, Weicheng Kuo, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, Chao Jia, Burcu Karagol Ayan, Carlos Riquelme, Andreas Steiner, Anelia Angelova, Xiaohua Zhai, Neil Houlsby, and Radu Soricut. Pali: A jointly-scaled multilingual language-image model. *ArXiv*, abs/2209.06794, 2022. 1, 2, 7
- [11] Brian L. Davis, B. Morse, Bryan Price, Chris Tensmeyer, Curtis Wigington, and Vlad I. Morariu. End-to-end document recognition and understanding with dessurt. In *ECCV Workshops*, 2022. 6
- [12] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018. 6
- [13] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. 2, 3
- [14] Chengyang Fang, Gangyan Zeng, Yu Zhou, Daiqing Wu, Can Ma, Dayong Hu, and Weiping Wang. Towards escaping from language bias and ocr error: Semantics-centered text visual question answering. *2022 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, pages 01–06, 2022. 7
- [15] Jiuxiang Gu, Jason Kuen, Vlad I. Morariu, Handong Zhao, Nikolaos Barmpalios, R. Jain, Ani Nenkova, and Tong Sun. Unified pretraining framework for document understanding. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.10939, 2022. 2, 6
- [16] Zhangxuan Gu, Changhua Meng, Ke Wang, Jun Lan, Weiqiang Wang, Ming Gu, and Liqing Zhang. Xylayoutlm: Towards layout-aware multimodal networks for visually-rich document understanding. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4573–4582, 2022. 2
- [17] Wei Han, Hantao Huang, and Tao Han. Finding the evidence: Localization-aware answer prediction for text visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3118–3131, 2020. 6, 7
- [18] Xiaoshuai Hao, Yi Zhu, Srikar Appalaraju, Aston Zhang, Wanqian Zhang, Boyang Li, and Mu Li. Mixgen: A new multi-modal data augmentation. In *IEEE WACV 2023 - Pre train Workshop*, volume abs/2206.08358, 2023. 1
- [19] Adam W Harley, Alex Ufkes, and Konstantinos G Derpanis. Evaluation of deep convolutional nets for document image classification and retrieval. In *International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR)*. 1
- [20] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In *CVPR*. 2016. 2
- [21] Chih-Hui Ho, Srikar Appalaraju, Bhavan Jasani, R Manmatha, and Nuno Vasconcelos. Yoro-lightweight end to end visual grounding. In *European Conference on Computer Vision - ECCV CAMP Workshop*, 2022. 1
- [22] Teakgyu Hong, DongHyun Kim, Mingi Ji, Wonseok Hwang, Daehyun Nam, and Sungrae Park.

- Bros: A pre-trained language model for understanding texts in document. *under review* <https://openreview.net/references/pdf?id=uCz3OR6CJT>, 2020. 2, 6
- [23] Teakgyu Hong, DongHyun Kim, Mingi Ji, Wonseok Hwang, Daehyun Nam, and Sungrae Park. Bros: A pre-trained language model for understanding texts in document. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=punMXQEsPr0>, 2020. 2
- [24] Ronghang Hu, Amanpreet Singh, Trevor Darrell, and Marcus Rohrbach. Iterative answer prediction with pointer-augmented multimodal transformers for textvqa. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9992–10002, 2020. 6, 7
- [25] Yupan Huang, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Yutong Lu, and Furu Wei. Layoutlmv3: Pre-training for document ai with unified text and image masking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.08387*, 2022. 2, 4, 5, 6
- [26] Wonseok Hwang, Jinyeong Yim, Seunghyun Park, Sohee Yang, and Minjoon Seo. Spatial dependency parsing for semi-structured document information extraction, 2020. 6
- [27] Guillaume Jaume, Hazim Kemal Ekenel, and Jean-Philippe Thiran. Funsd: A dataset for form understanding in noisy scanned documents. *2019 International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition Workshops (ICDARW)*, 2:1–6, 2019. 1, 5
- [28] Yash Kant, Dhruv Batra, Peter Anderson, Alexander Schwing, Devi Parikh, Jiasen Lu, and Harsh Agrawal. Spatially aware multimodal transformers for textvqa. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 715–732, 2020. 7
- [29] Jihyung Kil, Soravit Changpinyo, Xi Chen, Hexiang Hu, Sebastian Goodman, Wei-Lun Chao, and Radu Soricut. Prestu: Pre-training for scene-text understanding. *ArXiv*, abs/2209.05534, 2022. 7
- [30] 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*, 2021. 5
- [31] Wonjae Kim, Bokyung Son, and Ildoo Kim. Vilt: Vision-and-language transformer without convolution or region supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 1
- [32] Taku Kudo and John Richardson. Sentencepiece: A simple and language independent subword tokenizer and detokenizer for neural text processing. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2018. 3
- [33] Chen-Yu Lee, Chun-Liang Li, Timothy Dozat, Vincent Perot, Guolong Su, Nan Hua, Joshua Ainslie, Renshen Wang, Yasuhisa Fujii, and Tomas Pfister. Formnet: Structural encoding beyond sequential modeling in form document information extraction. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2022. 2, 6
- [34] Kenton Lee, Mandar Joshi, Iulia 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. *ArXiv*, abs/2210.03347, 2022. 5
- [35] Bingjia Li, Jie Wang, Minyi Zhao, and Shuigeng Zhou. Two-stage multimodality fusion for high-performance text-based visual question answering. In *Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022. 7
- [36] Chenliang Li, Bin Bi, Ming Yan, Wei Wang, Songfang Huang, Fei Huang, and Luo Si. Structurallm: Structural pre-training for form understanding. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6309–6318, 2021. 2, 6
- [37] Chenge Li, István Fehérvári, Xiaonan Zhao, Ives Macêdo, and Srikanth Appalaraju. Seetek: Very large-scale open-set logo recognition with text-aware metric learning. *2022 IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 587–596, 2022. 1
- [38] Junlong Li, Yiheng Xu, Lei Cui, and Furu Wei. Markuplm: Pre-training of text and markup language for visually rich document understanding. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2021. 2
- [39] Peizhao Li, Jiuxiang Gu, Jason Kuen, Vlad I. Morariu, Handong Zhao, R. Jain, Varun Manjunatha, and Hongfu Liu. Selfdoc: Self-supervised document representation learning. *2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5648–5656, 2021. 2, 6
- [40] Yulin Li, Yuxi Qian, Yuechen Yu, Xiameng Qin, Chengquan Zhang, Yan Liu, Kun Yao, Junyu Han, Jingtuo Liu, and Errui Ding. Structext: Structured text understanding with multimodal transformers. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2021. 6
- [41] Ron Litman, Oron Anschel, Shahar Tsiper, Roei Litman, Shai Mazor, and R Manmatha. Scatter: selective context attentional scene text recognizer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11962–11972, 2020. 1
- [42] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019. 6
- [43] Ze Liu, Han Hu, Yutong Lin, Zhuliang Yao, Zhenda Xie, Yixuan Wei, Jia Ning, Yue Cao, Zheng Zhang, Li Dong, Furu Wei, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer v2: Scaling up capacity and resolution. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11999–12009, 2021. 8
- [44] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 9992–10002, 2021. 2, 3
- [45] Xiaopeng Lu, Zhen Fan, Yansen Wang, Jean Oh, and Carolyn P Rosé. Localize, group, and select: Boosting text-vqa by scene text modeling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2631–2639, 2021. 7
- [46] Siwen Luo, Feiqi Cao, Felipe Weason Núñez, Zean Wen, Josiah Poon, and Caren Han. Scenegate: Scene-graph based

- co-attention networks for text visual question answering. *ArXiv*, abs/2212.08283, 2022. 7
- [47] Minesh Mathew, Viraj Bagal, Rubèn Tito, Dimosthenis Karatzas, Ernest Valveny, and CV Jawahar. Infographicvqa. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1697–1706, 2022. 5
- [48] Minesh Mathew, Dimosthenis Karatzas, and CV Jawahar. Docvqa: A dataset for vqa on document images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 2200–2209, 2021. 1
- [49] Minesh Mathew, Dimosthenis Karatzas, R. Manmatha, and C. V. Jawahar. DocVQA: A dataset for vqa on document images, 2020. 1, 5, 8
- [50] Anand Mishra, Shashank Shekhar, Ajeet Kumar Singh, and Anirban Chakraborty. Ocr-vqa: Visual question answering by reading text in images. In *2019 international conference on document analysis and recognition (ICDAR)*, pages 947–952. IEEE, 2019. 5, 6, 7
- [51] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01703*, 2019. 5
- [52] Qiming Peng, Yinxu Pan, Wenjin Wang, Bin Luo, Zhenyu Zhang, Zhengjie Huang, Teng Hu, Weichong Yin, Yongfeng Chen, Yin Zhang, et al. Ernie-layout: Layout knowledge enhanced pre-training for visually-rich document understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06155*, 2022. 2
- [53] Rafał Powalski, Łukasz Borchmann, Dawid Jurkiewicz, Tomasz Dwojak, Michał Pietruszka, and Gabriela Pałka. Going full-tilt boogie on document understanding with text-image-layout transformer. In *International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*, pages 732–747, 2021. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
- [54] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021. 1
- [55] Colin Raffel, Noam M. Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *ArXiv*, abs/1910.10683, 2019. 4, 5
- [56] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross B. Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 39:1137–1149, 2015. 3
- [57] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. *ArXiv*, abs/1505.04597, 2015. 3
- [58] Park Seunghyun, Shin Seung, Lee Bado, Lee Junyeop, Surh Jaeheung, Seo Minjoon, and Lee Hwalsuk. Cord: A consolidated receipt dataset for post-ocr parsing. 2019. 1, 5, 6
- [59] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards vqa models that can read. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8317–8326, 2019. 5, 7
- [60] Zineng Tang, Ziyi Yang, Guoxin Wang, Yuwei Fang, Yang Liu, Chenguang Zhu, Michael Zeng, Chao-Yue Zhang, and Mohit Bansal. Unifying vision, text, and layout for universal document processing. *ArXiv*, abs/2212.02623, 2022. 2, 5, 6
- [61] Wolf Thomas, Debut Lysandre, Sanh Victor, Chaumond Julien, Delangue Clement, Moi Anthony, Cistac Pierric, Rault Tim, Louf Rémi, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. Hugging-face’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*, 2019. 5
- [62] Jun Wang, Mingfei Gao, Yuqian Hu, Ramprasaath R Selvaraju, Chetan Ramaiah, Ran Xu, Joseph F JaJa, and Larry S Davis. Tag: Boosting text-vqa via text-aware visual question-answer generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01813*, 2022. 7
- [63] Jiapeng Wang, Lianwen Jin, and Kai Ding. Lilt: A simple yet effective language-independent layout transformer for structured document understanding. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2022. 2
- [64] Jianfeng Wang, Zhengyuan Yang, Xiaowei Hu, Linjie Li, Kevin Lin, Zhe Gan, Zicheng Liu, Ce Liu, and Lijuan Wang. Git: A generative image-to-text transformer for vision and language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14100*, 2022. 1, 2, 6, 7
- [65] Zilong Wang, Yichao Zhou, Wei Wei, Chen-Yu Lee, and Sandeep Tata. A benchmark for structured extractions from complex documents. *ArXiv*, abs/2211.15421, 2022. 2
- [66] Yiheng Xu, Minghao Li, Lei Cui, Shaohan Huang, Furu Wei, and Ming Zhou. Layoutlm: Pre-training of text and layout for document image understanding. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1192–1200, 2020. 2, 4, 6
- [67] Yang Xu, Yiheng Xu, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Furu Wei, Guoxin Wang, Yijuan Lu, Dinei Florencio, Cha Zhang, Wanxiang Che, et al. Layoutlmv2: Multi-modal pre-training for visually-rich document understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14740*, 2020. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [68] Yang Xu, Yiheng Xu, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Furu Wei, Guoxin Wang, Yijuan Lu, Dinei Florencio, Cha Zhang, Wanxiang Che, et al. Layoutlmv2: Multi-modal pre-training for visually-rich document understanding. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2579–2591, 2021. 3, 4
- [69] Zhengyuan Yang, Yijuan Lu, Jianfeng Wang, Xi Yin, Dinei Florencio, Lijuan Wang, Cha Zhang, Lei Zhang, and Jiebo Luo. Tap: Text-aware pre-training for text-vqa and text-caption. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8751–8761, 2021. 7
- [70] Łukasz Borchmann, Michał Pietruszka, Tomasz Stanisławek, Dawid Jurkiewicz, Michał P. Turski, Karolina Szyndler, and Filip Graliński. Due: End-to-end document understanding benchmark. In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2021. 2, 5