Hebrew Manuscript Entity Extraction System

Extraction Mode Comparison Report

# System Overview

The Hebrew Manuscript Entity Extraction System is a sophisticated pipeline designed to automatically extract and classify entities (dates, locations, persons) from Hebrew manuscript catalog records using MARC metadata fields. The system operates in three distinct modes: (1) Normal Mode uses a legacy gazetteer of 21,766 locations combined with regex pattern matching and AI-based classification fallback for efficient extraction; (2) Kima Mode leverages the comprehensive Kima/Maagarim gazetteer with 48,128 canonical places and 87,166 total lookup entries, employing Hebrew linguistic patterns with AI fallback for enhanced location coverage and context-aware heuristics that achieve 83.9% event-based classifications; (3) AI-Only Mode uses the Grok API for end-to-end entity extraction and classification, providing the highest recall with 5.2× more dates, 1.9× more locations, and 4.5× more persons compared to regex-based modes. All modes now include field source tracking that distinguishes between entities found in structured MARC fields (651$a, 700$a, 260$a, etc.) versus 'new data' extracted from unstructured note fields (957$a, 500$a, 561$a), enabling researchers to assess data quality and identify newly discovered information. The output format follows the pattern 'value | classification | source\_field', where classifications are event-based relationships aligned with CIDOC-CRM ontology (e.g., 'production place', 'resided in', 'author'), and source fields indicate either specific MARC field tags or 'new data' for entities discovered in notes, providing full provenance tracking for scholarly validation and cataloging enhancement.

# Extraction Mode Comparison Results

## Summary

**File Generated:** extraction\_mode\_comparison.csv  
**Total Manuscripts:** 100  
**Extraction Modes:** Normal, Kima, AI-Only

## Output Format with Field Source Tracking

All entity columns now use the format:

value | classification | source\_field

Examples:

• פרנקפורט דמיין | resided in | new data  
• דוד בן בנימין | author | 700$a  
• פולין | production place | new data

## Field Source Statistics (100 manuscripts)

### 📍 Locations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mode | Total | From MARC | New Data |
| Normal | 76 | 0 (0.0%) | 76 (100.0%) |
| Kima | 124 | 0 (0.0%) | 124 (100.0%) |
| AI-Only | 144 | 1 (0.7%) | 143 (99.3%) |

### 👤 Persons

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mode | Total | From MARC | New Data |
| Normal | 80 | 59 (73.8%) | 21 (26.2%) |
| Kima | 80 | 59 (73.8%) | 21 (26.2%) |
| AI-Only | 362 | 291 (80.4%) | 71 (19.6%) |

### 📅 Dates

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mode | Total | From MARC | New Data |
| Normal | 29 | 12 (41.4%) | 17 (58.6%) |
| Kima | 29 | 12 (41.4%) | 17 (58.6%) |
| AI-Only | 152 | 14 (9.2%) | 138 (90.8%) |

## Key Insights

**✓ Locations are almost entirely "new data" (99%+)**  
 The extraction pipeline discovers location information not present in structured MARC fields, demonstrating the value of mining unstructured note fields.

**✓ Persons are mostly from structured MARC fields (70-80%)**  
 MARC fields 700$a and 100$a properly capture person data, indicating good cataloging practices for personal names.

**✓ Dates vary by extraction mode**  
 Normal/Kima modes extract 41% from MARC fields and 59% new data, while AI-Only mode extracts 91% new data by identifying more temporal expressions in notes.

**✓ AI-Only mode extracts significantly more entities**  
 Compared to regex-based modes, AI-Only extracts 5.2× more dates (152 vs 29), 1.9× more locations (144 vs 76), and 4.5× more persons (362 vs 80), demonstrating superior recall at the cost of API calls.

## Extraction Mode Comparison

**Normal Mode:** Uses legacy gazetteer (21,766 locations) with regex pattern matching and AI classification fallback. Efficient and cost-effective for standard extraction tasks.

**Kima Mode (Recommended):** Leverages comprehensive Kima/Maagarim gazetteer (48,128 places, 87,166 lookup entries) with context-aware heuristics achieving 83.9% event-based classifications. Best balance of coverage and accuracy.

**AI-Only Mode:** Uses Grok API for end-to-end extraction and classification. Highest recall and most comprehensive extraction, but requires API calls and is slower. Best for research requiring maximum entity discovery.

## MARC Field Categories

Note Fields (where "new data" is discovered):

* 957$a - Summary/abstract (Hebrew)  
  500$a - General notes  
  561$a - Provenance notes

Structured Fields (existing cataloged data):

**Dates:** 046$a, 046$b, 046$d, 260$c, 264$c, 008  
**Locations:** 651$a, 751$a, 260$a, 264$a, 034$a  
**Persons:** 100$a, 600$a, 700$a, 710$a, 100$e, 700$e

## Benefits of Field Source Tracking

* Data Quality: Distinguish between validated MARC fields and extracted note data
* Source Tracking: Know the origin of each entity for scholarly citation
* Validation: Identify entities that need verification ("new data")
* Coverage: See which entities are already cataloged vs newly discovered
* Consistency: Works across all extraction modes automatically

## Output Files Created

* extraction\_mode\_comparison.csv - Main comparison file with all modes
* output\_normal/manuscript\_extraction\_entities.csv - Normal mode results
* output\_kima/manuscript\_extraction\_entities.csv - Kima mode results
* output\_ai/manuscript\_extraction\_entities.csv - AI-Only mode results

## Recommendations

**For Production Use:** Use Kima Mode for the best balance of coverage (124 locations vs 76 in Normal mode), accuracy (83.9% event-based classifications), and cost-effectiveness (minimal API calls).  
  
**For Research Projects:** Use AI-Only Mode when maximum recall is required and API costs are acceptable. This mode extracts 4-5× more entities than regex-based modes.  
  
**For Budget-Constrained Projects:** Use Normal Mode with legacy gazetteer for cost-free extraction with reasonable coverage.
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