

Small data set

Character Wise Accuracy

| Model | Number of chars Matched | Total Number of Chars | Ratio |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| Model 1 - OCR Model | 275 | 510 | 0.54 |
| Model 2 - Transition Model | 338 | 510 | 0.66 |
| Model 3 - Combined Model | 363 | 510 | 0.71 |

Word Wise Accuracy

| Model | Number of Words Matched | Total Number of Words | Ratio |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| Model 1 - OCR Model | 9 | 104 | 0.087 |
| Model 2 - Transition Model | 27 | 104 | 0.26 |
| Model 3 - Combined Model | 37 | 104 | 0.36 |

Average Dataset log-likelihood

| Model | $\sum \log\text{-likelihood}$ | Total Number of Words | Avg log-likelihood |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Model 1 - OCR Model | -812.067 | 104 | -7.808 |
| Model 2 - Transition Model | -738.095 | 104 | -7.097 |
| Model 3 - Combined Model | -653.071 | 104 | -6.279 |

We can clearly see the increase in accuracy in the three metrics as the model is changed from only OCR to OCR+Transition to OCR+Transition+Skip factor model.

All the words which are corrected by the trans model are listed in 0-1.txt and the words corrected by combined model but are partially corrected by trans and wrongly interpreted by ocr are given in 1-2.txt.

Large Dataset - Combined Model Results

Character-Wise Accuracy

| Datase t | Number of chars Matched | Total Number of Chars | Ratio |
|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------|
| 1 | 7735 | 10919 | 0.708 |
| 2 | 7722 | 10919 | 0.707 |
| 3 | 7712 | 10919 | 0.706 |
| 4 | 7728 | 10919 | 0.7077 |
| 5 | 7760 | 10919 | 0.7083 |

Word-Wise Accuracy

| Datase t | Number of Words Matched | Total Number of Words | Ratio |
|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------|
| 1 | 689 | 2188 | 0.3148 |
| 2 | 696 | 2188 | 0.3180 |
| 3 | 699 | 2188 | 0.3194 |
| 4 | 697 | 2188 | 0.3185 |
| 5 | 729 | 2188 | 0.3332 |

Avg-dataset log-likelihood

| Datase t | $\sum \log\text{-likelihood}$ | Total Number of Words | Avg log-likelihood |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | -13722.8 | 2188 | -6.27186 |
| 2 | -13721.6 | 2188 | -6.2713 |
| 3 | -13707.9 | 2188 | -6.26506 |
| 4 | -13714.2 | 2188 | -6.26793 |
| 5 | -13692.3 | 2188 | -6.25789 |

I have runned for every large dataset using combined model dataset-5 is having large accuracy in terms of all the three metrics. The character accuracy ratios are higher compared to word accuracy as it is difficult to capture all the relativity between the character combinations that are forming with the model we are having.

To Compare between the three models I have runned it along the dataset-5 and the results are

OCR

Total chars:10919

Matched # of Chars:6391

Total words:2188

Matched # of Words:253

Avg Dataset log-likelihood:-7.857453254399122

OCR+Trans

Total chars:10919

Matched # of Chars:7475

Total words:2188

Matched # of Words:584

Avg Dataset log-likelihood:-7.158425135057614

Combined

Total chars:10919

Matched # of Chars:7760

Total words:2188

Matched # of Words:729

Avg Dataset log-likelihood:-6.257888800554419

we can clearly see the combined model has beat in all three metrics

I have tried to attempt extra credit question by increasing the skip factor what I have found is as if we give more weight to the skip factor the word and character wise have not changed but we can see an increase in average log-likelihood. which is true as expected as in skip factor we are giving weight if img and word are equal at a time.