Text Extraction Research Report: OCR vs. API Extraction Models

OCR & Document Extraction Test Summary (Generalized)

Image OCR

• Method: EasyOCR

Average Time: ~1.5 to 2 seconds

• **Performance:** Consistently accurate on small and clear images.

• Preview Example:

photosynthesis process through which green plants create energy using carbon dioxide and water

PDF Extraction

1. Small PDF (1 page)

Method: PDF Text Extraction

○ Time Taken: ~0.06 to 0.1 seconds

o Performance: Extremely fast and accurate.

2. Large PDF (~300+ pages)

Method: PDF Text Extraction

Time Taken: ~4.4 to 5 seconds

o RAM Usage: 30-57 MB

o Performance: Stable and efficient.

Note: Gemini could not process PDFs of this size.

DOCX Extraction

Method: DOCX Extraction

• Time Taken: ~0.02 seconds

• Performance: Instantaneous and stable

ML Model System Summary

• Capabilities:

- o OCR, PDF extraction, blocked PDF extraction, DOC/DOCX support.
- Pagination features: Measures and indexes each page.
- Font measurement: Can identify and measure fonts, sizes, styles within pages.
- o Handles formats Gemini cannot: DOC, PPTX, XLSX.

Performance:

- Much faster than Gemini.
- Uses very low resources.

• Stability:

Highly stable across various document types.

• Requirement:

Needs a dedicated server to function optimally.

General Limitations

- Gemini:
 - No support for DOC, PPTX, XLSX.
 - Pagination and font detection are possible, but unstable.
 - Struggles beyond 15 pages or with complex formatting.

ML Model System:

 Requires server but compensates with speed, stability, and wider format support.

Small image ocr-

📊 --- Extraction Summary ---

File: /content/tnt5mar87f (3).jpg

Method Used: Image OCR (EasyOCR)

Time Taken: 1.65 seconds

RAM Used: 0.0 MB

Saved Extracted Text To: /content/tnt5mar87f (3).jpg_extracted.txt

Preview:

photosynthesis process through which green plants create energy using carbon dioxide and water

Small pdf

📊 --- Extraction Summary ---

File: /content/hello (1).pdf

Method Used: PDF Text Extraction

Time Taken: 0.06 seconds

RAM Used: 2.99 MB

Saved Extracted Text To: /content/hello (1).pdf_extracted.txt

Preview:

=== Page 1 ===

hello dwdwq asdasdd as d asd asd asd asd asd dsada s

Small docs

III --- Extraction Summary ---

File: /content/hello (3).docx

Method Used: DOCX Extraction

Time Taken: 0.02 seconds

RAM Used: 0.0 MB

Saved Extracted Text To: /content/hello (3).docx_extracted.txt

📊 --- Extraction Summary ---

Time Taken: 4.41 seconds

H RAM Used: 30-57 MB

Saved Extracted Text To: /content/Adabiyot 9-sinf.pdf_extracted.txt

Gemini Model Analysis

PDF OCR / Text Extraction (~10-15 pages max)

- Time: Scales roughly to 10-15 seconds.
- Performance: Good for text extraction and OCR in smaller PDFs.
- Limitations: Cannot reliably handle PDFs beyond ~15 pages.
- **Special Features**: Can sometimes detect pagination, fonts, and structure, but this is unstable and inconsistent.

Mini Image OCR

Model: Gemini2-2.40
Time: ~2 - 2.5 seconds

• Performance: Good accuracy with occasional instability.

Small PDF (1 page)

• Time: ~2.45 seconds

Gemini testing model 137 seconds, 11 pages

Mini image Gemini2-2.40, good, unstable

Small pdfs: 2.45 seconds, good accuracy

No doc, no pptx, no xlsx, and sometimes not stable but when document has unexpected formats like bold spain or so, it can do it independently

Mistral Small 3 Analysis

Evaluation Criteria

| Criteria | Evaluation | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Accuracy | ✓ High — Captures hourglass structure, intro/body/conclusion components, and cultural variation. Good term definitions and relevant comprehension questions. | | |
| ® Time Taken | Moderate — Slight delay, possibly due to rate limit, but fast once available. | | |
| lack Memory Usage | Lightweight on user side — Processing occurs on OpenRouter's servers, requiring only prompt submission. | | |
| ► Output Structure | ✓ Very Clear — Cleanly separated into sections (summary, questions, terms) with effective use of bolding and bullet points. | | |
| Understanding of Educational Task | Yes — Content structured like a study guide: informative, extractive, and well-labeled. | | |

Conclusion

Gemini performs well for smaller PDFs and images with quick processing times but struggles with larger documents and inconsistent structural detection. Mistral Small 3 excels in accuracy and output structure, making it suitable for educational tasks, though it may experience slight delays.