

Fields by raw text:

```
.
{
  records:
    - record_id: 1
      account_number: 8123531476000
      address: "No. 88, Jianguo Road, Chaoyang District, Inner Mongolia"

    - record_id: 2
      account_number: 8123531476000
      address: "No. 100, Shiji Avenue, Meizhou City, Guangdong Province"

    - record_id: 3
      account_number: 8123531476000
      address: "Building T3, Southern Section, Science and Technology Park, Nanshan District, Jilin Province"
}
```

Fields combined:

```
fields:
  - record_id: 1
    account_number:
      - "8123531476000"
      - "8123531476000"
    address:
      - "No. 88, Jianguo Road, Chaoyang District, Inner Mongolia"
      - "No. 88, Jianguo Road, Chaoyang District, Inner Mongolia"

  - record_id: 2
    account_number:
      - "8123531476000"
      - "8123531476000"
    address:
      - "No. 100, Shiji Avenue, Meizhou City, Guangdong Province"
      - "No. 100, Shiji Avenue, Meizhou City, Guangdong Province"

  - record_id: 3
    account_number:
      - "8123531476000"
      - "8123531476000"
    address:
      - "Building T3, Southern Section, Science and Technology Park, Nanshan District, Jilin Province"
      - "Building T3, Southern Section, Science and Technology Park, Nanshan District, Jilin Province"
}
```

Field Confirmation Conclusion: The fields match the original text

Step 2: Confirm whether the mentioned anomaly matches the rule

- Conclusion 1:** Does the rule's premise hold?
The premise of the rule is "*If multiple electricity bill records share the same account number*", and the "account number" field in all affected records is <8123531476000 >, which is consistent across all records. Therefore, the premise is met, and Conclusion 1 is "**Yes**".
- Conclusion 2:** Does the rule's conclusion hold?
The conclusion of the rule is "*The addresses must be identical*", but the addresses for the affected records are clearly different, so they do not satisfy the rule's conclusion, resulting in a violation. Conclusion 2 is "**Yes**".

Anomaly Confirmation Conclusion: The mentioned anomaly matches the rule

Decision: Anomaly confirmed

The anomaly analysis processes for **Rules 2, 4, and 8** are the same as the anomaly analysis process for Rule 1 mentioned above, and are therefore omitted here. The final conclusion is that the financial document images to be inspected exhibit multiple anomalies, as detailed below:

- For Rule 2:** Violation of rule "*The account holder name must be consistent across records with the same account number*".
 - Affected records:** [1,2,3]
 - Explanation:** All account numbers are <8123531476000>, but the account holder names are <Zhang*Wei>, <WangFang*>, <Li*>.

- For Rule 4:** No violations were found for the rule: "*Records associated with the same account number must maintain a consistent status*".
 - Affected records:** None
 - Explanation:** None

- For Rule 8:** Violation of rule "*The company name must be uniform across all records sharing the same account number*".
 - Affected records:** [1,2,3]
 - Explanation:** All account numbers are <8123531476000>, but the company names are <State Grid Chifeng Power Supply Company>, <State Grid Meizhou Power Supply Company>, <State Grid Liangshan Power Supply Company>.