An open-source OCR workflow for digitizing legacy card catalogs

Anna Jerve, Chloe Cheng & Christine N. Garcia Stanford University, Stanford, CA Corresponding author: <u>ajerve@stanford.edu</u>

D 0000-0002-9276-1346, 0009-0005-2205-1284, 0000-0002-9728-3670

Background

- Stanford's mineral collection established with the first professor, JC Branner in 1891
- Medium-sized research & teaching collection
- Lack of dedicated staff for several decades despite continued growth

Purpose

To **digitize**, **OCR**, and database Stanford's mineral collection's original typed card catalog. Once **cleaned**,

the resulting dataset will serve as a tool for **inventorying** the collection and be the backbone of our mineral database.



Benefits

- Obtain structured data from analog source
- Create shareable, inexpensive and reusable open source tool

Stats

Total number of card catalog cards: **17,530** Python script development & testing: **60 hrs Preparation**: **60 hrs**, ~2500-3000 stapled cards **Scanning**: **150 minutes** (5 min/drawer) Processing through Python: 24 hrs Data cleaning: 150 hrs

Inventorying: to date,

1050 specimens, 2.5 high school interns, 288 hrs combined

Preparation C. O. Hutton Card catalog card with stapled envelope holding label on back Staples removed, catalog number added Processing • Input requirements pre-cropped OpenCV-readable images, stored in Google Drive • Output: data recorded on mineral card will import automatically into Google Sheets; original image files renamed to match catalog number • Image characteristics (contrast, color calibration) temporarily modified during the process to optimize OCR output Cleaning • Data clustered by mineral name, locality, 🗹 Auto-update 1136 clusters found source & description (1,2,3) # Choices in cluster • Mineral name and locality columns organized by number of occurrences. Any 2 - 24with < 5 occurrences were manually # Rows in cluster checked • All catalog numbers manually checked 0-110 against original scanned image Average length of choices • All blank mineral names and localities manually checked

0-130





Scanning

- Fujitsu fi-7700 scanner
- File type: tif

2

- Color image
- Resolution: 300 dpi







OpenRefine

5

Inventorying

- Specimens rehoused
- Staples on labels removed
- Label information captured verbatim in spreadsheet, incl. those affixed to specimen
- 10% of inventoried specimens, to date, not in card catalog and entered manually



Problems

1. Numbers were read and parsed incorrectly and inconsistently, so each catalog number had to be manually checked

×	V
26,300	2830
28,553	2833
29,725	2972
re65,92516.15.13	6392
oyeee16.16.15	6392
63,92716.16.13	6392
	28,553 29,725 re65,92516.15.13 oyeee16.16.15

2. Correct output was dependent on how high the contrast was between the card and the text, but this was often inconsistent and unpredictable

ligh contrast		Low contrast
	BROCHANTITE	
Magnet Cove, Hot Spring County, Arkansas		Proprietary New South Wa
	25,2.10	116W 30061 110
te t recorded] net Cove, nty,Arkansas	Location: South wal	
	Magnet Cove, Hot Spring County, Arkansas	Magnet Cove, Hot Spring County, Arkansas ix trecorded] net Cove, inty,Arkansas Magnet Cove, BROCHARTITE ale9 25,2,10 powdery coatin Name: Bro Catalog # HEY #: [no Location: South wal

3. Some cards did not follow the standardized formatting and required manual transcription



Future directions

- Improve code/procedure for future **processing**
- Ongoing **inventorying**
- Reconcile labels with specimens
- Standardize fields for import into database



