

Automated Tabular Data Extraction from arXiv Physics Papers Using Google Gemini CLI

Abstract

This thesis proposal outlines a pilot study on automating the extraction of tabular data from physics research papers on arXiv using a Large Language Model (LLM) approach, specifically Google's Gemini 2.0 Flash model accessed via the command-line interface (CLI), compared against a traditional PDF table extraction tool (Camelot). The motivation stems from the difficulty of reliably retrieving structured tables (e.g. experimental results, measurements) from PDF documents, a task that is labor-intensive to perform manually. Recent advances in LLMs offer new capabilities for understanding document content, including tables, through multimodal inputs and extremely long context windows ¹. We propose a focused 12–14 day experiment by a single student: a small set of arXiv physics papers will be processed to extract their tables using (a) Gemini's CLI (Flash model) and (b) Camelot's algorithmic parser. Extraction accuracy will be evaluated against ground-truth tables, and errors will be analyzed to characterize each method's failure modes. We will also document the prompt engineering techniques required to guide the LLM. The proposal details the research problem, relevant literature (from traditional PDF parsing to emerging LLM-based methods), methodology (dataset selection, tool setup, prompt strategy, evaluation metrics), a timeline of activities, and expected outcomes. We anticipate producing a comparative assessment of Gemini versus Camelot on this niche but representative task, shedding light on the strengths and limitations of an LLM-based approach to scientific table extraction. The findings will inform whether state-of-the-art LLMs like Gemini can complement or outperform conventional tools in this domain, guiding future larger-scale studies.

Keywords: Large Language Models, Table Extraction, PDF Parsing, Document AI, Google Gemini, Camelot

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	4
Background	4
Problem Statement	5
Research Questions	6
Research Objectives	6
Significance of the Study	7
Limitations	7
Definition of Key Terms	8
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Traditional Table Extraction Tools	10
2.2 Machine Learning-Based Table Extraction	11
2.3 Large Language Models for Document Parsing	12
2.4 Prompt Engineering and Structured Output	13
2.5 Research Gap and Rationale	14
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	16
3.1 Research Design	16
3.2 Dataset and Data Collection	17
3.3 Tools and Technical Setup	18
3.4 Prompt Engineering Strategy	19
3.5 Evaluation Metrics	21
3.6 Reproducibility and Ethical Considerations	22
CHAPTER 4: THEORETICAL/CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	23
CHAPTER 5: RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	25
Expected Outcomes	26
Timeline	28
References	30

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

Tables in scientific papers contain critical experimental data, results, and other structured information that researchers often need to extract for analysis or meta-studies. However, pulling tabular data from PDF documents is notoriously challenging due to the complex layout and formatting issues inherent in PDFs. In physics papers, for example, tables might span multiple columns or pages, include merged cells (for multi-level headers), or contain special notation and symbols – all of which complicate automated extraction. Traditionally, researchers have relied on manual copy-and-paste or ad hoc scripts to retrieve table contents, which is time-consuming and error-prone. Automating this process would significantly speed up literature reviews and data aggregation efforts, ensuring that quantitative information from publications is more accessible to analysis.

In recent years, PDF table extraction tools like Camelot have emerged to address this need ³. Camelot uses rule-based algorithms (lattice and stream modes) to parse table structures in PDFs and can output tables in formats like CSV or JSON. Such tools work well on many machine-generated (digital text) PDFs, but they have limitations: they may fail when table cell lines are not clearly demarcated or when the layout is complex (for example, multi-row headers or irregular cell spanning). Camelot only works on text-based PDFs (not scanned images) and often requires parameter tuning (such as specifying table regions or adjusting detection settings) to work optimally ⁴. The accuracy of traditional parsers can degrade on “edge cases,” often requiring manual corrections for complicated layouts. Thus, despite available tools, reliably extracting all tables from diverse research papers remains an open challenge.

Meanwhile, the field of Large Language Models has advanced rapidly, opening new possibilities for document understanding. Models like OpenAI’s GPT-3 and GPT-4 have demonstrated the ability to interpret and generate structured text in zero-shot settings (i.e. without task-specific training) ⁵. Modern LLMs can, in theory, read large portions of a document (including tables represented in text form) and output a structured representation. Google’s recent Gemini model is a state-of-the-art LLM released in late 2024, with versions such as Gemini 2.0 Flash and Gemini 2.5 Pro that offer extremely large context windows (up to 1 million tokens) and multimodal input capabilities ⁶ ¹. In other words, Gemini can potentially ingest entire PDF documents (or very large chunks of them) and reason about their content, including complex tables, without needing to slice the input into smaller pieces. Moreover, Gemini’s multimodal nature means it can analyze images or PDF files directly via an API, combining optical character recognition (OCR) with language understanding in a single model.

Given these developments, it is compelling to investigate whether an advanced LLM like Gemini can effectively extract tabular data from scientific PDFs as a more “intelligent” alternative to rule-based tools. If successful, an LLM-based method could reduce the need for tedious manual correction of tables and handle a wider variety of table formats by leveraging the model’s understanding of context and semantics. For instance, an LLM might correctly infer implicit table structures even when cell boundaries are ambiguous, using clues from surrounding text or headers – something hard-coded algorithms struggle with ⁷. Preliminary anecdotal evidence is promising: in a recent experiment, a ChatGPT-based approach to PDF tables reportedly required minimal user corrections compared to other methods ⁸. Google’s Gemini, being a cutting-edge model, has the potential to match or surpass such performance with proper prompting. On the other hand, LLMs are not infallible – they might “hallucinate” data or omit subtle details if prompts are not precise ⁹. Thus, a careful, critical evaluation is needed rather than assuming the newest AI model will automatically outperform specialized tools.

This study is both exploratory and comparative in nature. It is **exploratory** in demonstrating how one might harness a generative AI model (Gemini CLI) for a novel application (table extraction) and in refining prompt techniques for that purpose. It is **comparative** in that we will quantitatively and qualitatively compare the outputs of Gemini and Camelot on the same set of inputs. By narrowing the scope to a single domain (physics papers) and two extraction methods, we can keep the project manageable within roughly two weeks while obtaining directly interpretable results. Physics papers are an ideal testbed: they are openly available on arXiv (avoiding copyright issues) and they commonly contain tabular results (physical constants, experimental measurements, error margins, etc.) that are valuable to extract. Additionally, many physics papers use standardized LaTeX templates and two-column layouts, which may give tables relatively consistent structures. This setting allows us to evaluate whether an LLM can leverage those regularities. The central question is whether a state-of-the-art LLM can be practically deployed to handle real-world scientific document tasks and what the trade-offs are compared to a proven open-source library.

Problem Statement

Reliable extraction of tables from scientific PDF documents remains a challenging problem, especially for complex table layouts. Traditional PDF parsing tools (e.g., Camelot, Tabula) often struggle with tables that have spanning cells, multi-level headers, or unconventional formatting, leading to incomplete or incorrect data extraction. At the same time, emerging Large Language Models with multimodal capabilities (like Google's Gemini 2.0) present an opportunity to parse document content in a more context-aware manner, but it is not yet established how well these models perform on structured data extraction tasks such as tables. The problem this research addresses is the lack of dependable and automated methods to extract tabular data from physics research papers, and the uncertainty of whether a generative AI approach can outperform or supplement traditional rule-based extraction tools. In essence, we aim to determine if an LLM-based approach can **bridge the gap** in accuracy and flexibility, handling complex table structures that confound existing tools.

Research Questions

To tackle the above problem, the study is guided by the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** How accurately can the Gemini LLM (via the Gemini 2.0 Flash CLI) extract tabular data from arXiv physics papers compared to a traditional table extraction tool (Camelot)?
- **RQ2:** What types of errors or extraction failures are observed with each approach, and how do the error profiles differ between Gemini and Camelot?
- **RQ3:** Considering factors such as required user effort (prompt tuning, configuration) and consistency of results, is an LLM-based approach practical for a single-student project and for broader use in automating table extraction?

Research Objectives

Based on the research questions, the study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. **Evaluate Extraction Performance:** Quantitatively evaluate the accuracy of table data extraction by Google's Gemini 2.0 Flash model (via CLI) in comparison to the Camelot tool on a sample of physics papers. This involves measuring cell-level and table-level accuracy against ground truth data (addressing RQ1).
2. **Analyze Error Types:** Identify and compare the types of errors produced by the LLM-based method versus the traditional method. For instance, determine if Camelot commonly misses merged header cells or splits columns improperly, and whether Gemini might omit entries or hallucinate values under certain conditions (addressing RQ2).
3. **Assess Practicality:** Assess the practicality of using the LLM approach in terms of the effort required (e.g., prompt engineering iterations, runtime considerations) and the consistency/reliability of outputs. We will document the workflow and any obstacles (such as API limits or prompt sensitivities) to evaluate whether this approach is feasible and efficient for individual researchers or small-scale projects (addressing RQ3).

Through these objectives, the study not only compares "which method is better" in a general sense, but also characterizes the conditions under which an LLM approach might be favorable or unfavorable. Achieving these objectives will provide insight into the potential of integrating AI language models into scientific data extraction workflows.

Significance of the Study

This research is significant on several fronts. **For scientific data analysis and literature review:** if LLMs like Gemini prove effective at extracting tables, researchers could dramatically accelerate the process of aggregating data from papers. Instead of manually transcribing tables or dealing with the quirks of conventional parsers, an AI assistant could pull out structured results in seconds. This would make quantitative information in publications more accessible, enabling meta-analyses and systematic reviews that compile data from many sources with far less effort. In the specific context of physics, an accurate table extraction system could allow, for example, the rapid compilation of experimental constants or performance metrics across dozens of papers for comparison.

For the field of document processing and NLP: this study will provide one of the first empirical evaluations of a state-of-the-art LLM (Google's Gemini) on a focused document extraction task (tables in scientific papers). The results will add to the growing body of knowledge on what LLMs can and cannot do well. If the LLM approach shows high reliability, it could encourage more adoption of such models for similar tasks (extracting information from forms, reports, etc.) without requiring custom-built rule-based systems for each format. A positive outcome would support the claim that "language models can understand and convert document content effectively," contributing to literature on LLM applications in information extraction. Conversely, if the LLM underperforms in certain cases, that finding is equally valuable: it would illustrate that traditional methods remain competitive for those cases and that current LLMs are not a cure-all. This insight could save others time by indicating when an LLM is worth applying and when it is not, and it could guide developers of LLMs to improve on these specific weaknesses (for example, by incorporating better table structure understanding into training).

For future research: any limitations or failure modes identified in our experiments will highlight areas for further investigation. For instance, if we discover that Gemini consistently struggles with tables spanning multiple pages or with very dense formatting, subsequent research could focus on those challenges, perhaps by fine-tuning models or combining LLMs with layout-aware algorithms. If our pilot shows near-perfect performance on a small scale, it raises questions of generalizability: would the success hold on a much larger and more diverse set of documents? what about the trade-offs of cost and speed at scale? These questions could form the basis of follow-up studies that this initial work would motivate.

Finally, **on a personal and educational level,** the project's successful execution will demonstrate the researcher's ability to combine cutting-edge AI tools with classical problems in data extraction. It serves as a learning opportunity in prompt engineering, experimental design, and critical evaluation of AI systems. The resulting thesis (and possibly a conference or workshop paper) would contribute to the student's academic profile, showcasing skills in both software development and research. Moreover, our commitment to open science – by releasing the evaluation scripts, prompt designs, and dataset – will allow others to reproduce and extend the work. This openness can foster collaborative improvements (for example, someone might test a different model like GPT-4 on our same tables, or integrate our prompts into another project). In summary, the study's significance lies in advancing practical AI for document understanding, informing the community of its capabilities and limits, and providing a stepping stone for future innovations in automating knowledge extraction from the vast body of scientific literature.

Limitations

It is important to recognize the limitations of this proposed study. First, the project is **limited in scope and sample size** – we plan to use on the order of 10 arXiv papers (roughly 15–20 tables total) as the dataset. This small sample is sufficient for a focused pilot evaluation but is not large enough to claim broad generalizability across all scientific papers or even all physics subfields. The findings will be interpreted as case-specific insights rather than definitive statistical conclusions. In other words, this is a feasibility study or “proof of concept” rather than a comprehensive benchmark of table extraction methods.

Second, the **time frame is constrained to approximately two weeks** of work by one student. This means certain compromises have to be made. For example, we will not be developing any new algorithms or performing extensive parameter sweeps beyond what is necessary – we will use tools and models largely in their default or recommended configurations (with some prompt tuning for the LLM). The short duration also limits the depth of analysis; while we will thoroughly check each table extraction, we might not explore every possible prompt variation or every mode of Camelot if something initially works adequately.

Another limitation is the **focus on a single LLM (Gemini 2.0 Flash)** and a single baseline tool. We are not comparing multiple LLMs or multiple traditional tools. Gemini is chosen because it is state-of-the-art and available, but we acknowledge that results might differ with another model (e.g., GPT-4 or an open-source model). Similarly, Camelot is a strong baseline but not the only traditional option; other tools (like PDFPlumber or Adobe’s API) are outside our scope. Thus, our comparative claims will be specific to Gemini vs Camelot, rather than LLMs vs all rule-based methods universally.

There are also **practical and technical constraints**. The Gemini model is accessed via a cloud API, which means we depend on internet access and Google’s service availability. Any changes to the API or model during the project (though unlikely within two weeks) could affect consistency. We will mitigate this by fixing the model version and noting it, but the dependency remains. Additionally, since Gemini is a black-box service, we have limited insight into why it fails in certain cases (beyond speculation from the outputs), whereas Camelot being open-source allows more introspection. This could limit the depth of our error analysis for the LLM approach.

From an **ethical standpoint**, while our use of the AI is within a research context on public data (arXiv papers), we must be cautious about the accuracy and potential misrepresentation of extracted data. We will treat the LLM outputs with scrutiny; any data extracted will be verified against the source to ensure we do not propagate errors. We will also discuss in our report that any use of LLM-extracted scientific data should be verified, as a matter of responsible research practice – highlighting that even if our results are positive, one should not blindly trust AI outputs without validation, especially in scientific contexts.

In summary, this study is constrained by its pilot scale, time limits, focus on specific tools, and reliance on an external AI service. The outcomes will be interpreted with these limitations in mind, and we will refrain from over-generalizing. The goal is to draw initial conclusions and identify trends or issues, which can then be explored further in subsequent, more extensive research.

Definition of Key Terms

To avoid ambiguity, key terms and concepts used throughout this proposal are defined below:

- **Tabular Data Extraction:** The process of retrieving structured table information (rows, columns, and cell values) from a document (in this case, PDF papers) and converting it into a machine-readable format (such as CSV or JSON). This involves detecting the boundaries of the table and accurately extracting the text or numbers in each cell.
- **PDF (Portable Document Format):** A widely used document format that preserves page layout and formatting. In this study, we deal with digital PDFs of arXiv papers (not scanned images). PDFs render text and figures in a fixed layout, which makes extracting content challenging because the logical reading order and structure (for example, table grids) are not explicitly represented in the file's text stream.
- **arXiv Physics Papers:** Research papers in various physics disciplines that are publicly available on arXiv (an open-access preprint repository). These papers often use LaTeX templates and include figures, tables, and references. We use arXiv physics papers as our data source due to their availability and standardized formatting.
- **Large Language Model (LLM):** A type of artificial intelligence model, typically based on Transformer architectures, that is trained on massive amounts of text data and can understand or generate human-like text. Modern LLMs (e.g., GPT-4, Google Gemini) can perform a wide array of language tasks and can often do so without task-specific training (through zero-shot or few-shot learning). In this proposal, when we refer to the LLM, we specifically mean models capable of processing not just plain text but also structured or formatted text (and possibly images) to accomplish tasks like extracting information from documents.
- **Google Gemini CLI (Flash):** A command-line interface and associated API for interacting with Google's Gemini LLM, specifically the "Flash" version of Gemini 2.0. Gemini 2.0 Flash is optimized for speed and allows extremely large context windows (up to ~1 million tokens) with support for multimodal inputs ⁶. Using the Gemini CLI (or the Python SDK for Gemini), one can provide prompts and input data (including PDF file content or images) and receive the model's output. In our project, "Gemini CLI" refers to using the Gemini LLM via its API/CLI to perform table extraction tasks. Flash denotes the model variant used (as opposed to the larger "Pro" model); the Flash model was chosen for its availability and speed, which are suitable for a limited-duration pilot.
- **Camelot:** An open-source Python library (and CLI tool) for PDF table extraction, often referenced by its tagline "PDF Table Extraction for Humans." Camelot uses algorithmic methods to parse tables in PDFs that contain embedded text (not scans). It offers two main extraction modes: lattice (which looks for drawn lines in the PDF to delineate cell boundaries) and stream (which infers table structure by detecting consistent whitespace and text alignment). Camelot outputs tables as structured data (e.g., as Pandas DataFrames or CSV files). In this proposal, Camelot represents the traditional, non-LLM baseline approach for comparison with the LLM approach.
- **Prompt Engineering:** The practice of crafting the input prompts given to an LLM in order to elicit the desired output. Because LLMs like Gemini are flexible and can generate a wide range of responses, how the task is described in the prompt can significantly affect the model's output quality. Prompt engineering techniques may include giving the model explicit instructions, providing context or examples, and formatting the input in a way that the model can easily interpret. In our context, prompt engineering involves instructing the model clearly to extract table data – for example, by specifying the output format (JSON, CSV) and perhaps including a short example of a table-to-text

conversion. We may also adjust LLM parameters like temperature (which controls randomness) to improve reliability.

- **Evaluation Metrics:** The criteria and measures we will use to assess the performance of each table extraction method. Key metrics in this project include **cell-level accuracy** (the percentage of table cells correctly extracted by a method), as well as precision and recall of extracted cells. In this context, precision can be defined as the number of correctly extracted cell entries divided by the total number of entries extracted (a measure of how many extraction outputs were actually correct), and recall as the number of correctly extracted cell entries divided by the total number of true cell entries in the ground truth table (a measure of how much of the table was captured). We will also consider the harmonic mean of precision and recall (F1 score) for an overall effectiveness measure. Additionally, we will note table-level accuracy (whether an entire table was perfectly extracted with no errors). Definitions and formulas for these metrics will be detailed in Chapter 3 (Methodology).
- **Reproducibility:** In the context of this experiment, reproducibility refers to the ability for others to repeat the study and obtain the same results. To enhance reproducibility, we will fix certain settings for the LLM (for instance, using deterministic parameters like temperature = 0 to ensure consistency in outputs) and document all relevant version information (Gemini model version, Camelot version, etc.). We will use version control (e.g., Git) to track our code and any changes made during the project, and we will publicly release our dataset (the collection of PDF tables and corresponding ground truth) along with the scripts used for extraction and evaluation. This way, another researcher could rerun the comparison under the same conditions. Potential issues for reproducibility, such as changes in the Gemini API or model over time, will be acknowledged.
- **Flash vs. Pro (Gemini Models):** Shorthand for two variants of the Gemini 2.0 model. Flash refers to the faster, more lightweight model variant that is optimized for quick responses and high throughput (and is generally available for free with usage limits as of early 2025). Pro refers to a larger, more powerful model variant which might achieve higher accuracy or handle more complex tasks at the cost of speed and which may be in a preview or paid tier. Our project uses **Gemini 2.0 Flash** exclusively, due to its accessibility and more than sufficient capabilities for a pilot test. We note this to clarify that our results pertain to the Flash model; in principle, the Pro model could yield different results (possibly better extraction accuracy), but testing that is beyond our scope.
- **Physics-specific Terminology:** While not a core concept of our methodology, it is worth noting that tables in physics papers might include domain-specific symbols and notation (for example, “±” for uncertainty, units like MeV/c^2 , Greek letters for variables, etc.). We assume that the LLM (Gemini) has been trained on enough scientific and technical text to handle these appropriately (i.e., not to be thrown off by unusual characters or notations). In evaluating the outputs, we will pay attention to whether such symbols and formats are preserved correctly by each method. If, for instance, Camelot or Gemini systematically drops or misinterprets a certain symbol (like not recognizing “ μ ” or splitting “ 10^5 ” incorrectly), we will document that as part of the error analysis.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The task of extracting tables from documents has been approached through both traditional rule-based methods and more recent machine learning and AI-driven techniques. This literature review summarizes key developments and findings from previous work, providing context for our research. We organize the review into thematic subsections: traditional table extraction tools, advanced machine learning approaches, the emergence of large language models for document parsing, recent techniques in prompt engineering for structured output, and finally the identified research gap that our study aims to fill.

2.1 Traditional Table Extraction Tools

Early solutions for table extraction from PDFs and other documents were largely heuristic and layout-based. A prominent example is **Tabula**, an early GUI tool that allowed users to select and extract tables from PDFs. Around the same time, libraries like **Camelot** (developed by Vinayak Mehta in 2018) were introduced to provide more automated parsing of PDF tables. Camelot, in particular, is built on two parsing strategies: **lattice mode**, which detects tables by finding ruling lines (borders) on the page, and **stream mode**, which relies on detecting consistent whitespace and text alignment to separate columns ¹⁰ ¹¹. The design goal of Camelot was to make table extraction accessible “for Humans,” meaning it provides user-friendly outputs (e.g., directly into Python Pandas DataFrames) and even reports an internal accuracy estimate for each extraction attempt ¹². Camelot and similar tools work well on many machine-generated PDF tables—especially those that have clear cell boundaries or separation. For example, if a table has visible grid lines, Camelot’s lattice mode can usually capture it with near-perfect accuracy, and if a table is plain text in columns, the stream mode often suffices.

However, these rule-based tools have well-documented limitations. When table layouts become complex, their performance degrades. If a table has multi-line merged header cells, irregular column spans, or if the text is dense and without clear spacing, heuristic algorithms can misinterpret the structure (e.g., merging two distinct columns or splitting one column into two) ¹³. There are also issues with text accuracy if PDFs use unusual fonts or encodings (though for digital PDFs this is typically minor). In summary, the literature and user reports suggest that while tools like Camelot (and other open-source libraries such as PDFPlumber or PyMuPDF) handle simple tables with high precision, they struggle with edge cases. Often, a human has to intervene—by tweaking parameters (like specifying the exact table area for extraction) or by manually fixing the output for cells that were merged or split incorrectly ¹⁴. This limitation of traditional tools has motivated researchers to seek more robust methods.

2.2 Machine Learning-Based Table Extraction

Recognizing the limitations of purely rule-based approaches, researchers have developed data-driven methods for table extraction, often using computer vision and machine learning techniques. One line of work treats table extraction as an image processing problem: the PDF page is rendered as an image, and then algorithms (increasingly, deep learning models) detect and interpret the table within that image. For example, some methods use convolutional neural networks (CNNs) or transformers to locate table regions on a page and even segment the table into cells. A notable contribution in this space is the **PubTables-1M** dataset (Smock et al., 2021), which consists of over one million table annotations from a variety of documents ¹⁵ ¹⁶. This dataset has enabled training and evaluation of advanced table extraction algorithms under more diverse and challenging conditions. Using such data, researchers have proposed models that explicitly handle table structure recognition. For instance, approaches like TableNet (2019) and the Graph-based Table Structure Recognition (GTE) model by Zheng et al., 2020 introduced neural architectures to handle spanning cells and complex layouts by learning to predict the relationships between text blocks (which ones form a row, which form a column, etc.). Typically, these ML models break the problem into two stages: (1) **Table detection** – finding where on the page the tables are located, and (2) **Table structure recognition** – reconstructing the cell grid (rows and columns) of each detected table.

When successful, vision-based and ML-based methods can be more robust than manual heuristics. They can learn from examples to handle variations that weren’t explicitly coded in rules. For instance, a trained model might correctly infer the structure of a table with partially missing borders, whereas a rule-based

approach would fail. However, these methods come with their own challenges. They require substantial annotated data for training (hence the importance of datasets like PubTables-1M), and training such models is computationally intensive. Moreover, a model might be **overfit** or specialized to the types of tables it saw during training; applying it to a very different style of table (say, a scientific table with equations in cells, when it was trained mostly on financial tables) can lead to poor results unless the model has seen a wide variety of layouts¹⁷ ¹⁸. A recent survey by Chen (2023) noted that despite progress, traditional ML-based table extraction still struggles with the deeper semantic interpretation of tables – meaning that purely vision-based models might get the cell boundaries right but not understand relationships like which header applies to which column, etc. The survey suggested that a combination of **vision and language understanding** is likely needed for truly reliable extraction of complex tables⁹. This insight is part of what paves the way for considering LLMs in the loop, since LLMs excel at understanding text and could potentially reason about table content in ways beyond what pure vision models do.

2.3 Large Language Models for Document Parsing

The advent of large pre-trained language models has revolutionized many natural language processing tasks, but applying LLMs to structured documents (like tables in PDFs) is not straightforward. Large Language Models such as GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) demonstrated that with sufficient scale, models can perform tasks like question answering and data extraction from plain text with little or no task-specific training²⁰. One might hope, then, that an LLM could simply read a table (converted to text) and output the structured data. There have indeed been initial attempts to do this: for example, giving the LLM the raw text of a table (e.g., rows separated by newlines, columns by some delimiter) and asking it to parse or reformat it.

However, studies have found that LLMs can be brittle when it comes to truly understanding tables presented as text. A table in a PDF is essentially a two-dimensional structure, but when we feed it to an LLM, we often have to linearize it (for instance, by reading row by row left-to-right). LLMs don't have an innate notion of rows and columns—they see a sequence of tokens. Research by Zhu et al. (2021) reported that naive methods of feeding tables as delimited text to LLMs break down as table complexity increases²¹. The model might do well on a simple table, but as soon as the table has multi-line headers, or cells that span multiple columns/rows, the linearized representation confuses the model. Another recent paper by Liu, Wang, & Chen (2023) systematically evaluated LLMs on tabular data understanding and found that even minor changes in how a table is formatted as text can significantly degrade the LLM's performance²². For instance, rearranging columns, or altering how lines are wrapped, could throw off the model's interpretation. These findings indicate that LLMs do have the capacity to understand table content (since they can see the words and numbers), but they are very sensitive to presentation. An LLM doesn't inherently know that a certain string of text was meant to be a table cell unless it's conveyed clearly in the input.

On the other hand, LLMs bring some potential advantages if we can leverage them correctly. Unlike fixed algorithms, an LLM has knowledge and context—GPT-4, for example, “knows” a lot about general physics concepts, units, common table patterns, etc., from its training data (OpenAI, 2023). This means it might infer, say, that a column of values likely all belong under a particular header even if the text alignment is ambiguous, simply because it understands the semantic relationship (for example, a column of numbers with “kg” in each cell is probably all under a header that mentions mass). Traditional algorithms don't do this kind of reasoning; they operate on positional rules. So the promise of using LLMs for table extraction is to combine their language understanding with layout information to overcome cases that stump rule-based methods.

2.4 Prompt Engineering and Structured Output

To address the brittleness of LLMs with tabular input, two strategies have emerged in recent literature and practice: **better prompting techniques** and **structured output constraints**. Prompt engineering involves crafting the input to the LLM in a way that makes the task clear and the format regular. For example, simply asking an LLM “extract the table” might yield a verbose or oddly formatted answer, whereas a prompt that says “Output the table as JSON with the following fields...” provides a strong guidance on what is needed. Researchers have found that adding clear delimiters (such as using pipes `|` or commas to explicitly mark column boundaries in the input text) can help the model recognize the table structure. Providing an example in the prompt (few-shot prompting) of a simple table and its JSON output is another technique that can set the pattern for the model to follow ²³. Essentially, the prompt needs to teach the model how to interpret the spatial relationships in the table text.

The second strategy is using the model’s ability to handle **structured outputs or function calls**. Platforms like OpenAI and Google have introduced features where you can define a JSON schema or a set of output fields, and the model will try to conform to that. Google’s Gemini, for instance, supports a “structured output” mode (through their SDK) where the user can provide a Python type or JSON schema, and the model is constrained to produce output in that format ²⁴ ²⁵. Early adopters of Gemini have demonstrated this capability on documents: for example, Schmid (2025) showed that Gemini 2.0 could take a PDF invoice and output specific fields (invoice number, date, total, etc.) in JSON by combining the file upload feature with a carefully crafted prompt and schema ²⁶. This approach essentially guides the model to fill in the blanks of a predefined structure, greatly reducing the likelihood of it generating irrelevant text or omitting necessary parts. It also helps prevent hallucination, since the model is not free to invent new fields – it must stick to the schema given.

In our context, we plan to leverage these insights. The literature suggests that to get the best performance from an LLM on table extraction, one should instruct it very clearly on the format (e.g., “provide the output as CSV with one line per row, separated by commas”) or even use structured output mode to enforce a JSON array output. We will experiment with both approaches in our methodology: starting with straightforward prompts and then possibly introducing a JSON schema. By doing so, we hope to capture the table content accurately and consistently. The goal is to have the LLM produce something that we can directly compare to the ground truth without needing heavy post-processing.

2.5 Research Gap and Rationale

Having reviewed the above strands of work, we can identify the gap that this proposal aims to fill. Traditional tools and recent ML models provide a baseline for table extraction, and some anecdotal uses of LLMs (like using ChatGPT via an API or the Gemini blog examples) hint at the potential of language models in this realm. However, what is lacking is a **direct empirical comparison** of an LLM-based approach with a strong traditional baseline on the same task. In particular, to our knowledge, no published study has yet evaluated Google’s Gemini LLM on extracting tables from scientific papers, nor compared it side-by-side with a tool like Camelot. A very recent master’s thesis by Tunová (2025) did integrate a ChatGPT-based component into a table extraction pipeline and found it to be the “most reliable” among tested methods for the task of verifying information across documents ²⁷. However, that work had a different focus (ensuring consistency of tables across multiple documents) and used ChatGPT in a semi-automated fashion. It did not quantify extraction accuracy against ground truth in a straightforward way.

Our proposed study will specifically measure how well an LLM can extract table data relative to a known baseline, using clear metrics. By focusing on arXiv physics papers, we also constrain the problem to a manageable domain while still encountering real-world complexity. The motivation is that if Gemini (an advanced LLM) can at least match Camelot’s performance on these tables — and especially if it can surpass Camelot on the trickier tables — it would be a strong proof-of-concept that LLMs can be viable tools for document data extraction. This would bridge the gap between the conceptual advantages we know LLMs have (contextual understanding, flexibility) and practical evidence of their effectiveness on a document task.

In summary, existing literature provides the building blocks and suggests what might be possible, but we have yet to see a formal evaluation of “LLM vs algorithm” for table extraction. Our work will contribute by providing that evaluation, along with a detailed account of the prompt engineering and setup required. This not only helps answer whether the LLM approach is currently competitive, but also informs future efforts by highlighting what worked, what didn’t, and how the latest AI model can be integrated into data workflows. It positions our research at the intersection of document processing and NLP, leveraging established knowledge from both sides and pushing into a novel evaluation scenario that can inform both practitioners and researchers.

Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter details the methodology of our study, including the experimental design, dataset selection, tools and implementation details, prompt engineering strategy for the LLM, and the evaluation metrics and considerations. The methodology is designed to be achievable within a 12–14 day period by a single researcher while still maintaining rigor in the comparison. We focus on controlling variables where possible so that differences in outcomes can be attributed to the methods (Gemini vs Camelot) rather than extraneous factors.

3.1 Research Design

The study is structured as a **pilot-scale experimental comparison**. We will apply two different methods to the same set of data and then evaluate and compare their outputs. The two methods are:

- **Method A:** Traditional rule-based table extraction using Camelot (baseline).
- **Method B:** LLM-based table extraction using Google’s Gemini 2.0 Flash model via its CLI/Python SDK.

The overall design is within-subjects for the tables: each table in our dataset will be extracted by both Method A and Method B. This allows a direct side-by-side comparison for each instance (each table acts as its own control to some extent). The evaluation will look at accuracy and errors on a per-table basis and then aggregate results, rather than, say, training a model on some tables and testing on others. There is no machine learning training phase in our study; we are utilizing pre-existing tools and models.

Controlled Variables: We aim to keep as many factors constant as possible between the two methods. The input to both methods will essentially be the same PDF files (or the extracted text from those PDFs). Both methods will be evaluated against the same ground truth data. We will not introduce any other tools or processes that treat one method differently from the other (for example, we won’t do special pre-processing for one method that we don’t for the other, unless absolutely necessary). If any preprocessing is needed (like converting PDFs to images or text for Gemini), we will document it and apply it uniformly.

Experimental Procedure (Overview): For each paper in our dataset: 1. Identify the tables in the paper and manually extract their content to create a ground truth reference (this is done once per table). 2. Run Camelot on the paper to extract the table(s). If needed, adjust Camelot’s mode or parameters to get the best extraction (noting any adjustments). 3. Run Gemini on the same paper/table using a designed prompt. If needed, iterate on the prompt using one or two sample tables until we have a stable prompt format, then use that prompt consistently for all tables. 4. Compare the outputs from Camelot and Gemini to the ground truth for each table. Compute accuracy metrics and record error types. 5. Compile the results across all tables for aggregate analysis.

It is important to note that this is an **evaluation study**, not a development of a new model. We won’t be modifying the internal workings of Camelot or Gemini; we are using them as-is (with configuration and prompting as the main levers to pull). The “experiment” is about how well each tool performs given reasonable usage.

3.2 Dataset and Data Collection

The dataset for our study will consist of a small selection of physics research papers from arXiv (the exact number is anticipated to be around 10 papers). These papers will be chosen using the following criteria:

- Each selected paper **contains at least one clearly identifiable table** (with a label like “Table 1” or a caption indicating a table). We want to ensure that there is tabular data to extract.
- The papers are **recent (from the last few years)** and formatted in typical arXiv styles (many arXiv physics papers use standard IEEE or APS LaTeX templates). Using recent papers ensures the PDFs are digital text (not scanned) and likely have a consistent structure and encoding.
- We will aim for a variety in content: papers from different subfields of physics (e.g., astrophysics, condensed matter, high-energy physics, etc.) so that we encounter different styles of tables. For example, one paper might have a simple numeric table of experimental results, another might have a table with some symbols or equations, another might have a larger table spanning two columns, etc. This variety, even in a small sample, is important to test the methods under different conditions.
- We ensure all chosen PDFs are **text-based PDFs (not images)**, which is generally the case for arXiv, but we will double-check. Camelot cannot parse image-based tables and our focus is not on OCR, so we exclude any papers that might have tables only as embedded images.

Once the papers are selected, we will obtain the PDFs from arXiv (these are openly accessible). The first step for each paper will be **ground truth extraction** of the tables. This means manually extracting the content of each table in the paper. In practice, this could involve copying the table from the PDF if possible and cleaning it up, or retyping it if necessary. We will record the ground truth in a structured format (for example, as CSV files or as tables in a spreadsheet) so that it’s easy to compare with the outputs from Camelot and Gemini.

Each table will be given an identifier for reference (e.g., “Paper3_Table2”). We will also note any particular features of the table when recording ground truth (like “this table has a multi-row header” or “this table has footnotes in some cells”), as this will help later in analyzing error patterns.

It is worth mentioning that because our sample is small, we are not building a training set vs. test set; every table we collect is essentially a test instance for the two methods. The ground truth data will not be used to train or fine-tune anything—only to evaluate performance.

By intentionally including at least one “challenging” table (like one with a complex header or layout) and one very “easy” table (like a basic 3x4 grid of numbers) in our set, we ensure that we observe both ends of the difficulty spectrum. This way, our evaluation can comment on straightforward cases (where presumably both methods should do well) and difficult cases (where differences may emerge).

All the data we use (papers from arXiv) are open access and we will cite the source of each paper in the final write-up if needed. Since this is non-commercial research, using these papers is in line with arXiv’s policies. The compiled ground truth and any code we write will be made available in an online repository for reproducibility.

3.3 Tools and Technical Setup

Our experiment will utilize two primary tools corresponding to our two methods:

(A) Camelot (Baseline Tool): We will use the Camelot library in Python, version 0.10.1 (or the latest stable release, which at the time of writing is 1.0.0). Camelot will be installed via pip and used in a Python environment (likely a Jupyter Notebook for interactive analysis, and scripts for batch processing). Camelot provides both a command-line interface and a Python API; we intend to use the Python API so that we can script the extraction over multiple files and also catch any exceptions programmatically.

Camelot will be run in both of its modes: - Lattice mode: which looks for explicit lines in the PDF page to delineate table cells. This mode is effective for tables that have drawn borders for every cell or at least every row/column. - Stream mode: which relies on detecting consistent spacing to separate columns, used when no lines are present in the table (text flows in columns separated by whitespace).

For each table in each PDF, we may try both modes and choose the output that is more accurate (Camelot’s documentation suggests using lattice by default, but falling back to stream if the table has no ruling lines). We will record which mode was ultimately used for each table’s result. We expect that many physics papers might not use drawn lines in tables (they often rely on just formatting), so stream mode might be needed frequently. If a table is particularly troublesome, Camelot also allows specifying the table area or coordinates; we will avoid using such manual hints except as a last resort, since that defeats the purpose of automation. However, if we do need to specify an area to get Camelot to focus on a table (for instance, if a page has two tables and Camelot mixes them up), we will note that.

In terms of environment, Camelot has a couple of dependencies: it requires a tool like Ghostscript for PDF processing and in lattice mode it uses OpenCV. We will ensure these are installed on our system. The experiments will be run on a standard personal computer (e.g., a laptop with 8-16 GB of RAM, running Windows or Linux). Camelot is not very memory or GPU intensive—it runs on the CPU and each table extraction usually takes only a second or two. We do not anticipate performance issues using Camelot on our small dataset.

The output from Camelot for each table will likely be captured as a Pandas DataFrame or as a CSV file. We will ensure to preserve the exact extracted text of each cell for comparison.

(B) Google Gemini 2.0 Flash (LLM via CLI/SDK): Accessing the Gemini model will be done through Google’s Generative AI Developer interface. Specifically, we will use the **Google Generative AI Python SDK** (`google-generativeai`) which provides programmatic access to Gemini models ²⁸. We have obtained API

access (as of early 2025, Google allows researchers and developers to use the Gemini Flash model with a generous free quota, requiring an API key from their AI platform). We will use the Gemini 2.0 Flash model for all our tests to keep consistency. If during the project Google releases an updated version or if the Pro model becomes available to us, we may note differences anecdotally, but our formal evaluation will stick to one model version for fairness.

Technical setup steps for Gemini include: - Installing the `google-genai` SDK package. - Authenticating with our API key. - Setting the model parameters (we will explicitly choose the model ID for Gemini 2.0 Flash, e.g., `"gemini-2.0-flash"`). - We will set the model generation parameters to ensure reproducibility: specifically, we will use `temperature = 0` for deterministic output (this means the model will try to give the most likely completion every time, reducing randomness). We'll also disable any non-deterministic features if present (like top-p sampling or similar, though usually temperature=0 effectively makes it deterministic).

Gemini 2.0 Flash supports context up to around 1 million tokens, which is extremely high; our use will not approach that limit (each paper's content might be at most a few thousand tokens of text). One of Gemini's features is the ability to upload files and refer to them in prompts ²⁹. We plan to utilize this to feed the PDF content to the model. The approach will be: - Upload the PDF (or potentially just the specific page or portion of the PDF containing the table) via the API. This returns a file identifier that the model can access. - In the prompt to Gemini, reference that file and instruct the model to extract the table. For example, the prompt may say: "In the file doc123 (an academic paper PDF), find Table 2 and extract its data. Output the table in [specified format]." The SDK and API allow such usage where the model can read from the file content as context.

Alternatively, we could extract the text of the table ourselves and include it directly in the prompt (using a library like PyMuPDF or PDFPlumber to copy text). This might give us more control over formatting (we could add our own delimiters, for instance). We will experiment with both approaches on a couple of tables initially: - **Direct file approach:** letting the model handle the PDF. This leverages Gemini's multimodal and long-context abilities directly. - **Manual text extraction approach:** where we ourselves get the raw text of the table (as it appears line by line in the PDF) and then feed that to Gemini with instructions.

If the direct file approach works reliably, it is cleaner (less work for us in formatting). If it has issues (for example, perhaps the model might get confused if the PDF has two tables on one page), we might use the manual approach for finer control.

We will ensure that the runtime environment for Gemini calls is stable. Each API call might take a few seconds to perhaps 20-30 seconds if the input is large; since our dataset is small, the total time for all calls is manageable and within free tier limits (e.g., 20 tables * a few attempts each = maybe 40-50 calls total, which is fine). We will keep an eye on any rate limits (the free tier allows ~1500 requests/day, which we are well under).

We will log crucial information for reproducibility: the exact model ID (e.g., `gemini-2.0-flash`) and any version hash if provided), the SDK version, and any relevant settings. In case Google updates the model, having the date and version noted will let others know what we were using.

One aspect to note is that we are **not** focusing on runtime performance (speed) or cost in this study, but it's an important practical consideration. We will observe, informally, how long Gemini takes per table

extraction and note that in the discussion on practicality. Camelot's extraction is nearly instantaneous for our cases (a second or two), whereas Gemini might be a bit slower per table and requires internet access. These are factors we'll mention qualitatively rather than measure precisely, since our main metric is accuracy.

Finally, no other tools will be integrated. For example, we are not using any intermediate OCR or external transformers. This isolation ensures that we are evaluating the capabilities of Camelot and Gemini specifically. If one method fails on a table and we could fix it by some manual preprocessing, we will note that but not introduce a new automated component, since that would complicate the comparison.

3.4 Prompt Engineering Strategy

Designing an effective prompt for the LLM (Gemini) is a critical part of our methodology. The quality and format of the prompt will directly influence Gemini's output, so we plan to spend some effort upfront to establish a prompt that yields good results across our tables.

Prompt Goals: We want the LLM to output the table data in a **structured, machine-readable format** that makes comparison with the ground truth straightforward. Two obvious choices are JSON and CSV: - JSON format: We can instruct the model to output the table as a JSON array of rows, where each row is itself an array (or object) of cell values. JSON is nice because it's clearly structured and easy to parse. - CSV format: Comma-separated values with one row per line. This is human-readable and also easy to parse, though we have to be careful about commas within the data or newlines.

Our plan is to try both approaches on one or two sample tables to see which the model handles more consistently. JSON might be better especially if using the structured output feature of Gemini (the SDK allows us to specify something like a Pydantic schema for the response ³⁰ ³¹). For example, we could define a schema like `List[List[str]]` (a list of list of strings) to represent the table. This would force the model to return, say, `[["Column1", "Column2"], ["value1", "value2"], ...]`. Using such a schema can greatly reduce any extraneous text from the model.

If for some reason the structured output mode is difficult to use (perhaps it might require the model to fully comply with the schema or else error out, which could complicate things), we can fall back to instructing via prompt alone. In that case, we might do something like: - Direct CSV prompt example: "Extract the table from the document. Provide the output in CSV format (comma-separated values), with one row per line. Only output the table data and nothing else." Then after this instruction, include the table content (or reference the file). - Direct JSON prompt example: "Extract the table and output it as a JSON array. The output should look like: `[["Header1", "Header2", ...], ["row1col1", "row1col2", ...], ...]` with each inner list representing a row of the table. Do not add any explanation or extra text."

We will include some context for the model so it knows where to find the table. For instance, if using the file, we might say "In the PDF file, there is Table 1 with the caption 'Properties of materials'. Extract that table...". If we include text directly, we might prefix it with something like: "Here is an excerpt from a paper:\nTable 1: Properties of materials.\nMaterial | Density | ... \n (table text) \n Please output...". Providing a bit of the caption or table title can help the model anchor what it's extracting.

During our initial prompt trials (likely on Day 5–6 of the timeline), we will iteratively refine the prompt: - If the model returns extraneous sentences (e.g., "The table shows the following..."), we'll emphasize "only

output the data". - If it misses a part of the table, we'll try to provide more explicit guidance or ensure that part of the input is clearly included. - If the format is slightly off (like missing quotes in JSON or something), we might adjust by providing an example format.

We will also test prompt variants such as including a **system message** (Gemini's API likely has a system vs user prompt distinction, like OpenAI's). A system message can set a role like: "You are a helpful assistant that extracts tables." This sometimes helps keep the model on task.

One interesting feature to consider is that Gemini can handle images. We have a note to ourselves: what if we provided a screenshot image of the table to Gemini instead of text? In principle, Gemini's multimodal ability could then internally do OCR + understanding in one go (this would simulate a scenario of letting the model "see" the table as formatted). However, due to time constraints and to keep things straightforward, we decided not to heavily pursue the image input route for the main experiment. We will concentrate on text-based input which is easier to evaluate directly (since we have the ground truth text).

Example Prompt Illustration: (for clarity in this document, here is an illustrative snippet)

Suppose a paper has a table:

```
Table 1: Properties of Sample Materials

Material | Density (g/cm^3) | Conductivity (S/m)
Copper   | 8.96              | 5.9e7
Alumina  | 3.95              | 1e-11
```

We might give the model the following prompt (either via text or by referring to a file containing that text):

User prompt:

"Table 1 in the paper lists properties of materials. Extract the table as JSON. Provide the output as an array of arrays, where the first inner array is the header. Only give valid JSON, no extra commentary."

We expect an output like:

```
[ ["Material", "Density (g/cm^3)", "Conductivity (S/m)"],
  ["Copper", "8.96", "5.9e7"],
  ["Alumina", "3.95", "1e-11"] ]
```

We will strive for this kind of clean output. If needed, we will instruct the model about number formats or special symbols, but likely it will carry them over as seen (e.g., scientific notation like 5.9e7 should be fine).

Throughout the use of Gemini, we will maintain **consistency** in prompts once we finalize them. All tables will be processed with the same prompt template to avoid biasing results (we don't want to hand-craft a new prompt for each table to get the best outcome, as that wouldn't reflect a general solution).

Lastly, we will document the final prompt (or prompts) that we use, so that the process is transparent. If we adjust a prompt mid-experiment (for instance, after seeing a new type of error around Day 8, we tweak the prompt slightly), we will note that and consider its effect. However, ideally we will have the prompt strategy locked down by the time we do the full extraction run on all tables.

3.5 Evaluation Metrics

After obtaining the results from both Camelot and Gemini for each table, we will carry out a detailed evaluation. Our evaluation plan involves both quantitative metrics and qualitative analysis of errors.

The primary **quantitative metrics** are defined as follows: - **Cell-level Accuracy:** This is the simplest measure: the percentage of individual table cells for which the extracted content exactly matches the ground truth content. We will calculate this for each method on each table, and also aggregate across all tables. For example, if a table has 50 cells and Camelot correctly extracted 45 of them, Camelot's cell accuracy for that table is 90%. We'll also report an overall accuracy (sum of all correct cells across all tables divided by total cells in all tables). - **Precision and Recall (of cell extraction):** These metrics become relevant especially if a method doesn't extract the exact same number of cells as the ground truth (e.g., it might merge two cells, thereby outputting fewer cells, or hallucinate an extra cell). - Precision = (Number of correctly extracted cells) / (Total number of cells output by the method). In our case, a "correctly extracted cell" means the method's output for that cell matches the ground truth content for that cell's position. If the method outputs something extra that isn't in the ground truth or outputs more cells than exist (unlikely in our scenario, but possible if it, say, duplicated a row), precision would penalize that. - Recall = (Number of correctly extracted cells) / (Total number of cells in the ground truth). This measures how much of the table the method successfully captured. If a method misses cells (or entire rows/columns), recall goes down. - We will compute precision and recall per table and possibly average them (though averaging precision/recall across tables can be tricky; we might compute a global precision and recall by summing up totals). - F1 Score: the harmonic mean of precision and recall, which gives a single measure of overall accuracy balancing false positives and false negatives. F1 is useful if there's an imbalance, but in table extraction, typically if a method is mostly doing a one-to-one mapping of cells, precision and recall will both be high or both low. Still, we will report it for completeness. - **Table-level Accuracy:** This is a stringent measure that is 100% if and only if the method extracted the entire table perfectly (every cell correct), and 0% otherwise. Or we could say "the number of tables for which the extraction was perfectly correct." This is a useful summary for how many tables need no manual correction after using the method. We anticipate that Camelot might perfectly get some simpler tables and struggle on others, and similarly for Gemini. If, for instance, out of 15 tables, Camelot got 10 perfectly and Gemini got 12 perfectly, that's an interesting result.

Beyond these, we will note the **error types qualitatively:** - Does the method miss whole rows or columns? - Does it merge cells that shouldn't be merged, or split one cell into two entries? - Does it mis-recognize content (e.g., misread a number like interpreting "1e-11" as "1e-1" or some such error)? - In Gemini's case, does it introduce any content that wasn't actually in the table (hallucination)? For example, adding a summary row or an extra decimal point, etc. We expect this to be rare if prompts are good, but we will watch for it. - In Camelot's case, typical errors might include outputting a smaller table (like it thought the table ended early) or putting NaN in some cells where it couldn't parse a number.

We will categorize each observed error under a category. For RQ2 (error profiles), we might end up with categories like: - **"Structural error"** (e.g., wrong number of columns, due to merging or splitting). -

“**Content omission**” (some data missing). - “**Content misread**” (present but incorrect). - “**Extraneous content**” (only likely in LLM output, if any). We’ll tally which method had which types of errors how often.

Another aspect of evaluation is the **effort required** to use each method. While harder to quantify, we will document the amount of prompt tweaking Gemini needed versus the tweaking Camelot needed (like did we have to specify table areas or not). This can be discussed in terms of “practical effort” in our conclusions.

We will present the results in a clear manner, likely using tables or charts in the thesis: - A table listing each test table and metrics for Camelot and Gemini on it. - Possibly an aggregate metric comparison. - Examples of errors for a couple of illustrative cases (perhaps included as a small figure or snippet in the final thesis, though for the proposal document we might just describe them).

All the evaluation code (like computing these metrics) will be straightforward since we have ground truth and output in CSV/JSON; we will likely write a Python script or use pandas to compare the dataframes cell by cell.

We will also ensure **statistical soundness** where applicable. With such a small sample, we won’t do heavy statistical tests, but if differences are large we can confidently state those. If differences are small, we’ll be careful not to over-claim superiority of one method.

Finally, we will consider **reproducibility** in evaluation. We will fix any randomness (the only source of randomness would be Gemini if temperature was >0, but we’re making it deterministic). We will also share the outputs or output processing scripts in our repository so that someone could verify our scoring.

3.6 Reproducibility and Ethical Considerations

Reproducibility: To ensure that our results can be replicated, we will adhere to best practices in experiment tracking. All code developed for this project (for calling the APIs, running Camelot, computing metrics) will be maintained in a version-controlled repository (e.g., Git). Important parameters such as the version of Camelot, the version or date of the Gemini model, and any settings (like the prompt templates, the temperature, etc.) will be clearly documented. We will also save the raw outputs produced by each method for each table (for example, JSON files from Gemini and CSVs from Camelot) so that our analysis can be verified independently. If any prompt adjustments are made mid-experiment, we will record when and why the change was made.

An aspect to consider is that the Gemini service might update its model weights over time. While we cannot control that, by documenting the timing and providing the outputs, someone in the future can still compare or run on the same dataset with perhaps a newer model. If necessary, we could also include an appendix with the exact prompt and output for one example table to illustrate how we interacted with the model.

We will publish our small **ground truth dataset** (likely as a collection of CSV files corresponding to each table, along with a README describing each). Since the data is derived from public domain sources (arXiv papers), there should be no legal issue in sharing these partial extracts for the sake of reproducibility.

Ethical Considerations: This project has minimal ethical concerns compared to studies involving human subjects or private data, but a few points are worth noting: - All source data (arXiv papers) are publicly available and properly attributed. We will cite the papers if we use any content from them in the thesis text

or if showing a table example. - We must consider the **accuracy and potential misuse of extracted data**. Especially with the LLM method, there is a risk (albeit small with our careful prompting) that the model could output incorrect data that looks plausible. In a real-world scenario, blindly trusting such output could be problematic (e.g., if someone were extracting medical trial data from papers, an AI hallucination could lead to false conclusions). In our study, since we are verifying against ground truth, this is under control. But we will include a note in our discussion that emphasizes the importance of verification of LLM-extracted information. We treat this project itself as an evaluation – meaning we will manually verify everything – and we encourage that any future use of similar AI for extraction have human oversight at least in critical applications. - There is a slight ethical consideration regarding the use of a proprietary model (Google Gemini). The model’s inner workings are not transparent. We are essentially treating it as a tool. We must abide by its terms of service (which typically would prohibit us from attempting to extract secrets or generate disallowed content – our use case is well within normal operations). We also have to be mindful not to send any sensitive or non-public data to the API; in our case, all data is from publicly published papers, so this is fine. - If any of the papers had sensitive information (unlikely in physics papers, but hypothetically say authors included some personal data in a table), we would need to handle that responsibly. Our chosen domain avoids that scenario.

In conclusion, we aim for our methodology to be transparent and reproducible. We will make all materials available for peer scrutiny. Ethically, we focus on accuracy and responsible use of AI outputs, ensuring that our analysis highlights both successes and failures of the AI method without undue bias. The ultimate goal is to provide honest evidence of what works and what doesn’t, which aligns with the ethical duty of truthful reporting in research.

Chapter 4: Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

In this section, we describe the conceptual framework that underlies our comparative study. The framework can be visualized as a parallel pipeline for table extraction using two different approaches, and a subsequent evaluation process that brings the results together for comparison.

Conceptual Model of the Table Extraction Process: At a high level, the problem of table extraction can be viewed as a transformation: Input (PDF document with tables) → Output (Structured table data). Our framework involves two distinct transformations applied to the same input, followed by a common evaluation mechanism: - **Pipeline A (Traditional Parsing):** The PDF document is processed by a rule-based parser (Camelot). Internally, Camelot’s algorithm interprets the PDF’s layout structure: in lattice mode it looks for lines, in stream mode it looks at text spacing. The output of this pipeline is a structured representation of tables (e.g., a CSV or DataFrame). - **Pipeline B (LLM-Based Parsing):** The same PDF is processed by the Gemini LLM through a prompt. Conceptually, the LLM is performing a form of “reasoning” over the document’s content. It might internally convert the PDF to text (or parse it visually if using images) and then use its learned knowledge to format the output as instructed (JSON/CSV). The output here is also structured table data (in JSON or CSV format as generated by the model).

These two pipelines operate independently but in parallel on the identical set of input documents.

The **theoretical basis** for Pipeline A is deterministic algorithmic parsing: given the same input, Camelot will produce the same output every time (assuming no randomness in detection). It relies on explicit rules about geometry and text positions. Pipeline B’s theoretical basis is the learned latent knowledge and pattern recognition of the LLM: it doesn’t have fixed rules for tables coded, but it has been trained on innumerable

examples of text (including presumably tables and their descriptions) and can leverage that to infer structure. Pipeline B also uses prompt instructions as a form of real-time “programming” of the model’s behavior, an aspect grounded in the prompt-response paradigm of large language models.

Comparative Framework: We conceptualize the comparison as follows: 1. **Equivalence of Input:** Ensure both pipelines get equivalent information. For fairness, if Camelot reads the raw PDF text, we ensure Gemini is given the same content (either via the file or text). This controls the variable of input quality. 2. **Extraction Phase:** Each pipeline extracts data according to its method. Camelot might have limitations (can’t infer content beyond layout), whereas Gemini might have to be guided by the prompt to not deviate. 3. **Output Standardization:** We bring both outputs to a common format for evaluation. For example, we might convert both Camelot’s output and Gemini’s output into a standard CSV representation for each table, so they can be directly compared cell by cell. 4. **Evaluation Phase:** This is essentially a function that takes three things: the ground truth table, Pipeline A’s output, and Pipeline B’s output. This evaluation function computes accuracy metrics and highlights differences. The conceptual framework treats evaluation as a separate module that is method-agnostic — it just compares outputs to truth.

Underlying this framework are some **theoretical considerations about error sources**: - Camelot’s errors are hypothesized to come from physical layout misinterpretation (a theoretical model of Camelot is that it assumes certain spacing equals new column, etc. — when that assumption is violated by a complex format, errors occur). - Gemini’s errors, in theory, could come from either misunderstanding the content (if the prompt or context doesn’t clarify structure) or from the model’s tendency to fill in gaps (it might produce something that “looks right” but isn’t exactly the input — a form of hallucination by using prior knowledge).

We incorporate these considerations by framing specific hypotheses (in Chapter 5) about error types linked to each pipeline’s conceptual operation mode.

Conceptual Diagram (Description): If we were to draw a diagram of the conceptual framework, it would consist of: - A box for the “Input: arXiv PDF Paper” branching into two arrows: one to “Camelot Parser” and one to “Gemini LLM”. - The Camelot Parser box yields an output arrow labeled “Extracted Table (Camelot)”. - The Gemini LLM box would possibly be broken internally into “Prompt + Model inference” to illustrate that the prompt guides the model, yielding an output arrow labeled “Extracted Table (Gemini)”. - Both outputs then feed into an “Evaluation & Comparison” box, alongside the “Ground Truth” reference (ground truth might be another input box in the diagram). - The Evaluation box then produces metrics or results, which feed into our “Analysis/Findings”.

While we are not including an actual figure image in this text, the above description serves to outline how each component relates. The framework emphasizes parallel processing and a coming together at the analysis stage.

This conceptual design ensures that we treat each method fairly and that the comparison is grounded in the same set of data. It also isolates where human input is involved: notably in constructing the ground truth and in crafting the LLM prompt. These are outside the automated pipelines and are controlled parts of the experimental setup. The rest — what happens inside Camelot and inside Gemini — can be considered a “black box” comparison, which our evaluation will open up by analyzing their outputs.

In theoretical terms, our study can also be seen as testing the proposition that a language-model-based understanding of documents can match a purpose-built algorithm on a structured task. It touches on

theories of representation: Camelot explicitly represents tables as line objects and text positions, whereas Gemini implicitly represents the table through language. The conceptual framework does not assume one is superior; it provides a structure to observe and measure their performance differences empirically.

Chapter 5: Research Hypotheses

Based on the literature review, background knowledge, and our conceptual expectations of each method, we have formulated a set of hypotheses that correspond to the research questions. These hypotheses are predictions that will be tested through our experiment, and they provide a focused way to interpret the results.

- **H1: Accuracy of LLM vs. Traditional Tool** – Gemini will achieve comparable or higher accuracy than Camelot in extracting table cell contents. We anticipate that Gemini’s understanding of context and semantics will allow it to handle complex table structures better than Camelot in many cases. For example, if a table has a multi-level header or irregular cell spans, Gemini might correctly infer the intended structure (especially with a good prompt), whereas Camelot may mis-segment the table (like merging cells incorrectly or outputting data in the wrong column). This hypothesis will be supported if we find that cell-level accuracy and table-level success rates for Gemini are equal to or greater than those for Camelot across our sample. It will be especially supported if Gemini shows strength on tables where Camelot fails. However, we are not assuming Gemini will be perfect; “comparable or higher” means we expect it to at least not be significantly worse, and likely better in some cases.
- **H2: Different Error Profiles** – The types of errors made by Camelot and Gemini will differ systematically. We hypothesize that:
 - Camelot’s errors will mostly be **structural** – e.g., failing to detect a split between two columns (thus merging them), or splitting one column into two if there’s an extra space, or truncating a table if an element is outside expected boundaries. In other words, errors stemming from layout interpretation.
 - Gemini’s errors, on the other hand, might be **content-wise or due to misunderstanding** – e.g., occasionally omitting a cell or an entire row if it wasn’t referenced clearly in the prompt, or (less likely, but possible) hallucinating a value that isn’t actually in the table if the prompt is ambiguous. Another possible LLM-specific error is formatting issues, like not aligning output exactly as expected if it misinterprets the format instruction (though we try to prevent that with structured output).

We think Gemini might especially excel in cases where interpreting the meaning of the table helps – for instance, recognizing that a header spans multiple columns because the content under it logically falls into two groups, whereas Camelot might naively treat it as separate columns. Conversely, Camelot might never introduce a value that wasn’t there, whereas an LLM might (for example, if a table had a missing entry, Camelot would leave a blank, but an LLM might fill it with something that “makes sense”). We will confirm this hypothesis by analyzing error types from our results. We expect to see, for instance, that Camelot often has issues with merged cells and multi-line headers, while Gemini’s errors might include the occasional dropped or added item, particularly if the prompt needed adjustment.

- **H3: Practicality and Consistency** – With appropriate prompt engineering, Gemini CLI will produce reliable structured outputs for tables, but using the LLM may require more iterative tuning and be slower

compared to Camelot’s straightforward process. This hypothesis addresses RQ3 about the practicality of an LLM approach. We suspect that once we discover an effective prompt template (which might take a few trials), Gemini will then output consistently formatted tables for our dataset (especially given we use deterministic settings). In that sense, it becomes practical and not overly random – a concern one might have with AI models. However, we also expect that getting to that point might require more effort than using Camelot. Camelot usage is relatively simple: you call a function and get results, perhaps tweak a parameter if needed. With Gemini, there is an overhead of crafting the prompt, dealing with the API, and potentially waiting for the model’s response. Additionally, each table extraction by Gemini might be slower (e.g., 10 seconds) than Camelot (1 second). We also note the dependency on internet and API access as a practical drawback. Our hypothesis is essentially saying: Yes, it can be made to work reliably (so practicality in terms of output quality is fine), but it has practical trade-offs in terms of user effort and latency. We expect to confirm this by documenting how many prompt iterations we needed and by qualitatively noting the time/effort. If the final output quality of Gemini is good but it took significant fiddling, that supports H3. If, contrary to expectation, using Gemini turns out to be plug-and-play with hardly any extra effort, or if it ends up being just as fast, then H3 would be contradicted.

These hypotheses will be evaluated after we conduct the experiments. They are interconnected: H1 is about final performance outcomes, H2 about the nature of those outcomes (qualitative differences), and H3 about the process of getting those outcomes. Together, they reflect our informed expectations: that LLMs have the potential to be as good or better than traditional methods (H1), that they will fail in different ways (H2), and that using them involves different considerations in practice (H3).

Expected Outcomes

Based on our plans and the hypotheses above, we outline the expected results of the study and the implications these results would carry. These are predictions of what we anticipate finding:

Expected Results: - We expect that **Google Gemini 2.0 Flash will successfully extract the majority of table content correctly**, especially for tables that are well-formatted and not excessively large or complex. For relatively simple tables (for example, those with clear column structures, straightforward headers, and mostly numerical/text data), Gemini might produce an almost perfect extraction—potentially matching Camelot’s performance or even exceeding it. This would align with our Hypothesis H1, showing that in straightforward cases, an LLM can be on par with a rule-based parser. - In **more complex table scenarios** – such as tables with multi-row (hierarchical) headers, tables that span across two columns or multiple pages, or tables with irregular layouts – we anticipate mixed outcomes. Given a well-crafted prompt, Gemini might interpret certain complex structures correctly. For instance, if a table has a header that spans two columns (“Category” above two sub-columns like “Value1” and “Value2”), we suspect Gemini could output a nested structure or otherwise indicate the hierarchy properly, whereas Camelot might output the header cells in separate columns without indicating the relationship. In such cases, we expect Gemini to show a clear advantage by preserving the logical structure that Camelot might miss. This would be a notable finding, as it demonstrates the LLM’s ability to handle structural nuances that confound traditional parsers. - Conversely, we foresee certain **failure modes for Gemini** that Camelot would not exhibit. One potential issue is omission: if a table is very large or contains unusual formatting, the model might skip or truncate some content (for example, not all rows get processed if the prompt isn’t specific enough, or it might stop output partway if it hits token limits or format uncertainties). Another is the risk of hallucination or format deviation: although we set temperature low, the model might still, for example, add a summary row (“Total

= ...) that wasn't actually in the table, or misread a character (though since we plan to give it text not images, pure mis-OCR is unlikely; hallucination would mean it logically infers something not present, which we'll watch for). By contrast, Camelot will never invent data – it might mis-segment, but it won't produce a number that isn't in the PDF. Any instance of Gemini introducing a non-existent value would highlight a fundamental difference between AI and deterministic tools. We expect such incidents to be relatively rare (especially with our careful prompting), but if they occur even once, it is important and we will document it. In summary, Camelot's errors will be different (missing or garbling content, but not creating content), whereas Gemini's errors might include minor fabrications or omissions, supporting Hypothesis H2. - **Quantitatively**, we expect Gemini's cell-level accuracy to be high – perhaps in the 90-100% range for most tables, with only the very complex tables falling below that. Camelot might likewise be very high on the easiest tables (even 100% on those), but its performance could drop more significantly on the hardest ones (where it could misplace multiple cells). If we speculate on an aggregate outcome: out of, say, 15 tables in total, Camelot might perfectly extract around 10 of them, and Gemini might perfectly extract around 10–12. In cases where Camelot fails (like splitting a table incorrectly), we expect Gemini might succeed in a few, giving it an edge in the count of perfectly extracted tables. It's also possible that each method fails on different tables; such a scenario would be interesting as well because it would suggest they complement each other (one does well where the other falters and vice versa). - A specific nuanced expectation: **Gemini will handle textual nuances well.** For example, if a table cell contains something like "See Eq. (5)" or a special symbol (alpha, β , etc.), the LLM should include it properly in the output because it's essentially copying content it understands as text. Camelot, being text-based, would also extract those since they are characters in the PDF text layer. If there were an image or an embedded formula, Camelot would definitely fail (and Gemini might too, unless it had vision to parse the image). Since our PDFs are text-based, we don't anticipate that scenario. But if, say, a table includes a Unicode character or a formatting like subscript, Camelot might drop formatting (it would just give plain text, which is fine), and Gemini likewise would output plain text. In general, for purely textual content, both should be fine. However, if a table cell had something conceptually tricky, like an equation or a long phrase, the LLM's understanding could ensure it doesn't truncate weirdly, whereas Camelot might break a line (though typically it wouldn't). We expect both methods to capture text content similarly for text that is clearly in the PDF. - **Multi-page tables or very large tables** (if any in our sample) are one area we think Camelot might struggle (Camelot might treat each page separately), whereas Gemini with the whole file could, in principle, handle it. That said, multi-page tables are complicated for any method. If we include one, we expect maybe partial success: Gemini might not realize a table continues unless told, and Camelot might just break it into two outputs. We will see; we don't pin a strong expectation there, but if Gemini does manage it seamlessly due to seeing all pages, that would be a bonus.

Expected Impact: - For the **field of document processing and extraction**, this pilot study will provide one of the first empirical glimpses into how a state-of-the-art LLM (Google's Gemini) performs on a practical document extraction task in comparison to a traditional tool. If our results show that Gemini is generally reliable and possibly superior in certain aspects, it could encourage more researchers and practitioners to consider using LLMs for similar tasks (like extracting structured data from other scientific literature, business reports, etc.). It would lend support to the idea that "large language models can understand and convert document content effectively" and could reduce the need to develop complex rule-based systems for every new document format. Essentially, it could shift the approach in the field: instead of writing a parser for each document type, perhaps we can prompt an AI to do it. - On the other hand, if our results show that despite the hype, the LLM did not significantly outperform Camelot (or even underperformed in some cases), that is an important finding too. It suggests that for certain tasks, established methods remain quite competitive and that LLMs are not a silver bullet in every scenario. Such an outcome would caution

others against blindly using an LLM when a simpler solution exists, and it would highlight that current LLMs have limitations. This could save effort in the community by clarifying where human-coded algorithms are still the better choice. It could also push the AI community to address those specific shortcomings – for instance, to improve how models handle tabular structure or to integrate layout understanding in model training. - For **future academic research**, our study will identify specific limitations that can be investigated. If we find, for example, that Gemini fails systematically on tables with certain structures (say, lots of spanning cells or special formatting), future work could focus on that – maybe by fine-tuning an LLM on tabular data or developing hybrid systems (LLM + structure detector). Conversely, if we find nearly perfect performance on our limited sample, the question arises: is this generalizable to a much larger set of tables? Also, performance vs. cost and speed at scale become relevant – perhaps something we note if Gemini calls are slow or if using many calls would be expensive. Those could be follow-up research directions, like how to optimize for cost or speed. - For the **specific use-case of physics research or scientific literature review**, having an LLM that can pull data from papers could be quite powerful. Imagine an AI assistant that reads hundreds of papers and aggregates their result tables automatically – this could enable meta-analyses that were previously too tedious to do. Our study might demonstrate a stepping stone toward that capability. If we find that Gemini outperforms Camelot in quality, one immediate impact might be that tools like Camelot consider incorporating LLMs into their pipeline or that new tools emerge that use LLMs for document parsing. Alternatively, we might show that a combination works best: perhaps use Camelot to get a first pass and then an LLM to clean up or verify the table. - A **critical assessment impact**: Regardless of outcome, our work encourages a careful evaluation approach. We treat the LLM not as magic but as a component to be tested. This mindset is important as AI gets deployed in data workflows. If our study is read by others, one impact is promoting the idea that when using AI for data extraction, one should systematically check it against ground truth if possible and understand the types of errors. In practical terms, if an organization were to use LLMs for data extraction, they might put checks in place (like evaluating a subset manually as we did) to ensure quality, especially early in adoption. - For the **thesis author (student)**, the expected outcome – successfully completing this project – has academic and professional significance. It demonstrates the ability to apply new AI technology to a classical problem and to critically evaluate it. This could open up pathways for future research (e.g., a full thesis or a publication) and builds expertise at the intersection of AI and data management. The work, if well-executed, could potentially be turned into a workshop paper or poster, given that the topic of using LLMs for document AI is very current. - In terms of **software and open science**: We plan to release our evaluation scripts and the small dataset we create. Although the dataset is small, making it public allows others to reproduce and even extend our experiment. For example, someone could take our exact tables and try running GPT-4 or another model on them, comparing to our results with Gemini. Or they might test a newer version of Gemini in the future on the same data. The prompts we develop could serve as examples for others attempting similar tasks. If we come up with a particularly clever prompt strategy or output schema for table extraction, sharing that can save others time. This contributes to the community's collective knowledge on prompt engineering for structured outputs. - One more expected outcome is **knowledge contribution**: even if small in scale, our comparison will contribute to understanding the capabilities of generative AI in a real-world task domain (scientific data extraction). It can stimulate discussion: for instance, if we find an interesting error case, it might be something that AI developers want to address, or if we find a neat way to coerce the model into structured output, that tip can be valuable to others.

In conclusion, we expect our study to demonstrate affirmative evidence that large language models (exemplified by Gemini) can serve as effective tools for extracting structured information from academic text – at least in a constrained test – and that their performance is competitive with, if not better than, a

specialized rule-based approach. At the same time, we anticipate uncovering limitations that will inform how future systems are built (perhaps combining methods) and how future research can target these issues. Whether the outcome leans positive or negative for the LLM, valuable insights will be gained into bridging AI language understanding with document data extraction, an area of growing interest in both academia and industry.

Timeline

The project is designed to be completed in approximately two weeks (14 days). Below is a breakdown of the timeline with key phases and milestones:

- **Days 1–2: Preparatory Phase** – Setup and Data Collection. We will finalize the selection of ~10 arXiv physics papers and obtain their PDFs. In parallel, set up the development environment: install Camelot and its dependencies (Ghostscript, etc.), and configure access to Google’s Gemini API (obtain API key, install `google-gemini` SDK, test a simple request to Gemini to ensure it’s working).
Milestone (end of Day 2): Environment ready and at least one sample PDF loaded and inspected to confirm it contains tables as expected.
- **Day 3: Ground Truth Compilation** – Manual extraction of tables. For each selected paper, manually extract the content of each table. This involves carefully copying or retyping table data into a structured format (e.g., entering data into CSV files or spreadsheets). Double-check each entry against the PDF to avoid any transcription errors. **Milestone:** Ground truth dataset completed – all tables from all papers are recorded accurately in a reference format.
- **Day 4: Baseline Tool Dry Run** – Camelot initial tests. Run Camelot on a couple of PDFs to ensure it’s functioning. Try both lattice and stream modes on known tables to see which mode works better by default. If Camelot requires any configuration (e.g., if a table isn’t detected, try specifying table regions or tweaking parameters), note that process. Possibly create a small script to automate running Camelot on all PDFs and saving outputs (but we may not run it on all yet, just a couple to validate process). **Milestone:** Confirmation that Camelot can successfully extract at least 1–2 tables with default settings, and any necessary adjustments for tricky tables are identified.
- **Days 5–6: Prompt Engineering and Gemini Trials** – Developing the LLM approach. Begin designing and refining the prompt for Gemini. Take one or two example tables (perhaps one simple, one complex) and iterate on prompts. Try a straightforward prompt (CSV output) and evaluate the output against ground truth to see where it falls short. Then adjust: incorporate JSON structured output or provide clearer instructions as needed. Also experiment with using the file upload vs. feeding text directly, to decide on our approach for the main run. By Day 6, aim to have a stable prompt template that yields correct format and reasonably accurate content on the test cases. **Milestone:** A refined prompt (and chosen output format) that we plan to use for all tables, validated on a few trial tables with satisfactory results.
- **Day 7: Midpoint Check-in** – Review and Plan Adjustments. At roughly halfway, take stock of progress. Meet with the advisor (if scheduled) or internally review: Are we on track with data and setup? Make any necessary adjustments to scope or approach. For example, if by now we realize one paper’s tables are extremely problematic (say, a table is too unstructured), we might decide to replace that

paper or acknowledge it as a limitation. Also finalize how we will organize results (set up spreadsheets or code for metrics calculation). **Milestone:** Interim progress report or notes, ensuring clarity on the plan for the next steps. Any course corrections (e.g., adjusting number of tables or switching a method) should be decided here.

- **Days 8–9: Full Extraction Run** – Execute both methods on entire dataset. Use Camelot to extract tables from all selected PDFs. For each table, note which mode (lattice/stream) and any special settings used, saving the output. Concurrently or thereafter, run Gemini on all tables using the final prompt strategy. This may be done via a script loop: for each table, send prompt (with either file reference or embedded text) and capture the model’s output. If any output looks clearly wrong or incomplete, we might do a quick second attempt (for example, if Gemini totally misses a table on first try, adjust prompt slightly and re-run for that case), but we will document if we do this. By the end of Day 9, we should have: Camelot outputs for every table and Gemini outputs for every table, all stored in a structured form. **Milestone:** Raw results collection completed – both methods have produced outputs for all tables in the dataset.
- **Day 10: Evaluation and Analysis** – Compare outputs to ground truth. This day is devoted to computing metrics and identifying errors. We will write or use a script to compare each Camelot output to the ground truth for the corresponding table, computing cell accuracy, etc., and do the same for each Gemini output. Compile the results into a summary (e.g., a table listing accuracy metrics per table per method). Additionally, begin a qualitative error analysis: go table by table and note what kinds of errors occurred (e.g., “Camelot missed column 3 header” or “Gemini miswrote one value”). If there are many differences to document, this could spill into Day 11. **Milestone:** Preliminary results ready – for each table, we know how each method did (metrics calculated) and have noted major error types.
- **Day 11: Documentation of Results** – Record findings and prepare report sections. Write the Results section in the thesis document, including any tables or figures that summarize the findings. For instance, create a comparison table or bar chart of overall accuracy. Document interesting examples: if a particular table exemplifies a scenario where Gemini succeeded and Camelot failed, outline that case (perhaps include a snippet or figure in the final thesis to illustrate). Also start drafting the discussion points – how do the results relate to our hypotheses? Jot down initial answers to the research questions based on the data. **Milestone:** Results and initial discussion drafted. At this point, the core of the experiment is done and recorded.
- **Day 12: Conclusion and Wrap-Up** – Finalize analysis and overall narrative. Write the Conclusion section of the thesis proposal: revisit each research question and succinctly state the findings (e.g., “RQ1: We found that Gemini achieved slightly higher overall accuracy than Camelot, confirming H1 in most cases...”). Discuss the implications and any limitations observed (this mirrors some content from Expected Outcomes section, tailored to actual results). Also outline potential next steps or future work ideas that emerged. Ensure all sections of the proposal document are filled in (some sections like Introduction or Literature Review may have been drafted earlier and now need minor updates to reflect what was done). Do a thorough revision for coherence and formatting, making sure the document reads as a unified thesis proposal. Prepare any appendices if needed (for example, including the final prompt template as an appendix, or a sample output). **Milestone:** A complete draft of the thesis proposal is ready for review.

- **Days 13–14: Buffer and Final Touches** – Reserve time for delays or additional tasks. These last two days act as a buffer in case any of the earlier tasks took longer than expected or if new tasks arise:
 - If everything is on track, this time can be used to create a presentation for a proposal defense or to get feedback from the advisor and refine the document accordingly.
 - If some unexpected issue occurred (e.g., the Gemini API was down for a day or a particular table required extra handling), these days ensure we still finish on time.
 - Additionally, if the advisor or committee has follow-up questions like “Could you also measure X?” or “What if you try this one extra test?”, we could attempt small additional experiments in this buffer period, time permitting (as long as they don’t derail the main focus).

Final Milestone (end of Day 14): Thesis proposal document finalized and submitted.

This timeline is aggressive but feasible given the limited scope of the project. Each phase has a clear goal, and we have built in a small cushion (the buffer days) for the unpredictable aspects of research (such as debugging environment issues or refining prompts). By following this schedule, we aim to ensure that all project components – from setup and data collection to analysis and writing – are completed in a timely manner, culminating in a successful thesis proposal submission.

References

Bondili, M., & Chen, J. (2025, March 3). Use Gemini 2.0 to speed up document extraction and lower costs. Google Cloud Blog. Retrieved from <https://cloud.google.com/blog/products/ai-machine-learning/use-gemini-2-0-to-speed-up-data-processing>

Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., ... & Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 1877–1901.

Camelot Developers. (2024). Camelot: PDF Table Extraction for Humans (Version 1.0.0) [Computer software]. Retrieved from <https://camelot-py.readthedocs.io/en/master/>

Liu, T., Wang, F., & Chen, M. (2023). Rethinking Tabular Data Understanding with Large Language Models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16702.

Mehta, V. (2018, October 3). Announcing Camelot, a Python library to extract tabular data from PDFs. *Atlan Humans of Data Blog*. Retrieved from <https://humansofdata.atlan.com/2018/10/camelot-python-library-pdf-data/>

OpenAI. (2023). GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774.

Schmid, P. (2025, February 7). From PDFs to Insights: Structured outputs from PDFs with Gemini 2.0. [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://www.philtschmid.de/gemini-pdf-to-data>

Smock, B., Pesala, R., & Abraham, R. (2021). PubTables-1M: Towards comprehensive table extraction from unstructured documents. arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.00061.

Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., et al. (2023). LLaMA 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288.

Tunová, Ž. (2025). Automated extraction of tabular data from PDF documents (Master's thesis, Masaryk University, Brno). Retrieved from https://is.muni.cz/th/z71bv/Thesis_final.pdf

Zhu, Y., Brettin, T., Xia, F., Partin, A., Shukla, M., Yoo, H., Evrard, Y. A., Doroshov, J. H., & Stevens, R. L. (2021). Converting tabular data into images for deep learning with convolutional neural networks. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 11325.
