

# TOIN

### WILL NEURAL MT BE A BREAKTHROUGH IN ENGLISH-TO-JAPANESE TECHNICAL TRANSLATION?

Tsunao Mikasa and Nobuko Kasahara, TOIN Corporation September 2017



### AGENDA

- Question: Is MT really usable for English-to-Japanese translation?
- **Pilot project** we carried out for assessing quality and productivity
  - Overview
  - MT engines examined
  - Methodology and assumptions
  - Results
- Conclusion





# QUESTION

Is MT usable for English-to-Japanese (E2J) translation services where the required quality is at the same level as Human Translation (HT)?

- Until recently, the answer was **NO**; to obtain certain productivity gains in post-editing, quality of final translation needed to be compromised
- In other words, only "Light PE" was worth considering, and "real" translation was achievable only by human translators with no help of "machine translators"



# QUESTION (CONTD.)

Is MT usable for English-to-Japanese (E2J) translation services where the required quality is at the same level as Human Translation (HT)?

- We claim that the answer will be **YES** if using the latest MT technologies, in particular **neural** engines (under some reasonable assumptions about content types)
- In other words, MT will enable most E2J translators to achieve the **same quality** without compromise at **higher productivity** (except for some special content types, such as marketing materials)



# **PILOT PROJECT**

To examine our claim, we carried out a simple pilot project for accessing quality and productivity in Human Translation (HT) and Post-Editing (PE)

### Key Assumptions:

- We focused on Technical documents, as this sector accounts for the largest portion of many language service providers in Japan
- PE quality was required to be the same level as HT, since our interest was in examining whether HT quality can be achieved by PE without any compromise in quality (not "Light PE")



### **MT** ENGINES EXAMINED

We examined two engines which are recognized as ones of the best Neural and Statistical Englishto-Japanese MT engines:

• Google NMT—Neural

oNICT みんなの自動翻訳@TexTra® —Statistical

(NICT: National Institute of Information and Communications Technology 情報通信研究機構)

Note: NICT has recently also released its Neural engine

# METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS

**Content translated:** A typical technical document, User Manual of a major PLM software product

• Not too technical, easy-to-understand for the average user (and for translators!)

### Volume:

- **o 5k** words for PE/HT productivity evaluation
- Additional **10k** words for MT quality evaluation

# **METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS (CONTD.)**

### Sample segments:

				Trancla	ator KH	
Segm	Source Segment	MT Target Segment	MT Engine		Post-edited Target	Translated Target
	The action is only available when creating or editing a change task.	この操作は、変更タスクを作成ま たは編集するときに使用できるよ うになります。	NICT	КН	この操作は、変更タスクを作成ま たは編集するときにのみ使用でき ます。	
246	The action is only available when you access the Resulting Objects table from the change task information page.	操作は、変更タスクの情報ページ の「結果オブジェクト」(Resulting Objects)テーブルにアクセスした場 合にのみ使用できます。		КН		この操作は、変更タスク情報ペー ジから「結果のオブジェクト」 テーブルにアクセスするときにの み使用できます。
247	Open a new window to edit the change task.	新しいウィンドウが開き、変更タ スクを編集します。	NICT	КН	新しいウィンドウを開き、変更タ スクを編集します。	
248	Set effectivity on an object.	オブジェクトのエフェクティビ ティを設定します。	NICT	KH		オブジェクトで有効性を設定しま す。
249	View effectivity on an object.	オブジェクトのエフェクティビ ティを表示します。	NICT	КН	オブジェクトの有効性を表示しま す。	





### **METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS (CONTD.)**

# Resources—Linguists (Translators/Post-Editors) who worked in the pilot:

- Four senior-level linguists with 10+ year-experience in E2J technical translation
- Past experience in PE was **not** required (though two of them did have some PE experience)
- Each of them translated/PE'd the same 5,000-word sample document
- They focused on achieving sufficient (HT-level) quality in PE; never forced to use MT outputs or "hurry up" in PE

# METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS (CONTD.)

### Linguistic reference:

Made linguistic reference as **simple** as possible to see the pure impact of MT on quality and productivity:

• No Translation Memory (TM)

• No Terminology Database (TD)

• No Style Guidelines (SG)

## 

### **METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS (CONTD.)**

### **Piot project for Productivity evaluation**

 Each linguist produces a translation of each segment, either by

- **HT**: translating the source segment without referring to any MT outputs, or
- PE: editing MT output of the source segment
- To do HT or PE is randomly chosen by the system so that the total # of HT/PE'd segments will be equal

# METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS **TOIN** (CONTD.)

### Piot project for Productivity evaluation (contd.)

• For PE, either GNMT or NICT engine applied

- Randomly chosen by the system so that the total # of the segments from each engine will be equal
- Not make it visible to the linguist which engine was used (to avoid any bias)

• We used <u>TAUS DQF tools</u> for productivity evaluation



### **METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS (CONTD.)**

- We used <u>TAUS DQF tools</u> and their evaluation criteria for quality evaluation
  - Fluency
    - Flawless (4) refers to a perfectly flowing text with no errors.
    - **Good** (3) —refers to a smoothly flowing text even when a number of minor errors are present.
    - Disfluent (2) refers to a text that is poorly written and difficult to understand.
    - Incomprehensible (1) —refers to a very poorly written text that is impossible to understand.
  - Adequacy
    - Everything (4)—All the meaning in the source is contained in the translation, no more, no less.
    - Most (3)—Almost all the meaning in the source is contained in the translation.
    - Little (2)—Fragments of the meaning in the source are contained in the translation.
    - None (1)—None of the meaning in the source is contained in the translation.



## **RESULTS**—**PRODUCTIVITY**



### **Overall Productivity (wph)**



# **RESULTS—PRODUCTIVITY (CONTD.)**

### **Key findings:**

### **OPE w/ GNMT**

- Highest productivity
- 63% faster than HT on average

### • PE w/ NICT

 30% faster than HT on average





**RESULTS—PRODUCTIVITY (CONTD.)** 

#### Other observations:

- No apparent correlation observed between Productivity and Segment Length (word count of each segment)
- In particular, in **HT**, SL does not seem to affect Productivity at all
- GNMT seems to show a slight tendency that the longer SL, the higher productivity, but it's not significant





Proceedings of MT Summit XVI, Vol.2: Users and Translators Track



# **RESULTS**—**QUALITY**

### • Key findings

- GNMT had better scores overall, where
  - o +85% segments had Flowless (4) or Good (3) fluency
  - +90% segments had *Everything* (4) or *Most* (3) adequacy

### Other observations

Almost no correlation observed between Segment
Length and Quality of MT outputs in our pilot:

Scatter plots of the evaluation data:





# CONCLUSION

### **Productivity** gains

- We observed 63% average productivity gains in PE w/ GNMT as well as 30% gains in PE w/ NICT.
- This strongly suggests that significant improvement in efficiency can be achieved in most E2J technical localization projects by utilizing the latest MT engines, in particular, GNMT, in the translation process.

### Other findings

 In our pilot, we didn't observe the tendency "Longer sentences give worse MT outputs, thus result in lower PE productivity", which may be a myth.