

# Machine Translation is Not **One Size Fits All**







Email me: Lori@LexWorks.com

et al. (Eds.) Proceedings of AMTA 2014, vol. 2: MT Users Vancouver, BC On the Authors nect: linkedin.com/in/lorithic

# Contents

- What is technology agnostic?
- Who is technology agnostic?
- Why is it important?
- Best practices for post-editors
- Rules of thumb for RBMT, SMT & Hybrid
- o Case studies



## First, a word about LexWorks

- MT services branch of Paris-based Lexcelera
- "T-shaped" expertise
- MT services provider
- Consulting, metrics, engine training, post-editing
- Technology agnostic

Beregovaya et al. (Eds.) Proceedings of AMTA 2014, vol. 2: MT Users Vancouver, BC © The Authors

# **Current R&D projects**

# **AC**:**JEPT**

UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

Beregovaya et al. (Eds.) Proceedings of AMTA The University of Edinburgh

- EU funded, Moses
- Developing new technologies to help MT work better with community content



 Impact of pre-editing on post-editing productivity

acrolinx 💺

€Lexcelera



WITHOUT BORDERS

acrolinx 🖳

Symantec. *Symantec*.



## We already match the tool to the task





govaya et al. (Eds.) Proceedings of AMTA 2014, vol. 2: MT Users Vancouver, BC © The Authors S Machine Translation That Works





We already match the tool to the task



Machine Translation That Works

85

# MT is more than a tool. MT is a process.



Beregovaya et al. (Eds.) Proceedings of AMTA 2014, vol. 2: MT Users Vancouver, BC © The Authors Machine Translation That Works

## Other technology agnostics





# A Best-of-Breed approach

### "A good MT strategy should be technology-agnostic and look for the most efficient solution on a case-by-case basis."



Rubén Rodríguez de la Fuente, PayPal





# Post-editors really hate bad MT (and why we should care)



Beregovaya et al. (Eds.) Proceedings of AMTA 2014, vol. 2: MT Users Vancouver, BC © The Authors

ine Translation That Works

# Post-editing as a share of total costs

### **Initial MT Project**



hine Translation That Works



### Subsequent MT Project



MT Training
Post-Editing
Engineering

Beregovaya et al. (Eds.) Proceedings of AMTA 2014, vol. 2: MT Users Vancouver, BC © The Authors

# 7 best practices for post-editors

- Don't give post-editors bad MT & expect them to fix it for a discount
- 2. Choose the right engine for the content
- 3. Train it well
- 4. Test the output: retrain if necessary
- 5. Set post-editing expectations: what type of errors to look for and what quality is needed
- 6. Let post-editors be involved in improving the engine
- 7. Integrate changes quickly



# 4 Types: RBMT, SMT, Hybrid & Online SMT



## Rules of thumb: content type



# Rules of thumb: languages





# A comparison of features

Area	Feature	RBMT	SMT
Capability	Number of languages handled out of the box	~20	~50
Capability	Ability to add language pairs (if training data available)		$\checkmark$
Cost	Free or Open Source version exists (e.g. Apertium, Moses)	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Cost	SaaS (Software-As-A-Service) models exist	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Quality	Output is fluent		$\checkmark$
Quality	Output is predictable	$\checkmark$	
Quality	Pre-editing significantly improves output quality	$\checkmark$	
Quality	Can handle poor grammar or spelling		$\checkmark$
Quality	Uses specified terminology applying correct grammar	$\checkmark$	
Quality	Handles software tags without special programming	$\checkmark$	
Quality	Can be integrated with TM (Translation Memory) tools	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$

Beregovaya et al. (Eds.) Proceedings of AMTA 2014, vol. 2: MT Users Vancouver, BC © The Authors

Machine Translation That Works

Area	Feature	RBMT	SMT
Suitability	Better performance with online chat		$\checkmark$
Suitability	Better performance with UGC and broad-domain content (e.g. patents)		$\checkmark$
Suitability	Better performance for documentation/UI and other narrow domain content	$\checkmark$	
Suitability	Suited to rare language pairs (where training data is available)		$\checkmark$
Suitability	Suited to full post-editing/real-time improvement cycles	$\checkmark$	
Training	Learns automatically		$\checkmark$
Training	Rapid improvement cycle	$\checkmark$	
Training	Can be trained by engineers		$\checkmark$
Training	Can be trained by linguists	$\checkmark$	
Training	Effective with limited training data	$\checkmark$	



# Testing assumptions is sometimes surprising

Translation engine	Engine Type	BLEU Score	GTM Score (SymEval)
Systran	Hybrid	69.74	72.69
Moses	Statistical	50.46	57.93
Microsoft Translator	Statistical	54.01	60.81





### Alstom Transport Factory, Novocherkassk Russia

Challenge:

- English to Russian
- 2 pages to 100 pages daily
- Over 3 years
- Technical specifications, contracts
- No bilingual data at project start

Technology Used:

RBMT





### eDiscovery

### Looking for that Smoking Gun

#### Challenge:

- Japanese to English
- 30,000 pages, mostly emails, technical reports, meeting minutes
- Poor grammar, colloquial

### Technology Used:

Hybrid





### SNCF, Response to Technical RFP

Challenge:

- French & English to Braz. Portuguese
- 3400 pages, lots of different documents
- Multiple passes on same file
- Tender response
- Limited data at project start

Technology Used:

Hybrid





### **Customer Support**

### **Online Forums and FAQs**

#### Challenge:

- 9 languages
- Dynamic content
- Poor grammar, colloquial
- Solve problems before help desk
- Need 24/7 availability

Technology Used:

Online SMT







### **BNP's Self-Service MT Server**

Challenge:

- World's 3<sup>rd</sup> largest bank
- Centralized MT server for 200,000 employees
- Multiple business units with their own terminology
- Self-Service
- Behind the firewall; we train & update remotely

Technology Used:

Hybrid







# **Questions?**





Translation That Works



Email me: Lori@LexWorks.com



govaya et al. (Eds.) Proceedings of AMTA 2014, vol. 2: MT Users Vancouver, BC, O The Authors nnect: linkedin.com/in/lorithicke