



Boosting Neural Machine Translation with Similar Translations

AMTA 2022



Specialization: highest quality translations for your content

User Dictionaries & Translation memories

Linguistic Translation Profiles

Feedback loop for continuous improvement

 \bigcirc As the pioneer in Machine Translation, we introduce new features on a regular basis.

For example, in 2020 we introduced the ability to train multi-domain engines. <u>This significantly improves the translation</u> <u>quality for low resource domains</u> and allows you to address various business cases with the same neural engine. Specialization of the neural MT engine using your own data







NFA Workflow - Overview





How many augmented examples must be used in training?





How many training iterations are needed to effectively teach a regular model to use similar translations?





How "similar" must similar sentences be?





Translating with out-domain translation memories





Ē



Qualitative Analysis

Input sentence augmented with a fuzzy match and match/non-match information.

f = How long does the flight last ? $\int f' =$ How long does a flu last ?

 $\begin{bmatrix} f' = \text{How long does a flu last } \\ e' = \text{Qu'elle est la durée d'une grippe } \end{bmatrix}$

How Is long Is does the Is flight Is last Is ? IS HIB Qu'elle Mestim laim durée M d'une INM grippe INM ? M



Automated quality assessment

Automatic measure evaluation.

Ē

	BLEU ↑	METEOR \uparrow	TER ↓	chrF↑	BERTScore ↑	$\mathbf{COMET} \uparrow$	DTED \downarrow
ТМ	44.49	56.10	60.26	59.67	84.86	14.46	63.09
Baseline NMT	58.87	75.53	29.66	75.52	92.56	78.33	29.76
NFR	66.07	79.45	25.25	79.33	93.49	81.79	26.33



Automated quality assessment

BLEU scores for the TM, baseline NMT and NFA system in different FM ranges.

	All	50–59%	60–69%	70–79%	80-89%	90–99%
ТМ	44.49	5.18	10.77	23.52	43.99	75.25
Baseline NMT	58.87	34.64	42.94	50.24	59.09	74.64
NFR	66.07	35.97	43.63	53.93	67.29	85.24



TER: Edit operations

F

		Baseline NMT		NFR		NMT vs. NFR	
		Total	/Sent	Total	/Sent	% Difference	
Insertions	Content words	4747	0.76	4239	0.68	-10.70	
	Function words	5527	0.89	4966	0.80	-10.15	
	Other	1114	0.18	1089	0.18	-2.24	
	Total	11,388	1.83	10,294	1.66	-9.61	
Deletions	Content words	3063	0.49	2677	0.43	-12.60	
	Function words	3609	0.58	3102	0.50	-14.05	
	Other	475	0.08	431	0.07	-9.26	
	Total	7147	1.15	6210	1.00	-13.11	
Substitutions	Content words	12,258	1.97	10,146	1.63	-17.23	
	Function words	8511	1.37	7030	1.13	-17.40	
	Other	919	0.15	832	0.13	-9.47	
	Total	21,688	3.49	18,008	2.90	-16.97	
Token shifts	Content words	3253	0.52	2651	0.43	-18.51	
	Function words	4552	0.73	3610	0.58	-20.69	
	Other	415	0.07	352	0.06	-15.18	
	Total	8220	1.32	6613	1.07	-19.55	
Total token-level edits		48,443	7.80	41,125	6.62	-15.10	
Group shifts		2255	0.36	1832	0.30	-18.76	



NFA produced translations that required fewer edit operations overall

Percentage of difference in total number of edits, per edit type, and different FM ranges between NFA and baseline NMT output.





Fine-Grained Error Analysis

Number of errors per category of the SCATE error taxonomy, for the baseline NMT and NFA systems.

	BASE	NFR		BASE	NFR
FLUENCY	89	71	ACCURACY	110	128
Coherence	20	11	 Mistranslation 	58	57
 Logical problem 	18	9	 Multiword expression 	10	5
 Co-reference 	_	_	 Semantically unrelated 	12	27
 Cultural reference 	_	_	• Word sense	14	8
 Verb tense 	2	2	 Part-of-speech 	2	1
 Inconsistency 	_	_	• Partial	_	
Grammar and Syntax	8	15	• Other	20	16
∘ Extra word	2	1	 Omission 	36	40
 Missing word 	2	6	Addition	8	25
 Multi-word syntax 	_	_	• Do-not-translate	_	_
• Word order	2	2	 Untranslated 	2	_
 Word form 	2	6	 Mechanical 	4	5
• Other	_	_	 Capitalization 	_	_
• Lexicon	29	12	• Punctuation	4	5
 Lexical choice 	17	9	• Other	_	
 Non-existing/Foreign 	7	1	• Other	2	1
• Wrong preposition	5	2			
• Orthography	2	4			
 Punctuation 	2	1			
 Capitalization 	_	_			
∘ Spelling	_	3			
• Other	_	_			
 Style and Register 	30	29			
• Disfluent	26	26			
• Register	1	1			
 Repetition 	3	2			
 Untranslated 	_	_			

Ę

Impact of data augmentation

Analysis of match (m) and no-match (nm) words in FMs and whether they appeared in the MT output (pass) as well as in the reference translation (REF).

	F	ull Test Set	50–59%	90–99%	
	NFR	Baseline NMT	NFR	NFR	
Fuzzy match 1					
% m/FM1	62.2		26.6	82.7	
% m-pass	88.4	82.6	74.5	95.8	
% m-pass-REF	69.5	66.6	59.5	77.4	
% nm/FM1	37.8		73.4	17.3	
% nm-pass	36.5	31.9	23.5	45.8	
% nm-pass-REF	29.6	27.3	17.4	38.7	



NFA > NMT > TM

Improving translation quality with Neural Fuzzy Adaptation



Results showed that all automated metrics, which compared the MT output to a reference translation, showed higher scores for the NFA system than for an NMT baseline and confirmed the significant improvements it achieved.



A detailed TER analysis showed that the strengths of the NFA system are to produce translations with more similar lexical choices and word order than the reference translations.

