



A Bootstrapped Interlingua-Based SMT Architecture

Manny Rayner, Paula Estrella Pierrette Bouillon









- Goals of paper
- Background
- Bootstrapping an interlingua-based SMT
- Experiments

Goals of Paper

• « Relearning Rule-Based MT systems » – Usual goal: add robustness - E.g. Dugast et al 2008 with SYSTRAN • Can we do it with a small-vocabulary highprecision system? - Our GEAF 2009 paper: it's not so easy • Can we do better if we use interlingua in the right way?

« Relearning RBMT »

 Use rule-based MT system to generate training data

Train statistical MT system



Naive approach

(GEAF 2009 paper) • Naive approach is unimpressive If bootstrapped SMT translation different from RBMT translation, usually wrong • Very poor for English \rightarrow Japanese <u>– Better for English</u> \rightarrow French • Tops out quickly, then no improvement

« Relearning Interlingua-Based Machine Translation »



« Relearning Interlingua-Based Machine Translation »



« Relearning Interlingua-Based Machine Translation »



Key Questions

What is «interlingua text»?
How can we use it to relearn an interlinguabased system as an SMT?
How well does it work in practice?



- Goals of paper
- > Background
- Bootstrapping an interlingua-based SMT
- Experiments

MedSLT

- Unidirectional doctor \rightarrow patient spoken translation
- Controlled language, grammar-based
 - Implemented using Regulus platform
- Multi-lingual, interlingua-centred
 - Current prototype: 6 languages, any-to-any
 - English, French, Japanese, Arabic, Catalan, Swedish
- System checks correctness by backtranslating

English MedSLT examples

Where is the pain?Is the pain in the front of the head?Do you often get headaches in the morning?Does bright light give you headaches?Do you have headaches several times a day?Does the pain last more than an hour?

Backtranslation

• Source: Do you have headaches at night?

- B/trans: Do you experience the headaches at night?
- Target: Vos maux de tête surviennent-ils la nuit?
- Target: Yoru atama wa itamimasu ka?

Interlingua text

• Think of interlingua as a language Define using formal grammar Associate text form with representation Text form is simplified/telegraphic English • Functions of interlingua grammar – Allows us to induce an SMT Constrains semantic content of input language Surface form useful in development/debugging

Interlingua and Text Form

English sentence

"Does the pain spread to the jaw?"

Interlingua representation

[null=[utterance_type,ynq], arg1=[symptom, pain], null=[state, radiate], null=[tense,present]], to_loc=[body_part, jaw]]

Interlingua Text

"YN-QUESTION pain radiate PRESENT jaw"

Different Forms of Interlingua Gloss

Current gloss is simplified English

Word-order is English-like

Can have simplified forms of other languages too

In particular, Japanese

Different Forms of Interlingua Gloss (2)

does the pain last for more than EN one day IN/E **YN-QUESTION** pain last PRESENT duration more-than one day ichinichi sukunakutomo itami wa JP tsuzukimasu ka IN/J more-than one day duration pain last PRESENT YN-QUESTION



- Goals of paper
- Background
- Bootstrapping an interlingua-based SMT
- Experiments

Bootstrapping an interlinguabased SMT

Randomly generate 1M sents source data
Translate using EN-FR and EN-JP RBMT
Save interlingua in text form

Both English (IN/E) and Japanese (IN/J) forms

Train SMT models using Moses etc

EN-FR, EN-JP, EN-IN/E, IN/E-FR, IN/J-JP

Ways to exploit interlingua text

Rescoring

- Do Source \rightarrow Interlingua in N-best mode
- Prefer well-formed interlingua text
- Reformulation
 - Split up EN-JP as EN-IN/E + IN/J-JP
 - Use interlingua grammar to do IN/E-IN/J
 - SMT translation only between languages with similar word-orders

RBMT

● (Plain RBMT)

Source text

• (Plain SMT)

Source text



Target text

Target text



\odot SMT + rescoring + SMT



● SMT + interlingua-reformulation + SMT



Other combinations

- SMT + rescoring + int-reformulation + SMT
- SMT + rescoring + RBMT



- Goals of paperBackground
- Bootstrapping an interlingua-based SMT
- Experiments

Experiments

- Evaluate relative performance of different processing pipelines
- Evaluate on held-out part of generated data
 - Measure agreement with RBMT translation
 - GEAF 2009 paper: when SMT and RBMT different, SMT often worse and hardly ever better
- Evaluate best pipelines on real out-of-coverage data
 - Use human judges

Results on generated data

(Metric: agreement with original RBMT system)

| Configuration | $EN \rightarrow FR$ | $EN \rightarrow JP$ |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Plain RBMT | (100%) | (100%) |
| Plain SMT | 65.8% | 26.8% |
| SMT + SMT | 76.6% | 10.5% |
| SMT + int-reformulation + SMT | | 74.1% |
| SMT + int-rescoring + SMT | 78.5% | 10.8% |
| SMT + int-rescore + int-reform + SMT | | 78.5% |
| SMT + RBMT | 83.5% | 81.9% |
| SMT + int-rescoring + RBMT | 87.0% | 87.1% |

Results on real data (EN-FR) (Use best versions: SMT + rescoring + SMT/RBMT) 358 out-of-coverage utterances 245well-formed interlingua 81 good backtranslation **SMT** + **RBMT** translations 75/81 75/75good SMT + RBMT translations 81/81 **SMT + SMT** translations 76/81 good SMT + SMT translations

Results on real data (EN-JP)

(Use best versions: SMT + rescore + reform + SMT/RBMT)

358 out-of-coverage utterances

- well-formed interlingua
- 81 good backtranslation
- 81/81 SMT + RBMT translations
- 77/81 good SMT + RBMT translations
- 81/81 SMT + SMT translations
- 71/81 good SMT + SMT translations

Summary

- Goal: relearn small RBMT system as SMT
- Not trivial if high precision required
- Much better results if we use interlingua
- Key idea: text form of interlingua
 - Use interlingua to reorder SMT output
 - Use interlingua to handle word-order problems
- Good results on EN-FR and EN-JP