

Statistical Machine Translation for Indian Languages: Mission Hindi 2

Raj Nath Patel
KBCS, CDAC Mumbai
rajnathp@cdac.in

Prakash B. Pimpale
KBCS, CDAC Mumbai
prakash@cdac.in

Abstract

This paper presents Centre for Development of Advanced Computing Mumbai's (CDACM) submission to NLP Tools Contest on Statistical Machine Translation in Indian Languages (ILSMT) 2015 (collocated with ICON 2015). The aim of the contest was to collectively explore the effectiveness of Statistical Machine Translation (SMT) while translating within Indian languages and between English and Indian languages. In this paper, we report our work on all five language pairs, namely Bengali-Hindi (*bn-hi*), Marathi-Hindi (*mr-hi*), Tamil-Hindi (*ta-hi*), Telugu-Hindi (*te-hi*), and English-Hindi (*en-hi*) for Health, Tourism and General domains. We have used suffix separation, compound splitting and reordering prior to SMT training and testing.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we present our SMT experiments from Bengali, Marathi, Tamil, Telugu and English to Hindi. From the set of languages involved, Bengali, Hindi and Marathi belong to the Indo-Aryan family and Tamil and Telugu are from Dravidian language family. All languages except English, have the same flexibility towards word order, canonically following the Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) structure.

With reference to morphology Bengali, Marathi, Tamil, and Telugu are more agglutinative compared to Hindi. It is known that SMT produces unknown words resulting in bad translation quality if morphological divergence between source and target languages is high. Koehn and Knight (2003), Popovic and Ney (2004), and Popović et al. (2006) have demonstrated

ways to handle this issue with morphological segmentation of words in the source sentences before training the SMT system. To handle this morphological difference we have used suffix separation and compound word splitting developed by Pimpale et al. (2014) and Patel et al. (2014).

For English-Hindi SMT, we achieve better alignment using reordering (Patel et al., 2013) and stem as an alignment factor (Koehn and Hoang, 2007).

All machine translation (MT) systems suffer from Out of Vocabulary (OOV) words. These OOV words are mostly named entities, technical terms and foreign words which can be translated using transliteration system. We used Durrani et al. (2014), which is a fully unsupervised approach for developing a transliteration system using parallel corpus meant for the SMT training.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we discuss dataset and experimental setup. Section 3 discusses experiments and results. Submitted systems to the shared task are described in section 4 followed by the conclusion and future work in section 5.

2 Data-set and Experimental Setup

In the following subsections, we describe Training and Testing corpus followed by pre-processing and SMT system setup for experiments.

2.1 Corpus for SMT Training and Testing

We have used corpus shared by ILSMT detailed in Table 1 for the experiments. Testing for the experiments was done using Test1 which is the development set. The submitted systems were evaluated against Test2 corpus, by the organizers. For unconstrained systems, additional data (Bojar et al., 2014; Khapra et al., 2010) has been used for language modeling.

| | health | tourism | general |
|---------------|--------|---------|---------|
| training (TM) | 24K | 24K | 48K |
| training (LM) | 24K | 24K | 48K |
| test1 | 500 | 500 | 1000 |
| test2 | 500 | 400 | 1000 |

Table 1: Corpus distribution; TM: Translation Model, LM: Language Model

2.2 SMT System Set Up

The baseline system was setup by using the phrase-based model (Och and Ney, 2003; Brown et al., 1990; Marcu and Wong, 2002; Koehn et al., 2003; Koehn et al., 2007) and Koehn and Hoang (2007) was used for factored model. The language model was trained using KenLM (Heafield, 2011) toolkit with modified Kneser-Ney smoothing (Chen and Goodman, 1996). For factored SMT training source and target side stem were used as an alignment factor. Stemming was done using a lightweight stemmer for Hindi (Ramanathan and Rao, 2003). For English, we used porter stemmer (Minnen et al., 2001).

2.3 Evaluation Metrics

The different experimental systems were compared using, BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), NIST (Doddington, 2002), translation error rate (TER) (Snover et al., 2006). For an MT system is to be better, higher BLEU and NIST scores with lower TER are desired.

2.4 Pre-Processing (PP)

To tackle the morphological divergence between the source and target languages for the purpose of a better SMT system, we preprocessed the source (Bengali, Marathi, Tamil, and Telugu) for suffix separation and compound word splitting (Pimpale et al., 2014; Patel et al., 2014) prior to training and testing. To handle the structural divergence (*en-hi*), we used source side reordering (Patel et al., 2013).

2.5 Transliteration (TR)

We developed transliteration systems using Durani et al. (2014) inbuilt with the Moses tool. We used n-best transliteration output for OOV words. These candidates were then plugged in and re-scored with the language model to get the best translation for the given source sentence.

2.6 Language Modelling

We trained 5-gram LM using KenLM with modified Kneser-Ney smoothing. LM size was quite large (ARPA-88.7GB, binary-27.4GB), even after binarization. Training LM with the huge amount of monolingual data like Bojar et al. (2014) (approx. 10GB) required good computing resources (60GB RAM and 200GB storage space in the working dir). Also, Bojar et al. (2014) corpus contains unwanted symbols (<s>) for KenLM which we need to remove prior training.

3 Experiments and Results

Table 2 shows evaluation scores for various systems tried under constrained submission, that is, systems trained only on the shared data. We can see the use of the preprocessing and transliteration contributed to the improvement of around 1-5 bleu points across the language pairs. Detailed evaluation scores for unconstrained systems, that is, systems using language model built on external data, are in Table 3. Significant improvement can be observed from the table when additional data was used for language modeling.

| | | BLEU | NIST | TER |
|--------------|----|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>bn-hi</i> | S1 | 30.18 | 6.888 | 48.43 |
| | S2 | 31.23 | 6.943 | 47.27 |
| | S3 | 32.22 | 7.092 | 46.46 |
| <i>en-hi</i> | S1 | 18.76 | 5.862 | 64.05 |
| | S2 | 23.15 | 6.037 | 59.89 |
| | S3 | 23.44 | 6.092 | 59.58 |
| <i>mr-hi</i> | S1 | 35.74 | 7.511 | 42.75 |
| | S2 | 40.01 | 7.805 | 39.95 |
| | S3 | 40.21 | 7.867 | 39.62 |
| <i>ta-hi</i> | S1 | 16.64 | 4.742 | 64.68 |
| | S2 | 20.17 | 5.303 | 62.65 |
| | S3 | 20.58 | 5.391 | 62.12 |
| <i>te-hi</i> | S1 | 24.88 | 6.219 | 52.18 |
| | S2 | 28.94 | 6.532 | 49.97 |
| | S3 | 29.86 | 6.679 | 49.19 |

Table 2: Scores for different systems (CONSTRAINED); S1:BL; S2:BL+PP; S3:BL+PP+TR; BL:Baseline; TR:Transliteration

4 Submission to the Shared Task

We submitted two different results for the contest, namely constrained and unconstrained. The constrained systems were trained only on the data

| | | BLEU | NIST | TER |
|--------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>bn-hi</i> | S1 | 30.18 | 6.888 | 48.43 |
| | S2' | 31.58 | 7.080 | 47.03 |
| | S3' | 33.77 | 7.195 | 45.52 |
| <i>en-hi</i> | S1 | 18.76 | 5.862 | 64.05 |
| | S2' | 19.96 | 5.922 | 63.03 |
| | S3' | 24.00 | 6.121 | 58.99 |
| <i>mr-hi</i> | S1 | 35.74 | 7.511 | 42.75 |
| | S2' | 36.80 | 7.617 | 42.35 |
| | S3' | 41.20 | 7.935 | 39.25 |
| <i>ta-hi</i> | S1 | 16.64 | 4.742 | 64.68 |
| | S2' | 16.38 | 4.677 | 64.45 |
| | S3' | 20.38 | 5.340 | 62.25 |
| <i>te-hi</i> | S1 | 24.88 | 6.219 | 52.18 |
| | S2' | 25.47 | 6.251 | 51.99 |
| | S3' | 29.72 | 6.669 | 49.26 |

Table 3: Scores for different systems (UNCONSTRAINED); S1:BL; S2':BL+ELM; S2':BL+PP+ELM; BL:Baseline; ELM:Extended LM (Additional data used for LM training)

shared by the organizers. For unconstrained systems, we used additional monolingual data which include Bojar et al. (2014) and Khapra et al. (2010), for language modeling.

5 Conclusion and Feature Work

In this paper, we presented systems for translation from Bengali, English, Marathi, Tamil and Telugu to Hindi. These SMT systems with the use of source side suffix separation, compound splitting, reordering and bigger language model shows significantly higher accuracy over the baseline. Adding more complex features for factored models and formulating preprocessing with better way could be the next step.

References

- [Bojar et al.2014] Ondřej Bojar, Vojtěch Diatka, Pavel Rychlý, Pavel Straňák, Vít Suchomel, Aleš Tamchyna, and Daniel Zeman. 2014. HindMonoCorp 0.5. <http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-097C-0000-0023-6260-A>. LINDAT/CLARIN digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics, Charles University in Prague.
- [Brown et al.1990] Peter F Brown, John Cocke, Stephen A Della Pietra, Vincent J Della Pietra, Fredrick Jelinek, John D Lafferty, Robert L Mercer, and Paul S Roossin. 1990. A Statistical Approach to Machine Translation. *Computational linguistics*, 16(2):79–85.
- [Chen and Goodman1996] Stanley F Chen and Joshua Goodman. 1996. An Empirical Study of Smoothing Techniques for Language Modeling. In *Proceedings of the 34th annual meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 310–318. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Doddington2002] George Doddington. 2002. Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation Quality using N-gram Co-occurrence Statistics. In *Proceedings of the second international conference on Human Language Technology Research*, pages 138–145. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- [Durrani et al.2014] Nadir Durrani, Hassan Sajjad, Hieu Hoang, and Philipp Koehn. 2014. Integrating an unsupervised transliteration model into statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the ACL (EACL 2014)*, volume 14, pages 148–153. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Heafield2011] Kenneth Heafield. 2011. KenLM: Faster and Smaller Language Model Queries. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 187–197. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Khapra et al.2010] Mitesh M Khapra, Anup Kulkarni, Saurabh Sohoney, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. 2010. All Words Domain Adapted WSD: Finding a Middle Ground between Supervision and Unsupervision. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1532–1541. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Koehn and Hoang2007] Philipp Koehn and Hieu Hoang. 2007. Factored translation models. In *EMNLP-CoNLL*, pages 868–876.
- [Koehn and Knight2003] Philipp Koehn and Kevin Knight. 2003. Empirical Methods for Compound Splitting. In *Proceedings of the tenth conference on European chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics-Volume 1*, pages 187–193. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Koehn et al.2003] Philipp Koehn, Franz Josef Och, and Daniel Marcu. 2003. Statistical Phrase-Based Translation. In *Proceedings of the 2003 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics on Human Language Technology-Volume 1*, pages 48–54. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Koehn et al.2007] Philipp Koehn, Hieu Hoang, Alexandra Birch, Chris Callison-Burch, Marcello Federico, Nicola Bertoldi, Brooke Cowan, Wade Shen, Christine Moran, Richard Zens, et al. 2007. Moses: Open Source Toolkit for Statistical Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 45th*

- annual meeting of the ACL on interactive poster and demonstration sessions*, pages 177–180. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Marcu and Wong2002] Daniel Marcu and William Wong. 2002. A Phrase-Based, Joint Probability Model for Statistical Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the ACL-02 conference on Empirical methods in natural language processing-Volume 10*, pages 133–139. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Minnen et al.2001] Guido Minnen, John Carroll, and Darren Pearce. 2001. Applied morphological processing of english. *Natural Language Engineering*, 7(03):207–223.
- [Och and Ney2003] Franz Josef Och and Hermann Ney. 2003. A Systematic Comparison of Various Statistical Alignment Models. *Computational linguistics*, 29(1):19–51.
- [Papineni et al.2002] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. BLEU: A Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting on association for computational linguistics*, pages 311–318. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Patel et al.2013] Raj Nath Patel, Rohit Gupta, Prakash B Pimpale, and Sasikumar M. 2013. Re-ordering rules for english-hindi smt. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Hybrid Approaches to Translation*, pages 34–41. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Patel et al.2014] Raj Nath Patel, Prakash B Pimpale, and Sasikumar M. 2014. Statistical Machine Translation for Indian Languages: Mission Hindi. In *Proceedings of NLP Tools contest. ICON-2014: 11th International Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- [Pimpale et al.2014] Prakash B Pimpale, Raj Nath Patel, and Sasikumar M. 2014. SMT from Agglutinative Languages: Use of Suffix Separation and Word Splitting. In *Proceedings of ICON-2014: 11th International Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- [Popovic and Ney2004] Maja Popovic and Hermann Ney. 2004. Towards the Use of Word Stems and Suffixes for Statistical Machine Translation. In *LREC*.
- [Popović et al.2006] Maja Popović, Daniel Stein, and Hermann Ney. 2006. Statistical Machine Translation of German Compound Words. In *Advances in Natural Language Processing*, pages 616–624. Springer.
- [Ramanathan and Rao2003] Ananthkrishnan Ramanathan and Durgesh D Rao. 2003. A Lightweight Stemmer for Hindi. In *The Proceedings of EACL*.
- [Snover et al.2006] Matthew Snover, Bonnie Dorr, Richard Schwartz, Linnea Micciulla, and John Makhoul. 2006. A Study of Translation Edit Rate with Targeted Human Annotation. In *Proceedings of association for machine translation in the Americas*, volume 200.