

## I<sup>2</sup>R Chinese-English Translation System for IWSLT-2007

Boxing Chen, Jun Sun, Hongfei Jiang, Min Zhang, Ai Ti Aw

Department of HLT Institute for Infocomm Research (I<sup>2</sup>R), Singapore



## Outline

- Motivation
- Multi-pass approach
  - 1<sup>st</sup> pass: decoding
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> pass: regeneration
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> pass: rescoring
- Experiments and results
- Conclusion



#### **Motivation**

- A two-pass SMT system's performance could be improved from two aspects:
  - Scoring models
  - N-best Hypotheses
- Rescoring focus on improving the scoring models
- We try to improve the N-best hypotheses through an additional pass: regeneration and system combination



#### Multi-pass Approach



- 1<sup>st</sup> Pass
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Pass
- Decoding

- n-gram expansion
- Log-linear model System combination
- Multi decoders

- 3<sup>rd</sup> Pass
  - Rescoring
  - Log-linear model
  - Additional features



#### 1<sup>st</sup> Pass: Decoding



- 3 systems
  - Sys1: preprocessing setting 1 + Moses decoder
  - Sys2: preprocessing setting 2 + Moses decoder
  - Sys3: preprocessing setting 2 + STSG decoder



#### 1<sup>st</sup> Pass: Syntax-based decoder

- STSG: Synchronous Tree Substitution Grammar
- A rule is a pair of elementary tree (PET) with alignment information.
  - PET is defined as a Triple  $<\xi_s, \xi_t, A >$ 
    - $\xi_s$  and  $\xi_t$  are source/target elementary tree
    - A is the alignments between leaf nodes of two elementary trees
- Two major benefits:
  - Possible to explicitly model the target syntax
  - Allow Multi-level global structure distortion



#### 1<sup>st</sup> Pass: STSG Modelling





#### 2<sup>nd</sup> pass: n-gram expansion

- n-gram expansion generates new hypotheses
  - Collect all the n-grams from the original N-best
  - Continuously expand the partial hypothesis through the ngrams.



#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Pass: System Combination



- System Combination
  - Hypotheses are simply joined
  - Duplicate hypotheses are removed



### 3<sup>rd</sup> Pass: Rescoring

• Rich additional feature functions (Chen et al., 2006)

Moses Features:

**Translation Model** 

**Reordering model** 

Language Model

Word penalty

Translation confidence

Rescoring Features:

Dir/Inv IBM model 1 and 3 score
CLA association score

3) lexicalized word/block reordering probabilities

4) 6-gram target LM

5) 8-gram target word-class based LM

6) source and target length ratio

7) question feature

- 8) frequency of n-grams in the N-best
- 9) n-gram post-probabilities

10) sentence length post-probabilities



#### Experiments: training data

- Task: Chinese-English Open data track
- Bilingual Training data: BTEC+HIT-corpus
  - Sys1 and Sys2:
    - 400K sentence-pairs
    - 4.5M target words

– Sys3:

- 90K sentence-pairs
- 1.0M target words
- Additional target data: Tanaka corpus
  - 155K sentence-pairs, 1.4M target running words



#### **Experiments: preprocessing**

- Preprocessing
  - Tools: LDC-SEG (L) , ICTCLAS (I), Stanford parser

|              | Sys1 |    | Sys2 |    | Sys3 |    |
|--------------|------|----|------|----|------|----|
|              | ch   | en | ch   | en | ch   | en |
| Tokenization | L    | Х  | Ι    | Х  | Ι    | Х  |
| Parsing      |      |    |      |    | х    | Х  |
| Txt-to-digit | X    | Х  |      |    |      |    |
| Lower-casing |      | Х  |      | Х  |      | Х  |





#### **Experiments: setting**

- Two series of experiments:
  - DEV: dev1, TEST: dev2, dev3
  - DEV: dev4, TEST: dev5
- 6 types of MT outputs:
  - Sys1/2/3: 3 baselines
  - Resc1: rescoring on Sys1 N-best list
  - Resc2: rescoring on Sys1+Sys2 N-best lists
  - Comb: final translation output with n-gram expansion, system combination and rescoring incorporated



#### **Results: Baseline**





#### Results: Resc1/2 vs. Comb

#### Resc1/2:

Advantages: More features (include local feat. used in decoding)

Disadvantages: Less hypotheses



Comb:

#### Advantages: More hypotheses

Disadvantages: Less features (no local features)



#### Results: Resc1/2 vs. Comb





### Results: Analysis

• Average length and relative improvements on BLEU (Resc2 vs. Comb)

|          | Dev1 | Dev2 | Dev3 | Dev4 | Dev5 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Length   | 6.7  | 7.0  | 7.5  | 12.1 | 12.6 |
| $\Delta$ | -1.5 | -0.2 | 0.8  | 6.3  | 5.3  |

Number of new generated hypotheses in Comb (about 500 sentences for each dev set.

|           | Dev1 | Dev2 | Dev3 | Dev4 | Dev5 |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| #new hypo | 29   | 18   | 12   | 59   | 74   |

 n-gram expansion benefits longer sentences more than short sentences. Because it permits long distance word movements through a low-order LM (e.g. a bi-gram LM).



#### Results: test set

- Test set are more similar to dev1 than other dev sets:
  - average length 6.5 (test) vs. 6.7(dev1)
- On dev1: "Resc2" produces better BLEU score than "Comb"

|              | Official submission |      | Only BTEC data |       |  |
|--------------|---------------------|------|----------------|-------|--|
|              | BLEU(%)             | Rank | BLEU(%)        | NIST  |  |
| Run1 (Resc2) | 40.77               | 1    | 38.67          | 6.740 |  |
| Run2 (Comb)  | 39.42               | 2    | 37.04          | 6.756 |  |





#### Conclusion

- Multi-pass system
  - Multi-decoder to produce N-best lists
  - n-gram expansion to generate new hypotheses
  - Rich additional feature functions to do rescoring
- Rescoring gives significant improvements
- n-gram expansion and system combination give consistent improvement on longer sentences



# Thanks for your attention! Any questions?

