

Lecture 03:


Machine Translation

Radoslav Neychev
Anastasia Ianina

Harbour.Space University
16.06.2021, Barcelona, Spain

- Machine Translation historical overview
 - Statistical Machine Translation
 - Word alignments
- Neural Machine Translation (NMT)
 - Seq2Seq
 - Beam Search

Historical overview



Before Deep Learning

1950s: first Machine Translation

- Georgetown experiment (7 Jan 1954)
 - Automatic Russian-English translation of 60 sentences
 - 250 vocabulary articles
 - 6 grammar rules
 - Calculated on Mainframe IBM 701
- The same experiment in the USSR (1954 too)
 - Rule-based translation
 - Calculated on BESM

1990-2010: Statistical Machine Translation

We want to find best English sentence y , given French sentence x

Let's use Bayes Rule to break this down into two components:

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmax}_y P(y|x) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_y \underbrace{P(x|y)}_{\text{Translation Model}} \underbrace{P(y)}_{\text{Language Model}} \end{aligned}$$

Translation Model

Models how words and phrases
should be translated (*fidelity*).
Learnt from parallel data.

Language Model

Models how to write
good English (*fluency*).
Learnt from monolingual data.

1990-2010: Statistical Machine Translation

How to learn translation model from the parallel corpus?


Let's calculate

$$P(x, a|y)$$

Where **a** is an **alignment** (word-level correspondence between French sentence x and English sentence y)

1990-2010: Statistical Machine Translation


Alignment can be: **many-to-one**



	Le	reste	appartenait	aux	autochtones
The	■				
balance		■			
was			■		
the			■		
territory			■		
of				■	
the				■	
aboriginal					■
people					■

1990-2010: Statistical Machine Translation


Alignment can be: **one-to-many**



	Le	programme	a	été	mis	en	application
And							
the							
program							
has							
been							
implemented							

1990-2010: Statistical Machine Translation


Some words are very fertile!




	he	hit	me	with	a	pie
il						
a						
m'						
entarté						

1990-2010: Statistical Machine Translation

Alignment can be: **many-to-many**





1990-2010: Statistical Machine Translation



Enumerate every possible y and calculate the probability? No!

Use a heuristic search algorithm to search for the best translation, discarding hypotheses that are too low-probability

1990-2010: Statistical Machine Translation



1990-2010: Statistical Machine Translation

- Systems had many separately-designed subcomponents
- Lots of feature engineering
- Need to design features to capture particular language phenomena
- Require compiling and maintaining extra resources (tables of equivalent phrases)
- Lots of human effort to maintain
- Repeated effort for each language pair!


Neural Machine Translation

What is Neural Machine Translation?


- Neural Machine Translation (NMT) is a way to do Machine Translation with a single neural network
- The neural network architecture is called sequence-to-sequence (aka **seq2seq**), it involves two **RNNs**

Seq2seq NMT


This state encodes
the whole sentence




Forwarded as initial
hidden state to decoder



Seq2seq NMT





Seq2seq NMT



Seq2seq NMT

Encoder



Decoder

NMT: how does it work?

- NMT directly calculates $P(y|x)$
 - y – target sentence, x – source sentence

$$P(y|x) = P(y_2|y_1, x)P(y_3|y_1, y_2, x) \dots \underbrace{P(y_T|y_1, y_2, \dots, x)}$$


Probability of next word
in target language



- To train it we need a huge parallel corpus.

Seq2seq is trained end-to-end

Loss
(e.g. Negative
log-likelihood)




- Decoder predicts the most probable token (argmax) on each step
- The approach is **greedy**

Any problems with it?

Any mistake is treated as input on the next step!

Greedy decoding



Exhaustive search

- We want the translation that maximizes the likelihood:

$$P(y|x) = P(y_1|x) \prod_{t=2}^T P(y_t|y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}, x)$$

- We cannot compute all the possible sequences (exponential complexity)

Beam search


- On each step of decoder, keep track of the k most probable partial translations (which we call hypotheses)
- k is the beam size (in practice around 5 to 10)
- A hypothesis has a score which is its log probability:

$$\text{score}(y_1, \dots, y_t) = \log P_{\text{LM}}(y_1, \dots, y_t | x) = \sum_{i=1}^t \log P_{\text{LM}}(y_i | y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, x)$$

- We search for high-scoring hypotheses, tracking top k on each step
- Beam search does not guarantee finding optimal solution

Beam search decoding: example

Beam size = $k = 2$. Blue numbers = $\text{score}(y_1, \dots, y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^t \log P_{\text{LM}}(y_i | y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, x)$



Beam search decoding: stopping criterion

- In **greedy decoding**, usually we decode until the model produces $\langle \text{EOS} \rangle$ token
- In **beam search decoding**, different hypotheses may produce $\langle \text{EOS} \rangle$ tokens on different timesteps
 - When a hypothesis produces $\langle \text{EOS} \rangle$, that hypothesis is complete.
 - Place it aside and continue exploring other hypotheses via beam search.
- Usually we continue beam search until:
 - We reach pre-defined timestep T
 - We have at least n completed hypotheses

Beam search decoding: finishing up

- How to select top one with highest score?
- Each hypothesis on our list has a score:

$$\text{score}(y_1, \dots, y_t) = \log P_{\text{LM}}(y_1, \dots, y_t | x) = \sum_{i=1}^t \log P_{\text{LM}}(y_i | y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, x)$$

- **Problems?**

Longer hypotheses have lower scores

- **Fix:** Normalize by length. Use this to select top one instead:

$$\frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \log P_{\text{LM}}(y_i | y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, x)$$

NMT: Quality Evaluation

BLEU (Bilingual Evaluation Understudy) compares the machine-written translation to human-written translation, and computes a similarity score based on:

- n-gram precision
- penalty for too-short system translations (brevity penalty)

$$BLEU = \text{brevity penalty} \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \text{precision}_i \right)^{1/n} \cdot 100\%$$

$$\text{brevity penalty} = \min \left(1, \frac{\text{output length}}{\text{reference length}} \right)$$

BLEU (Bilingual Evaluation Understudy) compares the machine-written translation to human-written translation, and computes a similarity score based on:

- n-gram precision
- brevity penalty

SYSTEM A: Israeli officials responsibility of airport safety
2-GRAM MATCH 1-GRAM MATCH

REFERENCE: Israeli officials are responsible for airport security

SYSTEM B: airport security Israeli officials are responsible
2-GRAM MATCH 4-GRAM MATCH

Metric	System A	System B
precision (1gram)	3/6	6/6
precision (2gram)	1/5	4/5
precision (3gram)	0/4	2/4
precision (4gram)	0/3	1/3
brevity penalty	6/7	6/7
BLEU	0%	52%

$$BLEU = \text{brevity penalty} \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \text{precision}_i \right)^{1/n} \cdot 100\%$$

BLEU is imperfect:

- There are many valid ways to translate a sentence
- So a good translation may get a poor BLEU score just because of low n-gram overlap with the human translation

Other ways to estimate translation quality

- **ROUGE** (Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation)
- **METEOR** (Metric for Evaluation of Translation with Explicit ORdering)
 - Uses synonyms from WordNet
- **NIST** (of US National Institute of Standards and Technology)
 - More weight to rare n-grams, less punishment for short texts
- **TER**
 - Uses the number of changes that should be made to get to the reference translation

- Better performance
 - More fluent
 - Better use of context
 - Better use of phrase similarities
- A single neural network to be optimized end-to-end
 - No subcomponents to be individually optimized
- Requires much less human engineering effort
 - No feature engineering
 - Same method for all language pairs

NMT: disadvantages

- NMT is less interpretable
 - Hard to debug
- NMT is difficult to control
 - For example, can't easily specify rules or guidelines for translation
 - Safety concerns!

NMT: disadvantages



Feedback



NMT: disadvantages



АНГЛИЙСКИЙ

Instead I spent friday evening cleaning the kitchen.

52 / 10000

РУССКИЙ



Вместо этого я провела вечер пятницы, убирая кухню.



АНГЛИЙСКИЙ

Instead I spent friday evening drinking with friends.

53 / 10000

РУССКИЙ



Вместо этого я провел вечер пятницы, выпивая с друзьями.

NMT: disadvantages

Somali ▾
Translate from Irish


ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag
ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag ag
ag Edit

English ▾

As the name of the LORD was written
in the Hebrew language, it was written
in the language of the Hebrew Nation

Feedback

NMT: disadvantages



Is Machine Translation solved?

- Many difficulties remain:
 - Out-of-vocabulary words
 - Domain mismatch between train and test data
 - Maintaining context over long texts
 - Low-resource language pairs (no big parallel corpora)


Attention

Seq2seq NMT

This state encodes the whole sentence

It is a bottleneck!

Encoder




Main idea:


on each step of the **decoder**, use **direct connection to the encoder** to focus on a particular part of the source sequence




Seq2seq with attention




Seq2seq with attention




Seq2seq with attention




Seq2seq with attention




Seq2seq with attention



Seq2seq with attention



Seq2seq with attention



Attention in equations

Denote encoder hidden states $\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_N \in \mathbb{R}^k$
and decoder hidden state at time step t $\mathbf{s}_t \in \mathbb{R}^k$

The attention scores \mathbf{e}^t can be computed as dot product


$$\mathbf{e}^t = [\mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{h}_N]$$

Then the attention vector is a linear combination of encoder states

$$\mathbf{a}_t = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i^t \mathbf{h}_i \in \mathbb{R}^k, \text{ where } \boldsymbol{\alpha}_t = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{e}_t)$$

Attention provides interpretability


- We may see what the decoder was focusing on
- We get word alignment for free!



Attention variants

- Basic dot-product (the one discussed before): $e_i = \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{h}_i \in \mathbb{R}$
- Multiplicative attention: $e_i = \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{h}_i \in \mathbb{R}$
 - $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2 \times d_1}$ - weight matrix
- Additive attention: $e_i = \mathbf{v}^T \tanh(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{h}_i + \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{R}$
 - $\mathbf{W}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_3 \times d_1}, \mathbf{W}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_3 \times d_2}$ - weight matrices
 - $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_3}$ - weight vector


Summary




- Seq2seq is an architecture for NMT (2 RNNs)
- Attention is a way to focus on particular parts of the input



Seq2seq with attention




Seq2seq with attention



Machine Translation

I'M GOING TO THE THEATER = ICH GEHE INS THEATER

I'M GOING TO THE CINEMA ^{???} = ICH GEHE INS KINO



KINO

Quality evaluation: Perplexity

$$PP(W) = P(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N)^{-\frac{1}{N}} = \sqrt[N]{\frac{1}{P(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N)}} = \sqrt[N]{\frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^N P(w_i | w_1, \dots, w_{i-1})}}$$

WER (Word Error Rate)

$$WER = \frac{S + D + I}{N} = \frac{S + D + I}{S + D + C}$$

- S is the number of substitutions,
- D is the number of deletions,
- I is the number of insertions,
- C is the number of correct words,
- N is the number of words in the reference ($N = S + D + C$)

- **ROUGE** Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation
- Recall in the context of ROUGE means how much of the reference summary is the system summary recovering or capturing
- **BLEU** is focusing on **precision**:
 - $\text{overlapping_words} / \text{total_words_in_system_summary}$
- **ROUGE** is focusing on **recall**:
 - $\text{overlapping_words} / \text{total_words_in_reference_summary}$

ROUGE - Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation

- **ROUGE-N:** Overlap of N-grams between the system and reference summaries.
- **ROUGE-L:** Longest Common Subsequence (LCS) based statistics. Longest common subsequence problem takes into account sentence level structure similarity naturally and identifies longest co-occurring in sequence n-grams automatically.
- **ROUGE-W:** Weighted LCS-based statistics
- etc.