LLMs Are Not Scorers: Rethinking MT Evaluation with Generation-Based Methods

Hyang Cui Peking University cx0329@stu.pku.edu.cn

Abstract

Recent studies have applied large language models (LLMs) to machine translation quality estimation (MTQE) by prompting to assign numeric scores. models Nonetheless, these direct scoring methods tend to show low segment-level correlation with human judgments. In this paper, we propose a generation-based evaluation paradigm that leverages decoder-only LLMs to produce high-quality references, followed by semantic similarity scoring using sentence embeddings. We conduct the most extensive evaluation to date in MTQE, covering 8 LLMs and 8 language pairs. Empirical results show that our method outperforms both intra-LLM direct scoring baselines and external non-LLM reference-free metrics from MTME. These findings demonstrate the strength of generation-based evaluation and support a shift toward hybrid approaches that combine fluent generation with accurate semantic assessment. Code and data are available at our GitHub repository.1

1 Introduction

Timely feedback is critical for improving machine translation, but human evaluation is expensive and slow. To address this, machine translation quality estimation (MTQE) has emerged, using automatic metrics to approximate human judgment.

BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) was the first widely adopted metric, relying on n-gram overlap. METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005) enhanced this approach by incorporating linguistic features such as stemming and synonymy. But its reliance

on handcrafted resources constrained its crosslingual generalizability. chrF (Popović, 2015) introduced a language-agnostic alternative based on character-level F-scores, improving robustness but still rooted in surface matching.

To address these limitations, researchers turned to metrics that capture semantic meaning. BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020) compared contextual embeddings from pretrained models, allowing high scores even with different wordings even the meanings aligned. However, it remained unsupervised and detached from human judgment. Building on this, COMET (Rei et al., 2020) and BLEURT (Sellam et al., 2020) introduced supervised learning paradigms that train on human-labeled data, ushering in the neural era of MTQE.

Still, neural metrics typically output a single score, offering limited insight. xCOMET (Guerreiro et al., 2023) enhanced interpretability with word-level error types. UniTE (Wan et al., 2022) unified reference-based and reference-free evaluation, improving flexibility.

Recently, the "LLM-as-a-judge" (Zheng et al., 2023) approach has attracted attention for using large language models directly for MT evaluation. However, results from ACL 2024 (Huang et al., 2024) show low segment-level correlation (≈0.2), and sometimes even negative values. This unexpected result raises important questions: Are we misusing LLMs? Have we failed to leverage their strengths?

2 Related Work

Recent studies have explored using LLMs for MTQE. GEMBA (Kocmi and Federmann, 2023)

¹ https://github.com/CuiNiki/LLMs-Are-Not-Scorers

Score the following translation from {src_lang} to {tgt_lang} on a continuous scale from 0 to 100 that starts on "No meaning preserved", goes through "Some meaning preserved", then "Most meaning preserved and few grammar mistakes", up to "Perfect meaning and grammar".

{tgt_lang} translation: "{translation}" Score (0-100):

Figure 1: Prompt used in GEMBA for direct scoring

prompts GPT models to assign translation scores on a 0–100 scale. However, both GEMBA and the later EAPrompt (Lu et al., 2024) evaluated only three high-resource language pairs on three models, limiting generalizability.

Subsequent work expanded the use of GEMBAstyle prompts by evaluating more models and language pairs, but two key issues have emerged. First, studies published in the same year—ACL 2024 (Huang et al.) and EMNLP 2024 (Qian et al.)—reported conflicting findings regarding the role of source input. Huang et al. (2024) found that including the source reduced correlation with human judgments, while Oian et al. (2024) observed the opposite. This inconsistency raises concerns about methodological reliability. Second, GEMBA-style methods continue to struggle at the segment level. LLMs often produce repeated integer scores, indicating memorized patterns and limiting their ability to capture fine-grained translation quality.

These limitations suggest that direct scoring may not be the best use of LLMs for MTQE, as decoder-only models are trained for next-token prediction rather than regression. This reflects the "Generative AI Paradox" (West et al., 2023): large generative models may outperform humans in generation tasks while underperforming in understanding tasks. This paradox suggests that LLMs can fluently assign a score to a translation but may not truly comprehend the semantic fidelity between source and output—casting doubt on direct scoring approaches.

To address this, we propose a generation-based evaluation paradigm, detailed in Section 3 and empirically validated through two rounds of experiments in Section 4.

You are a certified WMT benchmark translator. Translate the following sentence from the WMT22 dataset into English. Your translation will be directly compared to WMT system outputs using the 'all-mpnet-base-v2' semantic similarity model. To ensure accurate benchmarking, provide exactly one clean English sentence—no alternative translations, explanations, or additional text.

Sentence: {*src*} Translation:

Figure 2: Prompt used in our generation-based method

3 Methodology

3.1 Overview

We introduce a generation-based evaluation paradigm for machine translation quality estimation, consisting of three steps:

- (1) Generating References. Given a source sentence (*src*), we prompt a decoder-only model to generate a high-quality reference translation, denoted as *src translation*.
- (2) Computing Semantic Similarity. We compute the semantic similarity between the generated reference (*src_translation*) and the machine translation output (*mt*) using the all-mpnet-base-v2 embedding model from Sentence-BERT. We use the resulting similarity score as our predicted quality score.
- (3) Evaluating Correlation with Human Judgments. To evaluate how well our method aligns with human judgment, we calculate the correlation coefficients between the predicted similarity scores and human-annotated Direct Assessment (DA) scores for each language pair.

3.2 Advantages

Our method offers three main advantages: stability, interpretability, and flexibility:

(1) Improved Stability. LLMs often fail to return scores or produce invalid outputs when prompted for numeric judgments (Qian et al., 2024). In contrast, prompting them to generate translations aligns with their training objective, resulting in fewer

		NE-EN		ET-EN		SI-EN		RO-EN		RU-EN	
		ρ	r	ρ	r	ρ	r	ρ	r	ρ	r
	ours	0.56	0.543	0.441	0.347	0.441	0.419	0.665	0.708	0.506	0.522
Gemma-7B	baseline	0.333	0.379	0.349	0.384	0.274	0.29	0.624	0.585	0.327	0.421
	growth	+68%	+43%	+26%	-10%	+61%	+44%	+7%	+21%	+55%	+24%
	ours	0.199	0.21	0.105	0.133	0.084	0.056	0.644	0.731	0.527	0.588
Llama-2-7B	baseline	0.183	0.216	0.044	0.123	0.08	0.13	0.307	0.266	0.172	0.234
	growth	+9%	-3%	+138%	+8%	+4%	-57%	+110%	+174%	+207%	+151%
	ours	0.451	0.454	0.234	0.25	0.146	0.179	0.662	0.744	0.559	0.602
OpenChat3.5	baseline	0.378	0.361	0.54	0.547	0.412	0.406	0.471	0.431	0.571	0.589
	growth	+19%	+26%	-57%	-54%	-64%	-56%	+41%	+72%	-2%	+2%
Llama-3-8B	ours	0.444	0.441	0.365	0.385	0.393	0.385	0.65	0.742	0.52	0.55
Llama-2-13B	baseline	0.089	0.062	0.216	0.234	0.015	0.03	0.279	0.305	0.393	0.404
	growth	+399%	+613%	+69%	+65%	+2485%	+1206%	+133%	+143%	+32%	+36%
	ours	0.451	0.453	0.428	0.429	0.226	0.238	0.664	0.761	0.533	0.562
Qwen1.5-14B	baseline	0.349	0.327	0.484	0.513	0.383	0.369	0.22	0.561	0.516	0.505
	growth	+30%	+39%	-12%	-16%	-41%	-35%	+202%	+36%	+3%	+11%

Table 1: Results of Experiment 1

failures and a more robust evaluation pipeline.

- (2) Enhanced Interpretability. GPTScore (Fu et al., 2023) relies on token-level likelihoods, which are opaque and can reward fluent but semantically incorrect translations. In contrast, our method incorporates source information and offers a transparent evaluation process with clearly interpretable scores.
- (3) Greater Flexibility. Traditional metrics depend on a static reference. In contrast, our method generates dynamic references on the fly, allowing control over tone, terminology, or style via prompt design. This makes it well-suited for domain-specific or stylistically sensitive evaluation tasks.

The official WMT 2024 QE Shared Task report (Zerva et al., 2024) highlights a performance gap of LLMs between generation (Task 3) and scoring (Task 1), encouraging hybrid approaches. Our method aligns with this vision: we use a decoderonly LLM to generate references and an encoderonly model to evaluate them. Additionally, the WMT23 Metrics Shared Task (Freitag et al., 2023) emphasizes the critical role of reference quality. In response, the organizers proposed generating synthetic references. Inspired by this, we generate context-sensitive references, leveraging LLMs' generative strengths to enhance evaluation quality. This hybrid framework combines the strengths of generative and embedding-based models, yielding scores that better align with human judgment.

4 Experiment

4.1 Experimental Setup

- Hardware: 1× A100 GPU (40GB)
- Language Pairs: 8 pairs from WMT22(Freitag et al., 2022), covering a range of resource levels from low to high: NE-EN, ET-EN, SI-EN, RO-EN, UK-EN, CS-EN, RU-EN, DE-EN.
- Models: Gemma-7B (Gemma Team et al., 2024), LLaMA-2-7B (Touvron et al., 2023), OpenChat3.5 (Wang et al., 2023), LLaMA-3-8B (Grattafiori et al., 2024), Qwen3-8B (Yang et al., 2025), Qwen1.5-14B (Bai et al., 2023), DeepSeek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI, 2025), and GPT-4-turbo (OpenAI, 2023).

4.2 Experiment 1

This experiment compares our method against the baseline proposed by Qian et al. (2024). The aim is to assess whether our method performs better under the same model settings.

The baseline includes six models. We excluded one non-decoder-only model and replaced LLaMA-2-13B due to its instability, as reported in the baseline paper: on the RO-EN test set (867 segments), 461 segments failed to produce a score. To ensure fair comparability, we substituted it with a smaller model with fewer parameters. Interestingly, LLaMA-3-8B delivered more stable and higher-quality results, suggesting that larger models do not necessarily perform better.

	UK-EN		CS-EN		RU-EN		DE-EN		
		ρ	r	ρ	r	ρ	r	ρ	r
	Gemma-7B	0.025	0.016	0.041	0.030	0.000	0.005	0.011	0.006
	Qwen3-8B	0.019	0.006	0.047	0.038	0.009	0.004	0.009	0.011
ours	DeepSeek-R1	0.017	0.012	0.040	0.039	0.010	0.005	0.017	0.024
	GPT-4-turbo	0.016	0.010	0.033	0.038	0.006	0.004	0.012	0.017
	HWTSC-Teacher-Sim	0.011	0.005	0.026	0.024	0.010	0.010	0.024	0.018
	COMETKiwi	0.005	0.005	0.041	0.044	0.002	0.008	0.017	0.020
mtme [noref]	UniTE-src	0.005	0.004	0.038	0.039	0.002	0.007	0.027	0.030
	REUSE	0.000	-0.008	0.002	0.005	-0.011	-0.010	0.014	0.012
	COMET-QE	-0.003	-0.010	0.015	0.022	-0.007	-0.002	0.030	0.024

Table 2: Results of Experiment 2

4.3 Experiment 2

While Experiment 1 shows that our method outperforms a direct scoring baseline using LLMs, many existing MTQE metrics are not LLM-based. Therefore, we extend our evaluation to ask: can our method also outperform non-LLM metrics?

We use the official MTME toolkit² released by the WMT. To ensure fair comparison, we focus on reference-free metrics, since our method does not require gold references. Reference-based metrics introduce additional semantic input and belong to a fundamentally different evaluation paradigm. For completeness, we report reference-based results in Appendix A.

Together, the two experiments form a progressive evaluation: Experiment 1 compares our method to LLM-based direct scoring, while Experiment 2 benchmarks it against MTME's reference-free metrics, highlighting its broader advantages.

5 Results

Experiment 1 demonstrates that our method consistently outperforms the baseline proposed by Qian et al. (2024). Table 1 presents the results, where bolded values indicate cases in which our method outperforms the baseline. Three out of five models surpass the baseline across all five language pairs. The remaining two models outperform the baseline on three and two language pairs, respectively. These results suggest that strong performance on one language pair does not guarantee consistent effectiveness across others—model behavior can vary depending on the language. Overall, our method shows stronger and

more consistent performance than the baseline within LLM-based evaluation settings.

Experiment 2 extends the comparison to reference-free MTME metrics. As shown in Table 2, bolded values mark cases where our method exceeds the average scores of MTME's [noref] systems. Among the four language pairs evaluated, our method achieves higher average correlations than all MTME baselines on three. Notably, in two of these three language pairs, our scores also surpass MTME's best-reported results. For the low-resource pair UK–EN, all of our models outperform all five MTME metrics—establishing new state-of-the-art results across the board.

This progression of results highlights not only the overall effectiveness of our method, but also its cross-linguistic generalizability across both highand low-resource scenarios.

6 Conclusion

This work rethinks the role of large language models (LLMs) in machine translation quality estimation, shifting from direct scoring to a generation-based evaluation framework. conduct the most extensive study to date, evaluating 8 LLMs and 8 language pairs through two experiments. Our method consistently outperforms LLM-based scoring approaches and surpasses non-LLM official MTME reference-free metrics, particularly in low-resource settings. These findings underscore the limitations of using LLMs as scorers and demonstrate the effectiveness of leveraging them as generators. We advocate for a hybrid evaluation paradigm that combines the fluency of generation with the semantic precision of embedding-based scoring.

² https://github.com/googleresearch/mt-metrics-eval

Limitation

We acknowledge a key limitation of our study: all language pairs use English as the target language. This choice was made to reduce confounding variables and focus on the effects of the source language, especially given that prior studies have reached opposing conclusions about its role in LLM evaluation. While this design helped ensure internal consistency, we fully recognize that it limits the generalizability of our findings. We encourage future research to apply our method to a broader range of target languages to better assess its multilingual applicability.

Ethics Statement

This study does not involve human subjects or sensitive content. All data used in our experiments are publicly available, including the WMT22 dataset from the WMT shared task, the dataset released in a prior EMNLP 2024 publication, and evaluation resources from the MTME toolkit. The language models employed are open-access and widely used in the research community. Our goal is to promote more effective and transparent approaches to machine translation evaluation. We believe this work offers constructive insights while adhering to ethical standards in data usage and model deployment.

References

Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chava Navak. Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Allonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, Danny Wyatt, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Govind Thattai, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jack Zhang, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia et al. 2024. The Llama 3 Herd of Models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.

An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, Chujie Zheng, Daviheng Liu, Fan Zhou, Fei Huang, Feng Hu, Hao Ge, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jing Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Lianghao Deng, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Mingze Li, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Shixuan Liu, Shuang Luo, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Wenbiao Yin, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Wang, Xinyu Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yinger Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zekun Wang, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhipeng Zhou, Zihan Qiu. 2024. Owen3 Technical Report. Preprint, arXiv:2505.09388.

Chrysoula Zerva, Frederic Blain, José G. C. De Souza, Diptesh Kanojia, Sourabh Deoghare, Nuno M. Guerreiro, Giuseppe Attanasio, Ricardo Rei, Constantin Orasan, Matteo Negri, Marco Turchi, Rajen Chatterjee, Pushpak Bhattacharyya, Markus Freitag, and André Martins. 2024. Findings of the Quality Estimation Shared Task at WMT 2024: Are LLMs Closing the Gap in QE?. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 82–109, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z.F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J.L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Livue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R.J. Chen, R.L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S.S. Li et al. (2025). DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. *ArXiv*, *abs/2501.12948*.

Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, Pouya Tafti, Léonard Hussenot, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Adam Roberts, Aditya Barua, Alex Botev, Alex Castro-Ros, Ambrose Slone, Amélie Héliou, Andrea Tacchetti, Anna Bulanova, Antonia Paterson, BethTsai, Bobak Shahriari, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Clément Crepy, Daniel Cer, Daphne Ippolito, David Reid, Elena Buchatskaya, Eric Ni, Eric Noland, Geng Yan, George Tucker, George-Christian Muraru, Rozhdestvenskiy, Henryk Michalewski, Ian Tenney, Ivan Grishchenko, Jacob Austin, James Keeling, Jane Labanowski, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Jeff Stanway, Jenny Brennan, Jeremy Chen, Johan Ferret, Justin Chiu, Justin Mao-Jones, Katherine Lee, Kathy Yu, Katie Millican, Lars Lowe Sjoesund, Lisa Lee, Lucas Dixon, Machel Reid, Maciej Mikuła, Mateo Wirth, Michael Sharman, Nikolai Chinaev, Nithum Thain, Olivier Bachem, Oscar Chang, Oscar Wahltinez, Paige Bai- ley, Paul Michel, Petko Yotov, Rahma Chaabouni, Ramona Comanescu, Reena Jana, Rohan Anil, Ross McIlrov. Ruibo Liu, Ryan Mullins, Samuel L Smith, Sebastian Borgeaud, Sertan Girgin, Sholto Douglas, Shree Pandya, Siamak Shakeri, Soham De, Ted Klimenko, Tom Hennigan, Vlad Feinberg, Wojciech Stokowiec, Yu hui Chen, Zafarali Ahmed, Zhitao Gong, Tris Warkentin, Ludovic Peran, Minh Giang, Clément Farabet, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis. Zoubin Ghahramani, Douglas Eck, Joelle Barral, Fernando Pereira, Eli Collins, Armand Joulin, Noah Fiedel, Evan Senter, Alek Andreev, and Kathleen Kenealy. 2024. Gemma: Open Models Based on Gemini Tech-Research and nology. Preprint. arXiv:2403.08295.

Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. 2024. GPTScore: Evaluate as You Desire. In Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 6556–6576, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingx- uan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. 2023. Owen Technical Report.

Juhyun Oh, Eunsu Kim, Inha Cha, and Alice Oh. 2024. The Generative AI Paradox in Evaluation: "What It Can Solve, It May Not Evaluate". In Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop, pages 248–257, St. Julian's, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.

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 of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Maja Popović. 2015. chrF: character n-gram F-score for automatic MT evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 392–395, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Markus Freitag, Nitika Mathur, Chi-kiu Lo, Eleftherios Avramidis, Ricardo Rei, Brian Thompson, Tom Kocmi, Frederic Blain, Daniel Deutsch, Craig Stewart, Chrysoula Zerva, Sheila Castilho, Alon Lavie, and George Foster. 2023. Results of WMT23 Metrics Shared Task: Metrics Might Be Guilty but References Are Not Innocent. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 578–628, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Markus Freitag, Ricardo Rei, Nitika Mathur, Chi-kiu Lo, Craig Stewart, Eleftherios Avramidis, Tom Kocmi, George Foster, Alon Lavie, and André F. T. Martins. 2022. Results of WMT22 Metrics Shared Task: Stop Using BLEU – Neural Metrics Are Better and More Robust. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Machine Translation (WMT)*, pages 46–68, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid). Association for Computational Linguistics.

Nuno M. Guerreiro, Ricardo Rei, Daan van Stigt, Luisa Coheur, Pierre Colombo, and André F. T. Martins. 2024. xcomet: Transparent Machine Translation Evaluation through Fine-grained Error Detection. Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 12:979–995.

- OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. Preprint, arXiv:2303.08774.
- Qingyu Lu, Baopu Qiu, Liang Ding, Kanjian Zhang, Tom Kocmi, and Dacheng Tao. 2024. Error Analysis Prompting Enables Human-Like Translation Evaluation in Large Language Models. In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024, pages 8801–8816, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. COMET: A Neural Framework for MT Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2685–2702, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. In Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization, pages 65–72, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shenbin Qian, Archchana Sindhujan, Minnie Kabra, Diptesh Kanojia, Constantin Orasan, Tharindu Ranasinghe, and Fred Blain. 2024. What do Large Language Models Need for Machine Translation Evaluation?. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3660–3674, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thibault Sellam, Dipanjan Das, and Ankur Parikh. 2020. BLEURT: Learning Robust Metrics for Text Generation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7881–7892, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tianyi Zhang*, Varsha Kishore*, Felix Wu*, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tom Kocmi and Christian Federmann. 2023. Large Language Models Are State-of-the-Art Evaluators of Translation Quality. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, pages 193–203, Tampere, Finland. European Association for Machine Translation.

- Touvron, Hugo, Louis Martin, Kevin R. Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Daniel M. Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Cantón Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanui Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony S. Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel M. Kloumann, A. V. Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, R. Subramanian, Xia Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zhengxu Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. LLaMA 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. Preprint, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Wang, Guan, Sijie Cheng, Xianyuan Zhan, Xiangang Li, Sen Song, and Yang Liu. 2023. OpenChat: Advancing Open-source Language Models with Mixed-Quality Data. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.11235.
- Xu Huang, Zhirui Zhang, Xiang Geng, Yichao Du, Jiajun Chen, and Shujian Huang. 2024. Lost in the Source Language: How Large Language Models Evaluate the Quality of Machine Translation. In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024, pages 3546–3562, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yu Wan, Dayiheng Liu, Baosong Yang, Haibo Zhang, Boxing Chen, Derek Wong, and Lidia Chao. 2022. UniTE: Unified Translation Evaluation. In Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 8117–8127, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zheng, Lianmin, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric P. Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Judging LLM-as-a-Judge with MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena. *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.05685.

A Comparison with MTME Metrics

		UK-EN				CS-EN		RU-EN			DE-EN		
		ρ	r	τ	ρ	r	τ	ρ	r	τ	ρ	r	τ
	Gemma-7B	0.025	0.016	0.017	0.041	0.030	0.028	0.000	0.005	0.003	0.011	0.006	0.004
	Qwen3-8B	0.019	0.006	0.013	0.047	0.038	0.031	0.009	0.004	0.006	0.009	0.011	0.006
ours	Deepseek-R1	0.017	0.012	0.011	0.040	0.039	0.027	0.010	0.005	0.007	0.017	0.024	0.011
	GPT-4-turbo	0.016	0.010	0.011	0.033	0.038	0.022	0.006	0.004	0.004	0.012	0.017	0.008
mtme	median	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.026	0.024	0.018	0.002	0.007	0.001	0.024	0.020	0.016
[noref]	mean	0.004	-0.001	0.002	0.024	0.027	0.017	-0.001	0.003	-0.001	0.022	0.021	0.015
	HWTSC- Teacher-Sim	0.011	0.005	0.007	0.026	0.024	0.018	0.010	0.010	0.007	0.024	0.018	0.016
	COMETKiwi	0.005	0.005	0.004	0.041	0.044	0.028	0.002	0.008	0.001	0.017	0.020	0.011
mtme [noref]	UniTE-src	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.038	0.039	0.026	0.002	0.007	0.001	0.027	0.030	0.018
	REUSE	0.000	-0.008	0.000	0.002	0.005	0.002	-0.011	-0.010	-0.007	0.014	0.012	0.009
	COMET-QE	-0.003	-0.010	-0.002	0.015	0.022	0.010	-0.007	-0.002	-0.005	0.030	0.024	0.020
	BLEU	0.010	0.004	0.007	0.064	0.049	0.043	0.021	0.020	0.014	0.013	0.016	0.009
	chrF	0.004	0.000	0.003	0.062	0.048	0.042	0.022	0.019	0.015	0.025	0.028	0.017
	BLEURT-20	0.003	-0.001	0.002	0.053	0.046	0.036	0.021	0.024	0.014	0.026	0.031	0.018
	COMET-20	-0.003	0.002	-0.002	0.050	0.044	0.034	0.020	0.025	0.014	0.027	0.025	0.018
	YiSi-1	0.007	0.007	0.004	0.055	0.042	0.037	0.026	0.030	0.018	0.018	0.027	0.012
mtme	BERTScore	0.004	0.005	0.003	0.058	0.046	0.039	0.028	0.033	0.019	0.016	0.026	0.011
	COMET-22	0.002	0.005	0.002	0.046	0.050	0.031	0.019	0.031	0.013	0.028	0.038	0.019
	MS-COMET- 22	-0.001	0.002	0.000	0.044	0.039	0.030	0.010	0.018	0.007	0.020	0.022	0.013
	UniTE	0.005	0.004	0.004	0.053	0.047	0.036	0.018	0.020	0.012	0.028	0.031	0.019
	f200spBLEU	0.009	0.003	0.006	0.064	0.049	0.043	0.027	0.024	0.018	0.014	0.020	0.010
	metricx_xxl_ MQM_2020	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.038	0.046	0.026	0.017	0.034	0.011	0.021	0.035	0.014