

# Lecture 6.2: automatic evaluation of MT

# Why automatic?

- Cost
- Speed
- Without “emotion” 😊
- How to evaluate the evaluation?
  - Does it correspond to human judgment?
  - If *system A* has a better score than *system B* humans should prefer its translations

# Metrics

- BLEU: **Bi**Lingual **E**valuation **U**nderstudy
  - Most popular metric
  - Correlates with human judgment... sometimes!
  - Based on words (and n-grams) overlap between reference and MT output
    - Rewards words in the same order
    - “clipped word count” to “punish” repeated words in MT
    - Brevity penalty to “punish” too short/too long MT

Papineni, K.; Roukos, S.; Ward, T.; Zhu, W. J. (2002). "BLEU: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation". *ACL-2002: 40th Annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. pp. 311–318.

# BLEU METRIC

- $$p_n = \frac{\sum_{c \in \{candidates\}} \sum_{ngram \in C} Count_{clip}(ngram)}{\sum_{c' \in \{candidates\}} \sum_{ngram' \in C'} Count(ngram')}$$

$$BP = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c > r \\ e^{(1-r/c)} & \text{if } c \leq r \end{cases}$$

BP: brevity  
c: total length of candidate translation corpus  
r: test corpus' effective reference length

$$BLEU = BP \cdot \exp\left(\sum_{n=1}^N w_n \log p_n\right)$$

N=number of words in n-grams (consecutive words form n-grams up to length N)  
Usually N=4

- $$BLEU = BP \times \exp(\sum_n \log p_n)$$

# BLEU

- Score between 0 and 1 (0-100%):
  - 0-no common words
  - 1-MT is exactly one of the reference
- No scoring at sentence level
  - see smoothed BLEU
  - E.g. Moses Mert uses “sentence-bleu”
- No synonym, flexions or paraphrases
  - $\text{BLEUs}^{(*)}(\text{“this house has window”, “these houses have windows”}) = 0.3$
- No difference between words
  - $\text{BLEUs}(\text{“this house has window”, “this dog has legs”}) = 0.39$
  - $\text{BLEUs}(\text{“this house has window”, “the house have window”}) = 0.39$

# Other metrics

- METEOR
- Levenstein's string edit distance
- Word error rate
- Translation Error Rate

# METEOR

- Uses stems and synonyms (paraphrases) for its similarity
- Pro: Usually more accurate than BLEU
- Cons: works only in some languages (e.g. paraphrases in es,cz,fr,en,de,ru)

# RIBES

- Word rank-based metric that compares the ratio of contiguous and dis-contiguous word pairs between MT and reference
- Efficient metric for e.g. Japanese-English



# Other metrics

- Levenstein's string edit distance
- Word error rate
- Translation Edit Rate
- METEOR

# Levenshtein edit distance

- The Levenshtein edit distance (in our context) between two sentences is the number of words we have to delete, insert or substitute to change one sentence into the other

$$\text{lev}_{a,b}(i, j) = \begin{cases} \max(i, j) & \text{if } \min(i, j) = 0, \\ \min \begin{cases} \text{lev}_{a,b}(i-1, j) + 1 \\ \text{lev}_{a,b}(i, j-1) + 1 \\ \text{lev}_{a,b}(i-1, j-1) + 1_{(a_i \neq b_j)} \end{cases} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- In automatic MT evaluation: a metric measuring the “distance” between reference and MT translation
- In post-edition evaluation: it represents the number of words that a post-editor changed to correct a MT
- This is a distance: between 0 and  $n$  ( $n$ : max number of words)

# Word error rate (WER)

- WER is the Leveinshtein distance normalized by number of words.
- It is a ratio, between 0 (all words are the same) and 1 (all words are different)

F: La maison bleue , verte ou marron

Ref: The blue , green or brown house

Mt: The blue house , green or brown ~~X~~

- $WER = (1 \text{ del} + 1 \text{ ins}) / 7 = 0.286$

# Translation error rate (TER)

- Same as WER but adds “shift” operation

F: La maison bleue , verte ou marron

Ref: The blue , green or brown house

Mt: The blue house , green or brown



- $TER = 1 \text{ shift} / 7 = 0.143$