Assignment 4

Pin-Jie Lin

pili00001@stud.uni-saarland.de https://github.com/pjlintw/CL20/tree/main/assignment4

1. Introduction

In the report, we demonstrate the comparison between our IBM model 1 and other implementations, namely another IBM model 1 and the second version fast_align . You can run it with the code:

```
python run_aligner.py -n 10000 > myIBM-1k
```

For all the evalution, we use the script score-alignments.

python score-alignments < myIBM-1k</pre>

2. Compare with other Implemenation

We compare our implementation with other on 1000, 3000 and 500k sentence pairs. It gives similar results between the two implementations.

Comparison with other IBM Model 1 Implementation

Models	Precision	Recall	AER
Another IBM-Model1(1k)	25	23	76
Another IBM-Model1(3k)	26	24	74
Another IBM-Model1(5k)	27	25	74
Our IBM-Model1(1k)	24	22	76
Our IBM-Model1(3k)	25	24	75
Our IBM-Model1(5k)	26	25	74

3. Compare with fast_align

We evaluates our IBM model 1 with the second version of model fast_align on different scale datasets. We set the iteration 1 and train them on 10000, 30000, 50000, 80000 sentence pairs.

Both models perform better when increasing training examples. The fast_align can achieve the 28 accuracy with only 1000 examples but our IBM model requires 8x examples. In the recall score, the fast_align on 1k, 3k, 5k and 8k are not as good as its precision.

Performances of IBM Model 1 and fast_align

fast_align(AER)	fast_align(recall)	fast_align(precision)	IBM Model1(AER)	IBM Model1(recall)	IBM Model1(precision)	Models
75	21	28	76	22	24	1,000
75	21	28	75	24	26	3,000
74	21	28	74	25	26	5,000
73	22	29	72	28	28	8,000

4. Visualizations

We visualize the a aligments example from our implemenation and the baseline.

Alignments (our) Alignment (other)



