

# Multi-Source Translation Methods

Lane Schwartz  
lane@cs.umn.edu

University of Minnesota

23 Oct 2008

Related Work

Oracle Experiment

Revisiting Och and Ney (2001)

# Motivation

## Principle of Translational Promiscuity:

If a document is translated into more than 1 language, it will likely be translated into many more languages.

- ▶ Translate into first  $n$  target languages by hand
- ▶ Translate into remaining target languages using MT

# Motivation

## Principle of Translational Promiscuity:

If a document is translated into more than 1 language, it will likely be translated into many more languages.

- ▶ Translate into first  $n$  target languages by hand
- ▶ Translate into remaining target languages using MT

# Motivation

## Principle of Translational Promiscuity:

If a document is translated into more than 1 language, it will likely be translated into many more languages.

- ▶ Translate into first  $n$  target languages by hand
- ▶ Translate into remaining target languages using MT

## Related Work

Can using multiple sources of information improve translation?

- ▶ Lattice inputs
- ▶ Consensus decoding
- ▶ Hypothesis ranking

## Related Work

Can using multiple sources of information improve translation?

- ▶ Lattice inputs
- ▶ Consensus decoding
- ▶ Hypothesis ranking

## Related Work

Can using multiple sources of information improve translation?

- ▶ Lattice inputs
- ▶ Consensus decoding
- ▶ Hypothesis ranking



## Related Work

Can using multiple sources of information improve translation?

- ▶ Lattice inputs
- ▶ Consensus decoding
- ▶ Hypothesis ranking

## Related Work

Can using multiple sources of information improve translation?

- ▶ Lattice inputs
- ▶ Consensus decoding
- ▶ Hypothesis ranking

## Related Work — Lattice Input

- ▶ Begin with alternate representations of a source sentence
  - Chinese word segmentations
  - Arabic morphological analyses
- ▶ Align alternate representations into a word lattice
- ▶ Use standard decoding algorithms, modified to accept lattice input (Dyer et al., 2008)
- ▶ Can be extended to accept multilingual inputs (ongoing work by Josh Schroeder)

## Related Work — Lattice Input

- ▶ Begin with alternate representations of a source sentence
  - Chinese word segmentations
  - Arabic morphological analyses
- ▶ Align alternate representations into a word lattice
- ▶ Use standard decoding algorithms, modified to accept lattice input (Dyer et al., 2008)
- ▶ Can be extended to accept multilingual inputs (ongoing work by Josh Schroeder)

## Related Work — Lattice Input

- ▶ Begin with alternate representations of a source sentence
  - Chinese word segmentations
  - Arabic morphological analyses
- ▶ Align alternate representations into a word lattice
- ▶ Use standard decoding algorithms, modified to accept lattice input (Dyer et al., 2008)
- ▶ Can be extended to accept multilingual inputs (ongoing work by Josh Schroeder)

## Related Work — Lattice Input

- ▶ Begin with alternate representations of a source sentence
  - Chinese word segmentations
  - Arabic morphological analyses
- ▶ Align alternate representations into a word lattice
- ▶ Use standard decoding algorithms, modified to accept lattice input (Dyer et al., 2008)
- ▶ Can be extended to accept multilingual inputs (ongoing work by Josh Schroeder)

## Related Work — Lattice Input

- ▶ Begin with alternate representations of a source sentence
  - Chinese word segmentations
  - Arabic morphological analyses
- ▶ Align alternate representations into a word lattice
- ▶ Use standard decoding algorithms, modified to accept lattice input (Dyer et al., 2008)
- ▶ Can be extended to accept multilingual inputs (ongoing work by Josh Schroeder)

## Related Work — Consensus Decoding

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find a *consensus* translation
- ▶ Bilingual consensus decoding  
(Frederking and Nirenburg, 1994; Bangalore et al., 2001; Jayaraman and Lavie, 2005; Rosti et al., 2007)
  - ▶ Translate source text using  $n$  different systems
  - ▶ Align the  $n$  output hypotheses into a weighted word lattice
  - ▶ Intersect word lattice with n-gram language model
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
  - ▶ Matusov et al. (2006)
  - ▶ Japanese and Chinese into English
  - ▶ 4.8 BLEU improvement



## Related Work — Consensus Decoding

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find a *consensus* translation
- ▶ Bilingual consensus decoding  
(Frederking and Nirenburg, 1994; Bangalore et al., 2001;  
Jayaraman and Lavie, 2005; Rosti et al., 2007)
  - ▶ Translate source text using  $n$  different systems
  - ▶ Align the  $n$  output hypotheses into a weighted word lattice
  - ▶ Intersect word lattice with n-gram language model
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
  - ▶ Matusov et al. (2006)
  - ▶ Japanese and Chinese into English
  - ▶ 4.8 BLEU improvement

## Related Work — Consensus Decoding

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find a *consensus* translation
- ▶ Bilingual consensus decoding  
(Frederking and Nirenburg, 1994; Bangalore et al., 2001;  
Jayaraman and Lavie, 2005; Rosti et al., 2007)
  - ▶ Translate source text using  $n$  different systems
  - ▶ Align the  $n$  output hypotheses into a weighted word lattice
  - ▶ Intersect word lattice with n-gram language model
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
  - ▶ Matusov et al. (2006)
  - ▶ Japanese and Chinese into English
  - ▶ 4.8 BLEU improvement

## Related Work — Consensus Decoding

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find a *consensus* translation
- ▶ Bilingual consensus decoding  
(Frederking and Nirenburg, 1994; Bangalore et al., 2001;  
Jayaraman and Lavie, 2005; Rosti et al., 2007)
  - ▶ Translate source text using  $n$  different systems
  - ▶ Align the  $n$  output hypotheses into a weighted word lattice
  - ▶ Intersect word lattice with n-gram language model
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
  - ▶ Matusov et al. (2006)
  - ▶ Japanese and Chinese into English
  - ▶ 4.8 BLEU improvement

## Related Work — Consensus Decoding

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find a *consensus* translation
- ▶ Bilingual consensus decoding  
(Frederking and Nirenburg, 1994; Bangalore et al., 2001; Jayaraman and Lavie, 2005; Rosti et al., 2007)
  - ▶ Translate source text using  $n$  different systems
  - ▶ Align the  $n$  output hypotheses into a weighted word lattice
  - ▶ Intersect word lattice with n-gram language model
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
  - ▶ Matusov et al. (2006)
  - ▶ Japanese and Chinese into English
  - ▶ 4.8 BLEU improvement

## Related Work — Consensus Decoding

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find a *consensus* translation
- ▶ Bilingual consensus decoding  
(Frederking and Nirenburg, 1994; Bangalore et al., 2001; Jayaraman and Lavie, 2005; Rosti et al., 2007)
  - ▶ Translate source text using  $n$  different systems
  - ▶ Align the  $n$  output hypotheses into a weighted word lattice
  - ▶ Intersect word lattice with n-gram language model
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
  - ▶ Matusov et al. (2006)
  - ▶ Japanese and Chinese into English
  - ▶ 4.8 BLEU improvement

## Related Work — Consensus Decoding

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find a *consensus* translation
- ▶ Bilingual consensus decoding  
(Frederking and Nirenburg, 1994; Bangalore et al., 2001; Jayaraman and Lavie, 2005; Rosti et al., 2007)
  - ▶ Translate source text using  $n$  different systems
  - ▶ Align the  $n$  output hypotheses into a weighted word lattice
  - ▶ Intersect word lattice with n-gram language model
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
  - ▶ Matusov et al. (2006)
  - ▶ Japanese and Chinese into English
  - ▶ 4.8 BLEU improvement

## Related Work — Consensus Decoding

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find a *consensus* translation
- ▶ Bilingual consensus decoding  
(Frederking and Nirenburg, 1994; Bangalore et al., 2001; Jayaraman and Lavie, 2005; Rosti et al., 2007)
  - ▶ Translate source text using  $n$  different systems
  - ▶ Align the  $n$  output hypotheses into a weighted word lattice
  - ▶ Intersect word lattice with n-gram language model
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
  - ▶ Matusov et al. (2006)
  - ▶ Japanese and Chinese into English
  - ▶ 4.8 BLEU improvement

## Related Work — Consensus Decoding

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find a *consensus* translation
- ▶ Bilingual consensus decoding  
(Frederking and Nirenburg, 1994; Bangalore et al., 2001; Jayaraman and Lavie, 2005; Rosti et al., 2007)
  - ▶ Translate source text using  $n$  different systems
  - ▶ Align the  $n$  output hypotheses into a weighted word lattice
  - ▶ Intersect word lattice with n-gram language model
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
  - ▶ Matusov et al. (2006)
  - ▶ Japanese and Chinese into English
  - ▶ 4.8 BLEU improvement



## Related Work — Hypothesis Ranking

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find the *best* translation in the set
- ▶ Bilingual language model ranking (Kaki et al., 1999; Callison-Burch and Flourney, 2001)
- ▶ Multilingual translation model ranking (Och and Ney, 2001)

- ▶ MAX

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$

Produce results reported translating up to 2 languages

- ▶ PROD

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$$

Produce results reported translating up to  $N$  languages

## Related Work — Hypothesis Ranking

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find the *best* translation in the set
- ▶ Bilingual language model ranking (Kaki et al., 1999; Callison-Burch and Flourney, 2001)
- ▶ Multilingual translation model ranking (Och and Ney, 2001)

- ▶ MAX

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$

Prognostic results reported (translating only 2 languages)

- ▶ PROD

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$$

Prognostic results reported (translating up to 8 languages)

## Related Work — Hypothesis Ranking

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find the *best* translation in the set
- ▶ Bilingual language model ranking (Kaki et al., 1999; Callison-Burch and Flourney, 2001)
- ▶ Multilingual translation model ranking (Och and Ney, 2001)

- ▶ MAX

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$

Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages

- ▶ PROD

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$$

Positive results reported combining up to 6 languages

## Related Work — Hypothesis Ranking

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find the *best* translation in the set
- ▶ Bilingual language model ranking (Kaki et al., 1999; Callison-Burch and Flourney, 2001)
- ▶ Multilingual translation model ranking (Och and Ney, 2001)

- ▶ MAX

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$

Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages

- ▶ PROD

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$$

Positive results reported combining up to 6 languages

## Related Work — Hypothesis Ranking

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find the *best* translation in the set
- ▶ Bilingual language model ranking (Kaki et al., 1999; Callison-Burch and Flourney, 2001)
- ▶ Multilingual translation model ranking (Och and Ney, 2001)
  - ▶ MAX  
 $\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$   
Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages
  - ▶ PROD  
 $\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$   
Positive results reported combining up to 6 languages

## Related Work — Hypothesis Ranking

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find the *best* translation in the set
- ▶ Bilingual language model ranking (Kaki et al., 1999; Callison-Burch and Flourney, 2001)
- ▶ Multilingual translation model ranking (Och and Ney, 2001)
  - ▶ MAX
$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$
Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages
  - ▶ PROD
$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$$
Positive results reported combining up to 6 languages

## Related Work — Hypothesis Ranking

- ▶ Given a set of translations, find the *best* translation in the set
- ▶ Bilingual language model ranking (Kaki et al., 1999; Callison-Burch and Flourney, 2001)
- ▶ Multilingual translation model ranking (Och and Ney, 2001)
  - ▶ MAX
$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$
Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages
  - ▶ PROD
$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$$
Positive results reported combining up to 6 languages

## Experiment — Hypothesis Ranking using an Oracle

- ▶ What are the maximum gains possible from hypothesis ranking?
- ▶ Oracle experiment — choose hypothesis based on WER distance to the reference.



## Experiment — Hypothesis Ranking using an Oracle

- ▶ What are the maximum gains possible from hypothesis ranking?
- ▶ Oracle experiment — choose hypothesis based on WER distance to the reference.

## Phrase-based bilingual systems

languages	BLEU	TER	METEOR
da-en	28.4	57.5	52.9
de-en	27.3	58.9	52.4
el-en	29.3	56.4	53.6
es-en	<b>32.5</b>	<b>52.8</b>	<b>56.3</b>
fi-en	24.6	62.1	50.4
fr-en	31.9	53.1	55.8
it-en	29.2	57.1	53.7
nl-en	25.7	62.7	50.4
pt-en	31.8	53.7	56.0
sv-en	<b>32.7</b>	<b>52.3</b>	<b>56.6</b>

Results of ten bilingual phrase based decoders into English. All systems were trained on Europarl v3. Test set is Europarl test05. Best results are bold.

## Oracle BLEU scores

	da	de	el	es	fi	fr	it	nl	pt	sv
da	—	3.2	<b>3.7</b>	2.4	1.9	2.6	<b>4.0</b>	2.4	2.4	1.7
de		—	2.7	2.0	1.9	2.0	3.3	2.7	2.1	1.6
el			—	2.1	1.8	2.3	<b>3.7</b>	2.6	2.5	2.5
es				—	1.2	3.1	2.4	1.7	3.1	<b>3.7</b>
fi					—	1.0	1.9	2.7	1.1	0.6
fr						—	2.4	1.6	3.5	<b>3.7</b>
it							—	2.4	2.5	2.7
nl								—	1.8	1.3
pt									—	3.5
sv										—

Absolute change in BLEU after combining two languages using oracle compared with the best BLEU of either language individually.

## Oracle BLEU scores

- ▶ Oracle improvements ranged from 0.6 to 4.0 BLEU for two languages
- ▶ Much greater gains are seen when combining more languages

languages	BLEU	TER	METEOR
oracle-all	40.8	40.5	62.5

Combining ten systems results in **8.0 BLEU** improvement over best bilingual system.

## Oracle BLEU scores

- ▶ Oracle improvements ranged from 0.6 to 4.0 BLEU for two languages
- ▶ Much greater gains are seen when combining more languages

languages	BLEU	TER	METEOR
oracle-all	40.8	40.5	62.5

Combining ten systems results in **8.0 BLEU** improvement over best bilingual system.

# Oracle All Systems

system	% selected
da-en	14.1
de-en	9.6
el-en	10.3
es-en	14.0
fi-en	4.0
fr-en	12.9
it-en	7.2
nl-en	5.5
pt-en	9.8
sv-en	12.9

Percentage of time that sentences from each system were selected in an All-English oracle WER experiment. Score for overall oracle output was 43.8 WER and 40.8 BLEU.

## Revisiting MAX in Och and Ney (2001)

MAX

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$

- ▶ Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages
- ▶ All reported combinations using MAX had positive results
- ▶ No results reported for German-English or Finnish-English
- ▶ Test sentences were short (10-14 words)

Conducted new experiment using larger Europarl corpus.

- ▶ Experiment using Europarl (10 source languages)
- ▶ Include longer sentences (average 29 words)

## Revisiting MAX in Och and Ney (2001)

MAX

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$

- ▶ Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages
- ▶ All reported combinations using MAX had positive results
- ▶ No results reported for German-English or Finnish-English
- ▶ Test sentences were short (10-14 words)

Conducted new experiment using larger Europarl corpus.

- ▶ Experiment using Europarl (10 source languages)
- ▶ Include longer sentences (average 29 words)



## Revisiting MAX in Och and Ney (2001)

MAX

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$

- ▶ Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages
- ▶ All reported combinations using MAX had positive results
- ▶ No results reported for German-English or Finnish-English
- ▶ Test sentences were short (10-14 words)

Conducted new experiment using larger Europarl corpus.

- ▶ Experiment using Europarl (10 source languages)
- ▶ Include longer sentences (average 29 words)

## Revisiting MAX in Och and Ney (2001)

MAX

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$

- ▶ Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages
- ▶ All reported combinations using MAX had positive results
- ▶ No results reported for German-English or Finnish-English
- ▶ Test sentences were short (10-14 words)

Conducted new experiment using larger Europarl corpus.

- ▶ Experiment using Europarl (10 source languages)
- ▶ Include longer sentences (average 29 words)

## Revisiting MAX in Och and Ney (2001)

MAX

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \max_n p(f_n|e)\}$$

- ▶ Positive results reported combining up to 3 languages
- ▶ All reported combinations using MAX had positive results
- ▶ No results reported for German-English or Finnish-English
- ▶ Test sentences were short (10-14 words)

Conducted new experiment using larger Europarl corpus.

- ▶ Experiment using Europarl (10 source languages)
- ▶ Include longer sentences (average 29 words)

## Experiment — MAX

	da	de	el	es	fi	fr	it	nl	pt	sv
da	—	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.1</b>	-0.8	-1.3	-1.3	<b>0.3</b>	-1.4	-0.7	-1.6
de		—	-0.2	-0.6	-0.8	-2.0	-0.1	-0.8	-0.8	-1.1
el			—	-0.2	-1.8	-1.0	<b>0.6</b>	-1.9	-0.3	-0.5
es				—	-1.5	<b>0.5</b>	-0.9	-2.6	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>
fi					—	-2.9	-1.3	-0.3	-1.9	-2.3
fr						—	-1.6	-3.7	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.2</b>
it							—	-1.5	-1.0	-1.0
nl								—	-2.4	-2.9
pt									—	-0.1
sv										—

Absolute change in BLEU after combining two languages using MAX ranking method compared with the best BLEU of either language individually. Only 20% of MAX pairwise combinations led to an improvement in BLEU.

# Revisiting PROD in Och and Ney (2001)

PROD

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$$

- ▶ Positive results reported combining up to 6 languages
- ▶ All but 2 reported combinations using PROD had positive results
- ▶ No results reported for German-English or Finnish-English
- ▶ Test sentences were short (10-14 words)

Attempted new experiment using larger Europarl corpus.

# Revisiting PROD in Och and Ney (2001)

PROD

$$\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$$

- ▶ Positive results reported combining up to 6 languages
- ▶ All but 2 reported combinations using PROD had positive results
- ▶ No results reported for German-English or Finnish-English
- ▶ Test sentences were short (10-14 words)

Attempted new experiment using larger Europarl corpus.

# Constraint Decoding

PROD requires each system to calculate a translation model probability for the output hypotheses of every system.

- ▶  $n$  systems each produce one target hypothesis
- ▶  $\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$
- ▶ Each system must calculate  $p(f_n|e)$  for all  $n$  target hypotheses.

	da-en	de-en	es-en	fr-en
% reachable	10.5	9.8	11.5	10.6

Percentage of sentences reachable by the Swedish-English system when constrained by the output of the listed systems.

# Constraint Decoding

PROD requires each system to calculate a translation model probability for the output hypotheses of every system.

- ▶  $n$  systems each produce one target hypothesis
- ▶  $\hat{e} = \arg \max_e \{p(e) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^N p(f_n|e)\}$
- ▶ Each system must calculate  $p(f_n|e)$  for all  $n$  target hypotheses.

	da-en	de-en	es-en	fr-en
% reachable	10.5	9.8	11.5	10.6

Percentage of sentences reachable by the Swedish-English system when constrained by the output of the listed systems.



# Conclusions

- ▶ Hypothesis ranking has the potential to produce large improvements in translation quality
- ▶ MAX does not consistently produce positive results
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ New results show only 20% of MAX pairwise combinations led to an improvement in BLEU.
- ▶ Unable to replicate PROD
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ Vast majority of hypothesis unreachable during constraint decoding

# Conclusions

- ▶ Hypothesis ranking has the potential to produce large improvements in translation quality
- ▶ MAX does not consistently produce positive results
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ New results show only 20% of MAX pairwise combinations led to an improvement in BLEU.
- ▶ Unable to replicate PROD
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ Vast majority of hypothesis unreachable during constraint decoding

# Conclusions

- ▶ Hypothesis ranking has the potential to produce large improvements in translation quality
- ▶ MAX does not consistently produce positive results
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ New results show only 20% of MAX pairwise combinations led to an improvement in BLEU.
- ▶ Unable to replicate PROD
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ Vast majority of hypothesis unreachable during constraint decoding

# Conclusions

- ▶ Hypothesis ranking has the potential to produce large improvements in translation quality
- ▶ MAX does not consistently produce positive results
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ New results show only 20% of MAX pairwise combinations led to an improvement in BLEU.
- ▶ Unable to replicate PROD
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ Vast majority of hypothesis unreachable during constraint decoding

## Conclusions

- ▶ Hypothesis ranking has the potential to produce large improvements in translation quality
- ▶ MAX does not consistently produce positive results
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ New results show only 20% of MAX pairwise combinations led to an improvement in BLEU.
- ▶ Unable to replicate PROD
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ Vast majority of hypothesis unreachable during constraint decoding

# Conclusions

- ▶ Hypothesis ranking has the potential to produce large improvements in translation quality
- ▶ MAX does not consistently produce positive results
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ New results show only 20% of MAX pairwise combinations led to an improvement in BLEU.
- ▶ Unable to replicate PROD
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ Vast majority of hypothesis unreachable during constraint decoding

# Conclusions

- ▶ Hypothesis ranking has the potential to produce large improvements in translation quality
- ▶ MAX does not consistently produce positive results
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ New results show only 20% of MAX pairwise combinations led to an improvement in BLEU.
- ▶ Unable to replicate PROD
  - ▶ Och and Ney (2001) reported consistent positive results for up to 3 source languages
  - ▶ Vast majority of hypothesis unreachable during constraint decoding

## Future Work

- ▶ Approximate translation model probabilities for PROD
- ▶ Incorporate system weighting
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
- ▶ Multilingual lattice inputs
- ▶ Multi-synchronous decoding algorithms



## Future Work

- ▶ Approximate translation model probabilities for PROD
- ▶ Incorporate system weighting
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
- ▶ Multilingual lattice inputs
- ▶ Multi-synchronous decoding algorithms

## Future Work

- ▶ Approximate translation model probabilities for PROD
- ▶ Incorporate system weighting
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
- ▶ Multilingual lattice inputs
- ▶ Multi-synchronous decoding algorithms

## Future Work

- ▶ Approximate translation model probabilities for PROD
- ▶ Incorporate system weighting
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
- ▶ Multilingual lattice inputs
- ▶ Multi-synchronous decoding algorithms

## Future Work

- ▶ Approximate translation model probabilities for PROD
- ▶ Incorporate system weighting
- ▶ Multilingual consensus decoding
- ▶ Multilingual lattice inputs
- ▶ Multi-synchronous decoding algorithms

Thank you!

Thank you!

Mahalo!