A Hierarchical Phrase-Based Model for Statistical Machine Translation

David Chiang University of Maryland Institute for Advanced Computer Studies

In a nutshell

- Hiero: a new statistical translation model
- Significantly improves on the phrase-based model it generalizes (Pharaoh: Koehn et al)
- Synchronous context-free grammar allows more complex structural mappings
- Learnable without syntactic information

Example



Human translation:

Australia is one of the few countries that have diplomatic relations with North Korea.

Phrase-based translation



Phrase-based translation

- Phrase-based systems learn reorderings within phrases well
- Reordering of phrases, not so well: classically, no lexical sensitivity
- Why not use phrases to reorder phrases?

Hierarchical phrases



Hierarchical phrases



Hierarchical phrases



A new approach

- Formalize as productions of a synchronous CFG (aka syntax-directed translation schema, inversion transduction grammar)
- Learned without syntactic information (like Wu, Alshawi et al; unlike Yamada and Knight)
- Heavily lexicalized, as in phrase-based models

Synchronous CFG



 $(X \rightarrow 与 X_1 有 X_2, X \rightarrow have X_2 with X_1)$



$$X \rightarrow$$
北 韩, $X \rightarrow$ North Korea)



 $(X \rightarrow 邦 \overline{X}, X \rightarrow diplomatic relations)$

Grammar extraction





Glue rules

• Plus "glue" rules:

$$(S \rightarrow S_1 X_2, S \rightarrow S_1 X_2)$$
$$(S \rightarrow X_1, S \rightarrow X_1)$$

Acts as fallback like phrase-based systems



Assumptions

- Per-sentence uniform distribution on initial phrases; per-phrase, on final rules
- Length limit on initial phrases (≤7–15) and final rules (≤5 term+nonterm)
- Limit to two nonterminals
- etc.

Probability model

Combine multiple features into a log-linear model (Och and Ney, 2002)

- $P(D) \propto \prod_{r \in D} \prod_{i} V_i(r)^{\lambda_i(r)}$

Weights λ_i learned by maximum-BLEU training (Och 2003; Koehn implementation)

Model features

Phrase translation:

 $p(X \rightarrow X_{1} \not{Z} - | X \rightarrow \text{one of } X_{1})$ $p(X \rightarrow \text{one of } X_{1} | X \rightarrow X_{1} \not{Z} -)$ • Lexical weighting (Koehn): $\frac{1}{2}[p(\not{Z} - | \text{one}) + p(\not{Z} - | \text{of})]$ $p(\text{one} | \not{Z} -) \times p(\text{of} | \not{Z} -)$

Rule scoring

- Problem: rules not actually observed
- Stipulate:
 - All the initial phrases extracted from a sentence get equal weight (Och)
 - All the rules extracted from an initial phrase get equal weight
- Then relative-frequency estimation

More model features

- But glue rule $S \rightarrow SX$ has dedicated feature
- Trigram language model:
 p(Australia | <S>) × p(is | <S> Australia) …
- Number of English words
- Number of non-glue rules

Decoding

0澳洲1是2与3北4韩5有6邦交7的8少数9国家10之一11

- Parse Chinese side using CKY-like algorithm
- Thought of as deductive inference:

[X,3,5] [X,6,7] [X,2,7] because X → 与 X 有 X

Integrating the LM

0澳洲1是2与3北4韩5有6邦交7的8少数9国家10之一11

 Store English translations in hypotheses to calculate *n*-gram probabilities online:

[X,3,5,North Korea] [X,6,7,diplomatic relations]

[X,2,7,have diplomatic...North Korea]

• Elide all but outermost n-1 English words

Optimizations

- Prune search space to improve efficiency
 - For all (X, i, j), throw out hypotheses with score β worse than the best, or not in the top b
 - Extra optimization to reduce blowup due to language model
- Limit hierarchical phrase length (≤10 or 15)

Experiment: setup

- Training: FBIS (about 7M+9M words, Chinese-English newswire)
- Language model: 200M words English
- Max-BLEU training: MT Eval 2002
- Test: MT Eval 2003 (also newswire)
- Baseline: Pharaoh (Koehn et al), 2004 version, same training and features

Experiment: results

 MT Eval 2003 Chinese-English, caseinsensitive BLEU-4:

Pharaoh-200426.76Hiero28.77

• 7.5% relative improvement, statistically significant (bootstrapping)

Discussion

- Try adding a constituent-reward feature: without 28.77
 with 28.81
- Insignificant improvement
- Gets healthy weight, same as phrase penalty
- Bracket precision: 47% without, 76% with

Discussion

- Glue rule gets higher weight than any other rule
- Types of phrases used:

Glue	16%
Hierarchical	49%
Ordinary	35%

Conclusions

- Hiero's structural mappings result in better performance than many phrase-based systems
- Learned from parallel text without syntactic information
- Future work: improve efficiency, induction of syntactic information