

Context-aware Decoder for Neural Machine Translation using a Target-side Document-Level Language Model

Amane Sugiyama

Naoki Yoshinaga

Institute of Industrial Science,
the University of Tokyo

{sugi, ynaga}@tkl.iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

Although many context-aware neural machine translation models have been proposed to incorporate contexts in translation, most of those models are trained end-to-end on parallel documents aligned in sentence-level. Because only a few domains (and language pairs) have such document-level parallel data, we cannot perform accurate context-aware translation in most domains. We therefore present a simple method to turn a sentence-level translation model into a context-aware model by incorporating a document-level language model into the decoder. Our context-aware decoder is built upon only a sentence-level parallel corpora and monolingual corpora; thus no document-level parallel data is needed. In a theoretical viewpoint, the core part of this work is the novel representation of contextual information using point-wise mutual information between context and the current sentence. We show the effectiveness of our approach in three language pairs, English to French, English to Russian, and Japanese to English, by evaluation in BLEU and contrastive tests for context-aware translation.

1 Introduction

Neural machine translation (NMT) has been explored typically in sentence-level translation settings. Such sentence-level NMT models inevitably suffer from ambiguities when multiple interpretations are possible to a source sentence.

To address this issue, context-aware NMT models have recently been presented to incorporate document-level information in translation (Jean et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017; Tiedemann and Scherrer, 2017; Maruf and Haffari, 2018; Voita et al., 2018; Bawden et al., 2018; Miculicich et al., 2018; Maruf et al., 2019; Voita et al., 2019b). Most of the existing context-aware NMT models are end-to-end models which take as input the current

source sentence to be translated and the context sentences, and then output a translation. These models are trained on document-level parallel data, namely, sentence pairs with surrounding, usually preceding, sentences in the source and target language. However, in practical scenarios, document-level bilingual data is limited in most language pairs and domains, posing a challenge to building context-aware NMT systems (§ 5).

In this study, we propose a simple yet effective approach to context-aware NMT using two primitive components, a sentence-level NMT model and a document-level language model (LM). This approach allows us to independently train the two components on bilingual data and monolingual data, respectively, without resorting to expensive document-level bilingual data.

To give a probabilistic foundation to this combination of two independent models, we exploit the probabilistic nature of NMT decoding. When generating a sequence, a left-to-right decoder outputs a categorical probability distribution over the vocabulary at every time step. The decoder assigns higher probability to the tokens that would be more suitable at that step. Therefore, when multiple valid translations are possible to the source sentence, the decoder just gives a higher probability to the translation that is plausible without considering contexts. Our idea is to adjust the probability distributions in a context-aware manner using a document-level LM of the target language which models inter-sentential dependencies in the target side document.

We evaluate our methods on English to French, Russian and Japanese translations with OpenSubtitles2018 corpus (Lison et al., 2018) in terms of the BLEU scores (Papineni et al., 2002) and contrastive discourse test sets (Bawden et al., 2018; Voita et al., 2019b; Sugiyama and Yoshinaga, 2019). Experimental results confirmed that our method achieved comparable performance with existing

context-aware NMT models.

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We established **context-aware NMT without the need for document-level parallel data**; we can build context-aware NMT models from the state-of-the-art sentence-level NMT models in various language pairs and domains.
- A comparison between our approach and shallow fusion (Garcia et al., 2017) reveals that **our approach generalizes shallow fusion** while adding a probabilistic foundation.

2 Context-aware Decoding using Document-level Language Model

In this section, assuming a sentence-level encoder-decoder model (Bahdanau et al., 2015; Vaswani et al., 2017), we first derive *context-aware score* (C-SCORE for short), a context-aware objective function of outputs to be maximised in decoding. We next describe how to compute the C-SCORE using the decoder with a document-level language model (D-LM) (§ 2.1). We then detail how to perform context-aware decoding based on C-SCORE (§ 2.2).

2.1 C-SCORE: objective function for context-aware NMT decoding

Let us consider to find a translation \mathbf{y} of a source sentence \mathbf{x} in a document. The target-side context sentence(s) preceding \mathbf{y} , $\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}$, given by the past translations. We formulate context-aware translation conditioned on $\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}$ as the maximisation of the conditional probability $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{y}} &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}) \\ &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \log \frac{p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})}{p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}|\mathbf{x})} \\ &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \log p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Assuming that \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are semantically similar, we make the following approximation,

$$p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \approx p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}|\mathbf{y}). \quad (2)$$

From Eq. 1 and Eq. 2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{y}} &\approx \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \log p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}|\mathbf{y})p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \log \frac{p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}, \mathbf{y})}{p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})})p(\mathbf{y})} p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \text{C-SCORE}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{C-SCORE}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}) = \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) + \text{PMI}(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}, \mathbf{y}) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{PMI}(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}, \mathbf{y}) = \log \frac{p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}, \mathbf{y})}{p(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})})p(\mathbf{y})} = \log \frac{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})})}{p(\mathbf{y})} \quad (4)$$

$\text{PMI}(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}, \mathbf{y})$ is the point-wise mutual information of $\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}$ and \mathbf{y} which represents the degree of co-occurrence of \mathbf{y} and $\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}$. Given \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{y} and $\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}$, we can evaluate the C-SCORE by computing the two terms in Eq. 3 using a sentence-level NMT (S-NMT) and a document-level LM (D-LM), respectively.

Notations We first introduce some to explain computation in Eq. 3 and Eq. 4 using (auto-regressive) neural sequence generation models in NMT and LM. For sequence \mathbf{s} ($|\mathbf{s}| \geq 0$) and token w , a neural sequence generation model parameterized by θ can compute the log probability that w follows \mathbf{s} , which we denote by $\log p_{\theta}(w|\mathbf{s})$:

$$\log p_{\theta}(w \text{ follows } \mathbf{s}) = \log \frac{p_{\theta}(\mathbf{s} \cdot w)}{p_{\theta}(\mathbf{s})} = \log p_{\theta}(w|\mathbf{s})$$

where “ \cdot ” denotes sequence concatenation. Applying this auto-regressively, for any sequence $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$ ($|\mathbf{s}^{(1)}| \geq 0$) and $\mathbf{s}^{(2)}$ ($|\mathbf{s}^{(2)}| \geq 1$), the probability that $\mathbf{s}^{(2)}$ follows $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$ is thereby computed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{s}^{(1)} \text{ follows } \mathbf{s}^{(2)}) \\ = \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{s}^{(1)}|\mathbf{s}^{(2)}) = \sum_{t=1}^{|\mathbf{s}^{(2)}|} \log p_{\theta}(s_t^{(2)}|\mathbf{s}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{<t}^{(2)}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{s}_{<t}^{(2)} = [s_1, \dots, s_{t-1}]$.

$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ computed by sentence-level NMT Computing $\log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ using an S-NMT is straightforward. Suppose \mathbf{y} a sequence of raw tokens $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, \dots, y_T]$. Then $\log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ is computed by

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \log p_{\text{S-NMT}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}; \mathbf{x}) \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = [y_1, \dots, y_T, </s>]$ and $</s>$ is a special token to indicate the end of sentence.

PMI computed by document-level LM To compute the components of $\text{PMI}(\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})}, \mathbf{y})$, $p(\mathbf{y})$ and $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}^{(\mathbf{y})})$, we use a document-level language model (D-LM) which can handle a long text span containing multiple sentences.

Our D-LM explicitly models sentence boundaries. We generate training examples for D-LM from a document as follow. We first insert the special token $\langle /s \rangle$ into every sentence boundary including the start and end of the document. By this preprocessing, all the sentences start right after $\langle /s \rangle$ and end right before $\langle /s \rangle$. We then randomly choose a text span of length W from the document, where the start and end of the span do not have to match sentence boundaries, and the resulting sequence is fed to the D-LM for training. Note that $\langle /s \rangle$ for D-LM indicates sentence boundaries, in other words, both start and end of sequence.

Using D-LM, $p(\mathbf{y})$ is computed by

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}) = \log p_{\text{D-LM}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}|\langle /s \rangle). \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = [y_1, \dots, y_T, \langle /s \rangle]$.

To compute $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}^{(y)})$, we first obtain the context sequence $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^{(y)}$ by concatenating all the sentences in $\mathbf{c}^{(y)}$ with $\langle /s \rangle$ inserted at every sentence boundary. We then compute the conditional probability $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}^{(y)})$ by

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}^{(y)}) = p_{\text{D-LM}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}|\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^{(y)}) \quad (8)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = [y_1, \dots, y_T, \langle /s \rangle]$.

Let us explain why we use the boundary-aware D-LM, whereas boundary-agnostic D-LM, which do not use a marker ($\langle /s \rangle$ to explicitly tell sentence boundaries, are more common.¹ Firstly, boundary-agnostic LMs cannot compute the probability that a sentence is closed with a certain length, namely, Eq. 7 cannot be computed. Secondly, they also cannot compute $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}^{(y)})$ correctly. For example, suppose the context $\mathbf{c}^{(y)}$ is “he’s my friend” (with the punctuation “.” omitted), and the current target sentence \mathbf{y} is “he’s nice.” In this case, Eq. 8 is computed by

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}^{(y)}) = p_{\text{D-LM}}([\text{he,'s,nice}][\text{he,'s,my,friend}]).$$

However, this estimation of $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}^{(y)})$ may be much less than the actual $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}^{(y)})$ because Eq. 8 inevitably gives significant probabilities to other \mathbf{y} such as “s father” as well since “He’s my friend’s father” is fluent as a sequence. This behavior is not what we expect since “s father” is not a complete sentence, thus unsuitable for \mathbf{y} .²

¹LMs may be implicitly aware of sentence boundaries based on punctuations such as “.” and “?”. However, since punctuation can be omitted in some domains (e.g., subtitles), we cannot rely on it to let the LM know sentence boundaries.

²Precisely speaking, we assume \mathbf{y} to be a realization of a random variable Y which is a sentence sampled from the space of an infinitely large document.

2.2 Searching for the optimal solution

Searching for the optimal output \mathbf{y} that maximises the C-SCORE is not trivial since there are $\mathcal{O}(V^T)$ candidate sequences where V is the vocabulary size and T is the maximum length of sequences to be searched. We investigate two approaches to obtain approximate solutions: reranking (§ 2.2.1) and context-aware beam search (§ 2.2.2).

2.2.1 Reranking with C-SCORE

We first generate B hypotheses of the translation $\mathcal{H}_B = \{\mathbf{y}^1, \dots, \mathbf{y}^B\}$ with beam search of beam size B using the sentence-level NMT. We then choose the one which maximises the C-SCORE.

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{H}_B} \text{C-SCORE}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}^{(y)}) \quad (9)$$

A potential issue of this approach is low diversity in the hypotheses. It is known that hypotheses obtained by beam search tend to share tokens in their front part, namely, the variation is unevenly concentrated on the tail. Moreover, plausible variations can be pushed out of the hypotheses by trivial variations such as whether to put a comma. Therefore, ambiguity to be disambiguated using contextual information may be pruned in beam search.

2.2.2 Context-aware beam search

Context-aware beam search (C-AWARE beam) is beam search that is extended to work with C-SCORE. C-SCORE (Eq. 3) can be decomposed into token-wise C-SCORES (Eq. 5 through Eq. 8).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{C-SCORE}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}^{(y)}) &= \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) + \text{PMI}(\mathbf{c}^{(y)}, \mathbf{y}) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \text{C-SCORE}_w(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t}) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{C-SCORE}_w(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t}) &= \log p_{\text{S-NMT}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t}; \mathbf{x}) \\ &+ \log \frac{p_{\text{D-LM}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t|\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^{(y)}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t}}{p_{\text{D-LM}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t|\langle /s \rangle) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t}} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

By this decomposition, C-SCORE_w is conditioned by the partial sequence generated by time step t . We can thereby apply beam search to generate sequences in an auto-regressive manner.

The first term of Eq. 11 represents translation probability for the t -th token. The second term can be interpreted as PMI between the t -th token and

the context, that is, how consistent the t -th token is with the context. Compared to the reranking approach, C-AWARE beam can be considered to maximise the C-SCORE more directly in the sense that disambiguation and token selection based on the context is performed at every step in beam search. Thus we expect C-AWARE beam to alleviate the low diversity problem of reranking.

2.2.3 Smoothing probabilities for PMI

In our experiments, we observe that the original C-AWARE beam significantly improves contrastive tests but deteriorates BLEU at the same time. By analyzing contextual PMI correlation between source and target texts, we find the PMI term in the C-SCORE sometimes takes an excessively large value against the translation probability term, which destroys the C-SCORE. This is understood intuitively by the fact that the calculation of PMI includes subtraction of log probability, and log probability may take a very small negative value to represent a probability close to zero. To alleviate this problem, we investigated some methods including probability smoothing and restriction of the vocabulary set on which LM gives probabilities.

We explore two smoothing methods which we found simple but effective. These smoothing techniques are applied to both the numerator and denominator LM outputs of Eq.11. Hereafter, we use the notation of $p_{y=w} \in \{p(y=w), p(y=w|\mathbf{c})\}$ where $w \in V$ and $\sum_w p_{y=w} = 1$.

Add- α smoothing is inspired by the count smoothing with the same name, and replaces $p_{y=w}$ by

$$\bar{p}_{y=w} = \frac{p_{y=w} + \frac{\alpha}{|V|}}{\alpha + 1} \quad (12)$$

where α is a hyper-parameter to be tuned to maximise the translation performance on a development set. Smaller probabilities take larger scaling ($\bar{p}_{y=w}/p_{y=w}$). $\alpha = 0$ is equivalent to no smoothing and $\alpha = \infty$ is equivalent to setting all the token probabilities to $\frac{1}{|V|}$.

Temperature scaling (Guo et al., 2017)³ replaces $p_{y=w}$ by

$$\bar{p}_{y=w} = \frac{p_{y=w}^T}{\sum_{w'} p_{y=w'}^T} \quad (13)$$

where T is a hyper-parameter. $T = 1$ is equivalent to no smoothing. Basically, we choose T from $(0, 1)$ to flatten the probability distribution.

³Although Eq. 13 is different from the original, the scaling mechanism is identical if we replace T by $\frac{1}{T}$.

2.2.4 On the relation to shallow fusion

Shallow fusion (Gulcehre et al., 2015) is a method to integrate probability distribution outputs obtained by NMT and a language model at sentence level (LM) to form a new translation objective that is expected to promote fluency of translations. The original shallow fusion score is computed using a sentence-level language model. The token-wise formula of the computation is

$$\log p(y_t) = \log p_{S\text{-NMT}}(y_t; \mathbf{x}) + \beta \log p_{S\text{-LM}}(y_t),$$

where β is a hyper-parameter. In our notation with the document-level LM, this is written by

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(y_t) &= \log p_{S\text{-NMT}}(\tilde{y}_t | \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t}; \mathbf{x}) \\ &\quad + \beta \log p_{S\text{-LM}}(\tilde{y}_t | \langle /s \rangle \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t}). \end{aligned}$$

A natural extension of this objective to the context-aware scenario should be

$$\begin{aligned} p(y_t | \mathbf{c}^{(y)}) &= \log p_{\text{NMT}}(\tilde{y}_t | \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t}; \mathbf{x}) \\ &\quad + \beta \log p_{\text{D-LM}}(\tilde{y}_t | \tilde{\mathbf{c}}^{(y)} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t}), \end{aligned}$$

where context $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^{(y)}$ is integrated into the condition. We call this the *conditional document-level shallow fusion*. Obviously, this is what we obtain from Eq. 11 by ignoring the discount of the unconditional LM probability $p_{\text{D-LM}}(\tilde{y}_t | \langle /s \rangle \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{<t})$.

An important difference made by the absence of discounting with the unconditional LM is that the conditional document-level shallow fusion would prefer tokens which frequently occur regardless of the context. It is also worth noting that, when the context is empty, our C-SCORE falls back to sentence-level NMT, whereas conditional document-level shallow fusion becomes equivalent to the original sentence-level shallow fusion.

3 Experimental Setup

We evaluate the proposed approaches on three language pairs: English to French (En-Fr) and Russian (En-Ru) and Japanese to English (Ja-En), in terms of BLEU scores (Papineni et al., 2002) and contrastive tests (Bawden et al., 2018; Voita et al., 2019b; Sugiyama and Yoshinaga, 2019).

3.1 Datasets and preprocessing

We use the OpenSubtitles2018 corpus (Lison et al., 2018) for parallel and monolingual corpora. Following the criteria for document segmentation and filtering on sentence pairs presented by (Voita et al.,

	French	Russian	English
train	106M, 8.61	44.8M, 8.00	440M, 8.24
dev	41.7k, 8.16	33.2k, 8.27	49.8k, 8.49

Table 1: Statistics of the monolingual corpora (# of sentences, # of tokens per sentence).

	En-Fr	En-Ru	Ja-En
train	17.6M, 10.5, 10.7	12.5M, 10.2, 9.6	742k, 8.92, 10.0
dev	1665, 11.8, 12.3	4407, 12.3, 11.8	2834, 11.9, 11.8
test	4166, 12.6, 12.7	4439, 11.7, 11.1	2820, 11.3, 11.4

Table 2: Statistics of the monolingual corpora (# of sentences, # of tokens per source and target sentence).

2019b), we build monolingual corpora and parallel corpora as follows. To build monolingual corpora, we add document boundary information into them such that each document consists of contiguous subtitle sentences from the same movie and timestamp difference of any two adjacent sentences in the same document is no more than 7 seconds. To build parallel corpora, we pick sentence pairs with a relative time overlap of subtitle frames between source and target languages being at least 0.9 to reduce alignment errors. For the training of 2-to-2 models (context-aware end-to-end NMT models described in § 3.2), document boundary information is added to the parallel corpora using the source-side timestamps as with the monolingual corpora. Prior to building the Russian corpora, we remove the movies from which the En-Ru contrastive test sets (described in § 3.4) were made.

We perform punctuation normalization, tokenization, and truecasing on English, French, and Russian text using Moses toolkit v4.0.⁴ We tokenize Japanese text using MeCab (v0.996)⁵ with ipadic (v2.7.0) dictionary. We then encode the texts of all the languages into subwords using SentencePiece (v0.1.81)⁶ with unigram language model. The subword vocabularies are of 16000 tokens and separately trained for each language. Statistics of the resulting corpora is listed in Table 1 and Table 2.

3.2 NMT models

As baselines, we trained existing sentence-level NMT and context-aware NMT models for each language pair. The sentence-level models (hereafter, 1-to-1) are also used for computing C-SCORE in our

⁴<http://www.statmt.org/ Moses/>

⁵<https://taku910.github.io/mecab/>

⁶<https://github.com/google/sentencepiece>

method. For baseline context-aware NMT model, We adopt an end-to-end model called 2-to-2 (Tiedemann and Scherrer, 2017; Bawden et al., 2018), which inputs the concatenation of context and the source sentence that follows the context to a sentence-level NMT. Despite of its simplicity, 2-to-2 is known to be a strong context-aware baseline.

The NMT model architecture is all *Transforemr base* (Vaswani et al., 2017) with relative position representation (Shaw et al., 2018). 2-to-2 models are trained with up to three preceding sentences of both source and target as context concatenated to the current sentence. We allowed empty context in training 2-to-2. For both 1-to-1 and 2-to-2 models, training sentence pairs are batched together by approximate sequence length, such that each training batch contains approximately 16000 source tokens.

3.3 Document-level Language models

The architecture of the document-level language models is the decoder part of Transformer with relative position representation. The number of decoder blocks is 12. The dimensionality of embeddings and attention is 768 with 12 attention heads, and the inner layer of the feed-forward networks has dimensionality of 3072.

As described in § 2.1, when training the language models, a special control symbol $\langle /s \rangle$ is inserted at every sentence boundary. Each training mini-batch contains text spans each of which is a sequence of tokens randomly sampled from the same document and the maximum span length is $W = 512$. Text spans are batched such that about 32000 tokens are in a training batch.

3.4 Evaluation methods

We adopt contrastive tests (Bawden et al., 2018; Voita et al., 2019b; Sugiyama and Yoshinaga, 2019) for context-aware NMT to evaluate the model’s ability to capture contextual information in translation, in addition to the evaluation by BLEU scores (Papineni et al., 2002). A contrastive test set consists of contrastive questions for context-aware NMT models to answer. Each question has a source sentence \mathbf{x} , a source context $\mathbf{c}^{(x)}$, a target context $\mathbf{c}^{(y)}$, and translation candidates $\mathcal{Y} = \{y^1, \dots, y^M\}$. Models must answer a candidate $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ which would be the most appropriate translation of \mathbf{x} , i.e.

$$\hat{y} = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p(y | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}^{(x)}, \mathbf{c}^{(y)})$$

The En-Fr, En-Ru, and En-Ja test sets consist of 400, 6000, and 100 questions, respectively.

	En→Fr		En→Ru				En→Ja	
	coref.	coherence /cohesion	deixis	lex.c	ell.infl	ell.vp	zero pronoun	
1-to-1	50	50	50	45.8	53.2	26.2	50	
2-to-2	85	64	88.6	74.6	81.4	81.4	80	
C-SCORE	add- α	80	65.5	81.1	89.2	75.6	64.6	84
	T -scaling	83	69.5	85.8	94.2	84.2	74.4	84
Conditional Shallow Fusion		52.5	52	54.7	55.3	53.4	32.4	58
D-LM only	PMI($c^{(y)}, y$)	91.5	92	96.4	97.0	61.2	90.2	94
	$p(y c^{(y)})$	90	83.5	91.2	96.3	80.8	86.2	93

Table 3: Scores for En→Fr, En→Ru, and En→Ja contrastive tests.

3.5 Hyper-parameters

We tune hyper-parameters α , T (§ 2.2.3), and β (§ 2.2.4) based on BLEU score on the development set in the evaluation with BLEU, while we tune these hyper-parameters on the scores of contrastive tests in the evaluation of contrastive tests under the constraint that it does not deteriorate BLEU compared to the baseline sentence-level decoder.

We tune α and T for each language pair and model (reranking and C-AWARE beam), and tune β for each language pair and model (conditional and unconditional shallow fusion). α is tuned in range (0, 1000], and T and β are tuned in range (0, 1).

For beam search of 1-to-1, 2-to-2, C-AWARE beam, and shallow fusion, we use a beam size of 5. For beam search in the reranking, we use a beam size of 10. We confirmed on the development that 1-to-1 and 2-to-2 models with beam size of 5 perform better than or at least comparable to models with beam size of 10. We use three previous sentences as context for the context-aware models (2-to-2, C-AWARE beam, and conditional shallow fusion).

4 Results and Analysis

4.1 Contrastive tests

Table 3 lists evaluation results of the En-Fr, En-Ru, and Ja-En contrastive tests. En-Fr contrastive test comprises three test sets: two for translation of English anaphoric pronouns (denoted by *coref.*) and one for lexical cohesion in the target-side (denoted by *coherence/cohesion*). En-Ru contrastive test include four test sets: *deixis* is for person deixis, *lex.c* is for lexical cohesion, *ell.infl* is for inflection of Russian nouns caused by ellipsis in the source sentence, and *ell.vp* is for verb ellipsis in English text which is not allowed in Russian. The Ja-En test set is for translation of zero pronoun in Japanese. Although the contrastive test is targeted at context-

		En→Fr	En→Ru	En→Ja
1-to-1		39.26	34.39	21.60
2-to-2		39.29	34.09	20.31
Reranking	base	38.86	33.87	22.11
	add- α	39.54	34.97	22.36
	T -scaling	39.58	35.01	22.62
C-AWARE beam	base	37.50	32.15	20.41
	add- α	39.74	34.62	21.98
	T -scaling	39.56	35.26	22.23
Shallow Fusion (conditional)		39.39	34.87	21.71
(unconditional)		39.38	34.51	21.39

Table 4: BLEU scores for En→Fr, En→Ru, and En→Ja.

aware NMT models, it is possible to answer the contrastive questions by $\arg \max_y \text{PMI}(c^{(y)}, y)$ or $\arg \max_y p(y|c^{(y)})$. Scores obtained by these two objectives are also reported in the table.

The D-LM *only* objectives achieve higher scores than C-SCORE, except for the En-Ru *ell.infl*, although the C-SCORE has the advantage of the information about x given. This may be due to the difference of the distribution of the sentences in the monolingual corpora and the target-side of the parallel corpora. C-SCORE with T -scaling shows comparable performance with 2-to-2 as a whole.

4.2 Performance in BLEU

Table 4 shows the results in BLEU.⁷ Without smoothing, our reranking with context-aware scores is comparable to baseline 1-to-1 and 2-to-2 decoders, while C-AWARE beam degrades BLEU scores. We later analyse the reason in detail in § 4.3. Both add- α and T -scaling smoothing are effective for recovering the performance and fur-

⁷The hyper-parameter values for α and T in reranking, α and T in C-AWARE beam, and β in conditional/unconditional shallow fusion are $\{100, 0.1, 150, 0.1, 0.01, 0.01\}$ for En→Fr, $\{1000, 0.2, 250, 0.3, 0.1, 0.01\}$ for En→Ru, $\{100, 0.4, 100, 0.4, 0.1, 0.06\}$ for En→Ja, respectively.




Figure 1: BLEU and the average score of En→Fr contrastive test while varying hyperparameter values.




Figure 2: Source-target correlation of contextual PMI (a, b) and conditional probability (c, d), calculated based on the correct context (a, c) and wrong context that is randomly chosen from the dataset (b, d). The dataset is a subset of the training data from the En-Fr parallel corpus. Plots are for 4166 sentence pairs in the dataset.

ther improve BLEU by 1.02 over 1-to-1. C-AWARE beam and reranking with smoothing also outperform shallow fusion in the majority of cases.

Figure 1 depicts the trade-off of BLEU scores and average scores of contrastive tests for En→Fr translation with C-AWARE beam. This is a natural consequence of C-SCORE that captures a valid translation in the two independent perspectives. We will design context-aware BLUE in the future.

4.3 PMI correlation analysis

We have demonstrated in § 4.1 the effectiveness of PMI as a measure of a valid translation given context using contrastive tests. To gain a deeper insight into how well PMI conveys semantic connection of the current sentence and its context, we investigate the correlation of PMI between source and target and provide some analysis and visualization.

PMI correlation between source and target

The main results we show in this section is that PMI of the source and target correlate well. This is important because this supports that PMI is a language-independent measure of the connection between the current sentence and its context.

We have discussed only target-side $\text{PMI}(c^{(y)}, y)$ defined by Eq. 4. It is also possible to compute the source-side $\text{PMI}(c^{(x)}, x)$ in the same way. Given a

document-level parallel corpus, we measure a correlation between $\text{PMI}(c^{(x)}, x)$ and $\text{PMI}(c^{(y)}, y)$ for each sentence pair (x, y) in the corpus.

Figure 2a shows the PMI correlation for 4166 En-Fr sentence pairs taken from the training data. The pairs of PMI values are computed using English and French language models trained on the training data. We observe a clear correlation between source and target, which agrees with the intuition that if the target sentence matches well in the context, so does the source sentence. What is also obvious in Figure 2a is that most of the points lay in the first quadrant where both the source and target contextual PMI is greater than 0, which is explained by the simple intuition that most sentences should have positive cooccurrence relation with their contexts. These nature is lost when compute the contextual PMI using a wrong context \tilde{c} randomly chosen in the dataset as shown in Figure 2b.

The effectiveness of PMI as a measure of the valid translation of the current sentence given context is further emphasized when compared to the conditional probability $p(y|c^{(y)})$, which could be an alternative measure of how suitable y is in the context as described in § 2.2.4. Figure 2c and 2d are the conditional probability version of Figure 2a and 2b: $(p(x|c^{(x)}), p(y|c^{(y)}))$ for each sentence




Figure 3: Correlation of contextual PMI between the source sentences (from the training data) and the outputs of some models (1-to-1, C-AWARE beam, and C-AWARE beam with add- α smoothing of $\alpha = 400$).

pair (x, y) in the same dataset are plot in Figure 2c and the same tuples but with random contexts are plot in Figure 2d. Unlike the contextual PMI correlation, conditional probability correlation remains high even when we give wrong contexts. This is because the conditional probability of a sentence is highly affected by how frequently the sentence is observed regardless of context; if the source sentence is written with common expressions, then so is the target sentence and they are likely to be observed regardless of the context.

Analysis of the model outputs

PMI correlation gives us a good explanation of how C-AWARE beam with the base configuration fails (see Table 4). We plot the PMI correlation between the source sentences and their translations obtained with NMT models (Figure 3). We can find some outliers in the bottom right area of the plot for C-AWARE beam, which is the cause of the low correlation coefficient $R = 0.650 < R_{\text{src-ref}} = 0.681$. This result suggests that C-AWARE beam with the base configuration choose some tokens based on excessively high token-wise PMI, which breaks some translations resulting in the low BLEU. Translation of the 1-to-1 model shows higher correlation with the source texts than the reference translation (Figure 2a). An explanation could be alignment error in the corpus: although worse than the reference translations in quality, outputs of 1-to-1 are considered to be perfectly aligned to the source sentences. C-AWARE beam with add- α smoothing ($\alpha = 400$) seems to be free from this issue and achieves the highest PMI correlation $R = 0.752$.

5 Related Work

As an approach to context-aware NMT without document-level parallel data, our work is related to the context-aware translation error correction model (DocRepair) (Voita et al., 2019a). DocRepair is a sequence-to-sequence model to map a

document containing inconsistent sentences into a consistent one. DocRepair only looks at the output translation of the sentence-level NMT and thus is agnostic on the confidence of the words, which poses some limitations. For example, it may perform mis-correction when the output of the sentence-level NMT is irregular but correct. On the other hand, our C-SCORE-based models modify the output of the sentence-level model more softly based on the probabilities generated by the sentence-level NMT and a language model. Hence an irregular output of the sentence-level NMT is not changed when the sentence-level NMT is highly confident about it.

Our work is also related to shallow fusion (Gulcehre et al., 2015), in which token-wise probabilities output by an NMT model and a sentence-level language model are combined to be used as translation scores in decoding. As we have discussed in § 2.2.4 and the experimental results and analysis, C-SCORE captures contextual information better than the shallow fusion score with extended context.

6 Conclusions

We present an approach to context-aware NMT based on PMI between the context and the current sentence. We first provide the formulation of the objective, C-SCORE, and the computation process of the C-SCORE using a sentence-level translation model and a document-level language model. We investigate two search methods, reranking and beam search, and evaluate the methods in English-French, English-Russian, and Japanese-English translation. We also provide some analysis and visualization to better understand the nature of PMI between the context and the current sentence.

We plan to design context-aware BLEU using PMI for context-aware NMT models. We will extend our method to non-autoregressive NMT (Gu et al., 2017). We will release all of the code to promote the reproducibility of our results.

References

- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. [Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate](#). In *Proceedings of the third International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Rachel Bawden, Rico Sennrich, Alexandra Birch, and Barry Haddow. 2018. [Evaluating discourse phenomena in neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*, pages 1304–1313.
- Eva Martínez García, Carles Creus, Cristina España-Bonet, and Lluís Màrquez. 2017. Using word embeddings to enforce document-level lexical consistency in machine translation. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics*, 108(1):85–96.
- Jiatao Gu, James Bradbury, Caiming Xiong, Victor O.K. Li, and Richard Socher. 2017. [Non-autoregressive neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the the fifth International Conference for Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Çaglar Gulcehre, Orhan Firat, Kelvin Xu, Kyunghyun Cho, Loic Barrault, Hwei-Chi Lin, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. On using monolingual corpora in neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.03535*.
- Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. 2017. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML'17*, pages 1321–1330. JMLR.org.
- Sebastien Jean, Stanislas Lauly, Orhan Firat, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2017. [Does neural machine translation benefit from larger context?](#) *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05135*.
- Pierre Lison, Jörg Tiedemann, and Milen Kouylekov. 2018. Opensubtitles 2018: Statistical rescoring of sentence alignments in large, noisy parallel corpora. In *Proceedings of the 11th edition of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC 2018), Miyazaki, Japan.(accepted)*.
- Sameen Maruf and Gholamreza Haffari. 2018. [Document context neural machine translation with memory networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 1275–1284.
- Sameen Maruf, André F. T. Martins, and Gholamreza Haffari. 2019. [Selective attention for context-aware neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*, pages 3092–3102.
- Lesly Miculicich, Dhananjay Ram, Nikolaos Pappas, and James Henderson. 2018. [Document-level neural machine translation with hierarchical attention networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2947–2954.
- 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 on association for computational linguistics (ACL)*, pages 311–318.
- Peter Shaw, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Ashish Vaswani. 2018. [Self-attention with relative position representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 464–468, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amane Sugiyama and Naoki Yoshinaga. 2019. [Data augmentation using back-translation for context-aware neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Discourse in Machine Translation (DiscoMT 2019)*, pages 35–44, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jörg Tiedemann and Yves Scherrer. 2017. [Neural machine translation with extended context](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Discourse in Machine Translation (DiscoMT)*, pages 82–92.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30 (NIPS 2017)*, pages 5998–6008.
- Elena Voita, Rico Sennrich, and Ivan Titov. 2019a. [Context-aware monolingual repair for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 877–886, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Elena Voita, Rico Sennrich, and Ivan Titov. 2019b. [When a good translation is wrong in context: context-aware machine translation improves on deixis, ellipsis, and lexical cohesion](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 1198–1212.
- Elena Voita, Pavel Serdyukov, Rico Sennrich, and Ivan Titov. 2018. [Context-aware neural machine translation learns anaphora resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 1264–1274.

Longyue Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Andy Way, and Qun Liu.
2017. [Exploiting cross-sentence context for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2826–2831.