

LEAPT: LEARNING ADAPTIVE PREFIX-TO-PREFIX TRANSLATION FOR SIMULTANEOUS MACHINE TRANSLATION

Lei Lin, Shuangtao Li, Xiaodong Shi

Key Laboratory of Digital Protection and Intelligent Processing of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Fujian and Taiwan (Xiamen University), Ministry of Culture and Tourism, China

ABSTRACT

Simultaneous machine translation, which aims at a real-time translation, is useful in many live scenarios but very challenging due to the trade-off between accuracy and latency. To achieve the balance for both, the model needs to wait for appropriate streaming text (READ policy) and then generates its translation (WRITE policy). However, WRITE policies of previous work either are specific to the method itself due to the end-to-end training or suffer from the input mismatch between training and decoding for the non-end-to-end training. Therefore, it is essential to learn a generic and better WRITE policy for simultaneous machine translation. Inspired by strategies utilized by human interpreters and “wait” policies, we propose a novel adaptive prefix-to-prefix training policy called **LEAPT**, which allows our machine translation model to learn how to translate source sentence prefixes and make use of the *future* context. Experiments show that our proposed methods greatly outperform competitive baselines and achieve promising results.

Index Terms— Machine Translation, Simultaneous Machine Translation

1. INTRODUCTION

Simultaneous machine translation (SiMT) generates partial sentence translation (a target prefix) while receiving a streaming source input (a source prefix), thus demanding high translation quality and an as-short-as-possible delay. Compared with classic full-sentence machine translation, simultaneous machine translation is more challenging due to the incomplete source sentence during translating (see Figure 1).

A traditional streaming simultaneous translation (ST) system is usually formed by cascading a streaming auto-speech-recognition (ASR) component with a streaming machine translation (MT) component [1, 2]. Most of the previous work focuses on simultaneous text translation [3, 4, 5, 6], where main research direction is to figure out a reasonable READ policy and WRITE policy. Recent work generally splits into two classes:

Equal Contribution: Shuangtao Li. Corresponding author: Xiaodong Shi. This work is supported by National key R&D Program of China (Grant no.2020AAA0107904), the Key Support Project of NSFC-Liaoning Joint Foundation (Grant no. U1908216), and the Major Scientific Research Project of the State Language Commission in the 13th Five-Year Plan (Grant no. WT135-38).




Fig. 1. Overview of full-sentence NMT and SiMT.

- **READ Policies** determine whether to wait for another source word (READ). They can further fall into two classes commonly. One is fixed policies that segment the source sentence based on a fixed length [2, 6, 7, 8]. For example, the wait- k method needs to read k source words first, and then generates one target word continually after receiving each following source word. Although policies of this type are intuitive and simple to implement, they usually lead to a drop in translation quality owing to lacking consideration of contextual information. The other is adaptive policies that segment the source sentence according to dynamic contextual information. They either use a specific model [9, 4, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13] or end-to-end (e2e) approaches [5, 14, 15] to chunk the streaming source text. The adaptive methods can form more flexible segments than the fixed ones and attain better translations.
- **WRITE Policies** translate source sentence prefixes produced by READ policies. Previous work concentrates on non-end-to-end (ne2e) approaches [12, 3, 4] or e2e approaches [15, 16, 6] to translate source sentence prefixes. For e2e approaches, they are specific to the method itself and may suffer from error propagation caused by wrong segmentation. For ne2e approaches, they do not consider the input mismatch between training and inference. Therefore, it is important to find a generic and better WRITE policy for ne2e approaches.

Sentence Pair	牛顿发现了牛顿运动定律		
	Newton discovered newton’s laws of motion		
MU Pairs	牛顿	发现了	牛顿运动定律
	Newton	discovered	newton’s laws of motion

Table 1. The workflow of a simultaneous interpreter.

In this paper, we propose an adaptive prefix-to-prefix training policy for simultaneous machine translation. Our method is inspired by strategies utilized by human interpreters in simultaneous interpretation, who translate source sentence prefixes based on *Meaningful Unit* (MU) with clear and definite meaning, which can be directly translated monotonically (see Table 1). Specifically, when listening to speakers, interpreters usually preemptively group the streaming words into MUs (READ policy), and then perform translation monotonically while making the translation grammatically tolerable (WRITE policy). By doing so, interpreters can maintain high translation quality and an as-short-as-possible delay. Therefore, one natural question can be raised: can we train the WRITE policy to learn how to translate source sentence prefixes like human interpreters? To answer this question, we propose a novel translation-based method to generate pseudo prefix pairs, since there are no standard adaptive prefix pairs for training. Specifically, the method detects whether the translation of a source sentence prefix is a prefix of the full sentence’s translation. If so, we regard a source sentence prefix and its translation as a prefix pair. Besides, we further propose a refined method to make use of the *future* context to generate parallel prefix pairs with m future words to improve the translation quality and consistency between partial prefix translations. Finally, the prefix-to-prefix MT model is jointly trained on the original sentence pairs and pseudo prefix pairs.

Experimental results on NEU 2017 Chinese-English (Zh-En) and WMT 2015 German-English (De-En) datasets show that our approaches outperform the strong baselines in terms of translation quality and latency. The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- Inspired by strategies utilized by human interpreters, we propose a novel adaptive prefix-to-prefix training policy for SiMT, which produces high-quality translations with both low latency and high latency.
- Inspired by “wait” policies, we further propose a refined method to make use of the source sentence prefixes’ *future* context by adding m future words.
- Our method is effective and simple, which achieves 19.6 (45% relative improvement), and 27.2 (35% relative improvement) BLEU scores for Zh-En and De-En experiments respectively in low latency compared with strong baseline model.

2. ADAPTIVE PREFIX-TO-PREFIX TRAINING POLICY

Our idea is motivated by the way human interpreters translate an MU and “wait” policies. In this paper, our purpose is to

Sentence Pair	牛顿发现了牛顿运动定律	
	Newton discovered newton’s laws of motion	
Prefix Pairs	牛顿	牛顿发现了
	Newton	Newton discovered
Prefix pairs with m future words	牛顿 [fw] 发现了	牛顿发现了 [fw] 牛顿运动定律
	Newton	Newton discovered

Table 2. The training samples for the prefix-to-prefix MT model generated according to algorithm 1 and its refined method, where m is set to 2. “[fw]” is used to distinguish the source prefix from m future words.

split the streaming text into prefix pairs. Then, the prefix-to-prefix MT model is jointly trained on the original sentence pairs and pseudo prefix pairs. In the following, we first introduce our method to construct prefix pairs (Section 2.1) and prefix pairs with m future words (Section 2.2). Finally, we describe the joint training details in Section 2.3.

2.1. Constructing Prefix Training pairs

Since there are no standard prefix pairs for training, we propose a simple method to automatically extract meaningful unit pairs to construct prefix training samples.

Before we describe our method, we first try to figure out what is an MU. MU is first proposed in [12], which is defined as *the minimum segment whose translation will not be changed by subsequent text*. Therefore, we extend the definition of MU and then define an MU pair as *the minimum segment pair which can translate from source to target*. We expect a source sentence prefix of a prefix pair contains enough information to produce a target sentence prefix like sentence pairs do (see Table 1). A simultaneous interpreter dynamically segments the sentence pair into 3 MU pairs and translates source MUs monotonically.

Our idea to generate parallel prefix pairs is that, for a source sentence prefix $\mathbf{x}_{\leq t} = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t$, if its translation $\mathbf{y}^t = M_{nmt}(\mathbf{x}_{\leq t})$ is also a prefix of the candidates of full sentence’s translation $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = M_{nmt}(\mathbf{x})$, we add $(\mathbf{x}_{\leq t}, \mathbf{y}^t)$ prefix pair into \mathbf{S}_{pref} . Otherwise, the model continues reading source words and judges whether the current source prefix is a prefix of the candidates of full sentence’s translation. The reason is that $\mathbf{x}_{\leq t}$ contains enough information to produce a translation and $(\mathbf{x}_{\leq t}, \mathbf{y}^t)$ is the minimum segment pair that can translate from source to target. To keep consistency between previous partial translations, we forcedly decode previous partial translations and then decode the following new sequence. The whole process is described in Algorithm 1. The algorithm reads source sentence word-by-word through a *for* loop (Line 3), and generates translation by force decoding previous prefix translations, shown as *tgt_forced* (Line 4). If its translation is a prefix of the candidates of full sentence’s translation through beam search¹ (Line 5), we add it into \mathbf{S}_{pref} (Line 6).

2.2. Constructing Prefix Training pairs With M Future Words

The algorithm in section 2.1 is intuitive and simple, however, it is based on an ideal READ policy, i.e., the ability to de-

¹In this paper, we use top 10 results as candidates.




Fig. 2. Translation quality vs. latency results on the NJU-newstest-2017 dataset. Note that the full-sentence translation performance for each method is reported in upper right corner of the figure. δ is the threshold of the segmentation model of ASP.

termine sufficient source prefix for translation, which is not always true in practice and results in a drop in translation accuracy and fluency.

To alleviate it, we propose a refined method to extract prefix pairs with m future words. Our method is inspired by “wait” policies for waiting a fixed number of source words to make source prefix more sufficient for translation (see Table 2). The process is almost the same as algorithm 1, except that we modify the generation process of prefix pairs (Line 6). Specifically, given a streaming source text $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$, if we detect a source prefix $\mathbf{x}_{\leq t}$ that contains enough information to produce its translation, we further add a special token “[fw]” and m future words $f_t = \{x_{t+1}, \dots, x_{t+m}\}$ ² at the end of the source prefix. The reason is that adding m future words acts as “conjunctions” to allow the model to take into account the fluency and articulation between partial translations, and provides more source information that leads to generating better translation at the same time. In addition, the refined method is the first to combine adaptive policy and fixed policy in WRITE policy to take advantage of their respective advantages, which achieves promising results against strong baselines and is also complementary to previous non-end-to-end studies. Take the sentence pair in Table 1 as an example, we generate training samples as illustrated in Table 2. Note that for t larger than $T - m$, we only use the remaining words in the source sentence as *future* words.

2.3. Joint Training

In the training stage, we extract the prefix pairs in the training corpus according to the basic method (Section 2.1) or refined method (Section 2.2). Specifically, for each source sentence $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T\}$ in the training corpus, we generate P prefix pairs. Each prefix pair consists of a source prefix and a target prefix, as illustrated in Table 2. Then, our prefix-to-prefix MT model is jointly trained on the original sentence

² m is a hyper-parameter as the number of future words. Larger m means higher latency. In this paper, we set $m = 2$.




Fig. 3. Translation quality vs. latency results on the WMT15 German-English dataset.

Algorithm 1: Generating Parallel Prefix Pairs

Input: $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T\}$
Output: \mathbf{S}_{pref}

- 1 $k = 0$
- 2 $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = M_{\text{nmt}}(\text{src} = \mathbf{x})$
- 3 **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**
- 4 $\mathbf{y}^t = M_{\text{nmt}}(\text{src} = \mathbf{x}_{\leq t}, \text{tgt}_{\text{forced}} = \mathbf{y}^k)$
- 5 **if** \mathbf{y}^t is a prefix of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ **then**
- 6 $\mathbf{S}_{\text{pref}} = \mathbf{S}_{\text{pref}} \cup (\mathbf{x}_{\leq t}, \mathbf{y}^t)$
- 7 $k = t$
- 8 **end**
- 9 **end**
- 10 **return** \mathbf{S}_{pref}

pairs and pseudo prefix pairs.

As mentioned in Section 1, simultaneous machine translation involves a READ policy and WRITE policy, where a READ policy and WRITE policy are combined to achieve high translation quality and an as-short-as-possible delay in an e2e or ne2e way. In order to fully demonstrate the effectiveness of our methods, we choose one of the READ policies of ne2e adaptive approaches to combine with our proposed WRITE policies to do simultaneous interpretation. The reason is that the adaptive methods are more flexible than the fixed ones and achieve better results. Concretely, we use the ASP method as our READ policy and only replace the WRITE policy of ASP with our proposed methods, and keep the rest intact. ASP is easy to implement and one of recent work that performs competitive performance on adaptive policies while others are not open source [17].

3. EXPERIMENTS

We evaluate our proposed methods on two translation tasks: the NEU2017 Chinese-English (Zh-En) translation task (2M sentence pairs)³, and the WMT 2015 German-English (De-En) translation task (4.5M sentence pairs)⁴. We use case-sensitive detokenized BLEU[18] score and Average Lagging (AL) [6] to evaluate translation quality and latency respec-

³<http://mteval.cips.org.cn:81/agreement/description>

⁴<http://www.statmt.org/wmt15/translation-task.html>

Source	环境问题 表现在 大气、水、土壤污染上，但 根子 还是在 生产生活方式 上
ASP	WAIT*6 the expression of environmental problems WAIT*2 in the atmosphere, WAIT water WAIT, WAIT and soil pollution WAIT*2, WAIT he said. WAIT*2 the roots are still, WAIT*3 the way of life in production.
LEAPT	WAIT*6 environmental problems show in WAIT*2 the atmosphere, WAIT water WAIT, WAIT soil pollution WAIT*2, WAIT he said. WAIT*2 the roots are still WAIT*3 in the production lifestyle.
LEAPT++	WAIT*6 environmental problems appear in WAIT*2 the atmosphere, WAIT water WAIT, WAIT and soil pollution WAIT*2, WAIT but WAIT*2 roots are still WAIT*3 in the production lifestyle.

Table 3. A source sentence and its translation with ASP, LEAPT and LEAPT++. WAIT*i denotes waiting for i source words.

tively. δ is the threshold for the segmentation model of ASP.

3.1. Data Settings

We use an Chinese Tokenizer⁵ to preprocess Chinese text and Moses Tokenizer⁶ to preprocess German and English text. All text is encoded by byte-pair encoding [19] (BPE) to reduce the vocabulary sizes. For Zh-En, we use NJU-newsdev-2017 as our dev set and NJU-newstest-2017 as our test set, with 1,894 and 1,000 sentence pairs respectively. For De-En, we use newstest 2013 (3,000 sentence pairs) and newstest 2015 (2,169 sentence pairs) as our validation and test set.

3.2. Model Settings

We compare our methods with previous strong SiMT systems, which contain the most widely used policies of fixed and adaptive methods.

- *wait-k* [6]: first waits for k source words, and then translates a target word after reading each source word (fixed and end-to-end method).
- *ASP* [12]: first detects whether the current source prefix is a complete meaning unit, and then feeds it into a full-sentence MT model for translation until generating end of sentence token, where we use the basic method for comparison (adaptive and non-end-to-end method).
- *LEAPT*: first judges whether to wait for another source word via the basic READ policy of ASP, and then feeds it into our basic method for translation.
- *LEAPT++*: first judges whether to wait for another source word via the basic READ policy of ASP, and then feeds it into our refined method for translation.

For the READ policy, we use the same implementation as [12] and only replace the full-sentence MT model with our proposed methods to fully demonstrate the effectiveness of our methods. Specifically, the segmentation model is based on the classification task of BERT [20] (Chinese⁷ and German⁸ version), which determines whether to wait for another source word through its prediction (1 or 0)⁹. The training process of the segmentation model is based on BERT base version and following fine-tuning process [20].

For the WRITE policy, we use the base Transformer [21] for pre-training and fine-tuning with the learning rate of $3e^{-4}$, $3e^{-5}$ respectively. Besides, the prefix-to-prefix MT model uses beam search with a beam size of 10 during decoding.

⁵<https://github.com/foxsjy/jieba>

⁶[https://github.com/moses-](https://github.com/moses-smt/mosesdecoder/blob/master/scripts/tokenizer/tokenizer.perl)

[sm/mosesdecoder/blob/master/scripts/tokenizer/tokenizer.perl](https://github.com/moses-smt/mosesdecoder/blob/master/scripts/tokenizer/tokenizer.perl)

⁷<https://huggingface.co/bert-base-chinese>

⁸<https://huggingface.co/bert-base-german-cased>

⁹If the prediction is 0, the segmentation model needs to read another source word, otherwise the current source prefix can be fed into the WRITE policy for translation.

3.3. Overall Results

Figure 2 and 3 show the quality-latency results on NJU-newstest-2017 dataset and newstest 2015 dataset respectively. We observed that:

- Our methods outperform wait- k and ASP methods in terms of translation accuracy and latency for Zh-En and De-En experiments.
- Our methods perform more robustly than wait- k and ASP methods in both low and high latency for Zh-En and De-En experiments. In particular, our methods generate higher-quality translations in the same low latency with respect to the strong baselines.
- As δ increases, the quality and latency also increase accordingly. Therefore, δ can be tuned to obtain a balance between quality and latency according to different requirements.
- Compared to LEAPT, LEAPT++ significantly improve the translation quality with a slight increase in latency, which fully proves our previous hypotheses.

Note that the prefix-to-prefix MT model is slightly worse than the full-sentence MT model when translating full sentences, which is within our expectations.

3.4. Case Study

Due to length limitations, we only provide an example of ASP vs. our proposed methods in Table 3, where δ is set to 0.4. It is clear that our proposed methods are capable of generating higher-quality translations when translating source prefixes. For example, given “环境问题表现在大气、”, ASP generates “**the expression of environmental problem**” and our methods generate “**environmental problems show in**” and “**environmental problems appear in**” respectively, which translate “表现在” correctly while ASP ignores it. Compared to LEAPT, LEAPT++ generates not only more accurate but also coherent translations. The most straightforward illustration in the example (see Table 3) is that LEAPT produces “**he said.**” while LEAPT++ produces “**but**”, which confirms our above hypotheses of adding m future words as “conjunctions”.

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose a novel adaptive prefix-to-prefix training policy for SiMT, referred to as **LEAPT**. Motivated by strategies utilized by human interpreter and “wait” policies, the proposed prefix-to-prefix MT model is a generic and better WRITE policy for non-end-to-end approaches. Compared to strong baselines, our proposed methods greatly improve the translation quality in both low and high latency and are complementary to previous ne2e studies.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Yusuke Oda, Graham Neubig, Sakriani Sakti, Tomoki Toda, and Satoshi Nakamura, “Optimizing segmentation strategies for simultaneous speech translation,” in *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 2014, pp. 551–556.
- [2] Fahim Dalvi, Nadir Durrani, Hassan Sajjad, and Stephan Vogel, “Incremental decoding and training methods for simultaneous translation in neural machine translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.03661*, 2018.
- [3] Jiatao Gu, Graham Neubig, Kyunghyun Cho, and Victor OK Li, “Learning to translate in real-time with neural machine translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.00388*, 2016.
- [4] Kyunghyun Cho and Masha Esipova, “Can neural machine translation do simultaneous translation?,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.02012*, 2016.
- [5] Naveen Arivazhagan, Colin Cherry, Wolfgang Macherey, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Semih Yavuz, Ruoming Pang, Wei Li, and Colin Raffel, “Monotonic infinite lookback attention for simultaneous machine translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.05218*, 2019.
- [6] Mingbo Ma, Liang Huang, Hao Xiong, Kaibo Liu, Chuanqiang Zhang, Zhongjun He, Hairong Liu, Xing Li, and Haifeng Wang, “Stacl: Simultaneous translation with integrated anticipation and controllable latency,” 2018.
- [7] Xutai Ma, Juan Pino, and Philipp Koehn, “Simulmt to simulst: Adapting simultaneous text translation to end-to-end simultaneous speech translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.02048*, 2020.
- [8] Shaolei Zhang and Yang Feng, “Universal simultaneous machine translation with mixture-of-experts wait-k policy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05238*, 2021.
- [9] Vivek Kumar Rangarajan Sridhar, John Chen, Srinivas Bangalore, Andrej Ljolje, and Rathinavelu Chengalvarayan, “Segmentation strategies for streaming speech translation,” in *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2013, pp. 230–238.
- [10] Baigong Zheng, Renjie Zheng, Mingbo Ma, and Liang Huang, “Simpler and faster learning of adaptive policies for simultaneous translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01559*, 2019.
- [11] Baigong Zheng, Kaibo Liu, Renjie Zheng, Mingbo Ma, Hairong Liu, and Liang Huang, “Simultaneous translation policies: From fixed to adaptive,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13169*, 2020.
- [12] Ruiqing Zhang, Chuanqiang Zhang, Zhongjun He, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang, “Learning adaptive segmentation policy for simultaneous translation,” in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2020, pp. 2280–2289.
- [13] Ruiqing Zhang, Zhongjun He, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang, “Learning adaptive segmentation policy for end-to-end simultaneous translation,” in *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2022, pp. 7862–7874.
- [14] Baigong Zheng, Renjie Zheng, Mingbo Ma, and Liang Huang, “Simultaneous translation with flexible policy via restricted imitation learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01135*, 2019.
- [15] Xutai Ma, Juan Pino, James Cross, Liezl Puzon, and Jiatao Gu, “Monotonic multihead attention,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12406*, 2019.
- [16] Shaolei Zhang and Yang Feng, “Modeling dual read/write paths for simultaneous machine translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09163*, 2022.
- [17] Jialiang Lin, Yingmin Wang, Yao Yu, Yu Zhou, Yidong Chen, and Xiaodong Shi, “Automatic analysis of available source code of top artificial intelligence conference papers,” *International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering*, vol. 32, no. 07, pp. 947–970, 2022.
- [18] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu, “Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation,” in *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2002, pp. 311–318.
- [19] Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch, “Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.07909*, 2015.
- [20] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [21] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.