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Abstract

Neural Chat Translation (NCT) aims to translate conversational text into different languages. Existing methods mainly focus on modeling the bilingual dialogue characteristics (e.g., coherence) to improve chat translation via multi-task learning on small-scale chat translation data. Although the NCT models have achieved impressive success, it is still far from satisfactory due to insufficient chat translation data and simple joint training manners. To address the above issues, we propose a scheduled multi-task learning framework for NCT. Specifically, we devise a three-stage training framework to incorporate the large-scale in-domain chat translation data into training by adding a second pre-training stage between the original pre-training and fine-tuning stages. Further, we investigate where and how to schedule the dialogue-related auxiliary tasks in multiple training stages to effectively enhance the main chat translation task. Extensive experiments on four language directions (English\textarrow{\rightleftharpoons}Chinese and English\textarrow{\rightleftharpoons}German) verify the effectiveness and superiority of the proposed approach. Additionally, we will make the large-scale in-domain paired bilingual dialogue dataset publicly available for the research community.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1}The code and in-domain data are publicly available at: \url{https://github.com/XL2248/SML}}

1 Introduction

A cross-lingual conversation involves speakers in different languages (e.g., one speaking in Chinese and another in English), where a chat translator can be applied to help them communicate in their native languages. The chat translator bilaterally converts the language of bilingual conversational text, e.g., from Chinese to English and vice versa (Wang et al., 2016a; Farajian et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2021a, 2022). Generally, since the bilingual dialogue corpus is scarce, researchers (Bao et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2021a, e) resort to making use of the large-scale general-domain data through the pre-training-then-fine-tuning paradigm as done in many context-aware neural machine translation models (Tiedemann and Scherrer, 2017; Maruf and Haffari, 2018; Miculicich et al., 2018; Tu et al., 2018; Voita et al., 2018, 2019a, b; Yang et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2019; Maruf et al., 2019; Ma et al., 2020, etc), having made significant progress. However, conventional pre-training on large-scale general-domain data usually learns general language patterns, which is also aimless for capturing the useful dialogue context to chat translation, and fine-tuning usually suffers from insufficient supervised data (about 10k bilingual dialogues). Some studies (Gu et al., 2020; Gururangan et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021; Moghe et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Ruder, 2021) have shown that learning domain-specific patterns by additional pre-training is beneficial to the models. To this end, we firstly construct the large-scale in-domain chat translation data\footnote{Firstly, to build the data, for English\textarrow{\rightleftharpoons}Chinese (En\textarrow{\rightleftharpoons}Zh), we crawl two consecutive English and Chinese movie subtitles (not aligned). For English\textarrow{\rightleftharpoons}German (En\textarrow{\rightleftharpoons}De), we download two consecutive English and German movie subtitles (not aligned). Then, we use several advanced technologies to align En\textarrow{\rightleftharpoons}Zh and En\textarrow{\rightleftharpoons}De subtitles. Finally, we obtain the paired bilingual dialogue dataset. Please refer to \S\ 3.1 for details.}

Figure 1: The overall three-stage training framework.
incorporate it for learning domain-specific patterns, we then propose a three-stage training framework via adding a second pre-training stage between general pre-training and fine-tuning, as shown in Fig. 1.

To further improve the chat translation performance through modeling dialogue characteristics (e.g., coherence), inspired by previous studies (Phang et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2021e; Prucksachatkun et al., 2020), we incorporate several dialogue-related auxiliary tasks to our three-stage training framework. Unfortunately, we find that simply introducing all auxiliary tasks in the conventional multi-task learning manner does not obtain significant cumulative benefits as we expect. It indicates that the simple joint training manner may limit the potential of these auxiliary tasks, which inspires us to investigate where and how to make these auxiliary tasks work better for the main NCT task.

To address the above issues, we present a Scheduled Multi-task Learning framework (SML) for NCT, as shown in Fig. 1. Firstly, we propose a three-stage training framework to introduce our constructed in-domain chat translation data for learning domain-specific patterns. Secondly, to make the most of auxiliary tasks for the main NCT task, where: we analyze in which stage these auxiliary tasks work well and find that they are different strokes for different folks. Therefore, to fully exert their advantages for enhancing the main NCT task, how: we design a gradient-based strategy to dynamically schedule them at each training step in the last two training stages, which can be seen as a fine-grained joint training manner. In this way, the NCT model is effectively enhanced to capture both domain-specific patterns and dialogue-related characteristics (e.g., coherence) in conversation, which thus can generate better translation results.

We validate our SML framework on two datasets: BMELD (Liang et al., 2021a) (En↔Zh) and BConTrasT (Farajian et al., 2020) (En↔De). Experimental results show that our model gains consistent improvements on four translation tasks in terms of both BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and TER (Snover et al., 2006) scores, demonstrating its effectiveness and generalizability. Human evaluation further suggests that our model can produce more coherent and fluent translations compared to the previous related methods.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a scheduled multi-task learning framework with three training stages, where a gradient-based scheduling strategy is designed to fully exert the auxiliary tasks’ advantages for the main NCT task, for higher translation quality.
- Extensive experiments on four chat translation tasks show that our model achieves new state-of-the-art performance and outperforms the existing NCT models by a significant margin.
- We contribute two large-scale in-domain paired bilingual dialogue corpora (28M for En↔Zh and 18M for En↔De) to the research community.

2 Background: Conventional Multi-task Learning for NCT

We introduce the conventional multi-task learning framework (Liang et al., 2021e) for NCT, which includes four parts: problem formalization (§ 2.1), the NCT model (§ 2.2), existing three auxiliary tasks (§ 2.3), and training objective (§ 2.4).

2.1 Problem Formalization

In a bilingual conversation, we assume the two speakers have alternately given utterances in different languages for \( u \) turns, resulting in \( X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots, X_u \) and \( Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, \ldots, Y_u \) on the source and target sides, respectively. Among these utterances, \( X_1, X_3, X_5, \ldots, X_u \) are originally spoken and \( Y_1, Y_3, Y_5, \ldots, Y_u \) are the corresponding translations in the target language. Similarly, \( Y_2, Y_4, Y_6, \ldots, Y_{u-1} \) are originally spoken and \( X_2, X_4, X_6, \ldots, X_{u-1} \) are the translated utterances in the source language. According to languages, we define the dialogue history context of \( X_u \) on the source side as \( C_{X_u} = \{X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots, X_{u-1}\} \) and that of \( Y_u \) on the target side as \( C_{Y_u} = \{Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, \ldots, Y_{u-1}\} \).

The goal of an NCT model is to translate \( X_u \) to \( Y_u \) with dialogue history context \( C_{X_u} \) and \( C_{Y_u} \).

2.2 The NCT Model

The NCT model (Ma et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2021e) utilizes the standard transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) architecture with an encoder and a decoder\(^4\).

\(^3\)For each of \( \{C_{X_u}, C_{Y_u}\} \), we add the special token ‘CLS’ tag at the head of it and use another token ‘SEP’ to delimit its included utterances, as in Devlin et al. (2019).

\(^4\)Here, we just describe some adaptions to the NCT model, and please refer to Vaswani et al. (2017) for more details.
In the encoder, it takes $[C_{X_u}; X_u]$ as input, where $[;]$ denotes the concatenation. The input embedding consists of word embedding $WE$, position embedding $PE$, and turn embedding $TE$:

$$B(x_i) = WE(x_i) + PE(x_i) + TE(x_i),$$

where $WE \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times d}$ and $TE \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$. When computation in the encoder, words in $C_{X_u}$ can only be attended by those in $X_u$ at the first encoder layer while $C_{X_u}$ is masked at the other layers, which is the same implementation as in Ma et al. (2020).

In the decoder, at each decoding time step $t$, the top-layer ($L$-th) decoder hidden state $h_{d,t}^L$ is fed into a softmax layer to predict the probability distribution of the next target token:

$$p(Y_{u,t}|Y_{u,<t}, X_u, C_{X_u}) = \text{Softmax}(W_o h_{d,t}^L + b_o),$$

where $Y_{u,<t}$ denotes the preceding tokens before $t$-th time step in the utterance $Y_u$, $W_o \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times d}$ and $b_o \in \mathbb{R}^V$ are trainable parameters.

Finally, the training loss is defined as follows:

$$L_{NCT} = - \sum_{t=1}^{|Y_u|} \log(p(Y_{u,t}|Y_{u,<t}, X_u, C_{X_u})). \quad (1)$$

### 2.3 Existing Auxiliary Tasks

To generate coherent translation, Liang et al. (2021e) present Monolingual Response Generation (MRG) task, Cross-lingual Response Generation (XRG) task, and Next Utterance Discrimination (NUD) task during the NCT model training.

**MRG.** Given the dialogue context $C_{Y_u}$ in the target language, it forces the NCT model to generate the corresponding utterance $Y_u$ coherent to $C_{Y_u}$. Particularly, the encoder of the NCT model is used to encode $C_{Y_u}$, and the NCT decoder predicts $Y_u$. The training objective of this task is formulated as:

$$L_{MRG} = - \sum_{t=1}^{|Y_u|} \log(p(Y_{u,t}|C_{Y_u}, Y_{u,<t})),$$

$$p(Y_{u,t}|C_{Y_u}, Y_{u,<t}) = \text{Softmax}(W_m h_{d,t}^L + b_m),$$

where $h_{d,t}^L$ is the $L$-th decoder hidden state at the $t$-th decoding step, $W_m$ and $b_m$ are trainable parameters.

**XRG.** Similar to MRG, the NCT model is also jointly trained to generate the corresponding utterance $Y_u$ which is coherent to the given dialogue history context $C_{X_u}$ in the source language:

$$L_{XRG} = - \sum_{t=1}^{|Y_u|} \log(p(Y_{u,t}|C_{X_u}, Y_{u,<t})),$$

$$p(Y_{u,t}|C_{X_u}, Y_{u,<t}) = \text{Softmax}(W_c h_{d,t}^L + b_c),$$

where $W_c$ and $b_c$ are trainable parameters.

**NUD.** The NUD task aims to distinguish whether the translated text is coherent to be the next utterance of the given dialogue history context. Specifically, the positive and negative samples are firstly constructed: (1) the positive sample ($C_{Y_u}, Y_{u,+}$) with the label $\ell = 1$ consists of the target utterance $Y_u$ and its dialogue history context $C_{Y_u}$; (2) the negative sample ($C_{Y_u}, Y_{u,-}$) with the label $\ell = 0$ consists of the identical $C_{Y_u}$ and a randomly selected utterance $Y_{u,-}$ from the preceding context of $Y_u$. Formally, the training objective of NUD is defined as follows:

$$L_{NUD} = - \log(p(\ell = 1|C_{Y_u}, Y_{u,+}))$$

$$- \log(p(\ell = 0|C_{Y_u}, Y_{u,-})),$$

$$p(\ell = 1|C_{Y_u}, Y_u) = \text{Softmax}(W_n[H_{Y_u}; H_{C_{Y_u}}]),$$

where $H_{Y_u}$ and $H_{C_{Y_u}}$ denote the representations of the target utterance $Y_u$ and $C_{Y_u}$, respectively. Concretely, $H_{Y_u}$ is calculated as $\frac{1}{|Y_u|}\sum_{t=1}^{|Y_u|} h_{c,t}^L$, while $H_{C_{Y_u}}$ is defined as the encoder hidden state $h_{c,0}^L$ of the prepended special token `[CLS]' of $C_{Y_u}$. $W_n$ is the trainable parameter of the NUD classifier and the bias term is omitted for simplicity.

### 2.4 Training Objective

With the main chat translation task and three auxiliary objectives, the total training objective of the conventional multi-task learning is formulated as:

$$L = L_{NCT} + \alpha(L_{MRG} + L_{XRG} + L_{NUD}), \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha$ is the balancing factor between $L_{NCT}$ and other auxiliary objectives.

### 3 Scheduled Multi-task Learning for NCT

In this section, we introduce the proposed Scheduled Multi-task Learning (SML) framework, including three stages: general pre-training, in-domain pre-training, and in-domain fine-tuning, as shown in Fig. 1. Specifically, we firstly describe the process of in-domain pre-training (§ 3.1) and then present some findings of conventional multi-task learning (§ 3.2), which inspire us to investigate the scheduled multi-task learning (§ 3.3). Finally, we
elaborate on the process of training and inference (§ 3.4).

3.1 In-domain Pre-training

For the second in-domain pre-training, we firstly build an in-domain paired bilingual dialogue data and then conduct pre-training on it.

To construct the paired bilingual dialogue data, we firstly crawl the in-domain consecutive movie subtitles of En→Zh and download the consecutive movie subtitles of En→De on related websites. Since both bilingual movie subtitles are not strictly aligned, we utilize the Vecalign tool (Thompson and Koehn, 2019), an accurate sentence alignment algorithm, to align them. Meanwhile, we leverage the LASER toolkit to obtain the multilingual embedding for better alignment performance. Consequently, we obtain two relatively clean paired movie subtitles. According to the setting of dialogue context length in Liang et al. (2021a), we take four consecutive utterances as one dialogue, and then filter out duplicate dialogues. Finally, we attain two in-domain paired bilingual dialogue dataset, the statistics of which are shown in Tab. 1.

![Figure 2: The effect of each task on validation sets in different training stages, under transformer Base setting, where “All” denotes all four auxiliary tasks. We find that each auxiliary task performs well on the second stage while XRG and XNUD tasks perform relatively poorly in the fine-tuning stage. Further, we observe that all auxiliary tasks in a conventional multi-task learning manner do not obtain significant cumulative benefits. That is, the auxiliary tasks are different strokes for different folks.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>#Dialogues</th>
<th>#Utterances</th>
<th>#Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En→Zh</td>
<td>28,214,769</td>
<td>28,238,877</td>
<td>22,244,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En→De</td>
<td>18,041,125</td>
<td>18,048,573</td>
<td>45,541,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Statistics of our constructed chat translation data. The #Sentences column is the general-domain WMT sentence pairs used in the first pre-training stage.

Based on the constructed in-domain bilingual corpus, we continue to pre-train the NCT model after the general pre-training stage, and then go to the in-domain fine-tuning stage, as shown in the In-domain Pre-training & Fine-tuning parts of Fig. 1.

3.2 Findings of Conventional Multi-task Learning

According to the finding that multi-task learning can enhance the NCT model (Liang et al., 2021e), in the last two training processes (i.e., the In-domain Pre-training and In-domain Fine-tuning parts of Fig. 1), we conduct extensive multi-task learning experiments, aiming to achieve a better NCT model. Firstly, we present one additional auxiliary task, i.e., Cross-lingual NUD (XNUD), given the intuition that more dialogue-related tasks may yield better performance. Then, we conclude some multi-task learning findings that could motivate us to investigate how to use these auxiliary tasks well.

**XNUD.** Similar to the NUD task described in § 2.3, the XNUD aims to distinguish whether the translated text is coherent to be the next utterance of the given cross-lingual dialogue history context. Compared to the NUD task, the different point lies in the cross-lingual dialogue context history, i.e., a positive sample \( (C_{X_u}, Y_{u+}) \) with the label \( \ell = 1 \) and a negative sample \( (C_{X_u}, Y_{u-}) \) with the label \( \ell = 0 \). Formally, the training objective of XNUD is defined as follows:

\[
L_{XNUD} = -\log(p(\ell = 1|C_{X_u}, Y_{u+})) - \log(p(\ell = 0|C_{X_u}, Y_{u-})),
\]

\( p(\ell = 1|C_{X_u}, Y_u) = \text{Softmax}(W_x[H_{Y_u}; H_{C_{X_u}}]), \)

where \( H_{C_{X_u}} \) denotes the representation of \( C_{X_u} \), which is calculated as same as \( H_{C_Y} \) in NUD. \( W_x \) is the trainable parameter of the XNUD classifier and the bias term is omitted for simplicity.

**Findings.** Based on four auxiliary tasks (MRG, XRG, NUD, and XNUD), we investigate in which stage in Fig. 1 the auxiliary tasks work well in a conventional multi-task learning manner and the following is what we find from Fig. 2:

- Each auxiliary task can always bring improvement compared with the NCT model w/o task;

---

7https://github.com/facebookresearch/LASER
8Note that, in the last two in-domain stages, we use the conventional multi-task learning to pre-train and fine-tune models rather than the scheduled multi-task learning.
• By contrast, XRG and XNUD tasks perform relatively poorly in the final fine-tuning stage than MRG and NUD tasks;
• Some tasks used only in one stage (e.g., XRG and XNUD in the second stage) perform better than being used in both stages, revealing that different auxiliary tasks may prefer different stages to exert their advantages; (one best setting seems that all tasks are used in the second stage while only MRG and NUD tasks are used in the final fine-tuning stage.)
• Using all auxiliary tasks in a conventional multi-task learning manner does not obtain significant cumulative benefits.

Given the above findings, we wonder whether there exists a strategy to dynamically schedule them to exert their potential for the main NCT task.

3.3 Scheduled Multi-task Learning

Inspired by Yu et al. (2020), we design a gradient-based scheduled multi-task learning algorithm to dynamically schedule all auxiliary tasks at each training step, as shown in Algorithm 1. Specifically, at each training step (line 1), for each task we firstly compute its gradient to model parameters \( \theta \) (lines 2–4, and we denote the gradient of the main NCT task as \( g_{\text{nct}} \)). Then, we obtain the projection of the gradient \( g_k \) of each auxiliary task \( k \) onto \( g_{\text{nct}} \) (line 5), as shown in Fig. 3. Finally, we utilize the sum of \( g_{\text{nct}} \) and all projection (i.e., the blue arrows part, as shown in Fig. 3) of auxiliary tasks to update model parameters.

The core ideas behind the gradient-based SML algorithm are: (1) when the cosine similarity between \( g_k \) and \( g_{\text{nct}} \) is positive, i.e., the gradient projection \( g'_k \) is in the same gradient descent direction with the main NCT task, i.e., Fig. 3 (a), which could help the NCT model achieve optimal solution; (2) when the cosine similarity between \( g_k \) and \( g_{\text{nct}} \) is negative, i.e., Fig. 3 (b), which can avoid the model being optimized too fast and overfitted. Therefore, we also keep the inverse gradient to prevent the NCT model from overfitting as a regularizer. In this way, such auxiliary task joins in training at each step with the NCT task when its gradient projection is in line with \( g_{\text{nct}} \), which acted as a fine-grained joint training manner.

3.4 Training and Inference

Our training process includes three stages: the first pre-training stage on the general-domain sentence pairs \((X, Y)\):

\[
L_{\text{Sent-NMT}} = - \sum_{t=1}^{\vert Y \vert} \log(p(y_t | X, y_{<t})), \tag{3}
\]

the second in-domain pre-training stage, and the final in-domain fine-tuning stage on the chat translation data:

\[
J = L_{\text{NCT}} + \alpha \sum_k L_k, \tag{4}
\]

where \( T \) is the auxiliary tasks set and we keep the balancing hyper-parameter \( \alpha \). Although the form of \( L_k \) is the same with Eq. 2, the gradient that participates in updating model parameters is different where it depends on the gradient descent direction of the NCT task in Eq. 4.

At inference, all auxiliary tasks are not involved and only the NCT model after scheduled multi-task fine-tuning is applied to chat translation.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets and Metrics

Datasets. The training of our SML framework consists of three stages: (1) pre-train the model on a large-scale sentence-level NMT corpus (WMT20\(^9\));

\(^9\)http://www.statmt.org/wmt20/translation-task.html
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>En→Zh</th>
<th>Zh→En</th>
<th>En→De</th>
<th>De→En</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trans. w/o FT</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans.</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dia-Trans.</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate-Trans.</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>21.03</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPCC</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA-NCT</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SML (Ours)</td>
<td>32.25††</td>
<td>55.1††</td>
<td>26.42††</td>
<td>51.4††</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans. w/o FT</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans.</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>59.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dia-Trans.</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate-Trans.</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPCC</td>
<td>28.98</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA-NCT</td>
<td>28.86</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SML (Ours)</td>
<td>32.87††</td>
<td>54.4††</td>
<td>27.58††</td>
<td>50.6††</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Test results on BMELD (En→Zh) and BConTrasT (En→De) in terms of BLEU (%) and TER (%). The best and second best results are bold and underlined, respectively. “†” and “††” indicate that statistically significant better than the best result of all contrast NMT models with t-test $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$ hereinafter, respectively. The results of contrast models are from Liang et al. (2021a,e). Strictly speaking, it is unfair to directly compare with them since we use additional data. Therefore, we conduct further experiments in Tab. 3 for fair comparison.

(2) further pre-train the model on our constructed in-domain chat translation corpus; (3) fine-tune on the target chat translation corpus: BMELD (Liang et al., 2021a) and BConTrasT (Farajian et al., 2020). The target dataset details (e.g., splits of training, validation or test sets) are described in Appendix A.

**Metrics.** Following Liang et al. (2021e), we use SacreBLEU\(^{10}\) (Post, 2018) and TER (Snover et al., 2006) with the statistical significance test (Koehn, 2004) for fair comparison. Specifically, we report character-level BLEU for En→Zh, case-insensitive BLEU score for Zh→En, and case-sensitive BLEU score likewise for En→De.

**4.2 Implementation Details**

In this paper, we adopt the settings of standard Transformer-Base and Transformer-Big in Vaswani et al. (2017). Generally, we utilize the settings in Liang et al. (2021e) for fair comparison. For more details, please refer to Appendix B. We investigate the effect of the XNUD task in § 5.4, where the new XNUD performs well based on existing auxiliary tasks.

\(^{10}\)BLEU+case.mixed+numrefs.1+smooth.exp+tok.13a+version.1.4.13

**4.3 Comparison Models**

**Sentence-level NMT Systems.** Trans. w/o FT and Trans. (Vaswani et al., 2017): both are the de-facto transformer-based NMT models, and the difference is that the “Trans.” model is fine-tuned on the chat translation data after being pre-trained on sentence-level NMT corpus.

**Context-aware NMT Systems.** Dia-Trans. (Maruf et al., 2018): A Transformer-based model where an additional encoder is used to introduce the mixed-language dialogue history, re-implement by Liang et al. (2021a).

Gate-Trans. (Zhang et al., 2018) and NCT (Ma et al., 2020): Both are document-level NMT Transformer models where they introduce the dialogue history by a gate and by sharing the first encoder layer, respectively.

CPCC (Liang et al., 2021a): A variational model that focuses on incorporating dialogue characteristics into a translator for better performance.

CSA-NCT (Liang et al., 2021e): A multi-task learning model that uses several auxiliary tasks to help generate dialogue-related translations.
4.4 Main Results

In Tab. 2, we report the main results on En↔Zh and En↔De under Base and Big settings. In Tab. 3, we present additional results on En↔Zh.

Results on En↔Zh. Under the Base setting, our model significantly outperforms the sentence-level/context-aware baselines by a large margin (e.g., the previous best “CSA-NCT”), 4.58↑ on En→Zh and 4.06↑ on Zh→En, showing the effectiveness of the large-scale in-domain data and our scheduled multi-task learning. In terms of TER, SML also performs best on the two directions, 5.0↓ and 4.3↓ than “CPCC” (the lower the better), respectively. Under the Big setting, our model consistently surpasses all existing systems once again.

Results on En↔De. On both En→De and De→En, our model presents notable improvements over all comparison models by up to 2.50↑ and 2.69↑ BLEU gains under the Base setting, and by 2.55↑ and 2.53↑ BLEU gains under the Big setting, respectively. These results demonstrate the superiority of our three-stage training framework and also show the generalizability of our model across different language pairs. Since the baselines of En↔De are very strong, the results of En→De are not so significant than En↔Zh.

Table 3: Results on test sets of BMELD in terms of BLEU (%) and TER (%), where “Two-stage w/o data” means the pre-training-then-fine-tuning and the in-domain data not being used, and “Three-stage w/ data” means the proposed three-stage method and this group uses the in-domain data. The “M-NCT” denotes the multi-task learning model jointly trained with four auxiliary tasks in a conventional manner. All models apply the same two/three-stage training strategy with our SML model for fair comparison except the “Trans. w/o FT” model, respectively.

## Additional Results

Tab. 2 presents our overall model performance, though, strictly speaking, it is unfair to directly compare our approaches with previous ones. Therefore, we conduct additional experiments in Tab. 3 under two settings: (i) using the original pre-training-then-fine-tuning framework without introducing the large-scale in-domain data (i.e., “Two-stage w/o data” group); (ii) using the proposed three-stage method with the large-scale in-domain data (i.e., “Three-stage w/ data” group). And we conclude that (1) the same model (e.g., SML) can be significantly enhanced by the second in-domain pre-training stage, demonstrating the effectiveness of the second pre-training on the in-domain data; (2) our SML model always exceeds the conventional multi-task learning model “M-NCT” in both settings, indicating the superiority of the scheduled multi-task learning strategy.

5 Analysis

5.1 Ablation Study

We conduct ablation studies in Tab. 4 and Tab. 5 to answer the following two questions. Q1: why a three-stage training framework? and Q2: why the scheduled multi-task learning strategy?

To answer Q1, in Tab. 4, we firstly investigate the effect of the large-scale in-domain chat translation data and further explore where to use it. Firstly, the results of rows 1~3 substantially outperform those in row 0, proving the availability of incorporating the in-domain data. Secondly, the results of
we assign the translated utterances and their corre-

tances of these sampled conversations. Finally, we assign the translated utterances and their corre-

Table 5: Results on validation sets of the three-stage training framework in different multi-task training man-

ners, under the Base setting. Row 1 denotes that the auxiliary tasks are randomly added in a conventional training manner at each training step. Row 2 denotes that we add the auxiliary tasks according to their performance in different stages, i.e., we add all tasks in the second stage while only considering MRG and NUD in the fine-tuning stage according to prior trial results in Fig. 2. Row 4 denotes that we remove the inverse gradient projection of auxiliary tasks (i.e., Fig. 3 (b)).

Table 6: Results of human evaluation (En→Zh). All models use the three-stage training framework to introduce the in-domain data.

Table 7: Results (%) of dialogue coherence in terms of sentence similarity on validation set of BMELD in En→Zh direction. The “#-th Pr.” denotes the #-th preceding utterance to the current one. “††” indicates the improvement over the best result of all other comparison models is statistically significant (p < 0.01). All models use the three-stage training framework to introduce the in-domain data.

5.2 Human Evaluation

Inspired by Bao et al. (2020) and Liang et al. (2021a), we use two criteria for human evaluation to judge whether the translation is:

1. semantically coherent with the dialogue history?
2. fluent and grammatically correct?

Firstly, we randomly sample 200 conversations from the test set of BMELD in En→Zh. Then, we use 6 models in Tab. 6 to generate translated utterances of these sampled conversations. Finally, we assign the translated utterances and their corre-

ducing the in-domain data.

Models (Base) | Training Manners | En→Zh | Zh→En
---|---|---|---
0 | Conventional Multi-task Learning | 33.45 | 51.2 | 29.47 | 49.9
1 | Random Multi-task Learning | 32.88 | 51.6 | 29.19 | 49.5
2 | Prior-based Multi-task Learning | 33.94 | 51.1 | 29.74 | 49.1
3 | Scheduled Multi-task Learning (SML) | 34.21 | 51.0 | 30.33 | 49.0
4 | SML w/o inverse gradient projection | 33.85 | 51.1 | 29.79 | 49.1

5.3 Dialogue Coherence

We measure dialogue coherence as sentence similarity following Lapata and Barzilay (2005); Xiong et al. (2019); Liang et al. (2021a):

\[ \text{coh}(s_1, s_2) = \cos(f(s_1), f(s_2)), \]

where \( \cos \) denotes cosine similarity and \( f(s_i) = \frac{1}{|s_i|} \sum_{w \in s_i} (w) \) and \( w \) is the vector for word \( w \), and
Table 8: The results on validation sets after adding the XNUD task on three auxiliary tasks, i.e., MRG, XRG and NUD (Liang et al., 2021e), which are trained in conventional manner (without incorporating in-domain data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models (Base)</th>
<th>En→Zh</th>
<th>Zh→En</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCT+[MRG,CRG,NUD]</td>
<td>BLEU↑</td>
<td>TER↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT+[MRG,CRG,NUD.XNUD]</td>
<td>29.49††</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$s_i$ is the sentence. We use Word2Vec\(^\text{11}\) (Mikolov et al., 2013) trained on a dialogue dataset\(^\text{12}\) to obtain the distributed word vectors whose dimension is set to 100.

Tab. 7 shows the measured coherence of different models on validation set of BMELD in En→Zh direction. It shows that our SML produces more coherent translations compared to all existing models (significance test, $p < 0.01$).

5.4 Effect of the Auxiliary Task: XNUD

We investigate the effect of the XNUD task. As shown in Tab. 8, the “M-NCT” denotes the multi-task learning model jointly trained with four auxiliary tasks in conventional manner. After removing the XNUD task, the performance drops to some extent, indicating that the new XNUD task achieves further performance improvement based on three existing auxiliary tasks (Liang et al., 2021e). Then, based on the strong “M-NCT” model, we further investigate where and how to make the most of them for the main NCT task.

6 Related Work

Neural Chat Translation. The goal of NCT is to train a dialogue-aware translation model using the bilingual dialogue history, which is different from document-level/sentence-level machine translation (Maruf et al., 2019; Ma et al., 2020; Yan et al., 2020; Meng and Zhang, 2019; Zhang et al., 2019). Previous work can be roughly divided into two categories. One (Wang et al., 2016b; Maruf et al., 2018; Zhang and Zhou, 2019; Rikters et al., 2020) mainly pays attention to automatically constructing the bilingual corpus since no publicly available human-annotated data (Farajian et al., 2020). The other (Wang et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2021a,e) aims to incorporate the bilingual dialogue characteristics into the NCT model via multi-task learning. Different from the above studies, we focus on introducing the in-domain chat translation data to learn domain-specific patterns and scheduling the auxiliary tasks to exert their potential for high translation quality.

Multi-task Learning. Conventional multi-task learning (Caruana, 1997), which mainly focuses on training a model on multiple related tasks to promote the representation performance of the main task, has been successfully used in many natural language processing tasks (Collobert and Weston, 2008; Ruder, 2017; Deng et al., 2013; Liang et al., 2021d,c,b). In the NCT, conventional multi-task learning has been explored to inject the dialogue characteristics into models with dialogue-related tasks such as response generation (Liang et al., 2021a,e). In this work, we instead focus on how to schedule the auxiliary tasks at training to make the most of them for better translations.

7 Conclusion

This paper proposes a scheduled multi-task learning framework armed with an additional in-domain pre-training stage and a gradient-based scheduled multi-task learning strategy. Experiments on En→Zh and En→De demonstrate that our framework significantly improves translation quality on both BLEU and TER metrics, showing its effectiveness and generalizability. Human evaluation further verifies that our model yields better translations in terms of coherence and fluency. Furthermore, we contribute two large-scale in-domain paired bilingual dialogue datasets to the research community.
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A Datasets

As mentioned in § 4.1, our experiments involve the WMT20 dataset for general-domain pre-training, the newly constructed in-domain chat translation data for the second pre-training (please refer to § 3.1), and two target chat translation corpora, BMELD (Liang et al., 2021a) and BConTrasT (Farajian et al., 2020). The statistics about the splits of training, validation, and test sets of BMELD (En→Zh) and BConTrasT (En→De) are shown in Tab. 9.

WMT20. Following Liang et al. (2021a,e), For En→Zh, we combine News Commentary v15, Wiki Titles v2, UN Parallel Corpus V1.0, CCMT Corpus, and WikiMatrix. For En→De, we combine six corpora including Euporal, ParaCrawl, CommonCrawl, TildeRapid, NewsCommentary, and WikiMatrix. First, we filter out duplicate sentence pairs and remove those whose length exceeds 80. To pre-process the raw data, we employ a series of open-source/in-house scripts, including full-/half-width conversion, unicode conversation, punctuation normalization, and tokenization (Wang et al., 2020). After filtering, we apply BPE (Sennrich et al., 2016) with 32K merge operations to obtain subwords. Finally, we obtain 22,244,066 sentence pairs for En→Zh and 45,541,367 sentence pairs for En→De, respectively.

BMELD. The dataset is a recently released English→Chinese bilingual dialogue dataset, provided by Liang et al. (2021a). Based on the dialogue dataset in the MELD (originally in English) (Poria et al., 2019), they firstly crawled the corresponding Chinese translations from https://www.zimutiantang.com/ and then manually post-edited them according to the dialogue history by native Chinese speakers who are post-graduate students majoring in English. Finally, following Farajian et al. (2020), they assume 50% speakers as Chinese speakers to keep data balance for Zh→En translations and build the bilingual MELD (BMELD). For the Chinese, we follow them to segment the sentence using Stanford CoreNLP toolkit.

BConTrasT. The dataset is first provided by WMT 2020 Chat Translation Task (Farajian et al., 2020), which is translated from English into German and is based on the monolingual Taskmaster-I corpus (Byrne et al., 2019). The conversations (originally in English) were first automatically translated into German and then manually post-edited by Unbabel editors who are native German speakers. Having the conversations in both languages allows us to simulate bilingual conversations in which one speaker (customer), speaks in German and the other speaker (agent), responds in English.

B Implementation Details

For all experiments, we follow the settings of Vaswani et al. (2017), namely Transformer-Base and Transformer-Big. In Transformer-Base, we use 512 as hidden size (i.e., d), 2048 as filter size and 8 heads in multihead attention. In Transformer-Big,
Datasets | #Dialogues | #Utterances |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En→Zh</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zh→En</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En→De</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De→En</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Statistics of chat translation data.

we use 1024 as hidden size, 4096 as filter size, and 16 heads in multthead attention. All our Transformer models contain $L = 6$ encoder layers and $L = 6$ decoder layers and all models are trained using THUMT (Tan et al., 2020) framework. For fair comparison, we set the training step for the first pre-training stage and the second pre-training stage totally to 200,000 (100,000 for each stage), and set the step of fine-tuning stage 5,000. As for the balancing factor $\alpha$ in Eq. 4, we follow (Liang et al., 2021e) to decay $\alpha$ from 1 to 0 over training steps (we set them to 100,000 and 5,000 for the last two training stages, respectively). The batch size for each GPU is set to 4096 tokens. All experiments in three stages are conducted utilizing 8 NVIDIA Tesla V100 GPUs, which gives us about 8*4096 tokens per update for all experiments. All models are optimized using Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with $\beta_1 = 0.9$ and $\beta_2 = 0.998$, and learning rate is set to 1.0 for all experiments. Label smoothing is set to 0.1. We use dropout of 0.1/0.3 for Base and Big setting, respectively. $|T|$ is set to 10. When building the shared vocabulary $|V|$, we keep such word if its frequency is larger than 100. The criterion for selecting hyper-parameters is the BLEU score on validation sets for both tasks. During inference, the beam size is set to 4, and the length penalty is 0.6 among all experiments.

In the case of blind testing or online use (assumed dealing with En→De), since translations of target utterances (i.e., English) will not be given, an inverse De→En model is simultaneously trained and used to back-translate target utterances (Bao et al., 2020), which is similar for other translation directions.

C Case Study

In this section, we present two illustrative cases in Fig. 4 to give some observations among the comparison models and ours.

For the case Fig. 4 (1), we find that most comparison models just translate the phrase “30 seconds away” literally as “30 秒之外 (30 miǎo zhīwài)”, which is very strange and is not in line with Chinese language habits. By contrast, the “M-NCT” and “SML” models, through three-stage training, capture such translation pattern and generate an appropriate Chinese phrase “方圆数里 (fāngyuán shùlǐ)”. The reason behind this is that the large-scale in-domain dialogue bilingual corpus contains many cases of free translation, which is common in daily conversations translation. This suggests that the in-domain pre-training is indispensable for a successful chat translator.

For the case Fig. 4 (2), we find that all comparison models fail to translate the word “games”, where they translate it as “游戏 (yóuxì)”. The reason may be that they cannot fully understand the dialogue context even though some models (e.g., “CSA-NCT” and “M-NCT”) also jointly trained with the dialogue-related auxiliary tasks. By contrast, the “SML” model, enhanced by multi-stage scheduled multi-task learning, obtains accurate results.

In summary, the two cases show that our SML model enhanced by the in-domain data and scheduled multi-task learning yields satisfactory translations, demonstrating its effectiveness and superiority.
Figure 4: The illustrative cases of bilingual conversation translation.