

# Synthetic Spoken Data for Neural Machine Translation

Hany Hassan and Mostafa Elaraby and Ahmed Tawfik

Microsoft Research

{hanyh,a-moelar, atawfik}@microsoft.com

## Abstract

In this paper, we introduce a novel approach to generate synthetic data for training Neural Machine Translation systems. The proposed approach transforms a given parallel corpus between a written language and a target language to a parallel corpus between a spoken dialect variant and the target language. Our approach is language independent and can be used to generate data for any variant of the source language such as slang or spoken dialect or even for a different language that is closely related to the source language.

The proposed approach is based on local embedding projection of distributed representations which utilizes monolingual embeddings to transform parallel data across language variants. We report experimental results on Levantine to English translation using Neural Machine Translation. We show that the generated data can improve a very large scale system by more than 2.8 Bleu points using synthetic spoken data which shows that it can be used to provide a reliable translation system for a spoken dialect that does not have sufficient parallel data.

## 1 Introduction

Neural Machine Translation (NMT) (Bahdanau et al., 2014) has achieved state-of-the-art translation quality in various research evaluations campaigns (Sennrich et al., 2016b) and online large scale production systems (Wu et al., 2016). With such large systems, NMT showed that it can scale up with huge amounts of parallel data. However, such data is not widely available for all domains and language styles. Usually parallel training data

is widely available in written formal languages such as UN and Euroal data.

Real-time speech translation systems support spontaneous, open-domain conversations between speakers of different languages. Speech Translation Systems are becoming a practical tool that can help in eliminating language barriers for spoken languages. Those machine translation systems are usually trained using NMT with large amount of parallel data adapted from written data to the spoken style (Niu and Carpuat, 2016). This is a valid approach when the spoken and written languages are similar and mainly differ in style. For many languages, the written and spoken forms are quite different §2. While written form has an abundance of parallel data to train a reliable NMT system, the spoken form has hardly any parallel data or even a standardized written form for monolingual data.

In this paper, we propose a novel approach to generate synthetic data for NMT. The proposed approach transforms a given parallel corpus between a written language and a target language to a parallel corpus between the spoken dialect variant and the target language. Our approach is language independent and can be used to generate data for any variant of the source language such as slang, spoken dialect or social media style or even for a different language that is closely related to such source language.

The synthetic data generation approach is based on two simple principles: first, distributional word representation can preserve similarity relations across languages (Mikolov et al., 2013). Secondly, a local projection can be learned to transform between various representations (Zhao et al., 2015). We start from parallel corpus between two Languages A and B, then we transform it into a three-way corpus between A, B and C. The proposed approach assumes the existence of a seed bi-lingual lexicon or a small seed parallel data between C and

either A or B.

We used the proposed approach to generate spoken Levantine-English data from Arabic-English data then we experimented with utilizing the generated data in various settings to improve translation for the spoken dialect. The rest of this paper is organized as follows, Section §2 presents an overview of spoken dialects since it is the focus application of this work. Section §3 discusses related work. Section §4 presents a brief overview of Neural machine translation. Section §5 discussed in detail the proposed approach for generating data. Section §6 presents the experimental setup. Finally, we discuss the results and conclude in section §7.

## 2 Spoken Language Variants

Some languages present an additional challenge to Spoken Language Translation (SLT) when the spoken variant differs significantly from the written one. Spoken Brazilian Portuguese differs significantly from written Portuguese. Somewhat similar situation can be observed for the variants of Spanish in Latin America, German in Austria and Switzerland, and French in Canada, Belgium, and Senegale, .. etc.

Moreover, sometimes the spoken language in the daily life is quite different than the more standard form used in the education system as well as in formal communication such as news papers and broadcast news. For example, Singapore English (Singlish) is an English-based creole which is a mix of English, Mandarin, Malay, and Tamil (Lim and Deterding, 2010). Similarly, the standard form of written Arabic is Modern Standard Arabic (MSA); however, it is not the spoken mother tongue by Arabic speakers. The Arabic spoken dialects vary by geo-graphical region with at least five dialects: Egyptian, Levantine, Iraqi, gulf, and North African. While all dialects are stemmed from MSA, they are quite different phonologically, lexically, morphologically and syntactically. For example, spoken colloquial Levantine Arabic conversations share between 61.7% and 77.4% of their vocabulary with a written news corpus from the same region (Al-Shareef and Hain, 2011). This results in spoken dialects that are quite different and not even well interpreted between Arabic speakers of different dialects. An Arabic speaker cannot have a natural spontaneous conversation in MSA unless it is scripted (Bouamor et al., 2014).

Most of the spoken language variants are stemming from a more formal written language such as Singlish from English and Levantine from MSA. While the spoken dialects do not usually have parallel data, they enjoy a wide adoption on social media which results in monolingual corpora for such spoken variants. In this work, we are proposing a novel approach to overcome such limitation for spoken languages through generating parallel data via leveraging the spoken dialects monolingual data and the standard written parallel data.

In this paper we focus on Levantine-English translation as the pressing need for such translation systems due to the the refugee crisis and the need to provide a reliable open-domain translation from Levantine to English.

Dialectal Arabic translation has been a well-known problem, (Zbib et al., 2012) tried to solve this problem by crowd-sourcing translation for dialect data. They translated around (160K sentences) of Levantine and Egyptian data. The main limitation of this approach is that it is quite limited and not scalable. The vocabulary of the collected data is not sufficient to provide open-domain translation system. On the other hand, (Durrani et al., 2014) and (Sajjad et al., 2016) tried to solve the problem by applying rule-based transformation between Levantine or Egyptian to MSA. The main limitation of such approaches is that they require extensive linguistics knowledge to design the conversion rules which are not flexible to new vocabulary and styles that are constantly being introduced to the spoken languages.

## 3 Related Work

There have been a number of proposed approaches to learn synthesized translation units for statistical machine translation systems such as (Klementiev et al., 2012), (Saluja et al., 2014) and (Zhao et al., 2015). Such approaches focused on learning translation rules that would fit into a statistical phrase-based system. Those approaches do not fit Neural Machine Translation (NMT) systems which require full context to learn to encode the sentences.

A number of approaches have been proposed utilizing monolingual target data into NMT training. Most notably, (Sennrich et al., 2016b) used monolingual sentences by generating pseudo parallel data through back-translating the monolingual data and using it in the reverse direction to improve NMT systems. Back-Translation

showed significant improvement especially in domain adaption setups. The back-translation approach is not directly comparable to ours, since ours does not require a pre-trained system while back-translation does require one. However, we are using a seed parallel data as a source of our lexicon and it would be fairly comparable to use such data in both settings as we report in our experiments.

## 4 Neural Machine Translation

Neural Machine Translation is based on Sequence-to-Sequence encoder-decoder model as proposed in (Kalchbrenner and Blunsom, 2013), (Sutskever et al., 2014) and (Cho et al., 2014) along with an attention mechanism to handle longer sentences (Bahdanau et al., 2014) and (Luong et al., 2015a).

In this work we use an in-house implementation similar to (Bahdanau et al., 2014). NMT is modeling the log conditional probability of the target sequence given the source as shown in eqn1:

$$\log p(y|x) = \sum_{k=1}^n \log p(y_k | y_{<k}, x) \quad (1)$$

The encoder is a bidirectional recurrent neural network (LSTM) that calculates the hidden encoder state at each word  $h_1 h_2 \dots h_m$ . The decoder is another recurrent neural network (LSTM) as well that calculates the hidden state at each decoded output word  $s_1 s_2 \dots s_n$ .

$$y_k = \text{softmax}(y_{k-1}, s_k, c_k) \quad (2)$$

where  $c_k$  is calculated by the attention mechanism which is a weighted sum of the encoder’s hidden states that determines the importance of each encoder hidden state to the predicted output. The attention mechanism represents the variable length input sequence as a weighted fixed-dimension context vector  $c_k$

$$c_k = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{ki} h_i \quad (3)$$

where  $\alpha_{ki}$  is calculated as a dot product as described in (Luong et al., 2015a)

$$\alpha_{ki} = \text{softmax}(h_i^T \cdot s_k) \quad (4)$$

During training, all model’s parameters are optimized jointly using stochastic gradient methods to maximize the conditional probability of all sentence pairs in the training data. At decoding time,

one word is predicted at each step, a beam search is used to score the best translation path.

## 5 Synthesized Data Generation

Our data generation approach is motivated by two observations: firstly, distributional representations of words have been found to capture syntactic and semantic regularities in languages. In such continuous representation space, the relative positions between words are preserved across languages (Mikolov et al., 2013). Secondly, the representation spaces have localized sub-clusters from neighboring data point that form smooth manifolds (Roweis and Saul, 2000) which can be leveraged to learn a localized transformation between the sub-clusters in different spaces across languages (Zhao et al., 2015). We exploit those characteristics to design our synthetic data generation approach.

The proposed approach assumes the availability of two resources: (1) parallel data between Language A and Language B, and (2) a seed lexicon or seed parallel data between either B and C or A and C. The resulting data is a three-way data (A-B-C).

Figure 1 illustrates the data generation process. For illustration purposes, let’s assume that we have Spanish (ESN) to English (ENU) parallel data, and we would like to generate Catalan (CAT) to English parallel data. Furthermore, we assume that we have a seed lexicon between Catalan and English, we call it *BiLexicon*

We build three distributional representations (i.e. word2vec) using monolingual corpora: the first is a target representation, English in our example. The second is mixed source representation (Spanish-Catalan in our example). And the third is a Catalan only embedding.

The data generation proceeds as follows:

- For each English word  $e$  in sentence in ESN-ENU parallel data, we query its  $k$ -nearest neighbors ( $k$ -NN)
- $k$ -NN query on the English embedding results in a sub-cluster of  $k$  English words around  $e$ .
- If the  $k$  queried neighbors do not contain at least  $m$  words in *BiLexicon*, we repeat the query with  $2k$ .

- If no  $m$  anchor words can be retrieved, the process terminates for this word and move to the next word.
- We use  $m$  to query *BiLexicon* for equivalent words in the Catalan space.
- As shown in Figure 1, we use the two localized sub-clusters in English and Catalan Spaces to learn a localized projection between the two spaces. This is done using Local Embedding Projection (LEP) §5.3.
- The locally trained LEP is used to project the current English word  $e$  to its equivalent vector in the Catalan space.
- We perform  $k$ -NN query around the projected vector in the Catalan space to get  $n$  candidates words.
- We then rank the  $n$  candidates words according to their similarity with the Spanish words  $s$  aligned to the current English word  $e$ .
- The similarity is calculating cosine Similarity (SIM) in the Spanish-Catalan space between the candidate Catalan words and the Spanish word(s).
- The top ranked Catalan word  $c$  is selected and substituted in place of  $s$
- We can obtain the alignment information between English and Spanish words either by conventional word alignment techniques or by using Bi-Lingual embeddings as described in Section §5.1.

It is worth noting that for one-to-many mappings, we query multiple words as composed vector by addition of their corresponding vectors. There are a few other approaches to compose multi-words vectors. But empirically the simple additive method achieves good performance (Mitchell and Lapata, 2010).

Later on, we discuss the main components: Word Representation §5.1, efficient Nearest Neighbors Search §5.2 and Local Embedding Projection §5.3.

## 5.1 Word Representation

Continuous representations of words have been found to capture syntactic and semantic regularities in languages (Mikolov et al., 2013). The induced representations tend to cluster similar words

together. We directly use continuous representations learned from monolingual corpora such as bag-of-words (CBOW) representation. In such continuous representation spaces, the relative positions between words are preserved across languages. As shown in Figure 1, we learn three independent representations for spoken source, target and mixed sources. Those can be learned from monolingual corpora using off-the-shelf tools such as word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013).

We require a mapping between the words in the original parallel corpus which can be obtained by performing word alignment on the parallel sentences. Alternatively, this requirement can be relaxed by using a bi-lingual embedding trained on any parallel corpus such as Bivec (Luong et al., 2015b). Instead of using word alignment to map the source word to target word(s), we initiate a query to bilingual representation to retrieve the most likely target word mapped to a given source word. This can be handy in the case of using comparable corpus rather than parallel corpus. We evaluate the merit of this approach in §6.4

## 5.2 Nearest Neighbors Search

The algorithm discussed above, requires an extensive number of  $k$ -NN queries per word, which are the most time-consuming part of the procedure. A brute force  $k$ -NN query requires a linear search over the whole source or target vocabulary which is usually in the order of millions taking  $O(n)$  time. This dictates the need for a fast approximate  $k$ -NN query technique. While such techniques are widely used in various machine learning areas especially in vision application, they are not well explored for text applications.

Approximated  $k$ -NN query usually involves two steps, an offline index construction step and an online query step. While the offline step does not affect the run-time, it can be memory consuming. A good approximation sacrifices the query accuracy a little bit, but speeds up the query by orders of magnitude. Locality Sensitive Hashing (LSH) (Indyk and Motwani, 1998) is a popular technique, but its performance decreases as the number of dimensions grows, therefore it is not a good match for high dimensional spaces like ours (Zhao et al., 2015). In this paper, we experimented with two different methods Redundant Bit Vectors (RBV) (Goldstein et al., 2005) and Multiple Random Projection Trees (MRPT) (Hyvönen et al., 2016).




Figure 1: Synthetic Data Generation Using LEP

Redundant Bit Vectors (RBV) (Goldstein et al., 2005) are specially designed to quickly search over high dimensional space. RBV approximates high dimensional space hypersphere by a limited hyper-cube. Moreover, it partitions the query space to promote redundancy in the index while representing each partition with an efficient bit vector.

For a given point  $\mathbf{p}$  in high dimensional space, the volume of a hypersphere of radius  $r$  centered at  $\mathbf{p}$  can be approximately covered by a smaller hypercube that approximates the hypersphere. The dimensions are quantized into bins where each bin redundantly maintains the set of points whose hypercubes intersect with the bin on the particular dimension. This set contains an approximation of the super set of the neighbors of a query point  $\mathbf{p}$  that falls into the same bin on this dimension. Once there is a query  $\mathbf{p}$ , RBV fetches the bins  $\mathbf{p}$  falls into on all dimensions. Then performing a bitwise *AND* operation over the corresponding bit vectors generates the set of points that falls into  $\mathbf{p}$ 's hypercube which represents the candidate neighbor set. Finally, a linear search over this small set finds the approximated  $k$ -nearest neighbors.

MRPT (Hyvönen et al., 2016) uses multiple random projection trees to get a more randomized space-partitioning trees. The random projec-

tion trees result in splitting hyperplanes that are aligned with random directions sampled from the space hypersphere instead of the coordinate axes. Moreover, it utilizes voting search among the random projection trees to provide more randomization that leads to fast query times and accurate results. At run-time, a query  $\mathbf{p}$  is routed down in several trees, and then a linear search, similar to RBV, is performed in the union of the points of all the leaves the query point falls into, the result is the approximated  $k$ -nearest neighbors to  $\mathbf{p}$ .

During our experiments, we found out that MRPT is faster than RBV for both indexing and query time. Therefore we use it through out this work.

### 5.3 Localized Embedding Projection (LEP)

The  $k$ -NN queries result in two local clusters as shown in Figure 1. Given a word in one of the sub-clusters we want to find similar word(s) in the corresponding target sub-cluster. We use Localized Embedding Projection (LEP) to achieve this task.

LEP is based on simple intuition: the two sub-clusters represent smooth manifolds where each data point can be mapped to each other using their neighbors using locally linear transformation. LEP is based on the *locally linear embedding* method which was proposed in (Roweis and Saul,



2000) for nonlinear dimensionality reduction.

LEP utilizes a localized projection matrix for each word, this is unlike global linear projection, as proposed in (Mikolov et al., 2013), which uses a single projection matrix for the all words in the space. As shown in (Zhao et al., 2015), it can be brittle to small non-linearity in the representation vector space and therefore it is not a good choice for all possible words. Unlike global projection, local projection requires an additional  $k$ -NN query to find the neighbors for each word.

In LEP, a linear projection  $W_f$  is learned for each word  $\mathbf{f}$  from its neighbors to the neighbors of the anchor points in the projected/translation space.  $(\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{e}_1), (\mathbf{f}_2, \mathbf{e}_2), \dots, (\mathbf{f}_m, \mathbf{e}_m), \mathbf{f}_i \in N(\mathbf{f})$ .

Let’s denote  $f$  and  $e$  as source side and target side words respectively, and  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $\mathbf{e}$  as the corresponding words vectors. Following Mikolov et al. (2013), we learn the linear projection  $W$  from the translations of the  $n$  most frequent labeled source side phrases:  $(\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{e}_1), (\mathbf{f}_2, \mathbf{e}_2), \dots, (\mathbf{f}_n, \mathbf{e}_n)$ . Denote  $F = [\mathbf{f}_1^T, \mathbf{f}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{f}_n^T]^T$ ,  $E = [\mathbf{e}_1^T, \mathbf{e}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n^T]^T$ .  $W$  is calculated by solving the following linear system:

$$FW = E,$$

whose solution is:

$$W \approx (F^T F)^{-1} F^T E.$$

Once the linear transform  $W$  is known, for each word  $\mathbf{f}$ ,  $\mathbf{f}W = \bar{\mathbf{e}}$  is the location in the target side that should be close to the target words representing similar meaning. A  $k$ -NN query can fetch all the target word vectors near point  $\bar{\mathbf{e}}$ .

## 6 Experimental Setup

We used the proposed approach to generate spoken Levantine-English data from Arabic-English data then we experimented with utilizing the generated data in various settings to improve translation for the spoken dialect.

### 6.1 Datasets

The only publicly available Dialectal Arabic to English parallel corpus is LDC2012T09<sup>1</sup> (Zbib et al., 2012). It consists of about 160K sentences of web data of mixed Levantine and Egyptian manually translated to English. We use this data set as our baseline and as a source for the seed

<sup>1</sup><https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC2012T09>

Corpus	English	Arabic MSA	Levantine
# of Tokens	2b	1.1b	106m
# of Word Vectors	5.1m	6.8m	1.5m

Table 1: Monolingual corpora used in experiments.

lexicon to have anchor points between English and Levantine.

Our main focus is to develop an open-domain conversational translation system for Levantine-English. In recent translation evaluations, OpenSubtitles data (Tiedemann, 2012) has been found to yield good translation quality for conversational domains compared to other data sources (Niu and Carpuat, 2016). Therefore, we opt for using OpenSubtitles-2013<sup>2</sup> which consists of 3M sentences as our Arabic(MSA)-to-English parallel corpus, to generate Levantine-English Parallel corpus.

We have created a three-way test set for evaluating this work (LEV-ENU), where the source is transcription of spontaneous Levantine audio conversations that has been translated into both English and MSA Arabic. The test set is composed of 6K sentences.

We used monolingual corpora to train three distributional representations of English, Levantine and Mixed (MSA with Levantine). The data mostly consist of Gigaword corpora, UN data, Subtitles and web crawled data. The information of these corpora is listed in Table 1.

After that we use the off-the-shelf Word2Vec (Mikolov et al., 2013) to generate the word embeddings for each language using the Continuous Bag-Of-Words scheme, where the number of dimensions  $d = 250$ ,  $window = 5$ ,  $mincount = 5$ .

### 6.2 Data filtering

Our proposed approach depends on the quality of the parallel data, we have noticed that OpenSubtitles data has a lot of misaligned or badly translated sentences. Therefore, we have trained a decision tree classifier to identify whether the sentence pair is noisy or not. We reject the sentence pairs that are noisy. The decision tree classifier utilizes features from the meta-data of the aligned sentence pairs, namely: number of source words, number of target words, unaligned percentage, length-normalized alignment confidence score and per-

<sup>2</sup><http://opus.lingfil.uu.se/>

centage of one-to-one alignments.

On the word level, we do not try to transform all MSA words to its Levantine equivalence. We found that the word representations can map various names and numbers to each other since they appear in close proximity in the distributional space. We have applied a named entity tagger to detect named entities on either source or target sides to avoid mangling them. We also used a stop-word list to avoid mapping them.

### 6.3 NMT model and Pre-Processing

Our NMT system is described in §4, we use a bidirectional encoder with 1024-units LSTM and 2 layers decoder with attention. We use embedding size of 512 and dropout of 0.2.

For pre-processing, we use Byte Pair Encoding PBE (Sennrich et al., 2016a) with 32000 merging operations separately on the source and target. This results in 35K source and 34K target vocabularies. We limit the length of the sentences to 50 words. The training is done using Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) with Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014). We use mini-batch size of 64 and train for 1M steps. The translation quality is measured with lower-cased BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002).

Across all experiments we use those hyper parameters for the data generation process described in §5:  $k = 200$ ,  $n = 3$  and  $m = 5$ .

### 6.4 Bivec vs Word Alignment

In the first set of experiments, we have evaluated whether we should use word-alignment information or Bivec §5.1 to connect the source and target words in the given parallel data. As shown in table 2, our Baseline is trained on LDC2012T09 (160K) of mostly Levantine-English data. We then generate 50K sentences from Arabic-English Subtitles data with bilingual embedding (Gen-Bivec) and without it (Gen-Align). When we are not using Bivec, we just use the word alignment information on the Arabic-English parallel corpus to get the mapping between the words. The result shows that using alignment information is better than using Bivec in this case. It worth noting that using Bivec may be handy if the data is comparable data. In the rest of this work we used word alignment information since it yields better performance.

### 6.5 Data Generation Experiments

In this set of experiments, we added more generated data from the subtitles data applying the fil-

System	Data Size	LEV-ENU-Test
Baseline	160K	16.15
Gen-BiVec	210K	16.43
Gen-Align	210K	16.98

Table 2: LEV-ENU-Test translation performances for using Bivec vs. word alignment

tering described above §6.2. We end up with 1.1M sentences candidates for generation which we use for generating LEV-ENU data. In this setup, we also compared our approach with back-translation (Sennrich et al., 2016a) which is commonly used with NMT. The back-translation is not directly comparable to ours, since ours does not require a pre-trained system while back-translation does require one. However, we are using a seed parallel data as a source of our lexicon and it would be fairly comparable to use such data in both settings.

Furthermore, we investigated two different models to utilize the synthetic data. The first just used the LEV-ENU data while the second leveraged the 3-way characteristic of the generated corpus LEV-MSA-ENU.

We train the following systems:

- Baseline: This is trained on LDC Levantine-English corpus of 160K. Which is also part of all other systems reported below.
- Baseline-MSA: This is trained on LDC data in addition to 1.1M sentence pairs of filtered subtitles data which is MSA-English.
- BT: We trained an English-Levantine system similar to the Baseline though in the reverse direction; we used it to translate the 1.1M subtitles data from English into Levantine
- Gen-Mono-1M: This is the system using the generated LEV-ENU data
- Gen-Mono-Mixed: This system is trained with the source as concatenation of both MSA and Levantine while the target is English.

Table 3 shows that adding the MSA subtitles data (Baseline-MSA) hurt the performance, this is quite expected since the data is mainly MSA but it add a fair comparison in terms of the size of the training data.

Back-translation helped a little bit ( 0.3 Bleu), we think the system trained on LDC parallel data

System	LEV-ENU
Baseline	16.15
Baseline-MSA	15.37
BT	16.59
Gen-Mono	17.33
Gen-Mono-Mixed	17.63

Table 3: Translation performances for NMT with Generated data

is quite small to provide good lexical coverage to generate variates of the translated data that can help in back-translation.

Adding the synthetic data (Gen-Mono) is quite useful and improves the performance by more than 2 Bleu points. Compare to back-translation, the systematic data utilized the monolingual representation which can lead to lexical varieties that help in having better translation examples.

It is interesting to see that having both MSA and LEV as the source helps as well. The system (Gen-Mono-Mixed) used both MSA and the generated LEV as its source. The encoder get access to more information from both MSA and LEV. Surprisingly the attention model did not get confused by the double length of the source sentences.

## 6.6 Open-domain NMT System Experiments

Our main objective in this work is to enable large scale NMT systems to support spoken dialects. Therefore, we experimented with a very large scale Arabic-English open-domain system trying to adapt it to Levantine using the synthetic data. The large scale system uses UN data, subtitles data and various web crawled data with a total of 42M parallel sentences. The system is an ensemble of two identical systems that only differ by initialization, each ensemble is trained for 20 epochs on the data. We tried two approaches to utilize the synthetic data: adding it to the training data as usual and adapting one of the two ensembles by continuing to train it on the synthetic data for 2 more epochs, similar to the approach proposed in (Freatag and Al-Onaizan, 2016).

For this set of experiments, we have added 2M synthetic Levantine-English sentences. We also report results on MT-NIST-08 Arabic-English which is a 4-references test-set<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, we report results on the human converted MSA-ENU which is the same as LEV-ENU testset but translated into MSA by human annotators. This can

<sup>3</sup><https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC2010T01>

System	LEV-ENU	MSA-ENU	NIST08
Large-Sys	25.03	28.20	53.45
Large-Sys+GenData	27.91	28.32	53.42
Large-Sys+Adapted	27.37	27.45	52.97

Table 4: Translation performances for Large Scale NMT with Generated data

represent the oracle score of an MSA trained system on the LEV-ENU testset.

As shown in Table4, we see a very good improvement when adding the synthetic data as additional training data (Large-Sys+GenData) with 2.8 Bleu points. The performance of the system with the synthetic data is little bit shy of the oracle score on the human translated MSA (27.91 vs 28.20). Moreover, the addition of the synthetic data did not impact the MSA test sets as well, which allows to have a combined system for both written and spoken variants. This is a nice characteristic of NMT systems where encoders can successfully handle varieties of source data as has been utilized in multi-lingual systems (Firat et al., 2016).

Adapting the system did help as well but not as good as re-training from scratch, however it may be a good option to avoid retraining the large system again.

## 7 Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper we presented a novel approach for generating synthetic parallel data for spoken dialects to overcome the limitations of the training data availability for such language variants. We show that we need to start from a corresponding parallel data and a seed lexicon or small parallel data. The results show that this approach is quite efficient and useful to improve general purpose NMT systems to the spoken variants.

As for the future work, we would like to investigate the utilization of this approach for more languages as well as different variants such as social media text translation. On the other hand, we would like to investigate the possibility of training the transformation process end-to-end using a single neural network through learning the transformation from the sample seeds while making use of the monolingual corpus to learn the embeddings.

## References

Sarah Al-Shareef and Thomas Hain. 2011. An investigation in speech recognition for colloquial arabic.



- In *INTERSPEECH 2011, 12th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Florence, Italy, August 27-31, 2011*. pages 2869–2872.
- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *CoRR* abs/1409.0473.
- Houda Bouamor, Nizar Habash, and Kemal Oflazer. 2014. A multidialectal parallel corpus of arabic. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2014, Reykjavik, Iceland, May 26-31, 2014*. pages 1240–1245.
- Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merriënboer, Çağlar Gülçehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2014, October 25-29, 2014, Doha, Qatar; A meeting of SIGDAT, a Special Interest Group of the ACL*. pages 1724–1734.
- Nadir Durrani, Yaser Al-Onaizan, and Abraham Ittycheriah. 2014. *Improving Egyptian-to-English SMT by Mapping Egyptian into MSA*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pages 271–282.
- Orhan Firat, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2016. Multi-way, multilingual neural machine translation with a shared attention mechanism. In *HLT-NAACL*.
- Markus Freitag and Yaser Al-Onaizan. 2016. [Fast domain adaptation for neural machine translation](http://arxiv.org/abs/1612.06897). *CoRR* abs/1612.06897. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1612.06897>.
- Jonathan Goldstein, John C Plat, and Christopher JC Burges. 2005. Redundant bit vectors for quickly searching high-dimensional regions. In *Deterministic and Statistical Methods in Machine Learning*, Springer, pages 137–158.
- Ville Hyvönen, Teemu Pitkänen, Sotiris K. Tasoulis, Elias Jaasaari, Risto Tuomainen, Liang Wang, Jukka Corander, and Teemu Roos. 2016. Fast nearest neighbor search through sparse random projections and voting. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Big Data, BigData 2016, Washington DC, USA, December 5-8, 2016*. pages 881–888.
- Piotr Indyk and Rajeev Motwani. 1998. Approximate nearest neighbors: towards removing the curse of dimensionality. In *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. ACM, pages 604–613.
- Melvin Johnson, Mike Schuster, Quoc V. Le, Maxim Krikun, Yonghui Wu, Zhiheng Chen, Nikhil Thorat, Fernanda B. Viégas, Martin Wattenberg, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2016. Google’s multilingual neural machine translation system: Enabling zero-shot translation. *CoRR* abs/1611.04558.
- Nal Kalchbrenner and Phil Blunsom. 2013. Recurrent continuous translation models. In *EMNLP*. volume 3, page 413.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. [Adam: A method for stochastic optimization](http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980). *CoRR* abs/1412.6980. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>.
- Alexandre Klementiev, Ann Irvine, Chris Callison-Burch, and David Yarowsky. 2012. Toward statistical machine translation without parallel corpora. In *Proceedings of the 13th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. EACL ’12, pages 130–140.
- Lisa Lim and David Deterding. 2010. Singapore english. *International Phonetic Association. Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 40(3):359.
- Minh-Thang Luong, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015a. Effective approaches to attention-based neural machine translation. *CoRR* abs/1508.04025.
- Thang Luong, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D Manning. 2015b. Bilingual word representations with monolingual quality in mind. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Vector Space Modeling for Natural Language Processing*. pages 151–159.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Gregory S. Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26: 27th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2013. Proceedings of a meeting held December 5-8, 2013, Lake Tahoe, Nevada, United States*. pages 3111–3119.
- Jeff Mitchell and Mirella Lapata. 2010. Composition in distributional models of semantics. *Cognitive science* 34(8):1388–1429.
- Xing Niu and Marine Carpuat. 2016. The umd machine translation systems at iwslt 2016: English-to-french translation of speech transcripts. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop of Spoken Language Technologies, IWSLT*.
- 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*. Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 311–318.
- Sam T Roweis and Lawrence K Saul. 2000. Nonlinear dimensionality reduction by locally linear embedding. *Science* 290(5500):2323–2326.

- Hassan Sajjad, Nadir Durrani, Francisco Guzmán, Preslav Nakov, Ahmed Abdelali, Stephan Vogel, Wael Salloom, Ahmed El Kholy, and Nizar Habash. 2016. Egyptian arabic to english statistical machine translation system for NIST openmt'2015. *CoRR* abs/1606.05759.
- Avneesh Saluja, Hany Hassan, Kristina Toutanova, and Chris Quirk. 2014. Graph-based semi-supervised learning of translation models from monolingual data. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2014, June 22-27, 2014, Baltimore, MD, USA, Volume 1: Long Papers*. pages 676–686.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016a. Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016, August 7-12, 2016, Berlin, Germany, Volume 1: Long Papers*.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016b. Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016, August 7-12, 2016, Berlin, Germany, Volume 1: Long Papers*.
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey E. Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 15(1):1929–1958.
- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V. Le. 2014. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2014, December 8-13 2014, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*. pages 3104–3112.
- Jrg Tiedemann. 2012. Parallel data, tools and interfaces in opus. In *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*. Istanbul, Turkey.
- Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V. Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, Jeff Klingner, Apurva Shah, Melvin Johnson, Xiaobing Liu, Lukasz Kaiser, Stephan Gouws, Yoshikiyo Kato, Taku Kudo, Hideto Kazawa, Keith Stevens, George Kurian, Nishant Patil, Wei Wang, Cliff Young, Jason Smith, Jason Riesa, Alex Rudnick, Oriol Vinyals, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2016. Google's neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *CoRR* abs/1609.08144.
- Rabih Zbib, Erika Malchiodi, Jacob Devlin, David Stallard, Spyros Matsoukas, Richard M. Schwartz, John Makhoul, Omar Zaidan, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2012. Machine translation of arabic dialects. In *Human Language Technologies: Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association of Computational Linguistics, Proceedings, June 3-8, 2012, Montréal, Canada*. pages 49–59.
- Kai Zhao, Hany Hassan, and Michael Auli. 2015. Learning translation models from monolingual continuous representations. In *NAACL HLT 2015, The 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Denver, Colorado, USA, May 31 - June 5, 2015*. pages 1527–1536.