

VAIYAKARANA: A Benchmark for Automatic Grammar Correction in Bangla

Pramit Bhattacharyya and Arnab Bhattacharya

Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering,

Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur,

India

{pramitb,arnabb}@cse.iitk.ac.in

Abstract

Bangla (Bengali) is the fifth most spoken language globally and, yet, the problem of automatic grammar correction in Bangla is still in its nascent stage. This is mostly due to the need for a large corpus of grammatically incorrect sentences, with their corresponding correct counterparts. The present state-of-the-art techniques to curate a corpus for grammatically wrong sentences involve random swapping, insertion and deletion of words. However, these steps may not always generate grammatically wrong sentences in Bangla. Although large language models (LLMs) perform well in developing synthetic data for English, they lag in generating incorrect sentences for Bangla. In this work, we propose a pragmatic approach to generate grammatically wrong sentences in Bangla. We first categorize the different kinds of errors in Bangla into 5 broad classes and 12 finer classes. We then use these to generate grammatically wrong sentences systematically from a correct sentence. This approach can generate a large number of wrong sentences and can, thus, mitigate the challenge of lacking a large corpus for neural networks. We provide a dataset, *Vaiyākaraṇa*, consisting of 92,830 grammatically incorrect sentences as well as 18,426 correct sentences. We also collected 619 human-generated sentences from essays written by Bangla native speakers. This helped us to understand errors that are more frequent. We evaluated our corpus against neural models and LLMs and also benchmark it against human evaluators, who are native speakers of Bangla. Our analysis shows that native speakers are far more accurate than state-of-the-art models to detect whether the sentence is grammatically correct. However, even native speakers find it difficult to categorise the type of error. This shows the efficacy of our *Vaiyākaraṇa* corpus. Our methodol-

ogy of generating erroneous sentences can be applied for most other Indian languages as well.

1 Introduction

Grammatical Error Correction (GEC) aims to automatically detect and correct grammatical (and other related) errors in a text. Thus, given the following sentence in English, “A **ten year oldest** boy **go** to school.”, it will detect that there are errors in use of superlative degree as well as in verb number, and will correct it to “A **ten-year-old** boy **goes** to school.”. GEC systems are very effective in writing assistants (Napoles et al., 2017), speech recognition systems (Wang and Zheng, 2020), etc. CoNLL-2013 (Ng et al., 2013) and CoNLL-2014 (Ng et al., 2014) put an impetus on the advancement of GEC works in English.

Bangla (Bengali, বাংলা *Vāṁlā*¹) is the fifth most spoken language in the world and yet, to the best of our knowledge, there are only a few works in GEC for Bangla. Alam et al. (2007) proposed a rule-based statistical grammar checker for Bangla. However, the grammatical rules are basic and consequently, they fail to perform even for mildly tricky sentences. One of the pre-requisites of GEC for training-based methods is to have pairs of correct and corresponding wrong sentences. Islam et al. (2018) generated wrong sentences from a corpus of 250K sentences of Bangla by randomly inserting, deleting and swapping words from random positions. The prevalent methods such as random word swapping, deletion, and insertion may have worked well for English and other European languages but since Bangla and Indian languages are mostly free word-order languages, these methods fail to al-

¹We use ISO15919 transliteration scheme in this paper: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_15919

ways generate grammatically wrong sentences for Bangla. Moreover, words in Indian languages are equipped with *kāraka* (case) and *vibhakti* (inflection). Thus, in many sentences, all the six permutations of subject-verb-object are grammatically correct for Indian languages including Bangla. For example, consider the sentence *অমর গীতাকে ভালোবাসে।* (*amara gītākē bhālōvāsē।*, Amara loves Geeta.)² in Bangla as shown in Table A1 of Appendix A. The first five variants are the same words in different word order. The next three are word substitution, word deletion and word insertion variants. All these 8 variants are grammatically correct. Hence, simply using word operations is not enough, and a deeper look into the grammar rules is necessary to generate wrong sentences.

LLMs, including the instruction fine-tuning paradigm, have been highly successful in generating synthetic data for various downstream NLP tasks for English. However, their performance with Bangla is not up to the mark, thereby making them unreliable and unusable. For example, on prompting *বাংলায় ভুল বাক্য গঠন করো* (*vāmlāya bhula vākya gaṭhana karō*, “generate a wrong sentence in Bangla”) to the GPT-3.5 Turbo model, it generates sentences such as *শহরের গলির পাশে নদী পাওয়া যায়নি।* (*śaharēra galira pāsē nadī pāōyā yāyanī।*, No river was found by the side of the alleys of the city.) This sentence is grammatically correct. We show quantitative results in Sec. 5.

Hence, in this paper, we have proposed an alternate but pragmatic approach to generate grammatically incorrect sentences for Bangla. We first categorise the types of grammar errors that are possible in Bangla and other major Indian languages. We then systematically inject these errors in a given correct sentence to generate corresponding wrong sentences. Thus, with our generative method, a large number of incorrect sentences can be generated as a corpus for neural models.

As a benchmark, we have also generated a corpus *Vaiyākaraṇa*, with 92,830 sentences across 12 error categories and have evaluated their quality against both neural models and human evaluators. We also collected 619

human-generated sentences with 230 of them having grammatical errors. The human evaluators perform significantly better than the neural models on error detection.

In sum, our contributions in this paper are:

1. We categorized grammatical errors into 12 categories (Sec. 3). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt at such an extensive categorization of grammatical errors for Bangla.
2. We provide a pragmatic error generation approach (Sec. 4) to generate any number of grammatically erroneous sentences for Bangla. This approach can be also used for other Indian languages such as Hindi.
3. Using the above approach, we generated *Vaiyākaraṇa*, a dataset of 92,830 grammatically inaccurate sentences for Bangla across the 12 error categories.
4. We also collected 619 sentences through human generation by Bangla speakers.
5. We benchmarked *Vaiyākaraṇa* against neural models and native human speakers of Bangla (Sec. 5).

2 Related Work

Bangla and Indian Languages: The GEC work for Indian languages is in its nascent stages. [Sonawane et al. \(2020\)](#) focused on categorizing and generating various kinds of inflectional errors for GEC for Hindi, which can also be employed for other Indian languages. [S. et al. \(2023\)](#) proposed *Vyakranly*, a Hindi translation and Grammar error detection toolkit for Hindi. The authors employed statistical and handwritten rules to detect and correct grammatical errors in Hindi. The spelling error detection task was done at the word level on a corpus of 19,500 words. [Alam et al. \(2007\)](#) proposed a rule-based statistical model for Bangla that detects whether a sentence is correct or not. [Islam et al. \(2018\)](#) generated wrong sentences from a corpus of 250K sentences of Bangla by randomly inserting, deleting and swapping words at random positions. Their main idea was also to detect whether a sentence is grammatically correct. [Rahman et al. \(2023\)](#) proposed a CNN-based spelling error detection and correction model for Bangla on the sentence level. [Oshin et al. \(2023\)](#) provided a novel dataset for Bangla text error

²For every Bangla sentence, we show its transliteration in ISO15919 and translation in English.

classification. The dataset consists of 10,000 sentences from YouTube videos across different genres. The work classified text errors into four categories: spelling, grammatical, code-switching and multiple errors. Only 2,502 comments consist of spelling errors, whereas 638 comments consist of grammatical errors. Our benchmark dataset, *Vaiyākaraṇa*, on the other hand, consists of 92,830 sentences generated from 18,426 gold standard sentences. Our work also focused on categorizing the grammatical errors into 12 categories for Bangla, which, to the best of our knowledge, is also the first attempt at such an extensive categorizing of grammatical errors in Bangla.

[Hossain et al. \(2023\)](#) proposed Panini, a Vaswani-style monolingual transformer-based method for GEC correction in Bangla. In addition, they also curated a 7.7M+ sentences baseline corpus for Bangla GEC synthetically. The sentences are classified into 10 broader classes. In contrast, we classified grammatical errors into 12 classes, including tense errors, Gurucaṇḍālī Dōṣa and Spelling Errors Non-Dictionary and Missing Word Errors (including verb missing errors). We conducted a user survey to gather information about errors made by native and non-native Bangla speakers in real-time. We collected 619 such sentences. The survey revealed that tense errors Gurucaṇḍālī Dōṣa and Spelling Errors in Non-dictionary are common errors in real-time. Hence, they need to be appropriately handled for Bangla GEC. Based on this manual data, we curated *Vaiyākaraṇa* a benchmark dataset 1,11,256 sentences covering sentences from the 18th century (15K+ sentences) to the 21st century (30K+ sentences). We also propose a methodology for GEC in Bangla. Our methodology outperforms state-of-art models in detecting errors at the word level in Bangla.

[Maity et al. \(2024\)](#) generated a dataset of only 3,412 sentences curated by amalgamating 1,678 sentences from essays written by school students and 1,724 sentences by crawling social media websites. This work does not consider Number error, Gender Error and Semantic Error in Bangla, which may not be significant but occur. This work mainly focuses on the limitations of generative LLMs on the Grammar Error Explanation (GEE)

task. In contrast, we generated 1,11,256 benchmark for the GEC task on Bangla and proposed a methodology for deliberately generating wrong sentences in Bangla. In addition to 1,11,256, we also collected 619 sentences from organising a survey on essay writing. We also extensively categorised grammatical errors in Bangla, including Number, Gender and Semantic Errors. In this work, we also highlight the limitations of generative as well as transformer-based models on Bangla in detail.

GEC works in other languages are discussed in Appendix B

3 Grammar Error Correction

Automatic Grammar Error Correction (GEC) is a relatively unexplored territory for Bangla. The prevalent works did not concentrate on categorising most of the grammatical error types, such as word errors, Gurucaṇḍālī Dōṣa³ and others. In this section, we try to formally categorise grammatical errors in Bangla based on grammar. We mostly follow the categories described in one of the most well-known grammar books of Bangla ([Chakraborty, 2018](#)). The grammatical errors for Bangla can be classified into 5 broader classes. These classes as well as the 12 finer distinctions within them are described next. A sentence may contain multiple errors of one class or different classes as well. Table 1 lists example sentences⁴ of the error classes.

3.1 Spelling Errors

Spelling errors are amongst the most frequent types of errors. In Bangla and major Indian languages, there are almost similar sounding consonants and, thus, mistakes between ন / ণ (n / ṅ), শ / ষ / স (ś / ṣ / s), র / ড় / ঢ় (r / ṛ / ṛh), etc. are prominent among even the native speakers. Spelling errors are further classified into 2 types.

1. Non-Dictionary Words: Spelling errors of this type result in words that are not in a dictionary. We have considered Vācaspati ([Bhattacharyya et al., 2023](#)) as the vocabulary of Bangla words since it covers lit-

³This is a special kind of error, found in Bangla, as explained later.

⁴The text in red shows the erroneous portion of a sentence corresponding to the correct text in blue.

Error Class	Sub-class	Example of Wrong Sentence (in red) followed by Correct Sentence (in blue)
Spelling	Non-Dictionary	আমি কারখানায় কাব করি। (āmi kārakhānāya kāva kari, I <non-word> in factory.) আমি কারখানায় কাজ করি। (āmi kārakhānāya kāja kari, I work in factory.)
	Dictionary	আমি কাল বারি যাব। (āmi kāla vāri yāva, I will go water tomorrow.) আমি কাল বাড়ি যাব। (āmi kāla vāri yāva, I will go home tomorrow.) আমি কাল শাড়ি যাব। (āmi kāla śāri yāva, I will go saree tomorrow.) আমি কাল বাড়ি যাব। (āmi kāla vāri yāva, I will go home tomorrow.)
Tense		আমি গতকাল পড়াশোনা করব । (āmi gatakāla paṛāśōnā karava , I will study yesterday.) আমি গতকাল পড়াশোনা করেছিলাম । (āmi gatakāla paṛāśōnā karēchilāma , I studied yesterday.)
		যখন শীত আসবে তখন ফুল ফুটেছিল । (yakhana śīta āsavē takhana phula phuṭēchila , When winter comes, flowers bloomed .) যখন শীত আসবে তখন ফুল ফুটবে । (yakhana śīta āsavē takhana phula phuṭavē , When winter comes, flowers will bloom .)
Person		আমি কারখানায় কাজ করে । (āmi kārakhānāya kāja karē , I works in factory.) আমি কারখানায় কাজ করি । (āmi kārakhānāya kāja kari , I work in factory.)
		আমি এখানে চারজন থাকি। (āmi ēkhānē cārajana thāki, I four stay here.) আমরা এখানে চারজন থাকি। (āmarā ēkhānē cārajana thāki, We four stay here.)
Word	Number	উত্তম একজন অসাধারণ অভিনেত্রী । (uttama ēkajana asādhāraṇa ābhinētrī , Uttam is an outstanding actress .) উত্তম একজন অসাধারণ অভিনেতা । (uttama ēkajana asādhāraṇa ābhinētā , Uttam is an outstanding actor .)
	Gender	আমি রান্নাঘরকে ভাত খাই। (āmi rānnāgharakē bhāta khāi, I eat rice to kitchen.) আমি রান্নাঘরে ভাত খাই। (āmi rānnāgharē bhāta khāi, I eat rice in kitchen.)
Parts-of-Speech		হিমালয়ের সুন্দর অবিস্মরণীয়। (himālayēra sundara avismaraṇīya, The beautiful of Himalaya is unforgettable.) হিমালয়ের সৌন্দর্য অবিস্মরণীয়। (himālayēra saundarya avismaraṇīya, The beauty of Himalaya is unforgettable.)
	Missing	আমি কাল বাড়ি • । (āmi kāla vāri • , I • home tomorrow.) আমি কাল বাড়ি যাব । (āmi kāla vāri yāva , I will go home tomorrow.) উত্তম একজন অসাধারণ • । (uttama ēkajana asādhāraṇa • , Uttam is an outstanding • .) উত্তম একজন অসাধারণ অভিনেতা । (uttama ēkajana asādhāraṇa ābhinētā , Uttam is an outstanding actor .)
Gurucandāli Dōṣa		নন্দাবু ইহা লক্ষ্য করেছেন । (nandavāvu ihā lakṣya karēchēna , Nanda has noticed this.) নন্দাবু ইহা লক্ষ্য করিয়েছেন । (nandavāvu ihā lakṣya kariyaōchēna , Nanda has noticed this.) নন্দাবু ইহা লক্ষ্য করেছেন । (nandavāvu ihā lakṣya karēchēna , Nanda has noticed this .) নন্দাবু এটা লক্ষ্য করেছেন । (nandavāvu ēṭa lakṣya karēchēna , Nanda has noticed this .)
	Punctuation	আমি গতকাল পড়াশোনা করেছিলাম? (āmi gatakāla paṛāśōnā karēchilāma? , I studied yesterday?) আমি গতকাল পড়াশোনা করেছিলাম । (āmi gatakāla paṛāśōnā karēchilāma , I studied yesterday.)
Semantic		মানস আকাশ খেতে ভালোবাসে। (mānasa ākāśa khētē bhālōvāsē, Manas loves to eat the sky.) মানস আকাশ দেখতে ভালোবাসে। (mānasa ākāśa dēkhatē bhālōvāsē, Manas loves to see the sky.)
		মানস আকাশ খেতে ভালোবাসে। (mānasa ākāśa khētē bhālōvāsē, Manas loves to eat the sky .) মানস মাছ খেতে ভালোবাসে। (mānasa mācha khētē bhālōvāsē, Manas loves to eat fish .)

Table 1: Grammatical Error Types in Bangla

erary works of almost 8 centuries and works from both India and Bangladesh. In the example shown in Table 1, কাজ (kāja) gets changed to কাব (kāva) which is not a word.

2. Dictionary Words: A spelling error of this type produces another word which is in the dictionary. However, in the context of the sentence, it is an error. For example, in Table 1, changing ড় (ṛ) of বাড়ি (vāri) to র (r) produces a perfect word বারি (vāri). The sentence, however, ceases to have any valid meaning. Mostly these errors are of homonym types, i.e., similar sounding words. Simple non-homonym typos may, however, also result in a dictionary word শাড়ি (śāri) that does not make sense in the sentence, as shown in the second example.

3.2 Word Errors

A prominent class of grammatical errors in almost any language including Bangla is word errors. We have categorized word errors further into different sub-classes as explained next.

1. Tense Error: In Bangla, like most other languages, there are specific verb forms for the three tenses. Hence, not using the correct form results in an error, as shown in the example in Table 1. However, tense errors are more common when multiple verbs are used in a sentence, and a mismatch among the tenses occur. In the second example in the table, while the first verb আসবে (āsavē) is in future tense, the second verb ফুটেছিল (phuṭēchila) is in past tense.
2. Person Error: Similar to tenses, there are different verb forms and pronouns for different persons in Bangla. It is, thus, an error to use the wrong person of a verb. The sentence in Table 1 shows an example where instead of the first person form করি (kari), the third person form করে (karē) is used with the pronoun আমি (āmi, I). These errors are common in Indian languages.
3. Number Error: In Bangla, the verb forms for both singular and plural numbers are the same. However, there are distinct forms

for pronouns. The example in Table 1 shows such a wrong usage where the singular form আমি (āmi) is used instead of the plural form আমরা (āmarā). Number errors are more common in other Indian languages compared to Bangla.

4. Gender Error: In Bangla, the verb forms and pronouns for different genders are the same. However, there are distinct forms for adjectives as well as nouns. Moreover, the gender and number of an adjective should match that of the noun it qualifies. Hence, in the example in Table 1, since the proper noun উত্তম (uttama) is masculine, the correct adjective used should be the masculine form অভিনেতা (abhinētā) and not the feminine form অভিনেত্রী (abhinētrī). While strictly speaking, masculine forms of adjectives should not be used for feminine nouns, it is a common practice to accept them. In such sentences, the masculine form takes the role of a gender-neutral form. Hence, the sentence সুচিত্রা একজন অসাধারণ অভিনেতা। (sucitrā ēkajana asādhāraṇa abhinētā, Suchitra is an outstanding actor.) where সুচিত্রা (sucitrā) is a feminine proper noun but the adjective অভিনেতা (abhinētā) is masculine is not considered as incorrect. Many Indian languages such as Hindi has different forms of verbs for different genders and, thus, this kind of error is more common in those languages as compared to Bangla.
5. Case Error: Bangla and other Indian languages use a lot of inflected words. For different cases, different word forms are used that modify the original word. Case endings loosely correspond to prepositions in English. In the example in Table 1, the wrong case accusative is used instead of the correct case locative.
6. Parts-of-Speech Error: Sometimes, a word is used in a wrong parts-of-speech (POS). Since Indian languages including Bangla use a lot of nouns and their corresponding adjectives, these errors are common. Instead of a noun form, the adjective form is sometimes erroneously used, as shown in the example in Table 1.
7. Missing Word Error: These sentences are incomplete because of a missing word. Missing a verb in Bangla will always generate

this kind of error, as shown in the example in Table 1, while missing a random word may or may not be grammatically wrong, missing a noun corresponding to its adjective will also generate an erroneous sentence. The second example in Table 1 shows such a sentence.

3.3 Mixing of Language Variants: Gurucaṇḍālī Dōṣa

Bangla has a unique temporal language feature. All written works in Bangla till the 19th century were exclusively in সাধু ভাষা (sādhu bhāṣā, “refined language”). Authors started switching to (calita bhāṣā, “colloquial language”) during the the 20th century and, currently, almost all the works are in this variant of the language. The two differ mostly in verb forms and pronouns, and use exclusive sets of these. This is similar to the old English usage of “thou shalt” versus the modern “you shall”, etc., but is more elaborate. A sentence should be written either in one of the variants. It is, thus, an error to mix, for example, pronouns of one variant with verbs of another variant. The example in Table 1 shows two cases. The sentence নন্দবাবু ইহা লক্ষ্য করেছেন। (nandavāvu ihā lakṣya karēchēna) mixes the sādhu bhāṣā pronoun form ইহা (ihā) with the calita bhāṣā verb form করিয়াছেন (kariyāchēna). Either the verb form or the pronoun can be corrected, as shown in the examples. This mixing error is known as “গুরুচণ্ডালী দোষ” (Gurucaṇḍālī Dōṣa) in Bangla.

3.4 Punctuation Errors

Punctuation errors occur due to usage of wrong punctuation marks, or absence of punctuation marks where needed, or spurious usage of punctuation marks. Thus, while a simple imperative sentence ends with a । (fullstop mark), putting ? (interrogative mark) results in an error, as shown in Table 1.

3.5 Semantic Errors

Semantic error is a special class of error where the sentence’s semantic meaning becomes inconsistent or fictitious in the real world. For example, consider the sentence মানস আকাশ খেতে ভালোবাসে। (mānasa ākāśa khētē bhālōvāsē) which literally means “Manas loves to eat the sky.” or. Although both of these sentences

are grammatically correct as far as usage of words, spellings, etc. are concerned, it is still considered a wrong sentence due to its semantics. Note that this is for ordinary usage in a language, and such sentences may be correct in science fiction or other fantasy novels. Table 1 shows two correct sentences corresponding to the above wrong one. While in the first example, the verb is modified, in the second, the noun is modified to produce a semantically meaningful sentence.

4 Corpus

We aim to generate a corpus for automatic grammar correction in Bangla. We first curate a dataset by collecting hand-written sentences from Bangla speakers. However, since there is an issue in scalability of hand-written sentences, we also follow a rule-based approach for systematically generating erroneous sentences by injecting errors in correct sentences. We next discuss both these approaches.

4.1 Manual Generation

Our aim for manual generation is to get hands-on data on grammatical errors made by Bangla speakers during writing. We organized a survey asking participants to write an essay on a particular topic. Each participant was expected to write an essay within 20 minutes comprising at least 10 sentences and 100 words on a topic chosen by her from a set of choices. The survey took place in a proctored environment to generate an exam-like situation; this enabled us to gather live data (with errors) on Bangla. We gathered 619 sentences and 7,124 words from 36 essays written by 36 participants. The details of the topic and participants are provided in Appendix D. Of the 619 sentences written, 230 sentences were grammatically incorrect. Out of these, 49 sentences had multiple errors, while 181 had single errors. A total of 302 words were erroneous in these 230 sentences.

Table 2 shows the number of errors of each category described in Table 1 along with their percentage of occurrence with respect to the total number of erroneous words. Spelling mistakes are the most common type of errors, occurring more than 50% of the time. Further investigation reveals that more than 40% of

Error Class	#Occurrences	Percentage
Non-Dictionary	125	41.39%
Dictionary	45	14.90%
Spelling Errors	170	56.29%
Tense Errors	3	0.99%
Person Errors	5	1.66%
Number Errors	2	0.66%
Gender Errors	0	0.00%
Case Errors	47	15.56%
POS Errors	4	1.32%
Missing Words	17	5.63%
Word Errors	78	25.82%
Punctuation Errors	44	14.57%
Semantic Errors	1	0.33%
Gurucanḍālī Dōṣa	9	2.98%
Total	302	100.00%

Table 2: Grammatical errors in manual annotation

spelling errors are due to the mixing of the characters ‘ন’(n)/‘ণ’(ṅ); ‘র’(r)/‘ড়’(ṛ)/‘ঢ়’(ṛh); and ‘স’(s)/‘শ’(ś)/‘ষ’(ṣ). The mixing of “কি” (ki, whether) versus “কী” (kī, what) is the most prominent type of dictionary-based word spelling error. Tense, person, gender, number, POS and semantic errors are not that frequent. Punctuation errors are quite common, though.

4.2 Vaiyakarana

We collected 18,026 sentences from the Vācaspati (Bhattacharyya et al., 2023) corpus and 400 sentences from a well-known grammar book (Chakroborty, 2018). The sentences from the Vācaspati corpus are taken from literary works written between 1850 and 2022. Authors from both India (13,000 sentences) and Bangladesh (5,250 sentences) are represented. Thus, the dataset is curated to cover the temporal and spatial variations of Bangla. The 400 sentences from the grammar book make the dataset more grammatically and linguistically enriched. It also serves as a gold standard sentence for generating errors. These sentences were manually typed to avoid any error. We, thus, curated a dataset with 18,426 sentences. We followed the data cleaning and preprocessing steps as described in Appendix C to make the curated dataset suitable enough for error generation.

The steps taken to inject noise for different kinds of errors are next described.

- **Spelling Errors:** Spelling errors are those for which the original intention was to write the correct word, but some characters are wrongly typed. Typically, the misspelled word should be within one or at most two edit distance from the original word. They can be, thus, generated by substituting, inserting, or deleting one or two characters of a randomly chosen word in a sentence. These generated spelling errors may be of non-dictionary or dictionary types. We further collected 300 homonym word pairs from (Chakroborty, 2018). These homonyms are very common in Bangla. We replaced the original word in sentences with its corresponding homonyms to generate dictionary-based spelling errors.
 - **Word Errors:** We have followed different procedures to generate different types of word errors in Bangla.
 1. **Tense Error:** We collected 24 most commonly used verbs and their forms across three tenses and three persons, resulting in 470 verb forms from (Chakroborty, 2018). These verb forms are replaced against the original word to generate erroneous sentences.
 2. **Person Error:** To generate these types of errors, we replaced the original verb form with its corresponding verb form from the other two types of persons.
 3. **Number Error:** To generate this kind of error, we collected 23 pronouns with both of their singular-plural forms from (Chakroborty, 2018). We injected this error by deliberately replacing the original singular (respectively, plural) pronoun with its corresponding plural (respectively, singular) form. For pronoun detection, we used the POS tagger by Sarker (2021) since pronouns are typically a frozen list and taggers do well on detecting them.
 4. **Gender Error:** We collected 350 masculine-feminine gender pairs described in (Chakroborty, 2018). We replaced the original word with its counterpart gender word to generate this kind of error.
 5. **Case Error:** We handcrafted 200 sentences for this kind of error. In each sentence, we chose a random word and changed its case. We employed three native speakers to validate the error category, and based on majority voting, we added the sentences in *Vaiyākaraṇa*.
 6. **POS Error:** We collected 350 noun-adjective word pairs from (Chakroborty, 2018). We replaced a noun (respectively, adjective) with its corresponding adjective (respectively, noun) to generate errors.
 7. **Missing Word Error:** We ran the POS tagger (Sarker, 2021) and deleted verbs from the sentence to generate erroneous sentences. We applied the same technique to delete the noun corresponding to its adjective to generate errors. For other cases, we randomly deleted some words from the sentences. We asked three native speakers to validate whether the generated sentence was an error, and based on majority voting, we marked the sentences. If it is an error, we add the sentence to *Vaiyākaraṇa*. Else, we discard it.
 - **Semantic Error:** We handcrafted 500 sentences for this kind of error. We employed three native speakers to validate the error category of the sentences, and based on majority voting, we added the sentences in *Vaiyākaraṇa*.
 - **Gurucanḍālī Dōṣa:** We collected verbs and pronouns with their corresponding *sādhū* and *calita* forms from (Chakroborty, 2018). We then replaced the original word with its counterpart to generate this kind of error. In order to generate these sentences, we make sure that at least one verb or pronoun retains its original form so that the resulting sentence is actually an error that mixes the two variants.
- By following these steps, we generated 92,830 grammatically incorrect sentences, as outlined in Table 3. Following this procedure, we can generate large number of grammatically incorrect sentences for Bangla, which is a necessity for neural models.
- Although we focussed on generating *Vaiyākaraṇa* for Bangla, the aforementioned procedures of injecting noise to generate grammatically wrong sentences can also be

Error Class	#Sentences
Non-Dictionary	9,213
Dictionary Spelling	9,213
Spelling Error	18,426
Tense Error	3,071
Person Error	3,071
Number Error	3,071
Gender Error	3,071
Case Error	200
POS Error	3,071
Missing Word	3,071
Word Error	18,626
Punctuation Errors	18,426
Semantic Errors	500
Gurucanḍālī Dōṣa	18,426
<i>Incorrect</i>	92,830
<i>Correct</i>	18,426
Total	1,11,256

Table 3: Grammatical Error Types in Bangla

applied to other Indian languages, like Hindi, with little or no modification.

5 Evaluation

5.1 Machine Evaluation

We benchmarked Vaiyākaraṇa against the transformer-based models and LLMs. The models include monolingual models such as BanglaBERT (Bhattacharjee et al., 2022) and Vāc-bert (Bhattacharyya et al., 2023) as well as multilingual models such as XLM (large) (Conneau et al., 2020), mBERT (Pires et al., 2019), IndicBERT (Doddapaneni et al., 2023), MuRIL (Khanuja et al., 2021) We have also evaluated Vaiyākaraṇa against multilingual LLMs such as GPT-3.5, GPT-Neo (Black et al., 2022), Bloom 1.1B (Workshop et al., 2023) and monolingual LLM Paramanu-Bangla (Niyogi and Bhattacharya, 2024) 108.5M. Each model is run 5 times for 20 iterations with different seed values, and mean and standard deviations are reported in Table A3. Since standard deviations are low, the highest was not very different from the mean. «««< HEAD We have also reported the macro-F1 score achieved by Random Forest classifier, a non-neural model on the categorization task in Table A3. Hyperparameter details of all the models are provided in Appendix H. Unless otherwise mentioned, the macro-F1 score is used as the evaluation metric for all the classification tasks.

Model	Parameters	Binary	Broad	Finer
		Mean	Mean	Mean
mBERT	180M	39.32±0.03	36.41±0.02	32.18±0.02
XLM-R (large)	550M	40.04±0.02	35.91±0.02	30.98±0.02
IndicBERTv2.0	117M	43.30±0.01	38.20±0.05	31.90±0.03
MuRIL	236M	43.13±0.02	38.22±0.02	31.78±0.02
BanglaBERT	110M	54.06±0.02	47.84±0.02	40.84±0.02
Vāc-BERT	17M	54.87±0.03	47.84±0.03	40.72±0.02
RandomForest	0.42M	47.00±0.55	38.50±0.74	32.30±1.25
Human	12	81.00±3.46	68.50±3.75	57.30±3.90

Table 4: Macro-F1 on 600 human-evaluated sentences.

5.1.1 Error Classification Tasks

We tested three kinds of classification tasks. The first is a binary class, simply indicating if a given sentence is grammatically correct or wrong. The first multi-class task is for the 5+1 broad classes (ignoring the sub-classes), while the last one attempts to classify into the finer classes as well (12+1 classes).

5.1.2 Results

Table A3 of Appendix E shows the performance of all neural models and Random Forest Classifier on the 1,11,256 sentences in Vaiyākaraṇa.

BanglaBERT achieves the max mean and highest macro-F1 score for both the multi-class classification tasks, while Vāc-bert achieves the same for binary classification tasks. However, Table A3 also implies that only 52% of the time, the models are able to classify the sentences as correct or wrong, which decreases to 48% for broader classes and 41% for finer classes. The models performed poorly in detecting dictionary-based spelling errors, wrong POS errors, semantic errors and Gurucandali Dosa, but they performed fairly well in detecting person errors. Overall this results indicates that transformer-based models are not equipped to perform GEC in Bangla directly.

5.2 Prompts in LLMs

In this section, we discuss the ability of LLMs to detect and correct Bangla grammatical errors. We converted Vaiyākaraṇa into Alpaca JSON format for instruction tuning LLMs like GPT-Neo, GPT-3.5 and Paramanu. We instruction tuned the LLMs using the following prompts “বাক্যটি সঠিক অথবা ভুল কিনা তা নির্ধারণ কর।” (vākyati saṭhika athavā bhula kinā tā nirdhāraṇa kara|, is this sentence grammatically correct?) and “সঠিক ব্যাকরণ সংশো-

ধন কর।” (saṭhika vyākaraṇa saṁśōdhana karal, correct this sentence) and evaluated their responses against the ground truth on the human evaluated 600-sentence set mentioned in Sec 5.3. Table 5 shows the results of prompts with and without instruction-tuning the LLMs. Example sentences and responses to the prompts are shown in Appendix G. An in-depth analysis of the responses shows that the LLMs perform decently in identifying tense, person and gender errors (~45%). However, their performance drops to below 20% for dictionary-based spelling errors (homonyms), POS errors and gurucanḍālī dōṣa which increases to nearly 30% after instruction-tuning GPT-4. This result highlights the limitations directly using LLMs for GEC in Bangla.

5.3 Human Evaluation

To evaluate our benchmark dataset more rigorously, we next did a human evaluation of the same. We built an interface where given a sentence, a participant marks the error class (including the correct one). We took help of 12 Bangla speakers, each of whom was provided with a set of 50 sentences. This was selected randomly from a set of 2500 sentences from Vaiyākaraṇa, comprising 650 correct sentences and 1850 wrong sentences. There was no overlap between the set of sentences that each participant received. The mean macro-F1 scores achieved by 12 humans for binary, broad classes, and finer classes are 81.00%, 68.50%, and 57.33% respectively, while the highest macro-F1 scores by a human are 87.00%, 78.50% and 73.33% respectively. All of the respondents concur that categorising the errors of the sentences is not trivial, thus validating our claim that Vaiyākaraṇa can be a suitable benchmark for GEC in Bangla. We tested the transformer models against these $12 \times 50 = 600$ sentences under the setting described in Sec 5.1. Table 4 shows the results of various transformer models on the 600 manually evaluated sentences.

6 Discussions and Future Work

In this paper, we proposed a rule-based noise injection methodology for generating grammatically wrong sentences in Bangla.

We have generated erroneous sentences

Model	Without Instruction Tuning		With Instruction Tuning	
	1st Prompt	2nd Prompt	1st Prompt	2nd Prompt
GPT-3.5	28.30	29.70	40.60	41.80
GPT-4.0	30.30	32.60	43.30	47.50
OPT	26.50	27.20	35.30	36.60
GPT-Neo	26.38	27.58	27.90	30.60
Paramanu	25.00	25.50	29.00	29.50

Table 5: Macro-F1 of different LLMs for prompts with and without instruction tuning for 600 sentences.

across 12 categories in Bangla, which is the most extensive categorization of grammatical errors for Bangla.

We curated Vaiyākaraṇa consisting of 92,830 wrong and 18,426 correct sentences. We also collected a set of 619 sentences (230 being wrong) from manually written essays. The results show that human evaluators significantly outperform the neural models on all the classification tasks. However, even the human evaluators failed to perform satisfactorily on the finer classification task, implying that neither the task nor our dataset is trivial.

In future, we would like to apply this methodology to generate benchmarks for other Indian languages.

7 Limitations

Curating a large quality benchmark for GEC requires a good quality lemmatizer and POS tagger. Bangla suffers from a lack of quality lemmatizers and POS taggers. Hence, we had to resort to manually adding words available from (Chakroborty, 2018).

Also, hand-written Bangla data is not readily available. We conducted a survey and collected 619 hand-written sentences. In future, we will try to collect more hand-written sentences in Bangla.

Finally, while the 12 human evaluators are all native speakers of Bangla, evaluating against Bangla grammarians could have given us more insights into the process. We are planning to do that in the future.

8 Ethics Statement

The Vaiyākaraṇa benchmark is curated by merging sentences from Vacaspati corpus (Bhattacharyya et al., 2023) and (Chakroborty, 2018). The authors of Vacaspati provided us with the corpus, and (Chakroborty, 2018) is publicly available. Hence, there is no copyright infringement in curating Vaiyākaraṇa. We have made efforts

to ensure that *Vaiyākaraṇa* is also devoid of any objectionable statements. We have also conducted a manual essay writing survey for gathering real word errors. The participants have kindly allowed us to use their essays for research purpose. We will release *Vaiyākaraṇa*, alpaca format *Vaiyākaraṇa*, manual hand-written data, along with codes for the rule-based noise injection methodology upon acceptance of the paper under a non-commercial license.

References

- Md. Jahangir Alam, Naushad UzZaman, and Munit Khan. 2007. [N-gram based statistical grammar checker for bangla and english](#).
- Abhik Bhattacharjee, Tahmid Hasan, Wasi Ahmad Uddin, Kazi Mubasshir, Md. Saiful Islam, Anindya Iqbal, M. Sohel Rahman, and Rifat Shahriyar. 2022. [Banglabert: Languange Model Pretraining and Benchmarks for Low-Resource Language Understanding Evaluation in Bangla](#). In Findings of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022.
- Pramit Bhattacharyya, Joydeep Mondal, Subhadip Maji, and Arnab Bhattacharya. 2023. [VA-CASPATI: A diverse corpus of Bangla literature](#). In Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 1118–1130, Nusa Dua, Bali. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sid Black, Stella Biderman, Eric Hallahan, Quentin Anthony, Leo Gao, Laurence Golding, Horace He, Connor Leahy, Kyle McDonell, Jason Phang, Michael Pieler, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Shivanshu Purohit, Laria Reynolds, Jonathan Tow, Ben Wang, and Samuel Weinbach. 2022. [Gpt-neox-20b: An open-source autoregressive language model](#).
- Adriane Boyd. 2018. [Using Wikipedia edits in low resource grammatical error correction](#). In Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop W-NUT: The 4th Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text, pages 79–84, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#).
- Christopher Bryant, Mariano Felice, Øistein E. Andersen, and Ted Briscoe. 2019. [The BEA-2019 shared task on grammatical error correction](#). In Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications, pages 52–75, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bamandev Chakroborty. 2018. *Uchchatarā Bangla Byakaran*, volume 2nd. Akshay Malancha.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omerick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2022. [Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways](#).
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. [Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale](#). In Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sam Davidson, Aaron Yamada, Paloma Fernandez Mira, Agustina Carando, Claudia H. Sanchez Gutierrez, and Kenji Sagae. 2020. [Developing NLP tools with a new corpus of learner Spanish](#). In Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, pages 7238–7243, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.

- Sumanth Doddapaneni, Rahul Aralikkatte, Gowtham Ramesh, Shreya Goyal, Mitesh M. Khapra, Anoop Kunchukuttan, and Pratyush Kumar. 2023. [Towards leaving no Indic language behind: Building monolingual corpora, benchmark and models for Indic languages](#). In Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 12402–12426, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nahid Hossain, Mehedi Hasan Bijoy, Salekul Islam, and Swakkhar Shatabda. 2023. [Panini: a transformer-based grammatical error correction method for bangla](#). *Neural Comput. Appl.*, 36(7):3463–3477.
- Budi Irmawati, Hiroyuki Shindo, and Yuji Matsumoto. 2017. [Generating artificial error data for indonesian preposition error corrections](#). *International Journal of Technology*, 8(3):549–558.
- Sadidul Islam, Mst. Farhana Sarkar, Towhid Husain, Md. Mehedi Hasan, Dewan Md Farid, and Swakkhar Shatabda. 2018. [Bangla sentence correction using deep neural network based sequence to sequence learning](#). In 2018 21st International Conference of Computer and Information Technology (ICCIT), pages 1–6.
- Simran Khanuja, Diksha Bansal, Sarvesh Mehtani, Savya Khosla, Atreyee Dey, Balaji Gopalan, Dilip Kumar Margam, Pooja Aggarwal, Rajiv Teja Nagipogu, Shachi Dave, Shruti Gupta, Subhash Chandra Bose Gali, Vish Subramanian, and Partha Talukdar. 2021. [MuriL: Multilingual Representations for Indian Languages](#).
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. [Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization](#). In 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings.
- Katerina Korre and John Pavlopoulos. 2022. [Enriching grammatical error correction resources for Modern Greek](#). In Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, pages 4984–4991, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Myunghoon Lee, Hyeonho Shin, Dabin Lee, and Sung-Pil Choi. 2021. [Korean grammatical error correction based on transformer with copying mechanisms and grammatical noise implantation methods](#). *Sensors*, 21(8).
- Jared Lichtarge, Chris Alberti, Shankar Kumar, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, and Simon Tong. 2019. [Corpora generation for grammatical error correction](#). In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), pages 3291–3301, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Subhankar Maity, Aniket Deroy, and Sudeshna Sarkar. 2024. [How ready are generative pre-trained large language models for explaining bengali grammatical errors?](#)
- Jakub Náplava and Milan Straka. 2019. [CUNI system for the building educational applications 2019 shared task: Grammatical error correction](#). In Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications, pages 183–190, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Courtney Napoles, Keisuke Sakaguchi, and Joel Tetreault. 2017. [JFLEG: A fluency corpus and benchmark for grammatical error correction](#). In Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers, pages 229–234, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hwee Tou Ng, Siew Mei Wu, Ted Briscoe, Christian Hadiwinoto, Raymond Hendy Susanto, and Christopher Bryant. 2014. [The CoNLL-2014 shared task on grammatical error correction](#). In Proceedings of the Eighteenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning: Shared Task, pages 1–14, Baltimore, Maryland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hwee Tou Ng, Siew Mei Wu, Yuanbin Wu, Christian Hadiwinoto, and Joel Tetreault. 2013. [The CoNLL-2013 shared task on grammatical error correction](#). In Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning: Shared Task, pages 1–12, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mitodru Niyogi and Arnab Bhattacharya. 2024. [Paramanu: A family of novel efficient indic generative foundation language models](#).
- OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, and Paul Baltescu et al. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#).
- Nabilah Oshin, Syed Hoque, Md Fahim, Amin Ahsan Ali, M Ashraful Amin, and Akmmahbubur Rahman. 2023. [BaTEClCoR: A novel dataset for Bangla text error classification and correction](#). In Proceedings of the First Workshop on Bangla Language Processing (BLP-2023), pages 124–135, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Telmo Pires, Eva Schlinger, and Dan Garrette. 2019. [How Multilingual is Multilingual BERT?](#) In Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 4996–5001, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chowdhury Rahman, MD.Hasibur Rahman, Samiha Zakir, Mohammad Rafsan, and Mohammed Eunus Ali. 2023. [BSpell: A CNN-blended BERT based Bangla spell checker](#). In Proceedings of the First Workshop on Bangla Language Processing (BLP-2023), pages 7–17, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gaoqi Rao, Qi Gong, Baolin Zhang, and Endong Xun. 2018. [Overview of NLPTEA-2018 share task Chinese grammatical error diagnosis](#). In Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Natural Language Processing Techniques for Educational Applications, pages 42–51, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alla Rozovskaya and Dan Roth. 2019. [Grammar error correction in morphologically rich languages: The case of Russian](#). Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 7:1–17.
- Rachel S., Vasudha S., Shriya T., Rhotuja K., and Lakshmi Gadhikar. 2023. [Vyakranly: Hindi grammar & spelling errors detection and correction system](#). In 2023 5th Biennial International Conference on Nascent Technologies in Engineering (ICNTE), pages 1–6.
- Sagor Sarker. 2021. [BNLP: Natural language processing toolkit for Bengali language](#).
- Aiman Solyman, Zhenyu Wang, Qian Tao, Arafat Abdulgader Mohammed Elhag, Rui Zhang, and Zeinab Mahmoud. 2022. [Automatic arabic grammatical error correction based on expectation-maximization routing and target-bidirectional agreement](#). Knowledge-Based Systems, 241:108180.
- Ankur Sonawane, Sujeet Kumar Vishwakarma, Bhavana Srivastava, and Anil Kumar Singh. 2020. [Generating inflectional errors for grammatical error correction in Hindi](#). In Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: Student Research Workshop, pages 165–171, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Oleksiy Syvokon, Olena Nahorna, Pavlo Kuchmichuk, and Nastasiia Osidach. 2023. [UA-GEC: Grammatical error correction and fluency corpus for the Ukrainian language](#). In Proceedings of the Second Ukrainian Natural Language Processing Workshop (UNLP), pages 96–102, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lihao Wang and Xiaoqing Zheng. 2020. [Improving grammatical error correction models with purpose-built adversarial examples](#). In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), pages 2858–2869, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2022. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#).
- BigScience Workshop, :, Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gellé, Jonathan Tow, Alexander M. Rush, Stella Biderman, Albert Webson, and Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi et al. 2023. [Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model](#).
- Helen Yannakoudakis, Ted Briscoe, and Ben Medlock. 2011. [A new dataset and method for automatically grading ESOL texts](#). In Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 180–189, Portland, Oregon, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, Kurt Shuster, Daniel Simig, Punit Singh Koura, Anjali Sridhar, Tianlu Wang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. [Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models](#).

Original sentence	অমর গীতাকে ভালোবাসে। amara gītākē bhālōvāsē।
Word order 1	গীতাকে অমর ভালোবাসে। gītākē amara bhālōvāsē।
Word order 2	গীতাকে ভালোবাসে অমর। gītākē amara bhālōvāsē।
Word order 3	অমর ভালোবাসে গীতাকে। gītākē amara bhālōvāsē।
Word order 4	ভালোবাসে অমর গীতাকে। gītākē amara bhālōvāsē।
Word order 5	ভালোবাসে গীতাকে অমর। gītākē amara bhālōvāsē।
Word substitution	শ্যামল গীতাকে ভালোবাসে। śyāmala gītākē bhālōvāsē।
Word deletion	অমর ভালোবাসে। amara bhālōvāsē।
Word insertion	অমর গীতাকে খুব ভালোবাসে। amara gītākē khuva bhālōvāsē।

Table A1: Word order shuffling, substitution, deletion and insertion may not necessarily generate wrong sentences in Bangla.

A Word Order

Table A1 shows that all possible word order of sentence অমর গীতাকে ভালোবাসে। (amara gītākē bhālōvāsē।) is correct.

B Related Work

In this section we discuss about GEC in English and other non-Indian languages.

English: CoNLL-shared task 2013 (Ng et al., 2013) and CoNLL-shared task 2014 (Ng et al., 2014) played a pivotal role in advancing GEC works in English. Other than providing 55,000+ grammatically incorrect sentences in English, they also categorized grammatical errors in English into 5 broad classes and 27 finer classes. Napoles et al. (2017) presented a parallel corpus of 1,511 sentences for English representing an extended range of language proficiency and uses holistic edits that make the original text more native sounding. Yannakoudakis et al. (2011) curated a corpus of 1,238 scripts from 1,238 distinct learners. The BEA-2019 shared task (Bryant et al., 2019) contributed a new benchmark dataset of 43,169 sentences curated from the Write&Improve+LOCNESS corpus that represents a broader range of native learners of English.

Other Languages: Unlike English, low-

resource Asian languages suffer from the unavailability of large corpora for neural models. Attempts have been made to enrich resources for GEC in many languages: Spanish (Davidson et al., 2020), German (Boyd, 2018), Russian (Rozovskaya and Roth, 2019), Czech (Náplava and Straka, 2019), Greek (Korre and Pavlopoulos, 2022), and Chinese (Rao et al., 2018). Syvokon et al. (2023) presented a corpus annotated for GEC and fluency edits for Ukrainian. Lee et al. (2021) gave four different noising methods, such as grapheme-to-phoneme noising rules and heuristic-based noising rules and others, to generate incorrect sentences for Korean. Lichtarge et al. (2019) proposed a rule-based system for deliberately injecting noises for low-resource languages like Indonesian (Irmawati et al., 2017). Solyman et al. (2022) proposed semi-supervised noising methods to generate 13,333,929 synthetic parallel examples from a monolingual corpus for Arabic.

C Data Cleaning

- Cleaning of Unicode characters: Unicode characters “0020” (space), “00a0” (no-break space), “200c” (zero width non-joiner), “1680” (ogham space mark), “180e” (mongolian vowel separator), “202f” (narrow no-break space), “205f” (medium mathematical space), “3000” (ideographic space), “2000” (en quad), “200a” (hair space) are separated from the texts.
- Cleaning of different punctuation marks: In Bangla, usage of punctuation marks has also evolved alongside words. In particular, we have treated the following as punctuation marks: “...”, “!..”, “!|”, “!-”, “-”.

D Manual Generation

Table A2 provides the details of the essays given for the manual annotation survey. All the 9 essays given in this survey are very commonly asked in 10th standard board exams. Each participant were asked to write an essay on a randomly picked topic. 36 participants undertook the survey 3 of whom are non-native speakers.

Essay topic	# Essays
বিজ্ঞান আশীর্বাদ না অভিশাপ (vijñāna āśīrvāda nā abhiśāpa)	3
একটি বৃষ্টির দিন ēkaṭi vṛṣṭira dina	5
একটি নদীর আত্মকথা ēkaṭi nadīra ātmakathā	4
একটি স্মরণীয় দিন ēkaṭi smaraṇīya dina	3
খেলা শুধু খেলা নয় khēlā śudhu khēlā naḃa	2
হঠাৎ আলাদিনের আশ্চর্য প্রদীপ কুড়িয়ে পেলে কী করবে haṭhāt ālādinēra āścarya pradīpa kuriyē pēlē kī karavē	2
সামাজিক মাধ্যম আশীর্বাদ না অভিশাপ sāmājika mādhyama āśīrvāda nā abhiśāpa	7
ভীন গ্রহের প্রাণী ও তোমার কথোপকথন bhīna grahēra prāṇī ō tōmāra kathōpakathana	5
পনেরো বছর আগের তুমি আর আজকের তুমির মধ্যে কথোপকথন panērō vachara āgēra tumi āra ājakēra tumira madhyē kathōpakathana	5

Table A2: Grammar essays for manual survey

E Results of Transformer based models

Table A3 shows the performance of all neural models and Random Forest Classifier on the 1,11,256 sentences in Vaiyākaraṇa.

F LLM Evaluation

Large language models (LLMs), such as FLAN (Wei et al., 2022), OPT (Zhang et al., 2022), and PaLM (Chowdhery et al., 2022), have demonstrated remarkable performance in natural language understanding (NLU) tasks for English. GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 (OpenAI et al., 2023) with ChatGPT interface based on GPT (Brown et al., 2020) have garnered significant interest due to their outstanding performance in unifying all NLU tasks into generative tasks. Niyogi and Bhattacharya (2024) proposed a monolingual LLM in Bangla. We evaluated the performance of these LLMs in detecting and correcting erroneous sentences in Bangla. We have used the pre-trained version of these models with and without instruc-

Model	Parameters	Binary	Broad	Finer
		Mean	Mean	Mean
mBERT	180M	38.32±0.03	34.41±0.02	31.18±0.02
XLM-R (large)	550M	39.54±0.02	34.91±0.02	30.18±0.02
IndicBERTv2.0	117M	39.80±0.01	36.20±0.05	31.40±0.03
MuRIL	236M	39.54±0.02	36.22±0.02	31.38±0.02
BanglaBERT	110M	51.56±0.02	45.84±0.02	39.84±0.02
VAC-BERT	17M	51.87±0.03	45.84±0.03	39.82±0.02
Random Forest	0.42M	46.64±0.50	36.25±0.45	31.00±0.65

Table A3: Parameters and macro-F1 of models for 1,11,256 sentences.

tion fine-tuning.

We have prompted each of the models with two prompts “বাক্যটি সঠিক অথবা ভুল কিনা তা নির্ধারণ কর।” (vākyaṭi saṭhika athavā bhula kinā tā nirdhāraṇa karaḃ, is this sentence grammatically correct?) and “সঠিক ব্যাকরণ সংশোধন কর।” (saṭhika vyākaraṇa saṃśōdhana karaḃ, correct this sentence) and evaluated their responses against the ground truth on the human evaluated 600-sentence set. The first prompt focuses on whether a grammatically incorrect sentence can be identified. Table 5 shows that the highest accuracy is only 32.00% for the 600 sentences that are manually evaluated. The second prompt that aims to correct a sentence was passed for the 520 wrong sentences present in the set of 600. GPT-3.5 achieved the highest but still corrected only 35.00% of the sentences. An in-depth analysis of the responses shows that the LLMs perform decently in identifying tense, person and gender errors (45.00%). However, their performance drops to below 20% for dictionary-based spelling errors (homonyms), POS errors and Gurucandali Dosa. Even after instruction-tuning the LLMs with Vaiyākaraṇa, GPT-4 manages to correct 47.50% of 520 sentences. This result highlights the limitations of LLMs for GEC in Bangla.

G LLM Prompts

In this section we show the detailed prompts and their responses. The responses shown here are generated by GPT3.5 using ChatGPT without instruction tuning.

G.1 Prompts for Detecting Erroneous Sentences

Fig 1 and Fig 2 are responses generated by GPT-3.5 over ChatGPT without instruction tuning for prompt বাক্যটি সঠিক অথবা ভুল কিনা তা নির্ধারণ কর। (vākyaṭi saṭhika athavā

এই বাক্যটি সঠিক। এটি একটি প্রশংসা বা উদাহরণ যেখানে একটি ব্যক্তির রসিকতা পরিবর্তিত হলো এবং তিনি এখন অন্য ধরনের অনুভূতি অনুভব করছেন।

গান শুনেই অন্যরস ছেড়ে ঠাকুর এখন অন্যরসে মজেছেন।
বাক্যটি সঠিক অথবা ভুল কিনা তা নির্ধারণ কর।

Figure 1: Grammar error detection prompt 1

এই বাক্যটি সঠিক। এটি অনেকের সামগ্রিক মুগ্ধতা বা আনন্দের বিকৃতি ব্যাখ্যা করে, সেটি যখন কেউ ইন্ড্রাজলিকের ম্যাজিক দেখে মোহিত হয়ে যায় বা অবাক হয়ে যায়।

ইন্ড্রাজলিকের ম্যাজিকে সবাই মুগ্ধ।
বাক্যটি সঠিক অথবা ভুল কিনা তা নির্ধারণ কর।

Figure 2: Grammar error detection prompt 2

bhula kinā tā nirdhāraṇa karaḥ). Fig 1 shows that GPT-3.5 identified গান শুনেই অন্যরস ছেড়ে ঠাকুর এখন অন্যরসে মজেছেন। (gāna śunēi anyarasa chēṛē ṭhākura ēkhana anyarasē majēchēnaḥ) as correct even though there is spelling error (dictionary) in the sentence and the target sentence is গান শুনেই অন্যরস ছেড়ে ঠাকুর এখন অন্যরসে মজেছেন। (gāna śunēi annarasa chēṛē ṭhākura ēkhana anyarasē majēchēnaḥ). Fig 2 also shows that GPT-3.5 denoted ইন্ড্রাজলিকের ম্যাজিকে সবাই মুগ্ধ। as correct even though the sentence suffers from POS error and the target sentence is ইন্ড্রাজলিকের ম্যাজিকে সবাই মুগ্ধ। (aindrajālikēra myājikē savāi mugdhaḥ)

G.2 Prompts for Correcting Erroneous Sentences

Fig 3 and Fig 4 shows the output of GPT3.5 when prompted এই বাক্যটিকে সঠিক করো। (ēi vākyatikē sāṭhika karōḥ). Fig 3 shows that the LLM generates another sentence ইন্ড্রাজলিকের ম্যাজিক সবার মনে আশ্চর্য এবং উৎসাহিত করে। with same POS Error present in the input sentence instead of the target sentence ইন্ড্রাজলিকের ম্যাজিকে সবাই মুগ্ধ। (aindrajālikēra myājikē savāi mugdhaḥ). Fig 4 captures the inability of GPT-3.5 to identify Homonym errors (Spelling Error Dictionary class) by modifying the sentence to কোনো ধুলো জমেছে না। (kōnō dhulō jamēchē nāḥ) in place of the target sentence কোণে ধুলো জমেছে। (kōṇē dhulō jamēchēḥ).

H Model Hyper Parameters

We fine-tuned the transformer based models with Adam Optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2015) and learning rate of 2e-5 for 20 epochs.

ইন্ড্রাজলিকের ম্যাজিক সবার মনে আশ্চর্য এবং উৎসাহিত করে।

ইন্ড্রাজলিকের ম্যাজিকে সবাই মুগ্ধ।
এই বাক্যটিকে সঠিক করো।

Figure 3: Grammar error correction prompt 1

কোনো ধুলো জমেছে না।

কোনো ধুলো জমেছে
এই বাক্যটিকে সঠিক করো।

Figure 4: Grammar error correction prompt 2

The batch size of each transformer-based models have been 16 with maximum length set at 512. Same parameter values have been used for instruction-tuning LLMs. RandomForest classifier is used with number of trees (n_estimators) set to 100 and maximum depth of each tree is set to 6. We have set min_samples_leaf to 11 and n_jobs to 4 for RandomForest with “gini” as criterion. All other parameters are set to their default values. The total of trainable parameters for RandomForest is 441,875.