

From Brazilian Portuguese to European Portuguese

João Sanches, Rui Ribeiro, and Luisa Coheur

Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa/INESC-ID
{joao.sanches, rui.m.ribeiro, luisa.coheur}@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

Abstract. Brazilian Portuguese and European Portuguese are two varieties of the same language and, despite their close similarities, they exhibit several differences. However, there is a significant disproportion in the availability of resources between the two variants, with Brazilian Portuguese having more abundant resources. This inequity can impact the quality of translation services accessible to European Portuguese speakers. To address this issue, we propose the development of a Brazilian Portuguese to European Portuguese translation system, leveraging recent advancements in neural architectures and models. To evaluate the performance of such systems, we manually curated a gold test set comprising 500 sentences across five different topics. Each sentence in the gold test set has two distinct references, facilitating a straightforward evaluation of future translation models. We experimented with various models by fine-tuning existing Large Language Models using parallel data extracted from movie subtitles and TED Talks transcripts in both Brazilian and European Portuguese. Our evaluation involved the use of conventional automatic metrics as well as a human evaluation. In addition, all models were compared against ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo, which currently yields the best results.

Keywords: Translation · Closely-related languages · Fine-tuning.

1 Introduction

Despite Brazilian Portuguese (BP) and European Portuguese (EP) being very similar, linguistic differences between EP-speakers and BP-speakers, such as orthography and syntax [15], may detriment their mutual understanding. However, services that offer translation between BP and EP have limited capabilities. For instance, until recently Google Translate¹ only offered translation to a standardized Portuguese², while DeepL [22], despite offering translation for BP and EP to other languages, does not allow to directly translate between BP and EP.

In this paper, we tackle the challenge of translating from BP to EP. We will focus on Neural Machine Translation (NMT)-based models and delve into the process of fine-tuning multilingual models, namely M2M100 418M³ and mBART-large-50⁴; we also tested ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo⁵.

¹<https://translate.google.com>

²<https://cloud.google.com/translate/docs/languages>

³https://huggingface.co/facebook/m2m100_418M

⁴<https://huggingface.co/facebook/mbart-large-50>

⁵<https://chat.openai.com>

Furthermore, we also make available our training, development, and test datasets, which were collected from TED Talks⁶ transcripts and subtitles from OPUS [13]. We also contribute with a manually curated gold dataset of 500 parallel BP-EP sentences, from 5 different domains. This collection, which we also make available, allows for direct comparison between these and future models performing this task.

Our results show that the mBART-large-50 model, fine-tuned with a mixed dataset of TED Talks and subtitles, performs best among our models. However, it falls slightly short of surpassing ChatGPT 3.5 in the Golden Collection, despite achieving comparable performance.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we present related work, in Section 3 we introduce the manual curated Golden Collection, and in Section 4 we detail the experimental setup. In Section 5 we present and discuss the obtained results, and, finally, in Section 6 we highlight the main conclusions and point to future work.

2 Related Work

The first translation tasks were performed by human translators, relying on their linguistic expertise, cultural understanding, and contextual knowledge to ensure accurate and culturally relevant translations [2]. Then, Machine Translation (MT) emerged, and different translation architectures appeared: first rule-based translation, then statistical MT, and lastly NMT [18], which currently represents the state-of-art in this area.

To the best of our knowledge, the first work that proposes a translation between BP and EP, is presented in [14]. This work takes advantage of TED Talks to build phrase tables in a classic MT framework, however, it is no longer available.

A more recent work, is the one described in [6]. In this work, the authors employ a Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) encoder-decoder architecture with an attention mechanism [5]. More specifically, an improvement of RNNs with enhanced memorization abilities, a Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM), is responsible for the encoding phase, while a RNN is responsible for decoding the target translation text.

Recently, the work described in [1] developed various systems for translating between Catalan-Spanish, Portuguese-Spanish, and Franch-Bambara⁷ language pairs. This work uses various models based on Transformers [21], which is the base architecture used in current state-of-the-art pre-trained models, such as BERT [12] and Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) [3]. The authors leveraged these large models by fine-tuning with the language pairs from the target dataset for the NMT task. By using this transfer learning method, it is possible to help mitigate some data scarcity issues that happen in the real-world scenario. Additionally, this work found that using fine-tuned models could enhance the performance relative to models trained from scratch and that the models with tokenized data outperformed the ones without tokenization.

Other works explore the multilingual setting. For instance, in [10], the authors introduce a different approach by employing a multilingual NMT model where all parameters are shared across multiple language pairs, enabling the model to generalize across language boundaries during training.

⁶<https://www.ted.com/>

⁷<https://huggingface.co/Ife>

Our work is inspired by the study conducted by [4], which investigates the effectiveness of MT approaches for adapting linguistic and cultural material between EP and BP. The study assesses the extent to which MT models paraphrase sentences during the process of translation and evaluates their performance using both human and automatic evaluations. Four models were tested and analyzed, including a rule-based with a masked language model, a fine-tuned pre-trained NMT, and two GPT-4-based models. We adopt a similar strategy with some modifications. Our approach focuses on training and evaluating a wider variety of fine-tuned pre-trained models. The pre-trained model used in their study was mBART-50 with 100,000 sentences from OpenSubtitles [13], similar to one of our experiments.

Lastly, evaluating the performance of applications based on Large Language Models, such as ChatGPT, is also essential. In [9], the authors introduce a study that concludes that ChatGPT (built upon GPT-3) performs competitively with commercial translation products (e.g., Google Translate), particularly in well-resourced European languages. In addition, in [8], the authors demonstrate that GPT-3 based systems excel in high-resource language translations, being able to achieve state-of-art translation when combined with NMT systems. However, the authors also found that ChatGPT is still not as effective with respect to low-resource distant languages. In [9], it is suggested that ChatGPT does not perform as well in domain-specific areas and noisy environments, such as Reddit.

3 Towards the Gold Collection

3.1 Gathering the Data

The Golden Collection comprises 500 aligned sentence pairs, bridging BP and EP. These pairs are categorized into five distinct domains: scientific, legislative, social media, literature, and wiki (100 pairs each). Sentences pertaining to the social media, legislative, and wiki domains were extracted from the Carolina corpus⁸, which contains contemporary BP sentences of varied typology [7]. Sentences from the scientific domain were gathered from Summ-it⁹, a repository containing 50 scientific texts extracted from the Brazilian newspaper Folha de São Paulo; and finally we extracted literary sentences from BP books from the website Baixe Livros¹⁰.

The selection of sentences from each corpus was performed randomly. However, due to the high level of noise in some datasets, such as those from social media, we removed emojis and other noisy symbols. For instance, in the wiki domain, which had metadata in the main corpus, we removed the sentence “[...] LaViHD@C4AI 2021-08-04 2022-09-22 CC BY-SA 4[...]”. Moreover, we removed sentences in other languages.

Table 1 shows statistics of the Golden Collection. We can observe that the corpus is composed of a wide range of sentence lengths and unique word tokens across and within each category. The category that has the lowest value in size and diversification is the social media category, while at the other end of the spectrum, we have the scientific

⁸<https://huggingface.co/datasets/carolina-c4ai/corpus-carolina>

⁹<https://portulanclarin.net/repository/extradocs/Summit.pdf>

¹⁰<https://www.baixelivros.com.br/biblioteca/literatura-brasileira>

category. This is expected because sentences from social media sources are meant to be quickly read, therefore they will be smaller. On the other hand, scientific texts are usually more verbose.

Table 1. Golden Dataset statistics with respect to the number of word tokens.

	Total	Unique	Median	Average	Min	Max
Scientific	2,516	1,137	24	24.9	4	60
Legislative	2,362	911	20	23.6	3	126
Literature	1,704	765	12	16.9	3	105
Social Media	1,434	675	12	14.1	3	63
Wiki	2800	1,290	25	28.0	6	76
Golden (Total)	10,807	3,722	18.0	21.6	3	126

3.2 Building the Golden Collection

After creating the monolingual BP Golden Collection, we built two references in EP. The first reference was created manually, while the second utilized DeepL. For the manually created reference, we made the minimal number of changes necessary to the original text. Since DeepL does not support direct translation between BP and EP, we used English as the pivot language. This resulted in a translation that is significantly more distant from the original text compared to the manually constructed reference. In addition, some manual corrections were applied to the DeepL translation. Table 2 has examples of sentences of the Golden Collection from each category, alongside the corresponding references.

3.3 Evaluating the Golden Collection

A human evaluator assessed the Golden Collection using the Likert scale [11]. The evaluation involved 50 randomly selected sentences, which were analyzed for both adequacy and fluency. The results are summarized in Table 3. Notably, the DeepL reference achieved a higher fluency score compared to the manual reference. This may be due to the translation method employed: DeepL made more extensive corrections to the source sentence to enhance fluidity, whereas the manual reference implemented only the minimal changes necessary to achieve the target translation. Nonetheless, the evaluation indicated that both references received high scores for adequacy and fluency, suggesting that both are of high quality and appropriate for evaluating our models.

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Datasets

No pre-processing was done to the subtitles and TED Talks datasets, as they already consisted of aligned pairs, BP-EP. The resulting datasets (see also Table 4) are:

Table 2. Golden Collection examples.

Category	Examples
Science	BP: Desse total, 200 milhões se devem ao desmatamento. EP - Manual: Desse total, 200 milhões devem-se à desflorestação. EP - DeepL: Deste total, 200 milhões devem-se à desflorestação. EN: From this total, 200 million are due to deforestation.
Legislative	BP: Parágrafo único – Considera se atividade econômica atípica aquela realizada no recesso do lar. EP - Manual: Parágrafo único – Considera-se atividade económica atípica aquela realizada no refúgio do lar. EP - DeepL: Parágrafo único – As actividades económicas atípicas são as exercidas na privacidade do domicílio. EN: Unique paragraph: It is considered atypical economic activity the one which is performed at home.
Social Media	BP: E so para me respeita garotinha. EP - Manual: É só para me respeitares, pequena menina. EP - DeepL: Respeita-me, menina. EN: It is just to respect me, little girl.
Literature	BP: Lancei-me fora do ônibus; caminhei à direita e à esquerda; andei como um louco até nove horas da noite. EP - Manual: Pus-me fora do autocarro; caminhei à direita e à esquerda; andei como um louco até às nove horas da noite. EP - DeepL: Atirei-me para fora do autocarro; andei para a direita e para a esquerda; andei como um louco até às nove da noite. EN: I threw myself out of the bus; I walked right and left; I walked like a madman until nine o'clock at night.
Wiki	BP: Foi então que a vestimenta mais feminina que se conhece começou a ganhar forma: o espartilho. EP - Manual: Foi então que a peça de vestuário mais feminina que se conhece começou a ganhar forma: o espartilho. EP - DeepL: Foi nessa altura que começou a ganhar forma a peça de vestuário mais feminina que se conhece: o espartilho. EN: It was then that the most feminine garment known to man began to take shape: the corset.

Table 3. Human evaluation results.

Domain	Manual		DeepL	
	Adequacy	Fluency	Adequacy	Fluency
Scientific	5.0	4.9	4.8	4.8
Legislative	4.8	4.7	5.0	4.8
Literature	4.7	4.3	4.3	5.0
Social Media	4.8	4.2	4.7	4.8
Wiki	4.9	4.7	5.0	5.0
Average	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.9

- Subtitles Training Dataset: 126,984 aligned BP-EP subtitle sentences.
- TED Talks Training Dataset: 126,984 aligned BP-EP TED Talks sentences.

- Merged Training Dataset: Balanced mix of aligned subtitles and TED Talks sentences, with a total of 126,984 sentences, half from each source.
- Merged Validation Dataset: Balanced mix of aligned subtitles and TED Talks sentences, with a total of 12,698 sentences. No overlap with training datasets.
- Merged Test Dataset: Comprises a balanced mix of aligned subtitles and TED Talks sentences. No overlap with training, evaluation, or test sets is ensured.

Table 4. Datasets statistics with respect to the number of word tokens.

	Total	Unique	Median	Average	Min	Max
Subtitles train dataset	993,570	50,730	7	7.8	1	397
Ted Talks train dataset	2 439,714	80,106	16	19.2	2	692
Merged train dataset	1 711,744	74,839	10	13.5	1	692
Merged valid dataset	167,238	17,892	9	13.2	1	354
Merged test dataset	163,538	17,805	9	12.9	1	482

4.2 Models

Both mBART-50 and M2M100 models employ monolingual pre-training and multilingual fine-tuning. However, mBART-50 uses an English-centric approach, employing English as a pivot language, which can sometimes lead to a bias towards English and potential language context loss. On the other hand, M2M100 is a multilingual sequence-to-sequence model that can translate directly between any pair of 100 languages without relying on English as a pivot language. It avoids potential biases by using language families and bridge languages. M2M100 aims to preserve practical translation directions while reducing the need for numerous bitext pairs. As these multilingual models did not have the distinction between BP and EP, just having a standard “Portuguese” language, we had to fine-tune these models with parallel corpora in order to make them learn the distinction between these varieties.

First, we tokenized our training and evaluation data: for that end, the source and target language of the tokenizer for each model was the “Portuguese” language. After that, both M2M100 and mBART-50 were fine-tuned three times each, once with every training dataset designed for the text-to-text translation.

Regarding the experimental details, the models were trained for 10 epochs using an NVIDIA A100 80GB GPU. Each training session took approximately 9 to 10 hours. The hyper-parameters used for fine-tuning the pre-trained text-to-text translator models in this paper are as follows: a learning rate of 2×10^{-5} , a weight decay of 0.01, training and evaluation batch sizes of 8, and a maximum length of 128 for both the source and target tokenizers. These hyper-parameters were selected to optimize the models’ performance during the fine-tuning process.

After this process, we achieved the following models:

- Merged M2M100: M2M100 trained with the Merged Training Dataset.

- TED M2M100: M2M100 trained with the TED Talks dataset.
- Subtitles M2M100: M2M100 trained with the subtitles dataset.
- Merged mBART-50: mBART-50 trained with the Merged Training Dataset.
- TED Talks mBART-50: mBART-50 trained with the TED Talks dataset.
- Subtitles mBART-50: mBART-50 trained with the subtitles dataset.

We also evaluated ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo, which did not receive any training or fine-tuning from us: we used this model in April 2024.

4.3 Evaluation Metrics

We performed the evaluation of these models using NLP-Telescope [16], an accessible interface that can evaluate across a wide range of metrics in any MT model. The metrics chosen were BLEU [17], TER [20], and COMET [19]. To have a general score of the performance of the model, NLP-Telescope ranks the models based on a total score, which reflects the overall performance across these metrics, given by:

$$\text{Total Score} = \text{COMET} + \text{BLEU} + (1 - \text{TER}). \quad (1)$$

It is also important to note that the COMET score can exceed 1. This happens for two reasons:

- The version of COMET we are using is COMET-2020-da, which is unbounded.
- EP and BP are very similar variants, which leads to very close source, reference, and translation texts.

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 Cross Domain Results

We kept records of the evaluation loss during the training of each fine-tuned model and selected the best models based on this metric. The M2M100 model fine-tuned with a merged dataset or with just TED Talks achieved the best evaluation loss at epoch 3. Meanwhile, the M2M100 model fine-tuned with subtitles and the mBART-50 model trained with a merged dataset or subtitles reached their lowest evaluation loss at epoch 2. Finally, the mBART-50 model trained with TED Talks minimized the evaluation loss at epoch 1. The best results for the different models evaluated on the various subtitles and TED Talks tests are presented in Table 5.

Overall, these scores are not unexpected: fine-tuning a model to a certain domain leads to it being particularly good at translating that domain, which happened repeatedly in this part of the experiment. It is interesting to note that the merged datasets were very close to the score of the top models or even constituted that top score: as they were trained with data from both sources, they became proficient at tasks involving either type of data. As such, the models that seem the most promising so far are the Merged mBART-50 and the Merged M2M100. Regarding the models fine-tuned with TED Talks and the models fine-tuned with subtitles, we conclude that training solely with subtitles leads to the model generalizing better to new data than training only with TED Talks.

Table 5. Test Set: Subtitles, TED Talks, and average results.

Domain	Translation Model	COMET	BLEU	TER	Total Score	Rank
TED Talks	MERGED M2M100	0.80	0.38	0.50	1.68	4
	TED M2M100	0.79	0.40	0.48	1.71	1
	SUBS M2M100	0.79	0.32	0.56	1.55	6
	MERGED MBART-50	0.80	0.38	0.49	1.69	2
	TED MBART-50	0.80	0.38	0.49	1.69	2
	SUBS MBART-50	0.80	0.31	0.56	1.55	6
	ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo	0.83	0.35	0.53	1.65	5
Subtitles	MERGED M2M100	0.89	0.59	0.36	2.12	4
	TED M2M100	0.76	0.44	0.47	1.73	7
	SUBS M2M100	0.90	0.60	0.35	2.15	2
	MERGED MBART-50	0.90	0.60	0.35	2.15	2
	TED MBART-50	0.81	0.50	0.50	1.81	6
	SUBS MBART-50	0.90	0.61	0.34	2.17	1
	ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo	0.83	0.56	0.41	1.98	5
Average	MERGED M2M100	0.85	0.49	0.43	1.91	2
	TED M2M100	0.78	0.42	0.48	1.72	7
	SUBS M2M100	0.84	0.46	0.45	1.85	4
	MERGED MBART-50	0.85	0.49	0.42	1.92	1
	TED MBART-50	0.80	0.44	0.50	1.74	6
	SUBS MBART-50	0.85	0.46	0.45	1.86	3
	ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo	0.83	0.46	0.47	1.82	5

5.2 Results in the Gold Collection

Next, we evaluated the Golden Collection (Table 6). An additional experience was conducted, as shown in this table, to evaluate the obtained scores when the translation is exactly the same as the source text (in the table, lines “Nothing”). Our main conclusions are the following:

- Against the manual reference, our Merged and Subtitles fine-tuned models beat the total score of ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo. Models fine-tuned with TED Talks presented consistently the worst results out of all the models.
- Against the DeepL reference, we observed that our fine-tuned models did not beat ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo. ChatGPT was consistently the best model across all metrics. As for the results of our fine-tuned models, there was not much change: models fine-tuned with TED Talks, despite having relatively slightly better scores in comparison to the results against the manual reference, were still part of the bottom scoring models. This indicates that the translation that ChatGPT generates is the most similar to the one generated by DeepL, which is remarkably different from the source text. Our models, on the other hand, fare better with traditional translation, which deviates just a little from the source text.
- Finally, it is worth mentioning that doing “nothing” to the source text many times was better than any of our models and ChatGPT. This happens because EP and BP are very similar varieties of the same language. The only instance where the overall score of doing nothing was surpassed was against the DeepL reference. This result

is expected, as the DeepL reference is the most divergent from the source text, whereas we aimed to make minimal changes in the manual reference.

Table 6. Golden Collection: Manual, DeepL, and Average results.

Translation Model	COMET	BLEU	TER	Total Score	Rank	Reference
MERGED M2M	1.16	0.70	0.21	2.65	6	Manual
TED M2M	1.03	0.62	0.27	2.38	8	Manual
SUBS M2M	1.17	0.84	0.10	2.91	2	Manual
MERGED MBART	1.17	0.84	0.11	2.90	3	Manual
TED MBART	1.08	0.70	0.20	2.58	7	Manual
SUBS MBART	1.09	0.83	0.12	2.80	5	Manual
ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo	1.16	0.84	0.12	2.88	4	Manual
Nothing	1.21	0.89	0.07	3.03	1	Manual
MERGED M2M	0.93	0.50	0.37	2.06	3	DeepL
TED M2M	0.86	0.48	0.39	1.95	8	DeepL
SUBS M2M	0.95	0.49	0.38	2.06	3	DeepL
MERGED MBART	0.95	0.51	0.37	2.09	2	DeepL
TED MBART	0.92	0.51	0.37	2.06	3	DeepL
SUBS MBART	0.88	0.48	0.40	1.98	7	DeepL
ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo	0.99	0.53	0.36	2.16	1	DeepL
Nothing	1.00	0.49	0.38	2.11	2	DeepL
MERGED M2M	1.05	0.60	0.29	2.36	6	Average
TED M2M	0.95	0.55	0.33	2.17	8	Average
SUBS M2M	0.99	0.67	0.24	2.42	4	Average
MERGED MBART	0.99	0.68	0.24	2.43	3	Average
TED MBART	1.00	0.60	0.29	2.31	7	Average
SUBS MBART	0.99	0.66	0.26	2.39	5	Average
ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo	1.08	0.69	0.24	2.53	2	Average
Nothing	1.11	0.69	0.23	2.57	1	Average

5.3 Human Evaluation

Again using the Likert scale, a human evaluator assessed the translation quality of ChatGPT and our best fine-tuned model. These translations were also evaluated in terms of adequacy and fluency. For this evaluation task, 50 sentences – 10 from each domain – of the Golden Collection were randomly chosen and, then, the translations of these sentences were evaluated.

Results are presented in Table 7. Our best fine-tuned model had the worst performance out of all the translations, having particularly worse scores in the legislative domain. The GPT-3.5 model had similar scores to our manual reference (Table 3).

We can observe in Table 7 that our fine-tuned model fared relatively worse in comparison to ChatGPT particularly in the legislative domain. One reason why these bad scores happened could be seen in the first example of Table 8, where our model oversimplified too much the information from the original sentence when translating. This

Table 7. Human evaluation results.

Domain	Merged mBART-50		GPT-3.5 Turbo	
	Adequacy	Fluency	Adequacy	Fluency
Scientific	4.8	4.7	5.0	5.0
Legislative	3.7	3.7	4.8	4.5
Literature	4.7	3.9	4.6	4.5
Social Media	4.2	4.5	4.8	4.4
Wiki	4.7	4.5	4.8	4.7
Average	4.6	4.3	4.8	4.6

ultimately resulted in the translated sentence not being fluent and being somewhat adequate. We conclude that some styles of writing, like the one present in the legislative corpus, may lead to these types of mistakes. Another example is the literary sentence, also present in the same table, but instead of oversimplifying the original information, this time the model translation ended the sentence abruptly. One explanation for this is that during training, our model learned to end sentences earlier than it should, based on factors such as the punctuation of the original sentence. However, it is interesting to note that “forgetting”, truncating, and eliminating seemingly redundant information is not a problem exclusive to our fine-tuned model. Although it occurs less frequently, larger models such as ChatGPT, which we are currently evaluating, may also exhibit this same issue. An example of this is the Social media category, where all the onomatopoeias were eliminated, leading to a worse score in both in this model relative to our fine-tuned model. This eliminated information that was relevant to the overall context of the sentence; in this case, it indicated the sound of a phone ringing.

Table 8. Golden Collection examples. F stands for Fluency and A for Adequacy.

Category	Sentence	F	A
Legislative	BP: O SR.PRESIDENTE (Fernando Henrique Cardoso): – Está em votação a emenda.	-	-
	Merged mBART-50: O Sr. Presidente está em votação a emenda.	1	3
	ChatGPT: O SR. PRESIDENTE (Fernando Henrique Cardoso): - Está em votação a emenda.	5	5
Literary	BP: Leonardo ainda pôde dizer, olhando as estrelas que começavam a brilhar: - Como é belo o céu!	-	-
	Merged mBART-50: Leonardo ainda pôde dizer, olhando para as estrelas que começavam a brilhar:	2	4
	ChatGPT: Leonardo ainda conseguiu dizer, olhando as estrelas que começavam a brilhar: - Como é belo o céu!	4	5
Social media	BP: TRII TRII TRII TRII Vejo meu celular vibrando em cima da escrivaninha.	-	-
	Merged mBART-50: TRII TRII TRII Vejo o meu telemóvel a vibrar em cima da escrivaninha. Vejo o meu telemóvel a vibrar em cima da secretária.	5	5
	ChatGPT: Vejo o meu telemóvel a vibrar em cima da secretária.	4	4

6 Conclusions and Future Work

Our best-performing fine-tuned model, both in the test set and the Golden Collection, was the fine-tuned Merged mBART-50. It outperformed ChatGPT 3.5 Turbo in our test set, which had sentences of the same domains our model was trained on (Subtitles and TED talks). However, the Merged mBART-50 was not capable of generalizing as well as ChatGPT 3.5 in the Golden Collection, despite achieving similar performance. These results align with the study performed by [4], where ChatGPT outperformed their fine-tuned model on their Golden Collection. Although the enhancement was not significant when compared to training solely on subtitles, we conclude that incorporating a broader range of styles, sources, and data types is beneficial for improving translation outcomes overall. This is further evidenced by the results of solely relying on TED Talks for training, which resulted in inferior model performance.

For future work, we propose to extend the Golden Collection to more categories and sentences and to have a more comprehensive evaluation of each model. There is also room for more optimization at the training stage, namely, we would like to perform a grid search for optimizing the hyper-parameters.

References

1. Adebara, I., Abdul-Mageed, M.: Improving similar language translation with transfer learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.03533 (2021)
2. Altintas, K., Cicekli, I.: A machine translation system between a pair of closely related languages. In: Proceedings of the 17th International Symposium on Computer and Information Sciences. pp. 192–196. CRC Press (2022)
3. Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J.D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al.: Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **33**, 1877–1901 (2020)
4. Cortes, E.G., Vianna, A.L., Martins, M., Rigo, S., Kunst, R.: LLMs and translation: different approaches to localization between Brazilian Portuguese and European Portuguese. In: Gamallo, P., Claro, D., Teixeira, A., Real, L., Garcia, M., Oliveira, H.G., Amaro, R. (eds.) Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Computational Processing of Portuguese. pp. 45–55. Association for Computational Linguistics, Santiago de Compostela, Galicia/Spain (Mar 2024), <https://aclanthology.org/2024.propor-1.5>
5. Costa-jussà, M.R., Escolano, C., Fonollosa, J.A.R.: Byte-based neural machine translation. In: Faruqui, M., Schuetze, H., Trancoso, I., Yaghoobzadeh, Y. (eds.) Proceedings of the First Workshop on Subword and Character Level Models in NLP. pp. 154–158. Association for Computational Linguistics, Copenhagen, Denmark (Sep 2017). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W17-4123>, <https://aclanthology.org/W17-4123>
6. Costa-Jussa, M.R., Zampieri, M., Pal, S.: A neural approach to language variety translation. arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.00651 (2018)
7. Crespo, M.C.R.M., Rocha, M.L.d.S.J., Sturzeneker, M.L., Serras, F.R., de Mello, G.L., Costa, A.S., Palma, M.F., Mesquita, R.M., Guets, R.d.P., da Silva, M.M., et al.: Carolina: a general corpus of contemporary brazilian portuguese with provenance, typology and versioning information. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16098 (2023)

8. Hendy, A., Abdelrehim, M., Sharaf, A., Raunak, V., Gabr, M., Matsushita, H., Kim, Y.J., Afify, M., Awadalla, H.H.: How good are gpt models at machine translation? a comprehensive evaluation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09210 (2023)
9. Jiao, W., Wang, W., Huang, J.t., Wang, X., Tu, Z.: Is chatgpt a good translator? a preliminary study. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08745 (2023)
10. Johnson, M., Schuster, M., Le, Q.V., Krikun, M., Wu, Y., Chen, Z., Thorat, N., Viégas, F., Wattenberg, M., Corrado, G., et al.: Google’s multilingual neural machine translation system: Enabling zero-shot translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **5**, 339–351 (2017)
11. Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., Pal, D.K.: Likert scale: Explored and explained. *British journal of applied science & technology* **7**(4), 396 (2015)
12. Kenton, J.D.M.W.C., Toutanova, L.K.: Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In: *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*. pp. 4171–4186 (2019)
13. Lison, P., Tiedemann, J.: OpenSubtitles2016: Extracting large parallel corpora from movie and TV subtitles. In: Calzolari, N., Choukri, K., Declerck, T., Goggi, S., Grobelnik, M., Maegaard, B., Mariani, J., Mazo, H., Moreno, A., Odijk, J., Piperidis, S. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16)*. pp. 923–929. European Language Resources Association (ELRA), Portorož, Slovenia (May 2016), <https://aclanthology.org/L16-1147>
14. Marujo, L., Grazina, N., Luis, T., Ling, W., Coheur, L., Trancoso, I.: Bp2ep-adaptation of brazilian portuguese texts to european portuguese. In: *Proceedings of the 15th Annual conference of the European Association for Machine Translation* (2011)
15. Mateus, M.H.M., Ana, B., Inês, D., Isabel, F.: et alii (2003) gramática da língua portuguesa (2003)
16. Oliveira, R.: NLP-Telescope: Extending MT-Telescope for NLP Models. Master’s thesis, Instituto Superior Técnico (2023)
17. Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T., Zhu, W.J.: Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In: *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. pp. 311–318 (2002)
18. Poibeau, T.: *Machine translation*. MIT Press (2017)
19. Rei, R., Stewart, C., Farinha, A.C., Lavie, A.: Comet: A neural framework for mt evaluation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09025 (2020)
20. Snover, M., Dorr, B., Schwartz, R., Micciulla, L., Makhoul, J.: A study of translation edit rate with targeted human annotation. In: *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas: Technical Papers*. pp. 223–231. Association for Machine Translation in the Americas, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA (Aug 8-12 2006), <https://aclanthology.org/2006.amta-papers.25>
21. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, Ł., Polosukhin, I.: Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30** (2017)
22. Yulianto, A., Supriatnaningsih, R.: Google translate vs. deepl: a quantitative evaluation of close-language pair translation (french to english). *AJELP: Asian Journal of English Language and Pedagogy* **9**(2), 109–127 (2021)