

Findings of the WMT 2024 Shared Task on Discourse-Level Literary Translation

Longyue Wang, Siyou Liu, Chenyang Lyu, Wenxiang Jiao, Xing Wang, Jiahao Xu, Zhaopeng Tu, Yan Gu, Weiyu Chen, Minghao Wu, Liting Zhou, Philipp Koehn, Andy Way, Yulin Yuan
vincentwang0229@gmail.com

Abstract

Following last year, we have continued to host the WMT translation shared task this year, the second edition of the *Discourse-Level Literary Translation*. We focus on three language directions: Chinese→English, Chinese→German, and Chinese→Russian, with the latter two ones newly added. This year, we totally received 10 submissions from 5 academia and industry teams. We employ both automatic and human evaluations to measure the performance of the submitted systems. The official ranking of the systems is based on the overall human judgments. We release data, system outputs, and leaderboard at <https://www2.statmt.org/wmt24/literary-translation-task.html>.

1 Introduction

The organization of the WMT shared task (*Discourse-Level Literary Translation*) aims to explore the potential of machine translation (MT) and large language model (LLM) in overcoming the unique challenges of literary translation. In recent years, several studies have explored the capabilities of LLMs in the fields of literary translation (An et al., 2023; Lopez et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023; Xie et al., 2023; Zhu and Xiong, 2023) and discourse-level translation (Wang et al., 2023b, 2024; Wu et al., 2024b; Wang et al., 2024).

Following last year’s WMT shared task (Wang et al., 2023c), we have continued to host the second edition of the *Discourse-Level Literary Translation*. Notably, we expand the datasets to include Chinese-German and Chinese-Russian (only document-level), in addition to the existing Chinese-English (both document- and sentence-level).¹ The introduction of these new language pairs presents unique challenges, particularly given the document-level nature of the data and the absence of sentence-level alignment in the new datasets.

¹<https://github.com/longyuewangdcu/GuoFeng-Webnovel>.

Besides, we provide different types pretrained models and LLMs such as Chinese-Llama-2² and in-domain RoBERTa and mBART (Wang et al., 2023a). Apart from automatic evaluation, we employ two human evaluation criteria: 1) *general quality*, covering aspects such as fluency and adequacy; 2) *discourse-aware quality*, including factors such as consistency, word choice, and anaphora.³ Since there were only two participating teams for Chinese→German, and Chinese→Russian, we only use automatic evaluation. The task has Constrained Track and Unconstrained Track, however, most teams choose Unconstrained Track.

In this year, we totally received 10 submissions from 5 academia and industry teams. We found that (1) most of the participating teams’ models (after literary-domain enhancements) outperform Baseline systems (Llama-MT, Google Translate and GPT-4) in terms of d-BLEU; (2) for a certain system, there is a significant gap between the conclusions drawn from human and automatic evaluations; (3) the performance of the only Constrained Track system was close to that of the best system in the Unconstrained Track in terms of both automatic and human evaluation.

2 The GuoFeng Webnovel Corpus V2

2.1 Copyright and License


Copyright is a crucial consideration when it comes to releasing literary texts. Tencent AI Lab and China Literature Ltd. hold the copyright for this dataset. To support research advancement in this field, we offer the data to the research community under specific terms and conditions:

- After registration, WMT participants can utilize the corpus for non-commercial research and must

²<https://github.com/longyuewangdcu/Chinese-Llama-2>.

³Due to time constraints, we were unable to conduct A/B testing with web fiction readers this year.

Zh-En	#Book	#Chap.	#Sent.	#Word	IDI
Train	179	22.6K	1.9M	32.0M	1.4K
Valid ₁	22	22	755	18.3K	832
Test ₁	26	22	697	19.5K	884
Valid ₂	10	10	853	16.0K	1.6K
Test ₂	12	12	917	16.7K	1.4K
Test _{final}	12	239	16.7K	337.0K	*28.1K



Zh-De	#Book	#Chap.	#Word	Zh-Ru	#Book	#Chap.	#Word
Train	118	19.1K	25.6M	Train	122	20.0K	23.5M
Valid	11	11	16.7K	Valid	11	11	14.5K
Test	13	13	18.8K	Test	122	13	15.6K

Figure 1: Data statistics of the GuoFeng Webnovel Corpus V2 in Chinese→English (Zh-En), Chinese→German (Zh-De), Chinese→Russian (Zh-Ru) and genre distribution (Chinese→English training set). The #Book, #Chap. #Sent. mean the number in terms of books, chapters and sentences. The #Word is based on target language sides. The document length (IDI) is calculated by dividing #Word by the number of documents. In Zh-De and Zh-Ru, the IDI equals to #Chap.

adhere to the principle of fair use (CC-BY).

- Modification or redistribution of the dataset is strictly prohibited.
- Proper citation of this paper and the original download link is required.
- By using this dataset, you agree to the terms and conditions outlined above. We take copyright infringement very seriously and will take legal action against any unauthorized use of our data.

2.2 New Datasets

The data processing follows the same framework as last year (Wang et al., 2023c). The data statistics of the corpus are detailed in Figure 1.

- **Zh-En set:** This is same as the GuoFeng Webnovel Corpus V1. The *training set* comprises 22,567 continuous chapters from 179 web novels, spanning 14 genres such as fantasy and romance. To enable self-evaluation of model performance, we offer two *non-official validation/testing sets* with one reference. Dataset₁ includes books overlapping with the training data, whereas dataset₂ features unseen books. Participants can treat each chapter as a document to train and test their discourse-aware models. Additional parallel training data from the General MT Task is also available for data augmentation. In the final test stage, systems translate the *official testing set*

(Test_{final}), which consists of approximately 20 consecutive chapters from each book, allowing participants to treat all chapters within a book as a long document⁴. The final test set includes two references: Reference 1 by human translators and Reference 2 constructed through manual alignment of bilingual text on web pages. Genres in the validation and test sets are evenly sampled. for Dataset₁, books overlap with the training data, whereas Dataset₂ contains unseen books. Thus, each chapter is treated as a separate document. For Test_{final}, around 20 consecutive chapters from each book are selected, treating all chapters within a book as a long document.

- **Zh-De and Zh-Ru sets:** Based on the GuoFeng Webnovel Corpus V1, we expand it from Chinese→English to Chinese→German and Chinese→Russian. Specifically, we translate Chinese web novels into German or Russian at the document level using GPT-4, and then have human translators review or post-edit the translations. The main difference from Zh-En set is that 1) there is no sentence-level alignment information in training/test sets; 2) there is only one reference in test sets; 3) there is only one official test set which is similar with Zh-En Test_{final}.

⁴Participants may treat one chapter as a document, depending on model length capabilities.

Info.	Evaluator A
Position	Project manager and translator at a famous automobile enterprise
Education	Master in English, a 211 comprehensive university
Certification	TEM-8
Experience	Overseas project manager and translator for 10 years, part-time translator for 13 years
Level	Evaluator B
Position	Student at an international institution
Education	Bachelor in French
Certification	CET-6, IELTS-7.5
Experience	Interpreter for international company and translation organization
Level	Evaluator C
Position	Translator at a translation company
Education	Master of Marxism abroad
Certification	CET-6
Experience	Work in several translation companies

Table 1: The basic background of Zh-En human annotators.

2.3 Pretrained Models

In addition to the web novel training dataset, we provide in-domain pretrained models as supplementary resources (continuously trained on Chinese/English literary texts). These models can be used to fine-tune or initialize MT models. The RoBERTa (base) and mBART (CC25) models remain the same as last year, and this year we are providing an additional model, the Chinese-Llama-2 7B (Zefeng Du, 2023). Additionally, general-domain pretrained models listed in the General MT Track are permitted in this task: mBART, BERT, RoBERTa, sBERT, LaBSE.

3 Evaluation Methods

The evaluation of document-level and literary-domain translation quality remains a complex challenge. In this year’s shared task, the automated evaluation remains consistent with last year, and we are exploring new human evaluation methods,

moving away from the multidimensional quality metrics (MQM) framework (Lommel et al., 2014) used previously.

3.1 Automatic Evaluation

Our approach to automatic evaluation incorporates both sentence-level and document-level metrics. For sentence-level evaluation, we utilize sacreBLEU (Post, 2018), chrF (Popović, 2015), TER (Snover et al., 2006), and the pretraining-based COMET (Rei et al., 2020). For document-level evaluation, we employ document-level sacreBLEU (d-BLEU) (Liu et al., 2020), which assesses n-gram matches across complete documents. This involves concatenating all sentences in a document into a single line before applying the sacreBLEU metric. Evaluations are conducted in a case-sensitive manner. We utilize the sacrebleu tool⁵ to calculate sacreBLEU, chrF, TER, and d-BLEU with two references. The command used is: `cat output | python -m sacrebleu reference*`. For COMET scores, we use the `unbabel-comet` tool⁶ with the command: `comet-score -s input -t output -r reference1` (default model).

3.2 Human Evaluation

Guidelines We establish two sets of evaluation criteria: 1) *general quality*, covering aspects such as fluency and adequacy; 2) *discourse-aware quality*, including factors such as consistency, word choice, and anaphora. The detailed scoring criteria are listed in Table 6. Accordingly, each output will be assigned two distinct scores (0~5). A score of 5 indicates excellent overall translation quality, with no grammatical errors, accurate word choice, consistent key terms, and consistent context and tone throughout the passage. A score of 0 indicates poor overall translation quality, with more than half of the translation being mistranslated or missing, inconsistent key terms, and poor fluency and clarity. In between scores reflect varying degrees of translation quality, with factors such as fluency, accuracy, consistency of key terms, and context and tone consistency affecting the score. For each chapter, we assessed xxx sentences, with each instance containing outputs from 5 different systems. The scores were assigned to each window of neighboring sentences, taking into account the context provided

⁵<https://github.com/mjpost/sacrebleu> with signature: nrefs:2|case:mixed|eff:no|tok:13a|smooth:exp|version:2.3.1.

⁶<https://github.com/Unbabel/COMET>.

ID	Team	Institution	Flag	#	Main Methods
1	Cloudsheep	UC San Diego	⊗	1	Google Translate, GPT-4
2	HW-TSC	Huawei Translation Services Center	⊗	2	Chinese-Llama2, Doc Decoding
3	NLP ² CT-UM	University of Macau	⊗	5	Qwen, GPT-4, DeepSeek
4	NTU	Nantong University	⊗	1	Finetuned Llama-3-Chinese, Phi-3
5	SJTU-LoveFiction	Shanghai Jiao Tong University	⊗	5	Chunk-based SFT, Multi-Agents

Table 2: The summary of system submission and their participant teams. We also report the number of systems (#) and the constrained (⊙) and unconstrained (⊗) flags.

by the entire document. Our intent was for evaluators to consider discourse properties beyond single sentences, while also avoiding the difficult task of evaluating an entire document. We employed two professional evaluators for our study.

Human Evaluators We employed three professional evaluators and their background are detailed in Table 1. The human evaluations are only conducted for the Zh-En direction due to the limited participation in the Zh-De and Zh-Ru, with only two teams competing in each. Besides, our annotators were given practice items, and the annotations reaches 0.86 Cohen’s kappa scores (McHugh, 2012), demonstrating that the annotators work efficiently and consistently under this guideline.

4 Task Description

Overview The shared task focuses on translating literary texts across three language pairs: Chinese→English, Chinese→German, and Chinese→Russian. Participants are provided with two types of training datasets: (1) the discourse-level GuoFeng Webnovel Corpus V2, with Chinese-English datasets offering sentence-level alignment, and new Chinese-German and Chinese-Russian datasets without alignment information; (2) General MT Track Parallel Training Data for broader translation tasks. Additionally, participants have access to pretrained models, including in-domain models like Chinese-Llama-2, In-domain RoBERTa (base), and In-domain mBART (CC25), as well as general-domain language models.

In the final testing stage, participants will translate an official test set. The quality of translations is assessed using a combination of manual evaluation and automatic metrics. Systems are ranked based on human judgments according to our professional guidelines. Submissions are categorized into constrained or unconstrained tracks, depending on

the data and resources used, with appropriate flags distinguishing them.

Goals The primary objectives of the task are to:

- Stimulate research in machine translation, focusing on literary texts and integrating discourse knowledge.
- Provide a platform for evaluating and comparing different methods and systems on a challenging dataset.
- Advance the state of the art in machine translation, with an emphasis on practical application scenarios.

5 Participants’ and Baseline Systems

Here we briefly introduce each participant’s systems and refer the reader to the participant’s reports for further details. Table 2 shows the summary of systems and participant teams.

5.1 Cloudsheep

The team from UC San Diego, Halıcıoğlu Data Science Institute introduced 1 translation systems (Liu et al., 2024a). The CloudSheep system utilized a comprehensive tool pipeline to ensure translation accuracy and text coherence, especially emphasizing the consistent translation of names and idioms. Key strategies included the creation of custom dictionaries for names and the use of CEDICT for idiomatic expressions, with support from AI models like GPT-3.5-turbo and GPT-4 to refine translations.

5.2 HW-TSC

The team from Huawei Translation Service Center introduced 2 translation systems (Luo et al., 2024). About the HW-TSC system, they enhanced the Chinese-Llama2 model with continual pre-training and SFT, incorporating an incremental decoding framework that considered broader textual contexts. This approach maintained narrative coherence and

Type	System	Sent-Level				Doc-Level
		BLEU [↑]	chrF2 [↑]	COMET [↑]	TER [↓]	d-BLEU [↑]
<i>Baselines</i>	Google*	37.4	57.0	80.50	57.4	47.3
	Llama-MT*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	43.1
	GPT-4*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	43.7
<i>Primary</i>	Cloudsheep*	39.5	57.5	81.22	55.5	48.5
	HW-TSC*	40.5	58.5	82.61	56.0	50.2
	NLP ² CT-UM*	41.6	58.7	83.56	52.7	50.9
	NTU*	20.9	41.9	74.53	73.9	34.6
	SJTU-LoveFiction*	35.1	54.7	80.79	62.1	47.2
<i>Contrastive</i>	HW-TSC*	40.6	58.6	82.59	55.9	50.3
	NLP ² CT-UM ₁ *	41.6	58.7	83.54	52.8	50.8
	NLP ² CT-UM ₂ *	41.5	58.6	83.38	52.8	50.7
	SJTU-LoveFiction ₁ *	35.7	56.0	82.67	59.7	46.3
	SJTU-LoveFiction ₂ *	38.6	56.5	82.49	57.1	49.6

Table 3: The Zh-En evaluation results of baseline and participants’ systems in terms of **automatic evaluation methods**, including 1) **sentence-level** metrics BLEU, chrF, COMET, TER; and 2) **document-level** metrics d-BLEU. Systems marked with * are unconstrained. The COMET is calculated with *unbabel-comet* using *Reference 1* while others are calculated with *sacrebleu* using two references. The ranked 1st and 2nd primary systems are highlighted.

captured stylistic elements effectively, leading to marked improvements in BLEU scores at both the sentence and document levels.

5.3 NLP²CT-UM

The team from NLP²CT Lab, Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Macau introduced 5 translation systems (Liu et al., 2024b). Their approach utilized GPT-4o to generate three different translations using varied settings of additional contextual information and a custom terminology table. To optimize translation quality, they selected sentences with the highest xCOMET scores from among the alternatives for their final output, demonstrating a significant improvement over traditional chapter-level translation methods.

5.4 NTU

The team from Jiangsu Linchance Technology Co., Ltd. and Nantong University introduced 1 translation systems (Li et al., 2024). They leveraged the capabilities of the Llama and Phi models, employing both LoRA (Low-Rank Adaptation) and full-parameter tuning techniques. Despite memory constraints preventing the successful full-parameter tuning of the Llama-3-Chinese-8B-Instruct model, the fully fine-tuned Phi 3 model was chosen for its more natural and fluent output. Additionally, the integration of LoRA and a prompt-based translation

system significantly enhanced the performance of the Llama3 model, outperforming other models in both BLEU and ROUGE metrics.

5.5 SJTU-LoveFiction

The Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU LoveFiction) team implemented advanced methodologies across Chinese to English, German, and Russian pairs (Sun et al., 2024). The SJTU-LoveFiction system integrated the Qwen2-72B, Claude3.5, and GPT-4o models and featured novel techniques such as chunk-based SFT for enhanced contextual coherence, a multi-model merging approach using a GPT-4o-based Translation Editor Agent to synthesize translations, and a Terminology Intervention process employing a Term Proofreader Agent to ensure terminology consistency.

6 Evaluation Results

6.1 Automatic Evaluation

Zh-En. Table 3 demonstrates a comprehensive overview of the performance of various translation systems across the Chinese to English language pair. The evaluation was based on both sentence-level and document-level automatic metrics, including BLEU, chrF2, COMET, TER, and d-BLEU.

At the sentence level, NLP²CT-UM achieved the highest scores in BLEU (41.6) and COMET (83.56), indicating superior translation quality and

System	d-BLEU [†]	
	Zh-De	Zh-Ru
Google*	31.3	25.2
GPT-4*	26.7	20.5
NLP ² CT-UM*	26.7	22.7
SJTU-LoveFiction*	25.4	21.5

Table 4: The Zh-De and Zh-Ru evaluation results of baseline and participants’ systems in terms of **automatic evaluation methods (d-BLEU)**. Systems marked with * are unconstrained. The best primary systems are highlighted.

contextual alignment with the reference text. The chrF2 score, which assesses character n-gram precision and recall, was also notably high for NLP²CT-UM at 58.7. Besides, NLP²CT-UM achieves the lowest score in TER (52.7), suggesting it had fewer translation errors relative to the length of the output. At the document level, the d-BLEU metric, which evaluates the coherence and flow of translations over entire documents, highlighted NLP²CT-UM as a standout performer with a score of 50.9, slightly above HW-TSC with 50.2 and significantly ahead of other systems.

At the document level, the primary systems outperform the baselines in terms of d-BLEU, reflecting better overall translation consistency. Among the baselines, Google achieves 47.3, while the primary system NLP²CT-UM surpasses it with a score of 50.9. Similarly, HW-TSC achieves a strong d-BLEU of 50.2, showing consistent improvements over the baseline. These results highlight the primary systems’ ability to produce more accurate and coherent translations over entire documents compared to the baselines.

Zh-De and Zh-Ru. Table 4 demonstrates the results on Zh-De and Zh-Ru directions. The Google baseline achieves the highest d-BLEU scores of 31.3 and 25.2, respectively, demonstrating its strong overall translation performance for these language pairs. Among the primary systems, NLP²CT-UM achieves 26.7 in Zh-De and 22.7 in Zh-Ru, while SJTU-LoveFiction scores slightly lower with 25.4 and 21.5. These results indicate that while the primary systems show competitive performance, they fall short of the Google baseline, especially in maintaining document-level consistency for these language pairs.

System	General	Discourse	Rank
Cloudsheep	3.67	3.71	3
HW-TSC	3.54	3.46	4
NLP ² CT-UM	3.96	4.00	1 / 2
NTU	2.58	2.42	5
SJTU-LoveFiction	3.92	4.13	2 / 1

Table 5: The Zh-En evaluation results of baseline and primary systems in terms of **human evaluation**. We report two types of scores and System Rank. The human evaluation based on a scale from 0-5 encompasses two dimensions: general quality and discourse awareness.

6.2 Human Evaluation

In the Zh-En human evaluation, the systems were assessed based on general quality and discourse awareness, both scored on a scale of 0-5.

- *NLP²CT-UM* achieved the highest scores in General (3.96) and Discourse (4.00), securing the top ranks (1st in General, tied 2nd in Discourse), indicating strong overall translation quality and contextual coherence.
- *SJTU-LoveFiction* performed exceptionally well in Discourse with a score of 4.13, the highest in this category, and scored 3.92 in General, earning 2nd place in General and 1st place in Discourse.
- *Cloudsheep* achieved balanced scores of 3.67 (General) and 3.71 (Discourse), ranking 3rd overall.
- *HW-TSC* scored 3.54 (General) and 3.46 (Discourse), placing 4th in both categories.
- *NTU* lagged behind with 2.58 (General) and 2.42 (Discourse), ranking 5th overall.

These results highlight NLP²CT-UM and SJTU-LoveFiction as the top-performing systems, excelling in both general translation quality and discourse-level awareness.

7 Conclusion

Building on our experience in discourse-aware machine translation, in the era of NMT and (Wang et al., 2017; Lyu et al., 2023b; Wang et al., 2020, 2019; Longyue, 2019) LLM (Pang et al., 2024; Lyu et al., 2023a; Ming et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2024a), we continue to organize the WMT 2024 Shared Task: Discourse-Level Literary Translation, reporting the latest methods and advancements for this challenge.

References

- Li An, Linghao Jin, and Xuezhe Ma. 2023. Max-isi system at wmt23 discourse-level literary translation task. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 282–286.
- Kechen Li, Yaotian Tao, Hongyi Huang, and Tianbo Ji. 2024. Linchance-ntu for unconstrained wmt2024 literary translation. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 987–992.
- Lisa Liu, Ryan Liu, Angela Tsai, and Jingbo Shang. 2024a. Cloudsheep system for wmt24 discourse-level literary translation. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 960–966.
- Yinhan Liu, Jiatao Gu, Naman Goyal, Xian Li, Sergey Edunov, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Mike Lewis, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Multilingual denoising pre-training for neural machine translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:726–742.
- Yuchen Liu, Yutong Yao, Runzhe Zhan, Yuchu Lin, and Derek F Wong. 2024b. Noveltrans: System for wmt24 discourse-level literary translation. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 980–986.
- Arle Lommel, Hans Uszkoreit, and Aljoscha Burchardt. 2014. Multidimensional quality metrics (mqm): A framework for declaring and describing translation quality metrics. *Tradumàtica*, (12):0455–463.
- Wang Longyue. 2019. *Discourse-aware neural machine translation*. Ph.D. thesis, Dublin City University.
- Fabien Lopez, Gabriela González-Sáez, Damien Hansen, Mariam Nakhlé, Behnoosh Namdarzadeh, Marco Dinarelli, Emmanuelle Esperança-Rodier, Sui He, Sadaf Mohseni, Caroline Rossi, et al. 2023. The make-nmtviz system description for the wmt23 literary task.
- Yuanchang Luo, Jiaxin Guo, Daimeng Wei, Hengchao Shang, Zongyao Li, Zhanglin Wu, Zhiqiang Rao, Shaojun Li, Jinlong Yang, and Hao Yang. 2024. Context-aware and style-related incremental decoding framework for discourse-level literary translation. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 973–979.
- Chenyang Lyu, Zefeng Du, Jitao Xu, Yitao Duan, Minghao Wu, Teresa Lynn, Alham Fikri Aji, Derek F Wong, Siyou Liu, and Longyue Wang. 2023a. A paradigm shift: The future of machine translation lies with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.01181*.
- Chenyang Lyu, Jitao Xu, and Longyue Wang. 2023b. New trends in machine translation using large language models: Case examples with chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.01181*.
- Mary L McHugh. 2012. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia medica*, 22(3):276–282.
- Lingfeng Ming, Bo Zeng, Chenyang Lyu, Tianqi Shi, Yu Zhao, Xue Yang, Yefeng Liu, Yiyu Wang, Linlong Xu, Yangyang Liu, et al. 2024. Marco-llm: Bridging languages via massive multilingual training for cross-lingual enhancement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04003*.
- Jianhui Pang, Fanghua Ye, Longyue Wang, Dian Yu, Derek F Wong, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2024. Salute the classic: Revisiting challenges of machine translation in the age of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08350*.
- Maja Popović. 2015. chrF: character n-gram f-score for automatic mt evaluation. In *Proceedings of the tenth workshop on statistical machine translation*.
- Matt Post. 2018. A call for clarity in reporting BLEU scores. In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*.
- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. COMET: A neural framework for MT evaluation. In *EMNLP*.
- Mathew Snover, Bonnie Dorr, Richard Schwartz, John Makhoul, Linnea Micciulla, and Ralph Weischedel. 2006. A study of translation error rate with targeted human annotation. In *Proceedings of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas (AMTA)*.
- Haoxiang Sun, Tianxiang Hu, Ruize Gao, Jialong Tang, Pei Zhang, Baosong Yang, and Rui Wang. 2024. Sjtulovefiction’s system for wmt24 discourse-level literary translation. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*.
- Longyue Wang, Zefeng Du, Wenxiang Jiao, Chenyang Lyu, Jianhui Pang, Leyang Cui, Kaiqiang Song, Derek Wong, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2024. Benchmarking and improving long-text translation with large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 7175–7187.
- Longyue Wang, Zefeng Du, Donghuai Liu, Cai Deng, Dian Yu, Haiyun Jiang, Yan Wang, Leyang Cui, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2023a. Disco-bench: A discourse-aware evaluation benchmark for language modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08074*.
- Longyue Wang, Chenyang Lyu, Tianbo Ji, Zhirui Zhang, Dian Yu, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2023b. Document-level machine translation with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02210*.
- Longyue Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Yan Gu, Siyou Liu, Dian Yu, Qingsong Ma, Chenyang Lyu, Liting Zhou, Chao-Hong Liu, Yufeng Ma, Weiyu Chen, Yvette Graham, Bonnie Webber, Philipp Koehn, Andy Way, Yulin Yuan, and Shuming Shi. 2023c. *Findings of the WMT 2023 shared task on discourse-level literary translation: A fresh orb in the cosmos of LLMs*. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 55–67, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Longyue Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Xing Wang, Li Ding, Liang Ding, and Shuming Shi. 2020. Tencent ai lab machine translation systems for wmt20 chat translation task. In *Proceedings of the fifth conference on machine translation*, pages 483–491.
- Longyue Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Xing Wang, and Shuming Shi. 2019. One model to learn both: Zero pronoun prediction and translation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 921–930.
- Longyue Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Andy Way, and Qun Liu. 2017. Exploiting cross-sentence context for neural machine translation. In *EMNLP*.
- Minghao Wu, Jiahao Xu, and Longyue Wang. 2024a. Transagents: Build your translation company with language agents. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 131–141.
- Minghao Wu, Yulin Yuan, Gholamreza Haffari, and Longyue Wang. 2024b. (perhaps) beyond human translation: Harnessing multi-agent collaboration for translating ultra-long literary texts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11804*.
- Yuhao Xie, Zongyao Li, Zhanglin Wu, Daimeng Wei, Xiaoyu Chen, Zhiqiang Rao, Shaojun Li, Hengchao Shang, Jiabin Guo, Lizhi Lei, et al. 2023. Hw-tsc’s submissions to the wmt23 discourse-level literary translation shared task. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 302–306.
- Longyue Wang Zefeng Du, Minghao Wu. 2023. Chinese-llama-2. <https://github.com/longyuewangdcu/Chinese-Llama-2>.
- Anqi Zhao, Kaiyu Huang, Hao Yu, and Degen Huang. 2023. Dtnlp system for the wmt2023 discourse-level literary translation. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 296–301.
- Shaolin Zhu and Deyi Xiong. 2023. Tjunlp: System description for the wmt23 literary task in chinese to english translation direction. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 307–311.

Score	General Quality	Discourse Awareness
5	Translation passes quality control; the overall translation is excellent. Translation is very fluent with no grammatical errors and has been localized to fit target language. Word choice is accurate with no mistranslations. The translation is a 100% true to the source text.	No inconsistency relating to key terms such as names, organization, etc. Linking words or expressions between sentences keeps the logic and language of the passage clear and fluent. Context and tone are consistent throughout. The style of the text conforms to the culture and habit of the target language.
4	Translation passes quality control; the overall translation is very good. Translation is fluent. Any errors that may be present does not affect the meaning or comprehension of the text. Most word choice is accurate, but some may cause ambiguity. Key terms are consistent. Inconsistency is limited to non-key terms.	Logical and language is clear and fluent. Some sentences lack transition but does not affect contextual comprehension. Topic is consistent. Tone and word choice may be inconsistent, but comprehension is not affected. Translation conforms to the culture and habit.
3	Translation passes quality control; the overall translation is ok. Translation is mostly fluent but there are many sections that require rereading due to language usage. Some word choice is inaccurate or errors but meaning of the sentence can be inferred from context.	Some key terms may be inconsistent. Most sentences translation smoothly and logically but some sentences that may seem abrupt due to lack of linkage. Topic is consistent. Tone and word choice is inconsistent, noticeably affecting the accuracy of reading comprehension.
2	Translation does not pass quality control; the overall translation is poor. Meaning is unclear or disjointed. Even with multiple rereading, passage may still be incomprehensible. Translation is not accurate to the source text or is missing in large quantities, causing the translation to deviate from the source text.	Many key terms are inconsistent, needing multiple rereading to understand context of the passage. Some linkages are present but overall, the passage lacks fluency and clarity, causing trouble with comprehension. The topic or tone is different from the other passages, affecting reading comprehension.
1	Translation does not pass quality control; the overall translation is very poor. More than half of the translation is mistranslated or missing.	Key terms are inconsistent, causing great trouble with comprehension. Some linkages are present but overall, the passage lacks fluency and clarity, heavily interfering with comprehension. The topic or tone is different from the other passages, heavily interfering with comprehension.
0	Translation output is unrelated to the source text.	Output is unrelated to previous or following sections.

Table 6: Human evaluation criteria on document-level translation.