

Syntactic Transfer to Kyrgyz Using the Treebank Translation Method

Anton Alekseev^{1,2,3,4}, Alina Tillabaeva⁵,
Gulnara Dzh. Kabaeva⁴, Sergey I. Nikolenko^{6,1} *

¹ Steklov Mathematical Institute at St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia

² St. Petersburg University, St. Petersburg, Russia

³ Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, RT, Russia

⁴ Kyrgyz State Technical University n. a. I. Razzakov, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

⁵ Independent Researcher, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

⁶ ITMO University, St. Petersburg, Russia

Abstract

The Kyrgyz language, as a low-resource language, requires significant effort to create high-quality syntactic corpora. This study proposes an approach to simplify the development process of a syntactic corpus for Kyrgyz. We present a tool for transferring syntactic annotations from Turkish to Kyrgyz based on a treebank translation method. The effectiveness of the proposed tool was evaluated using the TueCL treebank. The results demonstrate that this approach achieves higher syntactic annotation accuracy compared to a monolingual model trained on the Kyrgyz KTMU treebank. Additionally, the study introduces a method for assessing the complexity of manual annotation for the resulting syntactic trees, contributing to further optimization of the annotation process.

1 Introduction

Kyrgyz language, like many other low-resource languages (LRLs) [6, 23, 38], has recently garnered increasing attention from research communities aiming to enhance machine-readable resources and tools for the related studies. One of the critical challenges in this domain is the development of syntactic corpora (treebanks), which demands significant efforts from experts and typically requires a large span of time.

In this work, we propose a semi-automatic approach to syntactic analysis as a potential solution to this problem. We perform cross-lingual syntactic parsing from a source language to Kyrgyz leveraging treebank translation method. By utilizing preliminary annotations generated by models, linguists can focus on refining

*The work was supported by a grant from the Russian Science Foundation #22-11-00135, “Research and development of technologies for processing and analyzing multimodal unstructured data from various sources and their applicability for solving economic and social problems”.

and correcting these annotations, thus accelerating the overall annotation process. We believe that the approach has the potential to substantially reduce the effort required to produce high-quality syntactic corpora of sufficient size.

We demonstrate the feasibility of this approach and present a specialized tool for syntactic transfer of the annotations from a resource-rich source language (Turkish) to the target language (Kyrgyz). The shared grammatical features of the selected languages, particularly their word order and agglutinative nature, facilitate cross-linguistic syntactic transfer.

Finally, we evaluate the proposed system using a recently published Kyrgyz treebank annotated within the Universal Dependencies (UD) framework. We have prepared a Python package implementing our method: <https://github.com/alexeyev/tratreetra>. The package allows to plug in any dependency parser, morphological analyzer, or word aligner.

2 Related Work

2.1 Kyrgyz Language in Universal Dependencies

Significant progress has been made in recent years in adapting the approach of the *Universal Dependencies* (UD) framework [12] for the Kyrgyz language. Efforts are ongoing to expand syntactically annotated corpora for Kyrgyz and to formalize labeling guidelines that address challenges such as copula tokenization, the annotation of modal words and null-headed clauses, and distinguishing between inflection and derivation. These challenges are similar to those encountered in developing UD resources for other Turkic languages and have been the subject of several recent studies [43–45]. The resulting resources and guidelines will play a crucial role in training parsers and overall advancing the tools for Kyrgyz syntactic analysis.

As of November 2024, two significant Kyrgyz syntactic corpora have been developed under the UD framework:

UD_Kyrgyz-KTMU Treebank. This treebank [8], in its initial version included in UD, contained 781 sentences. By late October 2024, it had grown to 2'480 sentences annotated within the dependency grammar framework [33]. The dataset, hereafter referred to as *KTMU*, is described in [9].

Kyrgyz-TueCL Treebank. This treebank contains 145 sentences, including 20 from the *Cairo* dataset [24] and approximately 100 provided by the *UD Turkic Group*¹. Each sentence is accompanied by translations into English, Turkish, and Azerbaijani, making it a part of the broader UD Turkic Treebank initiative [4, 40].

These resources represent crucial steps toward creating robust syntactic tools for the Kyrgyz language and integrating it into the broader Universal Dependencies ecosystem. However, the annotation approaches employed in these treebanks vary significantly. Some of these differences have been outlined in [44], particularly in the annotation of copulas (e.g., the forms «эле», «болгон») and modal words (e.g., «да», «эле», «керек», «бар», «жок»).

For instance, in the *TueCL* dataset, the discourse particle «-бы» is treated as a separate token (e.g., «жата-бы», «б-екен»), while in *KTMU*, this interrogative particle is not annotated separately.

¹Additional information can be found at <https://github.com/ud-turkic>.

Additionally, the negative word «эмес» is analyzed in *TueCL* as an adverb (ADV) functioning as an adverbial modifier (*advmod*). In contrast, in *KTMU*, this word is annotated as a VERB. The syntactic role of the particle is inconsistently annotated, appearing with labels such as *compound:svc*, *acl*, *ccomp*, and *nmod*.

Postpositions (e.g., «үчүн», «чейин», «соң») are also annotated differently. In *TueCL*, these words are analyzed as ADP with an *case* relation, whereas in *KTMU*, «үчүн» and «чейин» are given the part-of-speech (POS) tag ADV and are treated as *advmod*, and «соң» is annotated as NOUN functioning as *nmod*.

The examples presented above are not by any means an exhaustive list of annotation differences between the datasets. We present them to provide a general sense of the extensive inconsistencies present in Kyrgyz treebanks.

2.2 Syntactic Transfer

A detailed survey of existing methods for transferring syntactic parsing was presented in [11]. The authors categorize the approaches into three main types: model transfer, annotation projection, and treebank translation. The model transfer approach involves training models on source language data and then applying the trained model to parse the target language. In this case, the model is typically trained on PoS tags, sometimes enhanced with morphological features of words.

The basic version of the model transfer approach is demonstrated in [32]. The authors train a model to predict syntactic roles using sentences where all words are replaced with their corresponding PoS tags. The trained model is then applied to sentences in the target language, and in the final step, the resulting parses are enriched with lexical information.

To achieve better results, lexical features can be incorporated into the model during training. This can be accomplished by adding glosses for each word [15, 42] or utilizing multilingual vector representations [7].

Annotation projection is another noteworthy approach, relying on the availability of a parallel corpus for the selected languages. In this method, sentences in the source language are parsed using a monolingual parser, and the syntactic annotations are transferred to word-aligned sentences in the target language [18]. The generated syntactic trees are then utilized to train a monolingual model for the target language. This method has already been used to parse Kyrgyz sentences from the Manas epic corpus [35].

One challenge with this approach is the syntactic differences between languages (such as between Kyrgyz and Russian in the mentioned study), which complicates the task of word alignment.

In [3], the authors demonstrate that this issue can be resolved by utilizing multiple source languages and combining multilingual projections based on weighted similarity scores between the source languages and the target language. In [26], the authors combine annotation projection and model transfer methods. They modify sentences from the source language to match the dominant syntactic dependency patterns obtained from the annotation projection onto the target language, thus addressing syntactic distance between languages.

The third approach, known as treebank translation, is similar to annotation projection but relies on a parallel corpus generated through machine translation [34], which can be conducted at the word or sentence level. In this paper, the authors

evaluate various strategies for SMT-based translation of the source language’s gold-standard treebank. In [22], the authors emphasize the importance of consistent annotated treebanks for cross-lingual syntactic transfer. They also create a multi-lingual treebank incorporating five European languages and Korean.

The treebank translation method is the closest to the goals of our study, as the currently available treebank for Kyrgyz is extremely limited in size (see Section 2.1). However, our work differs from [34] in its choice of a target language from the Turkic family, for which fewer treebanks are available compared to European languages. Furthermore, efforts to unify annotation standards across languages in this group are only just beginning. Therefore, the goal of this paper is not to train a monolingual model but rather to focus on creating a tool to facilitate manual annotation.

3 Proposed Algorithm

The method described below represents a simple pipeline for syntactic parsing (within the dependency grammar formalism) in resource-constrained settings. It proposes leveraging models trained on related languages with richer resources. The stages of the pipeline are listed below.

1. *Identifying a dataset for quality evaluation:* select an appropriate dataset for assessing the target language syntactic parsing results.
2. *Selecting a model for the source language:* choose a pre-trained syntactic parsing model within the same formalism for a syntactically similar language.
3. *Target text translation:* automatically translate the text into the source language.
4. *Annotation projection:* transfer syntactic annotations to the target language sentence using automatic word alignment (bitext alignment) and simple algorithmic transformations.
5. *Evaluation of projection:* assess the quality of the generated parse tree using standard metrics and evaluation scripts based on the original dataset. This provides an estimate of the number of corrections the annotator will need to make.

3.1 Selecting a Dataset for Quality Evaluation

In Section 2.1, we highlighted the most significant differences between the available Kyrgyz treebanks. In our opinion, the *TueCL* treebank provides the most detailed and consistent annotations. Additionally, one of the baseline models we used was the only available Kyrgyz model, Stanza [25] `ktmu-nocharlm`, which was trained on the *KTMU* bank. Therefore, using *KTMU* for quality evaluation would not be appropriate.

```

Here are the sentences in Kyrgyz.

Кыз досуна кат жазды.
Жамгыр жаап жатат окшойт.

<...>

Дениз уктатылды.
Алар кетти.
Ал кетти.

I want you to translate them to Turkish
line-by-line, but you must not change
the word order and the total number
of words in each sentence. Do not add
any extra comments.

```

Table 1: A prompt to ChatGPT4o to obtain the translations of sentences in Kyrgyz from the *TueCL* treebank into Turkish “encouraging” preserving the order and number of words in each sentence.

3.2 Syntactic Parsers for Turkish

When selecting parsers, we considered the recency and size of the training corpus, as well as the ease of use of the corresponding tool. Among the main instruments available for syntactic analysis compatible with the Universal Dependencies format and formalism, we chose parsers from the *Stanza* library [25], trained on treebanks from UD version 2.12: *BOUN* [36] and *IMST* [29–31]. In our view, these datasets are closer in terms of the annotation scheme to *TueCL* than others. We also tested UDPipe models trained on UD version 2.5 (the *IMST* treebank).

3.3 Translation systems

As translation systems, we considered popular services providing machine translation: Google Translate and Yandex.Translate². Additionally, we used translations generated by GPT4o [2]; the corresponding prompt, which required maintaining the order and number of words, is presented in Table 1. While not all translations thus obtained met the requirements, the results presented in Section 4 suggest that this method had a significant impact on the quality of the final syntactic transfer.

3.4 Syntactic Transfer

To fill all fields adopted in the Universal Dependencies project for each word in the analysis, it is also necessary to obtain the lemma of each word. Therefore, in addi-

²Yandex.Translate had to be excluded due to numerous obviously incorrect translations (for instance, some names were replaced with unrelated nouns). It is worth noting, however, that Kyrgyz translation functionality in Yandex.Translate is still in beta.




Figure 1: An example of Russian and English sentences, aligned.

tion to the annotation projection described above, we implemented lemmatization using the morphological analyzer *apertium-kir* [41]. For simplicity, for each word, the first analysis item provided by the tool was selected. The heuristics proposed below will also require a method for determining part-of-speech tags (high accuracy is not required yet desirable); for this purpose, *apertium-kir* was also used as a PoS tagger.

By this stage, the texts must be tokenized, and Turkish translations should be obtained from *TueCL*, GPT-4o, and Google Translate. These translations should be enriched with Universal Dependencies (UD) syntactic annotations using the *Stanza-IMST-charlm*, *Stanza-IMST-BERT*, *Stanza-BOUN-BERT* models, as well as *UDPipe-1* (please see Section 3.2).

Next, word alignment [10] should be performed between Turkish and Kyrgyz sentences, followed by transformation using heuristic algorithms to facilitate the transfer of syntactic labels and structures from the source to the target sentences. A detailed description of this process is provided below.

3.4.1 Word Alignment

We utilized bitext alignment using *SimAlign* [19] to align words between Kyrgyz and Turkish in both directions. The result of this procedure is generally a “many-to-many” relation, represented as an arbitrary bipartite graph where edges connect word pairs from the two languages. It is worth noting that a more advanced model, such as [14], could have been used to deliver a better quality of token alignment. Additionally, the model could have been fine-tuned on sentence pairs (e. g., by constructing a parallel Turkish-Kyrgyz corpus using machine translation). However, we opted for an interface with minimal additional configuration. For alignment, the base models employed were the multilingual *RoBERTa* model (XLM-R) [20,21] and *mBERT* (a multilingual model based on BERT) [13]. An example of alignment for sentences in Russian and English is shown in Figure 1. Note that in this example, some words (e.g., the articles “the”) cannot be aligned to a counterpart in the other language, while other words are aligned to multiple words simultaneously (e.g., “стояли” and “were standing”). Additionally, the differences in word order between Russian and English contribute to the “complexity” of the alignment. For this reason, Turkish was chosen as the source language for syntactic parsing of Kyrgyz sentences.

Thus, at this stage, we obtain an approximate alignment between sentences in Turkish and Kyrgyz, as well as dependency trees where the nodes are tokens from the Turkish sentences.

In an ideal scenario, where the number of tokens matches and the alignment forms an identity permutation, the result would appear as shown in Figure 2.

However, often, this is not the case: alignments commonly include a number of edges between words at non-corresponding positions, multiple tokens aligned to a




Figure 2: Translations of the sentence “Стояли звери около двери” (en. “The beasts were standing by the door”) into Turkish and Kyrgyz languages demonstrate a very similar word order. Above the Turkish sentence, its Universal Dependencies parse is shown — obtained using UDPipe [28] (model `turkish-imst-ud-2.12-230717`, trained on the UD-IMST treebank data [29, 31]).

single one (as seen in Figures 1 and 3), as well as a certain number of erroneous alignments. Therefore, we developed a set of annotation projection rules based on practical considerations, without tuning them to a specific dataset (*TrueCL*), as described below.

In addition to the accuracy of transferring dependency arcs and labels, structural requirements must also be taken into account and satisfied. The resulting tree must be acyclic and have a valid sentence head (or root), which is a non-trivial task. The problem arises due to Turkish root not always having a corresponding token in Kyrgyz sentences because of alignment errors or, more broadly, structural mismatches. These requirements are satisfied through the use of the following heuristics, which were implemented without tuning on the test set.

3.4.2 Identifying the Sentence Head

The head of the Turkish sentence is identified during the automatic parsing process, and it is checked whether this token has a corresponding token in the Kyrgyz sentence.

1. If there is a single matching token for the Turkish root, the pair is excluded from the alignment, ensuring its inclusion in the final representation (the matching is constructed in the next stage; see below).
2. If the Turkish root is not matched to any token, a “greedy” selection and assignment of the pair are performed by reverse-order traversal of the Kyrgyz sentence (considering its SOV structure), prioritizing the following in order:
 - a token of the same PoS is the highest priority for the match;
 - a verb;
 - a noun;
 - the first word in the sentence.
3. If the Turkish root is matched to multiple tokens, we select the one the position of which is closest to the root token’s position in the Turkish sentence (the

absolute value of the difference in the respective indices should be the smallest possible). This ensures that the root of the Turkish sentence is included in the final alignment.

3.4.3 Alignments Filtering

For Turkish tokens with multiple alignments, PoS annotations from `apertium-kir` (converted to the Universal Tagset using `apertium2ud` [5]) are utilized to filter the alignments, retaining only those that match the corresponding parts-of-speech. If this filtering procedure reduces the number of alignments to zero, the original set of alignments is preserved.

3.4.4 Constructing the Matching

Since the alignment can be treated as a bipartite graph, one can construct a maximum matching — retaining edges such that no node is incident to more than one edge while maximizing the number of edges. Using the SciPy library [39], the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm [17] is applied to automatically build this matching, which is then used as the alignment for transferring labels. This approach eliminates the “cycle problem” (discussed earlier) during annotation transfer. As a result, structural correctness is ensured, though this step may potentially lead to some loss of information.

3.4.5 Adjusting the Sentence Head (Technical Step)

For the Kyrgyz token corresponding to the Turkish root, as determined by the constructed pairing, the `head` is manually set to 0.

3.4.6 Annotation Projection

All information from the Turkish sentence, except for `id`, `Token`, and `Lemma`, is transferred to the annotation for the corresponding Kyrgyz tokens. The `head` field is then updated to reflect the structure of the dependency arcs from the syntactic parse of the Turkish sentence.

The proposed heuristic approach ensures a high degree of universality. Further possibilities for improving the annotation transfer results through heuristic tuning on a held-out dataset are discussed in Section 6.

3.5 Quality Evaluation

Currently, there are user-friendly tools for dependency trees annotation [16, 27], including those specifically designed for Universal Dependencies [37]. Standard syntactic parsing quality metrics within the framework of dependency grammar are suitable for evaluating the effort required by experts to reannotate treebanks prepared using our method.

For example, UAS (Unlabeled Attachment Score) — a set of metrics evaluating the proportion of correctly predicted arcs (edges) — indicates the proportion of arcs that would need to be removed (precision) and the proportion that would need to be added anew (recall). LAS (Labeled Attachment Score) is a similar but stricter

metric that considers dependency relations, indicating the proportion that would need to be either re-checked or relabeled with a different type.

Similarly, the precision and recall of tokenization (creation and removal of the nodes in the tree), the precision and recall of part-of-speech tag assignments (creation and removal of UPOS tags), and other annotations can be interpreted in the same manner.

The *TueCL* treebank was used for quality evaluation, as its annotation principles selected by the experts currently provide, in our opinion, the most comprehensive reflection of the syntactic features of the Kyrgyz language that need to be considered, at least for these sentences.

For reproducibility, error prevention, and overall convenience, the UD’s script `tools/eval.py` [1] was used as the quality evaluation tool.

4 Results

All experiments were conducted on a computer with 16 GB of RAM and an Intel i7-8565U CPU @ 1.80GHz with 4 cores and 8 logical processors. The results of the experiments are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Table 3 shows metrics for which the results of all syntactic transfer models are identical. This is because these metrics evaluate parse elements obtained using `apertium-kir`, except for the Stanza `ktmu-noncharlm` parser, which is the only parser directly designed for Kyrgyz considered in this study. The “Words” metric assesses the alignment accuracy of matched words, while the “Lemmas” metric evaluates whether words were correctly normalized to their dictionary form.

Since the proposed text processing pipeline consists of multiple steps, it is not feasible to reliably assess the individual impact of errors at each stage on the final result. The reliability of the conclusions is also likely influenced by the small size of the test set. However, the obtained results allow us to draw the following conclusions:

- for this task, the XLM-RoBERTa model demonstrates superior alignment quality in zero-shot mode compared to mBERT. For instance, in the UPOS prediction task, alignment using XLM-RoBERTa provided an advantage (up to 1.22%) in 8 out of 12 cases (except for Turkish sentences from *TueCL*). Similarly, for UAS evaluations, XLM-RoBERTa outperformed in 10 out of 12 cases, and for LAS evaluations, in 11 out of 12 cases.
- for syntactic parsing tasks, models leveraging BERT-based representations consistently outperformed other tested approaches;
- determining parts of speech based on syntactic transfer was, as expected, not sufficiently effective (though it was not the primary goal of this work), hence for this task, preference should be given to `apertium-kir` or annotation using Stanza-KTMU-nocharlm; predicting parts-of-speech (UPOS tags) using Stanza-KTMU-nocharlm achieves a precision of 68.04%, recall of 66.13%, and an F_1 -score of 67.07%; in contrast, the best results obtained through annotation projection using the Stanza-BOUN-BERT model are $\mathbf{Pr} = 63.17\%$, $\mathbf{Re} = 61.34\%$, and $\mathbf{F}_1 = 62.24\%$;

MT	Alig.	Parser	UAS			LAS			UPOS		
			Pr	Re	F1	Pr	Re	F1	Pr	Re	F1
Kyrgyz Language											
—	—	St _{KTMU, nclm}	49.02	47.65	48.33	29.29	28.47	28.88	68.04	66.13	67.07
Turkish Language											
GPT4o	SA _{BERT}	St _{BOUN, BERT}	57.30	55.64	56.46	45.99	44.66	<u>45.31</u>	61.93	60.14	61.02
		St _{IMST, BERT}	55.04	53.45	54.23	43.21	41.96	42.57	61.83	60.04	60.92
		St _{IMST, charlm}	51.54	50.05	50.79	39.61	38.46	39.03	61.83	60.04	60.92
		UDPipe	48.46	47.05	47.74	26.65	25.87	26.25	56.07	54.45	55.25
	SA _{XLMR}	St _{BOUN, BERT}	60.39	58.64	59.50	48.25	46.85	47.54	63.17	61.34	<u>62.24</u>
		St _{IMST, BERT}	57.82	56.14	<u>56.97</u>	45.68	44.36	45.01	63.07	61.24	62.14
		St _{IMST, charlm}	54.32	52.75	53.52	41.87	40.66	41.26	63.07	61.24	62.14
		UDPipe	50.62	49.15	49.87	27.37	26.57	26.96	57.10	55.44	56.26
Google Translate	SA _{BERT}	St _{BOUN, BERT}	55.04	53.45	54.23	41.05	39.86	40.45	57.10	55.44	56.26
		St _{IMST, BERT}	52.47	50.95	51.70	39.09	37.96	38.52	57.10	55.44	56.26
		St _{IMST, charlm}	50.21	48.75	49.47	35.80	34.77	35.28	57.10	55.44	56.26
		UDPipe	48.25	46.85	47.54	23.66	22.98	23.31	53.81	52.25	53.02
	SA _{XLMR}	St _{BOUN, BERT}	56.17	54.55	55.35	42.59	41.36	41.97	57.82	56.14	56.97
		St _{IMST, BERT}	53.19	51.65	52.41	40.12	38.96	39.53	57.82	56.14	56.97
		St _{IMST, charlm}	50.62	49.15	49.87	36.83	35.76	36.29	57.82	56.14	56.97
		UDPipe	47.74	46.35	47.03	22.84	22.18	22.50	54.01	52.45	53.22
Transl. from TueCL	SA _{BERT}	St _{BOUN, BERT}	51.65	50.15	50.89	40.53	39.36	39.94	58.64	56.94	57.78
		St _{IMST, BERT}	47.94	46.55	47.24	37.96	36.86	37.40	58.54	56.84	57.68
		St _{IMST, charlm}	43.21	41.96	42.57	33.64	32.67	33.15	58.54	56.84	57.68
		UDPipe	43.42	42.16	42.78	22.53	21.88	22.20	54.42	52.85	53.62
	SA _{XLMR}	St _{BOUN, BERT}	53.50	51.95	52.71	42.39	41.16	41.76	57.72	56.04	56.87
		St _{IMST, BERT}	50.72	49.25	49.97	39.71	38.56	39.13	57.61	55.94	56.77
		St _{IMST, charlm}	45.68	44.36	45.01	34.98	33.97	34.47	57.61	55.94	56.77
		UDPipe	45.47	44.16	44.80	23.66	22.98	23.31	53.70	52.15	52.91

Table 2: Quality “metrics”: **Pr** — precision, **Re** — recall, **F1** — F-measure; SA — SimAlign; UDPipe — the UDPipe-1 parser, model IMST-UD-2.5-191206; St_{[treebank], [model]} — corresponding Stanza models.

- the use of machine translation with a special instruction via GPT4o provided a noticeable improvement in quality. This is clearly evident in the consistently higher F₁-scores for UAS, LAS, and UPOS metrics. In contrast, annotation transfer from “original” Turkish sentences generally performs worse, which is expected, as “human” translation lacks factors that could potentially and partially preserve similar word order (even at the cost of translation accuracy and grammatical correctness).

We would like to note that our approach demonstrates superiority compared to the monolingual Kyrgyz parser Stanza-KTMU-nocharlm. This outcome serves as an inspiration for further research and the development of more advanced parsers.

Moreover, the results obtained open up new opportunities for further improving

Model	Lemmas			Words		
	Pr	Re	F1	Pr	Re	F1
KY St _{KTMU, nclm}	74.61	72.53	73.56	96.81	94.11	95.44
TR Other (apertium-kir)	75.82	73.63	74.71	97.02	94.21	95.59

Table 3: Quality Metrics: **Words** — alignment accuracy of matched words, **Lemmas** — how accurate the conversion of the words to their dictionary form is.

syntax analysis models and adapting them to low-resource languages.

5 Error Analysis

In this study, no additional heuristics were applied for tokenizing multiword expressions into separate tokens, which resulted in 19.3% of sentences being incorrectly tokenized compared to the “gold standard”. These sentences were excluded from subsequent error analysis. The analyzed Turkish sentences, from which the annotations were projected onto Kyrgyz, were parsed using the Stanza-IMST model, which demonstrated high quality in the experiment.

Table 4 presents the accuracy of (`dep:rel`) tags and the (`head`) tags. We consider `dep:rel` tags to be correctly predicted if their subtype, when applicable, is also accurately identified. This approach differs from the calculation of LAS and UAS metrics in the UD tools package used in the previous section. The stricter methodology allows for a more detailed assessment of annotation projection quality, which is particularly useful in the context of applying our method to semi-automatic annotation. The table shows that slightly more than half of the `dep:rel` tags were incorrectly predicted in all cases. It is important to note that the authors of the treebank aimed to showcase the grammatical features of the Kyrgyz language, resulting in the treebank containing a relatively large number of rare and, therefore, challenging cases for automatic syntactic analysis. Moreover, the treebank includes dependency relation types specific to Kyrgyz, such as `nsubj:pass`, `nsubj:outer`, `obl:cau`, `obl:tmod`, and `compound:svc`. All these subtypes of syntactic relations (except for `nsubj:outer`) are not used in the IMST treebank. Consequently, the Turkish model assigned a universal label without specifying a subtype (e.g., `obl` instead of `obl:cau`), which was counted as an error during evaluation.

Additionally, a significant percentage of errors stemmed from syntactic differences in sentence translations. Specifically, 35.9% of errors in predicting the `dep:rel` tag were due to the inability to find a corresponding (i.e. matched in the alignment) word in the Turkish translation for a Kyrgyz word, leaving the Kyrgyz token without a label.

Thus, the `aux` tag was never predicted correctly (see Table 4), despite its high frequency in the treebank. In 71% of the total errors for this tag, the issue was due to syntactic differences between the languages. Specifically, while the Turkish translation used a synthetic verb form, the Kyrgyz sentence utilized an analytical form, resulting in a discrepancy in the number of tokens. An example of this is shown in Figure 3: the reciprocal pronoun “бири-бирин” (“each other”) is translated into Turkish as a single word, “birbirlerini”; “андан соң” (“that-ABL after”)

	Total	Correct <code>deprel</code>	Correct <code>head</code>
punct	152	91%	57%
nsubj	118	67%	64%
root	117	76%	76%
obl	65	58%	62%
aux	56	0%	52%
obj	49	67%	67%
advmod	26	35%	50%
advcl	23	57%	52%
conj	19	53%	42%
nmod	17	18%	71%
nmod:poss	15	73%	87%
ccomp	14	0%	14%
case	12	25%	25%
amod	11	73%	45%
det	11	55%	82%
cc	10	90%	40%
advmod:emph	10	40%	50%
acl	10	20%	10%
xcomp	10	0%	70%
compound	10	0%	10%
nummod	7	100%	100%
csubj	7	0%	43%
fixed	6	0%	0%
obl:tmod	6	0%	100%
cop	6	0%	83%
parataxis	6	0%	50%
orphan	5	0%	40%
flat	2	100%	100%
obl:cau	2	0%	100%
mark	2	0%	100%
compound:lvc	2	0%	0%
nsubj:outer	2	0%	100%
discourse	2	0%	50%
compound:svc	2	0%	50%
nsubj:pass	2	0%	100%
vocative	1	0%	100%
appos	1	0%	0%
acl:relcl	1	0%	100%

Table 4: Share of the correctly predicted `deprel` and `head` labels in the comparison between the *TueCL* annotations and one of the three best models, `StanzaIMST`, `charlm`.

is rendered as the single word “sonra”; and the past tense of the verb is expressed analytically in Kyrgyz as “чыгыш кетишти” (the synthetic form “çıktılar” in Turkish). Additionally, the token for comma is tagged incorrectly, as it is aligned with the conjunction “ve” (“and”). For similar reasons, the heads of the clause (`ccomp`, `xcomp`, `csubj`) are often misidentified. In Turkish translations, such constructions are frequently replaced with non-clausal equivalents.

Errors are introduced by the Turkish syntactic parser as well; for instance, all `parataxis` relations were labeled as `conj`.

Only 10% of errors in determining the `head` were related to incorrect words alignment. This value is significantly lower compared to the equivalent one for `deprel` (35.9%) because, for words without a pair during alignment we attached it the root instead of leaving this field empty, as was done for `deprel`.




Figure 3: An example from the *TueCL* treebank (at the top) and its Turkish translation (bottom), annotated using the Stanza-IMST-charlm model. Words without a corresponding counterpart in the Turkish sentence are highlighted in red, while dependency relations (`deprel`) predicted incorrectly are marked in dark red.

6 Conclusion

6.1 Key Findings

This study clearly demonstrates that machine translation combined with dependency parsing models trained on related languages data can significantly expedite manual dependency annotation for the Kyrgyz language. Comparison of the approaches to word alignment, syntactic parsing, and machine translation highlights the advantages of employing specialized models in similar tasks. For bitext alignment via multilingual embeddings without any fine-tuning, the XLM-RoBERTa model proved to be the most effective among those considered. For dependency parsing of Turkish texts, the most efficient parser was Stanza-BOUN-BERT. For machine translation, ChatGPT4o with a prompt of task-specific design was the most successful; the prompt instructed the generative model to preserve the word order and the number of words in sentences when translating from Kyrgyz to Turkish.

Given the pressing need to create treebanks for the Kyrgyz language suitable for training parsers, we encourage researchers and practitioners to explore and further develop this approach.

6.2 Limitations

When assessing the applicability of the proposed method, the following potential limitations of the presented analysis should be taken into account.

Firstly, the approach we propose does not incorporate additional language-specific heuristics specifically tailored to adapt annotations projections for the Kyrgyz language. A potential improvement to this tool could involve the use of rules that simplify the annotation process for certain types of words in Kyrgyz, such as discourse markers, copulas, particles, conjunctions, postpositions, etc. Additionally, a specialized method of processing (including the development of tokenization

and annotation rules) is required for multiword expressions, which are commonly encountered in the Kyrgyz language.

In the future, the task of multiword expressions tokenization can be addressed using the *apertium-kir* tool [41], which provides morphological analyses of words within sentences. The development of such heuristics can be carried out on a small dataset of eight sentences³, which were not included in the Kyrgyz language corpus *TueCL* but were also reviewed and annotated as part of the *UD Turkic Group* conference in accordance with the respective treebank guidelines.

Secondly, this method, despite its simplicity, assumes the availability of a developed morphological analyzer, which is not always available for the “truly low-resource” languages.

The same applies to the use of ChatGPT for sentence translation: for some low-resource languages, the machine translation quality remains low, which can significantly impact the final outcome.

Thirdly, in this study, we review only a limited number of available models for word alignment and syntactic parsing. Additionally, the question of how the source language influences the generated syntactic annotation remains open. Experiments with other grammatically related languages to Kyrgyz are yet to be conducted in future research.

There are significant opportunities for the error accumulation at each stage of the proposed processing pipeline. In the future, quality assessment should be performed at *each* step, or at the very least, the impact of each proposed annotation transfer heuristic on the final outcome should be investigated (i. e. ablation study). However, in this work, the primary focus was on demonstrating the overall feasibility of the proposed approach (*proof-of-concept*).

Finally, the *TueCL* treebank is too small for a convincing quality evaluation, its sentences are very similar to each other and have slight variations that highlight the syntactic features of the Kyrgyz language. Therefore, in the future, it would be desirable to use a more representative treebank that includes longer sentences and maintains an equally meticulous annotation. An ideal corpus could collect texts from various genres (registers), such as fiction, popular science, news, encyclopedias, social media, poetry, epic literature, etc.

6.3 Ideas for Future Research

The proposed empirical study serves only as a proof-of-concept for the approach, and it is clear that these are the initial steps toward the successful syntactic transfer. In the future, other improvements and alternative strategies can be explored, such as those outlined below.

Syntax Analysis Using LLMs. Direct parsing via prompts for large language models (LLMs) represents another promising avenue. Although unpublished results from related research [35] indicate that existing generative models often struggle with zero-shot learning (“prompting”) and few-shot learning (particularly “prompting with examples”) approaches, we believe that a more in-depth exploration of this method may still uncover its potential for syntactic annotation.

Automatically Constructed Dependency Trees as a Silver Standard Corpus. The

³The annotated sentences are available at <https://github.com/ud-turkic/general/blob/main/Annotations/Kyrgyz>

described methods can also be utilized to create a “silver standard”⁴ bank of dependency trees, which could be used for training syntax parsers for the Kyrgyz language. For instance, a Turkish corpus could be translated into Kyrgyz, word alignment (bitext alignment) could be performed, and the annotation could be transferred to the Kyrgyz translation using a method similar to the one proposed. The resulting dataset could then be used to train a parser. While such a parser might not be able to achieve perfect accuracy, it would likely represent a significant improvement in quality compared to the current state of affairs (i.e., the total absence of automatic syntactic parsing or models trained on a small treebank [8]).

The proposed approaches open promising avenues for addressing the critical shortage of syntactic resources for the Kyrgyz language. By building upon this methodology, future research may further enhance the efficiency and accuracy of the techniques for developing dependency corpora and training parsers, thus advancing both research and practical applications in Kyrgyz language processing as well as other less-resourced languages.

References

- [1] UniversalDependencies/tools/eval.py on GitHub.
<https://github.com/UniversalDependencies/tools/blob/19c980e95ed0944dd5ecd262322>
An evaluation script for Universal Dependencies.
- [2] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [3] Željko Agić, Anders Johannsen, Barbara Plank, Héctor Martínez Alonso, Natalie Schluter, and Anders Søgaard. Multilingual Projection for Parsing Truly Low-Resource Languages. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:301–312, 2016.
- [4] Furkan Akkurt, Bermet Chontaeva, Çağrı Çöltekin, Mehmet Oguz Derin, Gulnura Dzhumalieva, Soudabeh Eslami, Tunga Güngör, Sardana Ivanova, Murat Jumashiev, Aida Kasieva, Ash Kuzgun, Büşra Marşan, Balkız Öztürk, Chihiro Taguchi, Susan Üsküdarlı, Jonathan North Washington, and Olcay Taner Yıldız. Unifying the Annotations in Turkic Universal Dependencies Treebanks. In *2nd UniDive Workshop Theses*, February 2024.
- [5] Anton Alekseev. alexeyev/apertium2ud: mapping tagsets, 2023.
<https://github.com/alexeyev/apertium2ud>.
- [6] Anton Alekseev and Timur Turatali. KyrgyzNLP: Challenges, Progress, and Future. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Analysis of Images, Social Networks, and Texts (AIST 2024)*, To appear in Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNCS). Springer, 2024.

⁴*Silver standard* typically refers to annotation performed by machine learning models with little or partial expert verification.

- [7] Waleed Ammar, George Mulcaire, Miguel Ballesteros, Chris Dyer, and Noah A. Smith. Many Languages, One Parser. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:431–444, 2016.
- [8] Ibrahim Benli. UD_Kyrgyz-KTMU: UD for Kyrgyz. https://github.com/UniversalDependencies/UD_Kyrgyz-KTMU/, 2023.
- [9] Ibrahim Benli and Bakyt Sh. Sharshembayev. Dependency Parsing Based Treebank for Kyrgyz Language. *Ymer*, 23(07):325–342, 2024.
- [10] Peter F. Brown, Stephen A. Della Pietra, Vincent J. Della Pietra, and Robert L. Mercer. The mathematics of statistical machine translation: Parameter estimation. *Computational linguistics*, 19(2):263–311, 1993.
- [11] Ayan Das and Sudeshna Sarkar. A Survey of the Model Transfer Approaches to Cross-Lingual Dependency Parsing. *ACM Trans. Asian Low-Resour. Lang. Inf. Process.*, 19(5), 2020.
- [12] Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Christopher D. Manning, Joakim Nivre, and Daniel Zeman. Universal Dependencies. *Computational Linguistics*, 47(2):255–308, 07 2021.
- [13] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. 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 4171–4186, 2019.
- [14] Zi-Yi Dou and Graham Neubig. Word Alignment by Fine-tuning Embeddings on Parallel Corpora. In *Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EACL)*, 2021.
- [15] Greg Durrett, Adam Pauls, and Dan Klein. Syntactic transfer using a bilingual lexicon. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 1–11. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2012.
- [16] Johannes Heinecke. ConlluEditor: a fully graphical editor for Universal Dependencies treebank files. In *Universal Dependencies Workshop 2019*, Paris, 2019.
- [17] John E. Hopcroft and Richard M. Karp. An $n^{5/2}$ algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 2(4):225–231, 1973.
- [18] Rebecca Hwa, Philip Resnik, Amy Weinberg, Clara Cabezas, and Okan Kolak. Bootstrapping parsers via syntactic projection across parallel texts. *Natural Language Engineering*, 11(3):311–325, 2005.
- [19] Masoud Jalili Sabet, Philipp Dufter, François Yvon, and Hinrich Schütze. SimAlign: High Quality Word Alignments without Parallel Training Data using Static and Contextualized Embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference*

- on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*, pages 1627–1643, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [20] Yinhan Liu. Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale. volume 364, 2019.
- [21] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Che, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach, 2019.
- [22] Ryan McDonald, Joakim Nivre, Yvonne Quirnbach-Brundage, Yoav Goldberg, Dipanjan Das, Kuzman Ganchev, Keith Hall, Slav Petrov, Hao Zhang, Oscar Täckström, Claudia Bedini, Núria Bertomeu Castelló, and Jungmee Lee. Universal Dependency Annotation for Multilingual Parsing. In Hinrich Schuetze, Pascale Fung, and Massimo Poesio, editors, *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 92–97, Sofia, Bulgaria, August 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [23] Jamshidbek Mirzakhlov, Anoop Babu, Aigiz Kunafin, Ahsan Wahab, Bekhzodbek Moydinboyev, Sardana Ivanova, Mokhiyakhon Uzokova, Shaxnoza Pulatova, Duygu Ataman, Julia Kreutzer, Francis Tyers, Orhan Firat, John Licato, and Sriram Chellappan. Evaluating Multiway Multilingual NMT in the Turkic Languages. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 518–530, 2021.
- [24] Joakim Nivre. Towards a universal grammar for natural language processing. In *International conference on intelligent text processing and computational linguistics*, pages 3–16. Springer, 2015.
- [25] Peng Qi, Yuhao Zhang, Yuhui Zhang, Jason Bolton, and Christopher D. Manning. Stanza: A Python Natural Language Processing Toolkit for Many Human Languages. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, 2020.
- [26] Mohammad Sadegh Rasooli and Michael Collins. Density-Driven Cross-Lingual Transfer of Dependency Parsers. In Lluís Màrquez, Chris Callison-Burch, and Jian Su, editors, *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 328–338, Lisbon, Portugal, September 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [27] Pontus Stenetorp, Sampo Pyysalo, Goran Topić, Tomoko Ohta, Sophia Ananiadou, and Jun’ichi Tsujii. brat: a Web-based Tool for NLP-Assisted Text Annotation. In *Proceedings of the Demonstrations Session at EACL 2012*, Avignon, France, April 2012. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [28] Milan Straka. UDPipe 2.0 Prototype at CoNLL 2018 UD Shared Task. In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2018 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 197–207, Brussels, Belgium, October 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [29] Umut Sulubacak and Gülşen Eryiğit. Implementing universal dependency, morphology, and multiword expression annotation standards for Turkish language processing. *Turkish Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences*, 26(3):1662–1672, 2018.
- [30] Umut Sulubacak, Gülşen Eryiğit, and Tuğba Pamay. IMST: A revisited Turkish dependency treebank. In *1st International Conference on Turkic Computational Linguistics*, pages 1–6. Ege University Press, 2016.
- [31] Umut Sulubacak, Memduh Gökırmak, Francis Tyers, Çağrı Çöltekin, Joakim Nivre, and Gülşen Eryiğit. Universal dependencies for Turkish. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th international conference on computational linguistics: Technical papers*, pages 3444–3454, 2016.
- [32] Anders Søgaard. Data point selection for cross-language adaptation of dependency parsers. In *49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies: Short Papers-Volume 2*, page 682–686. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2011.
- [33] Lucien Tesnière. *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*. P.: Klincksieck, 1959.
- [34] Jörg Tiedemann, Željko Agić, and Joakim Nivre. Treebank Translation for Cross-Lingual Parser Induction. In Roser Morante and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 130–140, Ann Arbor, Michigan, June 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [35] Alina Tillabaeva. Syntactic Transfer Based on the Polivariant Parallel Kyrgyz-Russian Corpus Manas. Master’s thesis, HSE University, Moscow, Russia, June 2024. Please see <https://www.hse.ru/en/ma/ling/students/diplomas/930858853>.
- [36] Utku Türk, Furkan Atmaca, Şaziye Betül Özateş, Gözde Berk, Seyyit Talha Bedir, Abdullatif Köksal, Balkız Öztürk Başaran, Tunga Güngör, and Arzucan Özgür. Resources for Turkish Dependency Parsing: Introducing the BOUN Treebank and the BoAT Annotation Tool. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 56(1):259–307, March 2022.
- [37] Francis M. Tyers, Mariya Sheyanova, and Jonathan North Washington. Ud annotatrix: An annotation tool for universal dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Workshop on Treebanks and Linguistic Theories (TLT16)*, pages 10–17, 2018.
- [38] Yana Veitsman. Recent Advancements and Challenges of Turkic Central Asian Language Processing. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.05006>, 2024.
- [39] Pauli Virtanen, Ralf Gommers, Travis E. Oliphant, Matt Haberland, Tyler Reddy, David Cournapeau, Evgeni Burovski, Pearu Peterson, Warren Weckesser, Jonathan Bright, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Matthew Brett, Joshua Wilson, K. Jarrod Millman, Nikolay Mayorov, Andrew R. J. Nelson, Eric Jones, Robert Kern, Eric Larson, C. J. Carey, İlhan Polat, Yu Feng, Eric W. Moore,

Jake VanderPlas, Denis Laxalde, Josef Perktold, Robert Cimrman, Ian Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, Charles R. Harris, Anne M. Archibald, Antônio H. Ribeiro, Fabian Pedregosa, Paul van Mulbregt, and SciPy 1.0 Contributors. SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python. *Nature Methods*, 17:261–272, 2020.

- [40] Jonathan Washington, Çağrı Çöltekin, Furkan Akkurt, Bermet Chontaeva, Soudabeh Eslami, Gulnura Jumalieva, Aida Kasieva, Aslı Kuzgun, Büşra Marşan, and Chihiro Taguchi. Strategies for the Annotation of Pronominalised Locatives in Turkic Universal Dependency Treebanks. In *Proceedings of the Joint Workshop on Multiword Expressions and Universal Dependencies (MWE-UD)@ LREC-COLING 2024*, pages 207–219, 2024.
- [41] Jonathan North Washington, Mirlan Ipasov, and Francis M. Tyers. A finite-state morphological transducer for Kyrgyz. In *LREC*, pages 934–940, 2012.
- [42] Hai Zhao, Yan Song, Chunyu Kit, and Guodong Zhou. Cross language dependency parsing using a bilingual lexicon. In *Conference of the 47th Annual Meeting of the ACL and the 4th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing of the AFNLP*, pages 55–63. Association for Computational Linguistics, Suntec, Singapore, 2009.
- [43] Гульнура Джумалиева, Аида Касиева, Сейде Мусажанова. Адаптация терминов веб-проекта «Универсальные зависимости» на кыргызский язык. *Вестник КРСУ*, 23 (6):71–75, 2023.
- [44] Аида Касиева, Гульнура Джумалиева, Анна Томпсон, Мурат Жумашев, Бермет Чонтаева, Джонатан Норт Вашингтон. Проблемы кыргызской синтаксической аннотации в фреймворке Universal Dependencies. In *Turk-Lang, Визоро*, 2023.
- [45] Сейде Мусажанова, Аида Касиева, Гульнура Джумалиева. Синтаксическая аннотация кыргызского языка на основе новосозданного корпуса. *Вестник Иссык-Кульского университета*, 54 (2):140–148, 2023.