

# Curriculum Learning for Cross-Lingual Data-to-Text Generation With Noisy Data

Kancharla Aditya Hari  
Sentisum  
aditya@sentisum.com

Manish Gupta  
Microsoft, Hyderabad, India  
gmanish@microsoft.com

Vasudeva Varma  
IIIT Hyderabad  
vv@iiit.ac.in

## Abstract

Curriculum learning has been used to improve the quality of text generation systems by ordering the training samples according to a particular schedule in various tasks. In the context of data-to-text generation (DTG), previous studies used various difficulty criteria to order the training samples for monolingual DTG. These criteria, however, do not generalize to the cross-lingual variant of the problem and do not account for noisy data. We explore multiple criteria that can be used for improving the performance of cross-lingual DTG systems with noisy data using two curriculum schedules. Using the alignment score criterion for ordering samples and an annealing schedule to train the model, we show increase in BLEU score by up to 4 points, and improvements in faithfulness and coverage of generations by 5-15% on average across 11 Indian languages and English in 2 separate datasets. We make code and data publicly available<sup>1</sup>.

## 1 Introduction

Data-to-text generation (DTG) is the task of transforming structured data, such as fact triples and tables into natural language (Reiter and Dale, 2000). Cross-lingual DTG (XDTG) is a variant of the problem where the input data and the generated natural text are in different languages (Abhishek et al., 2022). This is of particular relevance for low-resource languages as it allows input data from high resource languages such as English to be leveraged to generate text in low-resource languages (Cripwell et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2023; Sagare et al., 2023). Abhishek et al. (2022) created the XALIGN dataset using automatic methods for XDTG from English to various Indian languages, the first such dataset for this task whereas the WEBNLG 2023 Challenge (Cripwell et al., 2023) focused on four under-resourced European

Input Facts	Language	Reference
<H> sally steele <R> editor <T> vegas rocks! magazine <R> place of birth <T> indianapolis	English	Sally Steele ( <i>née Craig</i> ) was born in Indianapolis and is the <i>publisher, founder, CEO</i> and Editor-in-Chief of Vegas Rocks!
<H> chanida sutthiruang <R> date of birth <T> 16 july 1993 <R> occupation <T> cricketer	Hindi	चनिदा सुथिरुंग (जन्म 16 जुलाई 1993) एक <i>थाई</i> क्रिकेटर है। (Translated: Chanida Sutthiruang (born 16 July 1993) is a <i>Thai</i> cricketer.)

Figure 1: Examples of noisy data in the XALIGN dataset (Abhishek et al., 2022). The input facts are represented as RDF triples with head, relation and tail tags (<H>, <R> and <T>). Highlighted text in the reference cannot be inferred from the input facts.

languages. These datasets tend to be automatically curated, utilizing methods like machine translation.

However, Dhingra et al. (2019) observed that automatically curated datasets are prone to being noisy. A particular problem observed was that of divergent references where the reference texts deviate from the input data. This can manifest as either including information that cannot be inferred from the input data or omitting information that is present in the input data. Two examples of such noisy samples are shown in Fig. 1.

In this work, we use curriculum learning, where training samples are presented to the model in a specific simple-to-difficult order based on certain criteria, to improve performance of neural methods for XDTG. The approach has been shown to improve performance of monolingual DTG systems (Chang et al., 2021) using various difficulty criteria. The applicability of these approaches to XDTG however has not been studied as the cross-lingual setting presents unique challenges. Previous work has shown that criteria that jointly model both the input and the target perform better than criteria based on only one. However, such criteria, defined for monolingual DTG, cannot be easily adapted to the cross-lingual setting. Moreover, existing works only study schedules based on the notion of increasing difficulty which does not account for potential noise in the data. Curriculum learning with “annealing” data, that progressively removes examples of lower quality, has previously been used

<sup>1</sup><https://tinyurl.com/yy5w8zu5>

for learning from noisy data in other tasks (Wang et al., 2018; Hirsch and Tal, 2024), and its utility for the XDTG task bears further investigation, and is therefore the focus of our work. To demonstrate the potential of our method, we use the existing XALIGN dataset, and also introduce a new cross-lingual noisy dataset based on the ToTTo dataset (Parikh et al., 2020) called xTOTTO.

Overall, we make the following contributions in this paper. (1) We propose the usage of curriculum learning for the XDTG problem with noisy input data. (2) We empirically study the behaviour of two curriculum learning schedules (expanding and annealing) with various ordering criteria on two XDTG datasets. (3) We propose a new quality based cross-lingual criterion (alignment score) and show that with an annealing approach, it results in the best performance, evaluating performance with a combination of automatic metrics including LLM-based evaluation and human evaluation. (4) We make code and data publicly available<sup>1</sup>.

## 2 Related Work

Various neural approaches have been investigated for XDTG. Abhishek et al. (2022) put forward the XALIGN dataset and established baselines using seq2seq models. Sagare et al. (2023) investigated multilingual pretraining and fact-aware embeddings, while Singh et al. (2023) focus on DTG for long text. Moussallem et al. (2020) used a graph attention network based encoder and a transformer decoder to verbalize RDF triples in English, German and Russian using the enriched version of the WEBNLG dataset (Castro Ferreira et al., 2018).

Bengio et al. (2009) showed empirically that curriculum learning has an effect on both the convergence speed and, in some cases, the quality of local minima obtained. For text based tasks, n-gram frequency, token rarity and sentence length are some criteria used which are based only on the input or output text (Kocmi and Bojar, 2017; Platanios et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2021). Kocmi and Bojar (2017) also use linguistic features such as number of coordinating conjunctions. Criteria such as data uncertainty (Zhou et al., 2020), and edit distances have been used to jointly consider both the input and output (Chang et al., 2021). Some methods have also been designed for generating faithful text from noisy data, such as loss truncation (Kang and Hashimoto, 2020) and controlled hallucinations (Filippova, 2020).



Figure 2: Two curriculum schedules: (a) Expanding schedule introduces new shards, (b) annealing schedule removes shards as the training progresses. Each row represents a training phase.

## 3 Curriculum Learning Strategy

**Annealing vs Expanding Approach.** We use a probabilistic curriculum learning strategy similar to the one used by Zhang et al. (2018) for machine translation. The training samples are first distributed into distinct *shards* based on the value of the chosen criterion. The training process is segmented into different *phases*, with samples selected from only a subset of shards in a phase. We experiment with two approaches for selecting the shards, as shown in Fig. 2. The first is to begin the training with the shard with the lowest scores, with shards added in the subsequent phases in ascending order. We term this the *expanding* approach. The *annealing* approach is based on studies related to learning from noisy data for other NLG tasks. Here, the training begins with every shard available in the first phase and shards with the lowest scores are removed in subsequent phases. The shards are shuffled within a specific phase. We choose this strategy over other curriculum learning strategies due to its flexible nature, requiring only a modification to the sampling strategy.

**Curriculum Criteria.** We consider two criteria used by Chang et al. (2021) for monolingual DTG: sequence length and word rarity. Their soft edit distance criterion cannot be used for cross-lingual learning as it relies on exact sequence matching between the input and reference text. Hence, we introduce a new cross-lingual criterion to jointly consider the input and target text: alignment.

(1) **Length:** Generating longer sentences is more challenging, as errors made early in the decoding process propagate further. For a sequence  $s = \{w_1, w_2 \dots w_N\}$ ,  $d_{\text{length}}(s) = N$ .

(2) **Rarity:** This is the sequence probability using a unigram model. Based on the intuition that rarer words are harder to generate, rarity implicitly encodes information about the frequency of the words in the sequence, as well as the sequence length.  $d_{\text{rarity}}(s) = -\sum_{k=1}^N \log p(w_k)$  where the unigram probability of  $w_i$  is given as  $p(w_i)$ .

(3) **Alignment:** Singh et al. (2023) and Filippova

	Lang	BLEU								chrF++							
		Base	LT	Length		Rarity		Alignment		Base	LT	Length		Rarity		Alignment	
				E	A	E	A	E	A			E	A	E	A		
XALIGN	as	<b>12.60</b>	8.14	10.26	8.22	8.19	7.20	7.59	11.53	<b>34.81</b>	26.54	31.99	28.33	29.04	29.50	29.17	33.43
	bn	48.03	44.33	43.13	<b>68.05</b>	38.65	67.76	42.78	64.78	74.30	67.99	68.40	42.87	82.10	81.89	67.47	<b>83.86</b>
	en	46.39	41.33	45.42	42.20	46.06	43.45	39.59	<b>48.63</b>	64.37	59.29	59.54	55.84	60.80	56.93	55.91	<b>64.41</b>
	gu	21.70	10.45	18.11	21.43	19.11	22.23	19.13	<b>22.83</b>	49.24	37.29	45.46	45.99	45.57	47.23	43.56	<b>51.17</b>
	hi	41.75	36.29	41.82	42.80	38.88	<b>47.43</b>	39.90	46.41	66.46	60.70	64.76	63.66	62.96	65.96	63.68	<b>67.17</b>
	kn	9.14	3.95	7.37	10.66	7.69	12.14	7.82	<b>12.70</b>	45.09	32.24	39.32	40.28	39.10	41.54	38.51	<b>46.58</b>
	ml	25.71	22.14	25.38	24.91	25.08	26.21	24.57	<b>28.50</b>	56.26	49.24	53.97	52.20	52.09	52.75	50.32	<b>56.94</b>
	mr	24.81	15.09	25.31	27.23	23.62	27.98	25.42	<b>28.90</b>	56.66	46.34	52.06	50.89	50.56	52.11	49.88	<b>58.35</b>
	or	<b>44.09</b>	31.68	32.15	26.90	36.23	32.00	35.30	42.93	<b>68.19</b>	53.11	57.80	49.28	58.71	53.70	58.61	64.61
	pa	25.71	13.92	19.29	27.70	21.46	27.44	23.65	<b>29.25</b>	50.61	38.51	44.38	46.06	44.68	46.57	44.55	<b>52.16</b>
	ta	18.92	8.97	16.83	19.66	13.02	18.93	21.25	<b>22.22</b>	54.12	43.46	52.16	51.81	46.42	54.22	53.36	<b>59.12</b>
	te	13.34	6.64	10.70	13.27	11.21	14.37	10.45	<b>15.56</b>	50.03	38.90	44.90	44.64	43.69	46.33	42.95	<b>50.99</b>
	Avg	27.06	20.05	24.61	28.60	23.56	29.65	24.59	<b>31.18</b>	55.77	46.45	51.52	51.95	50.19	53.29	50.05	<b>57.77</b>
xTOTTO	as	19.11	10.26	16.77	20.03	17.38	19.76	15.68	<b>20.24</b>	46.11	32.36	44.85	41.44	44.75	43.55	43.16	<b>47.82</b>
	bn	19.03	11.60	17.69	19.65	18.16	19.89	16.70	<b>20.70</b>	49.10	35.80	47.80	44.38	47.86	46.29	46.74	<b>50.16</b>
	en	27.33	16.61	27.46	29.43	28.86	29.51	26.28	<b>32.43</b>	50.01	30.35	49.58	46.75	51.14	48.61	47.85	<b>51.94</b>
	gu	21.86	13.44	21.56	24.05	22.00	24.14	18.77	<b>25.14</b>	47.78	32.85	46.29	43.15	46.54	44.63	44.21	<b>48.13</b>
	hi	23.32	13.08	21.70	24.35	23.14	25.35	19.88	<b>25.87</b>	47.66	32.61	46.59	43.42	47.15	45.24	44.63	<b>48.62</b>
	kn	20.05	9.17	18.45	19.37	19.73	20.71	16.84	<b>20.97</b>	50.24	34.84	48.50	45.49	48.88	47.48	47.11	<b>51.36</b>
	ml	18.00	7.53	15.84	18.31	16.73	19.19	14.78	<b>19.82</b>	45.98	28.36	43.40	41.38	44.20	42.87	42.13	<b>46.57</b>
	mr	18.65	9.75	18.02	20.32	17.96	<b>21.44</b>	16.69	21.23	45.84	30.58	44.01	40.94	44.35	42.80	43.43	<b>46.31</b>
	or	15.99	9.59	15.59	17.54	14.35	<b>17.62</b>	13.78	17.23	44.88	31.94	43.22	41.22	42.88	41.94	42.15	<b>45.60</b>
	pa	21.04	10.82	18.56	22.53	19.99	21.72	16.58	<b>22.90</b>	49.10	34.40	47.01	45.59	47.86	46.60	45.48	<b>50.31</b>
	ta	18.90	8.61	17.09	19.45	17.43	19.75	15.13	<b>20.75</b>	49.30	32.29	46.93	44.67	47.08	46.19	45.16	<b>49.88</b>
	Avg	20.30	10.95	18.98	21.37	19.61	21.73	17.37	<b>22.48</b>	47.82	32.40	46.20	43.49	46.61	45.11	44.73	<b>48.79</b>

Table 1: BLEU and chrF++ scores for XALIGN and xTOTTO datasets using models trained without curriculum learning - baseline method (base) and loss truncation (LT), and trained using curriculum learning with sequence length, word rarity and alignment criteria with expanding (E) and annealing (A) schedules.

(2020) showed that quantifying the alignment between input facts and reference texts can be used to improve the quality of generation in XDTG when the reference text is partially aligned. They train a binary classifier to classify fact-text pairs as having complete or partial alignment using a small, manually annotated dataset. Labels are then assigned to each example based on confidence scores of this classifier. We propose using this confidence score as the criterion for ordering the samples. We call this criterion the alignment score. For XALIGN, we train a MURIL model (Khanuja et al., 2021) using data and code from Singh et al. (2023)<sup>2</sup>. For xTOTTO, we use GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) to annotate samples for partial and complete alignment.

## 4 Experimental Setup

We perform experiments on two datasets: XALIGN and xTOTTO. XALIGN has 0.45M cross-lingual fact-text pairs in 13 languages: English (en), and 12 Indian languages: Assamese (as), Bangla (bn), Gujarati (gu), Hindi (hi), Kannada (kn), Malayalam (ml), Marathi (mr), Odia (or), Punjabi (pa), Tamil (ta), Telugu (te). XALIGN was automatically generated by aligning facts represented as RDF triples from Wikidata to sentences from Wikipedia using transfer learning. This results in partially aligned data containing noisy samples. Test set has 5042 manually annotated samples.

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/bhavyajeet/XFLT>

We also construct a new XDTG dataset based on the ToTTO dataset called xTOTTO. We use the round-trip translation strategy used by Zhu et al. (2019). Given a data-text pair  $(D, T)$ , we first translate  $T$  into the target language  $L$ , and then back to English to obtain  $\hat{T}$ . Then, cross-lingual pairs with  $\text{ROUGE1}(T, \hat{T}) > R_1$  and  $\text{ROUGE2}(T, \hat{T}) > R_2$  are selected. We use the 3.3B NLLB model (NLLB Team et al., 2022) to translate the texts in the XALIGN languages except Punjabi, which NLLB does not support. Since xTOTTO is based on the noisy annotations in the ToTTO dataset, xTOTTO also inherits the noise. We report scores on the validation set as the test set is hidden. xTOTTO has  $\sim 817\text{K}$  train and  $\sim 90\text{K}$  validation samples.

For every curriculum criterion, we performed experiments with both expanding as well as annealing schedule. We train baseline models without a curriculum learning strategy, and also compare the performance of our proposed approach with loss truncation (Kang and Hashimoto, 2020). This method involves dropping examples that have losses above a certain quantile estimate during gradient descent.

We train mT5 (Xue et al., 2021)-small models with 300M parameters. Appendix B provides detailed hyper-parameter settings.

## 5 Results and Analysis

**Standard Generation Metrics.** Table 1 shows that for both datasets, an annealing schedule with alignment criterion (ALG-ANN) results in the model

	XALIGN									xTOTTO								
	Loss Truncation			Baseline			Alignment (ALG-ANN)			Loss Truncation			Baseline			Alignment (ALG-ANN)		
	Fl.	Fa.	Cov.	Fl.	Fa.	Cov.	Fl.	Fa.	Cov.	Fl.	Fa.	Cov.	Fl.	Fa.	Cov.	Fl.	Fa.	Cov.
as	0.60	0.25	1.44	<b>0.86</b>	0.28	1.64	0.83	<b>0.38</b>	<b>1.84</b>	0.70	0.16	2.34	0.93	0.39	<b>2.56</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.40</b>	2.52
bn	0.86	0.41	1.46	<b>0.95</b>	0.51	1.43	0.90	<b>0.67</b>	<b>1.60</b>	0.63	0.16	2.46	0.92	0.35	<b>2.60</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.38</b>	2.58
en	0.76	0.23	2.41	<b>0.89</b>	0.45	2.50	0.87	<b>0.55</b>	<b>2.72</b>	0.54	0.24	2.33	<b>0.94</b>	0.38	<b>2.53</b>	0.93	<b>0.43</b>	<b>2.53</b>
gu	0.81	0.37	1.83	0.81	0.45	1.95	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>2.23</b>	0.78	0.22	2.48	0.94	0.34	2.58	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>2.59</b>
hi	0.88	0.53	1.96	<b>0.95</b>	0.52	2.01	0.94	<b>0.63</b>	<b>2.03</b>	0.68	0.17	2.19	0.93	0.31	<b>2.56</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.34</b>	2.55
kn	0.72	0.33	1.76	<b>0.78</b>	0.39	1.82	0.77	<b>0.54</b>	<b>2.30</b>	0.68	0.13	2.39	0.92	0.36	2.57	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>2.59</b>
ml	0.82	0.52	1.58	0.94	0.47	1.72	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>1.87</b>	0.58	0.14	2.25	0.89	0.32	2.53	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>2.55</b>
mr	0.70	0.38	1.85	0.88	0.41	1.98	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>2.13</b>	0.69	0.20	2.34	0.93	0.33	<b>2.56</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.37</b>	2.55
or	0.70	0.38	2.19	0.94	0.30	2.26	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>2.53</b>	0.67	0.21	2.48	0.90	0.43	2.54	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>2.56</b>
pa	0.75	0.34	1.96	<b>0.77</b>	0.40	2.07	0.74	<b>0.55</b>	<b>2.40</b>	— xTOTTO does not have Punjabi (pa) samples. —								
ta	0.78	0.40	1.65	<b>0.87</b>	0.49	1.75	0.85	<b>0.66</b>	<b>1.80</b>	0.52	0.12	2.32	0.90	0.28	<b>2.52</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.30</b>	2.50
te	0.74	0.36	1.83	0.83	0.36	1.88	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>2.17</b>	0.63	0.18	2.19	0.90	0.32	<b>2.55</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>2.55</b>
Avg	0.76	0.38	1.79	<b>0.87</b>	0.43	1.88	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>2.08</b>	0.65	0.18	2.34	0.92	0.34	<b>2.55</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>2.55</b>

Table 2: Fluency, faithfulness and coverage using GPT4-based evaluation. See Appendix D for example outputs.

with the highest BLEU and chrF++ scores. However, using length and rarity for ordering samples results in worse performance than the baseline method without curriculum learning. Perhaps, this is due to the inability of these criteria to deal with noisy data. Loss truncation leads to lowest scores, indicating its inefficacy in dealing with multilingual data. For both datasets and all ordering criteria, annealing schedule results in better scores than expanding schedule. While curriculum learning typically relies on the assumption that the performance of the model increases if “difficult” data is slowly added during training, the trend suggests that with noisy data it is important to refine training with highest quality data as the training progresses.

**LLM Evaluation.** Traditional automatic metrics are inadequate to measure nuanced aspects which are important for XDTG evaluation. Recent works have shown that LLM-based evaluation is consistent with expert human evaluation (Chiang and Lee, 2023). Hence, we use GPT-4 to evaluate our proposed method across three parameters: Fluency (Fl.), Faithfulness (Fa.) and Coverage (Cov.). Fl. and Fa. are on a scale of 0-1. Cov measures number of covered facts. Detailed prompts are in Appendix C. Table 2 compares best curriculum learning model (ALG-ANN) with baseline and loss truncation methods. Both baseline and ALG-ANN result in fluent text. However, ALG-ANN results in higher faithfulness and coverage. In XALIGN, it results in 15% absolute increase in Fa. and 0.4 higher Cov. The difference is less pronounced in xTOTTO, with 4% absolute increase in Fa. but similar Cov. While XALIGN was annotated by humans for alignment, GPT-4 was used to annotate xTOTTO which could be responsible for the narrower improvement. Further, xTOTTO requires greater reasoning over cells, making the task more challenging than XALIGN.

**Human Evaluation.** 100 sample generations of

		Baseline			ALG-ANN		
		Fl.	Fa.	Cov.	Fl.	Fa.	Cov.
XALIGN	en	0.84	0.51	2.55	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>2.61</b>
	hi	<b>0.82</b>	0.55	1.92	0.81	<b>0.70</b>	<b>1.93</b>
	te	0.78	0.53	1.42	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>1.57</b>
xTOTTO	en	0.87	0.53	2.50	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>2.52</b>
	hi	0.76	0.42	2.21	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>2.24</b>
	te	0.72	0.36	2.13	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>2.33</b>

Table 3: Human evaluation results.

our ALG-ANN method and the baseline are annotated by 3 annotators for en, hi and te due to availability constraints for expert annotators for other langs. Table 3 shows that ALG-ANN outperforms baseline in all three metrics. In XALIGN, the average faithfulness of generated texts increases by 14%, while in xTOTTO it increases by 6%. Human evaluation results also reveal that LLM-based evaluation overestimates the coverage of the generated texts, while underestimating their faithfulness. The higher coverage can be explained by the inability of GPT-4 to accurately extract the facts from the text, especially for multilingual data, while also often counting incorrectly verbalized data. Further, GPT-4 is stricter than human evaluators at marking examples as containing unsupported information. See Appendix D for example outputs.

## 6 Conclusion

We show that using curriculum learning with noisy data in a cross-lingual setting results in promising improvements in quality of XDTG. We show that standard difficulty based criteria are not suited for this task. Instead, our novel quality based criterion (alignment) when combined with an annealing schedule where as the training progresses the model is exposed to only the highest quality data results in the best performing model. An increase in automatic metrics (BLEU and chrF++) is observed, along with improvement in quality attributes as measured by both LLMs and human evaluation. The generated text is more fluent, is more faithful, and covers a greater amount of the input facts.

## 7 Limitations

The proposed alignment criterion requires annotating data-text pairs for alignment. While we demonstrate its potential when obtained using an LLM, the improvement in performance is smaller than that obtained using human annotations.

Further, while we investigate the problem of data-to-text generation, several other tasks such as headline generation, abstractive summarization etc. require text-grounded generation. These could also benefit from the method, and would establish its generalizability to other tasks.

## 8 Ethical Considerations

While our method considers the noisy nature of the data, the risk of generating hallucinatory text exists as with any other neural NLG system. Applying ideas from works focusing on reducing hallucinations could benefit the system.

The XALIGN V2 dataset is released under the MIT license on GitHub<sup>3</sup>. The dataset contains 12 languages, which are shown in Appendix Table 4. The ToTTo dataset is released under the Creative Commons Share-Alike 3.0 license on Github<sup>4</sup>.

mT5-small model<sup>5</sup> is also publicly released under Apache License 2.0.

## References

- Tushar Abhishek, Shivprasad Sagare, Bhavyajeet Singh, Anubhav Sharma, Manish Gupta, and Vasudeva Varma. 2022. [Xalign: Cross-lingual fact-to-text alignment and generation for low-resource languages](#). In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2022*, WWW '22, page 171–175, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. 2009. [Curriculum learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '09*, page 41–48, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Thiago Castro Ferreira, Diego Moussallem, Emiel Kraemer, and Sander Wubben. 2018. [Enriching the WebNLG corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 171–176, Tilburg University, The Netherlands. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ernie Chang, Hui-Syuan Yeh, and Vera Demberg. 2021. [Does the order of training samples matter? improving neural data-to-text generation with curriculum learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 727–733, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cheng-Han Chiang and Hung-yi Lee. 2023. [Can large language models be an alternative to human evaluations?](#) In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15607–15631, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Liam Cripwell, Anya Belz, Claire Gardent, Albert Gatt, Claudia Borg, Marthese Borg, John Judge, Michela Lorandi, Anna Nikiforovskaya, and William Soto Martinez. 2023. [The 2023 WebNLG shared task on low resource languages. overview and evaluation results \(WebNLG 2023\)](#). In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Multimodal, Multilingual Natural Language Generation and Multilingual WebNLG Challenge (MM-NLG 2023)*, pages 55–66, Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bhuwan Dhingra, Manaal Faruqui, Ankur Parikh, Ming-Wei Chang, Dipanjan Das, and William Cohen. 2019. [Handling divergent reference texts when evaluating table-to-text generation](#). In *Proc. of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4884–4895.
- Katja Filippova. 2020. [Controlled hallucinations: Learning to generate faithfully from noisy data](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 864–870, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Elad Hirsch and Ayellet Tal. 2024. [Clid: Controlled-length image descriptions with limited data](#). In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 5531–5541.
- Daniel Kang and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2020. [Improved natural language generation via loss truncation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 718–731, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Simran Khanuja, Diksha Bansal, Sarvesh Mehtani, Savya Khosla, Atreyee Dey, Balaji Gopalan, Dilip Kumar Margam, Pooja Aggarwal, Rajiv Teja Nagipogu, Shachi Dave, Shruti Gupta, Subhash Chandra Bose Gali, Vish Subramanian, and Partha Talukdar. 2021. [Muril: Multilingual representations for indian languages](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2103.10730.
- Tom Kocmi and Ondřej Bojar. 2017. [Curriculum learning and minibatch bucketing in neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the International Conference Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing, RANLP 2017*, pages 379–386, Varna, Bulgaria. INCOMA Ltd.

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/tushar117/XAlign>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/google-research-datasets/ToTTo>

<sup>5</sup><https://huggingface.co/google/mt5-small>

- Xuebo Liu, Houtim Lai, Derek F. Wong, and Lidia S. Chao. 2020. [Norm-based curriculum learning for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 427–436, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Diego Moussallem, Dwaraknath Gnaneshwar, Thiago Castro Ferreira, and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2020. Nabu – multilingual graph-based neural rdf verbalizer. In *The Semantic Web – ISWC 2020*, pages 420–437, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- NLLB Team, Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Hefernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Anna Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loic Barraud, Gabriel Mejia-Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Semaerley Jarrett, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Dirk Rowe, Shannon Spruit, Chau Tran, Pierre Andrews, Necip Fazil Ayan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Angela Fan, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Francisco Guzmán, Philipp Koehn, Alexandre Mourachko, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, and Jeff Wang. 2022. No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*.
- R OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article*, 2(5).
- Ankur Parikh, Xuezhi Wang, Sebastian Gehrmann, Manaal Faruqui, Bhuwan Dhingra, Diyi Yang, and Dipanjan Das. 2020. [ToTTo: A controlled table-to-text generation dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1173–1186, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emmanouil Antonios Platanios, Otilia Stretcu, Graham Neubig, Barnabas Poczos, and Tom Mitchell. 2019. [Competence-based curriculum learning for neural machine translation](#). 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 1162–1172, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ehud Reiter and Robert Dale. 2000. *Building Natural Language Generation Systems*. Studies in Natural Language Processing. Cambridge University Press.
- Shivprasad Sagare, Tushar Abhishek, Bhavyajeet Singh, Anubhav Sharma, Manish Gupta, and Vasudeva Varma. 2023. Xf2t: Cross-lingual fact-to-text generation for low-resource languages. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Natural Language Generation Conference*, pages 15–27.
- Bhavyajeet Singh, Aditya Hari, Rahul Mehta, Tushar Abhishek, Manish Gupta, and Vasudeva Varma. 2023. Xf1t: Exploring techniques for generating cross-lingual factually grounded long text. In *ECAI*, pages 2162–2169.
- Wei Wang, Taro Watanabe, Macduff Hughes, Tetsuji Nakagawa, and Ciprian Chelba. 2018. [Denoising neural machine translation training with trusted data and online data selection](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*, pages 133–143, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2021. [mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 483–498, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuan Zhang, Gaurav Kumar, Huda Khayrallah, Kenton Murray, Jeremy Gwinnup, Marianna J Martindale, Paul McNamee, Kevin Duh, and Marine Carpuat. 2018. An empirical exploration of curriculum learning for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00739*.
- Yikai Zhou, Baosong Yang, Derek F. Wong, Yu Wan, and Lidia S. Chao. 2020. [Uncertainty-aware curriculum learning for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6934–6944, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Junnan Zhu, Qian Wang, Yining Wang, Yu Zhou, Jijun Zhang, Shaonan Wang, and Chengqing Zong. 2019. [NCLS: Neural cross-lingual summarization](#). 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 3054–3064, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Language Codes

The language codes are shown in Table 4.

Language Code	Language
as	Assamese
bn	Bangla
en	English
gu	Gujarati
hi	Hindi
kn	Kannada
ml	Malayalam
mr	Marathi
or	Odia
pa	Punjabi
ta	Tamil
te	Telugu

Table 4: Language codes of the languages included in the XALIGN and XTOTTO datasets

## B Hyper-parameters for Reproducibility

We train mT5 (Xue et al., 2021)-small models with 300M parameters. We use Adafactor optimizer with an initial learning rate of 0.001, with a linear decaying schedule. For curriculum learning, the data was divided into 8 shards for all languages. For all experiments, the model with the lowest validation loss was picked. Also, we used ROUGE thresholds  $R_1 = 0.70$  and  $R_2 = 0.35$ .

## C LLM Prompts

### C.1 Alignment annotation prompt

\*\*\* OBJECTIVE \*\*\*

You are provided with data and the corresponding verbalization of the data. The data is from NAME dataset which is a data-to-text dataset. The texts are in #lang# and the data in English. Your task is determine if the alignment between the data and the text is PARTIAL or COMPLETE. PARTIAL alignment means that the text is not faithful to the input text and it contains extra information that is not present in the data. COMPLETE alignment means that the table is sufficient to infer the text, and the text contains no extra information. Focus on the meaning of the text rather than exact phrasing or verbiage; the task may require reasoning over the data, so not everything needs to be explicitly verbalized.

### C.2 LLM-evaluation prompt

\*\*\* OBJECTIVE \*\*\*

You are an expert for evaluating the quality of outputs generated by an NLG system for data-to-text generation. In this task, you will be given a pair of input data and the corresponding output for this. The data is from the ToTTo dataset, and in the form of a subtable, with the contents of the cell and its

column header provided as well the title of the page and the section it belongs to on Wikipedia. You are required to evaluate the response on the following three parameters -

1. **FLUENCY** The fluency is a the measure of how natural and grammatically correct the text is. Choose one of three options - "fluent", "mostly fluent", "not fluent"

2. **FAITHFULNESS** This is a measure of how the level of hallucination in the text with respect to the table. The text should express only information supported by the table or by non-expert background knowledge. - "faithful" - if the text has NO hallucinations or unsupported information and requires no expert background knowledge, - "mostly faithful" - if the text contains NO hallucinations or unsupported information but requires some background knowledge - "not faithful" - if the text contains ANY hallucinations or unsupported information Further, produce the list of phrases that are hallucinations/unsupported.

3. **COVERAGE** This is a measure of how much of the provided data is expressed in the input text. For this, count the cells that the generated text covers. Note that the text does not need to explicitly verbalize the information, and may be in the form of reasoning over the cells.

## D Examples

Lang	Source	Reference	Base	Alig-Ann
as	<H> k. r. narayanan <R> educated at <T> university of kerala	ভেলেকে কই আবু দ্বিভিতভ মাজভ মিহ্লাভভ কবি নৰায়ণল (কৰালা বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়ৰ পৰা প্ৰথম শ্বানমঃ স্নাতকোত্তৰ ডিগ্ৰীৰে)।	ভেওঁ (কৰালা বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়ৰ পৰা স্নাতকোত্তৰ ডিগ্ৰী লাভ কৰে।	ভেওঁ (কৰালা বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়ৰ পৰা স্নাতক ডিগ্ৰী লাভ কৰিছিল।
bn	<H> wheeler dryden <R> date_of_death <T> 30 september 1957 <R> place_of_death <T> los angeles	ফ্ৰাইডেন ১৯৫৭ সালৰ ৩০শে সেপ্টেম্বৰ লম আঞ্জলেস মৃত্যুবরণ কৰেন।	৩০ সেপ্টেম্বৰ, ১৯৫৭ তাৰিখে ৬১ বছৰ বয়সে লম আঞ্জলেসে ইল'ৱাৰ ফ্ৰাইডেনেৰ দেহাবসান ঘটে।	৩০ সেপ্টেম্বৰ, ১৯৫৭ তাৰিখে লম আঞ্জলেসে তেওঁৰ দেহাবসান ঘটে।
en	<H> ehsan adil <R> country_of_citizenship <T> pakistan <R> date_of_birth <T> 15 march 1993 <R> occupation <T> cricketer	Ehsan Adil ( born 15 March 1993 ) is a Pakistani international cricketer.	Ehsan Adil ( born 15 March 1993 ) is a Pakistani cricketer who plays for Peshawar Zalmi.	Ehsan Adil ( born 15 March 1993 ) is a Pakistani cricketer.
gu	<H> mukesh <R> ethnic_group <T> kayastha <R> place_of_birth <T> new delhi <R> religion <T> hinduism	মুধেশনী জন্ম দিল্লীৰ আদিত হিন্দু ধৰ্মৰ পৰিভাৰ্ণকৰণ কৰিছিল।	মুধেশনী জন্ম ৰাজধানী দিল্লীত হিন্দু ধৰ্মৰ পৰিভাৰ্ণকৰণ কৰিছিল।	মুধেশনী জন্ম নতুন দিল্লীত হিন্দু ধৰ্মৰ পৰিভাৰ্ণকৰণ কৰিছিল।
hi	<H> edward law, 1st earl of ellenborough <R> position_held <T> governor-general of india	ৱাল্ট এলনব'ৰো ভাৰতৰ গৱৰ্নৰ জেনৰেল হৈছে।	ৱাল্ট এলনব'ৰো ভাৰতৰ গৱৰ্নৰ জেনৰেল হৈছে।	ৱাল্ট এলনব'ৰো ভাৰতৰ গৱৰ্নৰ জেনৰেল হৈছে।
kn	<H> vijay shankar <R> member_of_sports_team <T> india national cricket team <R> occupation <T> cricketer	ভাইজ শঙ্কাৰ ভাৰতীয় ক্ৰিকেট দলৰ ক্ৰিকেট খেলোয়াড়।	ভাইজ শঙ্কাৰে ভাৰতীয় ক্ৰিকেট দলৰ ক্ৰিকেট খেলোয়াড় হৈছে।	ভাইজ শঙ্কাৰে ভাৰতীয় ক্ৰিকেট দলৰ ক্ৰিকেট খেলোয়াড় হৈছে।
ml	<H> unni mary <R> date_of_birth <T> 12 march 1962	1962 മാർച്ച് 12 - ന് ജനിച്ചു.	1962 മാർച്ച് 12 ന് കേരളത്തിലെ ഒരു ഇടത്തരം കുടുംബത്തിലാണ് ജനിച്ചത്.	1962 മാർച്ച് 12 നാണ് ജനിച്ചത്.
mr	<H> tarja halonen <R> date_of_birth <T> 24 december 1943 <R> place_of_birth <T> helsinki <R> position_held <T> president of finland	তাৰ্জা হেলোনে ( ; জন্ম: ২৪ ডিচেম্বৰ ১৯৪৩, হেলসিংকি ) হি ফিনলণ্ডৰ ২৪শাৰ্থী ৰাষ্ট্ৰপতি আৰু।	২৪ ডিচেম্বৰ, ১৯৪৩-ত হেলসিংকি, ফিনলণ্ড - ) হি ফিনলণ্ডৰ ২৪শাৰ্থী ৰাষ্ট্ৰপতি আৰু।	২৪ ডিচেম্বৰ, ১৯৪৩-ত হেলসিংকি, ফিনলণ্ড - ) হি ফিনলণ্ডৰ ২৪শাৰ্থী ৰাষ্ট্ৰপতি আৰু।
or	<H> jhaneeb debaseeh mishra <R> award_received <T> yuva puraskar <QR> point_in_time <QT> 2016	২০১৬ চনত 'যুৱ পুৰস্কাৰ' লাভ কৰিছিল।	২০১৬ চনত 'যুৱ পুৰস্কাৰ' লাভ কৰিছিল।	২০১৬ চনত 'যুৱ পুৰস্কাৰ' লাভ কৰিছিল।
pa	<H> bindu a. bambah <R> educated_at <T> university of chicago <QR> point_in_time <QT> 1983	১৯৮৩ চনত 'চিকাগো বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়'ত পঢ়িছিল।	১৯৮৩ চনত 'চিকাগো বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়'ত পঢ়িছিল।	১৯৮৩ চনত 'চিকাগো বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়'ত পঢ়িছিল।
ta	<H> stephanie luzie <R> date_of_birth <T> 06 april 1974	ইলভাৰ্ ১৯৭৪ চনত এপ্ৰিল ৬ তাৰিখে জন্ম হৈছিল।	ইলভাৰ্ ১৯৭৪ চনত এপ্ৰিল ৬ তাৰিখে জন্ম হৈছিল।	ইলভাৰ্ ১৯৭৪ চনত এপ্ৰিল ৬ তাৰিখে জন্ম হৈছিল।
te	<H> rajendra keshaviah shah <R> date_of_death <T> 02 january 2010 <R> place_of_death <T> mumbai	২০১০ চনত ২ জানুৱাৰীত মুম্বাইত মৃত্যু হৈছিল।	২০১০ চনত ২ জানুৱাৰীত মুম্বাইত মৃত্যু হৈছিল।	২০১০ চনত ২ জানুৱাৰীত মুম্বাইত মৃত্যু হৈছিল।

Table 5: Some examples of generation from XALIGN using the best performing model compared to baseline model

Lang	Source	Reference	Base	Alig-Ann
as	<page_title> List of waterfalls of Scotland </page_title> <section_title> A </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> Avich Falls </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> Waterfall name </col_header> </cell> </table>	এবিচ জলপাত, ফ্ৰাইডেন জলপাত।	এবিচ জলপাতৰ লগে ফ্ৰাইডেন সৰ্ব্ববৃহৎ জলপাত।	এবিচ জলপাতৰ লগে ফ্ৰাইডেন জলপাত।
bn	<page_title> Laurent Robinson </page_title> <section_title> 2007 NFL Draft </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> 4.41 s </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> 40-yard dash </col_header> </cell> </table>	ল'ৰেঞ্চ ৪.৪১ ছেকেণ্ডত ৪০ গজ চৌভ্ৰুছিল।	ল'ৰেঞ্চ ৪.৪১ ছেকেণ্ডত ৪০ গজ চৌভ্ৰুছিল।	ল'ৰেঞ্চ ৪.৪১ ছেকেণ্ডত ৪০ গজ চৌভ্ৰুছিল।
en	<page_title> Dev Patel </page_title> <section_title> Television </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> 2012–2014 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> Year </col_header> </cell> </table> <col_header> Title </col_header> </cell> </table> <col_header> Role </col_header> </cell> </table>	Dev Patel appeared as Neal Sampat in The Newsroom (2012–2014).	He is known for his role as Neal Sampat on the ABC soap opera The Newsroom ( 2012-2014 ).	He is known for his role as Neal Sampat on The Newsroom ( 2012-2014 ).
gu	<page_title> Mercia Deane-Johns </page_title> <section_title> Filmography </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> Unfinished Sky </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> YIP </col_header> </cell> </table>	২০০৭ চনত 'মৰ্সিয়া ডি.এ.জ'ৰ 'অনফিনিশেড স্কাই'ত অভিনয় কৰিছিল।	২০০৭ চনত 'মৰ্সিয়া ডি.এ.জ'ৰ 'অনফিনিশেড স্কাই'ত অভিনয় কৰিছিল।	২০০৭ চনত 'মৰ্সিয়া ডি.এ.জ'ৰ 'অনফিনিশেড স্কাই'ত অভিনয় কৰিছিল।
hi	<page_title> List of best-selling singles </page_title> <section_title> 7–7.99 million copies </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> "Ai Se Eu Te Pego" </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> Single </col_header> </cell> </table> <col_header> Sales (in millions) </col_header> </cell> </table>	৭.৭ মিলিয়নৰ অধিক কপি বিক্ৰী হৈছে।	৭.৭ মিলিয়নৰ অধিক কপি বিক্ৰী হৈছে।	৭.৭ মিলিয়নৰ অধিক কপি বিক্ৰী হৈছে।
kn	<page_title> Donnie Jones </page_title> <section_title> Professional statistics </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> 45.4 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> YIP </col_header> </cell> </table>	ড'নে'জ ৪৫.৪ মিলিয়নৰ অধিক কপি বিক্ৰী কৰিছিল।	ড'নে'জ ৪৫.৪ মিলিয়নৰ অধিক কপি বিক্ৰী কৰিছিল।	ড'নে'জ ৪৫.৪ মিলিয়নৰ অধিক কপি বিক্ৰী কৰিছিল।
ml	<page_title> 2004–05 Arsenal F.C. season </page_title> <section_title> Matches </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> Norwich City </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> Arsenal </col_header> </cell> </table>	২০০৪-০৫ চনত 'আৰ্সেনাল'ৰ 'নৰৱিচ সিটি'ত খেলিছিল।	২০০৪-০৫ চনত 'আৰ্সেনাল'ৰ 'নৰৱিচ সিটি'ত খেলিছিল।	২০০৪-০৫ চনত 'আৰ্সেনাল'ৰ 'নৰৱিচ সিটি'ত খেলিছিল।
mr	<page_title> Akshaya Khanna </page_title> <section_title> Filmography </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> 2007 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> Filmography </col_header> </cell> </table>	২০০৭ সালত 'আক্শয়া খান্না'ৰ 'মায় ফাদৰ'ত অভিনয় কৰিছিল।	২০০৭ সালত 'আক্শয়া খান্না'ৰ 'মায় ফাদৰ'ত অভিনয় কৰিছিল।	২০০৭ সালত 'আক্শয়া খান্না'ৰ 'মায় ফাদৰ'ত অভিনয় কৰিছিল।
or	<page_title> Amyntas IV of Macedon </page_title> <section_title> References </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> King of Macedon 359 BC </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	৩৫৯ চনত 'ম্যাকিড'নৰ 'কিং অফ ম্যাকিড' হৈছিল।	৩৫৯ চনত 'ম্যাকিড'নৰ 'কিং অফ ম্যাকিড' হৈছিল।	৩৫৯ চনত 'ম্যাকিড'নৰ 'কিং অফ ম্যাকিড' হৈছিল।
ta	<page_title> 2012–13 Watford F.C. season </page_title> <section_title> Pre Season </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> 8–0 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> Barnet </col_header> </cell> </table>	২০১২-১৩ চনত 'ৱাটফ'ৰ 'বাৰ্নেট'ত খেলিছিল।	২০১২-১৩ চনত 'ৱাটফ'ৰ 'বাৰ্নেট'ত খেলিছিল।	২০১২-১৩ চনত 'ৱাটফ'ৰ 'বাৰ্নেট'ত খেলিছিল।
te	<page_title> Akmoinsk Oblast (Russian Empire) </page_title> <section_title> Ethnic groups in 1897 </section_title> <table> <tbody> <tr> <td> 682,608 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <col_header> TOTAL </col_header> </cell> </table>	১৮৯৭ চনত '৬৮২,৬০৮'জন মানৱ বসতি আছিল।	১৮৯৭ চনত '৬৮২,৬০৮'জন মানৱ বসতি আছিল।	১৮৯৭ চনত '৬৮২,৬০৮'জন মানৱ বসতি আছিল।

Table 6: Some examples of generation from xTOTTo using the best performing model compared to baseline model