

ChatGPT for Arabic Grammatical Error Correction

Sang Yun Kwon¹ Gagan Bhatia¹ El Moatez Billah Nagoudi¹
Muhammad Abdul-Mageed^{1,2}

¹Deep Learning & Natural Language Processing Group, The University of British Columbia

²Department of Natural Language Processing & Department of Machine Learning, MBZUAI

{skwon01@student., gagan30@student., moatez.nagoudi@, muhammad.mageed@}ubc.ca

Abstract

Recently, large language models (LLMs) fine-tuned to follow human instruction have exhibited significant capabilities in various English NLP tasks. However, their performance in grammatical error correction (GEC) tasks, particularly in non-English languages, remains significantly unexplored. In this paper, we delve into abilities of instruction fine-tuned LLMs in Arabic GEC, a task made complex due to Arabic’s rich morphology. Our findings suggest that various prompting methods, coupled with (in-context) few-shot learning, demonstrate considerable effectiveness, with GPT-4 achieving up to 65.49 F₁ score under expert prompting (approximately 5 points higher than our established baseline). This highlights the potential of LLMs in low-resource settings, offering a viable approach for generating useful synthetic data for model training. Despite these positive results, we find that instruction fine-tuned models, regardless of their size, significantly underperform compared to fully fine-tuned models of significantly smaller sizes. This disparity highlights a substantial room for improvements for LLMs. Inspired by methods from low-resource machine translation, we also develop a method exploiting synthetic data that significantly outperforms previous models on two standard Arabic benchmarks. Our work sets new SoTA for Arabic GEC, with 72.19% and 73.26 F₁ on the 2014 and 2015 QALB datasets, respectively.

1 Introduction

As interest in second language learning continues to grow, ensuring the accuracy and effectiveness of written language becomes increasingly significant for pedagogical tools and language evaluation (Rothe et al., 2021; Tarnavskiy et al., 2022). A key component in this respect is grammatical error correction (GEC), a sub-area of natural language generation (NLG), which analyzes written text to




Figure 1: An example of an Arabic GEC system showing six types of errors: *character replacement*, *missing word*, *hamza error*, *missing punctuation*, *additional character*, and *punctuation confusion*.

automatically detect and correct diverse grammatical errors. Figure 1 shows an instance of GEC from (Mohit et al., 2014).

Despite the growing attention to GEC, it is predominantly studied within the English language. One significant challenge in extending GEC systems to other languages is the lack of high-quality parallel data and benchmark datasets. In this work, our focus is on Arabic. Currently, the only available parallel data and benchmark datasets for Arabic GEC (AGEC) is the Qatar Arabic Language Bank (QALB) (Mohit et al., 2014; Rozovskaya et al., 2015a), highlighting the complexity of the task. Furthermore, Arabic, a language of complex grammar and rich morphological features, presents significant challenges to GEC. This further motivates our focus on Arabic in this work.

Non-English settings aside, the field of GEC has witnessed significant advancements specifically with the emergence of sequence-to-sequence (seq-2-seq) models (Chollampatt and Ng, 2018; Gong et al., 2022) and sequence-to-edit models (seq-2-edit) (Awasthi et al., 2019; Omelanchuk et al., 2020) achieving SoTA results in the CONLL-2014 shared tasks (Ng et al., 2014).

Although these models have achieved prominent performance, their efficacy relies heavily on large

amounts of labeled data. Again, this presents challenges in low-resource scenarios. Recently, scaled up language models, *aka* large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable potential in various NLP tasks. Their core strength lies in their capacity to generalize across a wide range of languages and tasks, and in-context learning (ICL), enabling them to take on various NLP tasks once fed with only few examples (i.e., few-shot learning). A key component of this learning process is instruction fine-tuning, where these models are refined on a collection of tasks formulated as instructions (Chung et al., 2022). This process amplifies the models’ ability to respond accurately to such directives, reducing the need for few-shot examples (Ouyang et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022; Sanh et al., 2021). With their unique features adeptly addressing the challenges of low-resource NLP scenarios, LLMs have emerged as promising candidates for NLP tasks in these scenarios. In our current study, we delve into the capabilities of LLMs, taking ChatGPT as our focus. We examine the effectiveness of various prompting strategies such as few-shot chain of thought (CoT) prompting (Kojima et al., 2022) and expert prompting (Xu et al., 2023). Our research extends the realm of GEC research by concentrating on the unique challenges posed by Arabic, a complex and morphologically rich, low-resource language. Drawing upon the work of Junczys-Dowmunt et al. (2018a), we frame these challenges within the context of a low-resource MT task. We then carefully conduct a thorough comparison of the different methodologies employed in addressing GEC in Arabic. Our key contributions in this paper include:

1. We conduct a comprehensive investigation of the potential of LLMs, particularly focusing on ChatGPT, for tasks involving GEC in Arabic.
2. We provide a detailed examination of different prompting methods such as few-shot CoT and expert prompting, and an exploration into generating synthetic data with ChatGPT to complement the performance of transformer-based language models.
3. We further carry out in-depth and meaningful comparisons between several approaches (seq2seq, seq2-dit and instruction fine-tuning LLMs) in AGECE using the QALB 2014 and 2015 L1 benchmark dataset, allowing us to

offer novel insights as to the utility of these approaches on Arabic.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we review the related work on GEC, with a particular emphasis on Arabic. In Section 3, we describe available benchmark datasets for Arabic GEC and related evaluation metrics. In Section 4, we describe our experimental setup; Section 5 outlines our experiments on LLMs. In Section 6, we introduce our seq-2-seq approach and Section 7 discusses the sequence-2-edit approach. In 8, we conduct a comprehensive analysis of error types using the ARETA (Belkebir and Habash, 2021). Finally, in Section 9, we discuss our results, and in 10, we conclude the paper summarizing our contributions and outlining future research directions in the field of Arabic GEC.

2 Related Work

Progress in GEC. Pre-trained Transformer-based models allowed for reframing GEC as a MT task (Ng et al., 2014; Felice et al., 2014; Junczys-Dowmunt et al., 2018b; Grundkiewicz et al., 2019), leading to SoTA results. Meanwhile, sequence2edit methods cast the task as text-editing of input into an output (Malmi et al., 2019; Awasthi et al., 2019; Omelianchuk et al., 2020). These methods have simplified the complexity of model training while enhancing accuracy, especially in data-scarce scenarios. Furthermore, instruction fine-tuning (Chung et al., 2022) and various prompting techniques, such as the CoT (Kojima et al., 2022), help optimize the performance of LLMs in the context of GEC. Finally, there is recent work that treats application of LLMs such as ChatGPT in GEC, demonstrating the effectiveness of these models. Further details regarding each of these approaches can be found in Appendix A.

Arabic GEC. For Arabic GEC (AGECE), challenges stem from the complexity and morphological richness of Arabic. Arabic consists of a collection of diverse languages and dialectal varieties. Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) is a current standard variety of Arabic that is used in government and pan-arab media as well as education, alongside numerous regional dialects defined at the country or regional level (Abdul-Mageed et al., 2020). The inherent ambiguity of Arabic at the orthographic, morphological, syntactic, and semantic levels makes AGECE particularly challenging. Op-

tional use of diacritics further introduces orthographic ambiguity (Belkebir and Habash, 2021), making AGECE even harder.

Despite these hurdles, progress has been made in AGECE. For example, the QALB-2014 and 2015 shared task (Mohit et al., 2014; Rozovskaya et al., 2015b), released annotated datasets of comments and documents written by native (L1) and Arabic learner (L2) speakers. More recently, the ZAEBUC corpus (Habash and Palfreyman, 2022) a GEC corpus of essays written by first year university students in Zayed University, UAE. In terms of model development, innovative approaches have been introduced. Watson et al. (2018) develop the first character-level seq2seq model that achieved SoTA results on AGECE L1 data. Solyman et al. (2022, 2021) design a model that utilizes a dynamic linear combination and EM routing algorithm with a seq2seq Transformer. Convolutional neural network (CNN) have also been applied to AGECE, using unsupervised noise injection techniques to generate synthetic parallel data (Solyman et al., 2022, 2021, 2023). In spite of this progress, no work has considered the utility of employing ChatGPT (or any LLM in general) for AGECE. Nor has been significant work on exploring synthetic data generation, including from LLMs or adopting more diverse machine learning approaches, been carried out. Our research fills this existing gap.

3 Datasets & Evaluation

3.1 Datasets

In this study, we make use of the 2014 (Mohit et al., 2014) and 2015 (Rozovskaya et al., 2015b) QALB Shared Task datasets to evaluate the performance of our various models. Both datasets make use of the QALB corpus, a manually corrected collection of Arabic texts. These texts include online commentaries from Aljazeera articles in MSA by L1 speakers, as well as texts produced by L2 learners of Arabic. Both the QALB 2014 and 2015 dataset are split into training (Train), development (Dev), and test (Test) sets based on their annotated dates. QALB 2014 consists of 19,411 sentences, 1,017 sentences, and 968 sentences for the respective Train, Dev, and Test splits. QALB 2015 is an extension of the first 2014 shared task, including L1 commentaries and L2 texts that cover different genres and error types. For the purposes of our study, we exclusively utilize the L1 test set (2015), as we focus on sentence-level AGECE, where L2

Dataset	Split	Lines	Words	Err. %	Level	Domain
QALB-2014	Train	19,411	1,021,165	30%	Native	Comments
	Dev	1,017	53,737	31%	Native	Comments
	Test	968	51,285	32%	Native	Comments
QALB-2015	Train	310	43,353	30%	L2	Essays
	Dev	154	24,742	29%	L2	Essays
	Test-L2	158	22,808	27%	L2	Essays
	Test-L1	920	48,547	29%	Native	Comments

Table 1: Dataset descriptions and statistic for train, development (dev) and test data.

test sets are document-level. The parts of the 2015 dataset we use are comprised of 300 sentences for Train, 154 sentences for Dev, and 920 sentences for the L1 Test set. Statistics of these datasets are in Table 1.

3.2 Evaluation Metric

For evaluation, we utilize the overlap-based metric MaxMatch (M^2) (Dahlmeier and Ng, 2012), which aligns source and hypothesis sentences based on Levenshtein distance, selecting maximal matching edits, scoring the precision (P), recall (R), and F_1 measure. Moreover, in alignment with recent works on GEC, we also report the $F_{0.5}$ score as another important evaluation metric, a variation of the F_1 score that place twice as much weight on precision than on recall. This reflects a general consensus that precision holds greater importance than comprehensive error correction in GEC systems.

Normalisation methods. Following the QALB shared task’s evaluation method, we report system performance across three different categories, targeting distinct types of mistakes. Namely, we assess the system on normalized text with (1) Alif/Ya errors removed, (2) text without punctuation, and (3) text devoid of both Alif/Ya errors and punctuation. Although we primarily focus on the ‘*Exact Match*’ results for analysis and discussion, scores for most experiments are provided in our Appendixes. Examples of text under each setting, along with the comprehensive results, can be found in the Appendix B.

4 Baseline and Experimental Setup

Our baseline settings include AraBart (Eddine et al., 2022) and AraT5 (Nagoudi et al., 2021), text-to-text transformer-based models specifically tailored for Arabic tasks. We also evaluate the performance of the mT0 (Muennighoff et al., 2022) and mT5 (Xue et al., 2020) variants of the T5 model (Raffel et al., 2020), both of which are configured for multilingual tasks.

For our experiments, we fine-tune each models for 15 epochs. We employ a learning rate of $5e-5$ and a batch size of 32, then picking the best-performing model on our Dev data before blind-testing on Test.

5 LLMs and Prompting Techniques

This section outlines our experiment designed to instruction fine-tune LLMs and explore different prompting methods for ChatGPT in the context of GEC. We begin by experimenting with various prompting strategies using ChatGPT, comparing its performance against smaller LLMs and our listed baselines. We evaluate the performance of ChatGPT-3.5 Turbo and ChatGPT-4 using the official API, under two distinct prompting approaches: *Few-shot CoT* (Fang et al., 2023) and *Expert Prompting* (Xu et al., 2023). We now describe our prompting strategies.

5.1 ChatGPT Prompting

Preliminary experiment. Initially, we experiment with a diverse set of prompt templates to assess ChatGPT’s capabilities in zero-shot learning as well as two aspects of few-shot learning: vanilla few-shot and few-shot CoT (Fang et al., 2023). We also experiment with prompts in both English and Arabic. However, we discover that the responses from these prompt templates contain extraneous explanations and are disorganized, necessitating substantial preprocessing for compatibility with the M^2 scorer. This problem was particularly notable in the zero-shot and Arabic prompt setups, which failed to yield output to automatically evaluate.

Few-shot CoT. Adopting the few-shot CoT prompt design strategy from Kojima et al. (2022) and Fang et al. (2023), we implement a two-stage approach. Initially, we engage in ‘*reasoning extraction*’, prompting the language model to formulate an elaborate reasoning pathway. This is followed by an ‘*answer extraction*’ phase, where the reasoning text is combined with an answer-specific trigger sentence to form a comprehensive prompt. These directives include tailored prompts that position the model as an Arabic GEC tool. In the few-shot CoT setting, we include labeled instances from the development set in our prompts to implement in-context learning (ICL), facilitating learning from examples (Brown et al., 2020). This approach involves the use of erroneous sentences, indicated by `<input> SRC </input>`,

along with their corrected versions, coded by `<output> TGT </output>`.

Expert prompting. Xu et al. (2023) introduces a novel strategy, which leverages the expert-like capabilities of LLMs. This method involves assigning expert personas to LLMs, providing specific instructions to enhance the relevance and quality of the generated responses. Following the framework proposed by Xu et al. (2023), we ensure that our Arabic GEC correction tool exhibits three key characteristics: being *distinguished*, *informative*, and *automatic* during the ‘*reasoning extraction*’ stage of our prompt. To achieve this, we curate a distinct and informative collection of various error types rooted in the dataset, referencing the taxonomy of the Arabic Learner Corpus (Alfaifi and Atwell, 2012). Then we prompt to automate the system by instructing it to operate on sentence labeled with `<input>` and `<output>` tags. Details of both prompts can be found in Figure 2.

5.2 ChatGPT Results.

Table 2 presents the performance of ChatGPT under different prompting strategies in comparison to the baseline settings. Noticeably, we observe improvements particularly as we progress from the one-shot to five-shot configurations under both the few-shot CoT and expert prompting (EP) strategies. Under the CoT prompt, the $F_{1.0}$ score for ChatGPT increased from 53.59 in the one-shot setting to 62.04 in the five-shot setting. A comparable upward trend was also evident for the EP strategy, with the $F_{1.0}$ score improving from 55.56 in the one-shot setup to 63.98 in the five-shot setup. Furthermore, among all the ChatGPT trials, the three-shot and five-shot configurations of ChatGPT-4, under the CoT strategy, yield the highest scores. These configurations achieve $F_{1.0}$ scores of 63.88 and 65.49, respectively.

5.3 Instruction-Finetuning LLMs

InstructGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022) and studies on ChatGPT 2, highlight the potential of LLMs to excel in various downstream tasks just by leveraging a few examples as instructions. Further advancements have been realized by fine-tuning language models on a compilation of tasks presented as instructions, enhancing models’ responsiveness, and minimizing the need for few-shot exemplars (Chung et al., 2022).

In this study, we extend the application of




Figure 2: An illustration of Few-Shot CoT and Expert Prompts applied to CharGPT for Grammatical Error Correction.

instruction-finetuning to AGECE tasks across a broad range of models that range in size, including LLaMA-7B (Touvron et al., 2023), Vicuna-13B (Chiang et al., 2023), Bactrian- X_{bloom} -7B (Li et al., 2023), Bactrian- X_{llama} -7B (Li et al., 2023).

LLM finetuning. To instruct fine-tune relatively large language models, *henceforth* simply LLMs, we first pre-train LLMs on the translated Alpaca dataset¹ to help our model gain deeper understanding of the Arabic language and its complexities. Following this, we further fine-tune the models on our GEC dataset, targeting specifically the task of GEC (Taori et al., 2023). Then, we employ well-structured task instructions and input prompts, enabling the models to take on GEC tasks. Each model is assigned a task, given an instruction and an input for output generation. A detailed illustration of the instructions utilized for the models can be found in Appendix C.

LLM Results. As shown in Figure 3, larger models such as Vicuna-13B and models trained on multilingual data like Bactrian- X_{llama} -7B, and Bactrian- X_{bloom} -7B exhibit an overall trend of better performance, achieving F_1 scores of 58.30, 50.1, and

¹We translate Alpaca datasets using NLLB MT model (Costa-jussà et al., 2022)

Settings	Models	Exact Match			
		P	R	$F_{1.0}$	$F_{0.5}$
Baselines	mT0	69.16	52.63	59.78	65.07
	mT5	68.99	52.22	59.45	64.83
	AraBART	70.71	60.46	65.18	68.39
	AraT5	73.04	63.09	67.70	70.81
	ChatGPT (1-shot)	58.71	49.29	53.59	56.55
+ CoT	ChatGPT (3-shot)	64.60	60.37	62.41	63.71
	ChatGPT (5-shot)	64.70	59.59	62.04	63.61
	ChatGPT (1-shot)	60.49	51.37	55.56	58.42
+ EP	ChatGPT (3-shot)	65.83	61.41	63.54	64.90
	ChatGPT (5-shot)	66.53	61.62	63.98	65.49
	GPT4 (1-shot) *	—	—	—	—
+ CoT	GPT4 (3-shot)	69.31	59.24	63.88	67.03
	GPT4 (5-shot)	69.46	61.96	65.49	67.82

Table 2: Performance of ChatGPT under different prompting strategies.*Results for GPT4 1-shot are not included due to the high cost of producing these results, and a pattern has already been established showing that scores increase with the number of N-shot examples

52.5, respectively. Despite these improvements, it is noteworthy that all these LLMs fall short of ChatGPT’s performance in the AGECE tasks, reaffirming ChatGPT’s superior ability in this context.

6 Data Augmentation

Motivated by the significant improvements observed in low-resource GEC tasks in languages




Figure 3: Performance of LLMs compared to ChatGPT.

such as German, Russian, and Czech through synthetic data creation (Flachs et al., 2021), and recognizing the recent efforts to develop synthetic data for AGECE (Solyman et al., 2021), we experiment with three distinctive data augmentation methods, evaluating the efficacy of each method in complementing performance of seq-2-seq models.

ChatGPT as corruptor. With slight adaptation to our original prompt, we engage ChatGPT as an AI model with the role of introducing grammatical errors into Arabic text to generate artificial data. We randomly sample 10,000 correct sentences from the original training set and prompt ChatGPT to corrupt these, creating a parallel dataset. In order to ensure a varied range of error types, we adopt the taxonomy put forth by the Arabic Learner Corpus (Alfaifi and Atwell, 2012).

Token noising and error adaptation. Adopting techniques known as *token noising* (Xie et al., 2018) and *error adaptation* (Junczys-Dowmunt et al., 2018a), we generate artificial data by introducing random alterations and matching the error rates of the original benchmark dataset, in table 3. For token noising, random character-level and word-level changes are introduced into clean texts, creating a parallel dataset. These changes include random character manipulations, word separations, space adjustments, Arabic text normalization, and inserting or removing punctuation. To ensure domain compatibility with the original benchmark dataset, we use commentaries from the same newspaper domain as our clean inputs and adjust sentence lengths to align with the benchmark dataset.

	Edit	Add	Merge	Split	Delete	Move	Other
Train	55.34%	32.36%	5.95%	3.48%	2.21%	0.14%	0.50%
Dev	53.51%	34.24%	5.97%	3.67%	2.03%	0.08%	0.49%
Test	51.94%	34.73%	5.89%	3.48%	3.32%	0.15%	0.49%

Table 3: Error type statistics for training, development, and test Sets.

Reverse noising. We adopt a *reverse noising* approach (Xie et al., 2018), training a reverse model that converts clean sentences Y into noisy counterparts X . This involves implementing a standard beam search to create noisy targets \hat{Y} from clean input sentences Y . Our approach incorporates two types of reverse models: the first trains both QALB-2014 and 2015 datasets, and the second makes use of a parallel dataset generated by ‘*ChatGPT as corruptor*’. Subsequently, we produce two parallel datasets by inputting clean ‘in-domain’ and ‘out-of-domain’ examples from each reverse model. In this context, the ‘in-domain’ dataset refers to news article commentaries, the same as the original training data, and ‘out-of-domain’ refers to any Arabic sentences.

Data augmentation evaluation. To evaluate the efficacy of ChatGPT in generating artificial data, we select 10,000 parallel sentences generated through ‘*ChatGPT as corruptor*’, 10,000 examples from the parallel dataset from reverse noising on the ChatGPT dataset as well as 10,000 parallel sentences from the original training set. We then further fine-tune each of the configurations on the original training dataset and the ‘out-of-domain’ reverse noised dataset, aiming to assess whether these artificially created datasets can replace the gold standard training set. Figure 5 outlines the results. In our initial exploration, fine-tuning the AraT5 model exclusively on 10,000 samples, ChatGPT achieves an F_1 of 67.00, scoring slightly below the original QALB 2014 training data (68.45). Subsequently, when further fine-tuned on the original training set, our model (F_1 score at 68.39) is on par with the AraT5 model further fine-tuned on the equivalent-sized gold dataset (F_1 score at 68.05). This confirms the utility of ChatGPT for generating synthetic data. Conversely, when we further fine-tune the model on 10,000 out-of-domain examples, its performance drops significantly ($F_1 = 44.65$). This underscores the importance of relevant and high-quality synthetic data over randomly generated samples.

We scale our data augmentation experiments




Figure 4: Scores trained on 100k to 1m sentences of training data




Figure 5: Scores of models fine-tuned on 10,000 parallel sentences from different sources: original training data, 'ChatGPT as Corruptor', and reverse noising on the ChatGPT dataset.

comparing the 'token noising' and error adaptation' and 'reverse-noising'. Results, outlined in Figure 4, show consistent improvement over the baseline. The 'token noising and error adaptation' method helps improve the F1 scores, with a range of 68.09 to 68.85, attaining optimal performance with the one million dataset size. Similarly, the 'reverse noising' method, yielding scores from 68.44 to 68.88, also reaches its peak performance at the one million datasets. Both methods exhibit similar performance trends when tested on the QALB-2015

dataset.

7 Sequence Tagging Approach

In this section, we detail our methods to adapt the GECToR model (Omelianchuk et al., 2020) for experimenting with the sequence-to-edit approach.

Token level transformations. We first apply token-level transformation to recover the target text by applying them to the source tokens. 'Basic-transformations' are applied to perform the most common token-level edit operations,

such as keeping the current token unchanged (*KEEP*), deleting current token (*DELETE*), appending new token t_{-1} next to the current token x_i (*APPEND_* t_1) or replacing the current token x_i with another token t_{-2} (*REPLACE_* t_2). To apply tokens with more task specific operations we employ ‘*g-transformations*’ such as the (*MERGE*) tag to merge the current token and the next token into a single one. Edit space after applying token-level transformations results in *KEEP* (725K op), *DELETE* (13K op), *MERGE* (5.7K op), *APPEND_* t_1 (75K op), and *REPLACE_* t_2 (201K op) tags. As some corrections in a sentence depend on others, applying edit sequences once may not be enough to fully correct the sentence. To address this issue, GECToR employs an iterative correction approach from Awasthi et al. (2019). However, in our experiments, we find that the iterative correction approach does not result in any tangible improvement. Therefore, we set our iterations to 3.

Preprocessing and fine-tuning. We start the preprocessing stage by aligning source tokens with target subsequences, preparing them for token-level transformations. Subsequently, we fine-tune ARBERT v2 (Elmadany et al., 2022) and MARBERT v2 (Abdul-Mageed et al., 2021) on the preprocessed data. Then we employ a three step training procedure: an initial pre-training phase using artificially generated sentences with errors; a fine-tuning phase that exclusively uses sentences containing errors; and a final refinement phase that employs a combination of sentences, both with and without errors.

Sequence tagging evaluation. Outlined in Table 4, ARBERT v2 and MARBERT v2, exhibit high precision, with ARBERT v2’s three-step training scoring the highest precision at 74.39. However, relatively lower recall scores indicate challenges in ability of the two models to detect errors. The implementation of a three-stage training approach yielded mixed results: while accuracy improves, recall scores decrease, leading to a drop in the overall F_1 score (by 0.36 for ARBERT v2 and 1.10 for MARBERT v2, respectively). Consequently, all models fall behind the ‘seq2seq’ models in performance. However, both ARBERT v2 and MARBERT v2 surpass ‘mT0’ and ‘mT5’ in terms of $F_{0.5}$ scores highlighting their abilities in correcting errors with precision.

Settings	Models	QALB-2014				QALB-2015			
		P	R	$F_{1.0}$	$F_{0.5}$	P	R	$F_{1.0}$	$F_{0.5}$
Encoder-Decoder	mT0	69.16	52.63	59.78	65.07	67.61	58.41	62.67	65.55
	mT5	68.99	52.22	59.45	64.83	67.43	57.30	61.95	65.13
	AraBART	70.71	60.46	65.18	68.39	67.95	65.62	66.76	67.47
	AraT5	73.04	63.09	67.70	70.81	72.41	74.12	73.26	72.75
Encoder-Only	ARBERTv2	73.89	48.33	58.43	66.82	73.10	55.40	63.03	68.70
	ARBERTv2 (3-step)	74.39	47.62	58.07	66.87	74.20	53.80	62.37	68.96
	MARBERTv2	73.53	48.21	58.24	66.54	72.90	54.90	62.63	68.41
	MARBERTv2 (3-step)	74.21	46.45	57.14	66.29	74.00	52.70	61.56	68.46

Table 4: F_1 and $F_{0.5}$ scores of sequence tagging approach for QALB-2014 and QALB-2015

Error Type	Incorrect Sentence	Correct Sentence
Orthographic	. الرجل يرب الفرس . <i>The man rears the horse.</i>	. الرجل يركب الفرس . <i>The man rides the horse.</i>
	. الرجل يركب الفرس . The man, rides the horse.	. الرجل يركب الفرس . The man rides the horse.
Punctuations	. وجد رجلا يركب فرس . He found a man riding a hors.	. وجد رجلا يركب فرسا . He found a man riding a horse.
	. غدا الرجل سيركب الفرس . <i>Tomorrow the man will ride the horse.</i>	. غدا الرجل سيركب الفرس . <i>Tomorrow the man will ride the horse.</i>
Merge	. غدا الرجل يركب الفرس . The man ri des the horse.	. غدا الرجل يركب الفرس . The man rides the horse.
	. الرجل يجلس في ظهر الفرس . The man is sitting in the horse’s back.	. الرجل يجلس على ظهر الفرس . The man is sitting on the horse’s back.
Semantic	. غدا الرجل ركب الفرس . Tomorrow the man rode the horse.	. غدا الرجل سيركب الفرس . Tomorrow the man will ride the horse.
	. غدا الرجل سيركب الفرس . Tomorrow the man will ride the horse.	. غدا الرجل سيركب الفرس . Tomorrow the man will ride the horse.

Table 5: Examples of Merge, Morphological, Orthographic, Punctuation, Semantic, Split, and Syntactic errors, along with their corresponding corrections and English translations.

8 Error Analysis

8.1 Error Types.

Using the Automatic Error Type Annotation (ARETA) tool (Belkebir and Habash, 2021) we examine the performance of error types of our developed models. In the following, we briefly describe the different error’s types included in QALB, as well as the normalization methods used to evaluate the model performances.

Type of errors. We concentrate on seven error types using ARETA: *Orthographic*, *Morphological*, *Syntactic*, *Semantic*, *Punctuation*, and *Merge* and *Split* errors. Table 5 presents examples of each error alongside their translations. Top-performing systems from each approach, including ARBERT v2 (3-step), GPT-4 (5-shot) + CoT, and AraT5 fully trained on the AGEC dataset (Solyman et al., 2021), are analyzed in correcting these errors.

Figure 6 illustrates the performance of each model under various error type categories. AraT5, fully trained on the AGEC dataset, surpasses all other models across all error categories. In particular, it excels in handling *Orthographic* (ORTH) errors, *Morphological* (MORPH) errors, and *Punctu-*




Figure 6: F1 scores for each fine-grained error type on the QALB-2014 test set. The percentages in parentheses indicate the proportion of each error type.

ation (PUNCT) errors, consistently achieving over 65 F1 score. However, it is worth observing that all models encounter challenges with *Semantic* (SEM) and *Syntactic* (SYN) errors. These disparate outcomes underscore the significance of selecting the appropriate model based on the error types prevalent in a specific dataset.

8.2 Normalization Methods.

In addition to the ‘Exact Match’ score, we also analyze system performance under different normalization methods. Looking at Table 6, setting under ‘No punctuation’ leads to an increase in scores across all models, underscoring the models’ limitations in handling punctuation errors. Another noteworthy observation is the drop in F1 scores when Alif/Ya errors are removed, illustrating the models’ dependency on Alif/Ya features in making correction.

9 Discussion

LLMs and ChatGPT. ChatGPT demonstrates a remarkable ability to outperform other fully trained models by learning from only a few examples, particularly five-shot under both few-shot CoT and EP prompting strategies. Nevertheless, ChatGPT’s performance lags behind AraT5 and AraBART, suggesting potential areas for improvements in prompting strategies to fully exploit ChatGPT models. Larger models, such as Vicuna-13B, as well as those trained on multilingual datasets like Bactrian-*Xllama-7B* and Bactrian-*Xbloom-7B*, tend to perform better, with F1 scores of 58.30, 50.10, and 52.50 respectively. However, these models fail to match ChatGPT’s performance in AGEC tasks. This reinforces ChatGPT’s superiority in this domain.

Data augmentation techniques. Data augmenta-

tion results underscore the potential of synthetic data, generated by ChatGPT, in enhancing model performance. Moreover, our findings reveal that not just the quantity, but the quality of synthetic data, is crucial for achieving optimal performance. The relative underperformance of models further trained with ‘out of domain’ data examples emphasizes this conclusion. Furthermore, our results on scaled datasets indicate a trade-off between precision and recall. As the size of the dataset increases, precision improves, while recall drops. This trend is apparent across all dataset sizes.

Sequence tagging approach. These models exhibit high precision scores and relatively low recall scores, suggesting their strengths in making corrections rather than detecting errors. This trend can be explained by the absence of *G-transformations*. For instance, in the case of English GECToR models, *g-transformations* enable a variety of changes, such as case alterations and grammatical transformations. However, crafting effective *G-transformations* for Arabic, a language with rich morphological features, poses significant challenges, limiting the model’s ability to effectively detect errors.

10 Conclusion

This paper provided a detailed exploration of the potential of LLMs, with a particular emphasis on ChatGPT for AGEC. Our study highlights ChatGPT’s promising capabilities, in low-resource scenarios, as evidenced by its competitive performance on few-shot settings. However, AraT5 and AraBART still exhibit superior results across various settings and error types. Our findings also emphasize the role of high-quality synthetic data, reinforcing that both quantity and quality matter

Test Set	Models	Exact Match				No Alif / Ya Errors				No Punctuation				No Punctuation and Alif / Ya Errors				
		P	R	F _{1.0}	F _{0.5}	P	R	F _{1.0}	F _{0.5}	P	R	F _{1.0}	F _{0.5}	P	R	F _{1.0}	F _{0.5}	
QALB-2014	Solyman et al. (2021)	79.06	65.79	71.82	75.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AraT5 (11m)	77.12	67.85	72.19	75.07	62.04	52.69	56.99	59.91	86.57	82.70	84.59	85.77	79.32	67.19	72.75	76.56	-
	GPT4 (5-shot)	69.46	61.96	65.49	67.82	58.44	51.47	54.73	56.90	74.59	78.15	76.33	75.28	60.06	65.75	62.78	61.12	-
	ARBERT V2 (3-step)	74.39	47.62	58.07	66.87	65.25	41.58	50.79	58.58	77.00	46.00	57.60	67.85	56.99	28.90	38.35	47.71	-
	Mohit et al. (2014)	73.34	63.23	67.91	71.07	64.05	50.86	56.7	60.89	76.99	49.91	60.56	69.45	76.99	49.91	60.56	69.45	-
QALB-2015	Solyman et al. (2021)	80.23	63.59	70.91	76.24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AraT5 (11m)	72.41	74.12	73.26	72.75	55.95	43.53	48.96	52.93	85.46	72.56	78.48	82.53	75.23	52.56	61.88	69.26	-
	ChatGPT (3-shot) + EP	52.33	47.57	49.83	54.10	37.93	39.97	38.92	32.95	53.38	56.63	54.96	54.00	33.33	46.77	38.92	35.36	-
	ARBERT V2 (3-step)	74.20	53.80	62.37	68.97	57.30	38.50	46.06	52.20	66.70	61.50	63.99	65.59	71.24	38.50	49.99	60.88	-
	Rozovskaya et al. (2015a)	88.85	61.76	72.87	81.68	84.25	43.29	57.19	70.84	85.8	77.98	81.7	84.11	80.12	58.24	67.45	74.52	-

Table 6: Results on the Test sets of QALB-2014, QALB-2015 under Normalization Methods

in achieving optimal performance. Moreover, our work unveils trade-offs between precision and recall in relation to dataset size and throughout all the other experimental settings. These insight, again, could inform future strategies for improving GEC systems. Although our exploration of ChatGPT’s performance on Arabic GEC tasks showcases encouraging results, it also uncovers areas ripe for further study. Notably, there remains significant room for improvement in GEC systems, particularly within the context of low-resource languages. Future research may include refining prompting strategies, enhancing synthetic data generation techniques, and addressing the complexities and rich morphological features inherent in the Arabic language.

References

- Muhammad Abdul-Mageed, AbdelRahim Elmadany, and El Moatez Billah Nagoudi. 2021. **ARBERT & MARBERT: Deep bidirectional transformers for Arabic**. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7088–7105, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Muhammad Abdul-Mageed, Chiyu Zhang, Houda Bouamor, and Nizar Habash. 2020. **NADI 2020: The first nuanced Arabic dialect identification shared task**. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Arabic Natural Language Processing Workshop*, pages 97–110, Barcelona, Spain (Online). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abdullah Alfaifi and Eric Atwell. 2012. Arabic learner corpora (alc): A taxonomy of coding errors. In *The 8th International Computing Conference in Arabic*.
- Abhijeet Awasthi, Sunita Sarawagi, Rasna Goyal, Sabyasachi Ghosh, and Vihari Piratla. 2019. **Parallel iterative edit models for local sequence transduction**. 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 4260–4270, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Riadh Belkebir and Nizar Habash. 2021. Automatic error type annotation for arabic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08068*.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Christopher Bryant, Zheng Yuan, Muhammad Reza Qorib, Hannan Cao, Hwee Tou Ng, and Ted Briscoe. 2022. Grammatical error correction: A survey of the state of the art. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05166*.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. **Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality**.
- Shamil Chollampatt and Hwee Tou Ng. 2018. **A multi-layer convolutional encoder-decoder neural network for grammatical error correction**. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 32(1).
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.
- Marta R Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, et al. 2022. No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*.
- Daniel Dahlmeier and Hwee Tou Ng. 2012. **Better evaluation for grammatical error correction**. In *Proceedings of the 2012 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 568–572, Montréal, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Moussa Kamal Eddine, Nadi Tomeh, Nizar Habash, Joseph Le Roux, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2022. Arabart: a pretrained arabic sequence-to-sequence model for abstractive summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10945*.
- AbdelRahim Elmadany, El Moatez Billah Nagoudi, and Muhammad Abdul-Mageed. 2022. Orca: A challenging benchmark for arabic language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10758*.
- Tao Fang, Shu Yang, Kaixin Lan, Derek F Wong, Jinpeng Hu, Lidia S Chao, and Yue Zhang. 2023. Is chatgpt a highly fluent grammatical error correction system? a comprehensive evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01746*.
- Mariano Felice, Zheng Yuan, Øistein E. Andersen, Helen Yannakoudakis, and Ekaterina Kochmar. 2014. [Grammatical error correction using hybrid systems and type filtering](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning: Shared Task*, pages 15–24, Baltimore, Maryland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Simon Flachs, Felix Stahlberg, and Shankar Kumar. 2021. [Data strategies for low-resource grammatical error correction](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 117–122, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peiyuan Gong, Xuebo Liu, Heyan Huang, and Min Zhang. 2022. [Revisiting grammatical error correction evaluation and beyond](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6891–6902, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Roman Grundkiewicz, Marcin Junczys-Dowmunt, and Kenneth Heafield. 2019. [Neural grammatical error correction systems with unsupervised pre-training on synthetic data](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 252–263, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nizar Habash and David Palfreyman. 2022. [ZAEBUC: An annotated Arabic-English bilingual writer corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 79–88, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Marcin Junczys-Dowmunt, Roman Grundkiewicz, Shubha Guha, and Kenneth Heafield. 2018a. [Approaching neural grammatical error correction as a low-resource machine translation task](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 595–606, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marcin Junczys-Dowmunt, Roman Grundkiewicz, Shubha Guha, and Kenneth Heafield. 2018b. [Approaching neural grammatical error correction as a low-resource machine translation task](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.05940*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11916*.
- Haonan Li, Fajri Koto, Minghao Wu, Alham Fikri Aji, and Timothy Baldwin. 2023. [Bactrian-x: A multilingual replicable instruction-following model](https://github.com/MBZUAI-nlp/Bactrian-X). <https://github.com/MBZUAI-nlp/Bactrian-X>.
- Eric Malmi, Sebastian Krause, Sascha Rothe, Daniil Mirylenka, and Aliaksei Severyn. 2019. [Encode, tag, realize: High-precision text editing](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01187*.
- Behrang Mohit, Alla Rozovskaya, Nizar Habash, Wajdi Zaghouni, and Ossama Obeid. 2014. [The first qalb shared task on automatic text correction for arabic](#). In *Proceedings of the EMNLP 2014 Workshop on Arabic Natural Language Processing (ANLP)*, pages 39–47.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng-Xin Yong, Hailey Schoelkopf, Xiangru Tang, Dragomir Radev, Alham Fikri Aji, Khalid Almubarak, Samuel Albanie, Zaid Alyafeai, Albert Webson, Edward Raff, and Colin Raffel. 2022. [Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning](#).
- El Moatez Billah Nagoudi, AbdelRahim Elmadany, and Muhammad Abdul-Mageed. 2021. [Arat5: Text-to-text transformers for arabic language generation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.12068*.
- Hwee Tou Ng, Siew Mei Wu, Ted Briscoe, Christian Hadiwinoto, Raymond Hendy Susanto, and Christopher Bryant. 2014. [The CoNLL-2014 shared task on grammatical error correction](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning: Shared Task*, pages 1–14, Baltimore, Maryland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hwee Tou Ng, Siew Mei Wu, Yuanbin Wu, Christian Hadiwinoto, and Joel Tetreault. 2013. [The CoNLL-2013 shared task on grammatical error correction](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning: Shared Task*, pages 1–12, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kostiantyn Omelianchuk, Vitaliy Atrasevych, Artem Chernodub, and Oleksandr Skurzhandskyi. 2020. [Gector-grammatical error correction: tag, not rewrite](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.12592*.

- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551.
- Sascha Rothe, Jonathan Mallinson, Eric Malmi, Sebastian Krause, and Aliaksei Severyn. 2021. [A simple recipe for multilingual grammatical error correction](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 702–707. Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alla Rozovskaya, Houda Bouamor, Nizar Habash, Wajdi Zaghouani, Ossama Obeid, and Behrang Mohit. 2015a. The second qalb shared task on automatic text correction for arabic. In *Proceedings of the Second workshop on Arabic natural language processing*, pages 26–35.
- Alla Rozovskaya, Houda Bouamor, Nizar Habash, Wajdi Zaghouani, Ossama Obeid, and Behrang Mohit. 2015b. [The second QALB shared task on automatic text correction for Arabic](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Arabic Natural Language Processing*, pages 26–35, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*.
- Aiman Solyman, Zhenyu Wang, Qian Tao, Arafat Abdulgader Mohammed Elhag, Rui Zhang, and Zeinab Mahmoud. 2022. Automatic arabic grammatical error correction based on expectation-maximization routing and target-bidirectional agreement. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 241:108180.
- Aiman Solyman, Marco Zappatore, Wang Zhenyu, Zeinab Mahmoud, Ali Alfatemi, Ashraf Osman Ibrahim, and Lubna Abdelkareim Gabralla. 2023. [Optimizing the impact of data augmentation for low-resource grammatical error correction](#). *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences*, 35(6):101572.
- Aiman Solyman, Wang Zhenyu, Tao Qian, Arafat Abdulgader Mohammed Elhag, Muhammad Toseef, and Zeinab Aleibeid. 2021. [Synthetic data with neural machine translation for automatic correction in arabic grammar](#). *Egyptian Informatics Journal*, 22(3):303–315.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.
- Maksym Tarnavskiy, Artem Chernodub, and Kostiantyn Omelianchuk. 2022. [Ensembling and knowledge distilling of large sequence taggers for grammatical error correction](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3842–3852, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Daniel Watson, Nasser Zalmout, and Nizar Habash. 2018. Utilizing character and word embeddings for text normalization with sequence-to-sequence models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.01534*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903*.
- Haoran Wu, Wenxuan Wang, Yuxuan Wan, Wenxiang Jiao, and Michael Lyu. 2023. Chatgpt or grammarly? evaluating chatgpt on grammatical error correction benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13648*.
- Ziang Xie, Guillaume Genthial, Stanley Xie, Andrew Ng, and Dan Jurafsky. 2018. [Noising and denoising natural language: Diverse backtranslation for grammar correction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 619–628, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Benfeng Xu, An Yang, Junyang Lin, Quan Wang, Chang Zhou, Yongdong Zhang, and Zhendong Mao. 2023. Expertprompting: Instructing large language models to be distinguished experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14688*.
- Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2020. mt5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11934*.

A Related Works

Sequence to Sequence Approach. Transformer-based Language Models (LMs) have been integral to advancements in GEC. These models have substantially transformed the perception of GEC, reframing it as a MT task. In this framework, erroneous sentences are considered as the source language, and the corrected versions as the target language. This perspective, which has led to SOTA results in the CONLL 2013 and 2014 shared tasks (Bryant et al., 2022; Ng et al., 2013, 2014), reinterprets GEC as a low-resource or mid-resource MT task. Building on this paradigm, Junczys-Dowmunt et al. (2018a) successfully adopted techniques from low-resource NMT and Statistical Machine Translation (SMT)-based GEC methods, leading to considerable improvements on both the CONLL and JFLEG datasets.

Sequence Tagging Approach. Sequence tagging methods, another successful route to GEC, are showcased by models like GECToR (Omelianchuk et al., 2020), LaserTagger (Malmi et al., 2019), and the Parallel Iterative Edit (PIE) model (Awasthi et al., 2019). By viewing GEC as a text editing task, these models make edit predictions instead of tokens, label sequences rather than generating them, and iteratively refine predictions to tackle dependencies. Employing a limited set of output tags, these models apply edit operations on the input sequence, reconstructing the output. This technique not only capably mirrors a significant chunk of the target training data, but it also diminishes the vocabulary size and establishes the output length as the source text’s word count. Consequently, it curtails the number of training examples necessary for model accuracy, which is particularly beneficial in settings with sparse human-labeled data (Awasthi et al., 2019).

Instruction Finetuning. LLMs have revolutionized NLP, their vast data-learning capability enabling diverse task generalizations. Key to their enhancement has been instructional finetuning, which fortifies the model’s directive response and mitigates the need for few-shot examples (Ouyang et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022; Sanh et al., 2021). A novel approach, Chain of Thought (CoT), directs LLMs through a series of natural language reasoning, generating superior outputs. Proven beneficial in ‘Let’s think step by step’ prompts (Wei et al., 2022), CoT has harnessed LLMs for multi-task

cognitive tasks (Kojima et al., 2022) and achieved SOTA results in complex system-2 tasks like arithmetic and symbolic reasoning.

ChatGPT. In the specific realm of GEC, LLMs have demonstrated its potential. Fang et al. (2023) applied zero-shot and few-shot CoT settings using in-context learning for ChatGPT (Brown et al., 2020) and evaluated its performance on three document-level English GEC test sets. Similarly, Wu et al. (2023) carried out an empirical study to assess the effectiveness of ChatGPT in GEC, in the CoNLL2014 benchmark dataset.

B Normalisation Table

C Instructions for LLaMa

D ALC Error Type Taxonomy

E ARETA Results

F Dev Results

Normalisation Method	Example
Normal	نحن معشر العرب نعرف إلا الشماتة ، ولكن يجب أن ندرس هذه الحالة ونحن المخرج منها من الاقتصاد الإسلامي.
No Alif/Ya	نحن معشر العرب نعرف الا الشماتة ، ولكن يجب ان ندرس هذه الحالة ونحن المخرج منها من الاقتصاد الاسلامي.
No Punct	نحن معشر العرب نعرف إلا الشماتة ولكن يجب أن ندرس هذه الحالة ونحن المخرج منها من الاقتصاد الإسلامي
No Alif/Ya & Punct	نحن معشر العرب نعرف الا الشماتة ولكن يجب ان ندرس هذه الحالة ونحن المخرج منها من الاقتصاد الاسلامي

Table 7: Examples of normalized text: with Alif/Ya errors removed, punctuation removed, and both Alif/Ya errors and punctuation removed.

Translated in English	Instructions Samples
Correct all written errors in the following text except for a thousand, ya and punctuation:	قم بتصحيح كل الأخطاء الكتابية في النص التالي ماعدا المتلقة بالألف والياء وعلامات الترقيم :
Please verify spelling, grammatical scrutiny, and correct all errors in the following sentence, except for punctuation:	الرجاء التدقيق الإملائي والتدقيق النحوي وتصحيح كل الأخطاء في الجملة التالية إلا الخاصة بعلامات الترقيم :
Explore the grammatical errors and repair them except for punctuation marks such as a comma, or a question marks, etc:	قم بإستكشاف أخطاء التدقيق الإملائي وإصلاحها ماعدا المتعلقة بعلامات الترقيم كالفاصلة أو علامة إستفهام ، إلخ :
Can you correct all errors in the following text except those related to punctuation such as commas, periods, etc:	هل يمكنك كل الأخطاء الموجودة في النص التالي ماعدا المتعلقة بعلامات الترقيم كالفاصلة ، النقطة ، إلخ :
Can you fix all spelling and grammatical errors, except for the mistakes of the "Alif" and "Ya":	هل يمكنك إصلاح كل الأخطاء الإملائية والنحوية ماعدا الأخطاء الخاصة بالألف والياء:
Please explore the grammatical spelling errors and repair them all, except for the mistakes related to the "Alif" and "Ya"	الرجاء إستكشاف أخطاء التدقيق الإملائي النحوي وإصلاحها كلها ماعدا المتعلقة بالألف والياء:
Correct all the written errors in the following text except for the "Alif" and "Ya":	قم بتصحيح كل الأخطاء الكتابية في النص التالي ماعدا المتعلقة بالألف والياء:
Please correct all errors in the following sentence:	الرجاء تصحيح كل الأخطاء الموجودة في الجملة التالية:

Table 8: Different instructions used for instruction fine-tuning.

Fine-tune Instruction Example
فيما يلي أمر توجيه يصف مهمة مرتبطة بمدخل لتزويد النص بسياق اضافي. يرجى صياغة ردود مناسبة لتحقيق الطلب بطريقة مناسبة و دقيقة.
##: الأمر التوجيه
قم بتصحيح كل الأخطاء الكتابية في النص التالي:
##: المدخل
الرجل يرب الفرس .
##: الرد
الرجل يركب الفرس .

Table 9: Modified data format for the LLaMA instruction fine-tuning step.

Class	Sub-class	Description
Orthographic	OH	Hamza error
	OT	Confusion in Ha and Ta Mutadarrifatin
	OA	Confusuion in Alif and Ya Mutadarrifatin
	OW	Confusion in Alif Fariqa
	ON	Confusion Between Nun and Tanwin
	OS	Shortening the long vowels
	OG	Lengthening the short vowels
	OC	Wrong order of word characters
	OR	Replacement in word character(s)
	OD	Additional character(s)
	OM	Missing character(s)
	OO	Other orthographic errors
Morphological	MI	Word inflection
	MT	Verb tense
	MO	Other morphological errors
	XF	Definiteness
	XG	Gender
	XN	Number
	XT	Unnecessary word
	XM	Missing word
	XO	Other syntactic errors
Semantic	SW	Word selection error
	SF	Fasl wa wasl (confusion in conjunction use/non-use)
	SO	Other semantic errors
Punctuation	PC	Punctuation confusion
	PT	Unnecessary punctuation
	PM	Missing punctuation
	PO	Other errors in punctuation
Merge	MG	Words are merged
Split	SP	Words are split

Table 10: The ALC error type taxonomy extended with merge and split classes

CLASS	GECToR_ARBERT	five-shot_2014_expertprompt	five-shot_2014-chatgpt4	AraT5 (11M)	COUNT
OH	73.73	89.80	92.91	87.34	4902
OT	76.59	94.12	95.58	90.84	708
OA	78.63	84.66	88.93	87.35	275
OW	38.57	80.79	86.96	83.70	107
ON	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
OG	48.00	55.74	63.64	90.32	34
OC	21.43	28.57	53.66	87.18	22
OR	38.24	53.02	65.96	77.10	528
OD	33.76	51.89	59.60	73.07	321
OM	41.80	44.53	57.35	86.44	393
OO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
MI	11.02	13.25	20.53	75.00	83
MT	0.00	7.84	11.43	62.50	7
XC	32.95	46.10	50.78	88.35	526
XF	6.06	17.98	23.81	76.92	29
XG	37.10	19.57	31.35	89.47	79
XN	25.19	25.79	31.25	88.12	108
XT	3.95	3.78	5.48	2.48	66
XM	2.04	4.14	6.38	1.07	26
XO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
SW	50.51	21.25	33.38	8.29	219
SF	0.00	6.67	3.45	57.14	3
PC	60.89	56.25	47.59	74.98	713
PT	29.62	29.58	21.40	57.42	480
PM	55.24	54.21	52.09	67.08	5599
MG	25.05	75.96	79.70	64.80	434
SP	42.27	90.93	91.61	86.70	805
micro avg	55.67	60.05	64.51	57.28	16467
macro avg	30.84	39.13	43.51	61.62	16467
weighted avg	56.98	66.96	68.24	76.35	16467

Table 11: Analysis of Error Type performances on the QALB-2014 Test set.

Settings	Models	Exact Match				No Alif / Ya Errors				No Punctuation				No Punctuation and Alif / Ya Errors			
		P	R	F _{1.0}	F _{0.5}	P	R	F _{1.0}	F _{0.5}	P	R	F _{1.0}	F _{0.5}	P	R	F _{1.0}	F _{0.5}
Encoder-Only	ARBERTv2	73.30	47.85	57.90	66.25	65.60	44.20	52.81	59.81	72.38	48.75	58.26	65.98	57.40	33.90	42.63	50.41
	ARBERTv2 3 Stage	74.65	46.70	57.46	66.67	65.00	41.20	50.43	58.27	75.50	44.50	56.00	66.27	55.70	27.50	36.82	46.22
	MARBERTv2	72.95	47.65	57.65	65.95	64.60	43.20	51.78	58.78	73.72	44.16	55.23	65.02	56.80	34.20	42.69	50.17
	MARBERTv2 3 Stage	74.55	45.75	56.70	66.21	65.10	41.30	50.54	58.37	75.41	45.52	56.77	66.66	56.00	29.20	38.38	47.31
Decoder-Only	LLama 7B Original	58.20	32.50	41.71	50.25	35.50	16.70	22.71	28.98	19.60	54.30	28.80	22.47	65.10	32.00	42.91	53.94
	Alpaca 7B	42.20	31.20	35.88	39.42	42.20	33.40	37.29	40.09	82.20	62.20	70.81	77.23	62.20	39.50	48.32	55.79
	Vicuna 13B	63.90	51.00	56.73	60.82	51.40	39.30	44.54	48.42	83.90	73.90	78.58	81.69	68.50	49.00	57.13	63.45
	bactrian-x-bloom-7b1-lora	60.80	43.80	50.92	56.42	53.70	41.00	46.50	50.57	79.40	63.00	70.26	75.47	62.00	51.00	55.96	59.44
	bactrian-x-llama-7b-lora	58.60	41.40	48.52	54.10	51.00	38.10	43.62	47.77	77.00	59.20	66.94	72.63	58.60	48.10	52.83	56.15
	mT0	69.35	54.29	60.90	65.70	57.45	42.50	48.86	53.67	82.35	75.34	78.69	80.85	70.20	50.30	58.61	65.05
	mT5	69.00	53.20	60.08	65.13	56.70	39.50	46.56	52.16	81.00	70.00	75.10	78.53	68.00	48.00	56.28	62.77
	AraBART	72.00	61.50	66.34	69.62	60.00	49.70	54.37	57.61	85.00	78.50	81.62	83.62	74.00	60.50	66.57	70.84
AraT5	74.50	64.50	69.14	72.26	63.50	52.70	57.60	61.00	88.00	84.50	86.21	87.28	81.50	69.50	75.02	78.78	

Table 12: Dev Set results on the QALB-2014 benchmark dataset.

Encoder Decoder
Models