

# PRALEKHA: An Indic Document Alignment Evaluation Benchmark

Sanjay Suryanarayanan<sup>1</sup> Haiyue Song<sup>3</sup> Mohammed Safi Ur Rahman Khan<sup>1,4</sup>  
Anoop Kunchukuttan<sup>1,2</sup> Mitesh M. Khapra<sup>1,4</sup> Raj Dabre<sup>1,3,4,5\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nilekani Centre at AI4Bharat <sup>2</sup>Microsoft

<sup>3</sup>National Institute of Information and Communications Technology, Japan

<sup>4</sup>Indian Institute of Technology, Madras <sup>5</sup>Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay

 [huggingface.co/Pralekha](https://huggingface.co/Pralekha)  [github.com/Pralekha](https://github.com/Pralekha)

## Abstract

Mining parallel document pairs poses a significant challenge, primarily because existing sentence embedding models often have limited context windows, preventing them from effectively capturing document-level information. Another often overlooked issue is the lack of concrete evaluation benchmarks comprising high-quality parallel document pairs for assessing document-level mining approaches, particularly for Indic languages. In this study, we introduce **PRALEKHA**, a large-scale benchmark for document-level alignment evaluation. PRALEKHA includes over 2 million documents, with a 1:2 ratio of unaligned to aligned pairs, covering 11 Indic languages and English. Using PRALEKHA, we evaluate various document-level mining approaches across three dimensions: the embedding models, the granularity levels, and the alignment algorithm. To address the challenge of aligning documents using sentence and chunk level alignments, we propose a novel scoring method, Document Alignment Coefficient (DAC), which demonstrates substantial improvements over baseline pooling approaches, particularly in noisy scenarios, achieving average gains of 20–30% in precision and 15–20% in F1 score. These results highlight DAC’s effectiveness in parallel document mining for Indic Languages.




Figure 1: An overview of the PRALEKHA framework for document alignment evaluation. The pink path illustrates the proposed approach leveraging the Document Alignment Coefficient (DAC), while the green path represents baseline pooling-based methods.

## 1 Introduction

The exponential growth of multilingual content on the web presents both opportunities and challenges for natural language processing (NLP), particularly in machine translation and cross-lingual information retrieval. Document-level alignment, which involves identifying semantically equivalent text across languages at the document level, is essential for constructing datasets that support applications like document-level neural machine translation

(NMT). These datasets enable long-context translations, capturing discourse structure, coherence, and context-dependent semantics. However, while significant progress has been made in sentence-level parallel data mining (Schwenk et al., 2021a; Feng et al., 2022), document-level alignment remains

\*Corresponding author: [raj.dabre@cse.iitm.ac.in](mailto:raj.dabre@cse.iitm.ac.in)

relatively underexplored, especially for Indic languages.

Early approaches to parallel data extraction focused on structured resources such as Europarl (Koehn, 2005) and the United Nations corpus (Ziemski et al., 2016), but these methods rely heavily on metadata and are less suited for web-scale data. Recent advancements in multilingual embeddings and large-scale web mining have enabled more sophisticated sentence-level mining (Schwenk et al., 2021b; Bañón et al., 2020), but adapting these techniques to document-level tasks remains challenging. Indic languages, in particular, face additional complexities due to their linguistic diversity, complex scripts, and limited parallel resources (Siripragada et al., 2020; Kakwani et al., 2020). These challenges highlight the need for specialized strategies and resources for document-level alignment in such contexts.

This study focuses on systematically evaluating document alignment strategies across three critical dimensions: (1) the choice of embedding models, such as LaBSE (Feng et al., 2022) and SONAR (Duquenne et al., 2023), (2) the granularity of input representations, ranging from sentences to chunks of various lengths and up to the document level, and (3) the alignment algorithm employed for efficient document alignment based on all granularities. To support this evaluation, we propose **PRALEKHA**, a benchmark dataset designed specifically for evaluating document-level alignment across 11 Indic languages and English. **PRALEKHA** includes over 2 million documents, with a 1:2 ratio of unaligned to aligned pairs, covering 11 Indic languages and English. The aligned set comprises high-quality, human-verified parallel documents sourced from reliable platforms, such as the Indian Press Information Bureau (PIB) and the Mann Ki Baat radio program, spanning both written and spoken domains.

The primary goal of this study is to benchmark and evaluate the efficiency of various document alignment strategies to identify techniques capable of mining high-quality aligned documents. These mined documents can later be used to train long-context NMT models, which have the potential to significantly enhance translation quality and coherence at the document level. By focusing solely on the alignment task, this work provides a foundation for building robust parallel corpora for future applications.

Our contributions are as follows:

1. **Benchmark Dataset:** We introduce **PRALEKHA**, a large-scale, document-level alignment evaluation benchmark, comprising over 2 million documents, with a 1:2 ratio of unaligned to aligned document pairs across 11 Indic languages and English. This dataset fills a significant resource gap and enables robust evaluations of alignment techniques.
2. **Empirical Analysis:** We evaluate document alignment strategies across three key dimensions—the embedding models, the granularity levels, and the alignment algorithm—to identify the most effective techniques for multilingual document alignment.

By addressing the challenges of document-level alignment for Indic languages, this study lays the groundwork for future research in multilingual NLP. The findings will facilitate the development of advanced models and datasets for applications such as machine translation and cross-lingual information retrieval.

The structure of this paper is as follows: Section 2 reviews related work on parallel data extraction and document alignment. Section 3 details the curation process and provides statistical insights into **PRALEKHA**. Section 4 discusses the factors influencing alignment performance and describes the experimental setup. The results, along with an in-depth analysis, are presented in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the key findings and highlights potential directions for future research.

## 2 Related Work

Parallel data extraction from web sources has been widely researched, particularly at the sentence level (Schwenk et al., 2021a; Feng et al., 2022; Song et al., 2020), while document-level alignment remains comparatively underexplored. Initial approaches primarily relied on homogeneous sources, such as the Europarl (Koehn, 2005) and United Nations (Ziemski et al., 2016) corpora, where metadata facilitated parallel data extraction (Abdul-Rauf and Schwenk, 2009; Do et al., 2009). Although effective within limited domains, these methods have proven less suitable for the diverse and large-scale nature of web data.

Recent advances in multilingual embeddings have enabled more advanced techniques for mining parallel data from unstructured web sources (El-Kishky et al., 2020; Guo et al., 2019). Projects

such as CCMatrix (Schwenk et al., 2021a), WikiMatrix (Schwenk et al., 2021b), ParaCrawl (Bañón et al., 2020), and OPUS (Tiedemann, 2012) leverage these embeddings to compile extensive parallel corpora, significantly enhancing both scale and quality. Techniques such as Sentence-Mover’s Distance (El-Kishky and Guzmán, 2020) have also improved alignment accuracy, even within noisy datasets.

Nevertheless, key challenges persist, particularly with respect to the quality of mined data and its adaptability to diverse linguistic and domain-specific nuances. Additionally, most bilingual datasets and tasks (Buck and Koehn, 2016) focus predominantly on European languages, with limited resources available for Indic languages (Siripragada et al., 2020; Kakwani et al., 2020), underscoring a significant gap in resources and benchmarks for these languages.

Some progress has been made in adapting sentence alignment techniques to document-level alignment, as demonstrated by CCAIined (El-Kishky et al., 2020), which employs language identification and similarity metrics to detect document pairs within Common Crawl. Subsequent research has incorporated advanced multilingual embeddings and transformer-based approaches (Conneau et al., 2020; Guo et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2020) to capture more nuanced cross-lingual relationships, though studies examining quality factors in document-level alignment remain limited.

Building on this foundation, our work introduces PRALEKHA. By offering a comprehensive evaluation framework, PRALEKHA aims to advance both the scalability and precision of document alignment, addressing the unique challenges posed by Indic languages.

### 3 PRALEKHA

In this section, we present PRALEKHA, a document-level alignment benchmark designed to evaluate various long-context parallel data mining strategies. Given two document sets,  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ , where  $D_1$  contains documents in  $lang_1$  and  $D_2$  contains documents in  $lang_2$ , the task is to identify pairs of documents  $P = \{(d_1, d_2) \mid d_1 \in D_1, d_2 \in D_2\}$  such that  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  are similar—in this case, translations of each other.

The dataset in PRALEKHA is organized into two subsets: the *aligned\_set*, which includes parallel documents, and the *unaligned\_set*, which con-

tains non-parallel documents. Each instance in the dataset is represented as a tuple  $(n\_id, doc\_id, lang, text)$ . In this structure,  $n\_id$  serves as a unique identifier for each parallel document pair, while  $doc\_id$  uniquely identifies individual documents. The  $lang$  field indicates the document’s language using its ISO-3 code, and the  $text$  field contains the corresponding textual content in that language.

#### 3.1 Data Collection and Statistics

PRALEKHA covers 12 languages- Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Kannada, Malayalam, Marathi, Odia, Punjabi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, and English-containing a mixture of high and medium resource languages covering 11 different scripts. It covers two broad domains - News Bulletins and podcast scripts, therefore containing a mixture of written as well as spoken form of data. All the data is human-written/verified.

Following the methodology of Sangraha (Khan et al., 2024), we custom-scraped data from the Indian Press Information Bureau (PIB)<sup>1</sup> website, aligning documents by matching bulletin IDs interlinking bulletins across languages. For podcast scripts, we employed the approach used by Khan et al. (2024) and Siripragada et al. (2020) to collect transcripts from Mann Ki Baat,<sup>2</sup> a radio program hosted by the Indian Prime Minister. This program is typically spoken in Hindi, then manually transcribed and translated into various other Indian languages.




Figure 2: A heatmap of aligned document pairs for each language pair.

In Figure 2, the heatmap displays the distribution of aligned document pairs across language combinations, with darker cells representing higher

<sup>1</sup><https://pib.gov.in>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.pmindia.gov.in/en/mann-ki-baat>

Table 1: Document statistics of PRALEKHA, with the number of documents represented in thousands (K).

Language	ben	eng	guj	hin	kan	mal	mar	ori	pan	tam	tel	urd
<b>Aligned</b>	96K	298K	68K	205K	62K	68K	135K	46K	108K	150K	110K	220K
<b>Unaligned</b>	48K	149K	34K	102K	31K	34K	68K	23K	54K	75K	55K	110K
<b>Total</b>	144K	447K	102K	307K	93K	102K	203K	69K	163K	224K	165K	331K

alignment counts.

While this forms the aligned portion of the benchmark, in real-world settings, many documents are not ideally parallel with every other document. To simulate this, we sample a set of unaligned documents from SANGRAHA UNVERIFIED (Khan et al., 2024), selecting 50% of the number of aligned documents to form the unaligned set. This approach maintains a 1:2 ratio of unaligned to aligned documents in the final benchmark, ensuring at least one unaligned document for every two aligned document pairs.

Table 1 presents document counts for each language in the PRALEKHA dataset, broken down into aligned and unaligned categories, along with the total document count. Languages such as Hindi, English, and Urdu have the highest document counts, while languages like Malayalam, Gujarati, and Odia have fewer documents.

### 3.2 Data Cleaning

Despite the efforts to minimize the noise in the data while scraping, we still notice varied forms of noise in the collected data. Hence we employ various filters to ensure the removal of this noise. There were some instances where, despite being marked as language X on the website, the collected data was in a different language. To fix this, we use a combination of IndicLID (Madhani et al., 2023) and script-specific Unicode ranges to detect and filter out these instances. Additionally, we filter out other noisy content like headings using a combination of regex patterns. Finally, we manually verify a sample of these documents to ensure the data quality and alignment.

## 4 Evaluating Document Alignment

In this section, we examine the key dimensions that influence the performance of document alignment methods, using PRALEKHA for evaluating 11 Indic languages and English. Each dimension represents a unique variable affecting the accuracy with which parallel documents across languages are identified.

Specifically, we focus on three primary dimensions: the embedding models, the granularity levels, and the alignment algorithm. Below, we offer a detailed description of each:

### 4.1 The Embedding Model

The choice of text embedding model plays an important role in generating meaningful representations of the text in a higher dimensional space, where the alignment between two embedding vectors can be determined based on some similarity metric. For a good alignment, the resulting embeddings must not only capture the content of each language but also align semantically similar content from different languages closer to each other. In our study, we compare two multilingual embedding models LaBSE (Feng et al., 2022) and SONAR (Duquenne et al., 2023).

### 4.2 Granularity Level

The granularity level determines the unit of text at which similarity is calculated. Given the limited context window or maximum sequence length of embedding models, embedding an entire document at once is often impractical. To address this, we examine alignment performance across various granularity levels, including sentence-level, chunk-level (with chunks of 2, 4, and 8 sentences), and document-level.

At the document level, embeddings are created by pooling finer-grained embeddings into a comprehensive document-level representation. We assess several pooling strategies to determine their effectiveness for document alignment.

**Mean Pooling (MP)** generates a single embedding by averaging all unit embeddings (Mikolov et al., 2013).

**Sentence/Chunk Length (SL/CL) Weighting** adjusts the embedding of each unit based on its length, emphasizing longer segments, which are typically more content-rich and informative (Schwenk et al., 2017).

**Inverse Document Frequency (IDF) Weighting** applies inverse document frequency to prior-



itize rarer, more informative terms while down-weighting common, less distinctive ones, improving precision in alignment tasks (Robertson, 2004).

**Length-Inverse Document Frequency (LIDF) Weighting** combines the strengths of sentence/chunk length and IDF by leveraging both features. It emphasizes longer, content-rich segments while simultaneously reducing the impact of repetitive or generic terms, offering a balanced and robust approach for alignment tasks (El-Kishky and Guzmán, 2020).

These embeddings are aggregated using various alignment strategies to construct the final notion of parallel documents.

### 4.3 Alignment Algorithm

This dimension focuses on the algorithm for determining alignment between document pairs across varying text granularities.

Applying a fixed cosine similarity threshold for alignment often fails across diverse language pairs, as noted in prior multilingual studies (Schwenk et al., 2021b; Guo et al., 2018). To address this, our alignment approach employs a max-margin criterion (Artetxe and Schwenk, 2019a), leveraging relative similarity between candidate pairs rather than relying on a static threshold.

Our method processes document pairs with embeddings at multiple granularities. Using the FAISS library<sup>3</sup> to build efficient similarity indices, we query the top- $k$  nearest neighbors for each embedding and calculate margin scores  $M(x, y)$  to reflect similarity within each pair’s relative context. Pairs are then ranked by their margin scores, and a greedy bipartite matching strategy is applied to select high-scoring pairs, ensuring each embedding is aligned only once.

The same approach extends directly to the document level, where we align two documents by selecting high-scoring pairs through the greedy bipartite matching strategy. This method ensures a unique one-to-one alignment of document embeddings based on calculated margin scores.

For finer granularity at the sentence and chunk levels, we perform alignment within each document pair by matching their constituent sentences or chunks. To achieve this, we introduce a method inspired by the alignment ratio concept proposed by (Steingrímsson, 2023).

---

#### Algorithm 1 Max-Margin Alignment

---

1: **Input:** Embeddings  $\mathbf{X} = \{x_i\}$  and  $\mathbf{Y} = \{y_j\}$ ,  $k$  nearest neighbors

2: **Output:**  $\mathcal{U} = \arg \max_{\mathcal{U}'} \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{U}'} M(x, y)$

3: **FAISS Indexing:** Construct FAISS index for efficient similarity search

$\text{index\_X} \leftarrow \text{IndexFlatIP}(\mathbf{X})$

$\text{index\_Y} \leftarrow \text{IndexFlatIP}(\mathbf{Y})$

4: **Query top- $k$  nearest neighbors:**

$\text{NN}_k(x) = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\} \subset \mathbf{Y}$  for each  $x \in \mathbf{X}$

$\text{NN}_k(y) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\} \subset \mathbf{X}$  for each  $y \in \mathbf{Y}$

5: **Compute Margin Score:**

6: **for** each  $(x, y)$  in  $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$  where  $y \in \text{NN}_k(x)$  or  $x \in \text{NN}_k(y)$  **do**

$$A_x = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{z \in \text{NN}_k(x)} \cos(x, z)$$

$$A_y = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{z \in \text{NN}_k(y)} \cos(y, z)$$

$$M(x, y) = \frac{\cos(x, y)}{0.5 \times (A_x + A_y)}$$

7: **end for**

8: **Max Strategy:** Select pairs to maximize overall margin score

$$\mathcal{U} = \{(x, y) \mid y \in \text{NN}_k(x)\} \cup \{(y, x) \mid x \in \text{NN}_k(y)\}$$

$\mathcal{U}_{\text{sorted}} = \text{Sort}(\mathcal{U})$  by  $M(x, y)$  in descending order

9: **for** each  $(x, y)$  in  $\mathcal{U}_{\text{sorted}}$  **do**

10:     **if** both  $x$  and  $y$  are not in aligned pairs **then**

11:         Add  $(x, y)$  to aligned pairs

12:     **end if**

13: **end for**

14: **Return:**  $\mathcal{U}$ , aligned pairs that maximize the overall margin score

---

#### DOCUMENT ALIGNMENT COEFFICIENT (DAC)

To account for document length, DAC normalizes the proportion of aligned sentences or chunks relative to the total count in both languages. This provides a balanced measure of document alignment by avoiding reliance solely on the raw number of aligned segments.

$$\text{DAC} = \frac{2 \times N_{\text{aligned}}}{N_{\text{Lang1}} + N_{\text{Lang2}}} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $N_{\text{aligned}}$  denotes the number of aligned sentences or chunks, while  $N_{\text{Lang1}}$  and  $N_{\text{Lang2}}$  represent the total sentence or chunk counts in Language 1 and Language 2, respectively. The DAC yields a normalized alignment score between 0 and 1, with higher values indicating stronger alignment.

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/facebookresearch/faiss>

Metrics	Methods	LaBSE				SONAR			
		Sentence	Chunk			Sentence	Chunk		
			G=2	G=4	G=8		G=2	G=4	G=8
Precision	MP	0.1661	0.1620	0.1579	0.1535	0.1730	0.1689	0.1684	0.1712
	SL/CL	0.1725	0.1695	0.1682	0.1653	0.1774	0.1747	0.1776	<b>0.1834</b>
	IDF	0.1668	0.1627	0.1593	0.1543	0.1734	0.1696	0.1701	0.1720
	LIDF	0.1729	0.1696	0.1683	0.1654	0.1775	0.1749	0.1776	<b>0.1834</b>
	DAC	<b>0.2172</b>	<b>0.1978</b>	<b>0.2117</b>	<b>0.1735</b>	<b>0.2159</b>	<b>0.1951</b>	<b>0.2070</b>	0.1669
Recall	MP	0.2053	0.2011	0.1960	0.1947	0.2089	0.2041	0.1958	0.1918
	SL/CL	0.2104	0.2093	0.2114	0.2110	0.2124	0.2095	<b>0.2084</b>	<b>0.2081</b>
	IDF	0.2065	0.2025	0.1997	0.1965	0.2098	0.2054	0.2002	0.1940
	LIDF	<b>0.2113</b>	<b>0.2096</b>	<b>0.2115</b>	<b>0.2112</b>	<b>0.2126</b>	<b>0.2098</b>	<b>0.2084</b>	<b>0.2081</b>
	DAC	0.1982	0.1851	0.1876	0.1856	0.1949	0.1804	0.1793	0.1791
F1 Score	MP	0.1832	0.1790	0.1744	0.1711	0.1889	0.1844	0.1804	0.1802
	SL/CL	0.1892	0.1869	0.1870	0.1850	0.1930	0.1902	0.1914	<b>0.1948</b>
	IDF	0.1841	0.1800	0.1768	0.1723	0.1896	0.1854	0.1834	0.1818
	LIDF	0.1898	0.1871	0.1871	<b>0.1851</b>	0.1931	<b>0.1904</b>	0.1914	<b>0.1948</b>
	DAC	<b>0.2069</b>	<b>0.1910</b>	<b>0.1985</b>	0.1791	<b>0.2046</b>	0.1872	<b>0.1917</b>	0.1725

Table 2: Performance of alignment methods on PRALEKHA under SETTING 1. Metrics include Precision, Recall, and F1 Score, assessed using LaBSE and SONAR embeddings. Results are reported at sentence-level and chunk-level granularities, with bold values highlighting the highest scores for each granularity in the table.




Figure 3: Average F1 Score Across all Language Pairs by Granularity Level

## 5 Results and Analysis

This section presents the results of our experiments conducted under two distinct settings. SETTING 1 evaluates our approach using the entire PRALEKHA dataset, which contains both unaligned and aligned document pairs in a 1:2 ratio. SETTING 2 focuses on the aligned subset of documents from the PRALEKHA dataset, excluding any noise. These experiments focus solely on assessing the efficiency of document alignment, without considering its impact on downstream tasks.

To evaluate the performance of our document alignment method, we report three key metrics: precision, recall, and F1 score.

**Precision** measures the proportion of correctly identified aligned pairs among all predicted aligned pairs.

**Recall** quantifies the proportion of correctly identified aligned pairs among all true aligned pairs in the dataset.

**F1 score** combines precision and recall into a single metric, highlighting the balance between false positives and false negatives.

Together, these metrics provide a robust assessment of the alignment model’s performance across both experimental settings.

Below, we present an in-depth analysis of three dimensions: the embedding models, the granular-

Metrics	Methods	LaBSE				SONAR			
		Sentence	Chunk			Sentence	Chunk		
			G=2	G=4	G=8		G=2	G=4	G=8
Precision	MP	0.2027	0.2001	0.1979	0.1950	0.2058	0.2030	0.2006	0.1967
	SL/CL	0.2082	0.2080	0.2091	0.2084	0.2095	0.2096	0.2081	<b>0.2070</b>
	IDF	0.2036	0.2006	0.1988	0.1955	0.2065	0.2037	0.2018	0.1975
	LIDF	<b>0.2084</b>	<b>0.2081</b>	0.2091	<b>0.2086</b>	0.2097	<b>0.2098</b>	<b>0.2082</b>	<b>0.2070</b>
	DAC	0.2137	0.2000	<b>0.2122</b>	0.1987	<b>0.2128</b>	0.1972	0.2074	0.1948
Recall	MP	0.2039	0.2016	0.1968	0.1952	0.2074	0.2050	0.1966	0.1925
	SL/CL	0.2091	0.2097	0.2122	0.2118	0.2102	0.2105	0.2090	0.2090
	IDF	0.2053	0.2028	0.2007	0.1971	0.2085	0.2061	0.2008	0.1947
	LIDF	<b>0.2097</b>	<b>0.2099</b>	<b>0.2122</b>	<b>0.2120</b>	<b>0.2105</b>	<b>0.2108</b>	<b>0.2092</b>	<b>0.2090</b>
	DAC	0.2071	0.1949	0.2089	0.1956	0.2062	0.1920	0.2037	0.1920
F1 Score	MP	0.2033	0.2008	0.1972	0.1950	0.2066	0.2040	0.1984	0.1943
	SL/CL	0.2086	0.2088	<b>0.2106</b>	0.2101	0.2098	0.2101	0.2085	<b>0.2080</b>
	IDF	0.2044	0.2017	0.1997	0.1963	0.2075	0.2049	0.2012	0.1959
	LIDF	0.2090	<b>0.2090</b>	<b>0.2106</b>	<b>0.2103</b>	<b>0.2101</b>	<b>0.2103</b>	<b>0.2087</b>	<b>0.2080</b>
	DAC	<b>0.2104</b>	0.1974	<b>0.2106</b>	0.1971	0.2094	0.1945	0.2056	0.1934

Table 3: Performance of alignment methods on PRALEKHA under SETTING 2. Metrics include Precision, Recall, and F1 Score, assessed using LaBSE and SONAR embeddings. Results are reported at sentence-level and chunk-level granularities, with bold values highlighting the highest scores for each granularity in the table.

ity levels, and the alignment algorithm. We also examine how these factors impact performance in both noisy and clean scenarios.

## 5.1 Embedding Models

We experimented with SONAR and LaBSE sentence/chunk embedding models and found that LaBSE is more suitable for DAC, while SONAR performs better with baseline methods.

This difference arises from the pooling operation. In DAC, no pooling is performed, whereas in baseline methods, pooling combines sentence/chunk embeddings into a single document embedding. LaBSE embeddings are vulnerable to pooling because, during training, the sentence/chunk information is stored in the [CLS] token. In contrast, SONAR generates sentence/chunk embeddings by pooling the token embeddings.

As a result, during inference, SONAR produces high-quality document embeddings after pooling, whereas LaBSE struggles to maintain the same quality in this process.

## 5.2 Granularity

At the sentence level, DAC demonstrates its strongest performance, achieving the highest precision and F1 scores. This can be attributed to the method’s direct normalization of aligned segments relative to the total sentence counts in both languages. By operating at a fine-grained level, DAC effectively captures alignment nuances, as shorter

segments are more likely to exhibit strong one-to-one correspondence between languages. The normalization step ensures that alignment performance is not biased by document length, which is particularly critical at this granularity.

As the granularity increases, DAC’s performance gradually declines. This decline is primarily due to the increased variability and complexity introduced when aligning longer chunks. At higher granularities, the likelihood of partial or noisy overlaps between segments increases, making it more challenging for DAC to achieve high alignment scores. The normalization mechanism, while effective at accounting for document length disparities, is less sensitive to the nuanced misalignments that emerge with larger segments. Additionally, as chunk size grows, the segmentation boundaries may fail to align perfectly across languages, further reducing the alignment accuracy.

In contrast, pooling-based methods tend to improve slightly with larger granularity levels because longer segments inherently encapsulate more contextual overlap, reducing the reliance on precise segment boundaries. This suggests that DAC is highly effective for tasks requiring fine-grained alignment but may require additional adjustments or enhancements to handle chunk-based alignments where granularity increases alignment complexity.

### 5.3 Baseline Methods

Among the baseline methods, Sentence/Chunk Length (SL/CL) and Length-Inverse Document Frequency (LIDF) are the strongest performers. SL/CL assigns greater weight to longer sentences or chunks, which typically carry more alignment-relevant content, making it especially effective for chunk-level alignments where context aggregation is critical. LIDF further enhances this by incorporating Inverse Document Frequency (IDF) to down-weight common, repetitive sentences, slightly improving precision. However, IDF’s impact is limited due to the rarity of such repetitive content in the dataset, with chunk length being the dominant factor driving success (Artetxe and Schwenk, 2019b).

In contrast, Mean Pooling (MP) performs the weakest, as it uniformly weights all segments regardless of length or importance. This approach leads to diluted alignment quality, particularly at chunk levels where variability in length and content is significant. SL/CL and LIDF consistently outperform MP by effectively leveraging length and, in LIDF’s case, addressing repetitive content, making them more robust for chunk-level alignment.

### 5.4 Noisy and Clean scenarios

In this evaluation, we compare two scenarios on PRALEKHA: SETTING 1, a noisy scenario with a 1:2 ratio of unaligned to aligned pairs, and SETTING 2, a clean scenario with only aligned pairs. SETTING 1 simulates real-world challenges with prevalent noise, while SETTING 2 assesses performance under ideal conditions.

The results show that while differences exist between SETTING 1 and SETTING 2, the overall variation in scores is relatively small. In SETTING 1, the substantial proportion of aligned pairs maintains performance, though unaligned pairs have slightly lower precision and F1 scores. In contrast, the cleaner data in SETTING 2 facilitates more accurate alignment calculations, leading to modest improvements in these metrics.

DAC excels in SETTING 1, particularly in sentence-level precision, where its normalization mechanism effectively balances aligned and unaligned pairs. However, its advantage diminishes in SETTING 2, where the absence of noise reduces the normalization’s impact. Methods like SL/CL and LIDF demonstrate strong performance across both scenarios, benefiting from their reliance on sentence/chunk length and IDF weighting to em-

phasize informative segments while remaining less affected by noise in SETTING 1.

Mean Pooling (MP) continues to underperform in both scenarios due to its uniform weighting approach, which struggles with noise in SETTING 1 and fails to capitalize on the cleaner data in SETTING 2. Overall, the small differences in performance between the two scenarios highlight the robustness of alignment methods, with DAC excelling in noisy conditions and SL/CL and LIDF gaining the most from noise removal in SETTING 2.

## 6 Conclusion and Future Scope

This study introduced PRALEKHA, a large-scale benchmark for document-level alignment across 11 Indic languages and English, addressing the critical need for high-quality parallel document datasets in multilingual NLP. By systematically evaluating alignment strategies across three dimensions—the embedding models, the granularity levels, and the alignment algorithm. We demonstrated the effectiveness of the proposed Document Alignment Coefficient (DAC), which outperformed baseline methods, achieving notable improvements of 20–30% in precision and 15–20% in F1 score, particularly under noisy conditions.

Future work will focus primarily on mining large-scale parallel documents from web-crawled data using the optimal alignment strategies identified in this study. These mined datasets will be instrumental in training document-level neural machine translation (NMT) models, enabling long-context translations that capture discourse coherence, context-dependent semantics, and richer linguistic nuances. This approach aims to bridge a major gap in multilingual NLP, especially for under-resourced languages. Furthermore, integrating these alignment methods with domain-specific datasets and advanced multilingual embeddings can further enhance alignment quality, paving the way for more effective and context-aware cross-lingual applications. This emphasis on scalable data mining and context-aware training has the potential to revolutionize document-level machine translation systems, significantly advancing the field of multilingual NLP.



## References

- Sadaf Abdul-Rauf and Holger Schwenk. 2009. [On the Use of Comparable Corpora to Improve SMT Performance](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th Conference of the European Chapter of the ACL (EACL 2009)*, pages 16–23. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mikel Artetxe and Holger Schwenk. 2019a. [Margin-based Parallel Corpus Mining with Multilingual Sentence Embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3197–3203, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mikel Artetxe and Holger Schwenk. 2019b. [Massively Multilingual Machine Translation with Unsupervised Tokenization and Alignment](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3478–3488. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marta Bañón, Pinzhen Chen, Barry Haddow, Miquel Esplà-Gomis, Mikel L. Forcada, Ahsan Kamran, Sergio Ortiz-Rojas, Gema Ramírez-Sánchez, and Holger Schwenk. 2020. [ParaCrawl: Web-Scale Parallel Corpora for Multilingual Translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 4555–4564. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Christian Buck and Philipp Koehn. 2016. [Findings of the WMT 2016 Bilingual Document Alignment Shared Task](#). In *Proceedings of the First Conference on Machine Translation: Volume 2, Shared Task Papers*, pages 554–563. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. [Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thi-Ngoc-Diep Do, Viet-Bac Le, Brigitte Bigi, Laurent Besacier, and Eric Castelli. 2009. [Mining a Comparable Text Corpus for a Vietnamese-French Statistical Machine Translation System](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 165–172. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Paul-Ambroise Duquenne, Holger Schwenk, and Benoît Sagot. 2023. [SONAR: Sentence-Level Multimodal and Language-Agnostic Representations](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11466*.
- Ahmed El-Kishky, Vishrav Chaudhary, Francisco Guzmán, and Philipp Koehn. 2020. [CCAligned: A Massive Collection of Cross-Lingual Web-Document Pairs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5960–5969. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ahmed El-Kishky and Francisco Guzmán. 2020. [Massively Multilingual Document Alignment with Cross-lingual Sentence-Mover’s Distance](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.00761*.
- Fangxiaoyu Feng, Yinfei Yang, Daniel Cer, Naveen Ariavzhagan, and Wei Wang. 2022. [Language-Agnostic BERT Sentence Embedding](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 878–894. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mandy Guo, Qinlan Shen, Yinfei Yang, Heming Ge, Daniel Cer, Gustavo Hernandez Abrego, Keith Stevens, Noah Constant, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Brian Strope, and Ray Kurzweil. 2018. [Effective Parallel Corpus Mining using Bilingual Sentence Embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*, pages 165–176, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mandy Guo, Yinfei Yang, Keith Stevens, Daniel Cer, Heming Ge, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Brian Strope, and Ray Kurzweil. 2019. [Hierarchical Document Encoder for Parallel Corpus Mining](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Machine Translation (Volume 1: Research Papers)*, pages 64–72. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Divyanshu Kakwani, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Satish Golla, Gokul N.C., Avik Bhattacharyya, Mitesh M. Khapra, and Pratyush Kumar. 2020. [IndicNLP Suite: Monolingual Corpora, Evaluation Benchmarks and Pre-trained Multilingual Language Models for Indian Languages](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4948–4961. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mohammed Safi Ur Rahman Khan, Priyam Mehta, Ananth Sankar, Umashankar Kumaravelan, Sumanth Doddapaneni, G Suriyaprasaad, Varun G Balan, Sparsh Jain, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Pratyush Kumar, Raj Dabre, and Mitesh M. Khapra. 2024. [IndicLLM Suite: A Blueprint for Creating Pre-training and Fine-Tuning Datasets for Indian Languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15831–15879. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Philipp Koehn. 2005. [Europarl: A Parallel Corpus for Statistical Machine Translation](#). In *Proceedings of Machine Translation Summit X: Papers*, pages 79–86, Phuket, Thailand.
- Haoyue Liu, Junjie Zhou, Xiaodong Jiang, Xu Tan, Linfeng Li, Yi Chen, Nan Hu, Jing Liu, Tongfei Wu, Dian Yu, Jiaqi He, Xin Chen, Ting Chen, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Jianfeng Chen. 2020. [ALIGN: Aligning Multilingual Sentence Representations for Document-Level Machine Translation and Beyond](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1491–1504. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Yash Madhani, Mitesh M. Khapra, and Anoop Kunchukuttan. 2023. [Bhasa-Abhijnaanam: Native-script and romanized Language Identification for 22 Indic languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 816–826, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. [Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Stephen Robertson. 2004. [Understanding inverse document frequency: on theoretical arguments for IDF](#). *Journal of Documentation*, 60(5):503–520.
- Holger Schwenk, Loic Barrault, and Christophe Servan. 2017. [Learning Joint Multilingual Sentence Representations with Neural Machine Translation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04154*.
- Holger Schwenk, Vishrav Chaudhary, Shuo Sun, Hongyu Gong, and Francisco Guzmán. 2021a. [CC-Matrix: Mining Billions of High-Quality Parallel Sentences on the Web](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5998–6010. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Holger Schwenk, Vishrav Chaudhary, Shuo Sun, Hongyu Gong, and Francisco Guzmán. 2021b. [Wiki-Matrix: Mining 135 Million Parallel Sentences from Wikipedia](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1625–1639. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shashank Siripragada, Jerin Philip, Vinay P. Namboodiri, and C V Jawahar. 2020. [A Multilingual Parallel Corpora Collection Effort for Indian Languages](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 3743–3751. European Language Resources Association.
- Haiyue Song, Raj Dabre, Atsushi Fujita, and Sadao Kurohashi. 2020. [Coursera corpus mining and multi-stage fine-tuning for improving lectures translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 3640–3649, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Steinþor Steingrímsson. 2023. [A Sentence Alignment Approach to Document Alignment and Multi-faceted Filtering for Curating Parallel Sentence Pairs from Web-crawled Data](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 366–374, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jörg Tiedemann. 2012. [Parallel Data, Tools and Interfaces in OPUS](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*, pages 2214–2218. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Michał Ziemski, Marcin Junczys-Dowmunt, and Bruno Pouliquen. 2016. [The United Nations Parallel Corpus v1.0](#). In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'16)*, pages 3530–3534. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).