

DICTDIS: Dictionary Constrained Disambiguation for Improved NMT

Ayush Maheshwari, Piyush Sharma, Preethi Jyothi, Ganesh Ramakrishnan
Indian Institute of Technology Bombay

Abstract

Domain-specific neural machine translation (NMT) systems (*e.g.*, in educational applications) are socially significant with the potential to help make information accessible to a diverse set of users in multilingual societies. It is desirable that such NMT systems be lexically constrained and draw from domain-specific dictionaries. Dictionaries could present multiple candidate translations for a source word/phrase due to the polysemous nature of words. The onus is then on the NMT model to choose the contextually most appropriate candidate. Prior work has largely ignored this problem and focused on the single candidate constraint setting wherein the target word or phrase is replaced by a single constraint. In this work we present DICTDIS, a lexically constrained NMT system that disambiguates between multiple candidate translations derived from dictionaries. We achieve this by augmenting training data with multiple dictionary candidates to actively encourage disambiguation during training by implicitly aligning multiple candidate constraints. We demonstrate the utility of DICTDIS via extensive experiments on English-Hindi and English-German sentences in a variety of domains including regulatory, finance, engineering. We also present comparisons on standard benchmark test datasets. In comparison with existing approaches for lexically constrained and unconstrained NMT, we demonstrate superior performance with respect to constraint copy and disambiguation related measures on all domains while also obtaining improved fluency of up to 2-3 BLEU points on some domains.

1 Introduction

Neural machine translation (NMT) systems have seen great success in achieving state-of-the-art translation across several language pairs (Barrault et al., 2018). However, generic NMT pipeline does not guarantee the inclusion of specific terms in




Figure 1: Example from our test set where DICTDIS chooses a contextually appropriate phrase from the multiple constraints while the constrained model Leca (Chen et al., 2021) picks a random phrase. In addition to presenting text in the Devanagari script, transliterations are also presented in IAST format for ease of reading. In all our experiments, we present phrasal forms in Devanagari only (and not IAST).

the translation output which is extremely crucial in domain-specific scenarios such as translation of technical content. While adding domain-specific terms has been relatively easier in phrase-based statistical MT, such an intervention poses a challenge in NMT owing to the difficulty of directly manipulating output representations from the decoder (Susanto et al., 2020). Alternatively, domain-specific NMT systems have been proposed to generate domain-aware translations by fine-tuning generic NMT models on domain-specific parallel text. However, such fine-tuning would require curating translation pairs for each domain, entailing significant human effort and increasing the cost of maintaining models trained separately for each domain.

Therefore, it is imperative that the MT output adheres to the source domain by adopting domain-specific terminology, thus reducing and perhaps even guiding the translation post-editing effort. This is achieved in NMT via lexically constrained techniques that incorporate pre-specified words and phrases in the NMT output (Hokamp and Liu, 2017; Dinu et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2021). In addition to the source sentence, word or phrasal

constraints in the target language are provided as input. The constraints could be derived either from (i) in-domain source-target dictionaries or (ii) user-provided source-target constraints during interactive machine translation. Often, such constraints could encode multiple potential translations for a given source phrase. For example, the word ‘speed’ can be translated into 5 different Hindi phrases *teja*, *dauḍa*, *gati*, *raphtār*, *cāla* in the physics domain. However, existing constrained translation approaches do not accommodate such ambiguity in the constraints.

In this work, we propose a lexically constrained disambiguation framework, DICTDIS, wherein we train the NMT model to choose the most appropriate word or phrase, from among multiple constraints that are provided for a given source word or phrase. In Figure 1, we present the output of our model in contrast to another lexically constrained approach for a sample test instance.

DICTDIS is a *copy-and-disambiguation* method that accepts a source sentence and multiple source-target constraints as input and chooses an appropriate phrase from multiple candidate translations depending on the context. During training, we sample constraints from a generic source-target dictionary, in which, each source phrase could have multiple candidate translations. Toward this, we create a parallel corpus by appending each source sentence with multiple candidate translations delimited by appropriate separation symbols (*c.f.*, Figure 2). The model is trained in a *soft* manner such that no constraint is forced to appear in the predicted sentence — the constraint injected should (i) be contextually relevant and (ii) not impact the fluency of the sentence. During inference, the source sentence is pre-processed to include dictionary or user-specified constraints. Our main contributions are as follows:

1) Given a source sentence and domain specific dictionary constraints consisting of multiple source-target phrases, our proposed approach DICTDIS, can either pick the most relevant constraint or abstain from picking any constraint in order to least disrupt the fluency of the translation (*c.f.* Section 3.2).

2) DICTDIS is trained to do ‘soft’ disambiguation of phrases in the dictionary by automatically augmenting a domain agnostic corpus using synthetic domain-agnostic constraints (*c.f.* Section 3.3). Inspired by controlled text generation approaches (Pascual et al., 2021; Dathathri et al., 2019), we

also introduce a user controllable parameter in the decoding layer that can further improve the copy rate of constraints.

3) We present an extensive evaluation of DICTDIS on several datasets that we manually curated across finance, engineering and regulatory domains as well as standard benchmarks (*c.f.* Section 4.2). Further, we release our test set consisting of 4K manually curated English-Hindi sentences in these domains for public use and evaluation.

4) We compare against state-of-the-art constrained approaches, *viz.*, VDBA (Hu et al., 2019), Leca (Chen et al., 2021) as well as the unconstrained baseline. We report results using an n-gram matching based metric, BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), and a semantic matching-based metric COMET (Rei et al., 2020). Further, we estimate constraint copying rate using copy success rate (CSR) and also analyze CSR with respect to different polysemous degrees of constraints. We observe improvements in both CSR scores coupled with fluency improvement of upto 4 BLEU score points unlike other baselines which forgo fluency while improving CSR (*c.f.* Section 5).

2 Related Work

Lexically constrained NMT approaches can be broadly divided into two categories: *hard* and *soft*. In the *hard* category, all constraints are guaranteed to appear in the output sentence. Hokamp and Liu (2017); Post and Vilar (2018) modify the beam search decoding algorithm to ensure that target constraints are present in the output sentence. The beam search algorithm does not consider source word alignment but ensures high constraint copy rate. Chatterjee et al. (2022) propose a mix of alignment and soft-constraint decoding by formulating the loss function as joint probability of token probability from the decoder and alignment probability induced from intermediate transformer layers. Hard-alignment methods copy lexical constraints in the exact same form and might therefore result in ingestion of incorrect morphological forms. Moreover, it often results in lower BLEU scores on out-of-domain test set (*c.f.* Section 5).

Soft alignment approaches modify the NMT training algorithm to bias token prediction probabilities without forcing constraints to appear in the output. Ri et al. (2021); Michon et al. (2020) replace the source word with placeholders, such as a named entity type or part-of-speech tag of the




Figure 2: The embedding layer for the transformer-based encoder. Each source sentence is appended with the list of target constraints and separated by the special symbol ‘<sep>’. The target constraints are internally separated using the ‘<isep>’ symbol to distinguish candidate constraints for the same source phrase.

target constraint. Similarly, Song et al. (2019); Dinu et al. (2019) employ a bilingual dictionary to build a code-switching corpus by replacing the each source phrase with the corresponding target constraint during training. However, this often interferes with the meaning of the original source words, leading to poorer translation quality. Chen et al. (2021) propose Leca, a constraint-aware approach that bundles the source sentence with the constraints using a separator token. The training data is constructed by aligning source and target sentences and randomly creating a constraint during training using the aligned pairs. Some other approaches (Li et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2022) employ continuous memory to store source and target constraints and exploit their correspondence in the attention layer and are orthogonal to both constrained decoding and to data augmentation.

3 Approach

3.1 Problem Statement

Let each source sentence $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_S)$ of length S be associated with a constraint set C derived from a dictionary. Each source word can be mapped to multiple constraints in C . For example, $(x_i, C_i^1, \dots, C_i^k)$ denotes k possible dictionary translations associated with the word x_i . Let the corresponding translated sentence $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_T)$ be of length T . Conventional NMT systems are trained on the source and target sentences, unaware of constraints C . Our lexically constrained NMT system is trained with each source and target sentence, in conjunction with the possible set of constraints on the source sentence X . Often, a word (or phrase) is linked with a single constraint (Chen et al., 2021). However, in general, a source constraint can possibly contain one

or more target constraints.

As depicted in Figure 3, the model may choose not to include any of the candidate constraints so that the flow or fluency of the predicted sentence is not adversely affected.

3.2 DICTDIS: Dictionary Disambiguation in conjunction with NMT

Given a triplet of source sentence, constraints and target sentence (X, C, Y) , our objective is to choose constraint words or phrases from C and potentially include them in the target sentence Y . The source sentence is appended with C constraints, where each inter-phrase constraint C_i is separated by a symbol ‘<sep>’. In turn, candidate translations C_i^j for this i^{th} intra-phrase constraint are separated by another symbol ‘<isep>’. $\hat{X} = [X, <sep>, C_1^1, <isep>, C_1^2, <sep>, C_2^1, \dots, C_n, <eos>]$ where <eos> is the end of sentence token (c.f. Figure 2).

In our lexically constrained NMT approach, the model is trained by maximizing a log-likelihood objective similar to NMT, viz.,

$$p(Y|\hat{X}; \theta) = \prod_{t=1}^{T+1} p(y_t|y_{0:t-1}, x_{1:S}, C; \theta) \quad (1)$$

Unlike Hokamp and Liu (2017); Post and Vilar (2018), our method is based on *soft* ingestion, in which constraints are not forced to appear in the output. The logit values of constraints are adjusted during training such that the constraints occur in the beam (within the specified size) while decoding.

3.2.1 Encoder

We employ the standard Transformer-based architecture for NMT (Vaswani et al., 2017) that uses




Figure 3: DICTDIS decoding mechanism. Gating value g_t regulates the final token probability which determines the decision of whether to disambiguate or to copy.

self attention networks for both encoding and decoding. The encoder is a stack of N identical layers, each of which contains two sub-layers. Each layer consists of a multi-head self attention (Self-Att) and a feed-forward neural network (FFNN). For time step i in layer j , the hidden state $h_{i,j}$ is computed by employing self attention over hidden states in the previous layer $j - 1$.

We define a segment as the sequence of constraints corresponding to the textual span between two <sep> symbols. Inspired by BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), we append our input source token embedding with the learned embedding for the segment. This is illustrated in Figure 2. Further, positional indices of the constraint tokens begin with a number that is larger than the maximum source sentence length. For a given token, its embedding is sum of three components, *viz.*, token embedding, positional embedding and segment embedding.

3.2.2 Decoder

With a structure similar to the encoder, the decoder consists of a stack of N identical layers. In addition to two sub-layers, it also contains a cross attention (CrossAtt) sub-layer to capture information from the encoder. Cross attention is computed between the last layer of the encoder hidden state $h = h_{1,n}, h_{2,n} \dots h_{m,n}$ and the output of the self attention sub-layer, \tilde{s}_l .

$$\text{LayerNorm}(\text{CrossAtt}(\tilde{s}_l, h, h) + \tilde{s}_l)$$

LayerNorm is the layer normalization function (Ba et al., 2016). The probability for the token t is computed through a softmax over the target-side vocabulary, applied to the final decoder state s_N as

$$P_t^{\text{pred}}(y_t | (y_{<t}, \hat{X})) = \text{softmax}(s_{t,N}, W) \quad (2)$$

where W is the learnable weight matrix, X is the source sentence and $y_1, y_2 \dots y_t$ represent the target phrases. Inspired by (Gulcehre et al., 2016) and (Chen et al., 2021), we introduce a pointer network that adds logit values over the target-side constraints. Specifically, the token probability over the target vocabulary is the weighted sum of decoder probabilities from the predictive model P_t^{pred} and copy probabilities P_t^{copy} . This strengthens copying by identifying the target constraint (provided as an input) that needs to be copied. Copy probability for time step t is computed as the average multi-head attention weights of the last decoder layer. Intuitively, P_t^{copy} is the attention weight for the corresponding source position s .

$$P_t^{\text{copy}} = \text{avg}_{\text{heads}}(\text{CrossAtt}_{\text{head}_i}(\tilde{s}_{t,N}, h)) \quad (3)$$

We further add a disambiguation network to disambiguate between multiple inter-phrase constraints. This network learns to differentiate between multiple senses of a constraint based on the sentence context. We define disambiguation score for the j^{th} inter-phrase component of the i^{th} constraint, P_{ij}^{dis} as the dot product of weighted con-

text vector and inter-phrase component (constraint-component) contextual embedding normalised over all j inter-phrase constraints. We expect that constraint-component embedding combined with source context and cross attention can distinguish between multiple inter phrase constraints.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{score}_{ij}^{dis} &= c_t \cdot e_i^j = \sum_{s=1}^{\hat{S}} \alpha_{t,s} h_s e_i^j \\ P_{ij}^{dis} &= \text{normalise}_j(\text{score}_{ij}^{dis}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $c_t = \sum_{s=1}^{\hat{S}} \alpha_{t,s} h_s$ is the weighted context vector and e_i^j is the contextual embedding of inter-phrase constraints. Recall that h_s is the encoder hidden state at position s of the last layer, $\alpha_{t,s}$ is the averaged attention weight at the last decoder layer for source position s at decoding time step t . The final distribution over the target vocabulary is defined as the weighted sum of P_t^{pred} and the normalized probability sum of $P_t^{copy} + P_t^{dis}$ (refer Fig 3) :

$$p(y_t | (y_{<t}, \hat{X})) = g_t P_t^{pred} + (1 - g_t)(P_t^{copy} + P_t^{dis}) \quad (5)$$

where $g_t \in [0, 1]$ is a *learnable* gate controlling the weightage of the two probability distributions. It decides whether to keep the provided user constraint in translation or let the model predict (as can be seen in Fig. 3). We compute g_t as:

$$g_t = \text{FeedForward}(c_t, z_t) \quad (6)$$

where c_t is the weighted context vector, z_t is hidden state of the last layer of the decoder until timestep t and FeedForward is a single layer FFNN.

3.3 Training using Domain-agnostic Dictionaries

Data. We conduct experiments on English-Hindi and English-German translation tasks. In order to train DICTDIS we construct constraints using a domain-agnostic source-target dictionary such that each source phrase can contain one or more target phrases (refer Figures 1 and 2). We use a bilingual dictionary to append constraints if a phrase in the source sentence matches the source-side of the dictionary. We train our model on the Samanantar dataset (Ramesh et al., 2022) consisting of 8.4 million English-Hindi parallel sentences. We use a generic English-Hindi dictionary¹ containing 11.5K phrases. In Appendix B, we present

¹Available at https://sanskritdocuments.org/hindi/dict/eng-hin_unic.html.

Testsets	#sentences	Dictionary	Polysemous Degree (in %)				
			1	2	3	4	5
Regulatory	1000	Banking	90.4	9.5	0.1	-	-
Aerospace	1000	Phy,Chem, Maths, Mech	32.3	38.7	15.3	8.4	2.6
Banking	1016	Banking	85	14.8	0.1	-	-
Flores	1012	Administrative	26	36	16.2	15.9	2.9
WAT2021	3003	Administrative	32.3	38.8	15.4	8.4	2.6
WMT14	3003	Wiktionary	84.5	14.1	1	-	-

Table 1: Test sets used in our experiments. Dictionary refers to the type of domain dictionaries used for constrained translation. Polysemous degree refers to the number of candidate target constraints in the dictionary corresponding to a source constraint. The numbers represent distribution of target constraints for the corresponding polysemous degree in the test set. Due to paucity of space, we show constraints upto polysemy degree ≤ 5 .

the distribution of phrases (in percentage) in this domain-agnostic dictionary, with respect to the number of constraints associated with each phrase. During pre-processing, we match source-side dictionary phrases with the parallel corpus and find that 96% of the sentences contain at least one constraint pair. To avoid adversely affecting the translation performance (in terms of fluency), we leave the remaining 4% sentences as unconstrained.

In the case of English-German, we exactly follow the setup of Leca (Chen et al., 2021) and employ the WMT16 news data as a training corpus, newstest2013 as the development set and newstest2014 as the test set. To train DICTDIS, we use En-De bilingual dictionary from Muse (Lample et al., 2018). We use Moses tokenizer (Koehn et al., 2007) for pre-processing En-De and the Indic-NLP (Kunchukuttan, 2020) for pre-processing En-Hi sentences. The tokenized sentences are then processed using BPE (Sennrich et al., 2016) with 32K merge operations for both language pairs. We detokenize the predictions before computing BLEU, COMET and CSR. We describe implementation details in Section C in the Appendix.

4 Experiments

4.1 Evaluation

The performance of constrained machine translation is evaluated along the following three dimensions, viz., (1) **BLEU**: The BLEU score (Papineni et al., 2002) measures the translation quality by comparing n-grams of the predicted translation

with respect to the reference translation. We use SacreBLEU (Post, 2018) to estimate BLEU score. BLEU scores fail to robustly match paraphrases and measure semantic consistency between predicted and reference translation. This results in low BLEU score for fluent sentences having diverse translations. Therefore, we also report our results using the (2) **COMET** (Rei et al., 2020) metric which is based on a pretrained language model and has shown higher correlation with human judgments. We use the pre-trained `wmt20-comet-da` model for reporting COMET scores. We report COMET scores in Table 8 in the Appendix. (3) **CSR** (Copy Success Rate) (Campolungo et al., 2022): Following previous works (Chatterjee et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2021; Song et al., 2019), we report CSR which measures the percentage of constraints that are successfully generated in the translation.

4.2 Test Sets

In Table 1, we present summary of manually curated domain-specific parallel corpora in different domains to evaluate the performance of DICTDIS with domain-specific dictionary constraints. To the best of our knowledge, there is no such domain-specific publicly available aligned parallel corpus for Indian languages. Two of our corpora (*viz.*, Banking and Regulatory) were curated by aligning sentences from publicly available reports. The aerospace corpus was developed by manually translating sentences from an under-graduate textbook of aerospace engineering by a team of translators and reviewers. In addition to the curated corpus, we also present comparisons with popular benchmarks *viz.*, Flores-101 (Goyal et al., 2022) and WAT 2021². We use administrative dictionaries on these two datasets during constrained inference. We provide details on the annotation effort of each of our in-house developed dataset in Appendix A. For En-De, following Chatterjee et al. (2022), we use Wiktionary.975³ as our constraint dictionary.

4.3 Baselines

We compare against several state-of-the-art constrained as well as unconstrained approaches.

1. **Leca** (Chen et al., 2021): This is a constrained approach that accepts a single target constraint along with the source sentences as an input. In case

of multiple constraints for a phrase, Leca chooses a random phrase for insertion.

2. **Vectorized Dynamic Beam Allocation** (VDBA) (Hu et al., 2019) extends beam search to include pre-specified lexical constraints in the generated translation. We use constrained decoding implementation of fairseq to run the inference over unconstrained transformer.

3. **Transformer** (Unconstrained) : This is an unconstrained base transformer trained using fairseq.

5 Results

We present BLEU scores of DICTDIS and all baselines in Table 2. We split our test set into constrained set by matching atleast pair of source and target constraints on both source and target sentences. Un-constrained test set refers to those sentences where constraints from bilingual dictionary are not present in both source and target sentences. For unconstrained test sets, our method DICTDIS outperforms all the baselines. We observe that all models preserve their ability in translating unconstrained test sentences.

On the constrained test set, DICTDIS and its unconstrained variants achieve best BLEU performance on 5 test sets. DICTDIS yields best performance on 2 test sets and close to best scores on the other 4 test sets. For the Aerospace and Flores test set, DICTDIS achieves best performance. On Banking, WAT 2021 and WMT 14 test sets, the un-constrained variant of DICTDIS achieves best performance while the constrained variant trails by 0.4, 0.3 and 0.2 points respectively.

Leca performs poorly on all the constrained test sets. The difference between Leca and the best performing method on the Banking, Aerospace, Regulatory, Flores, WAT2021 and WMT14 set is 5.6, 11.4, 1.4, 5.1, 7.2 and 3.1 BLEU scores respectively. VDBA (Hu et al., 2019) enforces constraints only considering the target tokens of the lexicons which reduces fluency of the sentence. VDBA algorithm enforces constraints to appear in the output which is reflected in close to 99% CSR scores for the test sets but very low BLEU scores on out-of-domain test sets. Leca has far better BLEU scores than VDBA due to its training framework which focuses on learning a gating value of constraints when the decoder-encoder attention over the constraints has some significant value.

COMET (Rei et al., 2020) scores on the testsets are presented in Table 8. COMET score has demon-

²<http://lotus.kuee.kyoto-u.ac.jp/WAT/indic-multilingual/index.html>

³https://github.com/mtrresearcher/terminology_dataset/

Model	En-Hi										En-De	
	Banking		Aerospace		Regulatory		Flores		WAT 2021		WMT 14	
	Without	With	Without	With	Without	With	Without	With	Without	With	Without	With
Transformer	36.7	33.1	44.7	43.2	28.5	26.9	31.9	32.3	35	36.2	34.7	34.9
VDBA	-	18	-	16.8	-	16.7	-	16.4	-	15.3	-	31.7
Leca	36.3	28.5	40.5	32.6	28.5	25.4	30.2	28	35.1	29.6	33.6	32.1
DICTDIS(Uncons)	-	34.1	-	43.5	-	26.5	-	32.9	-	37.1	-	35.2
DICTDIS	37	33.7	45.1	44	28.9	26.3	32.2	33.1	34.8	36.8	35.9	35

Table 2: BLEU scores of constrained NMT without and with constraints on the test sets. VDBA has same results as Transformer without constraint on the test sets. DICTDIS gets overall best performance on most of the test sets. Constrained approaches such as Leca and VDBA do not perform well on test set. We report corresponding COMET scores in Table 8 in the Appendix.

Model	En-Hi					En-De
	Banking	Aerospace	Regulatory	Flores	WAT 2021	WMT 14
Transformer	77.1	81.6	79.3	83.2	90.4	82.8
Leca	91.7	75.6	94.1	72.9	78.0	85.5
DICTDIS(Uncons)	75.1	79.7	78.7	83.7	90.4	83.1
DICTDIS	83.8	82.2	85.3	84.4	91.3	85.9

Table 3: Copy success rate (CSR) results on the test sets. Leca (Chen et al., 2021) achieves higher CSR on test sets (*viz.* Banking and Regulatory) having higher percentage of single target candidate constraints. However, it suffers from low BLEU scores due to aggressive single constraint ingestion. We omit VDBA since it has CSR greater than 99% on all the datasets.

strated higher correlation with human judgements than BLEU, ChrF (Popović, 2015), BERTscore (Zhang et al., 2019). We observe that DICTDIS achieves highest rank among various baselines on 5 out of 6 testsets. En-De has a small/negative score for few baselines which could possibly be due to the different score scales. However, DICTDIS ranks higher for majority of test sets.

5.1 CSR

In Table 3, we present copy success rate of various baselines and DICTDIS. DICTDIS yields better CSR scores for Aerospace and WAT2021, whereas Leca has better CSR on Regulatory, Banking and WMT14 test sets. Leca achieves better CSR scores on test sets where single target constraints forms major part of constrained set (*c.f.*, Table 1) such as Banking, Regulatory and WMT14. On the contrary, it performs poorly on constraints having polysemous degree >1. DICTDIS constrained setting performs second best on the Banking, Regulatory and WMT14 datasets and yields overall best performance on other test sets.

In Table 5, we present polysemy degree-wise CSR scores for different test sets and constrained approaches. As pointed out in the preceding discussion, Leca ingests single degree constraints aggressively; however, it is unable to pick appropriate constraints when polysemy degree is 2 or higher.

DICTDIS performs consistently better for polysemy degree >2 and yields overall higher BLEU score on most datasets.

Low disambiguation performance on Regulatory and Banking can be explained by the inability of DICTDIS to ingest unambiguous (*i.e.*, polysemy degree 1) constraints aggressively in the predicted sentence. The Regulatory dataset includes around 90% of unambiguous constraints from the banking dictionary while other engineering and medical datasets have a sizeable proportion of constraints with degree >1. In the case of Regulatory, Leca ingests unambiguous constraints aggressively, resulting in much better disambiguation performance than other approaches. On the Banking dataset, Leca is unable to disambiguate ambiguous phrases with degree 2 polysemy. On other datasets, DICTDIS has better disambiguation performance and superior BLEU scores.

5.2 Controlled Text Generation

We observe that DICTDIS is not aggressive in ingesting single-degree constraint in favour of fluency. Therefore, inspired by controlled text generation approaches (Pascual et al., 2021; Dathathri et al., 2019), we introduce a user-controllable parameter α which controls the aggressiveness of ingesting single-degree constraints. α is governed by the normalized cross attention on the constraints

Model	Translations
Input	From 11 km onwards , the temperature is constant up to an altitude of 20 km .
Constraints	(‘constant’, ‘niyata, sthira , acala, अपारिवर्ति sthirāṃka, ekasamāna,satata’),(‘temperature’, ‘ tāpamāna , tāpakrama)
Leca	11 kilomiṭṭara se lekara 20 kilomiṭṭara taka tuṃgaṭā kā <u>tāpakrama</u> अपारिवर्ति sthirāṃka मेम banā huā hai
DictDis	11 kimī se, tāpamāna 20 kimī kī ūṃcāi taka sthira hai
Reference	11 kimī se tāpamāna 20 kimī kī ūṃcāi taka sthira hai
Input	Israels era of rule by judges ended with the coronation of its first king, Saul .
Constraints	(‘rule’, ‘śāsana, prabhutā,adhikāra,niyama’)(‘first’, ‘prathama, pahilā , sarva prathama, mukhya’) (‘era’, ‘samvata, varṣa, sana, kāla ’)(‘coronation’, ‘rājatilaka,ṭīkā, rājagaddī’)
Leca	ṭīkā karane ke varṣa मेम, isrāela ke prathama rājā, śāula ke rājyābhiṣeka ke sātha nyāya karane kā <u>adhikāra</u> samāpta huā
DICTDIS	nyāyiyom dvārā isrāela kā śāsana kāla apane pahale rājā, śāula ke rājyābhiṣeka ke sātha samāpta huā
Reference	nyāyiyom dvārā śāsana kie jāne kā isrāela kā kāla usake pahale rājā, śāula ke rājyābhiṣeka ke sātha samāpta ho gayā

Table 4: Examples from the test set using DICTDIS and Leca (constrained) models. Here, the correctly ingested constraints are highlighted in **bold** and incorrectly ingested constraints are highlighted as underlined. Sentences have been written in the IAST format for readability. DICTDIS is generally more effective in ingesting the constraints appropriately than Leca while maintaining fluency.

Test Sets	Banking		Aerospace						Regulatory		Flores				WAT2021					WMT14		
Polysemy Degree →	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
Leca	95	70	95	57	68	45	51	66	96	74	98	65	65	54	96	74	68	60	56	88	64	65
DictDis + Constraints	82	90	84	79	83	82	72	83	85	88	91	82	79	83	93	92	87	85	87	89	72	66

Table 5: Results for polysemy degree-wise CSR for different test sets and constrained approaches.

Model	Banking		Regulatory	
	BLEU	CSR	BLEU	CSR
Leca	28.5	91.7	25.4	94.1
DictDis	33.7	82.1	26.3	85.3
DictDis + α	32.9	87.8	25.9	86.7

Table 6: BLEU and CSR for Banking and Regulatory dataset with constraint ingestion parameter $\alpha = 0.1$.

for each time step t . The final value of logits of constraints are increased by $\alpha \times CrossAtt_t$. In Table 6, we present results for $\alpha = 0.1$ which is the optimum value governing tradeoff between CSR and BLEU. We observe that DICTDIS + α achieves better CSR than DICTDIS on these test set without sacrificing fluency unlike Leca. We observe that higher values of α results in high CSR but at the expense of lower BLEU scores.

5.3 Qualitative Analysis

In Table 4 we present two examples of translations with constrained approaches, *viz.*, DICTDIS and Leca. For the specified input sentence in English and corresponding dictionary constraints, our approach incorporates constraints without adversely affecting the fluency of the sentence. In both these examples, DICTDIS incorporates constraints specified during runtime into the translation and produces better sentence translations. Since our method is trained with multiple polysemy con-

straints, it learns to choose (or drop) appropriate constraints. We present more such examples in Table 9 in the Appendix.

6 Conclusion

We presented a *copy-and-disambiguation* approach, *viz.*, DICTDIS to translate under dictionary constraints provided at run-time, that potentially include multiple target candidates for each source language phrase. We present a recipe for training DICTDIS on a generic parallel corpus by synthesizing constraints during training by leveraging domain-agnostic dictionaries. Thus, given any sentence and hitherto unseen domain specific dictionary constraints, DICTDIS is *softly* trained to either pick the most relevant constraint or abstain from picking any constraints in order to least affect the fluency of the translation. We present an extensive evaluation of DICTDIS on publicly available datasets as well as on several new datasets, that we manually curated from the finance and engineering domains. We also release our test set consisting of 4K manually curated English-Hindi sentences in these new domains for public use and evaluation. On various domain specific translation tasks, we show how DICTDIS is extremely effective when evaluated with existing performance metrics.

References

- Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2016. Layer normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06450*.
- Loïc Barrault, Ondřej Bojar, Marta R. Costa-jussà, Christian Federmann, Mark Fishel, Yvette Graham, Barry Haddow, and Matthias andigital Humanities Huck. 2018. Findings of the 2019 conference on machine translation (WMT19). page 9. Frontiers.
- Niccolò Campolungo, Federico Martelli, Francesco Saina, and Roberto Navigli. 2022. Dibimt: A novel benchmark for measuring word sense disambiguation biases in machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4331–4352.
- Soumya Chatterjee, Sunita Sarawagi, and Preethi Jyothi. 2022. Accurate online posterior alignments for principled lexically-constrained decoding. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6675–6689.
- Guanhua Chen, Yun Chen, Yong Wang, and Victor OK Li. 2021. Lexical-constraint-aware neural machine translation via data augmentation. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3587–3593.
- Sumanth Dathathri, Andrea Madotto, Janice Lan, Jane Hung, Eric Frank, Piero Molino, Jason Yosinski, and Rosanne Liu. 2019. Plug and play language models: A simple approach to controlled text generation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Georgiana Dinu, Prashant Mathur, Marcello Federico, and Yaser Al-Onaizan. 2019. Training neural machine translation to apply terminology constraints. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3063–3068.
- Naman Goyal, Cynthia Gao, Vishrav Chaudhary, Peng-Jen Chen, Guillaume Wenzek, Da Ju, Sanjana Krishnan, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Francisco Guzman, and Angela Fan. 2022. The flores-101 evaluation benchmark for low-resource and multilingual machine translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:522–538.
- Caglar Gulcehre, Sungjin Ahn, Ramesh Nallapati, Bowen Zhou, and Yoshua Bengio. 2016. Pointing the unknown words. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.08148*.
- Chris Hokamp and Qun Liu. 2017. Lexically constrained decoding for sequence generation using grid beam search. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1535–1546.
- J. Edward Hu, Huda Khayrallah, Ryan Culkin, Patrick Xia, Tongfei Chen, Matt Post, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2019. Improved lexically constrained decoding for translation and monolingual rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 839–850, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Philipp Koehn, Hieu Hoang, Alexandra Birch, Chris Callison-Burch, Marcello Federico, Nicola Bertoldi, Brooke Cowan, Wade Shen, Christine Moran, Richard Zens, et al. 2007. Moses: Open source toolkit for statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 45th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics companion volume proceedings of the demo and poster sessions*, pages 177–180.
- Anoop Kunchukuttan. 2020. The IndicNLP Library. https://github.com/anoopkunchukuttan/indic_nlp_library/blob/master/docs/indicnlp.pdf.
- Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Ludovic Denoyer, and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2018. Unsupervised machine translation using monolingual corpora only. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Huayang Li, Guoping Huang, Deng Cai, and Lemao Liu. 2020. Neural machine translation with noisy lexical constraints. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 28:1864–1874.
- Elise Michon, Josep M Crego, and Jean Senellart. 2020. Integrating domain terminology into neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3925–3937.
- Myle Ott, Sergey Edunov, Alexei Baevski, Angela Fan, Sam Gross, Nathan Ng, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2019. fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Demonstrations)*, pages 48–53.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the*

- 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 311–318.
- Damian Pascual, Beni Egressy, Clara Meister, Ryan Cotterell, and Roger Wattenhofer. 2021. A plug-and-play method for controlled text generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 3973–3997.
- Maja Popović. 2015. chrF: character n-gram f-score for automatic mt evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 392–395.
- Matt Post. 2018. A call for clarity in reporting bleu scores. In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*, pages 186–191.
- Matt Post and David Vilar. 2018. Fast lexically constrained decoding with dynamic beam allocation for neural machine translation. 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 1314–1324.
- Gowtham Ramesh, Sumanth Doddapaneni, Aravindh Bheemaraj, Mayank Jobanputra, Raghavan AK, Ajitesh Sharma, Sujit Sahoo, Harshita Diddee, Divyanshu Kakwani, Navneet Kumar, et al. 2022. Samanantar: The largest publicly available parallel corpora collection for 11 indic languages. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:145–162.
- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. **COMET: A neural framework for MT evaluation**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2685–2702, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ryokan Ri, Toshiaki Nakazawa, and Yoshimasa Tsuruoka. 2021. Modeling target-side inflection in placeholder translation. In *Proceedings of the 18th Biennial Machine Translation Summit (Volume 1: Research Track)*, pages 231–242.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units. In *54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1715–1725. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL).
- Kai Song, Yue Zhang, Heng Yu, Weihua Luo, Kun Wang, and Min Zhang. 2019. Code-switching for enhancing nmt with pre-specified translation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 449–459.
- Raymond Hendy Susanto, Shamil Chollampatt, and Liling Tan. 2020. Lexically constrained neural machine translation with levenshtein transformer. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3536–3543.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Shuo Wang, Zhixing Tan, and Yang Liu. 2022. Integrating vectorized lexical constraints for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7063–7073.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*.

Appendix

A Dataset

We adopted two methods to create parallel corpora:

1. **Alignment:** We align parallel data available in finance domain. Several banking organizations in India produce their work reports in both Hindi and English. We semi-automatically align around 3K sentences using our in-house developed tool. 2. **Manual Translation:** We obtained manual translations for an engineering curriculum books from English into Hindi with the help of professional translators. This was with requisite permissions from the corresponding publishers and authors. 1. **Regulatory:** These are manually translated sentence pairs of the annual report of a central bank. We extract the sentences using OCR and automatically align sentences using multilingual sentence embeddings (Ramesh et al., 2022). The aligned sentences are then manually reviewed for alignment and OCR errors. The dictionary here primarily belongs to the finance domain.

2. **Aerospace:** This is an undergraduate aerospace engineering book. Since aerospace is a multi-disciplinary field, we choose dictionaries from physics, chemistry, mechanical and math domains to use with DICTDIS. Any single dictionary may not provide sufficient enough coverage over domain-specific terms.

3. **Banking:** These are manually translated sentence pairs of the annual report of a banking organization. We adopt the same method as in the regulatory dataset to derive the test set.

B Training Data

We use a generic English-Hindi synonym dictionary containing 11.5K phrases. In Table 7, we present the distribution of phrases (in percentage) in this domain-agnostic dictionary across different number of constraints associated with a phrase. During pre-processing, we match source-side dictionary phrases with the parallel corpus and find that 96of the sentences contain at least one constraint pair. To avoid adversely affecting the translation performance (in terms of fluency), we leave the remaining 4% sentences as unconstrained.

#constraints	% of phrases
1	15.6
2	27.6
3	29.6
4	19.7
5	7.0
6	0.85

Table 7: Percentage of phrases having different number of constraints in the constraint dictionary during training.

C Implementation Details

We implement DICTDIS using fairseq toolkit (Ott et al., 2019) v0.12⁴ over base Transformer model (Vaswani et al., 2017) for all our experiments. We set the maximum token length (including all inter-phrase constraints and intra-phrase constraints) to 2048. The optimizer employed is Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with label smoothing of 0.1, the learning rate is set to 5e-4 with 4000 warm-up steps, the probability dropout is set to 0.3, batch size to 4096 and maximum number of updates to 200,000. The beam-size for all experiments and baselines is set to 5. To maintain consistency in length of constraints in the batch, we pad tokens to make their lengths equal. Training takes approximately 3 hours for 1 epoch on three Nvidia A6000 GPU in a distributed setup.

D COMET scores on Test sets

In Table 8, we present mean COMET scores for the test sentences. COMET (Rei et al., 2020) metric is based on a pretrained language model that accepts source, reference and predicted sentence as an input. COMET has shown higher correlation with human judgements and its ability to identify the highest performing MT systems. We use pre-trained wmt20-comet-da model for calculating COMET scores. We observe that DICTDIS achieves highest rank among various baselines on 5 out of 6 testsets. En-De language pair has a small/negative score for few baselines which could possibly be due to the different scores scales. However, DICTDIS ranks higher for majority of test sets.

⁴<https://github.com/facebookresearch/fairseq/>

	Banking	Aerospace	Regulatory	Flores	WAT2021	WMT14
VDBA	71.6	65.6	62.3	51.9	94.2	-3.7
Leca	64.4	48.9	60.9	51.4	78.5	-13.1
Transformer	71.4	66.8	71.4	62	94.6	2.9
DICTDIS	74.5	77.3	65.7	72.8	97.5	8.2

Table 8: COMET scores for the test sets. Note that COMET scores are representative of ranking relative to direct assessment as measured by the pre-trained model instead of the translation quality.

Model	Sentences
Input	Stability and Turn Down Ratio The operation of the combusting device must be stable over the operating range.
Constraints	(‘ratio, ’ anapātu ,anupāta’), (operation, ’saṃkriyā, pracālana ’), (operating, ’saṃkāra, pracālana ’), (‘down’, ’adha,nīce’), (‘range’, ’parāsa parisara mālā,śreṇī, parāsa,parisara,mālā,śreṇī’), (‘stability’, ’ sthāyitva ’)
DictDis	sthīratā aura ṭarna ḍāuna anupāta kambasṭiṅga yukti kā pracālana pracālana sīmā para sthira honā cāhie
Transformer	kambasṭiṅga ḍivāisa kā saṃcālana aupareṭiṅga reṃja para sthira honā cāhie
Leca	sthāyitva aura ṭarna eṃḍa ḍāuna anupāta kambasṭiṅga yukti kī saṃkriyā aupareṭiṅga śreṇī para anakāraka honī cāhie
Reference	sthāyitva aura ṭarna ḍāuna anupāta : kambasṭiṅga yukti kā pracālana pracālana sīmā para sthira honā cāhie
Input	The precise mechanics of such a transformation has not been satisfactorily worked out yet.
Constraints	(‘transformation’, ’ rūpāntaraṇa ’)(‘precise’, ’pratatha,parisuddha’) (‘mechanics’, ’balavijñāna,yaṃtravijñāna, yāṃtrikī)(‘not’, ’nadta’)
DictDis	isa taraha ke parivartana kī saṭika yāṃtrikī abhī taka saṃtoṣajanaka ḍhaṅga se nahīṃ banāi gāi hai
Transformer	isa prakāra ke rūpāntaraṇa kī yathārtha kriyāvidhi kā abhī taka saṃtoṣajanaka rūpa se patā nahīṃ calā hai
Leca	isa taraha ke rūpāntaraṇa kā pravijñāna abhī taka saṃtoṣajanaka ḍhaṅga se <u>nadta-nadta</u> nahīṃ huā hai
Reference	isa taraha ke rūpāntaraṇa kī saṭika yāṃtrikī para abhī saṃtoṣajanaka ḍhaṅga se kāma nahīṃ kiyā gayā hai

Table 9: Constrained translation examples from the Aerospace testset using DICTDIS, Transformer (unconstrained) and Leca (constrained) models. Here, the correctly ingested constraints are highlighted in **bold** and incorrectly ingested constraints are highlighted as underlined. Sentences have been written in the IAST format for readability. It is evident that DICTDIS is generally more effective in ingesting the constraints appropriately than Leca and Transformer while maintaining fluency.

E More qualitative examples

In Table 9, we present two example translation from Combustion-T2 dataset with constrained approaches, *viz.*, DICTDIS and Leca, and the unconstrained Transformer. For the specified input sentence in English and corresponding dictionary constraints, our approach incorporates constraints without adversely affecting the fluency of the sentence. In both these examples, DICTDIS incorporates constraints specified during runtime into the translation and produces better sentence translations. Since our method is trained with multiple polysemy constraints, it learns to choose (or drop) appropriate constraints.