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Transcribe Mode

- The user is listening to someone speaking in a language they do not understand
  - A lecture they’re attending
  - Their grandmother telling a story

- The mic is left on, and they can read the translation in real time.
Translating sentence by sentence is too slow

We want to understand how to translate a sentence in progress.
Abstraction: Simultaneous Translation as Control

- In the beginning, there is nothing, just an empty source sequence

- A streaming agent has two possible actions:
  - Read a source token (waiting if one is not available)
  - Write a target token to extend the translation

- Joint goal: minimize latency, maximize quality
  - That is: read just enough to write accurately
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Previous work

2006-2016
Phrase-based techniques (often segmentation-driven) from KIT, AT&T, NAIST and others

Don’t Until the Final Verb Wait: Reinforcement Learning for Simultaneous Machine Translation
Alvin Grissom II, He He, Jordan Boyd-Graber, John Morgan, Hal Daumé III; 2014

Can neural machine translation do simultaneous translation?
Kyunghyun Cho, Masha Esipova; 2016

Learning to Translate in Real-time with Neural Machine Translation Strategies
Jiatao Gu, Graham Neubig, Kyunghyun Cho, Victor O.K. Li; 2017
Enter STACL and wait-k (Ma et al., 2019 [https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.08398](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.08398))
(See also: Dalvi et al., 2018 [https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N18-2079/](https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N18-2079/))

- Extremely simple agent:
  - Read k source tokens, then alternate write and read until end of source

  **Example:**
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  \text{Write} \\
  \text{Le} \\
  \text{The} \\
  \text{big} \\
  \text{red} \\
  \text{Read} \\
  \text{Read} \\
  \text{Read}
  \end{array}
  \]

  k=3

- Integrates nicely into training:
  - Leads to ability to **anticipate**!

- Cleaner evaluation metric for latency:
  - **Average lagging**: how far do we lag behind an ideal word-for-word system?
Monotonic Attention: (Raffel et al., 2017 [https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.00784])

- Attention links the decoder to the encoder by a softmax over encoder positions.

- Monotonic attention models a series of read-write decisions.

- Trainable in expectation with dynamic programming:
  - NMT learns to anticipate; agent learns to adapt to context.
MILk: Monotonic Infinite Lookback
(Arivazhagan et al., 2019: https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.05218)

- Extend Monotonic to not attend to the last word read, but with a softmax over all words read thus far
  - Much better fit for MT; dynamic program remains intact

- Need a new training criterion that optimizes latency + quality
  - Therefore also need a differentiable metric for latency
  - Trade-off controlled by a hyper-parameter (analogous to k)
Quality-Latency Trade-off Graphs

- Faster response
- Higher quality
MILk vs Wait-k: The value of adaptivity

WMT 14 English to French

WMT 15 German to English
What is the MILk attention doing?

#1 Noun-phrase chunking
Simultaneous Versus Offline

WMT 14 English to French

This is worrying...

WMT 15 German to English
Addressing the simultaneous versus offline gap

- **Bidirectional encoding**
  - STACL already has an (expensive) recipe for this for wait-k
  - Ma et al., 2019 (Baidu) [https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.08398](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.08398)

- **Speculative Beam Search**
  - Search a little further at each step to improve score estimates

- **Monotonic Multihead Attention**
  - Extend monotonic attention (+MILk) to Transformers
Distilling a full-sentence model into simultaneous (DeEn IWLST 2015, from ongoing work)
Check in on the product: they’re using a different abstraction

- Simultaneous translation isn’t control - it’s event handling
  - Each update to the source arrives as an event, triggers a new translation of the source prefix up to this point

  The → La
  The big → Le grand
  The big red → Le grand rouge
  The big red dog → Le gros chien rouge
  ...

- Retranslation!
Retranslation Pros and Cons

● Simple, portable - can immediately apply to our strongest models

● We can translate content as soon as it becomes available, and revise it later as we get more context
  ○ Potentially very responsive, with high final quality
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- Problem: The output is unstable!
Back to the literature


  - Provides us a metric for instability
    - Average number of tokens deleted to transition from one event to another
      (I’ll call this Erasure)

  - Provides a way to improve stability:
    - Prefix training: Train with a 50-50 mix of full pairs and pairs where both sides are truncated to a random prefix length.
    - Reduces erasure by 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Le</th>
<th>gros</th>
<th>chien</th>
<th>rouge</th>
<th>aime</th>
<th>Emily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td>loves</td>
<td>Emily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Le gros chien rouge aime Emily

Le gros
The big
Improving stability further

● **Mask-k:** Simply truncate the last k tokens
  ○ Trades speed for stability

● **Biased search:**
  ○ Some revisions are necessary, others are spurious, such as alternating between “may” and “could”
  ○ Bias the model / search to prefer outputs it committed to earlier
  ○ Trades quality for stability

\[
p'(y_j | y_{<j}, x_{\leq i}) = (1 - \beta) \cdot p(y_j | y_{<j}, x_{\leq i}) + \beta \cdot \delta(y_j, y'_j)
\]
Improved stability, visually
Comparing Retranslation (Best possible model)

- German-to-English WMT
- All retranslation points selected to be highly stable (<1 erasure per 5 final target words)
- Calculating lag in terms of time to stabilization: a token doesn’t count until it and all tokens before it stop changing.
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Comparing Retranslation (Importance of Prefix Training)

- German-to-English WMT
- All retranslation points selected to be highly stable
  (<1 erasure per 5 final target words)
- Calculating lag in terms of time to stabilization: a token doesn’t count until it and all tokens before it stop changing.
Moving to long-form and speech recognition (ASR) output

- Given a long-form streaming speech recognizer this is pretty straightforward.
  - Also assuming stable unspoken punctuation prediction, or endpointing.
  - Run retranslation on the latest sentence in the ASR output
Evaluating long-form latency

- Our evaluation metrics are overfit to the sentence level
  - Working on ASR sentence boundaries makes life very difficult

- BLEU trick (Matusov et al, 2005)
  - Levenshtein alignment between NMT output and reference to project reference sentence boundaries onto NMT

- Latency:
  - How many seconds does machine translation lag behind the source speaker?
  - Same trick to align NMT to reference target, and from there to reference source
  - In-sentence length ratios to relate each target word to a source word
  - Average the difference between NMT timestamps and source timestamps
Confirming our stability heuristics

- Tested on TED talks, En→XX
- “Improved” includes mask-k and biased search; configuration tuned on En→De
- Downloaded captions directly from TED for maximum language coverage
- Consistently achieve:
  - Near-perfect stability
  - Minimal BLEU degradation
  - Acceptable latency degradation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>BLEU</th>
<th>Lag (s)</th>
<th>Erasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nl</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surprise! Not all research findings transfer!

- Notice that prefix training wasn’t on the list of improvements.

- Needs more verification, but preliminary experiments with prefix-trained production-scale models indicate that the improvement from prefix training is marginal.
  - Unlike WMT data, perhaps our production data already contains prefix-like phenomena through extraction errors and other forms of data noise.
Looking back

- Monotonic Attention with Infinite Lookback (MILk)
- Improving and validating Retranslation
- An evaluation framework to compare the two

On research

- Started on this topic partly because of a product, partly because of a cool technology, and partly because of great work outside
- Checking back in with the product changed our direction, and then changed the product’s direction
  - Algorithmic refinements and metrics
Looking forward

- Modeling of retranslation
- Return to As-Control, or other abstractions (As-Segmentation?)
- Document-level modeling
- More focus on interaction with speech
  - Speech-adapted NMT
  - End-to-end models
  - Simultaneous text-to-speech
You might also like

- **Simultaneous Speech Translation in Google Translate**: Jeff Pitman
  - Happened at 1:00 PM Eastern today.
  - Product-oriented, broader view of Transcribe Mode and Speech Translation.

- **Dynamic Masking for Improved Stability in Online Spoken Language Translation**: Yuekun Yao and Barry Haddow from U. Edinburgh
  - Happening at 4:00 PM Eastern today (right after this).
  - Great work on improving Retranslation.
Thanks!