Data Selection with Fewer Words

Amittai Axelrod

Philip Resnik Xiaodong He Mari Ostendorf University of Maryland & Johns Hopkins University of Maryland Microsoft Research University of Washington



Domain* Adaptation

- $\cdot \, *$ Defined by construction.
- Ideally based on some notion of textual similarity:
 - \cdot Lexical choice
 - · Grammar
 - · Topic
 - · Style
 - · Genre
 - · Register
 - · Intent
- Domain = particular contextual setting.
 Here we use "domain" to mean "corpus".



Domain Adaptation

- Training data doesn't always match desired tasks.
- Have bilingual:
 - Parliament proceedings
 - Newspaper articles
 - Web scrapings
- Want to translate:
 - Travel scenarios
 - · Facebook updates
 - Realtime conversations
- Sometimes want a specific kind of language, not just breadth!



Data Selection

· "filter Big Data down to Relevant Data"

Use your regular pipeline,
 but improve the input!

Not all sentences are equally valuable...



Data Selection

- For a particular translation task:
 - · Identify the most relevant training data.
 - $\cdot\,$ Build a model on only this subset.
- · Goal:
 - Better task-specific performance
 - · Cheaper (computation, size, time)



Data Selection Algorithm

- Quantify the domain
- Compute similarity of sentences in pool to the in-domain corpus
- $\cdot \,$ Sort pool sentences by score
- Select top n%



Data Selection Algorithm

- Quantify the domain
- Compute similarity of sentences in pool to the in-domain corpus
- Sort pool sentences by score
- Select top n%
- · Use n% to build task-specific MT system
- · Combine with system trained on in-domain data (optional)
- · Apply task-specific system to task.



Perplexity-Based Filtering

 $\cdot \,$ A language model LM_Q measures the likelihood of some text by its perplexity:

$$ppl_{LM_Q}(s) = 2^{-\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\log LM_Q(w_i|h_i)} = 2^{H_{LM_Q}(s)}$$

- Intuition: Average branching factor of LM
- Cross-entropy H (of a text w.r.t. an LM) is *log*(ppl).



Cross-Entropy Difference

- Perplexity-based filtering:
 - Score and sort sentences in pool by perplexity with in-domain LM.
 - · Then rank, select, etc.
- However! By construction, the data pool does not match the target task.



Cross-Entropy Difference

Score and rank by cross-entropy difference:

$$\underset{s \in POOL}{\operatorname{argmin}} \quad H_{LM_{IN}}(s) - H_{LM_{POOL}}(s)$$

(Also called "XEDiff" or "Moore-Lewis")

- Prefer sentences that both:
 - · Are <u>like</u> the target task
 - Are <u>unlike</u> the pool average.



Bilingual Cross-Entropy Diff.

 Extend the Moore-Lewis similarity score for use with bilingual data, and apply to SMT:

$$(H_{L1}(s_1, LM_{IN}) - H_{L1}(s_1, LM_{POOL})) + (H_{L2}(s_2, LM_{IN}) - H_{L2}(s_2, LM_{POOL}))$$

 Training on only the most relevant subset of training data (1%-20%) yields translation systems that are smaller, cheaper, faster, and (often) better.



Using Fewer Words

- How much can we trust rare words?
- If a word is seen 2 times in the general corpus and 3 in the in-domain one, is it really 50% more likely?
- Low-frequency words often ignored (Good-Turing smoothing, singleton pruning...)



- In stylometry,
 syntactic structure = proxy for style.
- POS-tag n-grams used as features to determine authorship, genre, etc.
- Incorporate this idea as a pre-processing step to data selection:



- In stylometry,
 syntactic structure = proxy for style.
- POS-tag n-grams used as features to determine authorship, genre, etc.
- Incorporate this idea as a pre-processing step to data selection:

Replace rare words with POS tags



- Replace rare words with POS tags:
 - an earthquake in Port-au-Prince
 - \cdot an earthquake in NNP



- Replace rare words with POS tags:
 - an earthquake in Port-au-Prince
 - \cdot an NN in NNP



- Replace rare(?) words with POS tags:
 - · an earthquake in Port-au-Prince
 - · DT NN IN NNP



- Replace rare words with POS tags:
 - an earthquake in Port-au-Prince
 - \cdot an earthquake in NNP
 - · an earthquake in Kodari



- Replace rare words with POS tags:
 - an earthquake in Port-au-Prince
 - \cdot an earthquake in NNP
 - · an earthquake in Kodari
- · Threshold: (if *Count* < 10) in <u>either</u> corpus



Using Fewer Words

- Use the hybrid word/POS texts instead of the original corpora.
- Train LMs on the corpora, compute sentence scores, and re-rank the original general corpus.
- Standard Moore-Lewis / Cross-entropy diff, but with different corpus representation.



TED Zh-En Translation

- Task: Translate TED talks, Chinese-to-English, using LDC data (6m sentence pairs).
- Vocabulary reduction from TED+LDC: Eliminate 97% of the vocabulary

Lang	Vocab	Kept	%
En	470,154	10,036	2.1%
Zh	729,283	11,440	1.5%

• What happens to SMT performance?



TED Zh-En Translation



Slightly better scores, despite (much) smaller selection vocab!



Amittai Axelrod

Data Selection with Fewer Words

In-Domain Lexical Coverage



· Up to 10% more in-domain coverage



Data Selection with Fewer Words

General-Domain Coverage



Hybrid-selected data covers 10-15% more of the general lexicon.



Amittai Axelrod

Data Selection with Fewer Words

WMT 2015

Hybrid Word/POS Selection

- Must re-compute for every task/pool, but vocabulary statistics are easy.
- Aggregating the statistics for rare terms allows generalizing to other unseen words.
- Perhaps preserving sentence structure, picking up words that fill similar roles/patterns in the sentence?



Hybrid Word/POS Selection

- Replace all rare words with POS tags, then run regular data selection.
- Reduces active lexicon by 97%, to ~10k words with robust statistics
- Potentially helpful for algorithms bound by vocabulary size "V"
- $\cdot\,$ Selection LM is 25% smaller



Questions?



[this slide intentionally left blank]

