

# Neural Machine Translation with Explicit Phrase Alignment

Jiacheng Zhang<sup>†</sup>, Huanbo Luan<sup>†</sup>, Maosong Sun<sup>†</sup>, FeiFei Zhai<sup>#</sup>,  
Jingfang Xu<sup>#</sup> and Yang Liu<sup>†‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Institute for Artificial Intelligence

State Key Laboratory of Intelligent Technology and Systems

Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

<sup>‡</sup>Beijing National Research Center for Information Science and Technology

<sup>#</sup>Sogou Inc., Beijing, China

## Abstract

While neural machine translation (NMT) has achieved state-of-the-art translation performance, it is unable to capture the alignment between the input and output during the translation process. The lack of alignment in NMT models leads to three problems: it is hard to (1) interpret the translation process, (2) impose lexical constraints, and (3) impose structural constraints. To alleviate these problems, we propose to introduce explicit phrase alignment into the translation process of arbitrary NMT models. The key idea is to build a search space similar to that of phrase-based statistical machine translation for NMT where phrase alignment is readily available. We design a new decoding algorithm that can easily impose lexical and structural constraints. Experiments show that our approach makes the translation process of NMT more interpretable without sacrificing translation quality. In addition, our approach achieves significant improvements in lexically and structurally constrained translation tasks.

## 1 Introduction

Neural machine translation (NMT), which leverages neural networks to map between natural languages, has made remarkable progress in the past several years (Sutskever et al., 2014; Bahdanau et al., 2015; Vaswani et al., 2017). Capable of learning representations from data, NMT has achieved significant improvements over conventional statistical machine translation (SMT) (Koehn et al., 2003)

and become the new *de facto* paradigm in the machine translation community.

Despite its success, NMT suffers from a major drawback: there is no alignment to explicitly indicate the correspondence between the input and the output. As all internal information of an NMT model is represented as real-valued vectors or matrices, it is hard to associate a source word with its translational equivalents on the target side. Although the attention weights between the input and the output are available in the RNNsearch model (Bahdanau et al., 2015), these weights only reflect relevance rather than translational equivalence (Koehn and Knowles, 2017). To aggravate the situation, attention weights between the input and the output are even unavailable in modern NMT models such as Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017).

The lack of alignment in NMT leads to at least three problems. First, it is difficult to interpret the translation process of NMT models without alignment. In conventional SMT (Koehn et al., 2003), the translation process can be seen as a sequence of interpretable decisions, in which alignment plays a central role. It is hard to include such interpretable decisions in NMT models without the access to alignment. Although visualization tools such as layer-wise relevance propagation (Ding et al., 2017) can be used to measure the relevance between two arbitrary neurons in NMT models, the hidden states in neural networks still do not have clear connections to interpretable language structures.

Second, it is difficult to impose **lexical constraints** on

Webpage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1845 – American poet <a href="#">Edgar Allan Poe</a>’s “<b>The Raven</b>” (illustration shown) appeared in <i>The Evening Mirror</i>.</li> </ul>
HTML Code
<pre> &lt;li&gt;&lt;a&gt;1845 - American poet &lt;a&gt;Edgar Allan Poe&lt;/a&gt;’s “&lt;b&gt;&lt;a&gt;The Raven&lt;/a&gt;&lt;/b&gt;” (illustration shown) appeared in &lt;a&gt;&lt;i&gt; The Evening Mirror&lt;/i&gt;&lt;/a&gt; &lt;/li&gt; </pre>

Figure 1: Example structural constraints. The translation of a source string enclosed in a pair of HTML tags must be confined by the same tag pair on the target side.

NMT systems (Hokamp and Liu, 2017) without alignment. For example, given an English sentence

American poet Edgar Allan Poe

, one requires that the English phrase “Edgar Allan Poe” must be translated by NMT systems as a Chinese word “ailunpo”. Such lexical constraints are important for both automatic MT and interactive MT. In automatic MT, it is desirable to incorporate the translations of infrequent numbers, named entities, and technical terms into NMT systems (Luong et al., 2015). In interactive MT, human experts expect that the NMT system can be controlled and include specified translations in the system output (Cheng et al., 2016). Although Hokamp and Liu (2017) and Post and Vilar (2018) provide solutions to impose lexical constraints, their methods can only ensure that the specified target words or phrases will appear in the system output. As a result, the ignorance of the alignment to the source side might deteriorate the adequacy of system output (see Table 3).

Third, it is difficult to impose **structural constraints** on NMT systems without alignment. Figure 1 shows an example of webpage and its HTML code. Unlike lexical constraints, structural constraints require that source strings enclosed in paired HTML tags must be translated as single units and the translations must be enclosed in the same paired HTML tags. For example, the Chinese translation of “<a>The Raven</a>” should be “<a>wuya</a>”. It is challenging for NMT models trained on plain text to translate such structured text. While removing these

HTML tags before translation and inserting tags back after translation will maintain translation quality but often violate structural constraints (Zantout and Guessoum, 2001; Joanis et al., 2013), only translating the plain text within tags and concatenating the translations and tags in a monotonic way can strictly conform to structural constraints but impair translation quality (Al-Anzi et al., 1997).

In this work, we propose to introduce phrase alignment into the translation process of arbitrary NMT models. The basic idea is to develop an NMT model that treats phrase alignment as a latent variable. During decoding, the NMT model is used to score a search space similar with conventional phrase-based SMT (Koehn et al., 2003), in which phrase alignment is readily available. While the use of the trained NMT model keeps the capabilities of NMT in learning representations from data and capturing non-local dependencies, the availability of phrase alignment makes it possible to include interpretable decisions in the translation process. Also thanks to the availability of phrase alignment, we design a new decoding algorithm that applies to all the unconstrained, lexically constrained, and structurally constrained translation tasks. Experiments show that the use of phrase-based search space does not hurt the translation performance of NMT models on the unconstrained translation task. Moreover, our approach significantly improves over state-of-the-art methods on the lexically and structurally constrained translation tasks.

## 2 Related Work

Our work is related to three lines of research: (1) interpreting NMT, (2) constrained decoding for NMT, and (3) combining SMT and NMT.

### 2.1 Interpreting NMT

Our work is related to attempts on interpreting NMT (Ding et al., 2017; Li et al., 2019). Ding et al. (2017) calculate the relevance between source and target words with layer-wise relevance propagation. Such relevance measures the contribution of each source word to target word instead of translational equivalence between source and target words. Li et al. (2019) predict alignment with an

external alignment model trained on the output of a statistical word aligner and use prediction differences to quantify the relevance between source and target words. However, their external alignment model is not identical to the alignment in the translation process. Our approach differs from prior studies by introducing explicit phrase alignment into the translation process of NMT models, which makes each step in generating a target sentence interpretable to human experts.

## 2.2 Constrained Decoding for NMT

Our work is also closely related to imposing lexical constraints on the decoding process of NMT (Hokamp and Liu, 2017; Chatterjee et al., 2017; Post and Vilar, 2018). Hokamp and Liu (2017) propose a lexically constrained decoding algorithm for NMT. Their approach can ensure that pre-specified target strings will appear in the system output. Post and Vilar (2018) improve the efficiency of lexically constrained decoding by introducing dynamic beam allocation. One drawback of the two methods is that they cannot impose lexical constraints on the source side due to the lack of alignment. Chatterjee et al. (2017) and Hasler et al. (2018) rely on the attention weights in the RNNsearch model (Bahdanau et al., 2015) to impose source-aware lexical constraints with guided beam search. However, their methods can not be applied to Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017). With translation options, it is also easy to impose source-aware lexical constraints using our approach for arbitrary NMT models.

The direction of imposing structural constraints remains much unexplored, especially for NMT. Most prior studies have focused on SMT. Although the ideal solution is to directly train NMT models on parallel corpora for structured text (Du et al., 2010; Hudík and Ruopp, 2011; Tezcan and Vandeghinste, 2011), such labeled datasets are hard to construct and remain limited in quantity. Therefore, a more practical solution is to use off-the-shelf MT systems tailored for unstructured text to translate structured text (Al-Anzi et al., 1997; Zantout and Guessoum, 2001; Joanis et al., 2013). But these approaches face the risk of performance degradation or failure to impose structural constraints correctly. Our work proposes a structurally constrained decoding algorithm for NMT to preserve structural constraints without sacrificing translation quality.




Figure 2: Neural machine translation with explicit phrase alignment.

## 2.3 Combining SMT and NMT

Several authors have endeavored to combine the merits of SMT and NMT (Stahlberg et al., 2016; Khayrallah et al., 2017; Dahlmann et al., 2017). Stahlberg et al. (2016) propose to use the lattice output by SMT as the search space of NMT. The major difference is that our work allows for both source word omission and target word insertion, which seem to be helpful in reducing the gap between phrase-based and neural spaces. In this work, we only use NMT models to score the translations in a phrase-based space. It is possible to exploit SMT features as suggested by Dahlmann et al. (2017).

## 3 Approach

Our work aims to introduce phrase alignment into the translation process of arbitrary NMT models. Figure 2 il-

illustrate the central idea of our approach. During decoding, the target sentence and phrase alignment are generated simultaneously. As the target sentence grows from left to right, it is easy to apply arbitrary NMT models to calculate translation probabilities in an incremental way. A key difference of our approach from conventional phrase-based SMT (Koehn et al., 2003) is that unaligned source and target phrases are allowed to reduce the discrepancy between the search spaces of SMT and NMT models. For example, Figure 2(b) uses an unaligned target phrase (i.e., “de”) and Figure 2(e) uses an unaligned source phrase (e.g., “Edgar”). With access to phrase alignment, we develop a decoding algorithm that is capable of preserving lexical and structural constraints without sacrificing translation quality.

### 3.1 Modeling

Let  $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_I$  be a source sentence and  $\mathbf{y} = y_1, \dots, y_J$  be a target sentence. We use  $x_0$  to denote an empty source word that connects to all unaligned target phrases and  $y_0$  to denote an empty target word that connects to all unaligned source phrases. We use  $\mathbf{z} = z_1, \dots, z_K$  to denote the phrase alignment between the source and target sentences. Each link  $z_k = (i_b, i_e, j_b, j_e)$  is a 4-tuple, where  $i_b$  is the beginning position of the source phrase,  $i_e$  is the ending position of the source phrase,  $j_b$  is the beginning position of the target phrase, and  $j_e$  is the ending position of the target phrase. For example, the phrase alignment in Figure 2 comprises five links:  $z_1 = (1, 1, 1, 1)$ ,  $z_2 = (0, 0, 2, 2)$ ,  $z_3 = (2, 2, 3, 3)$ ,  $z_4 = (4, 5, 4, 4)$ , and  $z_5 = (3, 3, 0, 0)$ . For convenience, we use  $\mathbf{x}_{z_k}$  to denote the source phrase spanning from  $i_b$  to  $i_e$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{z_k}$  to denote the target phrase spanning from  $j_b$  to  $j_e$ . For example,  $\mathbf{x}_{z_4}$  is “Allan Poe” and  $\mathbf{y}_{z_4}$  is “alunpo”.

More formally, our approach is based on a latent variable model given by

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{\mathbf{z}} P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is a set of model parameters.

The probability of generating the target sentence  $\mathbf{y}$  and phrase alignment  $\mathbf{z}$  given the source sentence  $\mathbf{x}$  can be

further factored as

$$P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{k=1}^K P(z_k|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{z_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{z_{k-1}}, \mathbf{z}_{<k}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) P(\mathbf{y}_{z_k}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{z_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{z_{k-1}}, \mathbf{z}_k; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (2)$$

where  $P(z_k|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{z_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{z_{k-1}}, \mathbf{z}_{<k}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  is a *phrase alignment* model and  $P(\mathbf{y}_{z_k}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{z_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{z_{k-1}}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  is a *phrase translation* model. Note that  $\mathbf{z}_{<k} = z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}$  is a partial phrase alignment. As it is challenging to estimate the phrase alignment model from data due to the exponential search space of phrase alignments, we assume that the alignment model has a uniform distribution for simplicity and leave the learning of the alignment model for future work.

We distinguish between two kinds of phrase translation models: *non-empty* and *empty*. For non-empty target phrases, the phrase translation probability can be decomposed as a product of word-level translation probabilities:

$$P(\mathbf{y}_{z_k}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{z_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{z_{k-1}}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{l=1}^{|\mathbf{y}_{z_k}|} P(\mathbf{y}_{z_k}^{(l)}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{z_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{z_{k-1}}, \mathbf{y}_{z_k}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{z_k}^{(l-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_n), \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{y}_{z_k}^{(l)}$  is the  $l$ -th word in the target phrase  $\mathbf{y}_{z_k}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n$  denotes the set of model parameters related to non-empty phrases. Note that the word-level translation probabilities in Eq. (3) can be easily calculated by arbitrary NMT models.

For the empty target phrase such as  $\mathbf{y}_{z_5} = y_0$ , we define the phrase translation probability as

$$P(\mathbf{y}_{z_k}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{z_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{z_{k-1}}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = P(y_0|\mathbf{x}_{z_k}, \mathbf{x}/\mathbf{x}_{z_k}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_e), \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_{z_k}$  is the source phrase aligned to  $y_0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}/\mathbf{x}_{z_k}$  is the surrounding context on the source side, and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_e$  is the set of model parameters related to empty phrases. For simplicity, we restrict that unaligned source phrase  $\mathbf{x}_{z_k}$  to be a single source word. Note that  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_n \cup \boldsymbol{\theta}_e$ .

We use the self-attention based encoder (Vaswani et al., 2017) to model the translation probability of empty target phrases. The encoder takes  $\mathbf{x}_{z_k}$  and  $\mathbf{x}/\mathbf{x}_{z_k}$  as input and output the probability of omitting  $\mathbf{x}_{z_k}$ .

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9  
 <c1> American poet <c2> Edgar Allan Poe </c2> </c1>

Step	Rule	Coverage	Stack	Translation
0		00000000		
1	Push	10000000	<c1>	
2	Translate	11000000	<c1>	meiguo
3	Translate	11000000	<c1>	meiguo de
4	Translate	11100000	<c1>	meiguo de shiren
5	Push	11110000	<c1> <c2>	meiguo de shiren
6	Translate	11111100	<c1> <c2>	meiguo de shiren ailunpo
7	Push	11111110	<c1> <c2> </c2>	meiguo de shiren ailunpo
8	Pop	11111110	<c1>	meiguo de shiren ailunpo
9	Push	11111111	<c1> </c1>	meiguo de shiren ailunpo
10	Pop	11111111		meiguo de shiren ailunpo

Figure 3: An example derivation of structurally constrained decoding.

Item:  $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}, S, \mathbf{y}]$

Axiom:  $[\mathbf{x}, \{0\}^I, \emptyset, \epsilon]$

Inference rules:

Translate  $\frac{p : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_1, S, \mathbf{y}_1], 0 : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_2, \emptyset, \mathbf{y}_2]}{p + \log P(\mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_1) : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2, S, \mathbf{y}_1 \mathbf{y}_2]}$

Push  $\frac{p : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_1, S, \mathbf{y}], 0 : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_2, \emptyset, s]}{p : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2, S | s, \mathbf{y}]}$

Pop  $\frac{p : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}, S | s_1 s_2, \mathbf{y}]}{p : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}, S, \mathbf{y}]}$

Goal:  $[\mathbf{x}, \{1\}^I, \emptyset, \hat{\mathbf{y}}]$

Figure 4: The deductive system of structurally constrained decoding.

### 3.2 Training

Given a parallel corpus  $D = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(s)})\}_{s=1}^S$ , the standard training objective is to maximize the log-likelihood

of the training data:

$$\hat{\theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^S \log P(\mathbf{y}^{(s)} | \mathbf{x}^{(s)}; \theta) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

As training the latent-variable model requires to enumerate all possible phrase alignments, it is impractical to directly estimate  $\theta_n$  and  $\theta_e$  jointly. Instead, we propose to train the two models separately. For the non-empty translation model in Eq. (3), the training objective is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\theta}_n \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta_n} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{y}^{(s)}|} \log P(y_j^{(s)} | \mathbf{x}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_{<j}^{(s)}; \theta_n) \right\}. \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

For the empty translation model in Eq. (4), we can use an external word alignment tool (Och and Ney, 2003) to generate word alignments for the parallel corpus  $D$ . It is easy to decide whether a source word is unaligned or not based on the word alignments. As a result, the training

objective for the empty translation model is given by

$$\hat{\theta}_e = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta_e} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{x}^{(s)}|} \operatorname{CE}(\mathbf{x}^{(s)}, \mathbf{u}^{(s)}, \theta_e, i) \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}^{(s)} = u_1^{(s)}, \dots, u_I^{(s)}$  is an indicator vector corresponding to the  $s$ -th source sentence  $\mathbf{x}^{(s)}$  that indicates whether  $x_i^{(s)}$  is unaligned and  $\operatorname{CE}(\cdot)$  is the cross entropy loss defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{CE}(\mathbf{x}^{(s)}, \mathbf{u}^{(s)}, \theta_e, i) \\ = & -u_i^{(s)} \log P(y_0 | x_i^{(s)}, \mathbf{x}^{(s)} / x_i^{(s)}; \theta_e) + \\ & (1 - u_i^{(s)}) \log \left( 1 - P(y_0 | x_i^{(s)}, \mathbf{x}^{(s)} / x_i^{(s)}; \theta_e) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

### 3.3 Decoding

Given the learned model parameters  $\hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}_n \cup \hat{\theta}_e$  and an unseen source sentence  $\mathbf{x}$ , our goal is to find the target sentence  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$  and phrase alignment  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$  with the highest probability without violating pre-specified constraints:

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{z}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \text{ s.t. } C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathcal{C})=1} \left\{ P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{x}; \hat{\theta}) \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where  $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathcal{C})$  is a function that checks whether the resulting translation and alignment conform to a set of pre-specified constraints  $\mathcal{C}$ . The function returns 1 if all constraints are satisfied and 0 otherwise.

As it is computationally expensive to enumerate all possible phrases and alignments during decoding, we resort to an external bilingual phrase table (Koehn et al., 2003) to restrict the search space. Before decoding, the candidate translations of each source phrase, which are usually referred to as *translation options*, can be collected by matching the phrase table against the input sentence. Note that unlike Koehn et al. (2003), our approach allows a source phrase or a target phrase to be unaligned.

It is easy for our approach to impose lexical constraints during the option collection process simply by replacing the translation of the pre-specified source phrase with the pre-specified target phrase. To achieve this, we restrict that (1) the pre-specified source phrase must be translated into a continuous segment and (2) its translation options do not overlap with other words. To impose structural constraints, we restrict that the translation options within a paired HTML tags do not intersect with those outside.

As unconstrained decoding is a special case of structurally constrained decoding and lexically constrained decoding can be achieved by restricting translation options, we focus on describing the structurally constrained decoding algorithm. We use a deductive system to formally describe the decoding process. An item in the deductive system is a 4-tuple  $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}, S, \mathbf{y}]$  defined as follows:<sup>1</sup>

1. *Source sentence*  $\mathbf{x}$ : To capture structural constraints, we add *open constraint tags* (e.g., “<c1” and “<c2”) and *close constraint tags* (e.g., “</c1” and “</c2”) to the input, as shown in Figure 3. Note that sentence boundaries can also be seen as constraints.
2. *Coverage vector*  $\mathbf{c}$ : A vector that consists of 0’s and 1’s to indicate which source words have been covered. The coverage vector is initialized as  $\{0\}^I$ .
3. *Stack*  $S$ : A stack that stores constraint tags. The decoding algorithm uses the stack to preserve structural constraints.
4. *Translation*  $\mathbf{y}$ : Partial translation generated during the decoding process.

Each item is associated with a log probability  $p$  yielded by our model. Note that a translation option can also be represented as an item  $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}, \emptyset, \mathbf{y}]$ . Except for the position of the source phrase, all other positions in  $\mathbf{c}$  are set to 0.  $\mathbf{y}$  is simply the target phrase. The log probability of a translation option is set to 0.

As shown in Figure 4, the deductive system comprises three inference rules:

1. *Translate*: Translate a source phrase using a translation option. In Figure 4,  $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_1, S, \mathbf{y}]$  is a current item and  $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_2, \emptyset, \mathbf{y}_2]$  is a translation option. This rule is activated in two cases: the translation option covers an uncovered source phrase within the constraint<sup>2</sup> at the top of the stack, or the source phrase is empty (i.e.,  $\mathbf{c}_2 = \{0\}^I$ ).
2. *Push*: Push a constraint tag to the stack. The algorithm constructs a special translation option

<sup>1</sup>As it is easy to obtain phrase alignment during the decoding process, we omit it in the item for simplicity.

<sup>2</sup>By “within the constraint”, we mean that the constraint is the innermost one that encloses a token. For example, in Figure 3, “Edgar” is within the inner constraint c2 rather than the outer constraint c1.

$[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_2, \emptyset, s]$  for a constraint tag  $s$ . For the open constraint tag “ $\langle c \rangle$ ”, this rule is activated when all source words within the constraint are uncovered and the algorithm starts to translate any source phrase within the constraint. For the close constraint tag “ $\langle /c \rangle$ ”, this rule is activated when all source words within the constraint are covered.

3. *Pop*: Pop the top two constraint tags from the stack. This rule is activated if the top two elements in the stack are paired open and close tags (e.g., “ $\langle c1 \rangle$ ” and “ $\langle /c1 \rangle$ ”).

Similar to lexically constrained decoding (Hokamp and Liu, 2017; Post and Vilar, 2018), we use an  $I \times J$  matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  to store all items generated during decoding, where  $I$  is the length of input and  $J$  is the maximum length of the output. Each element  $M_{i,j}$  is a stack of items with  $i$  source words covered and  $j$  target words generated. While the time complexity of the decoding algorithm in standard NMT is  $\mathcal{O}(bJ)$ , the time complexity of our algorithm is  $\mathcal{O}(bIJ)$ , where  $b$  is the beam size (i.e., the maximum number of items stored in each stack). To speed up the decoding, our approach only keeps top- $b$  items for all stacks with the same number of generated target words (i.e.,  $M_{*,j}$ ). As a result, the time complexity of our algorithm is reduced to  $\mathcal{O}(kJ)$ , which is identical to that of Post and Vilar (2018).

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Setup

We evaluated our approach on the Chinese-English translation task. The training set contains 1.25M sentence pairs from LDC<sup>3</sup> with 29.8M Chinese tokens and 35.8M English tokens after byte pair encoding (Sennrich et al., 2016) with 32K merges. The NIST 2006 dataset is used as the development set and the NIST 2008 datasets is used as the test set. The evaluation metric is case-insensitive BLEU4 (Papineni et al., 2002) as calculated by the *multi-bleu.perl* script.

<sup>3</sup>The training set is composed of LDC2002E18, LDC2003E07, LDC2003E14, part of LDC2004T07, LDC2004T08, and LDC-2005T06.

empty		BLEU
source	target	
×	×	41.69
×	✓	47.43
✓	×	39.28
✓	✓	<b>47.77</b>

Table 1: Effect of empty phrases on the source and target sides on the development set.

model	MT06	MT08
Transformer	47.44	37.49
<i>this work</i>	<b>47.77</b>	<b>38.14</b>

Table 2: Comparison between the standard Transformer model and our latent variable model.

The NMT model used in our experiments is Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017). The number of layers is set to 6 for both encoder and decoder. The hidden size is set to 512 and the filter size is set to 2,048. There are 8 separate heads in the multi-head attention. We used Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2015) to optimize model parameters. During training, each batch contains approximately 25,000 tokens. We adopt the learning rate decay policy as described by Vaswani et al. (2017). The length penalty (Wu et al., 2016) is used and the hyper-parameter  $\alpha$  is set to 0.6.

For our approach, we used the training set to train the non-empty translation model in Eq. (3). The same training set was also used to obtain an aligned parallel corpus using GIZA++ (Och and Ney, 2003), which is used to extract a bilingual phrase table (Koehn et al., 2003) to collect translation options and train the empty translation model in Eq. (4). The translation options of the empty source phrase are restricted to most frequent words of which the probabilities of aligning to the empty source phrase are higher than 0.2 on the training set.

### 4.2 Results on Unconstrained Decoding

In this experiment, we compared our method with the standard Transformer model (Vaswani et al., 2017).




Figure 5: Comparison between attention and alignment.

### Effect of Empty Phrases

Table 1 shows the effect of empty source and target phrases on the development set. The empty source phrase allows for target word insertion and the empty target phrase permits source word omission. It is clear that introducing empty phrases on both sides is beneficial for improving translation quality, suggesting that it is important to use empty phrases to reduce the discrepancy between the phrase-based search space and neural models. An interesting finding is that allowing for target word insertion but disabling source word omission dramatically hurts the translation performance (i.e., 39.28). We find that the decoder tends to insert many meaningless target words.

### Comparison with Transformer

Table 2 shows the comparison between the standard Transformer model and our latent variable model. Our model is different from the standard model in two aspects. First, our model uses a phrase lattice to represent the search space. Second, empty phrases are introduced to make the search space more flexible than that of conventional SMT. We find that our model slightly improves over the standard model, suggesting that we can use the phrase-based search space to replace the standard search space for lexically and structurally constrained decoding.

### Visualization

Figure 5 shows the comparison between the attention and alignment. As there is no attention between the input and output in the Transformer model, the heatmap in Figure 5 is taken from the encoder-decoder attention in the third layer. In the heatmap, the attention weight is averaged over 8 different heads. While the attention matrix only reveals the relevance between source and target words, the phrase alignment generated by our model is more useful for achieving lexically and structurally constrained decoding.

### 4.3 Results on Lexically Constrained Decoding

In this experiment, we compared our method with dynamic beam allocation (DBA) proposed by Post and Vilar (2018). We asked human experts to pre-specify 467 distinct lexical constraints with 1,005 occurrences for the NIST 2008 dataset. They are mostly translations of named entities.

We find that imposing lexical constraints using DBA achieves a BLEU score of 38.54 and our approach achieves a BLEU score of 39.43. Table 3 shows some example translations. Given a lexical constraint (“taose”, “color blossoms”), unconstrained decoding fails to generate “color blossoms” on the target side. DBA is capable of enforcing the target phrase of the lexical constraint to appear in the translation. However, there is an extra target word “peach” (highlighted in bold) that is also connected to “taose”. In other words, “taose” is translated twice in a wrong way. To make things worse, DBA omits the source phrase “hai ting hao de” (highlighted in italic). Similar findings are also observed on the second example, in which the Chinese word “wendiya” is translated twice by DBA: “avandia” and “man dim” (highlighted in bold).

We observe that 6.9% of the source phrases of lexical constraints on the test set are repeatedly translated by DBA while the proportion drops to 0.3% for our approach. One possible reason is that DBA ignores the source side of a lexical constraint and thus inevitably impairs the adequacy of the resulting translation.



lexical constraints	(“ <b>taose</b> ”, “ <b>color blossoms</b> ”)
source	“ <b>taose</b> ” qian ban duan <i>hai ting hao de</i> , dajia dou shi xinren .
reference	the first half of “ <b>color blossoms</b> ” is quite good . they are all first-timers .
no constraint	the first half of the “ peach color ” is still quite good . people are new people .
DBA	in the first half of the “ <b>peach color blossoms</b> , ” people are new people .
<i>this work</i>	the first half of the “ <b>color blossoms</b> ” is still quite good . people are new people .
lexical constraints	(“ <b>yaoguanju</b> ”, “ <b>fda</b> ”), (“ <b>7 yue 30 ri</b> ”, “ <b>july 30</b> ”), (“ <b>wendiya</b> ”, “ <b>avandia</b> ”)
source	<b>yaoguanju</b> jiang yu <b>7 yue 30 ri</b> juxing youguan <b>wendiya</b> anquanxing de tingzhenghui
reference	the <b>fda</b> will hold a hearing into the safety of <b>avandia</b> on <b>july 30</b> .
no constraint	the drug administration will hold hearings on the safety of <b>wendiya</b> on <b>july 30</b> .
DBA	<b>fda</b> <b>avandia</b> will hold a hearing on the safety of <b>man dim</b> on <b>july 30</b> .
<i>this work</i>	the <b>fda</b> will hold hearings on the safety of <b>avandia</b> on <b>july 30</b> .

Table 3: Example translations of two lexically constrained decoding algorithms. We use DBA to denote the dynamic beam allocation method proposed by (Post and Vilar, 2018). Lexical constraints are highlighted in different colors. We find that although DBA is able to include all specified target phrases in the translations, it tends to either translate the specified source phrases repeatedly (highlighted in bold) or omitting source phrases (highlighted in italic).

#### 4.4 Results on Structurally Constrained Decoding

We evaluated our structurally constrained decoding algorithm on a webpage translation task.

##### Dataset

As labeled data is limited in quantity for webpage translation, we still use the unstructured Chinese-English dataset that contains 1.25M sentence pairs as the training set. We built a test set for Chinese-English structured text translation based on the webpages of Wikipedia. The test set contains 200 sentences with HTML tags retained. On average, each sentence in the test set has 36.9 words and 2.6 pairs of HTML tags.

##### Baselines

We compared our approach with the following five baselines:<sup>4</sup>

1. REMOVE: Remove all HTML tags before decoding

<sup>4</sup>We did not compare with the methods that train SMT models on parallel corpora for webpage translation because these datasets are not publicly available.

and do not insert tags back to translations after decoding.

2. SPLIT (Al-Anzi et al., 1997): Split the input by tags before decoding, translate textual parts independently, and concatenate translations monotonically after decoding.
3. MATCH (Zantout and Guessoum, 2001): Remove all HTML tags before decoding and insert tags back to translations by matching.
4. ALIGN (Joanis et al., 2013): Remove all HTML tags before decoding and insert tags back to translations using word alignments generated by GIZA++.
5. GOOGLE: The Google Translate online system.<sup>5</sup>

All the baselines except GOOGLE share the same Transformer model with our approach.

##### Results on Webpage Translation

Table 4 shows the comparison of imposing structural constraints with existing methods on the test set. As REMOVE ignores all HTML tags, it is not capable of imposing

<sup>5</sup><https://translate.google.com/>

Method	w/o tag	w/ tag	in tag
REMOVE	33.29	22.08	-
SPLIT	20.39	24.54	37.66
MATCH	33.29	33.32	37.74
ALIGN	33.29	36.71	30.98
GOOGLE	31.30	35.36	34.41
Ours	<b>33.42</b>	<b>37.52</b>	<b>38.41</b>

Table 4: Results on the webpage translation task. “w/o tag” denotes the BLEU score without considering HTML tags, “w/ tag” denotes the BLEU score considering HTML tags, and “in tag” denotes the BLEU score considering only the text enclosed by tags. Note that REMOVE does not have the “in tag” BLEU score because all tags are removed.

structural constraints. SPLIT ensures that the structural constraints can be imposed correctly because the sentence segments between HTML tags are translated independently, but the translation quality drops dramatically. MATCH and ALIGN take the full advantage of standard NMT to translate the textual parts but often fail to recover HTML tags correctly after decoding. According to the translations, it seems that GOOGLE uses a strategy similar to SPLIT but achieves much higher BLEU scores because it used much larger training data than all other methods. Our approach achieves the best performance in terms of all evaluation metrics by fully preserving the structural constraints without losing translation quality.

## 5 Conclusion

We have presented a latent variable model for neural machine translation that treats phrase alignment as an unobserved latent variable. The introduction of phrase alignment makes it possible to decompose the translation process of arbitrary NMT models into interpretable steps. In addition, it is also convenient to use our approach to impose lexical and structural constraints thanks to the availability of phrase alignment. Experiments show that the proposed method achieves significant better performance on both lexically and structurally constrained translation tasks.

## References

- F. Al-Anzi, K. Al-Zame, M. Husain, and H. Al-Mutairi. 1997. Automatic english/arabic html home page translation tool. In *Proceedings of The First Workshop on Technologies for Arabizing the Internet*.
- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. In *Proceedings of ICLR 2015*.
- Rajen Chatterjee, Matteo Negri, Marco Turchi, Marcello Federico, Lucia Specia, and Frédéric Blain. 2017. Guiding neural machine translation decoding with external knowledge. In *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Machine Translation*.
- Shanbo Cheng, Shujian Huang, Huadong Chen, Xin-Yu Dai, and Jiajun Chen. 2016. Print: A pick-revise framework for interactive machine translation. In *Proceedings of NAACL 2016*.
- Leonard Dahlmann, Evgeny Mastusov, Pavel Petrushkov, and Shahram Khadivi. 2017. Neural machine translation leveraging phrase-based models in a hybrid search. In *Proceedings of ACL 2017*.
- Yanzhuo Ding, Yang Liu, Huanbo Luan, and Maosong Sun. 2017. Visualizing and understanding neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of ACL 2017*.
- Jinhua Du, Johann Roturier, and Andy Way. 2010. Tmx markup: a challenge when adapting smt to the localisation environment. *European Association for Machine Translation*.
- Eva Hasler, Adrià De Gispert, Gonzalo Iglesias, and Bill Byrne. 2018. Neural machine translation decoding with terminology constraints. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2018*.
- Chris Hokamp and Qun Liu. 2017. Lexically constrained decoding for sequence generation using grid beam search. In *Proceedings of ACL 2017*.
- Tomáš Hufík and Achim Ruopp. 2011. The integration of moses into localization industry. In *Proceedings of EAMT 2011*.

- Eric Joanis, Darlene Stewart, Samuel Larkin, and Roland Kuhn. 2013. Transferring markup tags in statistical machine translation: A two-stream approach. *Machine Translation Summit XIV*.
- Huda Khayrallah, Gaurav Kumar, Kevin Duh, Matt Post, and Philipp Koehn. 2017. Neural lattice search for domain adaptation in machine translation. In *Proceedings of IJCNLP 2017*.
- Diederik Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of ICLR 2015*.
- Philipp Koehn and Rebecca Knowles. 2017. Six challenges for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Neural Machine Translation*.
- Philipp Koehn, Franz J. Och, and Daniel Marcu. 2003. Statistical phrase-based translation. In *Proceedings of NAACL 2003*.
- Xintong Li, Guanlin Li, Lemaoy Liu, Max Meng, and Shuming Shi. 2019. On the word alignment from neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of ACL 2019*.
- Minh-Thang Luong, Ilya Sutskever, Quoc V. Le, Oriol Vinyals, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2015. Addressing the rare word problem in neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of ACL 2015*.
- Franz J. Och and Hermann Ney. 2003. A systematic comparison of various statistical alignment models. *Computational Linguistics*.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: A method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of ACL 2002*.
- Matt Post and David Vilar. 2018. Fast lexically constrained decoding with dynamic beam allocation for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of NAACL 2018*.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units. In *Proceedings of ACL 2016*.
- Felix Stahlberg, Eva Hasler, Aurelien Waite, and Bill Byrne. 2016. Syntactically guided neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of ACL 2016*.
- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V. Le. 2014. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. In *Proceedings of NIPS 2014*.
- Arda Tezcan and Vincent Vandeghinste. 2011. Smt-cat integration in a technical domain: Handling xml markup using pre & post-processing methods. In *Proceedings of EAMT 2011*.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of NIPS 2017*.
- Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V. Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, Jeff Klingner, Apurva Shah, Melvin Johnson, Xiaobing Liu, Lukasz Kaiser, Stephan Gouws, Yoshikiyo Kato, Taku Kudo, Hideto Kazawa, Keith Stevens, George Kurian, Nishant Patil, Wei Wang, Cliff Young, Jason Smith, Jason Riesa, Alex Rudnick, Oriol Vinyals, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2016. Google’s neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. arXiv:1609.08144v2.
- Rached N. Zantout and Ahmed Guessoum. 2001. An automatic english-arabic html page translation system. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*.