

# An Empirical Study of Domain Adaptation for Unsupervised Neural Machine Translation

Haipeng Sun<sup>1\*</sup>, Rui Wang<sup>2</sup>, Kehai Chen<sup>2</sup>,  
Masao Utiyama<sup>2</sup>, Eiichiro Sumita<sup>2</sup>, and Tiejun Zhao<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China

<sup>2</sup>National Institute of Information and Communications Technology (NICT), Kyoto, Japan

hpsun@hit-mtlab.net, tjzhao@hit.edu.cn

{wangrui, khchen, mutiyama, eiichiro.sumita}@nict.go.jp

## Abstract

Domain adaptation methods have been well-studied in supervised neural machine translation (NMT). However, domain adaptation methods for unsupervised neural machine translation (UNMT) have not been well-studied although UNMT has recently achieved remarkable results in some specific domains for several language pairs. Besides the inconsistent domains between training data and test data for supervised NMT, there sometimes exists an inconsistent domain between two monolingual training data for UNMT. In this work, we empirically show different scenarios for unsupervised domain-specific neural machine translation. Based on these scenarios, we propose several potential solutions to improve the performances of domain-specific UNMT systems.

## 1 Introduction

Recently, unsupervised neural machine translation (UNMT) has attracted great interest in the machine translation community (Artetxe et al., 2018; Lample et al., 2018a; Yang et al., 2018; Lample et al., 2018b). Typically, UNMT relies solely on monolingual corpora with similar domain rather than bilingual parallel data in supervised neural machine translation (NMT) to model translations between the source language and target language and has achieved remarkable results on several translation tasks (Lample and Conneau, 2019).

Domain adaptation methods have been well-studied in supervised NMT (Chu et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017a,b; van der Wees et al., 2017; Farajian et al., 2017; Chu and Wang, 2018; Wang et al., 2018; Zeng et al., 2018) while they have not been

well-studied in UNMT. For UNMT, addition to inconsistent domains between training data and test data for supervised NMT, there also exist other inconsistent domains between monolingual training data in two languages. Actually, it is difficult for some language pairs to obtain enough source and target monolingual corpora from the same domain in the real-world scenario. In this paper, we empirically analyze several scenarios for UNMT with specific domain. Then we propose several potential solutions, including batch weighting and fine tuning methods, to improve the performance of UNMT in these scenarios.

## 2 Unsupervised Neural Machine Translation

There are three primary components of the state-of-the-art UNMT (Lample and Conneau, 2019): cross-lingual language model pre-training, denoising auto-encoder, and back-translation.

**Cross-lingual language model pre-training:** It aims at building a universal cross-lingual encoder that can encode two monolingual sentences into a shared embedding space. The pre-trained cross-lingual encoder is then used to initialize the UNMT model.

**Denoising auto-encoder:** In contrast with the normal auto-encoder, denoising auto-encoder (Vincent et al., 2010) could improve the model learning ability by introducing noise in the form of random token deleting and swapping in this input sentence. The denoising auto-encoder, which encodes a noisy version and reconstructing it with the decoder in the same language, acts as a language model during UNMT training.

**Back-translation:** It (Sennrich et al., 2016a) is adapted to train a translation system across different languages based on monolingual corpora.

\*Haipeng Sun was an internship research fellow at NICT when conducting this work.

| Scenarios                                  | Abbreviation | $L_1$ in-domain | $L_2$ in-domain | $L_1$ out-of-domain | $L_2$ out-of-domain |
|--|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Monolingual corpora from same domains      | <i>II</i>    | ✓               | ✓               | ×                   | ×                   |
|  | <i>OO</i>    | ×               | ×               | ✓                   | ✓                   |
|  | <i>IIOO</i>  | ✓               | ✓               | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Monolingual corpora from different domains | <i>IOO</i>   | ×               | ✓               | ✓                   | ✓                   |
|  | <i>IIO</i>   | ✓               | ✓               | ✓                   | ×                   |
|  | <i>IO</i>    | ×               | ✓               | ✓                   | ×                   |

Table 1: The statistics of monolingual training corpora for different scenarios. ✓ denotes having this monolingual corpus in one scenario; × denotes having no this monolingual corpus in one scenario.

The pseudo-parallel sentence pair produced by the model at the previous iteration would train the new translation model. The UNMT model would be improved through iterative back-translation.

### 3 Scenario

Generally, there are many scenarios of UNMT for domains of monolingual training corpora. Given two different languages  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ , we define two main scenarios: monolingual training corpora from the same domain, and monolingual training corpora from different domains, as shown in Table 1. Take monolingual corpora from different domains as an example, we further divide this scenario into three sub-scenarios: *IOO*, *IIO*, and *IO*, where “*I*” denotes the in-domain data for one language and “*O*” denotes the out-of-domain data for one language. Further, *IOO* denotes there are resource-rich out-of-domain monolingual corpora for both languages and resource-poor in-domain monolingual corpora for language  $L_2$  in this scenario.

## 4 Methods

### 4.1 Batch Weighting

Actually, the size of the out-of-domain corpora is often much larger than those of the in-domain corpora. Wang et al. (2017b; 2018) proposed a batch weighting method in which the weight of in-domain sentences was adjusted to increase the amount of in-domain sentences in every training batch. Their method improved the performance of in-domain NMT; however, it is difficult to be directly transferred to the UNMT training. Regardless of training cross-lingual language model or UNMT model, the model causes over-fitting in one language which includes the smaller amount of in-domain monolingual corpus. In other words, the large-scale out-of-domain monolingual corpus for other language is

not fully utilized.

To address this issue, we propose a batch weighting method for UNMT domain adaptation. Specifically, we adjust the weight of out-of-domain sentences to increase the amount of out-of-domain sentences rather than to increase that of in-domain sentences (Wang et al., 2018) in every training batch. In our batch weighting method, the out-of-domain sentence ratio is estimated as

$$\mathcal{R}_{out} = \frac{\mathcal{N}_{out}}{\mathcal{N}_{out} + \mathcal{N}_{in}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_{in}$  is the number of mini-batches loaded from in-domain monolingual corpora in intervals of  $\mathcal{N}_{out}$  mini-batches loaded from out-of-domain monolingual corpora.

For the *IO* and *IIO* scenario, we applied the proposed batch weighting method to train cross-lingual language model and UNMT model in turn.

### 4.2 Fine Tuning

Fine tuning (Luong and Manning, 2015; Sennrich et al., 2016a; Freitag and Al-Onaizan, 2016; Servan et al., 2016; Chu et al., 2017) is a conventional method for domain adaptation of supervised NMT. That is, an out-of-domain model is further trained on in-domain corpora. In this section, we applied the fine tuning method to UNMT models under the *IOO*, *IIOO*, and *IIO* scenarios, thus exploring the solution of domain adaptation.

For the *IIO* and *IIOO* scenario, we first train cross-lingual language models on resource-rich out-of-domain monolingual corpora for both languages to initialize the encoder and decoder of a UNMT model. We then train the UNMT model on the same corpora for both languages until convergence. Finally, UNMT models are gained by applying fine tuning method to the following two scenarios:

- UNMT model under the *IOO*: we further fine tune parameters of the UNMT model on the resource-poor in-domain monolingual corpora for language  $L_2$ .
- UNMT model under the *IIOO*: we further fine tune parameters of the UNMT on the resource-poor in-domain monolingual corpora for both languages.

In addition, for the *IIO* scenario, we first train cross-lingual language models and UNMT model with batch weighting method which is described in Section 4.1. Then, the UNMT was further fine-tuned on the resource-poor in-domain monolingual corpora for both languages.

| Scenarios   | Batch weighting | Fine tuning |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| <i>IIOO</i> | ×               | ✓           |
| <i>IOO</i>  | ×               | ✓           |
| <i>IIO</i>  | ✓               | ✓           |
| <i>IO</i>   | ✓               | ×           |

Table 2: The suitability of the proposed methods for different scenarios. ✓ denotes that the method is used in this scenario; × denotes that the method is not used in this scenario.

Overall, batch weighting method is used in the case that there are no out-of-domain monolingual corpora for both languages; fine tuning method is suitable to the case that there are in-domain and out-of-domain monolingual corpora for one language, as shown in Table 2. Note that scenario *II* and *OO* were only as the baselines to evaluate other four scenarios.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Datasets and settings

We considered two language pairs to do simulated experiments on the French(Fr) $\leftrightarrow$ English(En) and German(De) $\leftrightarrow$ En translation tasks. For out-of-domain corpora, we used 50 million sentences from WMT monolingual News Crawl datasets for each language. For in-domain corpora, we used 200 thousand sentences from the IWSLT TED-talk based shuffled training corpora for each language. To make our experiments comparable with previous work (Wang et al., 2018), we reported results on IWSLT test2010 and test2011 for Fr $\leftrightarrow$ En and IWSLT test2012 and test2013 for De $\leftrightarrow$ En. For preprocessing, we followed the same method of Lample et al. (2018b). That is, we used

a shared vocabulary for both languages with 60K subword tokens based on BPE (Sennrich et al., 2016b). We used the same vocabulary including in-domain and out-of-domain corpora for different scenarios. If there exists only one in-domain monolingual corpus in one scenario, we chose Fr/De in-domain monolingual corpus; if there exists only one out-of-domain monolingual corpus in one scenario, we chose En out-of-domain monolingual corpus for uniform comparison.

We used a transformer-based UNMT<sup>1</sup> and followed settings of Lample and Conneau (2019) for UNMT: 6 layers for the encoder and the decoder. The dimension of hidden layers was set to 1024. The Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2015) was used to optimize the model parameters. The initial learning rate was 0.0001, and  $\beta_1 = 0.9$ ,  $\beta_2 = 0.98$ . The cross-lingual language model was used to pre-train the encoder and the decoder of the whole UNMT model. We trained a specific cross-lingual language model for each scenario. We used the case-sensitive 4-gram BLEU computed by *multi-bleu.perl* script from Moses (Koehn et al., 2007) to evaluate the test sets. The baselines in different scenarios are the UNMT systems trained on the mixed monolingual corpora including in-domain and out-of-domain data in the corresponding scenarios.

### 5.2 Main Results

Table 3 shows the detailed BLEU scores of all UNMT systems on the De $\leftrightarrow$ En and Fr $\leftrightarrow$ En test sets. #1 and #2 are the BLEU scores of supervised NMT and #3-to-#12 are the BLEU scores of UNMT. Our observations are as follows:

1) The BLEU scores of baselines in the *IIOO*, *IOO*, *IIO*, and *IO* scenario were presented in the #5, #7, #9, and #11, respectively. The BLEU scores of UNMT systems after introducing our proposed methods in these scenarios were reported in the #6, #8, #10, and #12, respectively. The proposed methods are beneficial for improving the performance of UNMT in the defined four scenarios.

2) In the scenario where monolingual training corpora are from same domains, such as *IIOO*, fine tuning method could further improve UNMT performance.

3) In the scenario where monolingual training corpora are from different domains (unique

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/facebookresearch/XLM>

| Scenario               | Supervision | Method             | De-En    |          | En-De    |          | Fr-En    |          | En-Fr    |          | #  |
|------------------------|-------------|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----|
|                        |             |                    | test2012 | test2013 | test2012 | test2013 | test2010 | test2011 | test2010 | test2011 |    |
| <i>II</i>              | Yes         | Wang et al. (2018) | n/a      | n/a      | 23.07    | 25.40    | n/a      | n/a      | 32.11    | 35.22    | 1  |
|                        |             | Base               | 33.68    | 35.41    | 28.09    | 30.48    | 36.13    | 40.07    | 36.43    | 37.58    | 2  |
| <i>II</i><br><i>OO</i> | No          | Base               | 24.42    | 25.65    | 21.99    | 22.72    | 25.94    | 29.73    | 25.32    | 27.06    | 3  |
|                        |             | Base               | 21.21    | 21.66    | 10.25    | 9.90     | 24.28    | 28.77    | 23.08    | 26.08    | 4  |
| <i>IIOO</i>            | No          | Base               | 24.87    | 26.00    | 21.64    | 22.57    | 26.05    | 30.18    | 26.35    | 30.12    | 5  |
|                        |             | FT                 | 29.82    | 31.57    | 26.48    | 28.18    | 31.23    | 35.94    | 29.08    | 33.67    | 6  |
| <i>IOO</i>             | No          | Base               | 20.94    | 21.52    | 16.53    | 16.80    | 25.16    | 29.88    | 25.18    | 28.73    | 7  |
|                        |             | FT                 | 22.75    | 23.14    | 21.09    | 21.78    | 28.37    | 33.57    | 26.16    | 30.14    | 8  |
| <i>IIO</i>             | No          | Base               | 11.11    | 10.30    | 11.54    | 11.95    | 17.88    | 20.32    | 17.02    | 18.16    | 9  |
|                        |             | FT+BW              | 26.12    | 27.33    | 22.63    | 23.72    | 27.88    | 32.16    | 25.42    | 28.05    | 10 |
| <i>IO</i>              | No          | Base               | 10.79    | 10.77    | 11.44    | 11.82    | 18.00    | 20.91    | 16.19    | 16.84    | 11 |
|                        |             | BW                 | 17.78    | 18.00    | 16.01    | 16.60    | 22.53    | 25.29    | 20.04    | 22.12    | 12 |

Table 3: The BLEU scores in the different scenarios for En-De and En-Fr language pairs. Base denotes the baseline in the different scenarios; FT denotes fine tuning method; BW denotes batch weighting method. #1 and #2 are the results of supervised NMT; others are the results of UNMT.  $\mathcal{N}_{in} = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{out} = 30$  in batch weighting method.

scenario for UNMT domain adaptation), batch weighting method improved UNMT performance in the case that there are no out-of-domain monolingual corpora for both languages such as scenario *IIO* and *IO*. Fine tuning method is suitable to the case that there are in-domain and out-of-domain monolingual corpora for one language such as scenario *IIO* and *IOO*.

### 5.3 Batch Weighting Analysis

In Figure 1, we empirically investigated how the mini-batch size  $\mathcal{N}_{out}$  affects the UNMT performance on the De-En task in the *IO* scenario.  $\mathcal{N}_{in}$  was set to 1. The selection of  $\mathcal{N}_{out}$  influences the weight of out-of-domain sentences every batch across the entire UNMT training process. Larger values of  $\mathcal{N}_{out}$  enable more out-of-domain sentences utilized in the UNMT training. The smaller the value of  $\mathcal{N}_{out}$  is, the more important are in-domain sentences. As the Figure 1 shows,  $\mathcal{N}_{out}$  ranging from 10 to 100 all enhanced UNMT performance and a balanced  $\mathcal{N}_{out} = 30$  achieved the best performance.

### 5.4 Ablation Analysis

We performed an ablation analysis to understand the importance of our proposed methods in the *IIO* scenario in Table 4. +BW (Wang et al., 2018) ( $\mathcal{N}_{in} = 10$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{out} = 1$ ) achieved worse performance than the Base. This validates that the supervised domain adaptation method proposed by Wang et al. (2018) was not suitable for UNMT. We observed that both of +FT and +BW ( $\mathcal{N}_{in} = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{out} = 30$ ) outperformed the Base. In particular, the +FT+BW was further better than both +FT




Figure 1: Effect of mini-batch size  $\mathcal{N}_{out}$  for UNMT performance after introducing batch weighting method on the En  $\leftrightarrow$  De dataset in the *IO* scenario.

| Method                  | De-En    |          | En-De    |          |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                         | test2012 | test2013 | test2012 | test2013 |
| Base                    | 11.11    | 10.30    | 11.54    | 11.95    |
| +BW (Wang et al., 2018) | 8.15     | 7.05     | 9.28     | 9.70     |
| +BW (our)               | 17.78    | 18.00    | 16.01    | 16.60    |
| +FT                     | 19.78    | 20.70    | 17.24    | 18.02    |
| +FT+BW (our)            | 26.12    | 27.33    | 22.63    | 23.72    |

Table 4: Ablation analysis in *IIO* scenario on En-De language pairs. FT denotes fine tuning method; BW denotes batch weighting method.

and +BW. This means that the proposed batch weighting and fine tuning methods can improve the performance of UNMT in this *IIO* scenario, especially, both of them can complement each other to further improve translation performance.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we mainly raise the issue of UNMT domain adaptation since domain adaptation methods for UNMT have never been proposed. We empirically show different scenarios for unsuper-

vised domain-specific neural machine translation. Some scenarios are unique scenarios for UNMT domain adaptation. Then we propose several potential solutions including batch weighting and fine tuning to improve the performance of UNMT in these scenarios. In the future, we will try to investigate other unsupervised methods to further improve domain-specific UNMT performance.

## References

Mikel Artetxe, Gorka Labaka, Eneko Agirre, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2018. [Unsupervised neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Learning Representations*, Vancouver, Canada.

Boxing Chen, Colin Cherry, George F. Foster, and Samuel Larkin. 2017. [Cost weighting for neural machine translation domain adaptation](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Neural Machine Translation, NMT@ACL 2017, August 4, 2017*, pages 40–46, Vancouver, Canada.

Chenhui Chu, Raj Dabre, and Sadao Kurohashi. 2017. [An empirical comparison of domain adaptation methods for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 385–391, Vancouver, Canada.

Chenhui Chu and Rui Wang. 2018. [A survey of domain adaptation for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING 2018, August 20-26, 2018*, pages 1304–1319, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA.

M. Amin Farajian, Marco Turchi, Matteo Negri, and Marcello Federico. 2017. [Multi-domain neural machine translation through unsupervised adaptation](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Machine Translation, WMT 2017, September 7-8, 2017*, pages 127–137, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Markus Freitag and Yaser Al-Onaizan. 2016. [Fast domain adaptation for neural machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/1612.06897.

Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. [Adam: A method for stochastic optimization](#). In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Learning Representations*, San Diego, California.

Philipp Koehn, Hieu Hoang, Alexandra Birch, Chris Callison-Burch, Marcello Federico, Nicola Bertoldi, Brooke Cowan, Wade Shen, Christine Moran, Richard Zens, Chris Dyer, Ondrej Bojar, Alexandra Constantin, and Evan Herbst. 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, Prague, Czech Republic.

Guillaume Lample and Alexis Conneau. 2019. [Cross-lingual language model pretraining](#). *CoRR*, abs/1901.07291.

Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Ludovic Denoyer, and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2018a. [Unsupervised machine translation using monolingual corpora only](#). In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Learning Representations*, Vancouver, Canada.

Guillaume Lample, Myle Ott, Alexis Conneau, Ludovic Denoyer, and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2018b. [Phrase-based & neural unsupervised machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5039–5049, Brussels, Belgium.

Minh-Thang Luong and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. [Stanford neural machine translation systems for spoken language domain](#). In *International Workshop on Spoken Language Translation*, Da Nang, Vietnam.

Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016a. [Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 86–96, Berlin, Germany.

Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016b. [Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1715–1725, Berlin, Germany.

Christophe Servan, Josep Maria Crego, and Jean Senellart. 2016. [Domain specialization: a post-training domain adaptation for neural machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/1612.06141.

Pascal Vincent, Hugo Larochelle, Isabelle Lajoie, Yoshua Bengio, and Pierre-Antoine Manzagol. 2010. [Stacked denoising autoencoders: Learning useful representations in a noisy environment](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:3371–3408.

Rui Wang, Andrew Finch, Masao Utiyama, and Eiichiro Sumita. 2017a. [Sentence embedding for neural machine translation domain adaptation](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 560–566, Vancouver, Canada.

Rui Wang, Masao Utiyama, Andrew Finch, Lemao Liu, Kehai Chen, and Eiichiro Sumita. 2018. [Sentence selection and weighting for neural machine translation domain adaptation](#).

*IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 26(10):1727–1741.

- Rui Wang, Masao Utiyama, Lemao Liu, Kehai Chen, and Eiichiro Sumita. 2017b. [Instance weighting for neural machine translation domain adaptation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1482–1488, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Marlies van der Wees, Arianna Bisazza, and Christof Monz. 2017. [Dynamic data selection for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2017, September 9-11, 2017*, pages 1400–1410, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Zhen Yang, Wei Chen, Feng Wang, and Bo Xu. 2018. [Unsupervised neural machine translation with weight sharing](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 46–55, Melbourne, Australia.
- Jiali Zeng, Jinsong Su, Huating Wen, Yang Liu, Jun Xie, Yongjing Yin, and Jianqiang Zhao. 2018. [Multi-domain neural machine translation with word-level domain context discrimination](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, pages 447–457, Brussels, Belgium.