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ABSTRACT

This paper provides an analysis of the impacts of machine translation and speech synthesis on speech-to-speech translation systems. The speech-to-speech translation system consists of three components: speech recognition, machine translation and speech synthesis. Recently, many techniques for integration of speech recognition and machine translation have been proposed. However, speech synthesis has not yet been considered. The quality of synthesized speech is important, since users will not understand what the system said if the quality of synthesized speech is bad. Therefore, in this paper, we focus on the machine translation and speech synthesis components, and report a subjective evaluation to analyze the impact of each component. The results of these analyses show that the machine translation component affects the performance of speech-to-speech translation greatly, and that fluent sentences lead to higher naturalness and lower word error rate of synthesized speech.

Index Terms— speech synthesis, machine translation, speech-to-speech translation, subjective evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION

In speech-to-speech translation (S2ST), the source language speech is translated into target language speech. A S2ST system can help to overcome the language barrier, and is essential for providing more natural interaction. A S2ST system consists of three components: speech recognition, machine translation and speech synthesis. In the simplest S2ST system, only the single-best output of one component is used as input to the next component. Therefore, errors of the previous component strongly affect the performance of the next component. Due to errors in speech recognition, the machine translation component cannot achieve the same level of translation performance as achieved for correct text input. To overcome this problem, many techniques for integration of speech recognition and machine translation have been proposed, such as [1, 2]. In these, the impact of speech recognition errors on machine translation is alleviated by using \( N \)-best list or word lattice output from the speech recognition component as input to the machine translation component. Consequently, these approaches can improve the performance of S2ST significantly. However, the speech synthesis component is not usually considered. The output speech for translated sentences is generated by the speech synthesis component. If the quality of synthesized speech is bad, users will not understand what the system said: the quality of synthesized speech is obviously important for S2ST and any integration method intended to improve the end-to-end performance of the system should take account of the speech synthesis component.

The EMIME project [3] is developing personalized S2ST, such that the a user’s speech input in one language is used to produce speech output in another language. Speech characteristics of the output speech are adapted to the input speech characteristics using cross-lingual speaker adaptation techniques [4]. While personalization is an important area of research, this paper focuses on the impact of the machine translation and speech synthesis components on end-to-end performance of an S2ST system. In order to understand the degree to which each component affects performance, we investigate integration methods. We first conducted a subjective evaluation divided into three sections: speech synthesis, machine translation, and speech-to-speech translation. Various translated sentences were evaluated by using \( N \)-best translated sentences output from the machine translation component. The individual impacts of the machine translation and the speech synthesis components are analyzed from the results of this subjective evaluation.

2. RELATED WORK

In the field of spoken dialog systems, the quality of synthesized speech is one of the most important features because users cannot understand what the system said if the quality of synthesized speech is low. Therefore, integration of natural language generation and speech synthesis has been proposed [5, 6, 7].

In [5], a method was proposed for integration of natural language generation and unit selection based speech synthesis which allows the choice of wording and prosody to be jointly determined by the language generation and speech synthesis components. A template-based language generation component passes a word network expressing the same content to the speech synthesis component, rather than a single word string. To perform the unit selection search on this word network input efficiently, weighted finite-state transducers (WFSTs) are employed. The weights of the WFST are determined by join costs, prosodic prediction costs, and so on. In an experiment, this system achieved higher quality speech output. However, this method cannot be used with most existing speech synthesis systems, because they do not accept word networks as input.

An alternative to the word network approach is to re-rank sentences from the \( N \)-best output of the natural language generation component [6]. \( N \)-best output can be used in conjunction with any speech synthesis system although the natural language generation component must be able to construct \( N \)-best sentences. In this method, a re-ranking model selects the sentences that are predicted to sound most natural when synthesized with the unit selection based speech synthesis component. The re-ranking model is trained from the subjective scores of the synthesized speech quality assigned in a preliminary evaluation and features from the natural language gener-
We support what you said about. We are in favor of what you said. We can support what you said. We support what you have said. We support what you said.

We are in favor of what you have said.

MT-Fluency

signed scores for "Adequacy" and "Fluency" of the typed-in sentence were measured their word error rate (WER). In section 2, speech-to-speech translation was evaluated. Evaluators listened to synthesized speech and assessed their word error rate (WER). In section 3, machine translation was evaluated. Evaluators didn’t listen to synthesized speech. They read translated sentences and assigned scores of “Adequacy” and “Fluency” for each sentence (MT-Adequacy and MT-Fluency).

TTS, S2ST-Adequacy, S2ST-Fluency, MT-Adequacy, and MT-Fluency were evaluated on five-point mean opinion score (MOS) scales. Evaluators assigned scores to 42 test sentences in each section. 150 people participated in the evaluation.

3.3. Impact of MT and WER on S2ST

First, we analyzed the impact of the translated sentences and the intelligibility of synthesized speech on S2ST. WER averaged across all test samples was 6.49%. The correlation coefficients between MT-Adequacy and S2ST-Adequacy and between MT-Fluency and S2ST-Fluency were strong (0.61 and 0.68, respectively).

The correlation coefficient between WER and S2ST-Adequacy was –0.21, and the correlation coefficient between WER and S2ST-Fluency was –0.20. These are only weak correlations. The impact of the translated sentences on S2ST is larger than the impact of the intelligibility of the synthesized speech, although this does affect the performance of S2ST.

3.4. Impact of MT on TTS and WER

Next, we analyzed the impact of the translated sentences on the naturalness and intelligibility of synthesized speech. Table 2 shows the correlation coefficients between TTS and MT scores, and the correlation coefficients between WER and MT scores. MT-Fluency has a stronger correlation with both TTS and WER than MT-Adequacy. That is, the naturalness and intelligibility of synthesized speech were more affected by the fluency of the translated sentences than by the context of them. Therefore, next we focused on the relationship between the fluency of the translation output and the synthesized speech.

3. SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION

3.1. Systems

In the subjective evaluation, a Finnish-to-English S2ST system was used. To focus on the impacts of machine translation and speech synthesis, the correct sentences were used as the input of the machine translation component instead of the speech recognition results.

The system developed in [9] was used as the machine translation component of our S2ST system. This system is \( \text{HFSST} \): a hierarchical phrase-based system implemented with weighted finite-state transducers [10]. 865,732 parallel sentences from the EuroParl corpus [11] were used as training data, and 3,000 parallel sentences from the same corpus were used as development data. When the system was evaluated on 3,000 sentences in [9], it obtained 28.9 on the BLEU-4 measure.

As the speech synthesis component, an HMM-based speech synthesis system (HTS) [12] was used. 8,129 sentences uttered by one male speaker were used for training acoustic models. Speech signals were sampled at a rate of 16 kHz and windowed by an \( F_0 \)-adaptive Gaussian window with a 5 ms shift. Feature vectors comprised 138-dimensions: 39-dimension STRAIGHT [13] mel-cepstral coefficients (plus the zero-th coefficient), log \( F_0 \), 5 band-filtered aperiodicity measures, and their dynamic and acceleration coefficients.

We used 5-state left-to-right context-dependent multi-stream MSD-HSMMs [14, 15]. Each state had a single Gaussian. Festival [16] was used for deriving full-context labels from the text; the labels include phoneme, part of speech (POS), intonational phrase boundaries, pitch accent, and boundary tones.

The test data comprised 100 sentences from EuroParl corpus not included in the machine translation training data. The machine translation component output the 20-best translations for each input sentence, resulting in 2,000 translated sentences. To these, we added reference translations to give a total of 2,100 sentences to use in the evaluation. Table 1 shows an example of top 5-best translated sentences.

3.2. Evaluation procedure

The evaluation comprised 3 sections: In section 1, speech synthesis was evaluated. Evaluators listened to synthesized speech and assigned scores for naturalness (TTS). We asked evaluators to assign a score without considering the correctness of grammar or content. In section 2, speech-to-speech translation was evaluated. Evaluators listened to synthesized speech, then typed the sentence; we measured their word error rate (WER). After this, evaluators assigned scores for “Adequacy” and “Fluency” of the typed-in sentence (S2ST-Adequacy and S2ST-Fluency). Here, “Adequacy” indicates how much of the information from the reference translation sentence was expressed in the sentence and “Fluency” indicates how fluent the sentence was [17]. These definitions were provided to the evaluators. “Adequacy” and “Fluency” measures do not need bilingual evaluators; they can be evaluated by monolingual target language listeners. These measures are widely used in machine translation evaluations, e.g., conducted by NIST and IWSLT.

In section 3, machine translation was evaluated. Evaluators didn’t listen to synthesized speech. They read translated sentences and assigned scores of “Adequacy” and “Fluency” for each sentence (MT-Adequacy and MT-Fluency).

TTS, S2ST-Adequacy, S2ST-Fluency, MT-Adequacy, and MT-Fluency were evaluated on five-point mean opinion score (MOS) scales. Evaluators assigned scores to 42 test sentences in each section. 150 people participated in the evaluation.

3.3. Impact of MT and WER on S2ST

First, we analyzed the impact of the translated sentences and the intelligibility of synthesized speech on S2ST. WER averaged across all test samples was 6.49%. The correlation coefficients between MT-Adequacy and S2ST-Adequacy and between MT-Fluency and S2ST-Fluency were strong (0.61 and 0.68, respectively).

The correlation coefficient between WER and S2ST-Adequacy was –0.21, and the correlation coefficient between WER and S2ST-Fluency was –0.20. These are only weak correlations. The impact of the translated sentences on S2ST is larger than the impact of the intelligibility of the synthesized speech, although this does affect the performance of S2ST.

3.4. Impact of MT on TTS and WER

Next, we analyzed the impact of the translated sentences on the naturalness and intelligibility of synthesized speech. Table 2 shows the correlation coefficients between TTS and MT scores, and the correlation coefficients between WER and MT scores. MT-Fluency has a stronger correlation with both TTS and WER than MT-Adequacy. That is, the naturalness and intelligibility of synthesized speech were more affected by the fluency of the translated sentences than by the context of them. Therefore, next we focused on the relationship between the fluency of the translation output and the synthesized speech.

<p>| Table 1. Example of N-best MT output texts. |
|---|---|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Output text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>We can support what you said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>We support what you have said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We support what you have said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>We are in favour of what you have said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We support what you said about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We are in favour of what you said.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 2. Correlation coefficients between TTS or WER and MT scores |
|---|---|
| TTS | MT-Adequacy | MT-Fluency |
| WER | -0.17 | -0.25 |
speech is improved as the translated sentences become more fluent, previously described. Therefore, the intelligibility of synthesized speech is better when the sentences were more fluent, as unusual words or phrases, in addition to the naturalness of synthesized speech, is predicted when the translated sentence does not include correct full-context labels due to the errors in syntactic analysis of disfluent and ungrammatical translated sentences. In addition, the psychological effect called "Llewelyn reaction" appears to affect the results. The "Llewelyn reaction" is that evaluators perceive lower speech quality when the sentences are less fluent or the content of the sentences is less natural, even if the actual quality of synthesized speech is the same. Therefore, we conclude that the speech synthesis component will tend to generate more natural speech as the translated sentences become more fluent.

Table 3 shows the correlation coefficient between MT-Fluency and word N-gram score. The word 5-gram gave the strongest correlation coefficient of 0.44. Although there were weak correlations between MT-Fluency and word N-gram score on raw data, it was difficult to find strong correlation coefficients. Therefore, MT-Fluency scores were divided into 200 bins according to the word 5-gram score and subsequently average MT-Fluency scores for each bin were computed. In Figure 3, the averaged MT-Fluency scores and word 5-gram scores are shown, and the regression line is illustrated by the red line. Now, the correlation coefficient is 0.87. This result indicates that the word 5-gram score is an appropriate feature for measuring the average perceived fluency of translated sentences.

3.5. Correlation between MT Fluency and N-gram scores

We have shown that the naturalness and intelligibility of the synthesized speech are strongly affected by the fluency of sentences. MT-Fluency and word N-gram score. The word N-gram models we used were created using the SRILM toolkit [18], from the same English sentences used for training the machine translation component. Kneser-Ney smoothing was employed.

3.6. Correlation between TTS and N-gram scores

Table 3 shows the correlation coefficient between MT-Fluency and word N-gram score. The word 5-gram gave the strongest correlation coefficient of 0.44. Although there were weak correlations between MT-Fluency and word N-gram score on raw data, it was difficult to find strong correlation coefficients. Therefore, MT-Fluency scores were divided into 200 bins according to the word 5-gram score and subsequently average MT-Fluency scores for each bin were computed. In Figure 3, the averaged MT-Fluency scores and word 5-gram scores are shown, and the regression line is illustrated by the red line. Now, the correlation coefficient is 0.87. This result indicates that the word 5-gram score is an appropriate feature for measuring the average perceived fluency of translated sentences.

3.6. Correlation between TTS and N-gram scores

P.563 is an objective measure for predicting the quality of natural speech in telecommunication applications. However, we found no correlation between TTS and P.563. So, we looked for correlations with other objective measures. It is well known that speech synthesis systems generally produce better quality speech when the input sentence is in-domain (i.e., similar to sentences found in the training data). Therefore, we computed the correlation coefficient between TTS and phoneme N-gram score of the sentence being synthesized; the N-gram score is a measure of the coverage provided by
Table 4. Table of correlation coefficients between TTS and phoneme N-gram score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-gram</th>
<th>2-gram</th>
<th>3-gram</th>
<th>4-gram</th>
<th>5-gram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Correlation between TTS and phoneme 4-gram score

the training data for that particular sentence. The phoneme N-gram model was estimated from the English sentences used for training the speech synthesizer. Table 4 shows the correlation coefficients of TTS and phoneme N-gram scores; the 4-gram model gave the strongest correlation coefficient of 0.20. Figure 4 shows the bin-averaged TTS scores and phoneme 4-gram scores. Now, the correlation coefficient is 0.81. Although the correlation between TTS and phoneme N-gram score was weak on the raw data, there is a strong correlation between bin-averaged TTS and phoneme N-gram score. This result suggests that the phoneme 4-gram score is a good predictor of the expected naturalness of synthesized speech.

The ability to predict synthetic speech naturalness before generating the speech could be used in other applications, such as sentence selection (as in this work, or in natural language generation with speech output), voice selection before generating speech. We hope to investigate this further in the future.

4. CONCLUSION

This paper has provided an analysis of the impacts of machine translation and speech synthesis on speech-to-speech translation. We have shown that the naturalness and intelligibility of the synthesized speech are strongly affected by the fluency of the translated sentences. The intelligibility of synthesized speech is improved as the translated sentence becomes more fluent. In addition, we found that long-span word N-gram scores correlate well with the perceived fluency of sentences and that phoneme N-gram scores correlate well with the perceived naturalness of synthesized speech. Our future work will include investigations into the integration of machine translation and speech synthesis using word N-gram and phoneme N-gram scores.
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