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Abstract

With numerous new methods proposed recently, the evaluation of Bilingual Lexicon Induction has been quite hazardous and inconsistent across works. Some studies proposed some guidance to sanitize this; yet, they are not necessarily followed by practitioners. In this study, we try to gather these different recommendations and add our owns, with the aim to propose an unified evaluation protocol. We further show that the easiness of a benchmark while being correlated to the proximity of the language pairs being considered, is even more conditioned on the graphical similarities within the test word pairs.

1. Introduction

Bilingual lexicon induction (BLI) is a long studied task (Rapp, 1995, Fung, 1998) that received a lot of attention recently (Gouws and Søgaard, 2015; Artetxe et al., 2016; Ruder et al., 2019; Hakimi Parizi and Cook, 2020). Thanks to the push of deep learning and so-called word-embedding models such as word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013a), many new approaches vivified this task.

Many methods have emerged with the goal of computing accurate representations for cross-lingual word embeddings (CLWE). Mikolov et al. (2013b) used a linear transformation to project the source language into the target one, an approach known as mapping. In line, Faruqui and Dyer (2014) project the source and target embeddings in a new shared vector space. Artetxe et al. (2016) proposed several constraints (orthogonality, normalization, whitening etc.) to improve the quality of mapping.

More recently, unsupervised mapping methods (Conneau et al., 2017; Artetxe et al., 2018b) have been proposed which are nowadays starting to compete with supervised one. However, as noted in Artetxe et al. (2020), unsupervised methods, although interesting from a research point of view is not a realistic setup, as it is highly unlikely to have enough data to train CLWE without the existence of a seed lexicon.

A recent trend in BLI, known as joint-training consists in training the source and target word embeddings at the same time. Gouws and Søgaard (2015) proposed to concatenate the source and target corpora into which they randomly selected words (source or target) that they translated, thus producing a mixed corpus used to train a single embedding space. Following this, Duong et al. (2016) used a classic CBOW (Mikolov et al., 2013a) architecture and while training select the most appropriate translation of the context word based on a seed lexicon. Also Hakimi Parizi and Cook (2020) improved this by using the fastText model (Bojanowski et al., 2016). Finally, Wang et al., 2020 mixed joint-trained embeddings with a mapping method.

While people have been working on the BLI task for many years, and even more so recently, the evaluation of BLI has been somehow surprisingly overlooked. (Conneau et al., 2017) created (making use of an internal translation tool) the MUSE dataset: over a hundred automatically collected bilingual lexicons of up to 100k pairs of words. This dataset rapidly became the defacto benchmark for BLI.

While MUSE is an invaluable resource per see, a number of concerns about it has surfaced. For instance, Czarowska et al. (2019) observed that MUSE mainly gathers high frequency words, while Kementchedjhieva et al. (2019) indicate that about a quarter of the content of the lexicons consists of proper nouns, often perfectly identical graphically. Arguably, translating such entities is not of the utmost practical interest and focusing on less frequent words, for which translation are likely less listed in bilingual lexicons, is of more practical value.

In this paper, we review (Section 2) the different concerns already made about the evaluation in BLI (regarding the process itself or the data used) to which we add our own observations. We describe in Section 3 the data and the BLI systems we use to illustrate the concerns from Section 2. We then present in Section 4 the results of the different experiments made and analyze them. We finally conclude in Section 5.

2. Evaluation in BLI

The MUSE dataset is a collection of multiple bilingual lexicons in different languages: German, English, Spanish, French, Italian, and Portuguese languages all paired to each others. Lexicons from 39 other languages are also paired with English, in both directions. 108 language pairs are available in total, all with train and test sets already prepared.

2.1. Part-of-Speech (PoS) and Proper Nouns

Kementchedjhieva et al. (2019) conducted a study of the composition of MUSE. They manually annotated the English to/from German, Danish, Bulgarian, Arabic and Hindi lexicons. We report in Table 1 the detail
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of their annotations and the comparison made with the English Web Treebank (EWT) which contains gold-standard PoS tags.

|        | Noun | PNoun | Verb | Adj/Adv |
|--------|------|-------|------|---------|
| MUSE   | 49.6 | 24.9  | 12.5 | 13.0    |
| EWT    | 35.6 | 15.1  | 23.3 | 25.9    |

Table 1: English PoS percentage of 4 categories for the MUSE dataset in comparison with the EWT. After Kementchedjhieva et al. (2019).

This table indicates that the proportion of these four categories in EWT — a representative set of sentences — is not respected in MUSE; the main problem being the high proportion of proper nouns. Moreover, Kementchedjhieva et al. (2019) note that proper nouns can reference totally different entities (for example first names or surnames) making it hard to establish a real sense (Pierini, 2008) and thus, questioning the pertinence of their presence in a BLI test set. In order to correct this issue, Kementchedjhieva et al. (2019) suggest as a first step to get rid of these pairs of words to use gazetteers to filter them out.

We also point in the next section that pairs of proper nouns are made of a lot of identical words and thus propose a simple solution to correct this.

2.2. Graphical Similarities of Word Pairs

We first focus on graphically identical word pairs. We suggest that these pair of words, present in high quantity in the MUSE dataset, are for the most part not of great interest, if not incorrect (alignbars or wehrmacht as the source and target word in the French-Spanish lexicon), and propose a simple solution to solve this. We then extend on the graphically close word pairs.

2.2.1. Identical word pairs

We report in Table 2 the percentage of identical word pairs of MUSE lexicons involving the German, English, Spanish, French, Italian, and Portuguese languages. We also add some languages linked only with English such as Czech, Norwegian and Russian.

Among the different bilingual lexicons we consider, many have over 30% of identical word pairs. In particular, German-French and German-Italian with over 49%, which is clearly worrisome. However, we note that with lexicons involving English, we have the lowest percentage, suggesting either a better control has been made on the English lexicons or the greater quality/quantity of the English corpora used to generate the dataset allowed a better quality in the automatically generated lexicons. Despite this, we still find some graphically identical word pairs in the English-Russian lexicon whereas the two languages have a different writing system (for instance, motors or teen).

Table 2: Percentage of pairs of graphically identical words in selected MUSE lexicons.

|        | de | en | cs | fr | it | pt | avg |
|--------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| en     | 16.0 | -  | 16.5 | 21.0 | 21.1 | 18.4 | 18.6 |
| cs     | 20.3 | 18.4 | -  | 30.3 | 31.3 | 47.9 | 29.6 |
| fr     | 41.8 | 27.5 | 30.7 | -  | 29.2 | 24.8 | 30.8 |
| it     | 45.8 | 24.1 | 32.1 | 30.8 | -  | 38.0 | 34.2 |
| pt     | 40.9 | 21.6 | 47.5 | 27.4 | 41.2 | -  | 35.7 |
| avg    | 33.0 | 22.0 | 31.2 | 31.7 | 34.5 | 35.0 | 31.3 |

Table 3: Sample of graphically identical word pairs in the German-French and French-Spanish lexicons and their manual classification.

The FN and NE categories can be seen as sub-parts of the PNoun PoS tag, however, we decided to separate them because of what they really represent. As exposed earlier, FN (such as Federico or Bryan) do not represent much interest in a BLI task because they do not convey any real sense. However, for the NE part, if obtaining the equivalent in another language (we can not say translation here) for a named entity can be of interest in some scenario, it seems more suited to a bilingual version of a Named-Entity Recognition task than to BLI. We add that a major part of this category is made of cities or regions from Germany (Gelsenkirchen), France (Orléans) or other countries (Lugano, Nebraska). The pairs of words we classified as Doubtful are mostly made of words from other languages (for instance freedom, or musica) but also acronyms such as mva (a Belgium political party), and thus are arguably of no compelling interest for evaluating BLI. Finally, we note some pair of words made of real perfect cognates (for instance terminal is present in
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both the German-French and French-Spanish lexicons) but they only represent 5% of identical word pairs we sampled.

Thanks to the available proper nouns lists created by (Kementchedjhieva et al., 2019) on three language pairs with identical writing system (English to and from Danish, German and Spanish), we measure that 86% of the proper noun pairs are made of identical words (Tennessee or Georges).

Thus, we argue that a major part of graphically identical words are mainly of no interest in a BLI evaluating setting. Since we measured that only 5% of identical word pairs present a real interest, we suggest to getting rid of them while evaluating BLI, which will incidentally correct the problem of the proportion of proper nouns we discussed in Section 2.1.

2.2.2. Graphically close word pairs

We now take a look at graphically close pairs. After the removal of the identical word pairs, there is still an average of 40.1% word pairs with a Levenshtein distance of at most $k$. If we can logically note the proportion being higher between romance language (Portuguese-Spanish: 69.8% or Italian-French: 57.2%), it is surprising to see pairs such as Italian-English (46.5%) or French-English (44.4%) sharing that much similarities in their vocabulary, despite French and Italian being Romance languages while English is a Germanic one.

As the lexicons are made of a lot of graphically close words, we suggest, in addition to the evaluation on the lexicons without identical pairs, to split the lexicons in two sublists using the Levenshtein distance. We show later in Section 3 that the graphic proximity of the pair of words is a major factor in the success of the systems.

2.3. The Morph Dataset

Czarnowska et al. (2019) points three main problems with the existing datasets and MUSE: the lack of diversity in the frequency of the words, the fact that a word and its inflections can appear in both the train and test set (semantic leakage), and finally the lack of morphological diversity in most of the existing datasets. With the objectives of solving those problems, Czarnowska et al. (2019) introduce a new dataset to evaluate BLI, containing morphologically complete lexicons for 5 Slavic (Polish, Czech, Russian, Slovak, and Ukrainian) and 5 Romance (French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, and Catalan) languages. The lexicons are in every directions for both Slavic and Romance separately (meaning there is no dictionary from a Romance language to a Slavic and vice versa). We refer to them as Morph in the following.

Frequency Range: historically, BLI has mostly been focused on high frequency words. For instance, Mikolov et al. (2013b) used the 6k most frequent words to construct their training and test lexicons. Similarly, Czarnowska et al. (2019) reports that the pairs of words in the test lexicon of the MUSE dataset are all coming from the 10k most frequent source words. As Jakubina and Langlais (2017) empirically showed, it is far more difficult to identify translations of less frequent words, while we argue is a more sensible task (translations of common words are likely already listed in existing dictionaries). The Morph dataset is far more diverse on the frequency of its word pairs, containing, for the French-Spanish pair, 1 163 pairs of words with a source word from the top 10k of the vocabulary, but also (for instance) 1 126 pairs in the 500 – 600k range.

Semantic Leakage: Czarnowska et al. (2019) indicate that MUSE suffers of semantic leakage, meaning it is common for a word to appear in the training part of the lexicon as well as in the test part with a different inflection. In the Morph dataset the separation is done cleanly between the training and the testing part of the lexicons, because it is done on the lemmata, preventing the possibility of having two different inflections of a same word in the two lexicons.

Morphological Diversity: finally, the authors indicate that most words in MUSE has only one inflection form, while their dictionary is looking to have the best possible coverage for each lemmata. For instance, in the French-Spanish lexicon, the French verb injecter have 46 different inflections (from the first-person present tense injecte to the very seldom simple past form injecté).

The Morph lexicons present many interesting characteristics, however we point some problems. First, they do not come usable as is: if the presence of multiple inflections for each lemmata is an interesting feature, we think that being able to find them all, and particularly when there is that many (often out of use), is not the first objective of BLI. Thus, we recommend the usage of lemmata only.

In a similar vein, the high quantity of proposed translation lemmata per source lemmata is not really suited to a BLI task. For instance, the verb abandonner in French has 21 different candidates lemmata in Italian (abortire, allentare, arrendere, bandire, cedere, concedere, defezionare, demordere, desistere, disertare, fermare, interrompere, liberare, mollare, piantare, recedere, rinunciare, rinunciare, sfollare, sgomberare, sgombrare), and we think that finding 21 different translations for a single word is not what BLI is about.

About semantic leakage, we also point that, as the author indicate, a human translator is able to find more complex forms such as a first-person plural future form hablarános thanks to their knowledge of the canonical form hablar. Thus, we argue that semantic leakage should not be seen as problematic in BLI as it is very similar to this case.

While Morph presents less languages pairs than MUSE, we strongly recommend its use whenever possible, as we do next. Last, we note that in their work, Czarnowska et al. (2019) only evaluate Morph using
P@1, while we show in the next section that MAP would be much more relevant.

2.4. Mean Average Precision (MAP) vs Precision at rank k (P@k)

While most works in BLI use P@k (typically with \( k \in \{1, 5, 10\} \)) to evaluate the quality of their method, Glavaš et al. (2019) advocate for the use of MAP instead. They point that MAP is more informative, because in P@k, a model that ranks a correct translation at \( k + 1 \) is equally penalised as the model that ranks it at rank \( k + 1000 \), while MAP gives a reward based on the rank.

In addition to that, they point that using MAP with only one correct translation per query is equivalent to the Mean Reciprocal Rank. However, we stress that MUSE proposes multiple valid translations per source word and therefore, their remark does not apply here. To show this, we report the ratio of target word per source word in Table 3. We indicate this for the lexicons from and to English, but also for the lexicons that do not include English in addition to the average per lexicon.

|            | en-x | x-en | incl. en | no en | avg |
|------------|------|------|----------|-------|-----|
| ratio      | 1.73 | 1.61 | 1.67     | 1.09  | 1.58|

Table 4: Ratio of target words per source word in the MUSE dataset.

When using P@k, the evaluation system is just looking for the best ranked correct translation, leaving aside all the other ones. For instance, for a source word with 2 proposed translations, a system ranking one translation at top 1 and the other at top 2 \( \{1, 2\} \) will be rewarded the same as a system ranking \( \{1, 1000\} \) in P@1, while it will only be fully rewarded on the first case using MAP. Thereby, while using P@k, the presence of multiple translations in the lexicons does not become the assurance of a system of quality that takes into account polysemy as it will only look for one translation, which is obviously easier than finding them all.

We elaborate more on this problem by indicating that the ignored words in the case of multiple correct translations amplifies the problem of low frequency words or graphically distant pairs, as most systems are likely to find the higher frequency or the graphically closer translations first\(^4\).

Thus, we strongly agree with Glavaš et al. (2019), and highly recommend the usage of MAP over P@k when evaluating BLI.

3. Protocol

In this section we briefly present the data and the two BLI methods we use to support the points discussed in Section 2.

3.1. Data

We use five different Wikipedia corpora as our training data: English, French, Italian, Russian and Spanish. We extracted the corpora using the WikiExtractor tool (Attardi, 2015).

We used the MUSE training part of the dataset when a training lexicon was needed.

3.2. BLI Methods

We compare two representative BLI methods that we now describe.

**Mapping method**  Mapping (or alignment) methods consist in two steps. First, an embedding space is learnt separately for the source and target languages. We use fastText to train embeddings on the Wikipedia corpora. Second, a projection matrix is learned to map one language embedding space into the second one, allowing the comparison between languages. We use the VecMap tool (Artetxe et al., 2018a) as our mapping method.

**Joint-training method**  Joint-training methods consist in the following steps. First, a bilingual corpus is build by concatenating both the source and target languages in order to create a shared vocabulary across languages. Then, the training of the embeddings for the two languages at the same time on the concatenated bilingual corpus, followed by the separation of embeddings into their original vocabulary. We use the joint_align framework (Wang et al., 2020) to do so. It also uses fastText to train the embeddings. Wang et al. (2020) improved joint-training by adding a vocabulary reallocation phase such that, if an anchor word (i.e. a word graphically identical that appear in both part of the corpus and thus is only represented by one vector in the shared vocabulary) appears mostly in a language it is removed from the shared vocabulary in order to obtain a more precise representation during the mapping phase. For the alignment method, they use RCSLS (Joulin et al., 2018), which we follow.

3.3. Ranking of Candidates

Once the embeddings have been trained and projected in a shared space and in order to rank the candidates, we measure the similarity between every source word of the test dictionary with every target vocabulary word. We use the $\text{CSLS}$ (Conneau et al., 2017), an adaptation of the cosine similarity which reduces hubness\(^5\) to order them:

$$\text{CSLS}(w_s, w_t) = 2 \cos(w_s, w_t) - \text{knn}(w_s) - \text{knn}(w_t)$$

(1)

where \( w_s \) and \( w_t \) are the source and target word vectors, and \( \text{knn}(x) \) is a function that measures the mean cosine similarity between \( x \) and its \( k \) nearest neighbors.

\(^4\)We back this claim with experiments in Section 4

\(^5\)Words that tend to be the translation of many others.
4. Experiments

From the Morph dataset, we considered the Italian-Spanish, Spanish-French, and French-Italian lexicons which have respectively 1761, 1773 and 2273 source words. We selected the same language pairs from the MUSE dataset, as well as the English-Russian lexicon where the two languages have a different writing system, and finally the English-French pair. Each MUSE lexicon gathers around 1500 source words.

4.1. P@1 vs MAP

We report in Table 5 the results obtained when using P@1 or MAP, the last row of the table indicates the ratio of target words per source word.

In Section 2.2 we reported that Glavaš et al. (2019) advocate for MAP because it is more informative, essentially because it takes into account all the proposed valid translations, and not just the highest ranked. This table confirms this claim and shows that the results in P@1 are higher than MAP when there is multiple possible translations, while MAP becomes higher whenever the target-to-source ratio tends to 1.

One notable exception however is for English-Russian, where the MAP is above P@1 despite a ratio of 1.63. This can be explained by a P@5 of 72.0 (+27 points from P@1), meaning that the system find a good part of the correct translations between the second and fifth rank, which is rewarded by the MAP. While for other languages, the P@5 is usually better than P@1 by at most 10 points.

And thus, it shows that having multiple possible translations artificially improves the P@k whereas intuitively, the introduction of polysemy should make it harder to find all the translations. Following this, we report only MAP results next.

4.2. Graphically Close Words

In Table 6 we report the results on different lexicons. In the first sublists (not id.), we remove all the graphically identical word pairs, as we suggested in Section 2.2. Then, we split these sublists based on Levenshtein distance: Far contains pairs of words with a distance over 3, while the sublist Close gathers close word pairs (distance less than 4).

This table clearly indicates that for both methods, it is much easier to conduct BLI on graphically close word pairs. If we let aside the English-Russian lexicon, the difference between the Far and Close sublists goes from 8 points (es-fr with joint-training on MUSE) up to 50 points (it-es with mapping on Morph).

Since popular reference lexicons such as MUSE are built largely from similar word pairs, performances reported on this dataset are in a way optimistic, and reporting results on both Far and Close lists as we did here is we believe a good practice.

4.3. Analysis

We show in Table 6 some output of the VecMap system for three hand-picked source words, along their rank in the list of proposed candidates, as well as their number of occurrences in the target corpus. This table supports the idea that in the case of multiple possible translations, the first target word found will likely be the graphically close or very frequent, and thus with P@1, the system will not be evaluated much on its ability to handle rare or graphically distant words.

On the English-French lexicon, 802 source words have at least 2 candidate translations. For 69% of the source word, the best ranked candidates was the most frequent one, for 74% it was the graphically closest with the source word and it was the most frequent and graphically closest one for 51% of the source words.

| Source word | Target word | Rank | #occ. |
|-------------|-------------|------|-------|
| customs     | coutumes    | 1    | 7221  |
|             | douanes     | 2    | 4165  |
| arch        | arche       | 1    | 7407  |
|             | voûte       | 3    | 541   |
| reveal      | révéler     | 1    | 7577  |
|             | dévoiler    | 5    | 1858  |

Figure 1 shows the correlation between the MAP and the average Levenshtein distance between word pairs of the test lexicon. It shows that the difficulty of the task does not only correlate with the diversity of the pair of languages considered, but also from the graphical proximity of word pairs. English-Russian are two languages that present many more differences than

---

6Those languages have different writing systems and thus variations in the Levenshtein distance mainly come from the length of the words.
French-Italian, but as the Morph lexicons are made of very few graphically close word pairs (and thus have a high average of Levenshtein distance), the systems does not perform well in both case.

Table 7: MAP results when test lexicons are split based on the graphical proximity of their word pairs.

|            | MUSE | Morph |
|------------|------|-------|
|            | es-fr | fr-it | it-es | en-ru | en-fr | avg | es-fr | fr-it | it-es | avg |
| Mapping    |       |       |       |       |       |     |       |       |       |     |
| not id.    | 88.5  | 84.0  | 84.2  | 50.9  | 63.8  | 74.3 | 41.4  | 47.5  | 36.0  | 41.6 |
| Far        | 78.9  | 71.3  | 63.3  | 51.4  | 46.8  | 62.3 | 16.2  | 19.7  | 11.5  | 15.8 |
| Close      | 91.2  | 88.7  | 87.6  | 36.4  | 68.3  | 74.4 | 62.9  | 71.4  | 58.9  | 64.4 |
| Joint-Training |       |       |       |       |       |     |       |       |       |     |
| not id.    | 68.6  | 64.0  | 67.1  | 39.3  | 48.9  | 57.6 | 33.3  | 43.4  | 30.5  | 35.7 |
| Far        | 62.4  | 55.1  | 52.8  | 40.1  | 35.4  | 49.2 | 13.9  | 19.7  | 10.6  | 14.7 |
| Close      | 70.4  | 67.3  | 69.4  | 33.7  | 53.1  | 58.8 | 49.0  | 63.5  | 45.9  | 52.8 |

Figure 1: MAP versus Levenshtein distance of test word pairs.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we discuss different studies on BLI evaluation and add our own findings. We articulate a number of concerns that should guide BLI evaluation, leading us to formulate recommendations that are intended — we believe — to target what matters in practice: notably the ability to handle graphically distant pair of words. First, using MUSE as an evaluation dataset, we recommend the removal of graphically identical pair of words. As we have seen in Section 2, they represent a major part of the MUSE lexicons and are often not interesting or even incorrect word pairs. Second, and if the language pairs allow it, we recommend an evaluation on both MUSE and Morph. Then, and for both dataset, we recommend that the lexicons should be evaluated as a whole but also in two groups based on the Levenshtein distance. The results presented in Section 4 show that for both type of methods (mapping or joint-training), the systems perform way better on close pair of words.

Also, we endorse the usage of MAP over P@k, especially if multiple candidate translations per source words are available, as it will be way more representative of the capacity a system to handle polysemy.

Finally, we highly recommend a more thorough evaluation than just looking at the MAP alone, and selecting a few pair of words with different characteristics can give great insights on the reality of the quality of the system and what are its strengths and weaknesses.
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