

Diacritics Restoration for Arabic Dialects

Salima Harrat, Mourad Abbas, Karima Meftouh, Kamel Smaïli

► **To cite this version:**

Salima Harrat, Mourad Abbas, Karima Meftouh, Kamel Smaïli. Diacritics Restoration for Arabic Dialects. INTERSPEECH 2013 - 14th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Aug 2013, Lyon, France. 2013. <hal-00925815>

HAL Id: hal-00925815

<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-00925815>

Submitted on 8 Jan 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Diacritics restoration for Arabic dialect texts

S. Harrat¹, M. Abbas², K. Meftouh³, K. Smaili⁴

¹ENS Bouzareah, Algiers, Algeria

²CRSTDLA, Algiers, Algeria

³Badji Mokhtar University-Annaba, Algeria

⁴Campus scientifique LORIA , Nancy, France

slmhrtr@gmail.com, m.abbas04@yahoo.fr, Karima.meftouh@univ-annaba.org, smaili@loria.fr

Abstract

In this paper we present a statistical approach for automatic diacritization of Algiers dialectal texts. This approach is based on statistical machine translation. We first investigate this approach on Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) texts using several data sources and extrapolated the results on available dialectal texts. For evaluation we used word and diacritization error rates and also precision and recall.

Index Terms: Machine translation system, Modern Standard Arabic, automatic diacritization, Algiers's dialect

1. Introduction

Vocalization, diacritization or diacritics restoration is one of the major challenges for the Arabic natural language processing. Indeed, the absence of vowels in Arabic texts generates a considerable number of ambiguities in morphological, syntactic and semantic layer. For Arabic speakers, absence of vowels does not pose problems for understanding texts, although in some cases vocalization is not intuitive. Automatic vocalization for Arabic language (even for other languages) remains unresolved problem for which several works are dedicated [1][2][3][4]. Absence of diacritics in Arabic texts produces serious problem for many applications such as grapheme-phoneme conversion. Algiers dialect is concerned by most of the problems of Arabic language processing. Although, absence of diacritics in Algiers dialectal texts produces several challenges for many automatic tasks on this language. The goal of this work is automatic diacritics restoration for Algiers's dialect text. Actually, this is an intermediate purpose, since our general goal is speech translation between Modern Standard Arabic and Algerian dialect. In order to reach this aim, translation system must include a Text-to-Speech module. The first component of this module is a grapheme phoneme converter that we have to develop. Results of grapheme phoneme conversion for Arabic texts (both classical and dialectal) could not be acceptable if these texts are not diacritized. That is why the first step for developing our grapheme phoneme converter is an automatic diacritics restoration for Algiers's dialect texts.

In this paper, we present an automatic diacritization system for Arabic texts based on statistical approach. We attempt to use available tools for statistical machine translation for building such a system which basically does not require any linguistic knowledge. We began by working on MSA texts for many reasons: Algiers's dialect is an Arabic language which obey to almost the same rules of writing as MSA. Availability of diacritized texts in MSA allows to test our solution on a large amount of data, which is not the case for Algiers's dialect. Fi-

nally, we worked first on MSA texts because of the available results for many works in this field.

This paper is organised as follows: In section 2, we describe the Arabic language and present the main features of this language especially those related to diacritization. In section 3, we provide some specificities of Algiers's dialect. In section 4, we present related works in this field summarizing the main aspects of every work. In section 5, we present our approach and describe the used data (for training tuning and testing). Evaluation results and experiments are reported in the next. Finally, We conclude by showing our main results and future work directions.

2. Arabic language

Arabic is a Semitic Language with consonantal alphabet (which denotes only consonants). Arabic alphabet consists of 28 letters ¹ denoting consonants and three long vowels (ا *ā*, و *w* and ي *y*). Arabic script includes short vowels (ا *a*, ا *u*, ا *i*) and other phonetic symbol which are represented by diacritics (strokes placed above or below consonants and long vowels). Short vowels can appear anywhere in the word, the *tanween* represents doubled case endings, it consists of three cases (ان *an*, ا *un*, ا *in*) it appears only in the end of the words and expresses nominal indefiniteness. Arabic diacritics include also syllabification marks: the *Shadda* or germination mark denotes a double consonant(it could be combined with short vowels and doubled case endings), and the *Sukun* which denotes the absence of vowel (see table 1). According to the function of the word in the sentence, an Arabic word could take as case endings the short vowels (ا *a*, ا *u*, ا *i*) respectively for accusative, nominative and genitive case. It is important to note that in some cases diacritics are not allowed such as in the case of:

- The letter ا *ā* (*Alif Maksoura*) which never takes diacritics such as in the word سَعَى *sa'ā* (to endeavor).
- The long vowels و *w* and ي *y* when preceded (in a word) respectively by the short vowels ا *u* and ا *i*.
- The long vowel ا *ā* when preceded (in a word) by ا *ā* and in the definite article ا *al*.

¹Including 14 solar consonants which assimilate the ا *l* of a preceding definite article ا *al* and 14 lunar consonants which do not assimilate it.

Table 1: Arabic diacritics and their pronunciation

Diacritized consonant /b/	Name	Pronunciation
بَ	<i>Fatha</i>	/ba/
بُ	<i>Damma</i>	/bu/
بِ	<i>Kasra</i>	/bi/
بَا	<i>Tanween Fatha</i>	/ban/
بَب	<i>Tanween damma</i>	/bun/
بِب	<i>Tanween kasra</i>	/bin/
بَبْ	<i>Shadda</i>	/bb/
بْ	<i>Sukun</i>	/b/

- The consonant ل could not take a diacritic in the definite article ال when it is followed by a solar consonant.

Arabic diacritics are used for disambiguation, although a word without diacritics could have many valid diacritizations (depending on its grammatical category) which generates several interpretations (see table 2 for some examples).

Table 2: Some possible diacritizations of Arabic word فسر *fsr*

Diacritic form	Meaning	Grammatical category
فَسَّرَ <i>fassara</i>	he explained	verb (active voice)
فُسِّرَ <i>fussira</i>	was explained	verb (passive voice)
فَسِيرَ <i>fasir</i>	so walk	conjunction+ verb
فَسِيرُونَ <i>fasirrun</i>	and a secret	conjunction+noun
فَسْرٌ <i>fasrun</i>	statement	Noun

3. Algiers dialect

In Algeria, as elsewhere, spoken Arabic differs from written Arabic; Algerian Arabic has a vocabulary inspired from Arabic but the original words have been altered phonologically, with significant Berber substrates, and many new words and loanwords borrowed from French, Turkish and Spanish [5]. The Algiers's dialect represents the dialectal Arabic spoken in Algiers and its periphery. This dialect is different from the dialects spoken in the other areas of the country. Algiers's dialect simplifies the morphological and syntactic rules of the written Arabic. It uses the Arabic alphabet which includes 28 letters; however the use of some letters like ط *ṭ* and ذ *ḏ* is very rare, most of the time ط *ṭ* is pronounced ض *ḏ* and ذ *ḏ* is pronounced د *d*. The same case is observed for the letter ث *ṯ* which is pronounced ت *t*. Moreover Algiers's dialect uses some non-Arabic letters like ف *v* as in the word فَاع *vāc* (all) and پ *p* as in the word پَاپَا *pāpā* (dad). Besides phonological alteration of words, Algiers's dialect drops the case endings of the written language. Also, it uses Arabic script which denotes consonants and diacritics. It uses all Arabic diacritics listed above except the *Tanween* doubled case endings. We notice that case endings of words in Algiers's dialect are replaced by

the *Sukun* (absence of vowel), this simplifies diacritization process but generates ambiguity at syntactic level. This conducts to an ambiguity concerning the identification of grammatical role of certain words, for example, to specify the agent and the object in some simple sentences without using semantic knowledge (see in table 3 a detailed example). Instead of written Arabic, diacritics in Algiers's dialect are used for disambiguation, a word without diacritics could accept many valid diacritizations and then if they are missing, it would be difficult to understand its meaning(see table 4 for some examples). It is important to note that due mostly to dropping case endings of words in Algiers's dialect, the number of multiple valid diacritizations for a word is less important than it is for a MSA word.

4. Related works

Most works for diacritization are dedicated for Modern standard Arabic. Several approaches were adopted, in [1] the system is based on hierarchical search at sentence, phrase word and character level. From the sentence level, the system attempts to retrieve diacritized examples from training data, if no suitable example is found for the given sentence, the system splits it into phrases and searches for fitting diacritics phrases in the training data. If the search fails the phrase is split into words then into characters (if word search fails). The system uses n-grams to define suitable examples. In [2] the diacritization was considered as a machine translating problem from non-diacritized texts to diacritized texts. The authors (IBM Egypt) adopted a rule based approach. The shortcomings of this system are those of machine translation based rules: adding new cases requires the definition of new rules which makes system maintenance expensive in terms of human efforts. In [3] the authors combined weighted finite state machines and language models. Their system is based on three language models (trained on LDC's Arabic Treebank Data): word, character and clitics. Transducers transitions are obtained by probabilistic calculations from the three language models. In [4] two approaches are used, the first one a SMT based approach combined with rule based diacritizer, the second considers diacritization as a sequence labelling problem. The first approach operates at the whole sentence, word level and then at the character level then a combination of the two (word and character) levels is achieved. A statistical phrase based system is built by the alignment between the output of rule based system and correct diacritized text in order to perform a post-editing step. The second approach based on sequence labelling problem used Conditional Random Fields (CRFs) in order to predict the correct sequence of diacritics for un-diacritized consonants sequence. In [6] and [7] Markov Models (HMM) are used for diacritization, non-diacritized words are considered as observation and their possible diacritizations are taken as the hidden states that produced these observations. The Viterbi algorithm is used to define the best hidden states. It should be noted that these two studies use the Koran for training and testing. In [8] the diacritization is viewed as sequence classification problem: given a sequence of characters X, each character is labelled by its diacritic (a sequence of labels Y is obtained). The objective of the system is to assign the sequence of labels Y to X sequence of consonants, the authors propose a statistical approach based on maximum entropy framework (MaxEnt henceforth). The classification features used by their system were lexical, segment-based and part-of-speech tags.

Table 3: Example of ambiguity generated by dropped case endings in Algiers’s dialect

Dialectal Sentence	Arabic Sentence	Meaning	Agent	Object
سَمِعَ وَلِيدًا عُمَرَ <i>sma‘ waliyd ‘umar</i>	سَمِعَ وَلِيدًا عُمَرَ <i>sami'a waliyduṅ ‘umara</i>	Walid heard Omar	Walid	Omar
	سَمِعَ وَلِيدًا عُمَرَ <i>sami'a waliydan ‘umaro</i>	Omar heard Walid	Omar	Walid

Table 4: Example of multiple diacritizations of dialectical words

Dialectal Word	Valid diacritization	Meaning
جوز <i>ǧwz</i>	جَوَّزَ <i>ǧawwaz</i>	You or he spent
	جُوِّزَ <i>ǧuwz</i>	You pass
	جُوزَ <i>ǧuwz</i>	Nut
قریت <i>qryt</i>	قَرَيْتَ <i>qriyt</i>	I or you read/studied
	قَرَّيْتِ <i>qarriyt</i>	I or you taught

5. Baseline system

Our approach is based on statistical machine translation where source language is unvocalized text and target language is vocalized text.

5.1. Building the SMT system for diacritization

We built a SMT system for diacritization based on parallel corpora of diacritized and undiacritized texts. The system is phrase based [9] with default settings: bidirectional phrase and lexical translation probabilities, distortion model (with seven features), a word and a phrase penalty and a language model. The system consists of a word alignment between source and target which is got by GIZA++ [11], a phrase table with undiacritized and diacritized entries, a trigram language model trained on diacritized texts, we use for this purpose SRILM toolkit[10].

5.2. The Data

Using SMT approach assumes the availability of the parallel corpora for source and target languages. To built such a resource in our case, it is enough to get a vocalized corpus when available and proceed to remove diacritics from it or in the other case, diacritize an unvocalized corpus. The two ways were exploited in our work, the first one for MSA and the second one for Algiers’s dialect.

5.2.1. MSA corpora

At the beginning of this work, the only available corpus for us was Tashkeela² a free corpus under GPL licence. This corpora is a collection of classical Arabic books downloaded from an on-line library³. It consists of more than 6M words. We began by removing special symbols, numbers and some non Arabic characters from vocalized corpus, then we split long sentences to shorter ones. After that we removed the diacritics from it to get the unvocalized corpus. The training data consists of about 1200K pairs of sentences. It is important to note that we split data on training (80%), developing(10%) and testing sets(10%), by randomly allocating a set of books to each task. For comparison purpose, We get the LDC Arabic Treebank (Part3, V1.0)[12], which is widely used in several NLP systems es-

pecially those dedicated for diacritics restoration[3][4][8]. This corpus is a set of 600 documents collected from Annahar News Texts. It includes 340K Words. To exploit this resource, we built a full vocalized corpus by exploring all documents part-of-speech tagging, we extracted for each word in a document its correspondent diacritization (manually annotated by LDC team). For splitting the corpus into training developing and testing sets we followed the same repartition as tashkeela by randomly allocating the documents to each set.

5.2.2. Algiers’s dialect corpus

The big challenge of this work is the availability of Algiers’s dialect corpus since this language is a non-resourced language. We begin by creating this corpus by hand, initially it did not contain diacritics, so we proceed to vocalize it by hand also. This task was expensive in terms of time and human effort. At this time, the vocalized corpus consists of 4K pairs of sentences, with 23K words.

6. Experiments

For the evaluation of the system, we use WER (Word Error Rate): the percentage of incorrectly diacritization word (delimited by white-space). At the character level, we use DER (Diacritization Error Rate). We compute these error rates by using Sclite⁴ part of NIST SCK Scoring Toolkit which finds alignments between reference and hypothesis for both word and character levels. A word is considered as incorrectly diacritized if at least one of its characters have an incorrect diacritization. Since WER and DER are relative to error rates, we were interested by evaluating the results in terms of correctness rate. For this purpose we computed precision and recall. These measures are largely used for evaluating many Information Retrieval Systems. For computing these values, we consider that a set of candidate items are compared to a set of reference item, in the case of evaluating our SMT systems for diacritization, these measures could be calculated as follows:

$$Precision = \frac{\#Word\ correctly\ diacritized}{\#Word\ Diacritized} \quad (1)$$

$$Recall = \frac{\#Word\ correctly\ diacritized}{\#Total\ of\ Words} \quad (2)$$

²<http://sourceforge.net/project/tashkeela>

³<http://www.shamela.ws>

⁴<http://www1.icsi.berkeley.edu/Speech/docs/sctk-1.2/sclite.htm>

At character level, precision and recall are calculated as above by replacing word count by character count. We notice that recall rate could be deduced from WER, it corresponds to 1-WER.

6.1. Results for MSA

Results in table 5 show a WER of 16.2 and a DER of 4.1 for Tashkeela corpus and a WER of 23.1 and a DER of 5.7 for LDC Arabic Treebank corpus. Deletion and insertion error rates are both equal to zero because the same number of words is contained both in test and reference data. The difference between the two sets is only in diacritics. That is why, in DER distribution we notice different deletion and insertion rates. When observing the test data, we notice that the most errors are concentrated on case endings of words. Actually, we ran a test ignoring them the WER and DER decrease with more than 50% for both corpus.

Table 5: Word and Diacritization Error Rate Summary(MSA)

Corpus	Taskeela		LDC ATB	
	WER	DER	WER	DER
Substitution	16.2	1.8	23.1	0.5
Deletion	0.0	1.9	0.0	5.1
Insertion	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1
Total(WER/DER)	16.2	4.1	23.1	5.7

In terms of recall and precision, we notice slight increase of Tashkeela rates compared with ATB (see table 6), this due mainly to the size of the two corpora.

Table 6: Precision and recall Summary(MSA)

Level	Word		Character	
	Recall	Precision	Recall	Precision
Taskeela	83.8%	85.2%	95.9%	96%
ATB	76.9%	89.2%	94.3%	91.8%

6.2. Results for Algiers's dialect

For Algiers's dialect experiments, we notice a higher WER and DER than for MSA experiments. But this is mainly due to the smallness of the Algiers's dialect corpora. We get a WER of 25.8% and a DER of 12.8% (see in table 7 detailed results). It

Table 7: Word and Diacritization Error Rate Summary (Algiers's dialect)

Distribution	WER	DER
Substitution	25.8	0.1
Deletion	0.0	12.6
Insertion	0.0	0.1
Total(WER/DER)	25.8	12.8

is important to note that the DER at character level is mostly concentrated on the deletion rate, we notice also a small proportion of substitution. The high deletion rate is due to absence of words in the training data.

We computed also recall and precision values from test data. At word level, the precision and recall were respectively 96.3%

and 74.2%. We notice a high precision compared to recorded rates for MSA corpora, this is due mainly to absence of words case endings in Algiers's dialect and the multiple diacritization of a word in this language is less important then it is in MSA. At character level, values recorded were 98% for precision and 87.2% for recall (see table 8).

Table 8: Precision and recall Summary(Algiers's dialect)

Level	Word		Character	
	Recall	Precision	Recall	Precision
Algiers's dialect	74.2%	96.3%	87.2%	98%

We have performed several tests by increasing the amount of data at every test, and we observed that when the corpus size increases by a little percentage, the WER and DER decrease also. For comparison, we also run many tests for small MSA corpora extracted from Tashkeela and ATB with the same size order as Algiers's dialect corpus, recorded WERs and DERs were respectively more than 56.5% and DER 20.5% at each time and for both corpus.

7. Conclusion

We presented a statistical approach for diacritics restoration for Algiers's dialect texts based on a machine translation system. We experimented the solution on MSA corpora, for positioning our results against other works. We did not use any other NLP tools (even if they are available for Arabic language) in order to be in the same conditions for algiers's dialect which is under-resourced language. Regards to the small amount of training data for the dialect, we got an acceptable WER and DER when we compared them to the results with small MSA corpora. For Arabic language side, the results for Tashkeela corpus were slight better compared to those for Arabic Treebank corpus. This is mainly due to the size of the two corpora and the nature of data of each one. Although, the ATB consists of several kinds of texts with entirely different topics, data disparity in its case is considerable. Contrary to Tashkeela corpus which contains classical books related to theology. In terms of precision, we notice that indeed of the small amount of available data for the dialect, we got a higher percentage compared to MSA corpora (96.3% vs. 85.2% and 76.9%) at word level and (98% vs. 96% and 91.8%) at character level. Considering this interesting precision rate, we will use this system for the vocalization of the rest of the dialectal corpus, this will save human effort and time since a little amount of the data needs to be corrected (by hand). We will use this iterative process for enriching our dialect corpus for getting better results with few efforts.

8. References

- [1] Emam, Ossama and Fischer Volke, "Hierarchical Approach for the Statistical Vowelization of Arabic Text. Technical report", in IBM Corporation Intellectual Property Law, Austin, TX, US, 2005.
- [2] Tarek A. El-Sadany and Mohamed A. Hashish, "An Arabic Morphological System", IBM Systems Journal, 28(4), 1989.
- [3] Nelken Rani and Sheiber Stuart M. , "Arabic Diacritization Using Weighted Finite-State Transducers.", Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Computational Approaches to Semitic Languages, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, 2005.
- [4] Schlippe Tim, Nguyen ThuyLinh and Vogel Stephan, "Diacritization as a Machine Translating Problem and as a Sequence Labeling Problem", Proceedings of the Eighth Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas (AMTA), Hawai'i, USA,2008.
- [5] K. Meftouh, N. Bouchemal, and K. Smaïli, "A study of a non-resourced language: an Algerian dialect". In proceedings of the third international workshop on spoken languages technologies for under-resourced languages. Cape town, South Africa,2012.
- [6] Ya'akov Gal, "An HMM approach to vowel restoration in Arabic and Hebrew", Proceedings of the ACL-02 workshop on Computational approaches to semitic languages, PA, USA, 2002.
- [7] Husni Al Muhtaseb Mustafa Elshafei and Mansour Al-Ghamidi, "Statistical Methods for Automatic Diacritization of Arabic Text", Proceedings of the Saudi 18th National Computer Conference (NCC18), Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 2006.
- [8] Zitouni Imed, Sorensen Jeffrey S and Ruhi Sarikaya, "Maximum entropy based restoration of arabic diacritics, Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Computational Linguistics and 44th Annual Meeting of the ACL, Sydney, Australia, 2006.
- [9] 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 Evan Herbst, "Moses: Open Source Toolkit for Statistical Machine Translation", Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), demonstration session , Prague, Czech Republic,2007.
- [10] Andreas Stolcke, "SRILM An Extensible Language Modeling Toolkit on Spoken Language Processing", volume 2, pp. 901-904, Proceedings of the International Conference , 2002, Denver,
- [11] Franz Josef Och, Hermann Ney, "A Systematic Comparison of Various Statistical Alignment Models, Computational Linguistics, volume 29, number 1, pp. 19-51, 2003.
- [12] Mohamed Maamouri, Ann Bies, Tim Buckwalter, and Hubert , "Arabic Treebank: Part 3 v 1.0", Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia,2004.