
No Translation Needed: Forecasting Quality from Fertility and Metadata

Jessica M. Lundin
Institute for Disease Modeling
Gates Foundation

Ada Zhang
University of San Francisco

David Adelani
McGill University

Cody Carroll
University of San Francisco

Abstract

We show that translation quality can be predicted with surprising accuracy *without ever running the translation system itself*. Using only a handful of features, token fertility ratios, token counts, and basic linguistic metadata (language family, script, and region), we can forecast ChrF scores for GPT-4o translations across 203 languages in the FLORES-200 benchmark. Gradient boosting models achieve favorable performance ($R^2 = 0.66$ for $XX \rightarrow \text{English}$ and $R^2 = 0.72$ for $\text{English} \rightarrow XX$). Feature importance analyses reveal that typological factors dominate predictions into English, while fertility plays a larger role for translations into diverse target languages. These findings suggest that translation quality is shaped by both token-level fertility and broader linguistic typology, offering new insights for multilingual evaluation and quality estimation.

1 Introduction

Machine translation (MT) quality evaluation has evolved significantly from early rule-based and statistical methods to large-scale neural models. Traditional evaluation metrics such as BLEU [9] and METEOR [3] have been widely used but have been criticized for their limited sensitivity to linguistic diversity and their reliance on surface-level n-gram matches. More recent alternatives, such as ChrF [10] and ChrF++ [11], leverage character-level representations to better capture morphologically rich languages, and have shown strong correlation with human judgments in multilingual settings.

One central factor in MT quality is fertility, originally formalized in IBM Models for statistical machine translation [5]. Fertility reflects how many target tokens are generated per source token, and imbalances in fertility often lead to errors such as under-translation or over-translation. Figure 1 shows the language codes with highest and lowest fertility values for FLORES-200. While fertility has historically been studied in statistical MT, its role in neural MT evaluation remains underexplored. Recent work in large-scale multilingual evaluation, such as MEGA [2], has underscored the importance of tokenization and representation choices in shaping model performance across diverse languages, suggesting that fertility may still play a critical role.

At the same time, linguistic metadata such as language family, script type, and geographic region have been shown to influence translation performance. For example, scaling efforts such as NLLB [6], SIB-200 [1] and mSTEB [4] demonstrate that typological and resource disparities across languages lead to systematic variation in model accuracy. Similarly, the WMT Quality Estimation shared tasks [12] have highlighted the value of incorporating language-level features into predictive models of translation quality.




Figure 1: Languages with highest and lowest fertility for FLORES-200 dataset. Latin scripts tend to have lower fertility values.

These findings point to the need for a systematic investigation of how fertility and linguistic metadata interact with translation quality in multilingual neural MT. By explicitly modeling these features, we aim to better understand the factors driving translation quality across 200+ languages and to contribute to improved approaches for quality estimation in massively multilingual settings.

2 Methods

We developed regression models to predict ChrF (Character n-gram F-score) translation quality scores for GPT-4o translations in the FLORES-200 benchmark dataset [8]. We leverage the LLM predictions and annotated features released by mSTEB [4]. Our analysis covered two translation directions: multilingual-to-English (XX→English) and English-to-multilingual (English→XX) across 203 languages.

Table 3 shows features used to fit the ChrF regression. We extracted both linguistic and text-level features from the translation pairs. Text-level features included token counts counts for both source and target texts using the o200kbase tokenizer, as well as fertility ratios (tokens per word) for source and target texts. Linguistic features include language identification codes, script, Joshi class, language families, and geographic regions.

We compared the fit of multiple regression approaches: Linear (OLS, Lasso), Tree ensembles (Random Forest, XGBoost), and multi-layer perceptron (MLP).

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Model Performance Comparison

Table 1 demonstrates a clear performance hierarchy across all model types and translation directions. The substantial performance gap between linear models ($R^2 \approx 0.25-0.31$) and tree-based models ($R^2 \approx 0.66-0.72$) indicates strong non-linear relationships in the data that simple linear combinations cannot capture effectively. XGBoost achieves the highest performance in both directions: English-to-XX and XX-to-English respectively had R^2 values of 0.719 and 0.663, while Random Forest achieved values of 0.701 and 0.588.

Neural networks show moderate performance (0.586 train R^2 and 0.684 test R^2) but remain substantially below ensemble methods, while linear approaches (Linear and Lasso Regression) perform poorly across both directions with nearly identical results. The consistent superiority of XGBoost over Random Forest suggests that gradient boosting is particularly well-suited for capturing the complex interactions between linguistic features and translation quality, with performance gaps of 0.018 R^2 for English-to-XX and 0.075 R^2 for XX-to-English translation.

Figure 2 presents a comparison of marginal average translation quality scores across three key categorical features: geographic region, language family, and script. The analysis reveals systematic performance patterns that are remarkably consistent between XGBoost and Random Forest models across both translation directions, indicating that these linguistic biases are inherent to the underlying data rather than model-specific artifacts. Language family effects (2a) show dramatic variation

Table 1: Model Performance Comparison across Translation Directions

Model	XX→English			English→XX		
	R ²	RMSE	MAE	R ²	RMSE	MAE
Linear Regression	0.25	16.58	13.50	0.31	16.19	13.01
Lasso Regression	0.25	16.58	13.51	0.31	16.19	13.01
MLP	0.59	12.34	9.71	0.68	10.97	8.33
Random Forest	0.59	12.31	9.73	0.70	10.68	8.11
XGBoost	0.66	11.14	8.71	0.72	10.36	7.88




Figure 2: Marginal Average Translation Quality Scores by Categorical Features. Each panel shows XGBoost vs Random Forest performance across both English-to-XX and XX-to-English translation directions, displaying both predicted and actual scores. Panel (a) compares performance across geographic regions, revealing systematic differences where European languages consistently outperform African and Asian languages across all model-direction combinations. Panel (b) examines the top 5 and bottom 5 language families, demonstrating the substantial performance gap between high-resource families like Indo-European and Constructed languages versus low-resource families such as Niger-Congo and Austronesian. Panel (c) shows performance by writing script, with the top 6 (Latn is 6th) and bottom 5 scripts. Across all panels, predicted scores (solid bars) align well with actual scores (hatched bars), indicating good model calibration, and XGBoost and Random Forest show remarkably similar performance patterns, suggesting that the underlying linguistic patterns are robust across different ensemble methods.

between resource levels, where constructed languages like Esperanto and high-resource families like Indo-European score 15-20 points higher than low-resource families such as Niger-Congo and Austronesian. Regional disparities (2b) demonstrate clear geographic variation, with European languages achieving scores of 55-65 compared to 35-45 for African languages. Effects from the script type (2c) reveal the advantage of the top 5 scripts: Armn, Hebr, Thai, Grek, and Cyrl. In a twist, Latin (Latn) is not in the top nor bottom 5 scripts in terms of ChrF. The nearly identical performance patterns between XGBoost and Random Forest, combined with close alignment between predicted and actual scores, suggest that both models capture the same underlying linguistic regularities with high fidelity, making the observed categorical biases robust findings rather than model-dependent effects.

3.2 Feature Importance Analysis

Table 2 reveals distinct patterns in how XGBoost and Random Forest prioritize linguistic features across translation directions. For English-to-XX translation, XGBoost places overwhelming emphasis on Joshi Class (0.365 importance), indicating that resource-level categorization is the most critical factor when translating into diverse target languages. This is followed by regional patterns (0.206) and language family relationships (0.133), creating a clear hierarchical structure focused on language categorizations.

Table 2: Feature Importance Rankings by Model and Translation Direction

English-to-XX		XX-to-English	
XGBoost	Random Forest	XGBoost	Random Forest
Joshi Class (0.365)	Joshi Class (0.205)	Region (0.278)	Region (0.198)
Region (0.206)	Language Id Code (0.183)	Family (0.208)	Family (0.163)
Family (0.133)	Region (0.161)	Joshi Class (0.178)	Language Id Code (0.156)
Script (0.127)	Reference Fertility (0.115)	Script (0.103)	Joshi Class (0.116)
Language Id Code (0.092)	Candidate Fertility (0.081)	Language Id Code (0.092)	Candidate Fertility (0.089)
Reference Fertility (0.025)	Family (0.073)	Reference Fertility (0.040)	Reference Fertility (0.082)
Candidate Fertility (0.021)	Reference Tokens (0.072)	Reference Tokens (0.041)	Script (0.077)
Reference Tokens (0.018)	Script (0.066)	Candidate Fertility (0.029)	Reference Tokens (0.061)
Candidate Tokens (0.013)	Candidate Tokens (0.044)	Candidate Tokens (0.031)	Candidate Tokens (0.059)

Random Forest shows a more distributed approach for English-to-XX translation, with Joshi Class leading (0.205) but at much lower intensity than XGBoost, followed closely by individual language codes (0.183) and regional groupings (0.161). This more balanced distribution suggests Random Forest’s ensemble approach captures a broader range of linguistic patterns rather than focusing heavily on a single dominant feature.

The XX-to-English direction shows different priorities for both models. XGBoost emphasizes regional patterns (0.278) followed by language family relationships (0.208) and Joshi Class (0.178), suggesting that when translating into English, geographic and phylogenetic groupings become more predictive than individual resource levels. Random Forest maintains region as the top feature (0.198) but shows more balanced importance across language family (0.163) and individual language codes (0.156).

Both models consistently rank fertility measures and token counts in the lower importance ranges, though Random Forest assigns notably higher importance to these continuous features compared to XGBoost. For instance, candidate fertility ranges from 0.081-0.089 in Random Forest versus 0.021-0.029 in XGBoost. This difference reflects their underlying optimization strategies: XGBoost’s gradient boosting focuses on the most discriminative categorical features, while Random Forest’s bagging approach across diverse tree structures better captures subtle patterns in tokenization and fertility ratios.

4 Conclusion

This work shows that much of machine translation quality can be anticipated without ever looking at the translated words themselves. Using only fertility ratios, token counts, and high-level linguistic metadata, tree-based models predict ChrF scores across 200+ languages with striking accuracy. While the act of predicting ChrF is not inherently remarkable, the fact that such predictions are possible without inference underscores the systematic role of fertility and typology in shaping translation outcomes.

Equally important, tree ensembling methods such as XGBoost not only deliver the strongest predictive performance but also provide interpretable insights into which features matter most. The relative weights assigned to fertility, resource levels, and typological categories reveal consistent cross-linguistic patterns: target-side fertility explains predictability into diverse languages, while source-side typology dominates when translating into English. These interpretable rankings allow us to see translation quality through the lens of linguistic structure rather than opaque model behavior.

Looking forward, this perspective supports the role for lightweight quality estimation as a diagnostic tool for understanding multilingual systems and the typological factors that drive their performance. By showing that translation quality can be explained largely from fertility and metadata alone, our results highlight a path toward more efficient, interpretable, and linguistically grounded approaches toward improving translation.

References

- [1] David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Hannah Liu, Xiaoyu Shen, Nikita Vassilyev, Jesujoba O. Alabi, Yanke Mao, Haonan Gao, and En-Shiun Annie Lee. SIB-200: A simple, inclusive, and big evaluation dataset for topic classification in 200+ languages and dialects. In Yvette Graham and Matthew Purver, editors, *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 226–245, St. Julian’s, Malta, March 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2] Kabir Ahuja, Harshita Diddee, Rishav Hada, Millicent Ochieng, Krithika Ramesh, Prachi Jain, Akshay Nambi, Tanuja Ganu, Sameer Segal, Maxamed Axmed, Kalika Bali, and Sunayana Sitaram. Mega: Multilingual evaluation of generative ai, 2023.
- [3] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the ACL workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72, 2005.
- [4] Luel Hagos Beyene, Vivek Verma, Min Ma, Jesujoba O Alabi, Fabian David Schmidt, Joyce Nakatumba-Nabende, and David Ifeoluwa Adelani. msteb: Massively multilingual evaluation of llms on speech and text tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08400*, 2025.
- [5] Peter F Brown, Stephen A. Della Pietra, Vincent J. Della Pietra, and Robert L Mercer. The mathematics of statistical machine translation: Parameter estimation. *Computational linguistics*, 19(2):263–311, 1993.
- [6] Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Anna Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loic Barrault, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Searley Jarrett, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Dirk Rowe, Shannon Spruit, Chau Tran, Pierre Andrews, Necip Fazil Ayan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Angela Fan, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Francisco Guzman, Philipp Koehn, Alexandre Mourachko, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, and Jeff Wang. Scaling neural machine translation to 200 languages. *Nature*, 630(8018):841–846, 2024.
- [7] Pratik Joshi, Sebastin Santy, Amar Budhiraja, Kalika Bali, and Monojit Choudhury. The state and fate of linguistic diversity and inclusion in the nlp world, 2021.
- [8] NLLB Team, Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Anna Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loic Barrault, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Searley Jarrett, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Dirk Rowe, Shannon Spruit, Chau Tran, Pierre Andrews, Necip Fazil Ayan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Angela Fan, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Francisco Guzmán, Philipp Koehn, Alexandre Mourachko, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, and Jeff Wang. Scaling neural machine translation to 200 languages. *Nature*, 630(8018):841–846, 2024.
- [9] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, 2002.
- [10] Maja Popović. Chrf: character n-gram f-score for automatic mt evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 392–395, 2015.
- [11] Maja Popović. chrF++: words helping character n-grams. In *Proceedings of the second conference on machine translation*, pages 612–618, 2017.
- [12] Lucia Specia, Andre FT Martins, Carolina Scarton, et al. Findings of the wmt 2020 shared task on quality estimation. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 743–764, 2020.

A Features

A complete description of features used in ChrF predictive analysis are available in Table 3.

Table 3: Features used in the ChrF predictive analysis.

Feature	Example	Description
Joshi Class	1, 2, ... 6	Joshi class labels [7], categorizing languages by resource availability and computational support (1=highest resources, 6=lowest resources). These are imputed for the FLORES-200 dataset.
Region	Africa, Europe, Americas	9 geographic regions where the language is primarily spoken, used to capture regional linguistic patterns
Family	Austronesian, Afro-Asiatic, Indo-European	Linguistic family classification, grouping languages by common ancestral origins and structural similarities
Script	Arab, Latn, Cyrl, Deva	29 scripts used (Arabic, Latin, Cyrillic, Devanagari, etc.)
Code	ace, afr, amh, ara	ISO language code identifier, uniquely identifying each language
Reference Fertility	2.5, 3.2, 4.1	Average number of tokens per word in reference (human) translations, measuring morphological complexity
Candidate Fertility	2.3, 3.0, 3.8	Average number of tokens per word in LLM-generated translations, measuring model’s tokenization efficiency
Reference Tokens	54, 101, 160	Total number of tokens in the reference translation for a given text
Candidate Tokens	48, 78, 200	Total number of tokens in the LLM-generated translation for a given text