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Determining translators’ perception, productivity and post-editing effort when using SMT and NMT systems.
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1 Introduction

Machine Translation (MT) is nowadays one of the most useful resources for translators and the translation industry. Post-editing has become a usual practice within companies (Torres Hostench et al., 2016). With the great progress seen in NMT (Castilho et al., 2017), there are still some problems to overcome when using it, especially regarding terminology issues. Despite these innovations, SMT systems are still very popular. Hence, it is important to discover the differences between the two systems in order to use them properly.

2 Aim of this proposal

The aim of this paper is to determine the translators’ perception when using SMT and NMT, as well as to observe the differences when using SMT and NMT based on the topic of the source text. The research questions addressed will be:

- Do translators prefer SMT or NMT?
- Which issues present the use of SMT and which ones NMT? Does the SMT present more accurate results? Is the NMT more fluid?
- Are these issues different based on the topic of the text (marketing and user documentation source texts)?
- How do the translators post-edit these issues?

Results showed that the translators preferred NMT, which was more fluent and adequate than SMT. NMT was both more adequate and fluid, both for the instruction manual and the marketing webpage. Results showed that translators considerably prefer NMT over SMT. Moreover, NMT is more adequate and fluent than SMT.

References
