Look at both the input and the output of each sentence;

EITHER: the sentence is a completely good translation

it seems to be good English

it seems to say just what the source language said;

OR: the sentence is degraded by up to ***n*** errors (intelligibility);

AND/OR: the sentence is degraded by up to ***m*** information errors (Fidelity).

otherwise the sentence is wrong

Case 2: intelligibility and fidelity.

The drawback of this method is the limitation of the portability and reusability of the measurement which requires special skills, i.e. translational skills that may be hard to find and commit for the task of applying these metrics. Such a shortcoming should not be of a concern for those who are competent in both languages and who have a fair background in translation. However, the main shortcoming of the above metrics is that "good" could vary from one evaluator to another who will simply use their intuition to make evaluative judgments which are prone to human frailties, and therefore such metrics could be highly subjective. Moreover, the distinction between the two parameters, i.e. intelligibility and fidelity is not clear cut. They are correlated: a completely unintelligible expression conveys no information.

Case (3) one input, two outputs: In this case an MT developer should be able to make changes in the system so that it can improve its coverage. Since this ability is somehow impossible in our research where no changes can be done on *Google Translate,* this case will be neglected.