

# Extending English Large Language Models to New Languages

## *A Survey*

Anoop Kunchukuttan

*Microsoft Translator*



*AI4Bharat*



*IIT Madras*



*2<sup>nd</sup> April 2024*

# Outline

- Introduction to LLMs
- The Multilingual LLM Challenge
- Extending English LLMs
  - Vocabulary Expansion
  - Continued Pre-training
  - Instruction Tuning
- The Indic LLM Scenario
- Summary

If you find this survey useful, please cite it in your work

```
@online{kunchukuttan2024extendllm,  
author = {{Anoop Kunchukuttan}},  
title = {Extending English Large Language Models to New Languages:  
A Survey},  
url =  
{https://anoopkunchukuttan.gitlab.io/publications/presentations/extend\_en\_llms\_apr2024.pdf},  
date = {2nd April 2024},  
urldate = {2nd April 2024}  
}
```

BIBLIOGRAPHY (*identify paper by PAPER\_KEY on the slides*)

# What are Large Language Models?

- Typically, transformer decoder models
- They generate text by looking at only previously generated text (*auto-regressive*)
- Trained on a **self-supervised** task
  - Next word prediction task
  - Large amount of text data
  - Large Models
- In-context learning capability


*Instruction* Tell me the sentiment of this review

*Example* The movie begins .... The plot is engaging, thoroughly enjoyable.  
The movie is **great**

Oh, how can such a fine cast produce such a terrible performance..... A total waste of time.  
The movie is **pathetic**

*Prompt* It is just a rehash of old movies  
The movie is <MASK>

Only BERT was trained with MLM



(GPT3)

(InstructGPT)

- Finetuning on (relatively) small supervised and preference data to align instructions and values

# Current LLMs vs. older generation (BERT/BART/XLM-R)

## Current

- Every task is just text completion
- Decoder-only (NLU and NLG)
- In-context learning & Instruction Tuning
- Causal LM training objectives
- Large model size (GPT3: 175B params)
- Trained on large corpora (2T tokens  
LLama2)

## Old Generation

- Classification/text generation
- Encoder-only (NLU), Enc-dec (NLG)
- Per-task finetuning
- Denoising objectives (MLM, DAE)
- Small models (largest mT5: ~13B)
- Modest amount of data (~BERT: 137B tokens)

*NLU: natural language understanding  
NLG: natural language generation*

# What makes LLMs exciting?

- Inherent knowledge
- Multi-task abilities and task-composition
- Little task-specific training required
- Help in writing , creativity, brainstorming, data generation, explanation, etc.

 <b>Q&amp;A</b> Answer questions based on existing knowle...	 <b>Grammar correction</b> Corrects sentences into standard English.
 <b>Summarize for a 2nd grader</b> Translates difficult text into simpler concep...	 <b>Natural language to OpenAI API</b> Create code to call to the OpenAI API usin...
 <b>Text to command</b> Translate text into programmatic commands.	 <b>English to other languages</b> Translates English text into French, Spanish...
 <b>Natural language to Stripe API</b> Create code to call the Stripe API using nat...	 <b>SQL translate</b> Translate natural language to SQL queries.
 <b>Parse unstructured data</b> Create tables from long form text	 <b>Classification</b> Classify items into categories via example.
 <b>Python to natural language</b> Explain a piece of Python code in human un...	 <b>Movie to Emoji</b> Convert movie titles into emoji.
 <b>Calculate Time Complexity</b> Find the time complexity of a function.	 <b>Translate programming languages</b> Translate from one programming language ...
 <b>Advanced tweet classifier</b> Advanced sentiment detection for a piece o...	 <b>Explain code</b> Explain a complicated piece of code.

## Maths

**Prompt:** Can you write a proof that there are infinitely many primes, with every line that rhymes?

**GPT-4:**


Yes, I think I can,  
Though it might take a clever plan.  
I'll start by noting Euclid's proof,  
Which shows that primes aren't just aloof.  
Assume we have a finite list,  
Of primes, and that none have been missed.  
Multiply them all together,  
And add one, just to be clever.  
The result will be a number,  
That has no prime factors, oh wonder!  
But every number has a prime,  
That divides it, it's just a matter of time.  
So we've found a contradiction,  
And our finite list needs eviction.  
There must be infinitely many primes,  
And that's the end of my rhyming lines.s

**Prompt:** Can you generate a pyplot for the following data:  $x = [1, 3, 5, 6, 8]$ ,  $y1 = [2, 3, 5, 18, 1]$ ,  $y2 = [3, 5, 6, 8, 1]$ ,  $y3 = [5, 1, 2, 3, 4]$ ,  $y4 = [9, 7, 2, 3, 1]$ . I want  $y1$ ,  $y2$  to be in the same plot, but  $y3$  is in another plot next to that plot,  $y4$  is in below. I want the legend of  $y1$  to be "bob",  $y2$  to be "alice",  $y3$  to be "bilbo",  $y4$  to be "allie". I want the  $x$ -axis to be labeled with "time" and  $y$  axis to be labeled with "money". I want to add a 10%-40% random error bar to each curve, through all times (including non-integers). I want smoothed curves to show the plot, and smoothed error bar. Do not use linear interpolation, use smooth interpolation! I want to also add some small zig-zag to the smoothed curve to make it look more real. I want to put a baseline as the mean of each line. I want to put a pie chart below indicating the fraction of the four people in each time step. I also want an animation to show how the fractions are changing in the pie chart in \*\*continuous time\*\*. Interpolate the missing fractions! I also want vertical line animation in other three plots to match the pie chart. I want the fanciest plot. Please add as many fancy things as possible.

Here is a possible code to generate a pyplot for the following data, with some comments to explain the steps:

**Prompt:** Draw a unicorn in TiKZ.

**GPT-4:** [Produces L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X compiling to following picture.]




## Plotting

**Prompt:** Can you generate a pyplot for the following data:  $x = [1, 3, 5, 6, 8]$ ,  $y1 = [2, 3, 5, 18, 1]$ ,  $y2 = [3, 5, 6, 8, 1]$ ,  $y3 = [5, 1, 2, 3, 4]$ ,  $y4 = [9, 7, 2, 3, 1]$ . I want  $y1$ ,  $y2$  to be in the same plot, but  $y3$  is in another plot next to that plot,  $y4$  is in below. I want the legend of  $y1$  to be "bob",  $y2$  to be "alice",  $y3$  to be "bilbo",  $y4$  to be "allie". I want the  $x$ -axis to be labeled with "time" and  $y$  axis to be labeled with "money". I want to add a 10%-40% random error bar to each curve, through all times (including non-integers). I want smoothed curves to show the plot, and smoothed error bar. Do not use linear interpolation, use smooth interpolation! I want to also add some small zig-zag to the smoothed curve to make it look more real. I want to put a baseline as the mean of each line. I want to put a pie chart below indicating the fraction of the four people in each time step. I also want an animation to show how the fractions are changing in the pie chart in \*\*continuous time\*\*. Interpolate the missing fractions! I also want vertical line animation in other three plots to match the pie chart. I want the fanciest plot. Please add as many fancy things as possible.

Here is a possible code to generate a pyplot for the following data, with some comments to explain the steps:

**GPT-4:** [We give two snapshots from the animation resulting from the produced code]



**GPT-4:**

This is a conversation between a user and an artificial intelligence agent that follows instructions or answers questions. The AI always follows the instructions correctly.  
---

User: Can you compose a short tune (say four to eight bars) using ABC notation?

AI: There are many possible ways to compose a short tune in abc notation, but here is one example:

X:1

T:Example Tune

M:4/4

L:1/8

K:C

|:G2AB c2BA | G2AB c2c2 | edcB c2BA | G4-  
G2c2 :|  
|:c2de f2ed | c2de f2f2 | g2fe d2cB | c4-  
c2z2 :|

This tune has two four-bar phrases, each repeated once, forming an A part and a B part. The key is C major.

**GPT-4:**

User: After the first bar G2AB c2BA, you chose G to start the next bar. Give an example of a change to the notes in the first bar that would have caused you to pick D instead of G as the first note in the second bar.

AI:One possible change to the notes in the first bar that would have caused me to pick D instead of G as the first note in the second bar is:

|:G2AB c2Bc | ...

This change creates a stronger cadence on the C note at the end of the first bar, which is the fifth degree of the scale. This suggests a modulation to the dominant key of G major, which has D as its fifth degree. Therefore, starting the second bar with D would create a smooth transition to the new key and imply a harmonic progression of V-I.

## Understanding Programs

**Prompt:**

```
struct mystruct_A { char a; int b; char c; } x;  
struct mystruct_B { int b; char a; char c; } y;  
  
#include <stdio.h>  
int main(void)  
{  
    printf("Size of x: %zu bytes\n", sizeof(x));  
    printf("Size of y: %zu bytes\n", sizeof(y));  
    return 0;  
}
```

Possible Output:

**GPT-4:**

There are different ways to implement and align structures in memory, so the exact output may vary depending on the compiler, platform, and options used. However, one possible output is:

Size of x: 12 bytes  
Size of y: 8 bytes




This output assumes that the compiler uses 4-byte alignment for structures, meaning that each structure member starts at an offset that is a multiple of 4 bytes from the beginning of the structure. This may result in some padding bytes being inserted between or after the members to maintain alignment. For example, **in x**, there may be 3 padding bytes after **a** and 3 padding bytes after **c**, **while in y**, there may be no padding after **a**. The size of a structure is the sum of the sizes of its members plus any padding bytes.

(SparksOfAGI)

# Explosion of LLMs ... but mostly limited to English



ANTHROPIC



# Benefits of LLMs are mostly limited to English

Language	Cat.	ChatGPT	
		(en)	(spc)
English	H	70.2	70.2
Russian	H	60.8	45.4
German	H	64.5	51.1
Chinese	H	58.2	35.5
French	H	64.8	42.2
Spanish	H	65.8	47.4
Vietnamese	H	55.4	44.8
Turkish	M	57.1	37.1
Arabic	M	55.3	22.3
Greek	M	55.9	54.5
Thai	M	44.7	11.5
Bulgarian	M	59.7	44.6
Hindi	M	48.8	5.6
Urdu	L	43.7	6.3
Swahili	X	50.3	40.8

## Results on XNLI

Language	Cat.	ChatGPT(en)	
		EM	F1
English	H	56.0	74.9
Russian	H	30.2	49.1
German	H	45.9	65.8
Chinese	H	37.1	42.3
Spanish	H	41.8	65.8
Vietnamese	H	36.1	57.3
Turkish	M	34.5	56.4
Arabic	M	32.0	50.3
Greek	M	29.7	45.0
Thai	M	31.2	43.4
Hindi	M	17.5	37.8
Average		35.6	53.5

## Results on QnA

	#langs.	avg. chrF	avg. BLEU
ChatGPT (0-shot)	203	32.3	16.7
ChatGPT (5-shot)	203	33.1	17.3
GPT-4	20	44.6	24.6
NLLB	201	45.3	27.1
Google	115	52.2	34.6

*Performance on translation  
averaged across languages*



Lang.	ChatGPT		NLLB	
	BLEU	chrF	BLEU	chrF
srp_Cyril	1.36	3.26	<b>43.4</b>	<b>59.7</b>
kon_Latn	0.94	8.50	<b>18.9</b>	<b>45.3</b>
tso_Latn	2.92	15.0	<b>26.7</b>	<b>50.0</b>
kac_Latn	0.04	2.95	<b>14.3</b>	37.5
nso_Latn	3.69	16.7	<b>26.5</b>	<b>50.8</b>
jpn_Jpan	<b>28.4</b>	<b>32.9</b>	20.1	27.9
nno_Latn	<b>37.1</b>	<b>58.7</b>	33.4	53.6
zho_Hans	<b>36.3</b>	<b>31.0</b>	26.6	22.8
zho_Hant	<b>26.0</b>	<b>24.4</b>	12.4	14.0
acm_Arab	<b>28.2</b>	<b>44.7</b>	11.8	31.9

*Performance on translation  
High vs low resource*

- Significant gap between English and other languages on multiple tasks
- High-resource and Latin script languages can give good performance on GPT
- Poor performance on low-resource languages
- Translate-test is a strong baseline
- Open-source models lag behind GPT models → they are very English heavy

# Why do LLMs lag behind for other languages?

- Lack of
  - Pre-training data
  - Token representation
  - Instruction tuning data
  - Human preference data
- Inability to transfer from English
- Limitations of Translate-Test



(*BUFFET, MEGA, ChatGptMT*)

# Do English LLMs have some inherent multilingual capabilities?

**Yes, to some extent ...**

**Why?** – during training they might have been exposed to some non-English data

- Documents with multiple languages
- Incorrect LID      *Language ID*

**How good are the multilingual capabilities?**

- Might be ok at language understanding e.g. classification, sentiment analysis
  - Bad at generation
  - Better on Latin script languages
  - Languages with better pre-training representation perform better
- Some of these have improved significantly recently*

# How do English LLM achieve multilingual processing capabilities?

- *Do LLMs think in English?*
- *Do LLM use English as a pivot for decision making?*

Bottom layers: Feature learning

Middle layers: Concept mapping to language tokens  
(with English bias)

Top layers: Language generation in target language

**The central question in building multilingual LLM is to bring representations of English and other languages closer to achieve good cross-lingual transfer**

(LmaLatent,PNLD)

Output	文	:	-"	花
31	文	:	-"	花
29	文	:	-"	花
27	文	:	_flower	花
25	文	:	_flowe...	_flowe...
23	文	:	-"	_flowe...
21	文	:	_flowe...	_flowe...
19	文	:	-"	_flowe...
17	eval	:	-"	<0xE5>
15	ji	:	-"	ψ
13	í	_vac	ols	_bore
11	eda	eda	_Als	abei
9	eda	ná	_Als	_hel
7	iser	arie	◀	arias
5	npa	orr	◀	arias
3	心	ures	_Bedeut	arda
1	_beskre	化	Portail	_Kontr...



a BigScience initiative

**BLOOM**  
176B params 59 languages Open-access

# Open-source Multilingual LLM Efforts

**Trained from scratch:** BLOOM, mGPT, PolyLM, EAGLE, mT0, XGLM

- English representation is lesser compared to models like Llama, Gemma, Mistral → limited English capabilities
- Cannot expect good non-English capabilities either
- Large-scale compute needed for training

Focus of this survey


**Extending English LLMs:** ChineseLLama, OpenHathi, Seallm, ALMA, RomanSetu

- Strong English capabilities of base LLMs
- Less compute-requirements




# Extending English LLMs to Non-English Languages

Seems like all players are settling on this technique. GPT-40, Llama3, SeaLLM



# Vocabulary Expansion

# Vocabulary Basics



**Vocabulary:** Set of **tokens** (basic I/O units)

## LLM Vocabulary Properties

- **Finite** vocabulary size
- **Subword** units: basic units are smaller than words
- **Open** vocabulary: all words can be defined as concatenation of subwords

# What if vocabulary is under-represented?

<|> गगनयान <0xE0><0xA4><0x8F>क भारतीय चालक दल कक्षीय अंतर्रिक्ष यान है जिसका <0xE0><0xA4><0x89>देश्  
य भारतीय मानव अंतर्रिक्ष <0xE0><0xA4><0x89>ड़ान कार्यक्रम का प्रारंभिक अंतर्रिक्ष यान होना है।

Fertility = Average number of tokens per word

Unknown characters (BPE-based vocab)	UNK vocab item
Fallback to known characters (BPE-based vocab)	High Fertility
Fallback to bytes (Byte BPE-based vocab)	Even Higher Fertility

*High fertility →*

*More memory consumption*

*More decoding time*

*Limit on longest processable sequence*

# Addressing Vocabulary issues

## Status-quo (use suboptimal vocab)


- ✗ • High fertility
- ✗ • Increased sequence length
  - Increased inference time
  - Limit on max sequence length
- ✗ • Inferior token representation
- ✓ • Lesser pre-training required

## Extending Vocabulary

- ✓ • Low Fertility
- ✓ • Reasonable sequence length
  - Decreased inference time
  - Longer sequences possible
- ✗ • Increased softmax computation
- ✗ • More pre-training required

*Some evidence seems to suggest that extending vocabulary needs a lot of pre-training to align languages (0.5B tokens vs 30B tokens) (LmaByndEng)*

# How to extend tokenizer vocabulary?



# Initialization of New Embeddings

Sampling from Random (Normal) Distribution

*Simple*

*Changes existing vocab's probability distribution*  
*Large convergence time*

Average of Existing Embeddings

*Limited change in existing vocab's distribution*  
*Large convergence time [AveInit]*

Weighted Average of Existing Embeddings

*Limited change in existing vocab's distribution*  
*Initializations like WESCHEL, OFA, FOCUS*

*WESCHEL uses similarities between vocab items across languages to decide weights; this improves convergence rates*

# Average Initialization

[AveInit]

## Limitations of initialization from (Normal) Random distribution

- Incorrect generation in existing language
  - Large KL-divergence between pre- and post-expansion LMs for existing vocabulary
- No reason for fast convergence

## A simple solution: Initialize new tokens to average of embeddings of existing tokens

- Low KL-divergence between pre- and post-expansion LMs for existing vocabulary
- Greedy decoding with prefix of existing tokens will result in output from existing tokens
- A general result: the above applies if new embeddings are in the convex hull of existing embeddings

## A practical solution: We want to avoid all new embeddings been initialized to same value

- Add small random noise to the average embeddings

However, this method does not give any solution to improve convergence in continued pre-training

# Weighted Average Initialization

[WESCHEL]

- Target token embeddings as weighted average of source token embeddings
- Token weights based on source-target token similarities based on external static pre-trained word embeddings





Figure 1: Summary of our **WECHSEL** method. We show inputs, intermediate results and outputs.



Model	Score@0			Score@25k			Score@250k		
	NLI	NER	Avg	NLI	NER	Avg	NLI	NER	Avg
WECHSEL-RoBERTa	78.25	86.93	82.59	81.63	90.26	85.95	<b>82.43</b>	<b>90.88</b>	<b>86.65</b>
TransInner-RoBERTa	60.86	69.57	65.21	65.49	83.82	74.66	81.75	90.34	86.04
FullRand-RoBERTa	55.71	70.79	63.25	69.02	84.24	76.63	75.28	89.30	82.29
XLM-R <sub>Base</sub> (Final)	79.25	89.48	84.37						

## Continued Pre-training

Faster convergence vs. baselines for

- LM perplexity
- Downstream performance

Results for small LMs → embeddings contribute a large % of parameters

Will we see such convergence improvements for Large LMs?

$$\mathbf{e}_x^t = \frac{\sum_{y \in \mathcal{J}_x} \exp(s_{x,y}/\tau) \cdot \mathbf{e}_y^s}{\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{J}_x} \exp(s_{x,y'}/\tau)}$$

# More Methods and Findings

## Extensions of WESCHEL

**OFA (One-for-All):** multilingual vocabulary, need to handle large vocab (*OFA*)


- Reduce embedding dimension (inspired from ALBERT)
- Source embedding factorization with SVD for dimensionality reduction
  - Co-ordinates: language-dependent
  - Primitives: language-independent
- Projection of source co-ordinates to target co-ordinates like WESCHEL

**FOCUS:** Target token embeddings as weighted average of overlapping source token embeddings (*FOCUS*)

# Summary

- **Can we do better than random initialization?**
  - Embeddings which initialize new tokens based on similarity with older embeddings do better
  - Faster convergence
  - Slightly better downstream performance
  - Results mostly for smaller LMs and decoder LMs
- **Is vocabulary expansion better than relying to initial sub-optimal vocab?**
  - Vocab expansion might require lot of pre-training for alignment
- **Will vocabulary extension lead to lower performance on English?**
  - If initialized embeddings are in convex hull, greedy decoding result does not change

# Continual Pre-training



*Train on document-level data*

Finetuning on long, coherent sequences  
helps model learn and correlate  
different pieces of knowledge

*Causal Language Modeling Objective*

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T) = \prod_{t=1}^T p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t})$$

*To avoid forgetting English competence and knowledge*

- Include English in the pre-training data
- Finetune-only small number of adapter parameters  
*(ChineseLLama, OpenHathi)*

# Why do continual pre-training?

## Language competence/fluency in target language

	L(0)	L(10k)	L(100k)	L(1M)
Chinese	10.151	8.697	6.634	5.249

*Perplexity reduces with increase in pre-training corpus size*  
*(LmaByndEng)*

## Improve alignment b/w English and target language

Language	Base LLM	After CPT
Gujarati	0.39	0.46
Hindi	0.40	0.44
Marathi	0.44	0.48

*Cosine similarities between English and target languages increases with CPT*  
*(RomanSetu)*

## Provide required knowledge in target language for better understanding


- LMs better at using in-language knowledge vs. cross-lingual transfer (*Xfactr, MLAMA*)
- Incorporate cultural-specific knowledge capture in native language corpora only

## Most multilingual models can't transfer knowledge in English to other languages

Knowledge Probing Task → Predict missing tokens which capture model's knowledge

fact      ⟨Bloomberg L.P., founded\_in, New York⟩  
en prompt [X] was founded in [Y].

es sentence	Bloomberg L.P. fue fundada en ⟨mask⟩ × 1 ~ 5.	
prediction	#tokens	confidence
2012	1	-1.90
Nueva York	2	-0.61
EE. UU	3	-1.82
Chicago, Estados Unidos	4	-3.58
2012 Bloomberg L.P	5	-3.06



English accuracy for knowledge probing is much higher than other languages

Results on Knowledge Probing task shows that non-English languages don't have enough data

(Xfactr)

# Improving Cross-lingual Transfer in Pre-training

- Using Parallel/Translated Data
- Using Romanized Representation

## Why?

- Help improve cross-lingual alignment
- Make knowledge available in English in the target languages
- Help translation task

# Using Parallel/Translated Data

## Using parallel data

(*Tower, Palm2, PolyLM, OpenHathi, MTDataPretrain*)

- Train on document/paragraph pairs → very little availability
- Train on sentence pairs → modest availability depending on language pair
- MT Data modestly useful for NLU (results on encoder LMs) (*PrimerPMLM*)
  - More investigation needed

## Using Machine Translated data

(*IndicMonoDoc*)

Use off-the-shelf MT data to generate target language data at scale → needs a decent MT model

- Model training includes translated documents
- Some evidence to show that translated documents can achieve performance close to pre-training with original documents

*Need better to understand impact of translation quality*

# Using Parallel/Translated Data (1)

## Using human-written parallel data (Tower, Palm2, PolyLM, OpenHathi, MTDataPretrain)

- Train on document/paragraph pairs → very little availability
- Train on sentence pairs → modest availability depending on language pair

Useful for translation task (Tower, OpenHathi)

*No systematic results on utility of parallel data in pre-training*

### Previous work

- Encoder-only models & NLU tasks → parallel data has limited utility (PrimerPMLM)
- Encoder-decoder models & NLG tasks → don't know

# Using Parallel/Translated Data (2)

## Using Machine Translated data *(IndicMonoDoc)*

Use off-the-shelf MT data to generate target language data at scale

→ needs a decent MT model

- Model training includes machine translated documents
- Pre-training on translated documents slightly inferior to original documents
  - Translation quality filtering + using small original data makes result comparable
- For small LMs, synthetic data might outperform original data

(a) Results on Hindi

Model	NLU						NLG				
	iXNLI	bbc-a	iitp-mr	iitp-pr	midas	Avg.	Headline Gen.	Sentence Summ.	Question Gen.	Wikibio	Avg.
HI-clean	73.61	81.75	72.58	79.73	80.34	77.60	27.54	23.64	24.84	52.16	32.04
syn-HI_en-unfiltered	72.87	77.92	64.36	76.22	79.91	74.26	<b>27.29</b>	22.93	24.22	<b>50.14</b>	<b>31.14</b>
syn-HI_en-unfiltered+10%	74.63	78.36	67.75	77.46	80.17	75.67	-	-	-	-	-
syn-HI_en-filtered	<b>74.75</b>	<b>81.06</b>	69.03	78.58	79.73	76.63	27.15	<b>23.10</b>	<b>24.41</b>	49.88	31.13
syn-HI_en-filtered+10%	74.49	80.94	<b>71.61</b>	<b>79.92</b>	<b>80.64</b>	<b>77.52</b>	-	-	-	-	-

# Romanized Representation

(*RomanSetu*)

*Challenges with non-Latin  
script languages*

- High-fertility/data loss for under-represented vocab
- Poor representation quality
- Vocab extension requires lot of pre-training (*Lai et al . 2023*)

<ss> चारों अंतरिक्ष यात्री बेंगलुरु में भारतीय अंतरिक्ष अनुसंधान संग<0xE0><0xA4><0xA0>न (<0xE0><0xA4><0x87>सरो) की अंतरिक्ष यात्री सुविधा में प्रशिक्षण ले रहे हैं।<0x0A> **(130 tokens)**

<ss> chaaron antariksh yaatree bengaluru mein bhaarateey antariksh anusandhaan sangathan (issaro) kee antariksh ya atree suvidha mein prashikshan le rahe hain.<0x0A> **(63 tokens)**

## Pre-train on romanized corpora

- Natural transliteration
- Fixed Romanization schemes


Language	N	R
Gujarati	18.44	<b>3.39</b>
Hindi	7.36	<b>2.98</b>
Malayalam	12.85	<b>5.04</b>
Marathi	8.91	<b>3.64</b>
Tamil	12.11	<b>4.89</b>

*Romanized fertility more  
than 2x lower than native  
script fertility*

Language	E - N	E - R
Gujarati	0.39	0.47
Hindi	0.40	0.50
Malayalam	0.40	0.46
Marathi	0.44	0.48
Tamil	0.44	0.43

*Romanized representations are  
better aligned to English than  
native script representations*

# Instruction Tuning



*Train on in-language IFT dataset*

*Sources of IFT dataset*

*Quality and diversity of IFT dataset*

$$\ell_{\text{CE}}(\mathbf{y}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}) = - \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{V}|} y_j \log(\hat{y}_j) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{SFT}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{\text{CE}}(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathcal{M}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i))$$

*Cross entropy loss*

*To retain English task performance*

- Include English in the IFT training

# Instruction Tuning Tasks

*Variety of tasks/objectives to improve non-English performance*

- English Data IFT
- In-language IFT with Machine Translated Data
- Parallel Data
- Monolingual Data
- Romanized IFT Data
- Cross-lingual Thought Data
- Cross-lingual IFT Data
- Code-switched IFT Data

*Let's look at these tasks in detail*

# Using English IFT Dataset

- Instruction tune the model on English instruction dataset
- Evaluate on non-English data → Zero-shot cross-lingual evaluation
- Instruction tuning on English important to retain English capabilities

# Using Machine Translated IFT Dataset

- Translate English instruction tuning datasets into the language
- Fine-tune model on translated dataset

Task	BeleBele QA	MKQA	XL-Sum
	Accuracy	F1	Rouge-L
English IFT	45.58	36.48	8.42
Language IFT	<b>48.28</b>	<b>37.95</b>	<b>15.87</b>

Average performance across many languages; src: [SDRRL](#)

Instruction tuning on translated data outperforms English instruction-tuning

# Creating Translated IFT Data

Choice of Translation Engine

- Off-the-shelf NMT systems ([Airavat](#)): higher quality, particularly for low-resource
- GPT ([Okapi](#)): can do translation taking the entire context of input/output

	#langs.	avg. chrF	avg. BLEU
<b>ChatGPT</b> (0-shot)	203	32.3	16.7
<b>ChatGPT</b> (5-shot)	203	33.1	17.3
<b>GPT-4</b>	20	44.6	24.6
<b>NLLB</b>	201	45.3	27.1
<b>Google</b>	115	<b>52.2</b>	<b>34.6</b>

Comparison of various translation engines  
*Sentence-level*  
([ChatGptMT](#))

Model	Human (General/Discourse)				
	News	Social	Fiction	Q&A	Ave.
Google	1.9/2.0	1.2/1.3	2.1/2.4	1.5/1.5	1.7/1.8
DeepL	2.2/2.2	1.3/1.1	2.4/2.6	1.6/1.5	1.9/1.9
Tencent	2.3/2.2	1.5/1.5	2.6/2.8	1.8/1.7	2.1/2.1
GPT-3.5	2.8/2.8	2.5/2.7	<b>2.8/2.9</b>	2.9/2.9	2.8/2.8
GPT-4	<b>3.3/3.4</b>	<b>2.9/2.9</b>	2.6/2.8	<b>3.1/3.2</b>	<b>3.0/3.1</b>

Comparison of various translation engines  
*Document-level*  
([ChatGptMT](#))

# Creating Translated IFT Data (2)

What to Translate

- Instruction, Input, Output (Okapi, Airavat, xLLama, SDRRL)
- Input, Output (BLOOMZ)
  - English instruction is a common usecase
  - Models are good at English Instruction following

## Quality Filtering

*High quality examples are important for instruction tuning*


- Use an MT evaluation metric like COMET-QE to identify bad translations
- Rule-based filters to avoid code examples, etc. that are difficult to translate

# Creating Translated IFT Data (3)

- Instruction, Input (BactrianX)


- Give translated Instruction & Input
- Generate response using GPT in the target language
- Language/culture-specific examples

## What to Translate



- Seed Instructions (PolyLM, SeaLLM)


- Generates the entire examples from strong LLM like GPT **in target language**
- Language/culture specific examples, but quality/diversity might be issue



# Using Parallel Data

Translation is a *special* task for multilingual IFT models

- Teaches the model to translate
- Aligns English and language representations better
- Improves performance on other downstream tasks
- Parallel data and translated IFT data both help



Instruction Data	XQUAD (exact match)	MLQA (exact match)	mLAMA (exact match)	XLSum (Rouge-1)
Alpaca-En	31.8	26.7	5.3	9.0
Alpaca-En+En-Zh	34.3	38.0	5.8	27.1
Alpaca-En+Alpaca-Zh	51.7	48.0	21.9	25.5
Alpaca-En+Alpaca-Zh+En-Zh	54.9	51.8	30.4	28.3

**Results on Chinese for various Tasks**

Instruction-tuning Data	Ar	Hi	Vi	Zh
Alpaca-En	16.1	13.7	34.1	26.7
Alpaca-En+En-Zh	33.6	35.1	42.2	38.0
Alpaca-En+Alpaca-Zh	33.1	35.1	50.1	48.0
Alpaca-En+Alpaca-Zh+En-Zh	37.0	42.3	50.8	51.8

**Results for other languages on MLQA**

# Using Monolingual Data

- “Translationese IFT Data” → output language might not be fluent and high-quality
- Expose model to monolingual target language data during IFT
- Incorporate a task that helps model generate fluent output in target language

## Task 1: Standard next-word prediction (CLM)

Switch between IFT and CLM objective in mini-batches

## Task 2: Sentence Completion Task

Only IFT objective required



Question: Complete the following sentence in *Indonesian* according to its context.

*Sang rubah cokelat cepat*

Answer: *Sang rubah cokelat cepat melompati anjing malas.*

# Romanized Representation

Just like pre-training, use romanized representation for IFT too



- Continual Pre-training with romanized data is crucial
- NLG task performance improves with romanized data
- NLU task performance is on par, though more efficient

# Cross-Lingual Thought Prompting (XLT)


*Ask the model to implicitly think in a different language*

Monolingual QA



Monolingual QA  
with 'thinking in English' aka

Cross-lingual  
Thought  
Prompting



Model asked to generate intermediate English artifacts

No explicit translation call

The LLM itself is used as a translator **implicitly**


✓ **Multiple inferences are avoided**

✓ **Input in original language is available to LLM**

✗ **Increased token length for model, Reduces possible input token size**


(XLT, PLUG)

# TaCo: Instruction tuning with Cross-Lingual Thought data



## Limitations

- Reduced maximum sequence length
- Increased latency




	Standard IFT	TaCo
Nepali	39.3	88.1
Persian	46.5	83.9

Evaluation on translated Vicuna Benchmark with GPT4

The PLUG paper also shows improvements (discussed later)

(TaCo, PLUG)

# Cross-Lingual Instruction Tuning



$Q_{hi}$ : मैं अपने समय प्रबंधन कौशल को कैसे सुधार सकता हूँ? मुझे 5 संक्षिप्त बिंदु दीजिये।

$A_{en}$ :

1. Prioritize tasks based on importance and urgency.
2. Set specific goals with deadlines (SMART goals).
3. Use time management tools like calendars and apps.
4. Minimize distractions to maintain focus.
5. Regularly review and adjust your schedule for better efficiency.

***Cross-lingual instruction help the model to align languages and think in English***

***Avoids intermediate English generation of Cross-lingual Thought Prompting***

**(SDDRL,XCOT,CIT)**

# Code-switched Instruction Tuning

*Code-switching:* alternating between two or more languages in conversation

Generate code-switched instruction by replacing some source words with their target language translations


$Q_{hi}$ : मैं अपने time प्रबंधन skill को कैसे सुधार सकता हूँ? मुझे 5 brief बिंदु दीजिये।

$A_{en}$ :

1. महत्व और तात्कालिकता के आधार पर कार्यों को प्राथमिकता दें।
2. समय सीमा (स्मार्ट लक्ष्य) के साथ विशिष्ट लक्ष्य निर्धारित करें।
3. कैलेंडर और ऐप्स जैसे समय प्रबंधन टूल का उपयोग करें।
4. फोकस बनाए रखने के लिए विकर्षणों को कम करें।
5. बेहतर दक्षता के लिए नियमित रूप से अपने शेड्यूल की समीक्षा करें और उसे समायोजित करें।

*Code-switching help the model to align languages better at sub-sentence level*

# Self-Distillation from Resource Rich Language





Using the model's own responses can help uses the model's own representation space better

(SDDRL,LMPpl)


# SDRRL: Putting it all together

(SDDRL)



**(c) Self-Distillation from Resource-Rich Languages (Ours)**

Hmm, TBH it just looks like overtraining.



*(these tasks are added so model preserves native language competency)*

# Summary Results

Metrics are not that much better than  
(SDDRL) SFT

	BELE.	XL-SUM	FLORES	MKQA	AVG.
<i>Performance on Target Language</i>					
SFT	42.24	<u>16.48</u>	18.45	38.86	29.01
T-SFT	<u>42.77</u>	15.32	16.59	43.40	29.52
CIT	42.53	15.75	<u>20.49</u>	<u>43.70</u>	<u>30.62</u>
XCOT	41.19	15.79	17.21	42.04	29.06
SDRRL	<b>43.67</b>	<b>17.89</b>	<b>25.86</b>	<b>44.63</b>	<b>33.01</b>
<i>Performance on English Language</i>					
SFT	<u>60.19</u>	15.25	<u>28.49</u>	<u>39.62</u>	<u>35.89</u>
T-SFT	58.70	<u>15.63</u>	23.72	37.43	33.87
CIT	58.66	15.42	18.31	36.67	32.27
XCOT	57.73	14.90	23.96	37.94	33.63
SDRRL	<b>60.67</b>	<b>16.24</b>	<b>29.47</b>	<b>40.32</b>	<b>36.68</b>

(This summary is for the SeaLLM  
backbone LLM, results in main paper are  
for LLama)

*SFT: FT on English data*

*T-SFT: source and target translated*

*CIT: target translated*

*XCOT: source translated + source code-switching*

- Bringing together all these objectives and data augmentations:
- Helps improve overall response quality across multiple tasks
  - Retains English performance

# Ablation Studies (1)

(SDDRL)

		NLU AVG.		NLG AVG.	
		TAR.	ENG	TAR.	ENG
1	Full Method	<b>50.58</b>	<b>66.29</b>	<b>28.24</b>	<b>31.69</b>
2	- $\mathcal{D}_{\text{TL}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LT}}$	49.56	65.93	26.15	30.55
3	- $\mathcal{D}_{\text{synth}} + \mathcal{D}$	48.59	65.10	25.16	30.10
4	- $\mathcal{D}_{\text{mt}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{comp}}$	<u>50.41</u>	<u>66.01</u>	26.61	30.19
5	- Code Switching	50.37	65.94	<u>27.13</u>	<u>30.69</u>
6	Only $\mathcal{D}_{\text{mt}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{comp}}$	41.25	61.61	17.89	22.28

Table 6: Ablation study. Average scores of target language (TAR.) and English (ENG) on natural language understanding task (NLU, including BELEBELE) and natural language generation tasks (NLG, including FLORES, XL-SUM ROUGE-L, and MKQA) are reported.

- Using the LLMs own responses is a very useful method to improve cross-lingual transfer
- The MT and sentence completion tasks are very useful
- The cross-lingual instruction tuning tasks are also complementary
- Code-switching (on input side) has modest benefits

# Ablation Studies (2)

(PLUG)

Training Method Comparison	Chinese			Korean			Italian			Spanish		
	Win%	Loss%	Δ%	Win%	Loss%	Δ%	Win%	Loss%	Δ%	Win%	Loss%	Δ%
<i>English-Centric Foundation LLM: LLaMA-2-13B</i>												
PLUG vs. Pivot-Only	70.9	19.1	+51.8	76.5	12.7	+63.9	67.6	17.8	+49.8	64.0	20.9	+43.1
PLUG vs. Mono. Response	58.0	25.2	+32.8	64.1	19.9	+44.2	50.3	25.8	+24.5	53.0	27.6	+25.5
PLUG vs. Mono.+ Translation	53.0	28.0	+25.1	62.7	20.1	+42.6	50.1	26.6	+23.5	51.3	25.6	+25.7
PLUG vs. Mono.+ Code-Switch	50.2	31.6	+18.6	55.2	25.6	+29.6	46.2	30.9	+15.3	48.4	29.9	+18.5

PLUG: Thinking in pivot language

Pivot-only: IFT On pivot language

Mono-Response: IFT on pivot and target language

Mono + Translation: add translation task to Mono-Response

Mono + Code-Switch: add cross-lingual instruction tuning to Mono-Response

Evaluation with GPT4

- Including Translation task is useful
- Training on cross-lingual thought data is most effective
- Cross-lingual instruction tuning is the best next, closes gap on cross-lingual thought data

# The Indian Language LLM Scenario

# IndicLLMSuite

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.06350>


<https://github.com/AI4Bharat/IndicLLMSuite>



- Pre-training data for 22 languages
  - 88B tokens original
  - 162B tokens synthetic
- Instruction-tuning data generated from Llama and translated
- Harmless Response Generation data created
- SETU: Opensource pipeline for data crawling, filtering and processing

## Focus on data scale and quality

(IndicLLMSuite)



IndicAlign				
Component	Examples	Prompt source	Response source	Original / Translated
Indic ShareLlama	21.1 k	👤	🤖	ଓଡ଼ିଆ
Dolly - T	15.0 k	👤	👤	ଓଡ଼ିଆ
OpenAssistant - T	19.9 k	👤	👤	ଓଡ଼ିଆ
WikiHow	26.4 k	👤	👤	ଓଡ଼ିଆ
IndoWordNet	74.2 M	👤	👤	ଓଡ଼ିଆ
Anudesh	43.3 k	👤	🤖	ଓଡ଼ିଆ
Wiki-Conv	144 k	🤖	🤖	ଓଡ଼ିଆ
Wiki-Chat	202 k	🤖	🤖	ଓଡ଼ିଆ

INSTRUCT				
Component	Examples	Prompt source	Response source	Original / Translated
HH-RLHF	32.6 k	👤	🤖	ଓଡ଼ିଆ
ToxicMatrix	90.3 k	🤖	🤖	ଓଡ଼ିଆ

TOXIC		
Component	Examples	Prompt source
HH-RLHF	32.6 k	👤
ToxicMatrix	90.3 k	🤖

👤 Human    🤖 Model    📈 Translated

# OpenHathi

<https://www.sarvam.ai/blog/announcing-openhathi-series>

<https://huggingface.co/sarvamai/OpenHathi-7B-Hi-v0.1-Base>



- Base LLM for Hindi
- Trained on large Hindi monolingual and Hindi/English parallel corpora
- Vocabulary expanded to include Hindi tokens
- Bilingual pre-training to align Hindi and English
- Only LoRA adapters trained to efficiently use compute and prevent forgetting English knowledge
- Performs well on translation, code-mixing, etc. after finetuning

(OpenHathi)

# Airavata

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.15006>

<https://ai4bharat.github.io/airavata/>



- Instruction tuned Hindi LLM based on OpenHathi
- Trained on translated SFT data from truly open-source datasets *FLAN, OpenAssistant, Dolly, LymSys-Chat and MT task*
- Finetuning and Evaluation Benchmark IndicInstruct created

## Many other open LLM efforts

Navarasa, various language specific-Llama extensions for Odia, Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, etc.

# Navarasa

- Instruction tuned Indic LLM based on Gemma
  - 15 languages
  - Finetuned on translated ALPACA (IndicALPACA), Samvaad
- Gemma as lower fertility compared to Llama for Indic languages

<https://ravidesetty.medium.com/introducing-indic-gemma-7b-2b-instruction-tuned-model-on-9-indian-languages-navarasa-86bc81b4a282>

<https://ravidesetty.medium.com/introducing-navarasa-2-0-indic-gemma-7b-2b-instruction-tuned-model-on-15-indian-languages-31f6565b2750>

(Navarasa1, Navarasa2)

# Other Efforts in the works

- Ola Krutrim
- Mahindra Indus
- Corover BharatGPT
- IIT Bombay Consortium – BharatGPT

# Summary

- Rapid Advances in Multilingual LLMs
- Extending strong English LLMs to other languages is an effective and efficient direction
- Vocabulary expansion to support new languages and make LLMs efficient, but challenges in achieving convergence
- Continual pre-training important to improve language competence
- Lot of work on aligning languages in the instruction tuning stage

# Future Directions

## **Modeling/Training**

- Improving cross-lingual transfer
- Use of synthetic data
- Better “thinking” in English
- Composing Task and Language skills efficiently
- Small Multilingual models

## **Data/Resources**

- Scalable evaluation methods for multilingual LLMs
- Creation of multilingual benchmarks
- Collection of large-scale culture-specific text corpora

# Multilingual Pre-training Corpora

- MADLAD-400
- CulturaX
- ROOTS
- mC4
- OSCAR
- CC100
- Glot500-c
- Sangraha
- SEA-LION-PILE

# Notable Projects on Extending English LLMs

- BLOOM+1
- ChineseLLama
- Bactrian-X
- Okapi
- SeaLLM
- TOWER
- ALMA and ALMA-R
- AceGPT

# Thanks

If you find this work useful, please cite it in your work

```
@online{kunchukuttan2024extendllm,  
author = {{Anoop Kunchukuttan}},  
title = {Extending English Large Language Models to New Languages: A Survey},  
url = {https://anoopkunchukuttan.gitlab.io/publications/presentations/extend\_en\_llms\_apr2024.pdf},  
date = {2nd April 2024},  
urldate = {2nd April 2024}  
}
```

## Acknowledgments

Based on work, explorations and discussions with many colleagues ...

Raj Dabre, Ratish Puduppully, Jay Gala, Thanmay Jayakumar, Jaavid Aktar Husain, Aswanth Kumar, Mohammed Safi Ur Rahman Khan, Mitesh Khapra, Priyam Mehta, Diptesh Kanodia, Rudra Murthy, Nandini Mundra, Aditya Nanda Kishore, Sumanth Doddapaneni, Rupesh Mehta, Manish Gupta

**Contact:** [anoop.kunchukuttan@gmail.com](mailto:anoop.kunchukuttan@gmail.com)

**Home Page:** <https://anoopkunchukuttan.gitlab.io>