# <span id="page-0-1"></span>Accelerating Multilingual Language Model for Excessively Tokenized Languages

Jimin Hong Gibbeum Lee Jaewoong Cho KRAFTON

{jimmy.h, pirensisco, jwcho}@krafton.com

## Abstract

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) have remarkably enhanced performances on a variety of tasks in multiple languages. However, tokenizers in LLMs trained primarily on English-centric corpora often overly fragment a text into character or Unicode-level tokens in non-Roman alphabetic languages, leading to inefficient text generation. We introduce a simple yet effective framework to accelerate text generation in such languages. Our approach involves employing a new language model head with a vocabulary set tailored to a specific target language for a pretrained LLM. This is followed by fine-tuning the new head while incorporating a verification step to ensure the model's performance is preserved. We show that this targeted finetuning, while freezing other model parameters, effectively reduces token fragmentation for the target language. Our extensive experiments demonstrate that the proposed framework increases the generation speed by a factor of 1.7 while maintaining the performance of pre-trained multilingual models on target monolingual tasks.

#### 1 Introduction

Modern large language models (LLMs) [\(OpenAI,](#page-10-0) [2023;](#page-10-0) [Touvron et al.,](#page-11-0) [2023a;](#page-11-0) [Antropic,](#page-9-0) [2023\)](#page-9-0) have exhibited remarkable capabilities for a variety of tasks in multiple languages [\(Eloundou et al.,](#page-10-1) [2023;](#page-10-1) [Solaiman et al.,](#page-11-1) [2023\)](#page-11-1). Although these models are predominantly trained on English-centric data, they have shown a significant degree of multilingual proficiency [\(Bandarkar et al.,](#page-9-1) [2023\)](#page-9-1).

However, when applied to non-alphabetic languages, these models often suffer from slower text generation due to English-centric tokenization [\(Rust et al.,](#page-11-2) [2021;](#page-11-2) [Ahia et al.,](#page-9-2) [2023;](#page-9-2) [Petrov](#page-11-3) [et al.,](#page-11-3) [2023\)](#page-11-3). Current tokenization techniques used in Large Language Models (LLMs) are data-driven and optimize segmentation based on the frequency

<span id="page-0-0"></span>

Figure 1: Analysis of tokenization lengths and language distribution in pretraining corpus with percentage >=0.04% English script comprises 89.7% of the corpus and has an average token length of 29.6 in FLoRes-200. The languages using the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean (CJK) scripts have longer tokenization lengths compared to those using Latin and Cyrillic scripts. Our primary focus is on languages that are excessively tokenized by English-centric tokenizers.

of characters or bytes within a specific corpus [\(Sen](#page-11-4)[nrich et al.,](#page-11-4) [2016;](#page-11-4) [Kudo,](#page-10-2) [2018\)](#page-10-2). As a result, the tokenizers of multilingual models, which are heavily influenced by English-dominant training data, are predominantly composed of English subwords. This leads to *excessive fragmentation*, where non-English words are overly segmented into a large number of subword units [\(Rust et al.,](#page-11-2) [2021;](#page-11-2) [Ahia](#page-9-2) [et al.,](#page-9-2) [2023;](#page-9-2) [Petrov et al.,](#page-11-3) [2023\)](#page-11-3). The autoregressive nature of LLMs further amplifies this inefficiency, as it sequentially requires the generation of text.

To address these challenges, previous studies [\(Wang et al.,](#page-11-5) [2019;](#page-11-5) [Rust et al.,](#page-11-2) [2021;](#page-11-2) [Cui](#page-9-3) [et al.,](#page-9-3) [2023\)](#page-9-3) have proposed replacing or augmenting the existing vocabulary of pre-trained multilingual models with language-specific vocabularies to more effectively encode monolingual text corpora. Specifically, [Rust et al.](#page-11-2) [\(2021\)](#page-11-2) improved mBERT [\(Devlin et al.,](#page-9-4) [2019\)](#page-9-4) by replacing its tokenizer with a monolingual one and incorporating an additional 100,000 pre-training steps. On the other hand, [Cui et al.](#page-9-3) [\(2023\)](#page-9-3) enhanced Llama [\(Touvron](#page-11-0)



Figure 2: Overview of the proposed framework. Illustration of (Left) the generation with a pre-trained multilingual model and (Right) the generation of MuMo Framework. Given the Korean prefix "천왕성은" (*Uranus is*), the model generates the consecutive phrase "태양으로부터"(*from the Sun*) that consisted of 3 morphemes ("태양", "으로", "부터") in Korean. The generation with the pre-trained multilingual model faces inefficiency due to excessive fragmentation, requiring 12 steps to generate only 3 Korean morphemes. However, the MuMo framework empowers the multilingual language model to generate multiple tokens in a single iteration by extracting a word from the Korean Vocabulary, requiring 3 steps.

[et al.,](#page-11-0) [2023a\)](#page-11-0) by expanding the Chinese vocabulary and further pre-training it on a 120GB text corpus that includes Chinese texts. However, this approach requires an extensive pre-training phase with a substantial amount of data.

Another approach to address the challenges is the use of small draft models [\(Leviathan et al.,](#page-10-3) [2023;](#page-10-3) [Chen et al.,](#page-9-5) [2023a\)](#page-9-5). These models generate draft output tokens, which are then verified by the original language model. However, a significant challenge arises when trying to identify or train a suitable small model that can handle multiple languages with reliable performance [\(Conneau et al.,](#page-9-6) [2020;](#page-9-6) [Bandarkar et al.,](#page-9-1) [2023\)](#page-9-1).

In response to these challenges, our research introduces MuMo, accelerating Multilingual language models for a targeted Monolingual text generation, particularly in non-alphabetic languages. MuMo incorporates a new vocabulary of a target language into the output layer, also known as the Language Model (LM) head, and predicts the next token from this expanded vocabulary. This approach requires training only the extended portion of the output layer and specific layers of the feed-forward network. Importantly, MuMo eliminates the need for extensive text corpora or a draft model, requiring only a modest corpus of the target language, approximately 44M tokens in size. Empirical results across summarization, and translation tasks in Korean and Japanese demonstrate that MuMo significantly accelerates text generation, achieving over a 1.7-fold increase in speed without significantly compromising output quality.

Lang	Word	<b>Multilingual Tokens</b>
Kο	서울	$\overline{({}^{\alpha}\mathcal{A}]$ ", " $\overline{0}xec$ ", " $\overline{0}xb8$ ", " $\overline{0}x9a$ ")
JA.	発売	("\\\\; "\\test", "\\test\) \text{\care\)} ("\\\) \text\) \te

Table 1: Examples of the tokenization results. These examples are preprocessed by the Llama tokenizer [\(Tou](#page-11-6)[vron et al.,](#page-11-6) [2023b\)](#page-11-6). The target monolingual word are excessively segmented into byte units, when a suitable match is not found in the multilingual vocabulary.

# 2 Related Work

Tokenization Disparity Subword tokenization, a common approach in LMs, is typically datadriven. Most of pre-trained tokenizers, which are often trained on predominantly English corpora, frequently result in excessive fragmentation of non-English scripts [\(Rust et al.,](#page-11-2) [2021;](#page-11-2) [Zhang et al.,](#page-11-7) [2022\)](#page-11-7). [Ahia et al.](#page-9-2) [\(2023\)](#page-9-2); [Petrov et al.](#page-11-3) [\(2023\)](#page-11-3) have found significant tokenization disparities across languages in popular LLMs [\(Xue et al.,](#page-11-8) [2021,](#page-11-8) [2022;](#page-11-9) [Scao et al.,](#page-11-10) [2022;](#page-11-10) [OpenAI,](#page-10-0) [2023\)](#page-10-0). Our work endeavors to address the slowdown in inference that arises due to tokenization disparity in non-alphabetic languages.

Modifying Pre-trained Vocabulary Previous works have explored the adaptation of pre-trained vocabularies or the addition of new tokens [\(Artetxe](#page-9-7) [et al.,](#page-9-7) [2020;](#page-9-7) [Rust et al.,](#page-11-2) [2021;](#page-11-2) [Hong et al.,](#page-10-4) [2021;](#page-10-4) [Liu et al.,](#page-10-5) [2023\)](#page-10-5), these methods often necessitate extensive pre-training to integrate the new tokens effectively [\(Wang et al.,](#page-11-5) [2019;](#page-11-5) [Chau et al.,](#page-9-8) [2020;](#page-9-8) [Cui et al.,](#page-9-3) [2023;](#page-9-3) [Liu et al.,](#page-10-5) [2023\)](#page-10-5). In contrast, our MuMo framework sidesteps the need for finetuning the parameters of pre-trained models to preserve the original capabilities of the pre-trained language model. Efforts to select items of pre-trained embedding matrix have been made [\(Abdaoui et al.,](#page-9-9) [2020;](#page-9-9) [Domhan et al.,](#page-10-6) [2022;](#page-10-6) [Ushio et al.,](#page-11-11) [2023\)](#page-11-11), but these have not yielded significant speed up where the size of the embedding layer is relatively small [\(Bogoychev et al.,](#page-9-10) [2023\)](#page-9-10).

Accelerating LLM Inference The quest to accelerate inference in auto-regressive large language models (LLMs) has led to a variety of approaches. There has been a proliferation of systems specifically engineered for LLM inference [\(Yu et al.,](#page-11-12) [2022;](#page-11-12) [Sheng et al.,](#page-11-13) [2023;](#page-11-13) [Xiao et al.,](#page-11-14) [2023\)](#page-11-14). Our proposed methodology can be harmonically integrated with the aforementioned techniques. Speculative decoding [\(Leviathan et al.,](#page-10-3) [2023;](#page-10-3) [Chen et al.,](#page-9-5) [2023a\)](#page-9-5) have also been explored to increase inference velocity. However, the approach often relies on the assumption that a small model can maintain high fidelity when generating a series of multiple tokens. Moreover, acquiring a small yet competitive model may be tricky, especially in a multilingual setup [\(Conneau et al.,](#page-9-6) [2020;](#page-9-6) [Bandarkar et al.,](#page-9-1) [2023\)](#page-9-1). Our work distinguishes itself by specifically solving the inference inefficiency that arises from excessive fragmentation in the non-alphabetic context.

Parameter Efficient Cross-lingual Transfer Learning The *curse of multilinguality*, which refers a trade-off between the language coverage and model capacity [\(Conneau et al.,](#page-9-6) [2020\)](#page-9-6), is a significant issue even in massively multilingual models, such as mBERT, XLM-R, and mT5 [\(Devlin et al.,](#page-9-4) [2019;](#page-9-4) [Conneau et al.,](#page-9-6) [2020;](#page-9-6) [Xue et al.,](#page-11-8) [2021;](#page-11-8) [Ansell et al.,](#page-9-11) [2021\)](#page-9-11). The problem has been mitigated through modular parameterefficient adaptations of the multilingual models through lightweight adapters [\(Houlsby et al.,](#page-10-7) [2019\)](#page-10-7): additional trainable parameters inserted into the transformer layers of model [\(Pfeiffer et al.,](#page-11-15) [2020;](#page-11-15) [Üstün et al.,](#page-11-16) [2020;](#page-11-17) [Vidoni et al.,](#page-11-17) 2020; Parović et al., [2022\)](#page-10-8) for a target language. These techniques bear a resemblance to ours, in that they involve training partial parameters of a language model with a small amount of target language corpus. However, our goal is fundamentally different: we aim to accelerate the inference, whereas previous studies focus on improving the representational capability in target languages for multilingual models.

## 3 Proposed Framework

We propose a framework named **MuMo** to accelerate the inference speed of a pre-trained multilingual LM for a non-alphabetic monolingual language via a given small monolingual dataset. In the section, we introduce 1) the model architecture, 2) the finetuning process on a small targeted language dataset, and 3) the inference process of the proposed framework.

#### 3.1 Model Architecture

We illustrate the model architecture of MuMo in Fig. [3.](#page-3-0)

Pre-trained Multilingual Model We consider a setting in which a pre-trained multilingual model  $f_{\text{multi}}$  is given. The model consists of 1) Transformer layers that consist of attention and feedforward network, and 2) an output embedding layer called language model (LM) head. We denote  $V_{\text{multi}}$  as the multilingual vocabulary set of the model objective, as  $\mathcal{L}_{MLE}(p_{multi}, \mathbf{x})$  =  $\sum_{t=1}^{|{\bf x}|} \log p_{\text{multi}}(x_t | {\bf x}_{$ 

Target Monolingual LM Head The primary concept involves modifying pre-trained representations to predict a singular token unit within a target monolingual vocabulary  $V_{\text{mono}}$ . The Target Monolingual LM head  $f_{\text{mono}}$  projects the hidden representation  $h$ , which is composed of two main components: a feed-forward network (FFN) and an output linear layer, represented as  $g_{\text{mono}} : \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{mono}}} \rightarrow$  $\mathbb{R}^{|V_{\text{mono}}|}$ :

$$
FFN(h) = q(W_1^{\top}h)W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{mono}}},\qquad(1)
$$

where  $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{multi}} \times d_{\text{fin}}}$  and  $W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{ffn}} \times d_{\text{mono}}}$  are the weight matrices,  $q$  is non-linearity function, and  $d_{\text{mono}}$  represents the dimension of the target language representaiton. We set  $d_{\text{ffn}}$  as  $d_{\text{multi}}/4$ , and the non-linearity function  $q$  as SwiGLU [\(Shazeer,](#page-11-18) [2020\)](#page-11-18). The output linear layer  $g_{\text{mono}}$  then generates a subword token:

$$
f_{\text{mono}}(h) = g_{\text{mono}}(\text{FFN}(h)) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}_{\text{mono}}|}.
$$
 (2)

MuMo LM Head Note that the output space of  $f_{\text{mono}}$  is restricted to tokens in the  $V_{\text{mono}}$ . Inspired by [Lan et al.](#page-10-9) [\(2023\)](#page-10-9), we simply extend the  $f_{\text{mono}}$  by concatenating the output linear layer of pre-trained multilingual model. This is particularly useful when there is no suitable token in  $V_{\text{mono}}$  to

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

Figure 3: Illustration of a single-step prediction with MuMo. Initially, the MuMo LM Head  $f_{\text{mumo}}$  selects the top 6 candidates. Then, the pre-trained multilingual model verifies the feasibility of the candidates. Among the modules in MuMo, the Target Monolingual LM head (the Korean LM Head in the figure) is only trained.

predict, such as special symbols or alphabet-based tokens for non-alphabet languages.

Formally, given context representation  $h_{t-1}$ , the output of the MuMo LM head is computed as:

$$
f_{\text{mumo}}(h_{t-1}) =
$$

$$
[f_{\text{multi}}(h_{t-1}); f_{\text{mono}}(h_{t-1})] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}_{\text{multi}}|+|\mathcal{V}_{\text{mono}}|} \quad (3)
$$

where the symbol ; indicates the concatenation of two vectors, and the  $f_{\text{mumo}}$  indicates the output of the MuMo LM head. Thus, the MuMo LM head is composed of a combination of the pre-trained language model head and Target Monolingual LM head.

#### 3.2 Fine-tuning

In the proposed framework, we only fine-tune the target monolingual LM head  $f_{\text{mono}}$  leveraging a small given target monolingual dataset. Note that the parameters of the pre-trained multilingual model remain frozen during the process. The model is fine-tuned by maximizing the log-likelihood of a sequence:

$$
\max_{f_{\text{mono}}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{MLE}}(p_{\text{mumo}}, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \log p_{\text{mumo}}(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{< t}),
$$
\n(4)  
\nwhere  $p_{\text{mumo}}(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{< t}) = \text{Softmax}(f_{\text{mumo}}(h_{t-1})).$ 

### 3.3 Inference

Despite the availability of direct generation based on the  $p_{\text{mumo}}$ , the newly initialized Target Monolingual LM head, which is trained on limited data, may be constrained by generalization capabilities beyond the training dataset. The key concept is to leverage the probabilistic knowledge acquired by the pre-trained model  $p_{\text{multi}}$ , which has been extensively trained on large text corpora.

### 3.3.1 Step 1: Top-k Selection

Initially, we select top- $k$  candidates based on the probability  $p_{\text{mumo}}(x_t|\mathbf{x}_{\leq t})$ . We set k as 10 for all experiments. Given the fact that we do not modify the input embedding of the pre-trained model, we are unable to feed the predicted word if a word does not belong in  $V_{\text{multi}}$  during the subsequent iteration. Instead, we input the predicted word as the tokenization units of the pre-trained vocabulary. For example, let's consider the Korean word "수 소", which corresponds to a sequence of two tokens (" $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\sim}$ ", " $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\sim}$ ") in  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{multi}}$ . If the Korean word " $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\sim}$   $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\sim}$ " is selected among the Top- $k$  candidates, we employ these two multilingual tokens.

#### <span id="page-3-1"></span>3.3.2 Step 2: Verification

Then, the *feasibility* of these potential completions is measured using the log-joint probability distribution over  $p_{multi}$ . To account for shorter sequences

naturally having higher scores [\(Jean et al.,](#page-10-10) [2015;](#page-10-10) [Murray and Chiang,](#page-10-11) [2018\)](#page-10-11), we normalize each candidate's score by its token length.

We measure the *feasiblity* for a candidate sequence as follows:

$$
\sigma(\mathbf{c}^i) = \frac{1}{l^i} \sum_{k=1}^{l^i} \log p_{\text{multi}}(c_{t+k}^i | c_{
$$

where  $c^i$  symbolizes a predicted token within the top- $k$  candidates,  $p_{\text{multi}}$  represents the probability as determined by the pre-trained multilingual model, and  $l^i$  corresponds to the sequence length of the candidate  $c^i$ .

From the k candidates, the ultimate prediction can be derived from both deterministic and stochastic manners, depending on decoding strategies.

## <span id="page-4-2"></span>4 Experiments

#### 4.1 Setup

Languages As a case study, we focus on two non-roman alphabetical languages: Korean and Japanese. Since we aimed to utilize a pre-trained model with a reasonable level of effectiveness in the target language, it is essential that the language is explicitly mentioned as being trained within the pre-training corpus. In this context, we considered languages included in the Llama-2 [\(Touvron et al.,](#page-11-6) [2023b\)](#page-11-6) pre-training corpus. Moreover, the chosen language needed to exhibit the excessive fragmentation problem [\(Ahia et al.,](#page-9-2) [2023;](#page-9-2) [Petrov et al.,](#page-11-3) [2023\)](#page-11-3) by the English-centric pre-trained tokenizer. (See the Figure [1\)](#page-0-0) This criterion led to the exclusion of most European languages such as French, German, and Portuguese. Finally, we conduct a study on multiple tasks, necessitating the existence of an instruction dataset for the target language. Due to these considerations, we only implement the experiment in Korean and Japanese.

Model We utilize the Llama-2 13B model [\(Tou](#page-11-6)[vron et al.,](#page-11-6) [2023b\)](#page-11-6) for all experiments. We observed some language alignment discrepancies between instructions and responses when using the Llama-2  $13B$  $13B$  chat model.<sup>1</sup> To address the issue, we conduct multilingual instruction tuning [\(Muennighoff](#page-10-12) [et al.,](#page-10-12) [2022\)](#page-10-12) for English, Korean, and Japanese languages using the ShareGPT and Alpaca [\(Chen](#page-9-12) [et al.,](#page-9-12) [2023c\)](#page-9-12). This process improve the model's fluency in each language [\(Muennighoff et al.,](#page-10-12) [2022;](#page-10-12)

<span id="page-4-1"></span>

	Language Language Family	<b>Pre-trained Tokenizer</b>
Korean	Koreanic	EleutherAI/polyglot-ko-12.8b
Japanese	Japonic	rinna/japanese-gpt-neox

Table 2: Selected languages and tokenizers. We utilize the tokenizers to construct  $V_{\text{mono}}$  in each language.

[Chen et al.,](#page-9-13) [2023b\)](#page-9-13). We also report our results test on Llama-1 13B [\(Touvron et al.,](#page-11-0) [2023a\)](#page-11-0) in Appendix.

Implementation of MuMo To construct targeted monolingual vocabularies in MuMo Framework, we levergage the tokenizers from the off-the-shelf model, as shown in Table [2.](#page-4-1) We selected monolingual tokens by filtering vocabulary items based on the Unicode range of each monolingual script. Additionally, we excluded items from the selection if they were already present in the pre-trained vocabulary. In terms of the preprocessing algorithm, we employ a forward maximum matching strategy to identify words in a target language vocabulary. This strategy identifies the longest sequence of tokens that aligns with a word in the target language vocabulary.

Regarding the initialization of  $g_{\text{mono}}$ , we utilize the LM head of the pre-trained multilingual model. For example, when the Korean word "태양" is tokenized into subword units ("\0xed", ..., "\0x91") using the pre-trained vocabulary, we initialize the Korean LM head of "태양" by taking the mean of the corresponding subword embeddings of the multilingual LM head. This process ensures that the initialized embeddings of Target Monolingual head represent the original word in the multilingual context.

Fine-tuning We only train the Target Monolingual LM head  $g_{\text{mono}}$  with the translated ShareGPT and Alpaca datasets [\(Chen et al.,](#page-9-12) [2023c\)](#page-9-12) in Korean, and Japanese. The training is done with 1500 steps with one batch consisting of 128 examples. We use the AdamW [\(Loshchilov and Hutter,](#page-10-13) [2019\)](#page-10-13) optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001, weight decay of 0.01, and 150 steps of warm-up.

Evaluation We choose two representative generation tasks: summarization and translation. For summarization, we use 500 examples from XL-Sum [\(Hasan et al.,](#page-10-14) [2021\)](#page-10-14), and for translation, we use 500 examples from the FLoRes-200 [\(Goyal](#page-10-15) [et al.,](#page-10-15) [2022\)](#page-10-15) dataset. We translate English sentences to each target language sentence.

<span id="page-4-0"></span><sup>1</sup>[meta-llama/Llama-2-13b-chat](https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-13b-chat)

<span id="page-5-1"></span>

		<b>Summarization (0-shot)</b>			<b>Translation</b> (3-shot)			
Lang	Method	<b>ROUGE-2</b>	<b>ROUGE-L</b>	Tokens/sec	Speed Up	BLEU	<b>Tokens/sec</b>	Speed Up
	Vanilla Decoding	20.7	36.1	28.9	1.00x	21.2	29.8	1.00x
	Spec. (w/o Rejection)	18.7	33.5	35.2	1.21x	18.6	36.5	1.22x
Kо	Spec.	20.3	35.2	27.5	0.95x	21.5	29.2	0.98x
	Shortlisting	20.5	36.3	30.6	1.06x	19.5	32.7	1.03x
	$MuMo$ (Ours)	20.3	35.9	55.3	1.92x	21.7	50.9	1.70x
	Vanilla Decoding	11.3	26.6	29.3	1.00x	26.3	33.4	1.00x
	Spec. (w/o Rejection)	10.8	24.2	35.4	1.21x	22.7	39.9	1.21x
JA	Spec.	11.6	26.5	28.5	0.97x	26.0	29.7	1.03x
	Shortlisting	11.4	26.3	30.3	1.03x	25.2	34.9	1.04x
	MuMo (Ours)	11.6	26.3	59.2	2.02x	24.3	58.3	1.75x

Table 3: Comparative study of Language Model (LM) inference speed. The column labeled "Speed Up" represents the relative performance improvement in inference speed compared to the vanilla decoding method. The highest performance in each category is highlighted in Boldface, and the second highest score is underlined. All models use sampling-based decoding. MuMo outperforms the compared baselines in the inference speed. Detailed information about the generation hyperparameters, including those used for sampling-based decoding, can be found in Appendix [D.](#page-12-0)

For each task, we report 0-shot results for summarization, and 3-shot results for translation. We set the maximum sequence length as 512. We utilize flash-attention 2 [\(Dao,](#page-9-14) [2023\)](#page-9-14) and bfloat16 types for text generation.

Metrics In the summarization task, we gauge the reliability of the generated content by calculating the ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L [\(Lin,](#page-10-16) [2004\)](#page-10-16) scores, averaging the results across 5 different generated summaries. Likewise, for the translation task, we measure the quality of the translations by computing the BLEU [\(Papineni et al.,](#page-10-17) [2002\)](#page-10-17) score, again averaging over 5 translation results.[2](#page-5-0) We report Tokens/sec to measure the inference speed of the models.

## 4.2 Baselines

We consider the following several baselines for the comparison with the proposed method. Note that all the baselines are implemented instruction-tuned model with multilingual instruction dataset [\(Chen](#page-9-12) [et al.,](#page-9-12) [2023c\)](#page-9-12).

Vanilla Decoding The autoregressive generation is to sequentially sample the subsequent word based on the probability distribution over the pretrained vocabulary. This approach serves as the standard against which improvements are measured. Accounting for the nature of task, all the baselines and our framework utilizes samplingbased decoding strategy with temperature as  $0.1, k$ 

as 10 for top- $k$  sampling [\(Fan et al.,](#page-10-18) [2018\)](#page-10-18) and  $p$  as 0.7 for nucleus sampling [\(Holtzman et al.,](#page-10-19) [2020\)](#page-10-19).

Speculative Decoding Speculative decoding approach [\(Chen et al.,](#page-9-5) [2023a;](#page-9-5) [Leviathan et al.,](#page-10-3) [2023\)](#page-10-3) employs a preliminary "draft" model to rapidly generate a set of token candidates at each decoding step. Subsequently, these candidates undergo a validation process by the original language model to ascertain their likelihood as plausible continuations of the text. We implement two variants of this method: one with the capability to reject unsuitable candidates (Spec.) and another without its rejection module (Spec. w/o Rejection). For the draft model, we utilize Llama-2 7B [\(Touvron et al.,](#page-11-6) [2023b\)](#page-11-6). Following the implementation of [Chen et al.](#page-9-5) [\(2023a\)](#page-9-5), we generate 5 draft tokens at each iteration.

Lexical Shortlisting Lexical Shortlisting (Shortlisting) [\(Abdaoui et al.,](#page-9-9) [2020;](#page-9-9) [Ushio et al.,](#page-11-11) [2023\)](#page-11-11), or vocabulary selection, is the approach that optimizes the decoding process by allowing it to generate a word within a set of tokens during the inference stage [\(Ushio et al.,](#page-11-11) [2023\)](#page-11-11). We implement to filter out tokens that are not present within the corresponding target language subset of the mC4 corpus [\(Xue et al.,](#page-11-8) [2021\)](#page-11-8), as [Ushio et al.](#page-11-11) [\(2023\)](#page-11-11).

#### 4.3 Results

Table [3](#page-5-1) shows the generation results in both summarization and translation tasks. For the summarization task in Korean, MuMo outperforms all baselines in terms of speed, achieving a 1.92x speedup over the Vanilla Decoding while maintaining competitive ROUGE scores. In translation, MuMo again demonstrates superior efficiency with a 1.70x

<span id="page-5-0"></span><sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>We utilize SacreBLEU scores with the signature BLEU |nrefs:1 |case:mixed |eff:no |tok:ko,ja-mecab|smooth:exp |version: 2.2.0.

<span id="page-6-1"></span>

			Summarization (0-shot)				Translation (3-shot)		
Method	Update Param.	Dataset size (Tokens)	<b>ROUGE-2</b>	<b>ROUGE L</b>	Morphemes/sec	<b>Speed Up</b>	BLEU	Morphemes/sec	<b>Speed Up</b>
Vanilla Fine-tuning	3.0B	44M	21.0	36.0	9.8	.00x	21.4	10.1	1.00x
Vocabulary Expansion	3.1B	44M	13.7	23.1	17.1	1.92x	12.3	20.2	2.00x
Vocabulary Expansion <sup>†</sup>	3.1B	$60B + 44M$	20.3	37.3	20.5	2.12x	20.3	23.1	2.29x
$MuMo$ (Ours)	70M	44M	20.5	36.3	15.3	73x	21.7	17.2	1.71x

Table 4: Comparsion with the fine-tuning strategies. The column labeled "Speed Up" represents the relative performance improvement in inference speed compared to Vanilla Fine-tuning. Vocabulary Expansion† was pretrained on over 60B tokens, comprised of both Korean and English text corpora. Other methods are only trained with the instruction dataset (44M tokens) [\(Chen et al.,](#page-9-12) [2023c\)](#page-9-12), ShareGPT and Alpaca translated in Korean. The Boldface signifies the superior performances, and the second highest score is underlined.

speed-up and even shows an improvement in BLEU score compared to Vanilla Decoding.

In the case of Japanese, the results are similar, with MuMo achieving a 2.02x speed-up in summarization and a 1.75x speed-up in translation. The ROUGE and BLEU scores for MuMo are on par with or slightly below Vanilla Decoding, indicating that the increase in speed does not significantly compromise the quality of the output.

Shortlisting shows only marginal gains in speed across both languages and every tasks, while preserving the generation capability. This is likely because the relative computational cost of processing the embedding matrix is reduced in larger models, making vocabulary reduction less impactful [\(Be](#page-9-15)[rard et al.,](#page-9-15) [2021;](#page-9-15) [Ushio et al.,](#page-11-11) [2023\)](#page-11-11). On the other hand, the Spec. heavily relies on the capacity of the draft model, as shown as the comparison with (Spec. w/o Rejection). If the draft model lacks of sufficient multilingual capacity, it may not generate high-quality candidates, leading to a lower acceptance rate by the original model and thus reduced efficiency.

The superior performance of MuMo in terms of inference speed can be primarily attributed to its capability to predict larger linguistic units compared to those in the pre-trained vocabulary. We found that the target language tokens in  $V_{\text{mono}}$  are typically tokenized into 3-4 separate tokens in  $V_{\text{multi}}$ , suggesting that the decoding step could potentially be reduced by 3-4 times. It is hypothesized that the inference speed is significantly influenced by the disparity between the pre-trained multilingual vocabulary and the target language.

## 5 Further Analysis

# 5.1 Comparative Analysis of Fine-Tuning **Strategies**

In the section, we provide a comparative analysis of three distinct fine-tuning strategies for multilingual models. This analysis aims to highlight the

advantages and disadvantages of each strategy, particularly in terms of dataset requirements. and the number of parameters to train.

## 5.1.1 Setup

The two strategies compared in the analysis are:

1. Vanilla Fine-tuning: This strategy, which serves as a baseline, involves fine-tuning a standard multilingual model on a target monolingual instruction dataset (44M tokens) without any modifications to the pre-trained vocabulary.

2. Vocabulary Expansion: Inspired by prior work [\(Chau et al.,](#page-9-8) [2020;](#page-9-8) [Cui et al.,](#page-9-3) [2023\)](#page-9-3), this strategy involves expanding the vocabulary of the pre-trained multilingual model and fine-tuning on the instruction dataset. This method, unlike MuMo, expands not only the LM head but also the token embedding in the input layer. Two implementations of this strategy are considered. The first involves pre-training on large-scale text corpora (60B to $kens$ )<sup>[3](#page-6-0)</sup> before fine-tuning on the instruction dataset. This strategy is marked with a dagger in Table [4.](#page-6-1) The second only undergoes the fine-tuning phase on the instruction dataset.

To account for the variability of token unit between the different strategies, we report the inference speed with the morphemes per second (Morphemes/sec), providing a standardized measure-ment.<sup>[4](#page-6-2)</sup> We only compare the baselines in Korean, because of the availability of model.

#### 5.1.2 Discussion

Table [4](#page-6-1) reveals a consistent trend across both summarization and translation tasks. The vocabulary expansion strategies, which expand the dimension of both the token embeddings and LM head, exhibit significant increases in inference speed, but this is accompanied by a substantial decrease in the quality of the generated output when not trained on

<span id="page-6-0"></span><sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>We use the off-the-shelf checkpoint from [beomi/llama-2](https://huggingface.co/beomi/llama-2-koen-13b) [koen-13b](https://huggingface.co/beomi/llama-2-koen-13b)

<span id="page-6-2"></span><sup>4</sup> [python-mecab-ko](https://pypi.org/project/python-mecab-ko/)

		<b>Summarization (0-shot)</b>	<b>Translation</b> (3-shot)	
<b>LM HEAD INITIALIZATION</b>		$ROUGE-2   ROUGE-L$	<b>BLEU</b>	
MONO-INIT	20.7	36.2	21.5	
RANDOM-INIT	19.2	35.5	172	
MULTI-INIT	20.3	36.3	21.7	

Table 5: Comparative analysis for the initialization strategy. MONO-INIT signifies to leverage the pre-existing embedding representation. We use the language model head of the monolingual model from EleutherAI/polyglotko-12.8b. In the case of RANDOM-INIT, we randomly initialize with Gaussian distribution. MULTI-INIT indicates to leverage multilingual model representation by averaging its subword embedding as the main experiment. The Boldface signifies the superior performances.

<span id="page-7-0"></span>

			<b>Summarization (0-shot)</b>	<b>Translation (3-shot)</b>		
Lang	<b>Method</b>	ROUGE-2	<b>ROUGE-L</b>	<b>Tokens/sec</b>	<b>BLEU</b>	<b>Tokens/sec</b>
KO	MuMo	20.3	35.9	55.3	21.7	50.9
	w/o Verification	$11.0(-9.3)$	$26.4(-9.5)$	$60.8(+5.5)$	$16.3(-5.4)$	$62.3(+11.4)$
JA	MuMo	11.6	26.3	59.2	24.3	58.3
	w/o Verification	$6.7(-4.9)$	$20.4(-5.9)$	$69.1(+9.9)$	$10.8(-13.5)$	$73.6(+15.3)$

Table 6: Ablation Study. While the exclusion of the verification accelerates approximately 1.2 times in inference speed, it significantly compromises the quality of the generation.

large-scale text corpora. This indicates that merely fine-tuning with an expanded vocabulary on a limited downstream dataset may not suffice to maintain high-quality text generation, as suggested by [\(Conneau et al.,](#page-9-6) [2020\)](#page-9-6). Furthermore, while vocabulary expansion with pre-training achieves notable speed improvements, it does not exhibit significant enhancements in generation quality.

In contrast, our proposed method exhibits a modest increase in speed while also slightly improving BLEU scores relative to vanilla fine-tuning. The principal advantage of our method lies in its capacity to attain these results without necessitating vast monolingual text corpora. This approach not only reduces the number of parameters that need to be fine-tuned, making it more parameter-efficient but also lessens the dependency on large-scale data for pre-training, making it a more data-efficient solution.

## 5.2 Initialization of Target Monolingual LM **Head**

We investigate the impact of three different initialization strategies on the target monolingual LM head gmono in the Target Monolingual LM head. The first strategy involves leveraging embeddings that correspond to the pre-trained representation of a targeted monolingual LM head, termed as MONO-INIT. The second strategy is initializing the parameters with random value using Gaussian distribution (RANDOM-INIT). Lastly, we utilize the embeddings from the pre-trained multilingual

LM head (MULTI-INIT), as the main experiment. This is achieved by averaging the output embeddings of the multilingual model.

Table [17](#page-16-0) shows that MULTI-INIT achieves a ROUGE-L score of 36.3 and a BLEU score of 21.7, which are close to the 36.2 ROUGE-L and 20.9 BLEU scores of MONO-INIT. On the other hand, RANDOM-INIT shows a decrease in performance, with a ROUGE-L score of 35.5 and a BLEU score of 17.2.

The result demonstrates that the MULTI-INIT approach is almost equally effective with MONO-INIT. This suggests that our framework can be utilized some languages that have an off-the-shelf vocabulary set but lack suitable pre-trained representations.

# 5.3 Effectiveness of Verification Step

We design an ablation study to investigate the role of the verification step in the inference process ( Sec. [3.3.2\)](#page-3-1). To assess the impact of the verification step, we generated sequences without employing the verification step.

From the results in Table [6,](#page-7-0) conducted in both Korean and Japanese, we notice that the overall generation speed is approximately 1.2 times faster when the verification is excluded. However, it is crucial to highlight that the exclusion of the verification step in the inference phase leads to a significant reduction in the generation quality. This is evident in the decrease in ROUGE-2, ROUGE-L, and BLEU scores for both languages when the ver-

ification module is not used, as shown in the table. This suggests that while the verification step may slightly slow down the generation process, it plays a vital role in preserving the model's generation capability.

# <span id="page-8-4"></span>5.4 Comparative Study in Single-Task **Training**

In the experiment, our primary objective is to investigate whether the inherent capabilities of the instruction-tuned multilingual model, which handles a variety of tasks, could be compromised when trained exclusively on single tasks using either Vocabulary Expansion or MuMo. Both methods introduce newly initialized parameters, raising concerns about potential impacts on the model's versatility. To address these concerns, we separately trained the model on each task - Question Answering (QA) [\(Lim et al.,](#page-10-20) [2019;](#page-10-20) [Kurihara et al.,](#page-10-21) [2022\)](#page-10-21) and Summarization [\(Hasan et al.,](#page-10-14) [2021\)](#page-10-14) - and subsequently conducted a comparative analysis between Vocabulary Expansion and MuMo.

For evaluation, we utilize multiple-task datasets, specifically Korean<sup>[5](#page-8-0)</sup> and Japanese<sup>[6](#page-8-1)</sup>, which consist solely of questions. For the measurement, We adopt the single-answer grading setup from LLM-as-ajudge [\(Zheng et al.,](#page-11-19) [2023\)](#page-11-19). This involves presenting a question along with model-generated answers to GPT-4 (acting as the judge) for assessment. The answers are graded on a scale from 1 to 10.

As depicted in Figure [4,](#page-8-2) the instruction-tuned model initially achieves an average grading of 7.2 in the Korean experiment. However, when finetuned using only the QA task, Vocabulary Expansion receives a grading of 1.8, while MuMo receives a grading of 5.9. When trained solely on the summarization task, Vocabulary Expansion receives a grading of 1.6, while MuMo receives a grading of 4.7. Similar trends are observed in the Japanese experiment. The original model receives an average grading of 6.8. When fine-tuned with only the QA task, Vocabulary Expansion receives a grading of 2.1, while MuMo receives a grading of 5.2. When trained exclusively on the summarization task, Vocabulary Expansion receives a grading of 1.2, while MuMo receives a grading of 4.4.

These results suggest that while the grading of the model decreases when trained on single tasks using either method, the decrease is less pro-

<span id="page-8-2"></span>

Figure 4: Evaluation on multiple-task after training on QA and Summarization task. The red dotted lines represent the average grading of single answers derived from the instruction-tuned multilingual language model. The decline is less pronounced with MuMo, suggesting its relative effectiveness in preserving the model's multitask proficiency.

nounced with MuMo. This indicates that MuMo is more effective at preserving the model's multitask proficiency compared to Vocabulary Expansion. However, it is also clear that neither method can fully maintain the model's original instructionfollowing abilities on multiple tasks when trained solely on single tasks. These findings suggest that the instruction dataset, which the model was originally trained on, is crucial for preserving the pretrained model's capabilities.

# <span id="page-8-3"></span>6 Conclusion

Our study has successfully tackled the challenges in generating text for non-alphabet languages, particularly those associated with excessive fragmentation issues. The approach not only speeds up text generation but also paves the way for more efficient multilingual language applications. Our future work will broaden our experimental scope to languages that were not sufficiently represented in the pre-trained multilingual language model.

<span id="page-8-0"></span><sup>5</sup>[Korean-MT-bench](#page-0-1)

<span id="page-8-1"></span><sup>6</sup> [Japanese-MT-Bench](#page-0-1)

# Limitations

Our proposed framework has not been evaluated with languages that exhibit excessive fragmentation issues, such as Tamil, Hebrew, and Arabic [\(Ahia](#page-9-2) [et al.,](#page-9-2) [2023;](#page-9-2) [Petrov et al.,](#page-11-3) [2023\)](#page-11-3). These languages were not explicitly mentioned in the pre-training corpus of Llama-2 [\(Touvron et al.,](#page-11-6) [2023b\)](#page-11-6). Additionally, our framework requires off-the-shelf tokenizers for target languages to make Target monolingual LM Head. Our method does not alter the input sequence length, as we focus solely on improving the unit of prediction. This approach This approach differs from the the previous studies [\(Rust](#page-11-2) [et al.,](#page-11-2) [2021;](#page-11-2) [Cui et al.,](#page-9-3) [2023\)](#page-9-3) which efficiently encode text at the input-level sequence length for excessively tokenized languages. Furthermore, the language models evaluated in the study are restricted to a maximum size of 13B. Larger models, such as Llama-2 30B or 70B, were not implemented due to constraints on available computational resources.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Chaehun Park and Daeyoung Kim for their valuable discussions and feedback on the paper.

# References

- <span id="page-9-9"></span>Amine Abdaoui, Camille Pradel, and Grégoire Sigel. 2020. Load what you need: Smaller versions of multilingual bert. In *Proceedings of SustaiNLP: Workshop on Simple and Efficient Natural Language Processing*.
- <span id="page-9-2"></span>Orevaoghene Ahia, Sachin Kumar, Hila Gonen, Jungo Kasai, David R Mortensen, Noah A Smith, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023. Do all languages cost the same? tokenization in the era of commercial language models. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- <span id="page-9-11"></span>Alan Ansell, Edoardo Maria Ponti, Jonas Pfeiffer, Sebastian Ruder, Goran Glavaš, Ivan Vulic, and Anna ´ Korhonen. 2021. MAD-G: Multilingual adapter generation for efficient cross-lingual transfer. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*.
- <span id="page-9-0"></span>Antropic. 2023. [Model card and evaluations for claude](https://www-files.anthropic.com/production/images/Model-Card-Claude-2.pdf) [models.](https://www-files.anthropic.com/production/images/Model-Card-Claude-2.pdf)
- <span id="page-9-7"></span>Mikel Artetxe, Sebastian Ruder, and Dani Yogatama. 2020. On the cross-lingual transferability of monolingual representations. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- <span id="page-9-1"></span>Lucas Bandarkar, Davis Liang, Benjamin Muller, Mikel Artetxe, Satya Narayan Shukla, Donald Husa, Naman Goyal, Abhinandan Krishnan, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Madian Khabsa. 2023. The belebele benchmark: a parallel reading comprehension dataset in 122 language variants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16884*.
- <span id="page-9-15"></span>Alexandre Berard, Dain Lee, Stephane Clinchant, Kweonwoo Jung, and Vassilina Nikoulina. 2021. Efficient inference for multilingual neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- <span id="page-9-10"></span>Nikolay Bogoychev, Pinzhen Chen, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2023. Large language model inference with lexical shortlisting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09709*.
- <span id="page-9-8"></span>Ethan C. Chau, Lucy H. Lin, and Noah A. Smith. 2020. Parsing with multilingual BERT, a small corpus, and a small treebank. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*.
- <span id="page-9-5"></span>Charlie Chen, Sebastian Borgeaud, Geoffrey Irving, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Laurent Sifre, and John Jumper. 2023a. Accelerating large language model decoding with speculative sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01318*.
- <span id="page-9-13"></span>Pinzhen Chen, Shaoxiong Ji, Nikolay Bogoychev, Barry Haddow, and Kenneth Heafield. 2023b. Monolingual or multilingual instruction tuning: Which makes a better alpaca. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08958*.
- <span id="page-9-12"></span>Zhihong Chen, Shuo Yan, Juhao Liang, Feng Jiang, Xiangbo Wu, Fei Yu, Guiming Hardy Chen, Junying Chen, Hongbo Zhang, Li Jianquan, Wan Xiang, and Benyou Wang. 2023c. [MultilingualSIFT: Multilin](https://github.com/FreedomIntelligence/MultilingualSIFT.git)[gual Supervised Instruction Fine-tuning.](https://github.com/FreedomIntelligence/MultilingualSIFT.git)
- <span id="page-9-6"></span>Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- <span id="page-9-3"></span>Yiming Cui, Ziqing Yang, and Xin Yao. 2023. Efficient and effective text encoding for chinese llama and alpaca. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08177*.
- <span id="page-9-14"></span>Tri Dao. 2023. Flashattention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08691*.
- <span id="page-9-4"></span>Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of The Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*.
- <span id="page-10-23"></span>Konstantin Dobler and Gerard de Melo. 2023. FOCUS: Effective embedding initialization for monolingual specialization of multilingual models. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- <span id="page-10-6"></span>Tobias Domhan, Eva Hasler, Ke Tran, Sony Trenous, Bill Byrne, and Felix Hieber. 2022. The devil is in the details: On the pitfalls of vocabulary selection in neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of The Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*.
- <span id="page-10-1"></span>Tyna Eloundou, Sam Manning, Pamela Mishkin, and Daniel Rock. 2023. Gpts are gpts: An early look at the labor market impact potential of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10130*.
- <span id="page-10-18"></span>Angela Fan, Mike Lewis, and Yann Dauphin. 2018. Hierarchical neural story generation.
- <span id="page-10-15"></span>Naman Goyal, Cynthia Gao, Vishrav Chaudhary, Peng-Jen Chen, Guillaume Wenzek, Da Ju, Sanjana Krishnan, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, Francisco Guzmán, and Angela Fan. 2022. The flores-101 evaluation benchmark for low-resource and multilingual machine translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- <span id="page-10-14"></span>Tahmid Hasan, Abhik Bhattacharjee, Md Saiful Islam, Kazi Samin, Yuan-Fang Li, Yong-Bin Kang, M Sohel Rahman, and Rifat Shahriyar. 2021. Xl-sum: Large-scale multilingual abstractive summarization for 44 languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL)*.
- <span id="page-10-19"></span>Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020. The curious case of neural text degeneration. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- <span id="page-10-4"></span>Jimin Hong, Taehee Kim, Hyesu Lim, and Jaegul Choo. 2021. Avocado: Strategy for adapting vocabulary to downstream domain. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- <span id="page-10-7"></span>Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. 2019. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- <span id="page-10-10"></span>Sébastien Jean, Orhan Firat, Kyunghyun Cho, Roland Memisevic, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. Montreal neural machine translation systems for WMT'15. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*.
- <span id="page-10-22"></span>Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- <span id="page-10-2"></span>Taku Kudo. 2018. Subword regularization: Improving neural network translation models with multiple subword candidates. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- <span id="page-10-21"></span>Kentaro Kurihara, Daisuke Kawahara, and Tomohide Shibata. 2022. JGLUE: Japanese general language understanding evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*.
- <span id="page-10-9"></span>Tian Lan, Deng Cai, Yan Wang, Heyan Huang, and Xian-Ling Mao. 2023. Copy is all you need. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- <span id="page-10-3"></span>Yaniv Leviathan, Matan Kalman, and Yossi Matias. 2023. Fast inference from transformers via speculative decoding. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- <span id="page-10-20"></span>Seungyoung Lim, Myungji Kim, and Jooyoul Lee. 2019. Korquad1. 0: Korean qa dataset for machine reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.07005*.
- <span id="page-10-16"></span>Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*.
- <span id="page-10-5"></span>Mingjie Liu, Teo Ene, Robert Kirby, Chris Cheng, Nathaniel Pinckney, Rongjian Liang, Jonah Alben, Himyanshu Anand, Sanmitra Banerjee, Ismet Bayraktaroglu, et al. 2023. Chipnemo: Domain-adapted llms for chip design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00176*.
- <span id="page-10-13"></span>Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. [Decoupled](https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7) [weight decay regularization.](https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7) In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- <span id="page-10-12"></span>Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng-Xin Yong, Hailey Schoelkopf, et al. 2022. Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- <span id="page-10-11"></span>Kenton Murray and David Chiang. 2018. Correcting length bias in neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*.

<span id="page-10-0"></span>OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report.](https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4.pdf)

- <span id="page-10-17"></span>Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- <span id="page-10-8"></span>Marinela Parović, Goran Glavaš, Ivan Vulić, and Anna Korhonen. 2022. BAD-X: Bilingual adapters improve zero-shot cross-lingual transfer. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- <span id="page-11-3"></span>Aleksandar Petrov, Emanuele La Malfa, Philip HS Torr, and Adel Bibi. 2023. Language model tokenizers introduce unfairness between languages. In *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- <span id="page-11-15"></span>Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulic, Iryna Gurevych, and Sebas- ´ tian Ruder. 2020. Mad-x: An adapter-based framework for multi-task cross-lingual transfer.
- <span id="page-11-2"></span>Phillip Rust, Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulic, Sebastian Ruder, ´ and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. How good is your tokenizer? on the monolingual performance of multilingual language models. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- <span id="page-11-10"></span>Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ili'c, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagn'e, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, Franccois Yvon, and Matthias Gallé. 2022. Bloom: A 176bparameter open-access multilingual language model. *ArXiv*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100.
- <span id="page-11-4"></span>Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- <span id="page-11-18"></span>Noam Shazeer. 2020. Glu variants improve transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05202*.
- <span id="page-11-13"></span>Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Binhang Yuan, Zhuohan Li, Max Ryabinin, Daniel Y Fu, Zhiqiang Xie, Beidi Chen, Clark Barrett, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. 2023. High-throughput generative inference of large language models with a single gpu. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- <span id="page-11-1"></span>Irene Solaiman, Zeerak Talat, William Agnew, Lama Ahmad, Dylan Baker, Su Lin Blodgett, Hal Daumé III, Jesse Dodge, Ellie Evans, Sara Hooker, et al. 2023. Evaluating the social impact of generative ai systems in systems and society. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05949*.
- <span id="page-11-0"></span>Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- <span id="page-11-6"></span>Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023b. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- <span id="page-11-11"></span>Asahi Ushio, Yi Zhou, and Jose Camacho-Collados. 2023. An efficient multilingual language model compression through vocabulary trimming. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods*

*in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP): Findings*. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- <span id="page-11-16"></span>Ahmet Üstün, Arianna Bisazza, Gosse Bouma, and Gertjan van Noord. 2020. UDapter: Language adaptation for truly Universal Dependency parsing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- <span id="page-11-17"></span>Marko Vidoni, Ivan Vulić, and Goran Glavaš. 2020. Orthogonal language and task adapters in zero-shot cross-lingual transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.06460*.
- <span id="page-11-5"></span>Hai Wang, Dian Yu, Kai Sun, Jianshu Chen, and Dong Yu. 2019. Improving pre-trained multilingual model with vocabulary expansion. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- <span id="page-11-14"></span>Guangxuan Xiao, Yuandong Tian, Beidi Chen, Song Han, and Mike Lewis. 2023. Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17453*.
- <span id="page-11-9"></span>Linting Xue, Aditya Barua, Noah Constant, Rami Al-Rfou, Sharan Narang, Mihir Kale, Adam Roberts, and Colin Raffel. 2022. Byt5: Towards a token-free future with pre-trained byte-to-byte models. In *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- <span id="page-11-8"></span>Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2021. mt5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer. In *Proceedings of The Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*.
- <span id="page-11-12"></span>Gyeong-In Yu, Joo Seong Jeong, Geon-Woo Kim, Soojeong Kim, and Byung-Gon Chun. 2022. Orca: A distributed serving system for Transformer-Based generative models. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*.
- <span id="page-11-7"></span>Shiyue Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, Naman Goyal, James Cross, Guillaume Wenzek, Mohit Bansal, and Francisco Guzman. 2022. How robust is neural machine translation to language imbalance in multilingual tokenizer training? In *Proceedings of the 15th biennial conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas (Volume 1: Research Track)*.
- <span id="page-11-19"></span>Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2023. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. In *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) (Datasets and Benchmarks Track)*.

# Appendix

## A Dataset Details

Training Data Our study employed a multilingual instruction dataset from [Chen et al.](#page-9-12) [\(2023c\)](#page-9-12), encompassing Korean and Japanese, for multilingual instruction tuning. Specifically, we utilized ShareGPT and Alpaca-GPT4 for each respective language. The dataset comprises 56k, 55k, and 168k examples for Korean, Japanese and English respectively. To train MuMo LM head, we use ShareGPT and Alpaca-GPT4 [\(Chen et al.,](#page-9-12) [2023c\)](#page-9-12) in Korean and Japanese for each language.

Evaluation Data In summarization task, we use validation and test split of XLSum [\(Hasan et al.,](#page-10-14) [2021\)](#page-10-14), which consist of 1100 examples. We found that more than half of the samples within the validation and test split surpassed the maximum sequence length of Llama-2. Consequently, we filtered out examples exceeding 1536 tokens. From the remaining examples, we randomly selected 300 for our experiments.

Regarding translation task, the dev-test set of FLoRes-200 [\(Goyal et al.,](#page-10-15) [2022\)](#page-10-15) is employed, consisting of 1012 parallel examples across both languages. We randomly use 3 examples as 3-shot prompts from training set for individual run.

When evaluating multiple-task benchmark dataset [6,](#page-8-3) we exclude examples in coding and math categories.

# B Additional Results

Experiment on other Language Model Table [13,](#page-13-0) and Table [13](#page-13-0) present the comparative study in Llama-1 13B [\(Touvron et al.,](#page-11-0) [2023a\)](#page-11-0) and Mistral 7B [\(Jiang et al.,](#page-10-22) [2023\)](#page-10-22) respectively.

Generation Results Table [15](#page-15-0) and Table [16](#page-16-1) present generated texts in summarization and translation tasks.

# C Environment Details

All experiments are implemented using an A100- 40GB GPU. The library versions utilized across all experiments include Python 3.9.10, Pytorch 2.1.0, and Transformers 4.34.0.

# <span id="page-12-0"></span>D Hyperparameter Details



Table 7: Hyperparameters settings for multilingual instruction tuning. We follow the [script](#page-0-1) from FastChat Library.

<b>Hyperparameter</b>	<b>Value</b>
Learning rate	$1e-3$
Epoch	3
Dropout	0.1
<b>Tensor Type</b>	bfloat16
Batch size	128
optimizer	1.05
Weight decay	AdamW
Warmup ratio	0.04
Maximum sequence length	2048
Learning rate scheduler	cosine
$d_{\rm{ffn}}$	1280
non-linearity function $q$	SwiGLU

Table 8: Hyperparameters settings for training MuMo framework.



Table 9: Hyperparameter settings for inference.



Table 10: The evaluation prompt for the main experiment (Sec. [4\)](#page-4-2). We report on 0-shot results on summarization task, and 3-shot results on translation task respectively.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Training Prompt</b>
QA	A chat between a curious human and an artificial intelligence assistant. The assistant gives helpful, detailed, and polite answers to the human's questions. # Document $\{\{\text{context}\}\}\$ ## HUMAN: $\{$ {question}} ## ASSISTANT: { {answer}}
<b>Summarization</b>	A chat between a curious human and an artificial intelligence assistant. The assistant gives helpful, detailed, and polite answers to the human's questions. $#$ Document $\{\{\text{sourceDocument}\}\}\$ ## HUMAN: Summarize the document into a $\{ \{ \text{targetLang} \} \}$ sentence. ## ASSISTANT: $\{\{summary\}\}\$

Table 11: The training prompt for the analysis on single-task prompt finetuning (Sec. [5.4\)](#page-8-4).



Table 12: Comparative study of the inference speed in Llama-1 13B [\(Touvron et al.,](#page-11-0) [2023a\)](#page-11-0). The column labeled "Speed Up" represents the relative performance improvement in inference speed compared to the vanilla decoding method.

<span id="page-13-0"></span>

Table 13: Comparative study of the inference speed in Mistral 7B [\(Jiang et al.,](#page-10-22) [2023\)](#page-10-22). The column labeled "Speed Up" represents the relative performance improvement in inference speed compared to the vanilla decoding method.



Table 14: Generated texts on summarization task in Korean. The sample is extracted from the validation set of XLSum [\(Hasan et al.,](#page-10-14) [2021\)](#page-10-14). GT indicates the ground truth summary of the example.

<span id="page-15-0"></span>

Table 15: Generated texts on summarization task in Japanese. The sample is extracted from the validation set of XLSum [\(Hasan et al.,](#page-10-14) [2021\)](#page-10-14). GT indicates the ground truth summary of the example.

<span id="page-16-1"></span>

Table 16: Generated texts on translation task. The samples are extracted from the dev-test set of FLoRes-200 [\(Goyal](#page-10-15) [et al.,](#page-10-15) [2022\)](#page-10-15). GT indicates the ground truth sentence of the example.

<span id="page-16-0"></span>

Table 17: Comparative analysis for the initialization strategy We exploit FOCUS [\(Dobler and de Melo,](#page-10-23) [2023\)](#page-10-23) embedding to initialize the Target monolingual LM Head. Our framework can be harmonically integrated with the initialization strategy of multilingual token embedding.