

Romanization-based Large-scale Adaptation of Multilingual Language Models

Sukannya Purkayastha¹ Sebastian Ruder² Jonas Pfeiffer² Iryna Gurevych¹ Ivan Vulić³

¹ Ubiquitous Knowledge Processing Lab,
Department of Computer Science and Hessian Center for AI (hessian.AI),
Technical University of Darmstadt

² Google Research

³ Language Technology Lab, University of Cambridge

www.ukp.tu-darmstadt.de

Abstract

Large multilingual pretrained language models (mPLMs) have become the *de facto* state of the art for cross-lingual transfer in NLP. However, their large-scale deployment to many languages, besides pretraining data scarcity, is also hindered by the increase in vocabulary size and limitations in their parameter budget. In order to boost the capacity of mPLMs to deal with low-resource and unseen languages, we explore the potential of leveraging *transliteration* on a massive scale. In particular, we explore the UROMAN transliteration tool, which provides mappings from UTF-8 to Latin characters for all the writing systems, enabling inexpensive *romanization* for virtually any language. We first focus on establishing how UROMAN compares against other language-specific and manually curated transliterators for adapting multilingual PLMs. We then study and compare a plethora of data- and parameter-efficient strategies for adapting the mPLMs to romanized and non-romanized corpora of 14 diverse low-resource languages. Our results reveal that UROMAN-based transliteration can offer strong performance for many languages, with particular gains achieved in the most challenging setups: on languages with unseen scripts and with limited training data without any vocabulary augmentation. Further analyses reveal that an improved tokenizer based on romanized data can even outperform non-transliteration-based methods in the majority of languages.

1 Introduction

Massively multilingual language models (mPLMs) such as mBERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020) have become the driving force for a variety of applications in multilingual NLP (Ponti et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Moghe et al., 2022). However, guaranteeing and maintaining strong performance for a wide spectrum of low-resource languages is difficult due to two

Language	Original Text	Romanized Text	Translation
Bhojpuri	जॉलियन भासा	gorjiyan bhaasaa	Georgian language
Sinhala	ග්‍රහලෝක	grahalooka	planets
Sindhi	ایران	ayran	Iran
Khmer	សេដ្ឋកិច្ច	sedthakicca	economy

Figure 1: Romanization across different languages.

crucial problems. The first issue is the *vocabulary size*, as the vocabulary is bound to increase with the number of languages added if per-language performance is to be maintained (Hu et al., 2020; Artetxe et al., 2020; Pfeiffer et al., 2022). Second, pretraining mPLMs with a *fixed model capacity* improves cross-lingual performance up to a point after which it starts to decrease; this is the phenomenon termed the *curse of multilinguality* (Conneau et al., 2020).

Transliteration refers to the process of converting language represented in one writing system to another (Wellisch et al., 1978). Latin script-centered transliteration or *romanization* is the most common form of transliteration (Lin et al., 2018; Amrhein and Sennrich, 2020; Demirsahin et al., 2022) as the Latin/Roman script is by far the most widely adopted writing script in the world (Daniels and Bright, 1996; van Esch et al., 2022).¹ Adapting mPLMs via transliteration can address the two aforementioned critical issues. **1)** Since the Latin script covers a dominant portion of the mPLM’s vocabulary (e.g., 77% in case of mBERT, see Ács), ‘romanizing’ the remaining part of the vocabulary might mitigate the vocabulary size issue and boost vocabulary sharing. **2)** Since no new tokens are added during the romanization process, reusing pretrained embeddings from the mPLM’s embedding matrix helps reuse the information already present within the mPLM, thereby allocating the model’s parameter budget more efficiently.

However, the main drawback of transliteration seems to be the expensive process of creating effective language-specific transliterators, as they

¹According to Encyclopedia Britannica, up to 70% of the world population is employing the Latin script.

typically require language expertise to curate dictionaries that map tokens from one language and script to another. Therefore, previous attempts at mPLM adaptation to unseen languages via transliteration (Muller et al., 2021; Chau and Smith, 2021; Dhamecha et al., 2021; Moosa et al., 2022) were constrained to a handful of languages due to the limited availability of language-specific transliterators, or were applied only to languages that have ‘language siblings’ with developed transliterators.

In this work, unlike previous work, we propose to use and then evaluate the usefulness of a universal romanization tool, UROMAN (Hermjakob et al., 2018), for quick, large-scale and effective adaptation of mPLMs to low-resource languages. The UROMAN tool disposes of language-specific curated dictionaries and maps any UTF-8 character to the Latin script, increasing the portability of romanization, with some examples in Figure 1.

We analyze language adaptation on a massive scale via UROMAN-based romanization on a set of 14 diverse low-resource languages. We conduct experiments within the standard parameter-efficient adapter-based cross-lingual transfer setup on two tasks: Named Entity Recognition (NER) on the WikiANN dataset (Pan et al., 2017; Rahimi et al., 2019), and Dependency Parsing (DP) with Universal Dependencies v2.7 (Nivre et al., 2020). Our key results suggest that UROMAN-based transliteration can offer strong performance on par or even outperforming adaptation with language-specific transliterators, setting up the basis for wider use of transliteration-based mPLM adaptation techniques in future work. The gains with romanization-based adaptation over standard adaptation baselines are particularly pronounced for languages with unseen scripts (~ 8 -22 performance points) without any vocabulary augmentation.²

2 Background

Why UROMAN-Based Romanization? UROMAN-based romanization is not always fully reversible, and its usage for transliteration has thus been limited in the literature. However, due to its high portability, UROMAN can help scale the process of transliteration massively and as such benefit low-resource scenarios and wider adaptation of mPLMs. The main idea, as hinted in §1, is to (learn to) map any UTF-8 character to the Latin script, without the use of any external language-

specific dictionaries (see Hermjakob et al. (2018) for technical details).

Cross-Lingual Transfer to Low-Resource Languages. Parameter-efficient and modular fine-tuning methods (Pfeiffer et al., 2023) such as adapters (Houlsby et al., 2019; Pfeiffer et al., 2020b) have been used for cross-lingual transfer, putting a particular focus on enabling transfer to low-resource languages and scenarios, including languages with scripts ‘unseen’ by the base mPLM (Pfeiffer et al., 2021). Adapters are small lightweight components stitched into the base mPLM, and then trained for particular languages and tasks while keeping the parameters of the original mPLM frozen. This circumvents the issues of catastrophic forgetting and interference (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989) within the mPLM, and allows for extending its reach also to unseen languages (Pfeiffer et al., 2021; Ansell et al., 2021).

For our main empirical analyses, we adopt a state-of-the-art modular method for cross-lingual transfer: MAD-X (Pfeiffer et al., 2020b). In short, MAD-X is based on language adapters (LA), task adapters (TA), and invertible adapters (INV). While LAs are trained for specific languages relying on masked language modeling, TAs are trained with high-resource languages relying on task-annotated data and task-specific objectives. At inference, the source LA is replaced with the target LA while the TA is kept. In order to do parameter-efficient learning for the token-level embeddings across different languages and to deal with the vocabulary mismatch between source and target languages, Pfeiffer et al. (2020b) also propose INV adapters: they are placed on top of the embedding layer and their inverses precede the output embedding layer.³ We adopt the better-performing MAD-X 2.0 setup (Pfeiffer et al., 2021) where the adapters in the last Transformer layer are dropped at inference.⁴

3 Experiments and Results

As the main means of analyzing the impact of transliteration in general and UROMAN-based romanization in particular, we train different variants of language adapters within the MAD-X framework, based on transliterated and non-transliterated versions of target language data, outlined here.

³They are trained together with the LAs while the rest of the mPLM is kept frozen.

⁴We refer the reader to the original papers for further technical details regarding the MAD-X framework.

²Our code and data are available online at [URL].

Variants with Non-Transliterated Data. For the **Non-Trans_{LA+INV}** variant, we train LAs and INV adapters together. This variant serves to examine the extent to which mPLMs can adapt to unseen languages without any vocabulary extension.⁵ We compare this to **Non-Trans_{LA+Emb_{Lex}}**, which trains a new tokenizer for the target language (Pfeiffer et al., 2021): the so-called ‘lexically overlapping’ tokens are initialized with mPLM’s trained embeddings, while the remaining embeddings are initialized randomly. All these embeddings (Emb_{Lex}) are fine-tuned along with LAs.

Variants with Transliterated Data. We evaluate a **Trans_{LA+INV}** variant, which uses the same setup as **Non-Trans_{LA+INV}** but now with transliterated data. We again note that in this efficient setup, we do not extend the vocabulary size, and use the fewest trainable parameters. In the **Trans_{LA+mPLM_{ft}}** variant, we train LAs along with fine-tuning the pretrained embeddings of mPLM (mPLM_{ft}). This further enhances the model capacity by fine-tuning the embedding layer instead of using invertible adapters.⁶ For both variants, transliterated data can be produced via different transliterators: (i) language-specific ones; (ii) the ones from ‘language siblings’ (e.g., using a Georgian transliterator for Mingrelian), or (iii) UROMAN.

3.1 Experimental Setup

Data, Languages and Tasks. Following Pfeiffer et al. (2021), we select mBERT as our base mPLM. We experiment with 14 typologically diverse low-resource languages that are not part of mBERT’s pretraining corpora, with 5/14 languages written in distinct scripts (see Appendix A for details). For LA training, we use Wikipedia dumps for the target languages, which we also transliterate (using different transliterators). Evaluation is conducted on two standard cross-lingual transfer tasks in zero-shot setups: **1**) the WikiAnn NER dataset (Pan et al., 2017) with the train, dev, and test splits from (Rahimi et al., 2019); **2**) for dependency parsing, we rely on the UD Dataset v2.7 (Nivre et al., 2020).

LAs and TAs. English is the source language in all

⁵Since LAs without INV typically perform worse than with INV (Pfeiffer et al., 2020b), also confirmed in our preliminary experiments, we do not ablate to the setup without INV.

⁶We do not have this setup for non-transliterated data since, for languages with unseen scripts, most of the tokens are replaced by the generic ‘UNK’ token, and fine-tuning embeddings hardly benefit downstream performance.

experiments, and is used for training TAs. The English LA is obtained directly from [Adapterhub.ml](https://huggingface.co/adapters) (Pfeiffer et al., 2020a), LAs and embeddings (when needed) are only trained for target languages. The details of LA and TA training, including the chosen hyperparameters are available in Appendix C.

Finally, for the **Non-Trans_{LA+Emb_{Lex}}** variant, we train a WordPiece tokenizer on the target language data with a vocabulary size of 10K.

3.2 Results and Discussion

UROMAN versus Other Transliterators and Transliteration Strategies. In order to establish the utility of UROMAN as a viable transliterator, especially for low-resource languages, we compare its performance with transliteration options using the **Trans_{LA+INV}** setup as the most efficient scenario. First, we compare UROMAN with language-specific transliterators available for selected languages: *amseg* (Yimam et al., 2021) for Amharic, *ai4bharat-transliteration* (Madhani et al., 2022) for Hindi and Sindhi, *lang-trans* for Arabic, and *transliterate* for Russian and Georgian.⁷ The results are provided in Table 1. On average, UROMAN performs better or comparable to the language-specific transliterators. This provides justification to use UROMAN for massive transliteration at scale.

Second, we compare UROMAN to two other transliteration strategies. (i) **BORROW** refers to borrowing transliterators from languages within the same language family and written in the same script.⁸ Since building transliterators are costly, this gives us an estimate of whether it is possible to rely on the related transliterators when we do not have a language-specific one at hand. (ii) **RAND** refers to a random setting where we associate any non-ASCII character with any ASCII character, giving us an estimate of whether we actually need knowledge of the language to build transliterators. The results are provided in Table 2: UROMAN is largely and consistently outperforming both **BORROW** and **RAND**, where the single exception is **BORROW** (from Hindi to Bhojpuri). Surprisingly, **RAND** also yields reasonable performance and on average even outperforms the **Non-Trans_{LA+INV}** variant with non-transliterated data (21.59 vs 18.39 in Table 3 later). This provides further evidence towards the utility of transliteration in general and

⁷For reproducibility, the links to the language-specific transliterators are available in Appendix B.

⁸E.g., a Hindi transliterator can be borrowed for Bhojpuri since the two are related and written in Devanagari.

Task	Transliterator	am	ar	ka	ru	hi	sd	avg
NER (Macro F1)	UROMAN	25.6	24.8	61.4	66.5	48.6	35.3	43.7
	Other	25.5	23.7	57.3	63.9	56.7	35.9	43.8
UD (UAS / LAS)	UROMAN	36.1 / 6.6	33.0 / 19.8	-	47.3 / 32.4	33.8 / 17.8	-	37.5 / 19.1
	Other	29.9 / 5.4	32.6 / 19.9	-	45.0 / 19.9	33.2 / 17.9	-	35.2 / 15.8

Table 1: Comparison of UROMAN with language-specific transliterators.

Method	Seen Script							Unseen Script					avg
	bh	cdo	ckb	mhr	sd	ug	xmf	am	bo	dv	km	si	
UROMAN	32.59	27.34	67.73	64.68	35.33	28.10	52.58	25.69	35.95	29.99	41.76	31.83	26.89
BORROW	-	-	12.46 (ar)	45.86 (ru)	16.79 (ar)	12.85 (ar)	24.77 (ru)	-	-	-	-	-	-
RAND	25.42	19.51	53.55	42.02	27.20	25.18	35.82	18.00	18.95	21.19	32.75	20.01	21.59

Table 2: Comparison of various transliteration strategies on the NER task (Macro-F1).

Variant	Seen Script							Unseen Script					avg
	bh	cdo	sd	xmf	mhr	ckb	ug	am	bo	dv	km	si	
Non-Trans _{LA+INV}	55.14	24.19	31.31	49.74	70.31	45.54	33.53	3.26	19.86	18.72	13.81	23.14	18.39
Trans _{LA+INV}	32.59	27.34	35.33	52.58	64.68	67.73	28.10	25.69	35.95	29.99	41.76	31.83	26.89
Non-Trans _{LA+EmbLex}	60.00	28.91	42.47	51.99	61.05	79.12	50.42	47.60	40.96	31.21	53.94	45.89	49.01
Trans _{LA+mPLM_{ft}}	49.05	36.92	39.16	57.99	69.85	73.92	33.43	37.09	33.82	40.40	52.39	45.24	47.44

Table 3: Results (Macro-F1 scores) on WikiAnn NER averaged over 6 random seeds.

Variant	Seen Script				Unseen Script		avg
	bh	myv	ug	bxr	am		
Non-Trans _{LA+INV}	28.46 / 11.53	45.28 / 26.27	33.44 / 15.28	39.75 / 19.77	19.08 / 1.85	33.20 / 10.81	
Trans _{LA+INV}	25.12 / 10.17	45.74 / 26.64	32.30 / 15.10	37.92 / 17.23	36.07 / 7.58	35.43 / 12.41	
Non-Trans _{LA+EmbLex}	26.68 / 10.10	48.34 / 25.34	41.20 / 22.81	39.51 / 16.02	36.47 / 8.39	38.44 / 12.20	
Trans _{LA+mPLM_{ft}}	28.04 / 11.13	41.97 / 20.29	50.89 / 16.56	35.03 / 20.29	39.10 / 9.00	39.01 / 14.65	

Table 4: Results (UAS / LAS scores) in the DP task with UD, averaged over 6 random seeds.

UROMAN-based romanization in particular to assist and improve language adaptation.

Performance on Low-Resource Languages is summarized in Table 3 and Table 4. We note that Trans_{LA+INV} outperforms Non-Trans_{LA+INV} for all the languages with unseen scripts, and achieves that with huge margins (~ 8 -22 points for NER and ~ 17 points in UAS scores). We observe similar trends for some of the languages with seen scripts such as Min Dong (cdo), Sindhi (sd), Mingrelian (xmf) on NER tasks and Erzya (myv) on DP. The less efficient Trans_{LA+mPLM_{ft}}, as expected, further improves the performance for all the languages except for Tibetan (bo).⁹ Non-Trans_{LA+EmbLex}, however, now outperforms UROMAN-based methods for a majority of the languages. This observation can be attributed to various factors related to mBERT’s tokenizer, and we provide an in-depth analysis later in Appendix E. Nonetheless, we observe strong and competitive performance of Trans_{LA+mPLM_{ft}} in both tasks, again indicating that more attention should be put on transliteration-based language adaptation in future work.

Sample Efficiency. Finally, we simulate a few-

⁹For Tibetan, longer words are composed using shorter words separated by *tsek* (“.”) which is not a valid space delimiter for the mBERT tokenizer; the number of produced subwords is thus much higher than for the other languages.




Figure 2: Sample efficiency in the NER task.

shot setup to study the effectiveness of using transliterated versus non-transliterated data in data-scarce scenarios. For NER, we evaluate performance on all the languages and on languages with unseen scripts; for DP, we evaluate on all the languages. Figure 2 indicates that Trans_{LA+INV} on average performs better than all the other methods at sample sizes 100 (i.e., 100 sentences in the target language) and 1,000. However, from 10,000 sentences onward, Non-Trans_{LA+EmbLex} takes the lead. We observe similar trends in the DP task (see Appendix D). This establishes the utility of transliteration for (extremely) low-resource scenarios.

4 Conclusion

In this work, we have systematically analyzed and confirmed the potential of romanization, implemented via the UROMAN tool, to help with adaptation of multilingual pretrained language models. Given (i) its broad applicability and (ii) strong per-

formance overall and for languages with unseen scripts, we hope our study will inspire more work on transliteration-based adaptation.

Limitations

In this paper, we work with UROMAN (Hermjakob et al., 2018) which is an unsupervised romanization tool. While it is an effective tool for romanization at scale, it still has potential drawbacks. Since it is only based on lexical substitution, its transliterations may not semantically or phonetically align with the source content and may differ from transliterations preferred by native speakers. Moreover, UROMAN is not invertible—as we have highlighted—and may thus be less appealing when text in the original script needs to be exactly reproduced. Our proposed method, while it is parameter-efficient and effective—particularly for low-resource languages—still underperforms language-specific tokenizer-based non-transliteration methods. Future work may focus on developing an improved and more efficient tokenizer for transliteration-based methods as we highlight in the Appendix.

Acknowledgements

This work has been funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as part of the Research Training Group KRITIS No. GRK 2222. The work of Ivan Vulić has been supported by a personal Royal Society University Research Fellowship (no 221137; 2022-).

We thank Indraneil Paul, Yongxin Huang, Ivan Habernal, and Massimo Nicosia for their valuable feedback and suggestions on a draft of this paper.

References

- Chantal Amrhein and Rico Sennrich. 2020. [On Romanization for model transfer between scripts in neural machine translation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 2461–2469, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alan Ansell, Edoardo Maria Ponti, Jonas Pfeiffer, Sebastian Ruder, Goran Glavaš, Ivan Vulić, and Anna Korhonen. 2021. [MAD-G: Multilingual adapter generation for efficient cross-lingual transfer](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 4762–4781, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mikel Artetxe, Sebastian Ruder, and Dani Yogatama. 2020. [On the cross-lingual transferability of monolingual representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4623–4637, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ethan C. Chau and Noah A. Smith. 2021. [Specializing multilingual language models: An empirical study](#). In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Multilingual Representation Learning*, pages 51–61, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peter T. Daniels and William Bright. 1996. *The world’s writing systems*. Oxford University Press.
- Isin Demirsahin, Cibu Johny, Alexander Gutkin, and Brian Roark. 2022. [Criteria for useful automatic Romanization in South Asian languages](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 6662–6673, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- 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 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tejas Dhamecha, Rudra Murthy, Samarth Bharadwaj, Karthik Sankaranarayanan, and Pushpak Bhat-tacharyya. 2021. [Role of Language Relatedness in Multilingual Fine-tuning of Language Models: A Case Study in Indo-Aryan Languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8584–8595, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Timothy Dozat and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. [Deep biaffine attention for neural dependency parsing](#). In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24–26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- Goran Glavaš and Ivan Vulić. 2021. [Is supervised syntactic parsing beneficial for language understanding tasks? an empirical investigation](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the*

- Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 3090–3104, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ulf Hermjakob, Jonathan May, and Kevin Knight. 2018. [Out-of-the-box universal Romanization tool uroman](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2018, System Demonstrations*, pages 13–18, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR.
- Junjie Hu, Sebastian Ruder, Aditya Siddhant, Graham Neubig, Orhan Firat, and Melvin Johnson. 2020. [XTREME: A massively multilingual multi-task benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual generalisation](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4411–4421. PMLR.
- Ying Lin, Cash Costello, Boliang Zhang, Di Lu, Heng Ji, James Mayfield, and Paul McNamee. 2018. [Platforms for non-speakers annotating names in any language](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2018, System Demonstrations*, pages 1–6, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yash Madhani, Sushane Parthan, Priyanka A. Bedekar, Ruchi Khapra, Vivek Seshadri, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Pratyush Kumar, and Mitesh M. Khapra. 2022. [Aksharantar: Towards building open transliteration tools for the next billion users](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J. Cohen. 1989. [Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem](#). volume 24 of *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, pages 109–165. Academic Press.
- Nikita Moghe, Evgeniia Razumovskaia, Liane Guillou, Ivan Vulić, Anna Korhonen, and Alexandra Birch. 2022. [Multi3nlu++: A multilingual, multi-intent, multi-domain dataset for natural language understanding in task-oriented dialogue](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Ibraheem Muhammad Moosa, Mahmud Elahi Akhter, and Ashfia Binte Habib. 2022. [Does transliteration help multilingual language modeling?](#) *arXiv preprint*.
- Benjamin Muller, Antonios Anastasopoulos, Benoît Sagot, and Djamé Seddah. 2021. [When being unseen from mBERT is just the beginning: Handling new languages with multilingual language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 448–462, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joakim Nivre, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Filip Ginter, Jan Hajič, Christopher D. Manning, Sampo Pyysalo, Sebastian Schuster, Francis Tyers, and Daniel Zeman. 2020. [Universal Dependencies v2: An evergrowing multilingual treebank collection](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 4034–4043, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Xiaoman Pan, Boliang Zhang, Jonathan May, Joel Nothman, Kevin Knight, and Heng Ji. 2017. [Cross-lingual name tagging and linking for 282 languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1946–1958, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonas Pfeiffer, Naman Goyal, Xi Lin, Xian Li, James Cross, Sebastian Riedel, and Mikel Artetxe. 2022. [Lifting the curse of multilinguality by pre-training modular transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3479–3495, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonas Pfeiffer, Andreas Rücklé, Clifton Poth, Aishwarya Kamath, Ivan Vulić, Sebastian Ruder, Kyunghyun Cho, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020a. [AdapterHub: A framework for adapting transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 46–54, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonas Pfeiffer, Sebastian Ruder, Ivan Vulić, and Edoardo Maria Ponti. 2023. [Modular deep learning](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulić, Iryna Gurevych, and Sebastian Ruder. 2020b. [MAD-X: An Adapter-Based Framework for Multi-Task Cross-Lingual Transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7654–7673, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulić, Iryna Gurevych, and Sebastian Ruder. 2021. [UNKs everywhere: Adapting multilingual language models to new scripts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10186–10203, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Edoardo Maria Ponti, Goran Glavaš, Olga Majewska, Qianchu Liu, Ivan Vulić, and Anna Korhonen. 2020.

- [XCOPA: A multilingual dataset for causal common-sense reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2362–2376, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Afshin Rahimi, Yuan Li, and Trevor Cohn. 2019. [Massively multilingual transfer for NER](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 151–164, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Phillip Rust, Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulić, Sebastian Ruder, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. [How good is your tokenizer? on the monolingual performance of multilingual language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3118–3135, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daan van Esch, Tamar Lucassen, Sebastian Ruder, Isaac Caswell, and Clara Rivera. 2022. [Writing system and speaker metadata for 2,800+ language varieties](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 5035–5046, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Hans H Wellisch, Lee Breuer, Richard Foreman, and Robert Wilson. 1978. *The conversion of scripts, its nature, history, and utilization*. New York; Toronto: Wiley.
- Seid Muhie Yimam, Abinew Ali Ayele, Gopalakrishnan Venkatesh, Ibrahim Gashaw, and Chris Biemann. 2021. [Introducing various semantic models for amharic: Experimentation and evaluation with multiple tasks and datasets](#). *Future Internet*, 13(11).
- Judit Ács. [Exploring bert’s vocabulary](#). *Blog Post*.

Language	Family	Script
Bhojpuri (bh)	Indo-Europ	Devanagari
Buryat (bxr)	Mongolic	Cyrillic
Erzya (myv)	Uralic	Cyrillic
Meadow Mari (mhr)	Uralic	Cyrillic
Min Dong (cdo)	Sino-Tibetan	Chinese
Mingrelian (xmf)	Kartvelian	Georgian
Sindhi (sd)	Indo-Europ	Arabic
Sorani Kurdish (ckb)	Indo-Europ	Arabic
Uyghur (ug)	Turkic	Arabic
Amharic (am)	Afro-Asiatic	Ge'ez
Divehi (dv)	Indo-Europ	Thaana
Khmer (km)	Austroasiatic	Khmer
Sinhala (si)	Indo-Europ	Sinhala
Tibetan (bo)	Sino-Tibetan	Tibetan

Table 5: Languages with their ISO 639-3 codes used in our evaluation, along with their script and language family. The dashed line separates languages with unseen scripts, placed in the bottom part of the table.

A Languages in Evaluation

Languages in our evaluation, along with their ISO 639-3 language codes are provided in Table 5.

B Translitterators in Evaluation

Besides UROMAN, we also employ various language-specific translitterators which are publicly available. We list them in Table 6.

C Training of Language and Task Adapters

We train all the language adapters for 50 epochs or $\sim 50K$ update steps based on the corpus size. The batch size is set to 64 and the learning rate is $1e-4$.

We train English task adapters following the setup from (Pfeiffer et al., 2020b). For NER, we directly obtain the task adapter from [Adapterhub.ml](https://huggingface.co/adapters) which is trained with a learning rate of $1e-4$ for 10 epochs. For DP, we train a Transformer-based (Glavaš and Vulić, 2021) biaffine attention dependency parser (Dozat and Manning, 2017). We use a learning rate of $5e-4$ and train for 10 epochs as in (Pfeiffer et al., 2021).

All the reported results in both tasks (NER and DP) are reported as averages over 6 random seeds. All the models have been trained on A100 or V100 GPUs. None of the training methods consumed more than 36 hours.




Figure 3: Sample efficiency in the DP task.

D Sample Efficiency for Dependency Parsing

The experiment on sample efficiency, where the samples are sentences in the target language, has been conducted on both evaluation tasks. The results for NER are available in the main paper (Figure 2), while the results for DP are available in Figure 3, and we observe similar trends in both tasks.

E Further Analyses

Following previous work (Ács; Rust et al., 2021; Moosa et al., 2022), we further analyze tokenization quality of the mBERT tokenizer using the following established metrics: **1) % of “UNK”s** measures the % of “UNK” tokens produced by the tokenizer, and our aim is to compare their rate before and after transliteration; **2) fertility** measures the number of subwords that are produced per tokenized word; **3) proportion of continued subwords** measures the proportion of words for which the tokenized word is split across at least two subwords (denoted by the symbol ##).

From the results summarized in Figure 4, it is apparent that transliteration drastically reduces % of UNKs. However, mBERT’s tokenizer underperforms as compared to monolingual tokenizers based on fertility and the proportion of continued subwords (Rust et al., 2021). Transliteration performs better for some languages where the quality of the mBERT tokenizer is similar to the monolingual tokenizer such as for dv, km, and cdo. On the other hand, transliteration methods perform worse on languages where the quality of the underlying mBERT tokenizer is relatively poor.

In order to test the hypothesis that the tokenizer quality might be the principal reason for the performance gap for the transliteration-based methods in comparison to the non-transliteration based methods, we carried out an additional experiment. For the experiment, we adapt the Non-Trans_{LA+Emb_{Lex}} to operate on transliterated data, and call this vari-

Transliterator	Used for languages	Available at
UROMAN	All	github.com/isi-nlp/uroman
<i>amseg</i>	am	pypi.org/project/amseg/
<i>transliterate</i>	ru, ka	pypi.org/project/transliterate/
<i>ai4bharat-transliteration</i>	hi, sd	pypi.org/project/ai4bharat-transliteration/
<i>lang-trans</i>	ar	pypi.org/project/lang-trans/

Table 6: Transliterators used in this work.




Figure 4: Tokenizer quality analysis. a) % of UNKs before and after transliteration, b) Fertility, and c) Proportion of continued subwords for mBERT vs monolingual tokenizer.




Figure 5: Comparison of Non-Trans_{LA+Emb_{Lex}} with Trans_{LA+Emb_{Lex}} on NER (left) and DP (right).

ant Trans_{LA+Emb_{Lex}}. Here, we train a new tokenizer on the transliterated data and initialize lexically overlapping embeddings with mBERT’s pretrained embeddings.

We plot the performance in Figure 5. The new method, Trans_{LA+Emb_{Lex}} now outperforms the non-transliteration-based variant on 8/12 languages and also on average. Consequently, this validates our hypothesis and is in line with the previous work (Moosa et al., 2022). However, we found a drop in performance in the case of mhr (-10.71) and cdo (-10.14) when compared to Trans_{LA} + mPLM_n. These drops may be attributed to the lower degree of lexical overlap with mBERT’s vocabulary, and consequently a higher number of randomly initialized embeddings for those target languages.