

Do Not Worry if You Do Not Have Data: Building Pretrained Language Models Using Translationese

Meet Doshi*, Raj Dabre**, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya*

*CFILT, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay

**NICT, Japan

{meetdoshi, pb}@cse.iitb.ac.in

{prajdabre}@gmail.com

Abstract

In this paper, we explore the utility of *Translationese* as synthetic data created using machine translation for pre-training language models (LMs). Pre-training requires vast amounts of monolingual data, which is mostly unavailable for languages other than English. Recently, there has been a growing interest in using synthetic data to address this data scarcity. We take the case of English and Indic languages and translate web-crawled monolingual documents (clean) into the target language. Then, we train language models containing 28M and 85M parameters on this translationese data (synthetic). We show that their performance on downstream natural language understanding and generative tasks is only 3.56% poorer on NLU tasks and 1.51% on NLG tasks than LMs pre-trained on clean data. Further, we propose the use of lightweight *TinyLMs* pre-trained on clean data to filter synthetic data efficiently which significantly improves the performance of our models. We also find that LMs trained on synthetic data strongly benefit from extended pretraining on a tiny fraction (10%) of clean data. We release the data we collected and created as a part of this work, *IndicMonoDoc*, the largest collection of monolingual document-level corpora, which we hope will help bridge the gap between English and non-English performance for large language models.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) (Brown et al., 2020; Workshop et al., 2022; Almazrouei et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2022) have been able to perform very well on downstream tasks like MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021), Big-Bench (Srivastava et al., 2022), etc, and have even started to reach human potential in many of these tasks. But this performance has very largely been credited to their scale and the vast amount of data that they have been fed. Most of these language models (LMs) perform well in languages like English where abundant data is avail-




Figure 1: Comparison of NLU performance between language models trained on clean data and synthetic translationese data in English, Hindi, and Gujarati shows that filtering synthetic text and extending training on a clean subset (10%) can bring the performance of models trained on synthetic data closer to LMs trained only on clean data extracted from the web.

able (Kudugunta et al., 2023), but a vast majority of languages don't have comparable data as compared to English. As a consequence, many LLMs, both monolingual and multilingual, involving these languages still show poor performance for various downstream tasks. For example, the largest open source multilingual model BLOOM (Workshop et al., 2022) covers 46 natural languages spanning 9 language families, but the top 5 languages comprise 74.14% of the data. Despite the benefits of multilingualism (Dabre et al., 2020), this skew in data still means that the low-resource languages will not perform well.

Fortunately synthetic data is an option and previous works such as, but not limited to, back-translation (Sennrich et al., 2016a), sequence distillation (Kim and Rush, 2016), also known as forward translation, etc. have shown that synthetic data obtained using machine translation (MT) can supplement resource scarcity and can significantly enhance model performance (Popović et al.,

2020; Gala et al., 2023). However, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no work on showing the effectiveness of synthetic data for training LMs. Furthermore, the quality of synthetic data is also important, which many works take for granted. While there are options such as round-trip-translation (Moon et al., 2020) or referenceless neural quality estimation (QE) (Rei et al., 2021), they either involve twice the compute or a reasonably large model not available for most languages, and this might not be optimal to determine the quality of synthetic documents efficiently. We thus consider TinyLMs (Eldan and Li, 2023) as an efficient alternative, which have been shown to model documents by their fluent paragraph generation capabilities.

In this paper, we focus on English and Indic languages and present a comprehensive study of the utility of synthetic, *translationese* (Gellerstam, 1986), monolingual data obtained using machine translation (MT) for training LMs. We propose a simple framework that involves training small language models, TinyLMs, on original web-crawled data (clean) and then using them to filter synthetic data. We then compare LMs trained on clean and synthetic data followed by fine-tuning on downstream tasks, where we observe that, unfiltered synthetic data LMs perform slightly poor compared to LMs trained on clean data, but after filtering, it matches its performance. We also show that tuning these synthetic data LMs on small clean data leads to further improvements.

Our contributions are:

- a. A simple framework involving high-quality MT models and TinyLMs trained on clean web-crawled data to mass-produce and filter synthetic data for LM training.
- b. Demonstrating the efficacy of language models trained on filtered synthetic data across a range of downstream tasks in natural language understanding and generation.
- c. A new document-level monolingual corpora (*IndicMonoDoc*) consisting of 39.5B tokens worth of monolingual clean document-level data spanning 22 scheduled languages and English. This dataset, which is 2 times larger than IndicCorpV2 (Doddapaneni et al., 2023), will be made public alongside our models and code¹².

¹<https://github.com/meetdoshi90/TinyLM/>

²<https://huggingface.co/datasets/cfilt/IITB-MonoDoc>

2 Related Work

This paper focuses on creating, filtering, and utilizing synthetic data for training TinyLMs.

Monolingual Data: Previous efforts of collecting monolingual corpora for Indic languages include but not limited to the EMILLE/CIIL corpus (McEnery et al., 2000), HindMonoCorp (Borjar et al., 2014), Leipzig corpus (Goldhahn et al., 2012), IndicCorpV1 (Kakwani et al., 2020) and more recently IndicCorpV2 (Doddapaneni et al., 2023) which shows significant increase in size compared to previous Indic corpora. Although the size of IndicCorpV2 is large, it is a sentence-level corpora that can be used to train NLU models but language models with their increase in size can be trained on longer contexts that require long sequences of documents. In this work, we build upon existing monolingual corpora for Indic languages and also show the efficacy of using synthetic data.

Synthetic Data Generation and Quality Estimation: Synthetic data is valuable for NLP tasks like using back translations (Sennrich et al., 2016a), (Edunov et al., 2018) to enhance Machine translation (Marie et al., 2020), (Bogoychev and Sennrich, 2019), (Ni et al., 2022), or for tasks such as native language identification (Goldin et al., 2018). However, there’s a limited exploration of using synthetic data for pretraining LMs due to issues like hallucination (Maynez et al., 2020), and ungrounded non-factual text (Thorne et al., 2018). Machine translation can help mitigate these issues, but translation errors may still occur, impacting text quality. Evaluating synthetic text quality with round-trip-translation (RTT) BLEU scores requires twice the compute and is prone to errors. Alternative evaluation methods like BARTScore (Yuan et al., 2021), T5Score (Qin et al., 2023), MQM & COMET (Rei et al., 2020) require large-scale models or human annotations, limiting scalability. Approaches like KenLM (Heafield, 2011) have been used to filter monolingual corpora based on perplexity. We take inspiration from this and show that efficient TinyLM with just 28M parameters can be used to filter synthetic text.

TinyLMs: Language models as small as 10M parameters have been shown to produce fluent and consistent stories with almost perfect grammar (Eldan and Li, 2023) which means LMs even at a small scale have language understanding. Challenges like BabyLM (Warstadt et al., 2023) focus on improving LMs with a fixed data budget which enables




Figure 2: Overview of our approach to pre-train language models using translationese data. We leverage rich monolingual corpora in the *src* language and scarce corpora in the *tgt* language. Our method involves employing a pre-trained machine translation model to translate *src* to *tgt*. We then filter the resulting text using a TinyLM trained solely on clean *tgt* monolingual data for perplexity. The filtered synthetic data can be used to further pretrain larger language models.

exhaustive study of LM development methodologies, which can then be applied to larger LMs. We aim to utilize lightweight TinyLMs for efficient filtering of synthetic documents.

3 Methodology

In this section, we describe our framework for leveraging synthetic data for LM training. This consists of monolingual data curation from the web (clean), training a TinyLM with it, translation of clean data, using the aforementioned TinyLM to filter synthetic data, and then using this filtered data for training a larger LM to be used for downstream tasks. Our framework is described in Figure 2.

3.1 Monolingual Data

Web Crawled (Clean): Following Doddapaneni et al. (2023); Rae et al. (2022); Team et al. (2022), for all languages of interest, we **a.** obtain a list of URLs to be crawled via word-level n-grams passed to a search engine, **b.** after URL deduplication, we crawl all applicable webpages, **c.** automatically and manually (Ortiz Suárez et al., 2019; Abadji et al., 2022) filter out unwanted text like HTML tags and emoticons, **d.** use language detection-based (LID) filtering using cld3³ and IndicLID-FTN model (Madhani et al., 2023a) to discard languages not of interest, **e.** perform document filtering to remove offensive text using toxic words list provided by Team et al. (2022), **f.** merge all

³<https://github.com/google/cld3>




Figure 3: Language-wise corpora size comparison with IndicCorp2 (Doddapaneni et al., 2023): Stacked Bars

the filtered corpus with Wikipedia, OSCAR (Ortiz Suárez et al., 2019) and some dumps of mC4 (Xue et al., 2021) and finally, **g.** perform deduplication at paragraph level using Murmurhash algorithm⁴ with a 128-bit unsigned hash for each monolingual split of the corpora.

Translationese (Synthetic): We utilize state-of-the-art MT models like IndicTrans2 (Gala et al., 2023) to generate translationese data. We use beam search with a beam value of 5 to translate English tokens from the aforementioned crawled corpus to the languages of interest. Most MT models have a

⁴<https://pypi.org/project/mmh3/>




Figure 4: The plot illustrates TinyLM’s perplexity mean and variance across various datasets: Clean-EN (left), Syn-EN from filtered Hindi (middle), and Syn-EN from filtered Gujarati (right). Despite filtering, English documents generated from translating Gujarati show consistently higher variance.

maximum token limit, and thus we split the documents using Moses Sentence Splitter⁵ to perform translations into the target language at the sentence level and then merge again to form documents. Our experiments also focus on synthetic English data translated from Hindi and Gujarati.

3.2 Tiny Language Models (TinyLMs)

TinyLMs are simply tiny versions of language models inspired by Eldan and Li (2023). We follow the Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017) used by Eldan and Li (2023) and train it using only clean monolingual documents. Instead of using learned positional encodings, we use RoPE embeddings (Su et al., 2023) for better extrapolation to longer documents. We rely on Chinchilla scaling laws Hoffmann et al. (2022) and use compute optimal word tokens to train our models.

3.3 Synthetic Data Filtering

We first train TinyLMs on crawled data and then use them to compute perplexities on our synthetic documents ($W \in w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N$) using the equation:

$$\text{PPL}(W) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{N} \sum_i^N \log p_\theta(w_i | w_{<i}) \right\}$$

We also use our TinyLM to repair sentences in documents that exceed the maximum length of the MT models, but this happens in only 0.002% of such cases. We provide more details of our approach in Appendix C.

3.4 Final LM and Downstream Task Training

Using the filtered synthetic corpora, we train our final LMs which are comparatively larger, and

⁵<https://pypi.org/project/mosestokenizer/>

fine-tune them for natural language understanding (NLU) tasks such as IndicGLUE (Kakwani et al., 2020), GLUE (Wang et al., 2018) and generation (NLG) benchmarks such as IndicNLG (Kumar et al., 2022), summarization tasks (Nallapati et al., 2016), (Chen et al., 2021) and machine translation benchmarks (Team et al., 2022), (Gala et al., 2023).

4 IndicMonoDoc

Following the monolingual data curation strategy in Section 3, we crawl data for English and 22 Indic languages. As a result, we end up with IndicMonoDoc, with 27.5 billion tokens of Indic documents and 12 billion tokens of English documents for a total of 39.5 billion tokens of clean monolingual data. This is the largest ever for Indic languages, even surpassing (Doddapaneni et al., 2023) by 2 times. We use IndicMonoDoc for all clean parts of our experiments. We report additional details of IndicMonoDoc in Appendix D.

4.1 Analysis of Crawled Corpora

Figure 3 gives an overview of the comparison of IndicMonoDoc which is a document-level corpus with that of IndicCorpV2 which is a sentence-level corpus. It is important to note that we paid special attention to the low-resource languages.

4.2 Analysis of Synthetic Data

We use IndicMonoDoc for the clean part of our experiments and translate parts of it for the synthetic experiments. Figure 4 shows the perplexity mean and variance scores for TinyLM across token positions in the documents. This shows that on unseen documents, TinyLM shows higher variance on English documents generated by translating Gujarati documents from IndicMonoDoc as compared to English clean and English synthetic generated




Figure 5: Violin plot displaying the distribution of lengths of clean and filtered English documents on different data splits: *en-clean* (English web documents), *syn-en_hi* (synthetic English documents translated from Hindi), and *syn-en_gu* (synthetic English documents translated from Gujarati).

from Hindi. This also gives reason for the deterioration in results in Table 4 due to Gujarati documents. Figure 5 shows the distribution of lengths of filtered documents by TinyLMs showing that they do not add any bias for shorter documents during filtering. Although we do not experiment with all these languages, we believe that IndicMonoDoc will be an invaluable resource for Indic LMs.

5 Experiments

In this section, we describe the training procedure and datasets used for different models mentioned in Section 3. We pretrain and fine-tune all of the mentioned models from scratch in both mono and bilingual settings using a Causal Language Modeling (CLM) objective on NLG tasks and use a Linear classification head for all classification tasks. We specify the sample of the dataset used for pre-training and finetuning for each model and see the different effects of using synthetic corpora for pre-training.

5.1 Pretraining Data Settings

We refer to translated text or translationese as **synthetic** or **syn** and original or web-crawled data as **clean** throughout our experiments. For the pre-training of all base models, we use the following naming convention to denote our training splits for each model:

XX-clean: This is a clean subset sampled randomly from IndicMonoDoc where XX represents the language English (EN), Hindi (HI) or Gujarati (GU).

syn-XX_yy-unfiltered: Denotes synthetic monolingual documents in XX language generated by using yy as source during translation.

syn-XX_yy-filtered: Filtered synthetic data.

+10%: Refers to extended pretraining on a cleaned subset of IndicMonoDoc with an additional 10% tokens compared to regular training.

BI-XX-YY Prefix: Denotes bilingual models trained using an equal mixture of monolingual corpora in XX and YY languages. We append an *_syn* prefix to either XX or YY if a synthetic version of that language is employed in training and a *-parallel/nonparallel* tag to denote whether a parallel version of XX and YY are used or not.

Note, for each split we only use the number of tokens that are required to reach the point of optimality (Hoffmann et al., 2022) by the language model. We mention other details in Appendix B.

5.2 Implementation and Training

Tokenizer: We use a common byte-pair-encoding (BPE) (Sennrich et al., 2016b) tokenizer using Sentencepiece⁶ for all experiments. We train a shared vocabulary of 56k subwords between three languages, English, Hindi, and Gujarati by using 5 Million randomly sampled sentences per language and upsampling for Gujarati.

TinyLMs: We use Pytorch Lightning⁷ for our implementations and train TinyLMs as described in Section 3.2. We use hidden sizes of 768 and have two variants, one with 4 layers (*mini*) and one with 12 layers (*base*; same as GPT2-base) with 28M and 85M non-embedding parameters respectively. The *mini* models are trained on clean data with sequence lengths of 4096⁸ (*mini-4k*) for filtering synthetic documents as described in Section 3.3. On the other hand, for our main pre-training and downstream fine-tuning experiments, we train *mini* and *base* models with sequence lengths of 1024 (*mini-1k* and *base-1k*). Following Hoffmann et al. (2022) we use 2.4 billion word tokens per language to compute optimal training of *base* models. Since Gujarati has only 900M tokens in our dataset, whenever Gujarati is involved, we train only the *mini-1k* model. For models involving English and Hindi, we train both *mini* and *base* models. Additional details are in Appendix B.

⁶<https://github.com/google/sentencepiece>

⁷<https://lightning.ai/docs/pytorch/stable/>

⁸We keep long sequence lengths to be able to handle long documents for filtering.

(a) Results on Hindi

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

(b) Results on Gujarati

Model	NLU			NLG			
	iXNLI	iNLTK	Avg.	Headline Gen.	Sentence Summ.	Question Gen.	Avg.
GU-clean	67.8	92.1	79.95	17.62	13.82	15.18	15.54
syn-GU_en-unfiltered	65.51	89.78	77.65	16.21	13.29	13.66	14.39
syn-GU_en-unfiltered+10%	66.83	90.11	78.47	-	-	-	-
syn-GU_en-filtered	67.74	91.35	79.55	17.64	13.40	14.95	15.33
syn-GU_en-filtered+10%	68.04	92.41	80.23	-	-	-	-

Table 1: Results for Hindi and Gujarati: NLU/NLG tasks on *base-1k* (Hindi) and *mini-1k* (Gujarati) models on different clean and synthetic splits. Test accuracy for NLU tasks; Rouge-L F1 scores for NLG tasks. **Bold** values represent the best amongst synthetic splits.

5.3 Downstream Tasks and Evaluation

We finetune the *mini-1k* and *base-1k* models for various classification, regression, and generation tasks. We do some hyperparameter tuning for each task and then repeat them for different data splits. More hyperparameters and evaluation details can be found in Appendix B. For evaluations, we report our primary scores on IndicGLUE (Kakwani et al., 2020) and IndicXNLI (iXNLI) (Aggarwal et al., 2022) for Hindi and Gujarati and use the validation set of GLUE benchmark (Wang et al., 2018) for English. We also experiment with other generation tasks like CNN-Dailymail (Nallapati et al., 2016), DailogSum (Chen et al., 2021), XL-Sum (Hasan et al., 2021), IndicNLG⁹ (Kumar et al., 2022), FLoRes-200 (Team et al., 2022), IN22-Conv & IN22-Gen (Gala et al., 2023) and use standard evaluation metrics suitable for each task like accuracy, f1-score, Rouge-L (Lin, 2004) and chrF++ (Popović, 2017).

6 Results

We now present our results which help establish the utility of synthetic data for language modeling.

6.1 Main Results

In this section, we present results for Hindi, Gujarati, and English language models trained on clean data, as well as synthetic data generated from

⁹We only take first 4k examples of IndicNLG test split for each task due the large test split of IndicNLG

translations. We demonstrate the impact of filtering and adding additional clean data for extended pretraining of LMs trained solely on synthetic text. Additionally, we observe the effect of using the clean source text along with its translations (synthetic parallel documents) on downstream tasks. We follow the naming convention for different data splits as specified in Section 5. We provide details for pretraining of each model in Appendix B.

Filtered Synthetic Data is Competitive with Web Scraped Data: The results in Table 1 and 2 indicate that *syn-HI_en-unfiltered*, *syn-GU_en-unfiltered*, and *syn-EN_hi-unfiltered* exhibit lower downstream performance compared to their filtered counterparts: *syn-HI_en-filtered*, *syn-GU_en-filtered*, and *syn-EN_hi-filtered*, respectively. It is evident that filtering the synthetic documents using TinyLMs significantly improves the performance of both NLU and NLG tasks. In Table 2, we observe that for tasks like CoLA (Warstadt et al., 2019), language models trained solely on synthetic data lag behind when compared to other tasks. This suggests that *synthetic corpora may lack certain important elements necessary for language models to perform competitively in linguistic acceptability tasks, as opposed to LMs trained on clean, non-synthetic corpora.*

Fine-tuning on Web Scraped Data boosts performance: Even after filtering, we observe that language models trained solely on synthetic text slightly underperform LMs trained on clean text. To address this issue, we conduct extended pretrain-

Model		sst2	cola	mrpc	qnli	qqp	rte	mnli-m	mnli-mm	stsb	Avg.
		acc	mcc	f1	acc	f1	acc	acc	acc	pearson	
Mono	EN-clean	90.94	40.26	87.4	84.98	84.47	65.34	77.84	77.96	82.67	76.87
	syn-EN_hi-unfiltered	84.61	31.1	81.78	79.35	81.44	63.3	72.94	73.16	78.9	71.84
	syn-EN_hi-unfiltered + 10%	87.39	34.22	85.77	80.96	81.07	65.11	74.76	74.38	80.32	73.78
	syn-EN_hi-filtered	88.3	34.03	86.55	83.59	83.64	63.17	75.6	75.41	81.1	74.60
	syn-EN_hi-filtered + 10%	90.13	35.75	86.41	84.75	84.21	65.34	76.99	76.91	81.95	75.83
Bi	BI-EN-HI-clean	89.56	38.53	85.56	84.88	84.39	64.25	76.4	77.27	82.07	75.88
	BI-EN-HI_syn-parallel-filtered	89.56	39.57	85.71	84.75	84.62	64.98	77.31	77.85	82.41	76.31
	BI-EN-HI_syn-nonparallel-filtered	89.79	38.68	86.92	85.08	84.06	65.34	77.15	77.55	83.01	76.40
	BI-EN_syn-HI_syn-filtered	87.95	30.05	84.9	83.7	83.97	63.89	75.63	76.24	82.24	74.29
	BI-EN_syn-HI_syn-filtered + 10%	89.1	35.45	85.34	84.53	84.18	65.7	76.64	77.24	82.1	75.59

Table 2: Results on English: Dev set of GLUE tasks for different synthetic splits on the *base-1k* model. Synthetic LMs perform almost as well as clean LMs after filtering and further training with clean data. **Bold** values represent the best amongst synthetic splits.

ing of LMs using clean data sourced from IndicMonoDoc. The objective is to determine if this additional training improves performance. We only incorporate an additional 10% of clean data compared to the LM’s previous training data. We see these results across all three languages, and for Hindi and Gujarati, we see that *by incorporating even a small amount of clean data, we observe an increase in performance on downstream tasks, bringing the LM at par or closer to the performance of a clean LM.* We see an improvement in LMs trained using unfiltered synthetic corpora as well but we believe that filtering leads to the removal of noisy documents and thus better performance.

Model	iXNLI	bbc-a	iitp-mr	iitp-pr	midas	Avg.
HI-clean	68.74	80.25	67.74	77.05	78.33	74.42
syn-HI_en-unfiltered	67.32	77.92	65.63	76.81	77.58	73.05
syn-HI_en-filtered	69.48	78.98	65.16	77.43	77.33	73.68
syn-HI_en-filtered+10%	70.15	79.56	67.09	78.2	79.03	74.81

Table 3: Effect of reducing model size for Hindi on IndicGLUE accuracy. All the results reported here are on *mini-1k*. **Bold** values represent the best amongst synthetic splits

Using synthetic for one language doesn’t impact performance in another: For many multilingual language models, data imbalance causes a gap in performance across languages. But what if we can combine synthetic data along with clean data for training multilingual models, would the synthetic part deteriorate the performance of the multilingual model? To experiment with this, we train bilingual *base-1k* models over different combinations of clean and synthetic corpora for English and Hindi and evaluate their performance on GLUE (Wang et al., 2018), and report performance on IndicNLG, and Machine translation in Appendix A. Following Table 2, we see that using Hindi synthetic data does not affect its performance compared to *BI-EN-*

HI-clean model which is solely trained on clean corpora. This implies that *it is possible to train multilingual models where some languages are trained only over a clean subset and others on synthetic without deteriorating performance across languages.* We further see that *using parallel data does not have much impact on multilingual models.*

6.2 Further Exploration

Impact of source language for synthetic data generation: Choosing the right source language for synthetic corpora is crucial as it influences the characteristics of the generated translationese text. We evaluate this using Hindi and Gujarati clean documents from *IndicMonoDoc*, translating them into English. Since Gujarati has limited data (900M tokens), we train a *mini-1k* model for fair comparison. In Table 4, we see that the *synthetic text generated from Hindi achieves performance at par with the EN-clean model, while the synthetic text from Gujarati significantly lags behind.* This is likely because Hindi is more *macaronic* than Gujarati, i.e., a lot of Hindi text from the web consists of *Hinglish*, resulting in better translationese text due to increased overlap between languages. This can also be due to the weaker translations generated by the MT model. The performance gap is notable in tasks like STS benchmark, NLI (qnli and mnli), and CoLA, suggesting poorer translation quality from Gu→En compared to Hi→En.

Impact of model size: Following Table 4 and 3, we see that even after scaling down we see consistent improvements for filtering and adding additional data, which empirically shows that *indeed using synthetic text after filtering is a viable option for pretraining LMs of varying sizes.* In Table 3 we see that after filtering and extended pretraining, synthetic text outperforms LMs trained on clean

Model		sst2 acc	cola mcc	mrpc f1	qnli acc	qqp f1	rte acc	muli-m acc	muli-mm acc	sts pearson	Avg.
Original	EN-clean	87.95	25.59	83.84	78.83	80.78	64.62	71.6	71.69	73.48	70.93
Translationese Hi->En	syn-EN_hi-unfiltered	87.53	19.77	79.02	76.49	77.96	55.4	69.65	70.14	67.37	67.04
	syn-EN_hi-filtered	87.61	22.81	81.95	77.63	80.57	56.31	70.19	70.89	69.29	68.58
	syn-EN_hi-filtered + 10%	87.84	26.61	83.27	78.5	80.36	61.37	71.29	71.11	71.91	70.25
Translationese Gu->En	syn-EN_gu-unfiltered	83.11	17.66	78.53	66.01	77.68	53.6	63.21	64.55	27.33	59.08
	syn-EN_gu-filtered	85.66	21.15	81.45	66.35	77.36	54.15	66.27	65.72	26.16	60.47
	syn-EN_gu-filtered + 10%	86.58	25.17	81.67	67.1	77.75	57.76	68.78	68.56	27.54	62.32

Table 4: Effect of source selection for generating synthetic data on the dev set of GLUE benchmark. All the results reported here are on *mini-1k*. **Bold** values represent the best amongst synthetic splits

documents from the web in Hindi.

Model	XLSum HG	XLSum QG	Cnn	Dialogsum	Avg.
EN-clean	23.87	24.05	16.08	20.39	21.10
syn-EN_hi-unfiltered	22.17	22.97	12.56	18.30	19.00
syn-EN_hi-filtered	23.27	23.83	15.88	19.83	20.70

Table 5: Performance of English models on NLG tasks. All the results reported here are on *base-1k* and use Rouge-L F1 scores.

Impact on NLG: Without extended pretraining, language models trained on synthetic text perform as well as those trained on clean documents, *suggesting that for NLG tasks, synthetic data suffices for pretraining, eliminating the need for clean data*. This trend is evident across Hindi, Gujarati, and English NLG results (Tables 1 and 5). As their performance matches models trained on clean data, we refrain from extended pretraining for NLG tasks, focusing primarily on abstractive summarization for evaluating generation capabilities.

Model	FLORES		
	EN-HI	HI-EN	Avg.
BI-EN-HI-clean	46.56	51.7	49.13
BI-EN-HI_syn-parallel-filtered	44.12	50.64	47.38
BI-EN-HI_syn-nonparallel-filtered	45.65	51.29	48.47
	EN-GU	GU-EN	Avg.
BI-EN-GU-clean	26.44	35.3	30.87
BI-EN-GU_syn-parallel-filtered	26.77	34.84	30.81
BI-EN-GU_syn-nonparallel-filtered	26.7	36.54	31.62

Table 6: chrF++ Scores on FLoRes translation task. EN-HI models are based on *base-1k* and EN-GU models are based on *mini-1k*

Impact on Machine Translation: (MT) We focus on MT separately as a special case of NLG. We hypothesized that using parallel synthetic documents for bilingual models would improve translation performance by enhancing alignment between languages. However, our evaluation fails this hypothesis. Results indicate that *using nonparallel synthetic documents yields similar translation performance across language directions and bench-*

marks compared to parallel synthetic documents. This might be because there is no explicit alignment happening during training between parallel documents. See Table 6 for chrF++ scores on FLoRes-200 (Team et al., 2022), and Appendix A for chrF++ and BLEU scores on IN22-Conv, IN22-Gen (Gala et al., 2023).

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we performed a first of its kind study of the feasibility of using translationese data for training language models. We proposed a simple pipeline involving the translation of documents at scale followed by filtering using small and efficient language models trained on clean data. We then showed on a variety of downstream natural language understanding and generative tasks that language models trained on unclean synthetic data were only slightly inferior to those trained on original data, however, filtered synthetic data with extended pretraining on clean data mostly eliminates this gap. We also observed a positive impact of synthetic data on TinyLMs fine-tuned on 10% clean data. While we observed that the source language, and potential content, for synthetic data generation matters, it is clear that synthetic data can help bridge the resource scarcity faced by a vast majority of languages for language modeling. As a part of this work, we also created IndicMonoDoc, the largest collection of clean document-level datasets for 22 Indic languages and English, which we release along with our synthetic data, pipelines, and code. In the future, we aim to first generate synthetic data at much larger scales and experiment with large language models to push the boundaries of language modeling for low-resource languages.

Limitations

We consider the following limitations of our work.

- Work mainly focuses on TinyLMs so not all

observations may carry over to large language models, however, synthetic data generated from translations can surely help fill knowledge gaps.

- We could not experiment with entire test sets of IndicNLG tasks like Question Generation, WikiBio generation, Headline Generation, and Sentence Summarization due to its vast test split but we do not expect the main trends to change given that we already use 4000 examples per language.
- For GLUE tasks we report our numbers on the validation set and not on the test set for all models since the scale of our experiments was large, automatically submitting results on the test set was not feasible. We follow existing works doing the same. Plus our goal is not to achieve state-of-the-art results but rather to establish the utility of synthetic data by observing trends.
- We have not manually verified synthetic data so despite cleaning using TinyLMs there are chances that there may be some toxic content or bad documents. However, this is a future work.
- Our framework places significant emphasis on the translation model’s performance. Nevertheless, we are confident that this approach will significantly contribute to enhancing the performance of mid-resource languages, particularly those for which the translation model demonstrates considerable proficiency.

Ethical Considerations

As a part of this paper, we release monolingual and synthetic data. While we have taken care to remove any toxic content, accidental occurrences may exist and thus we exercise caution when using our data for training language models as they may produce toxic outputs. Given that we have shown the utility of synthetic data for training LMs, it should be possible to mass produce synthetic toxic data in various languages leading to LMs that can generate multilingual toxic content. However, this opens up research opportunities on how to detect and filter toxic content from synthetically created data.

We aim to release the code and models with an MIT License¹⁰. The dataset will be released under

¹⁰<https://opensource.org/licenses/mit/>

a CC-0 License¹¹.

References

- Julien Abadji, Pedro Ortiz Suarez, Laurent Romary, and Benoît Sagot. 2022. [Towards a Cleaner Document-Oriented Multilingual Crawled Corpus](#). *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2201.06642.
- Divyanshu Aggarwal, Vivek Gupta, and Anoop Kunchukuttan. 2022. [IndicXNLI: Evaluating multilingual inference for Indian languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10994–11006, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ebtesam Almazrouei, Hamza Alobeidli, Abdulaziz Alshamsi, Alessandro Cappelli, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Mérouane Debbah, Étienne Goffinet, Daniel Hesslow, Julien Launay, Quentin Malartic, Daniele Mazzotta, Badreddine Noune, Baptiste Pannier, and Guilherme Penedo. 2023. [The falcon series of open language models](#).
- Nikolay Bogoychev and Rico Sennrich. 2019. [Domain, translationese and noise in synthetic data for neural machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/1911.03362.
- Ondrej Bojar, Vojtech Diatka, Pavel Rychlý, Pavel Stranák, Vít Suchomel, Ales Tamchyna, and Daniel Zeman. 2014. [Hindencorp-hindi-english and hindi-only corpus for machine translation](#). In *LREC*, pages 3550–3555.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Yulong Chen, Yang Liu, Liang Chen, and Yue Zhang. 2021. [DialogSum: A real-life scenario dialogue summarization dataset](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 5062–5074, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Raj Dabre, Chenhui Chu, and Anoop Kunchukuttan. 2020. [A survey of multilingual neural machine translation](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 53(5).

¹¹<https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/public-domain/cc0/>

- Daniel Deutsch and Dan Roth. 2020. [SacreROUGE: An open-source library for using and developing summarization evaluation metrics](#). In *Proceedings of Second Workshop for NLP Open Source Software (NLP-OSS)*, pages 120–125, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sumanth Doddapaneni, Rahul Aralikkatte, Gowtham Ramesh, Shreya Goyal, Mitesh M Khapra, Anoop Kunchukuttan, and Pratyush Kumar. 2023. Towards leaving no indic language behind: Building monolingual corpora, benchmark and models for indic languages. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12402–12426.
- Sergey Edunov, Myle Ott, Michael Auli, and David Grangier. 2018. [Understanding back-translation at scale](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 489–500, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ronen Eldan and Yuanzhi Li. 2023. [Tinystories: How small can language models be and still speak coherent english?](#)
- Jay Gala, Pranjal A Chitale, A K Raghavan, Varun Gumma, Sumanth Doddapaneni, Aswanth Kumar M, Janki Atul Nawale, Anupama Sujatha, Ratish Pudupully, Vivek Raghavan, Pratyush Kumar, Mitesh M Khapra, Raj Dabre, and Anoop Kunchukuttan. 2023. [Indictrans2: Towards high-quality and accessible machine translation models for all 22 scheduled indian languages](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Martin Gellerstam. 1986. Translationese in swedish novels translated from english. *Translation studies in Scandinavia*, 1:88–95.
- Dirk Goldhahn, Thomas Eckart, and Uwe Quasthoff. 2012. [Building large monolingual dictionaries at the Leipzig corpora collection: From 100 to 200 languages](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*, pages 759–765, Istanbul, Turkey. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Gili Goldin, Ella Rabinovich, and Shuly Wintner. 2018. [Native language identification with user generated content](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3591–3601, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yvette Graham, Barry Haddow, and Philipp Koehn. 2019. [Translationese in machine translation evaluation](#). *CoRR*, abs/1906.09833.
- Tahmid Hasan, Abhik Bhattacharjee, Md. Saiful Islam, Kazi Mubasshir, 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-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 4693–4703, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kenneth Heafield. 2011. [KenLM: Faster and smaller language model queries](#). In *Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 187–197, Edinburgh, Scotland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Tom Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Erich Elsen, Jack W. Rae, Oriol Vinyals, and Laurent Sifre. 2022. [Training compute-optimal large language models](#).
- Divyanshu Kakwani, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Satish Golla, NC Gokul, Avik Bhattacharyya, Mitesh M Khapra, and Pratyush Kumar. 2020. [IndicNLPsuite: Monolingual corpora, evaluation benchmarks and pre-trained multilingual language models for indian languages](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4948–4961.
- Yoon Kim and Alexander M. Rush. 2016. [Sequence-level knowledge distillation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1317–1327, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. [Adam: A method for stochastic optimization](#). In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Sneha Kudugunta, Isaac Caswell, Biao Zhang, Xavier Garcia, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Katherine Lee, Derrick Xin, Aditya Kusupati, Romi Stella, Ankur Bapna, et al. 2023. [Madlad-400: A multilingual and document-level large audited dataset](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04662*.
- Aman Kumar, Himani Shrotriya, Prachi Sahu, Amogh Mishra, Raj Dabre, Ratish Pudupully, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Mitesh M. Khapra, and Pratyush Kumar. 2022. [IndicNLG benchmark: Multilingual datasets for diverse NLG tasks in Indic languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5363–5394, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Hugo Laurençon, Lucile Saulnier, Thomas Wang, Christopher Akiki, Albert Villanova del Moral, Teven Le Scao, Leandro Von Werra, Chenghao Mou, Eduardo González Ponferrada, Huu Nguyen, et al. 2022. The bigscience roots corpus: A 1.6 tb composite multilingual dataset. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:31809–31826.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. **ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries**. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Mikel Artetxe, Tianlu Wang, Shuohui Chen, Daniel Simig, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Shruti Bhosale, Jingfei Du, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Sam Shleifer, Punit Singh Koura, Vishrav Chaudhary, Brian O’Horo, Jeff Wang, Luke Zettlemoyer, Zornitsa Kozareva, Mona Diab, Veselin Stoyanov, and Xian Li. 2022. **Few-shot learning with multilingual generative language models**. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9019–9052, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. **Decoupled weight decay regularization**. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net.
- Yash Madhani, Mitesh M. Khapra, and Anoop Kunchukuttan. 2023a. **Bhasha-abhijnaanam: Native-script and romanized language identification for 22 indic languages**.
- Yash Madhani, Sushane Parthan, Priyanka Bedekar, Gokul Nc, Ruchi Khapra, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Pratyush Kumar, and Mitesh Khapra. 2023b. **Aksharantar: Open Indic-language transliteration datasets and models for the next billion users**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 40–57, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Benjamin Marie, Raphael Rubino, and Atsushi Fujita. 2020. **Tagged back-translation revisited: Why does it really work?** In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5990–5997, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joshua Maynez, Shashi Narayan, Bernd Bohnet, and Ryan McDonald. 2020. **On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization**. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1906–1919, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anthony McEnery, Paul Baker, Robert Gaizauskas, and Hamish Cunningham. 2000. **Emille: Building a corpus of south asian languages**. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Translation and Multilingual Applications in the new Millennium: MT 2000*.
- Jihyung Moon, Hyunchang Cho, and Eunjeong L. Park. 2020. **Revisiting round-trip translation for quality estimation**. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, pages 91–104, Lisboa, Portugal. European Association for Machine Translation.
- Ramesh Nallapati, Bowen Zhou, Caglar Gulcehre, Bing Xiang, et al. 2016. **Abstractive text summarization using sequence-to-sequence rnns and beyond**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.06023*.
- Jingwei Ni, Zhijing Jin, Markus Freitag, Mrinmaya Sachan, and Bernhard Schölkopf. 2022. **Original or translated? a causal analysis of the impact of translationese on machine translation performance**. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5303–5320, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez, Benoît Sagot, and Laurent Romary. 2019. **Asynchronous pipelines for processing huge corpora on medium to low resource infrastructures**. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Challenges in the Management of Large Corpora (CMLC-7) 2019*. Cardiff, 22nd July 2019, pages 9 – 16, Mannheim. Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache.
- 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*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maja Popović. 2017. **chrF++: words helping character n-grams**. In *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 612–618, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maja Popović, Alberto Poncelas, Marija Brkic, and Andy Way. 2020. **Neural machine translation for translating into Croatian and Serbian**. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on NLP for Similar Languages, Varieties and Dialects*, pages 102–113, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics (ICCL).
- Yiwei Qin, Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2023. **T5Score: Discriminative fine-tuning of generative evaluation metrics**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 15185–15202, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ella Rabinovich and Shuly Wintner. 2015. **Unsupervised identification of translationese**. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3:419–432.

- Jack W. Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, Eliza Rutherford, Tom Hennigan, Jacob Menick, Albin Cassirer, Richard Powell, George van den Driessche, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Mari-beth Rauh, Po-Sen Huang, Amelia Glaese, Johannes Welbl, Sumanth Dathathri, Saffron Huang, Jonathan Uesato, John Mellor, Irina Higgins, Antonia Creswell, Nat McAleese, Amy Wu, Erich Elsen, Siddhant Jayakumar, Elena Buchatskaya, David Budden, Esme Sutherland, Karen Simonyan, Michela Paganini, Laurent Sifre, Lena Martens, Xiang Lorraine Li, Adhiguna Kuncoro, Aida Nematzadeh, Elena Gribovskaya, Domenic Donato, Angeliki Lazaridou, Arthur Mensch, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Maria Tsim-poukelli, Nikolai Grigorev, Doug Fritz, Thibault Sot-tiaux, Mantas Pajarskas, Toby Pohlen, Zhitao Gong, Daniel Toyama, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Yujia Li, Tayfun Terzi, Vladimir Mikulik, Igor Babuschkin, Aidan Clark, Diego de Las Casas, Aurelia Guy, Chris Jones, James Bradbury, Matthew Johnson, Blake Hechtman, Laura Weidinger, Iason Gabriel, William Isaac, Ed Lockhart, Simon Osindero, Laura Rimell, Chris Dyer, Oriol Vinyals, Kareem Ayoub, Jeff Stanway, Lorraine Bennett, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Geoffrey Irving. 2022. [Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher](#).
- Gowtham Ramesh, Sumanth Doddapaneni, Aravindh Bheemaraj, Mayank Jobanputra, Raghavan AK, Ajitesh Sharma, Sujit Sahoo, Harshita Diddee, Mahalakshmi J, Divyanshu Kakwani, Navneet Kumar, Aswin Pradeep, Srihari Nagaraj, Kumar Deepak, Vivek Raghavan, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Pratyush Kumar, and Mitesh Shantadevi Khapra. 2022. [Samanantar: The largest publicly available parallel corpora collection for 11 indic languages](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:145–162.
- Ricardo Rei, Ana C Farinha, Chrysoula Zerva, Daan van Stigt, Craig Stewart, Pedro Ramos, Taisiya Glushkova, André F. T. Martins, and Alon Lavie. 2021. [Are references really needed? unbabel-IST 2021 submission for the metrics shared task](#). In *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 1030–1040, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. [COMET: A neural framework for MT evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2685–2702, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016a. [Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 86–96, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016b. [Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016, August 7-12, 2016, Berlin, Germany, Volume 1: Long Papers*. The Association for Computer Linguistics.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R. Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, Agnieszka Kluska, Aitor Lewkowycz, Akshat Agarwal, Alethea Power, Alex Ray, Alex Warstadt, Alexander W. Kocurek, Ali Safaya, Ali Tazarv, Alice Xiang, Alicia Parrish, Allen Nie, Aman Hussain, Amanda Askell, Amanda Dsouza, Ameet Rahane, Anantharaman S. Iyer, Anders Andreassen, Andrea Santilli, Andreas Stuhlmüller, Andrew M. Dai, Andrew La, Andrew K. Lampinen, Andy Zou, Angela Jiang, Angelica Chen, Anh Vuong, Animesh Gupta, Anna Gottardi, Antonio Norelli, Anu Venkatesh, Arash Gholamidavoodi, Arfa Tabassum, Arul Menezes, Arun Kirubarajan, Asher Mullokandov, Ashish Sabharwal, Austin Her-rick, Avia Efrat, Aykut Erdem, Ayla Karakas, and et al. 2022. [Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2206.04615.
- Jianlin Su, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Ahmed Murtadha, Bo Wen, and Yunfeng Liu. 2023. [Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding](#).
- NLLB Team, Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Hef-ernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Anna Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loic Bar-rault, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Semarley Jarrett, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Dirk Rowe, Shannon Spruit, Chau Tran, Pierre Andrews, Necip Fazil Ayan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Angela Fan, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Francisco Guzmán, Philipp Koehn, Alexandre Mourachko, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, and Jeff Wang. 2022. [No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation](#).
- James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Oana Cocarascu, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. [The fact extraction and VERification \(FEVER\) shared task](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Fact Extraction and VERification (FEVER)*, pages 1–9, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Antonio Toral, Sheila Castilho, Ke Hu, and Andy Way. 2018. [Attaining the unattainable? reassessing claims of human parity in neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*, pages 113–123, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R Bowman. 2018. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07461*.
- Alex Warstadt, Aaron Mueller, Leshem Choshen, Ethan Wilcox, Chengxu Zhuang, Juan Ciro, Rafael Mosquera, Bhargavi Paranjabe, Adina Williams, Tal Linzen, and Ryan Cotterell. 2023. [Findings of the BabyLM challenge: Sample-efficient pretraining on developmentally plausible corpora](#). In *Proceedings of the BabyLM Challenge at the 27th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 1–34, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Warstadt, Amanpreet Singh, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. [Neural network acceptability judgments](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:625–641.
- BigScience Workshop, :, Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Lucicioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, Jonathan Tow, Alexander M. Rush, Stella Biderman, Albert Webson, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Thomas Wang, Benoît Sagot, Niklas Muennighoff, Albert Villanova del Moral, Olatunji Ruwase, Rachel Bawden, Stas Bekman, Angelina McMillan-Major, Iz Beltagy, Huu Nguyen, Lucile Saulnier, Samson Tan, Pedro Ortiz Suarez, Victor Sanh, Hugo Laurençon, Yacine Jernite, Julien Launay, Margaret Mitchell, Colin Raffel, Aaron Gokaslan, Adi Simhi, Aitor Soroa, Alham Fikri Aji, Amit Alfassy, Anna Rogers, Ariel Kreisberg Nitzav, Canwen Xu, Chenghao Mou, Chris Emezue, Christopher Klamm, Colin Leong, Daniel van Strien, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Dragomir Radev, Eduardo González Ponferrada, Efrat Levkovich, Ethan Kim, Eyal Bar Natan, Francesco De Toni, Gérard Dupont, Germán Kruszewski, Giada Pistilli, Hady Elsahar, Hamza Benyamina, Hieu Tran, Ian Yu, Idris Abdulmumin, Isaac Johnson, Itziar Gonzalez-Dios, Javier de la Rosa, Jenny Chim, Jesse Dodge, Jian Zhu, Jonathan Chang, Jörg Froberg, Joseph Tobing, Joydeep Bhattacharjee, Khalid Almubarak, Kimbo Chen, Kyle Lo, Leandro Von Werra, Leon Weber, Long Phan, Loubna Ben allal, Ludovic Tanguy, Manan Dey, Manuel Romero Muñoz, Maraim Masoud, María Grandury, Mario Šaško, Max Huang, Maximin Coavoux, Mayank Singh, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Minh Chien Vu, Mohammad A. Jauhar, Mustafa Ghaleb, Nishant Subramani, Nora Kassner, Nurulaqilla Khamis, Olivier Nguyen, Omar Espejel, Ona de Gibert, Paulo Villegas, Peter Henderson, Pierre Colombo, Priscilla Amuok, Quentin Lhoest, Rhea Harliman, Rishi Bommasani, Roberto Luis López, Rui Ribeiro, Salomey Osei, Sampo Pyysalo, Sebastian Nagel, Shamik Bose, Shamsuddeen Hassan Muhammad, Shanya Sharma, Shayne Longpre, Somaieh Nikpoor, Stanislav Silberberg, Suhas Pai, Sydney Zink, Tiago Timponi Torrent, Timo Schick, Tristan Thrush, Valentin Danchev, Vassilina Nikoulina, Veronika Laippala, Violette Lepercq, Vrinda Prabhu, Zaid Alyafeai, Zeerak Talat, Arun Raja, Benjamin Heinzerling, Chenglei Si, Davut Emre Taşar, Elizabeth Salesky, Sabrina J. Mielke, Wilson Y. Lee, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Debajyoti Datta, Eliza Szczechla, Gunjan Chhablani, Han Wang, Harshit Pandey, Hendrik Strobelt, Jason Alan Fries, Jos Rozen, Leo Gao, Lintang Sutawika, M Saiful Bari, Maged S. Al-shaibani, Matteo Manica, Nihal Nayak, Ryan Teehan, Samuel Albanie, Sheng Shen, Srulik Ben-David, Stephen H. Bach, Taewoon Kim, Tali Bers, Thibault Fevry, Trishala Neeraj, Urmish Thakker, Vikas Raunak, Xiangru Tang, Zhengxin Yong, Zhiqing Sun, Shaked Brody, Yallow Uri, Hadar Tojarieh, Adam Roberts, Hyung Won Chung, Jaesung Tae, Jason Phang, Ofir Press, Conglong Li, Deepak Narayanan, Hatim Bourfoune, Jared Casper, Jeff Rasley, Max Ryabinin, Mayank Mishra, Minjia Zhang, Mohammad Shoeybi, Myriam Peyrounette, Nicolas Patry, Nouamane Tazi, Omar Sanseviero, Patrick von Platen, Pierre Cornette, Pierre François Lavallée, Rémi Lacroix, Samyam Rajbhandari, Sanjit Gandhi, Shaden Smith, Stéphane Requena, Suraj Patil, Tim Dettmers, Ahmed Baruwaa, Amanpreet Singh, Anastasia Cheveleva, Anne-Laure Ligozat, Arjun Subramonian, Aurélie Névéol, Charles Lovering, Dan Garrette, Deepak Tunuguntla, Ehud Reiter, Ekaterina Taktasheva, Ekaterina Voloshina, Eli Bogdanov, Genta Indra Winata, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jan-Christoph Kalo, Jekaterina Novikova, Jessica Zosa Forde, Jordan Clive, Jungo Kasai, Ken Kawamura, Liam Hazan, Marine Carpuat, Miruna Clinciu, Najaoung Kim, Newton Cheng, Oleg Serikov, Omer Antverg, Oskar van der Wal, Rui Zhang, Ruo Chen Zhang, Sebastian Gehrmann, Shachar Mirkin, Shani Pais, Tatiana Shavrina, Thomas Scialom, Tian Yun, Tomasz Limisiewicz, Verena Rieser, Vitaly Protasov, Vladislav Mikhailov, Yada Pruksachatkun, Yonatan Belinkov, Zachary Bamberger, Zdeněk Kasner, Alice Rueda, Amanda Pestana, Amir Feizpour, Ammar Khan, Amy Faranak, Ana Santos, Anthony Hevia, Antigona Unldreaj, Arash Aghagol, Arezoo Abdollahi, Aycha Tammour, Azadeh HajiHosseini, Bahareh Behroozi, Benjamin Ajibade, Bharat Saxena, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Daniel McDuff, Danish Contractor, David Lansky, Davis David, Douwe Kiela, Duong A. Nguyen, Edward Tan, Emi Baylor, Ezinwanne Ozoani, Fatima Mirza, Frankline Onon-iwu, Habib Rezanejad, Hessie Jones, Indrani Bhat-tacharya, Irene Solaiman, Irina Sedenko, Isar Nejadgholi, Jesse Passmore, Josh Seltzer, Julio Bonis Sanz, Livia Dutra, Mairon Samagaio, Maraim Elbadri, Margot Mieskes, Marissa Gerchick, Martha Akinlolu, Michael McKenna, Mike Qiu, Muhammed Ghauri, Mykola Burynok, Nafis Abrar, Nazneen Rajani, Nour Elkott, Nour Fahmy, Olanrewaju Samuel,

Ran An, Rasmus Kromann, Ryan Hao, Samira Alizadeh, Sarmad Shubber, Silas Wang, Sourav Roy, Sylvain Viguier, Thanh Le, Tobi Oyebade, Trieu Le, Yoyo Yang, Zach Nguyen, Abhinav Ramesh Kashyap, Alfredo Palasciano, Alison Callahan, Anima Shukla, Antonio Miranda-Escalada, Ayush Singh, Benjamin Beilharz, Bo Wang, Caio Brito, Chenxi Zhou, Chirag Jain, Chuxin Xu, Clémentine Fourrier, Daniel León Perinián, Daniel Molano, Dian Yu, Enrique Manjavacas, Fabio Barth, Florian Fuhrmann, Gabriel Altay, Giyaseddin Bayrak, Gully Burns, Helena U. Vrabec, Imane Bello, Ishani Dash, Jihyun Kang, John Giorgi, Jonas Golde, Jose David Posada, Karthik Rangasai Sivaraman, Lokesh Bulchandani, Lu Liu, Luisa Shinzato, Madeleine Hahn de Bykhovetz, Maiko Takeuchi, Marc Pàmies, Maria A Castillo, Marianna Nezhurina, Mario Sängler, Matthias Samwald, Michael Cullan, Michael Weinberg, Michiel De Wolf, Mina Mihaljcic, Minna Liu, Moritz Freidank, Myungsun Kang, Natasha Seelam, Nathan Dahlberg, Nicholas Michio Broad, Nikolaus Muellner, Pascale Fung, Patrick Haller, Ramya Chandrasekhar, Renata Eisenberg, Robert Martin, Rodrigo Canalli, Rosaline Su, Ruisi Su, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Samuele Garda, Shlok S Deshmukh, Shubhanshu Mishra, Sid Kiblawi, Simon Ott, Sincee Sang-aaronsiri, Srishti Kumar, Stefan Schweter, Sushil Bharati, Tanmay Laud, Théo Gigant, Tomoya Kainuma, Wojciech Kusa, Yannis Labrak, Yash Shailesh Bajaj, Yash Venkatraman, Yifan Xu, Yingxin Xu, Yu Xu, Zhe Tan, Zhongli Xie, Zifan Ye, Mathilde Bras, Younes Belkada, and Thomas Wolf. 2022. [Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model](#).

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 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 483–498, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. [Bartscore: Evaluating generated text as text generation](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 27263–27277.

Mike Zhang and Antonio Toral. 2019. [The effect of translationese in machine translation test sets](#). *CoRR*, abs/1906.08069.

A Additional results

We report additional results in this section. Tables 7, 8 show the chrF++ and BLEU scores across three translation evaluation benchmarks. This shows that using parallel synthetic data does not deteriorate the performance of the language model. Similar results are shown in Table 9 for IndicNLG tasks where performance on Hindi generation tasks are only

affected by a small margin and coupled with results in Table 2 showing that scores are not affected by using Hindi synthetic parallel data.

B Training and Evaluation

B.1 Training

In this section, we list the dataset and hyperparameters used for training our models for the experiments. For the pretraining of the base models, we keep a hard limit for the *base-1k* model as 2.38B tokens and for the *mini-1k* model as 1B tokens. But for the TinyLM we relax this token limit until we see overfitting. For our experiments, we use the NVIDIA A100-SXM4-80GB GPUs.

B.2 Extended pretraining

For the *mini-1k* models, we randomly sample 100M tokens from the clean subset of IndicMonoDoc for the target language, and for the *base-1k* model, we sample 200M for extended pretraining. We use the same hyperparameters as training and perform extended pretraining for 2 epochs over this newly sampled clean data.

B.3 Fine-tuning

For GLUE tasks we use the dev split on the clean part and do hyperparameter tuning to achieve the best scores, and then we use the same hyperparameters for all synthetic experiments. For IndicGLUE we follow a similar setting for the val split to find good hyperparameters and report results on the test split like [Kakwani et al. \(2020\)](#). For all classification and regression tasks, we use a single linear layer and use an appropriate activation function for classification and regression respectively. We use an Adam optimizer ([Kingma and Ba, 2015](#)) with a learning rate of $1e^{-5}$ and a batch size of 48. For NLG tasks we do extended pretraining using a separator token in between the input and output sequence with an effective batch size of 768 examples and only calculate loss for the output sequence. We use an AdamW optimizer ([Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019](#)) with learning rate = $6e^{-4}$, weight decay = $1e^{-1}$, $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.95$ and $\epsilon = 1e^{-5}$. For translation, we randomly sample 1M parallel sentence for each language pair from the samantar corpus ([Ramesh et al., 2022](#)) and evaluate on FloRes ([Team et al., 2022](#)), IN22-Conv and IN22-Gen ([Gala et al., 2023](#)). We list the batch size and number of epochs of each task in Table 12.

Model	IN22-Conv		IN22-Gen		FLORES	
	EN-HI	HI-EN	EN-HI	HI-EN	EN-HI	HI-EN
BI-EN-HI-clean	41.22	50.3	43.49	47.83	46.56	51.7
BI-EN-HI_syn-parallel-filtered	41.92	49.67	41.61	46.95	44.12	50.64
BI-EN-HI_syn-nonparallel-filtered	40.74	49.54	42.28	47.66	45.65	51.29
	EN-GU	GU-EN	EN-GU	GU-EN	EN-GU	GU-EN
BI-EN-GU-clean	35.85	41.27	22.95	31.83	26.44	35.3
BI-EN-GU_syn-parallel-filtered	34.36	41.86	22.93	30.84	26.77	34.84
BI-EN-GU_syn-nonparallel-filtered	34.49	42.08	23.06	32.81	26.7	36.54

Table 7: chrF++ Scores on FloRes, IN22-Conv and IN22-Gen splits for translation task. EN-HI models are based on *base-1k* and EN-GU models are based on *mini-1k*. **Bold** values represent the best amongst synthetic splits.

Model	IN22-Conv		IN22-Gen		FLORES	
	EN-HI	HI-EN	EN-HI	HI-EN	EN-HI	HI-EN
BI-EN-HI-clean	19.58	23.01	17.23	19.72	21.8	21.73
BI-EN-HI_syn-parallel-filtered	19.64	23.79	16.57	20.14	21.63	22.6
BI-EN-HI_syn-nonparallel-filtered	19.25	22.47	16.37	19.74	21.51	21.74
	EN-GU	GU-EN	EN-GU	GU-EN	EN-GU	GU-EN
BI-EN-GU-clean	10.24	15.19	4.65	7.92	5.44	9.57
BI-EN-GU_syn-parallel-filtered	11.24	15.7	4.87	8.44	6.7	10.02
BI-EN-GU_syn-nonparallel-filtered	10.86	15.57	5.07	9.07	6.17	10.03

Table 8: BLEU Scores on FloRes, IN22-Conv and IN22-Gen splits for translation task. EN-HI models are based on *base-1k* and EN-GU models are based on *mini-1k*. **Bold** values represent the best amongst synthetic splits.

Model	Headline Generation	Sentence Summarization	Question Generation	Wikibio Generation
BI-EN-HI-clean	27.47	23.78	24.25	50.82
BI-EN-HI_syn-parallel-filtered	26.96	23.10	25.38	48.26
BI-EN-HI_syn-nonparallel-filtered	27.32	22.84	24.95	50.22

Table 9: Performance of Bilingual models on IndicNLG tasks. All the results reported here are on base-1k and use Rouge-L F1 scores. **Bold** values represent the best amongst synthetic splits.

Hyperparameter	Value
vocab_size	56000
val_every	0.05
bs	48
n_embed	768
num_blocks	4
num_heads	16
head_size	n_embed // num_heads
context_len	1024
block_size	context_len
attn_drop_value	0.1
dropout	0.1
ffn_drop_value	0.1
use_flashattn	TRUE
ffn_scaling	4
positional_embedding	rope'
rotatory_embedding_dim	head_size // 2
lr	6.00E-04
wd	1.00E-01
beta_1	0.9
beta_2	0.95
eps	1.00E-05
epochs	2
precision	bf16
accumulate_grad_batches	8
gradient_clip_val	1
strategy	ddp'
accelerator	gpu'
warmup_steps	5000
num_workers	16
SHUFFLE_SEED	42
PIN_MEMORY	TRUE
NUM_NODES	1
NUM_DEVICES	2

Table 10: Hyperparameters used for training the *mini-1k* model

Hyperparameter	Value
vocab_size	56000
val_every	0.05
bs	48
n_embed	768
num_blocks	12
num_heads	12
head_size	n_embed // num_heads
context_len	1024
block_size	context_len
attn_drop_value	0.1
dropout	0.1
ffn_drop_value	0.1
use_flashattn	TRUE
ffn_scaling	4
positional_embedding	rope'
rotatory_embedding_dim	head_size // 2
lr	6.00E-04
wd	1.00E-01
beta_1	0.9
beta_2	0.95
eps	1.00E-05
epochs	2
precision	bf16
accumulate_grad_batches	8
gradient_clip_val	1
strategy	ddp'
accelerator	gpu'
warmup_steps	5000
num_workers	16
SHUFFLE_SEED	42
PIN_MEMORY	TRUE
NUM_NODES	1
NUM_DEVICES	2

Table 11: Hyperparameters used for training the *base-1k* model

Task	Batch size	Epochs	Metric
IndicXNLI	48	5	Accuracy
BBC-Articles	24	20	Accuracy
IITP-MR	24	20	Accuracy
IITP-PR	48	20	Accuracy
MIDAS	48	20	Accuracy
Headline Generation	768	2	Rouge-L F1
Sentence Summarization	768	2	Rouge-L F1
Question Generation	768	2	Rouge-L F1
WikiBio Generation	768	4	Rouge-L F1
iNLTK	48	20	Accuracy
sst2	48	10	Accuracy
CoLA	48	30	MCC
mrpc	48	30	F1
qnli	48	10	Accuracy
qqp	48	5	F1
rte	48	30	Accuracy
mnli-matched	48	5	Accuracy
mnli-mismatched	48	5	Accuracy
stsB	48	20	Pearson
XLSum Headline Gen.	768	4	Rouge-L F1
XLSum Question Gen.	768	4	Rouge-L F1
CNN Dailymail	768	4	Rouge-L F1
DialogSum	768	4	Rouge-L F1
Samanantar	768	2	chrF++ / BLEU

Table 12: Hyperparameters used for finetuning tasks

B.4 Evaluation

We use torch metrics¹² to calculate accuracy, f1-score, Pearson correlation, Matthew’s correlation coefficient. We report chrF++ scores¹³ and BLEU scores¹⁴ (Papineni et al., 2002) using the sacreBLEU¹⁵ implementation and Rouge-L f1 scores using the sacreRouge (Deutsch and Roth, 2020) implementation by the xl-sum repository¹⁶.

We report English scores for NLU on the validation split of the GLUE benchmark and test splits for XL-Sum, CNN Dailymail, and Dialogsum NLG benchmarks. For Hindi and Gujarati, we use the test split of IndicGLUE and IndicXNLI.

For classification and regression tasks, we use the models finetuned according to hyperparameters mentioned in Appendix B.3 to keep fair comparison for all models and mention results on the final epoch. For generations on IndicNLG and English NLG tasks, we use beam search with a beam width of 5, length penalty of 1.0, n_gram repetition penalty of 4 n_grams with sampling set to false and early stopping set to true. We also set a maximum generation length to 64 tokens. For the translation task, we follow a beam search with a beam width of 5, maximum new tokens to 256 and early stopping

¹²<https://lightning.ai/docs/torchmetrics/stable/pages/lightning.html>

¹³chrF++ signature
nrefs:1lcase:mixedleff:yeslnc:6lnw:2lspace:nolversion:2.4.0

¹⁴sacreBLEU signature:
nrefs:1lcase:mixedleff:noltok:13alsmooth:explversion:2.4.0

¹⁵<https://github.com/mjpost/sacrebleu>

¹⁶<https://github.com/csebuetnlp/xl-sum>

to true.

C Perplexity filtering

C.1 Creating synthetic data

“Translationese” is a term used to describe peculiarities in the text translated into a specific language, differentiating it from content originally written in that language (Gellerstam, 1986). Translated texts into the target language (via humans or machine-generated) often show distinctive features that differentiate them from their original counterparts in the target language. These disparities arise from either the influence of the translation process itself on the final product or the inherent “fingerprints” of the source language subtly present in the target language rendition (Rabinovich and Wintner, 2015). This is a common phenomenon in translation models where the target language translations often show characteristics of the source language and add bias to the evaluation of downstream tasks (Toral et al., 2018), (Zhang and Toral, 2019), (Graham et al., 2019). So far a lot of work on synthetic translated data has been done for using back translations (Sennrich et al., 2016a), (Edunov et al., 2018) for improving Machine translation performance (Marie et al., 2020), (Bogoychev and Sennrich, 2019), (Ni et al., 2022) or for classification tasks like native language identification (Goldin et al., 2018), etc. Translationese data has been used for many tasks but we explore the efficacy of using translationese data for pretraining of language models. We collect monolingual corpora in the source language as mentioned in section 4 and utilize a powerful off-the-shelf translation model IndicTrans2 (Gala et al., 2023) to generate translationese data. We use the 1B en-indic version¹⁷ of IndicTrans2 using beam search with a beam value of 5 to translate 5 billion English tokens from IndicMonoDoc to Hindi and Gujarati. Since IndicTrans2 can only handle a max sentence length of 256 BPE tokens, we split the documents using Moses Sentence Splitter¹⁸ to perform translations into the target language at the sentence level and then merge again to form documents. We also repair translations that exceed in length 256 BPE tokens using the TinyLM trained on clean corpora as mentioned in Section 5 to complete the sentence translation, we encounter only 0.002% of

¹⁷<https://huggingface.co/ai4bharat/indictrans2-en-indic-1B>

¹⁸<https://pypi.org/project/mosetokenizer/>

such cases. We also do the reverse using the 1B indic-en version¹⁹ of IndicTrans2 to translate 5B Hindi tokens and 900M Gujarati tokens from IndicMonoDoc to English. Together these make up the unfiltered synthetic translationese data in English, Hindi, and Gujarati. We use this corpus for the *synthetic* and *clean+synthetic* part of our experiments.

C.2 Perplexity filtering

Following Figure 2, we use these TinyLMs to filter the generated synthetic translationese corpora from IndicTrans2. We do this by using perplexity as a measure of document quality score. For language models, perplexity quantifies how well a model predicts a sequence of tokens. A lower perplexity indicates better predictive performance. It is calculated by:

$$\text{PPL}(W) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{N} \sum_i^N \log p_{\theta}(w_i | w_{<i}) \right\}$$

where the negative log-likelihood measures the error of the model’s predictions. While calculating perplexity over a sequence of tokens $W \in w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N$ we skip the first s tokens where $s = 10$, $e = 1024$ and calculate loss until only the first e tokens of the document. We find setting e to larger values can lead to higher variance in the document scores due to the size of the TinyLM. After initial analysis, we choose s and e such that we remove the high uncertainty of the language at the start of an unseen document and avoid penalizing longer documents due to the fragility of the extrapolation ability of TinyLM²⁰. Note that it is important to choose e such that the language model gives a uniform estimate of perplexity over an already seen sequence of tokens $\in w_s, w_{s+1}, \dots, w_e$. For our experiments, we use the TinyLMs to score all synthetically generated translationese data and calculate a document score using the above method. Following Laurençon et al. (2022) we do subsampling by thresholding document perplexity scores except Laurençon et al. (2022) did it using Ken-LM (Heafield, 2011) and we do it using our TinyLM. We keep the threshold value such that we include enough documents to reach the computed optimal token count for pretraining experiments.

¹⁹<https://huggingface.co/ai4bharat/indictrans2-indic-en-1B>

²⁰During experiments we saw that these TinyLMs can only go up to a certain context length before deteriorating in quality.

Language	IndicCorp2	Ours
bn	926.00	5258.47
en	6501.00	11986.53
gu	901.00	887.18
hi	6107.00	11268.33
kn	875.00	567.16
ml	931.00	845.32
mr	795.00	1066.76
ne	852.00	1542.39
pa	732.00	449.61
ta	476.00	2171.92
te	731.00	767.18
ur	667.00	2391.79
as	67.00	57.64
brx	2.50	2.25
doi	0.10	0.37
gom	31.90	2.91
kas	0.06	1.27
mai	13.70	1.51
mni	0.60	0.99
or	122.00	81.96
sa	125.00	80.09
sat	4.00	3.05
sd	13.20	83.81

Table 13: Languagewise corpora size comparison in Million tokens

D IndicMonoDoc

In this section, we describe the process of creating the IndicMonoDoc corpus which is the largest document-level corpora for Indic languages consisting of 39.5 billion tokens spanning 23 languages. IndicMonoDoc comprises 27.5B Indic tokens and 12B tokens of English tokens. Table 13 shows language language-wise deduplicated size of the IndicMonoDoc corpus and Figure 3 shows a comparative 100% stacked bar plot with IndicCorp2 which is a sentence level corpora.

D.1 Crawling

To extract URLs from the web we sample word level n -grams; $n=2, \dots, 6$ from a sample monolingual corpora to create a list of keyword searches. We then randomly merge k ; $k=1, \dots, 4$ keywords to form a query. Using these queries we perform automatic web searches to collect a large repository of URLs. We merge this list with a manual list of sources to perform URL-level deduplication. We crawl these webpages leaving out some of them²¹. We leave

²¹We leave webpages consisting of a robots.txt file and URLs containing offensive text or social media links

out webpages that consist of a considerable amount of English content using a simple script recognition regex. We perform this scrapping majorly for the bottom 14 low-resource languages. We also add script-level recognition using Unicode characters²² for each language before crawling a webpage to avoid scrapping non-Indic text.

D.2 Post processing

A lot of crawled content consists of unwanted text like HTML tags, emoticons, and text in another language. We use manual filtering pipelines inspired by OSCAR (Ortiz Suárez et al., 2019), (Abadji et al., 2022) to remove such content. We additionally use a language detection-based (LID) filtering using cld3²³ and IndicLID-FTN model (Madhani et al., 2023a) to discard languages not of interest. Following Doddapaneni et al. (2023) we perform document filtering to remove offensive text from the corpora using a list of offensive words and phrases extended from work by Team et al. (2022) which consists of offensive words in 209 languages. We also use a Romanized version of this list using the transliteration tool by Madhani et al. (2023b) to perform toxic document filtering in 17 languages. Following Kakwani et al. (2020) & Doddapaneni et al. (2023) we merge all the filtered corpus with Wikipedia, OSCAR (Ortiz Suárez et al., 2019) and some dumps of mC4 (Xue et al., 2021). Finally, we perform deduplication at paragraph level using Murmurhash algorithm²⁴ with a 128-bit unsigned hash for each monolingual split of the corpora. After all post-processing steps, the language wise size of the corpora is mentioned in Table 13. A major chunk of the corpus is comprised of English, Hindi, and Bengali which make up 72.15% of the corpora.

²²<https://unicode.org/charts/>

²³<https://github.com/google/cld3>

²⁴<https://pypi.org/project/mmh3/>