

The Power of Question Alignment in Multilingual Reasoning: Broadened Scope and Deepened Insights

Wenhao Zhu¹, Shujian Huang¹, Fei Yuan², Cheng Chen¹, Jiajun Chen¹, Alexandra Birch³

¹ National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University

² Shanghai AI Lab ³ School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh

zhuwh@smail.nju.edu.cn, huangsj@nju.edu.cn, yuanfei@pjlab.org.cn

chengchen@smail.nju.edu.cn, chenjj@nju.edu.cn, a.birch@ed.ac.uk

Abstract

Bridging the significant gap between large language model’s English and non-English performance presents a great challenge. While some previous studies attempt to mitigate this gap with translated training data, the recently proposed question alignment approach leverages the model’s English expertise to improve multilingual performance with minimum usage of expensive, error-prone translation. In this paper, we explore how broadly this method can be applied by examining its effects in reasoning with chain-of-thought, executable code and common sense. We also explore how to apply this approach efficiently to extremely large language models using proxy-tuning. Experiment results on multilingual reasoning benchmarks mGSM, MSVAMP and xCSQA demonstrate that the question alignment framework can be extended to boost multilingual performance across diverse reasoning scenarios, model families, and sizes. For instance, when applied to the LLaMA2 models, it brings an average accuracy improvements of 12.2% on mGSM even with the 70B model. To understand the mechanism of its success, we analyze representation space, step-by-step answers and translation data scales, which reveals how question translation training strengthens language alignment within LLMs and shapes their working patterns.

1 Introduction

Although large language models (LLMs) have shown the ability to solve complex problems (Chowdhery et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023), LLMs still struggle in multilingual contexts (Shi et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2023; Qin et al., 2023). This is unsurprising, given that their training data is predominantly made of English text and instructions (Blevins and Zettlemoyer,




Figure 1: An illustration of the benefits of fine-tuning on question translation data (QAlign) compared to only fine-tuning on question-response instruction data (RAlign). QAlign enhances the performance of LLaMA models across ten languages. Experiment results on more reasoning scenarios, model families and sizes will be reported in the experiment section.

2022; Wang et al., 2023). However, an important challenge remains: how to improve LLM performance on reasoning tasks in languages other than English with scarce multilingual resources.

Previous studies attempt to collect multilingual data for instruction-tuning (Chen et al., 2023) or continued pre-training (Nguyen et al., 2023). However, training for reasoning across potentially dozens or hundreds of languages is both costly and inefficient, and sometimes the necessary resources are either unavailable or of poor quality (Zhu et al., 2024a).

A compelling solution is to leverage the LLM’s English proficiency in non-English contexts (Shi et al., 2022; Sherborne et al., 2023). Focusing on multilingual mathematical reasoning, Zhu et al. (2024a) demonstrate that their devised two-step training framework can effectively enable the sharing of English reasoning capabilities across different languages. Specifically, they employ

question translation training to strengthen language alignment, and then utilizes cutting-edge English instruction data for response alignment to unlock LLM’s reasoning capabilities for multilingual contexts.

Despite the progress made in the previous work, there remain three limitations: (1) *single reasoning scenario*: the scope of consideration was limited to math reasoning with English chain-of-thought, with other reasoning scenarios not yet being taken into account. (2) *opaque training effects*: the impact of the two-stage training on the LLM’s working patterns and each training stage’s contribution remain unclear. (3) *limited model size*: the effectiveness and efficiency of this approach has yet to be confirmed on LLMs significantly larger than 13 billions parameters.

In this paper, we comprehensively address these limitations. First, we examine how broadly applicable the training framework is across three challenging and varied reasoning tasks. These involve distinct types of problem-solving languages and reasoning objectives: math reasoning with chain-of-thought, math reasoning with executable Python code (Toshniwal et al., 2024), and common sense reasoning (Lin et al., 2021). By utilizing specialized instruction data, we leverage the LLM’s specific English expertise to enhance its performance in other languages. We also explore the case of non-English response and discover that incorporating En-X translation data during response alignment stage can implicitly bias the LLM to generate non-English response.

To gain clearer insights, we analyze how our fine-tuned model utilizes its English reasoning capability in non-English contexts. Our analysis begins with the representation space, which fundamentally determines how the model derives the output answer. We discover that question translation training significantly affects the distribution of multilingual representations in LLM’s middle to top layers, aligning them within the same semantic space as English. Additionally, we examine the LLM’s step-by-step answers and find that the unified representation space makes the model to employ more similar problem-solving process to address multilingual questions.

Besides, we investigate how well question alignment approach scales and whether it offers benefits to the most powerful open-source LLMs. We explore applying question alignment to ex-

tremely large models, e.g., LLaMA2-70B (Touvron et al., 2023). While fully fine-tuning LLM’s parameters is straightforward, the computation cost becomes prohibitive as the number of parameters increases significantly. In contrast, we illustrate that proxy-tuning (Liu et al., 2024) offers as an efficient alternative for both dense models and Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) models. We also discover that by carefully selecting the proxy model, we can achieve 98.1% performance of fully fine-tuning without updating any parameters.

Experiments on several multilingual reasoning benchmarks MGSM, MSVAMP and XCSQA demonstrate that the question alignment framework is a broad technique applicable across a wide variety of difficult reasoning tasks and its modularized training pipeline enables us to efficiently unlock LLM’s multilingual capabilities in the targeted skills. By applying question alignment to extremely large language models, we find that it scales well and further strengthen those powerful LLM’s multilingual reasoning abilities. For instance, our fine-tuned LLaMA2-70B achieves 63.0% average accuracy on MGSM (Figure 1), pushing the multilingual reasoning performance of open-source models to a new height.

2 Related Work

LLM’s language bias With a large number of parameters pre-trained on large-scale corpora and instruction-tuned on powerful instruction data, LLMs have demonstrated a remarkable level of intelligence (Touvron et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023). However, extensive empirical analyses have shown that LLMs still face challenges in multilingual contexts, especially with low-resource languages (Shi et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2024b). This is not surprising, given that English predominates both in the pretraining data (Blevins and Zettlemoyer, 2022) and instruction data (Wang et al., 2023). In this paper, we focus on the core capability of LLM, i.e., the reasoning capability, and aim to push forward the boundaries of LLMs in multilingual reasoning.

Advancing multilingual reasoning Previously, there have been some attempts to improve LLM’s performance on multilingual reasoning. Huang et al. (2023) and Qin et al. (2023) prompt ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2022) to translate non-English query into English and then generate responses

based on these translations. However, it has been found that this prompting method is not always effective for open-source LLMs (Zhu et al., 2024a). To improve the multilingual capabilities of open-source LLMs, Nguyen et al. (2023); Fujii et al. (2024) perform continue-pretraining with a massive non-English corpus, but this approach requires huge computational resources and is not data-efficient. Chen et al. (2023); She et al. (2024) follow the translate-training paradigm (Artetxe et al., 2020) and use machine-translated multilingual data for instruction-tuning. Although multilingual instruction-tuning yields improvements, continuously translating an increasing volume of English instruction data is prohibitive and translating lengthy, logical response can sometimes be error-prone (Zhu et al., 2024a).

To make the best use of continuously evolving English instruction data and avoid drawbacks of translate-training paradigm, an ideal solution is to enable LLM to leverage English expertise in non-English scenarios. Motivated by this idea, Zhu et al. (2024a) propose a two-step instruction-tuning framework to guide LLMs to implicitly relate non-English questions to their English counterparts and solve the reasoning problems with their English expertise. In line with this philosophy, Yoon et al. (2024) also recognize the importance of building language alignment and explore the use of an additional multilingual encoder, the encoder of MT5 (Xue et al., 2021), to map multilingual queries into the LLM’s English semantic space for unified processing. In this paper, we build upon the pioneering work of Zhu et al. (2024a) and delve deeper to broaden the scope of that work and provide deepened insights.

3 Methodology

In this section, we will first recap the two-step training framework of Zhu et al. (2024a) (Section 3.1). Next, we introduce how we can extend the framework to diverse reasoning scenarios by modifying response alignment training (Section 3.2). Then, we present how we can flexibly implement question alignment stage using general domain translation data and introduce its benefits (Section 3.3). Finally, we present efficient recipes to scale this framework to extremely large language models (Section 3.4).

3.1 Recap: Two-stage Training Framework

The original training framework consists of two stages: *question alignment* and *response alignment*. During question alignment, X-En question translation data $(\mathcal{X}_e, \mathcal{X}_l)$ from \mathcal{D}_l is utilized to train the model to associate non-English questions \mathcal{X}_l with their English counterparts \mathcal{X}_e (Figure 2, subfigure I). This process enhances language alignment within the large language model. The optimization objective can be written as:

$$\arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{\{\mathcal{X}_e, \mathcal{X}_l\} \in \mathcal{D}_l} \log p_{\theta}(\mathcal{X}_e | \mathcal{X}_l)$$

where l is the target language, \mathcal{L} is the set of considered non-English languages, and θ denotes the model’s parameters.

During response alignment, English cutting-edge instruction data \mathcal{D}_e is used to unlock LLM’s English reasoning capability (Figure 2, subfigure II). The optimization objective can be written as:

$$\arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{\{\mathcal{X}_e, \mathcal{Y}_e\} \in \mathcal{D}_e} \log p_{\theta}(\mathcal{Y}_e | \mathcal{X}_e)$$

where \mathcal{X}_e and \mathcal{Y}_e denotes the English question and its corresponding response respectively. Thanks to the previously established language alignment, the LLM can effectively leverage its English expertise in non-English question contexts.

3.2 Extending to Diverse Reasoning Scenarios with Specialized Data

In this section, we present how we incorporate specialized data during the response alignment stage to adapt the training framework to diverse reasoning scenarios (Figure 2).

Math Reasoning with chain-of-thought in multiple languages

The first reasoning scenario is solving mathematical reasoning task through chain-of-thought (CoT). To unlock the model’s capability on this, we follow Zhu et al. (2024a) and utilize the English instruction data depicted in Figure 3. However, we notice that the model, when fine-tuned in this manner, tends to respond in English to multilingual questions. This could be problematic as users from diverse linguistic backgrounds may prefer responses in the same language as their queries, which enable them to better understand the model’s problem-solving process (Kew et al., 2023).




Figure 2: Illustration of the original two-step training framework (Zhu et al., 2024a) and our extension version (Section 3.2). Subfigure I and II illustrate the training and inference process of the original training framework, in which the fine-tuned model usually responds in English to non-English questions. By maintaining the question alignment stage unchanged and modifying the response alignment stage, we adapt this framework to a wider range of scenarios. In subfigure III, we incorporate En-X translation data in the second stage of training to bias the LLM to generate non-English response. In subfigure IV, we use code instruction data for the second stage of training to unlock the LLM’s capability for reasoning with executable code.




Figure 3: Illustration of our employed instruction data. We use this instruction data to teach model to solve mathematical reasoning task with chain-of-thought.

To enable multilingual chain-of-thought generation, we propose to mix English instruction data with En-X general domain translation data during the response alignment stage (Figure 2, subfigure III). We discover that the multi-task training enables LLM to spontaneously produce multilingual CoT, even when no multilingual question-response pairs are available during training.

Math reasoning with executable code The second reasoning scenario involves solving mathematical reasoning task with executable code. In this scenario, the response no longer contains a chain-of-thought in natural language; instead, it consists of Python code. One major advantage of




Figure 4: Illustration of our employed instruction data. We use this instruction data to teach model to solve mathematical reasoning task with executable code.

reasoning through executable code is that it helps avoid basic computational errors (Toshniwal et al., 2024). To unlock the model’s capability on this, we utilize the instruction data depicted in Figure 4. Specifically, the model needs to generate Python code enclosed within “<llm-code>” and “</llm-code>” tags. Then a Python interpreter will be used to execute this code block. The derived numerical answer, corresponding to the value of the

variable in the last line of the code block, will be enclosed within “<llm-code-output>” and “</llm-code-output>” tags.

Common sense reasoning The third reasoning scenario is common sense reasoning. Different from math reasoning, this scenario requires the model to solve the given question based on its common sense knowledge. To unlock the model’s capability on this, we utilize the instruction data depicted in Figure 5. In this task, the model needs to select the appropriate answer from the given options through common sense reasoning. This also presents a new scenario that does not involve generating an intermediate reasoning process.




Figure 5: Illustration of our employed instruction data. We use this instruction data to teach model to solve common sense reasoning task.

3.3 Flexible and Combinable Implementation of Question Alignment Stage

The original implementation requires question translation data for the question alignment stage. We discover that similar goal can be achieved by using general domain X-En translation data, which allows a more flexible implementation of the question alignment stage. More importantly, by combining question translation data \mathcal{D}_l with general domain translation data $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_l$, we can leverage the value of both data and further enhance the model’s understanding on non-English questions.

$$\arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{\{\mathcal{X}_e, \mathcal{X}_l\} \in \mathcal{D}_l \cup \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_l} \log p_{\theta}(\mathcal{X}_e | \mathcal{X}_l)$$

3.4 Scaling to Extremely Large LM

Extremely large language models, e.g., LLaMA2-70B, Mixtral-8×22B, often demonstrate state-of-the-art performance among open-source LLMs.

Therefore, it is non-trivial to examine how well the training framework scales to these models and whether it offers benefits on the multilingual performance of these powerful LLMs.

Vanilla fine-tuning While fully fine-tuning extremely large models is a straightforward solution, the process can be prohibitively time-consuming and computationally expensive, due to the vast number of parameters that need to be optimized.

Efficient proxy-tuning Inspired by Liu et al. (2024), we explore proxy-tuning as an efficient alternative solution. The objective of proxy-tuning is to guide a large pre-trained model \mathcal{M} to behave like a tuned model without updating any parameters. This is achieved by employing a small pre-trained model \mathcal{M}^- and a small tuned model \mathcal{M}^+ , which serve as the expert model and the anti-expert model¹. The underlying assumption of proxy-tuning is that the difference in logits between \mathcal{M}^- and \mathcal{M}^+ can approximate the difference between \mathcal{M} and a truly-tuned large model. At each inference step t , we condition the base model \mathcal{M} , the expert \mathcal{M}^+ and the anti-expert \mathcal{M}^- on the question \mathcal{X} and the generated prefix $\mathcal{Y}_{<t}$. The probability distribution for the proxy-tuned model $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ is derived from the prediction distributions of these models:

$$p_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}}(\mathcal{Y}_t | \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_{<t}) \propto p_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{Y}_t | \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_{<t}) \frac{p_{\mathcal{M}^+}(\mathcal{Y}_t | \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_{<t})}{p_{\mathcal{M}^-}(\mathcal{Y}_t | \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_{<t})}$$

Besides, we discover that the selection of the small expert and anti-expert model is crucial for the final performance. By carefully selecting small models for proxy-tuning, such as using a 13B model instead of a 7B model to proxy-tune the 70B model, we can almost achieve the performance of fully fine-tuning without updating any parameters.

4 Experiment setting

Base LLMs We consider a range of the most powerful open-source LLMs for our experiments. In most experiments, we use LLaMA2-7B as the base models. In experiments involving reasoning with Python code, we use CodeLLaMA-7B (Roziere et al., 2023) as the base model. In

¹The small models must have the same vocabulary as the large model to support arithmetic operations on prediction distributions.

| Dataset | # Lang | # Sample | Usage | Question | Response | Scenario |
|------------------|--------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|
| METAMATHQA | 1 | 395,000 | Training | ✓ | ✓ | ① |
| OPENMATHINSTRUCT | 1 | 1,343,849 | Training | ✓ | ✓ | ② |
| GSM8KINSTRUCT | 10 | 73,559 | Training | ✓ | ✗ | ①② |
| FLORES-101 | 10 | 18,081 | Training | - | - | ② |
| MGSM | 10 | 2,500 | Evaluation | ✓ | ✓ | ①② |
| MSVAMP | 10 | 10,000 | Evaluation | ✓ | ✓ | ①② |
| XCSQA-TRAIN | 1 | 8,888 | Training | ✓ | ✓ | ③ |
| XCSQA-TEST | 15 | 17,184 | Training | ✓ | ✗ | ③ |
| XCSQA-DEV | 15 | 16,000 | Evaluation | ✓ | ✓ | ③ |

Table 1: Statistics of involved datasets. “#Lang” denotes the number of languages covered by the dataset and “#Sample” refers to the total number of samples it contains. The labels “Question” and “Response” denotes whether each sample includes a question and a corresponding response. The symbols ①②③ correspond to the three scenarios discussed in Section 3.2: math reasoning with chain-of-thought in multiple languages, math reasoning with executable code and common sense reasoning.

experiments involving extremely large language models, we consider LLaMA2-70B, LLaMA3-70B (Meta, 2024), Mixtral-8x7B (Jiang et al., 2024) and Mixtral-8x22B (Mistral, 2024).

Training dataset In multilingual mathematical reasoning, we use multilingual questions from GSM8KINSTRUCT (Chen et al., 2023) for question alignment. During response alignment, we use METAMATHQA (Yuan et al., 2023) to teach LLM to reason with chain-of-thought and use multilingual translation data from FLORES-101 (Goyal et al., 2022) to bias LLM to generate multilingual CoT. To teach LLM to reasoning with Python code, we use OPENMATHINSTRUCT (Toshniwal et al., 2024). In multilingual common sense reasoning, we use multilingual questions from XCSQA-TEST for question alignment and use English supervised data in XCSQA-TRAIN (Lin et al., 2021) for response alignment. Statistics of involved datasets are reported in Table 1. Besides, we illustrate the flexible and combinable implementation of the question alignment stage by using translation data from large multilingual translation dataset WIKIMATRIX (Schwenk et al., 2021).

Training details Following Zhu et al. (2024a), we use *QAlign*² as the code base. We use consistent training hyper-parameters across two stages of training. At each stage, we fine-tune LLM’s full parameters for 3 epochs on 8×A100 GPUs. The learning rate is 2e-5, with a batch size of 128.

²<https://github.com/NJUNLP/QAlign>

Baseline model The direct baseline for the two-step training framework is only performing response alignment (RAlign), i.e. fine-tuning with monolingual reasoning data. Comparing this baseline with the alignment-enhanced model (QAlign→RAlign) directly illustrates the benefits of performing question alignment and the effectiveness of leveraging English expertise.

Evaluation dataset We use MGSM (Shi et al., 2022) and MSVAMP (Chen et al., 2023) to evaluate LLM’s performance on multilingual mathematical reasoning. We use XCSQA-DEV to evaluate LLM’s performance on multilingual common sense reasoning. Dataset statistics are reported in Table 1. We report LLM’s answer accuracy in a zero-shot and greedy-decoding setting. We measure answer accuracy by comparing the last numerical value (for MGSM, MSVAMP) or the label within brackets (for XCSQA) that appears in the LLM-generated response with the gold answer.

5 Experiment results

In this section, we will report experiment results and introduce our main findings.

Incorporating different specialized data for response alignment broadens the framework’s applicability across diverse reasoning scenarios

At first, we extend the training framework to various reasoning scenarios by using different specialized instruction data for stage II training. Experiment results on MGSM, MSVAMP and XCSQA are depicted in Figure 6. The improvement in multilingual performance is evident in all




Figure 6: Reasoning accuracy on mGSM, mSVAMP and xCSQA. The improvement in multilingual performance is evident in all three reasoning scenarios: reasoning with chain-of-thought, executable code and common sense.

three reasoning scenarios: reasoning with chain-of-thought, executable Python code and common sense. These results demonstrate that the two-stage training framework can be broadly applicable across diverse reasoning scenarios.

Incorporating En-X translation data during response alignment implicitly bias LLM to generate non-English response As shown in Table 2, the original QAlign→RAlign model usually exhibits extremely low question-response language consistency³ for non-English tasks, because it tends to respond in English to multilingual questions. After incorporating En-X translation data

³We perform language identification with the OPENLID toolkit (Burchell et al., 2023).

for stage II training, the fine-tuned model more frequently responds in the same language as the question, demonstrating a significant increase in language consistency (52.3% vs. 9.7%). However, we also acknowledge that while this approach increases question-response language consistency, it compromises reasoning accuracy. Future work will need to address this trade-off and balance both language consistency and reasoning accuracy without significant sacrifices in either area.

Combining question translation and general domain translation for question alignment stage could bring further improvements Next, we demonstrate the flexible and combinable implementation of the question alignment stage us-

| System (7B) | Question-Response Language Consistency (MGSM) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | Bn | Th | Sw | Ja | Zh | De | Fr | Ru | Es | En | Avg. |
| QAlign→RAlign (w.o. En-X translation) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 93.8 | 9.7 |
| QAlign→RAlign (w. En-X translation) | 26.8 | 42.7 | 49.3 | 63.1 | 26.8 | 63.2 | 36.9 | 82.4 | 37.9 | 93.4 | 52.3 |

| System (7B) | Reasoning Accuracy (MGSM) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | Bn | Th | Sw | Ja | Zh | De | Fr | Ru | Es | En | Avg. |
| QAlign→RAlign (w.o. En-X translation) | 32.4 | 39.6 | 40.4 | 44.0 | 48.4 | 54.8 | 56.8 | 52.4 | 59.6 | 68.0 | 49.6 |
| QAlign→RAlign (w. En-X translation) | 21.2 | 21.6 | 24.8 | 28.0 | 41.6 | 50.8 | 55.2 | 45.6 | 54.4 | 66.4 | 41.0 |

Table 2: Effects of incorporating En-X general domain translation data for response alignment training. En-X translation training implicitly bias LLM to generate non-English chain-of-thought and increase the question-response language consistency.

| Translation Data | # Pair | MGSM (CoT) | | |
|---------------------|----------|------------|------|------|
| | | Lrl | Hrl | En |
| - | - | 6.4 | 50.1 | 65.6 |
| WikiMatrix | 64k | 13.4 | 51.1 | 68.0 |
| WikiMatrix | 400k | 23.4 | 51.0 | 67.2 |
| Question | 73k | 36.4 | 52.7 | 68.0 |
| Question+WikiMatrix | 73k+400k | 39.6 | 53.6 | 67.2 |

Table 3: Experiment results for different implementation of the question alignment stage. the first row denotes the model that does not have the question alignment stage. “#Pair” refers to the total number of translation pairs we use. “Lrl” and “Hrl” denotes the average multilingual performance on non-English low-resource and high-resource languages respectively.

ing general domain translation data⁴. Experiment results in Table 3 show that using general domain translation for question alignment stage can achieve a similar enhancement purpose, although it is less data-efficient compared to using in-domain question translation data. The benefit of discovering this alternative implementation is that when we combine two types of translation data for stage I training, we can harness the value of both data types and achieve higher results on non-English tasks, especially in low-resource languages.

The two-stage training framework scales well to extremely large language models with both vanilla fine-tuning and efficient proxy-tuning.

Table 4 shows that the two-stage training framework is effective across different model sizes (7B, 8B, 13B, 70B) and scales well even on the 70B model. Notably, our fine-tuned LLaMA2-70B

⁴For each X-En directions, we sample at most 50k translation data from WIKIMATRIX. Since it does not cover Thai, we make observations on the remaining eight non-English languages and English. Following the definition in Shi et al. (2022), we divide these non-English languages into two groups in Table 3: low-resource languages (Bn, Sw) and high-resource languages (Ja, Zh, De, Fr, Ru, Es).

models reach a new performance ceiling on multilingual reasoning benchmarks, achieving an accuracy of 63.0% on MGSM. However, the computational cost required for fine-tuning extremely large language models is prohibitively high⁵.

Consequently, we explore proxy-tuning as an efficient alternative to fine-tuning. As we introduced in Section 3.4, we use the small fine-tuned model as the expert model and its untuned version as the anti-expert model. Across different model families (LLaMA2, LLaMA3, Mixtral), including both dense models and MoE models, proxy-tuning consistently enhances performance in both non-English and English tasks, effectively extrapolating our results from small models to extremely large models. Furthermore, experiments on LLaMA2 demonstrate that carefully selecting small models for proxy-tuning, such as using LLaMA2-13B instead of using LLaMA2-7B as the small proxy model, allows us to achieve 98.1% of the performance of fully fine-tuning (61.8 vs. 63.0) without updating any parameters.

6 Mechanism Analysis

In this section, we conduct further analysis to gain a deeper understanding of the training regime and its impact on LLM’s working pattern. The analysis is performed in the scenario of mathematical reasoning with chain-of-thought on MGSM dataset.

Question alignment produces a more unified semantic space, facilitating the utilization of English expertise in non-English contexts

Our analysis begins with the representation space, which fundamentally determines how the model derives the output answer. We feed multilingual

⁵For instance, in our experiments, instruction-tuning LLaMA2-70B with METAMATHQA dataset (comprising 395K question-response pairs) on 8×A100 GPUs takes 15 days.

| | Small tuned \mathcal{M}^+ | Small untuned \mathcal{M}^- | Large untuned $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ | Large tuned \mathcal{M} | MGSM | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Non-En | En | Avg. |
| RAlign (7B) | - | - | - | - | 35.4 | 65.5 | 38.4 |
| QAlign→RAlign (7B) | - | - | - | - | 47.6 | 68.0 | 49.6 |
| RAlign (13B) | - | - | - | - | 41.2 | 68.4 | 43.9 |
| QAlign→RAlign (13B) | - | - | - | - | 55.7 | 69.2 | 57.1 |
| - | - | - | - | RAlign (70B) | 47.7 | 78.4 | 50.8 |
| - | - | - | - | QAlign→RAlign (70B) | 61.5 | 76.0 | 63.0 |
| QAlign→RAlign (7B) | LLaMA2 (7B) | LLaMA2 (70B) | - | - | 55.8 | 70.8 | 57.3 |
| QAlign→RAlign (13B) | LLaMA2 (13B) | LLaMA2 (70B) | - | - | 60.1 | 76.8 | 61.8 |
| RAlign (8B) | - | - | - | - | 47.3 | 74.4 | 50.0 |
| QAlign→RAlign (8B) | - | - | - | - | 58.4 | 72.0 | 59.8 |
| QAlign→RAlign (8B) | LLaMA3 (8B) | LLaMA3 (70B) | - | - | 64.0 | 77.2 | 65.4 |
| RAlign (7B) | - | - | - | - | 35.2 | 70.4 | 38.7 |
| QAlign→RAlign (7B) | - | - | - | - | 48.2 | 70.8 | 50.4 |
| QAlign→RAlign (7B) | Mistral (7B) | Mixtral (8×7B) | - | - | 49.4 | 74.4 | 51.9 |
| QAlign→RAlign (7B) | Mistral (7B) | Mixtral (8×22B) | - | - | 55.6 | 78.0 | 57.9 |

Table 4: Experiment results of scaling the question alignment approach to extremely large language models. For the lines containing three models, this means that we use small models \mathcal{M}^+ and \mathcal{M}^- to proxy-tune the large model $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$. “Non-En” and “Avg.” denotes the average multilingual performance on non-English languages and all ten languages respectively. Bold text denotes the highest score among the same model families.




Figure 7: Visualization analysis on the representations of the last input tokens from multilingual questions. For brevity, we uniformly sample 5 layers out of the total 32 layers to illustrate the visualized distribution. Different colors denote the languages of the questions.

questions from the MGSM dataset into RAlign and QAlign→RAlign models in a teacher-forcing manner, and then visualize⁶ the representations of the last input token, which decides the content of the first output tokens and serves as an important clue for how the model starts its reasoning process (Wendler et al., 2024). The visualization results are shown in Figure 7. For both models, the context representations of multilingual queries always stay apart in the bottom

⁶For visualization, we use T-SNE for dimension reduction.

layer (1st and 8th layers). But from the middle to top layers, a notable difference emerges between our alignment-enhanced model and its unaligned counterpart: question alignment produce a more compact space, enabling the model to process multilingual queries in a unified way and facilitating the sharing of its English expertise across different languages.

The sharing of the English expertise makes the model to employ similar problem-solving process to address multilingual questions In addition to analyzing the layer-wise generation pro-




Figure 8: Comparative analysis of reasoning path consistency across different systems. The number in each cell represents the reasoning path consistency between the languages in the corresponding row and column. The number is in percentage. Darker blue denotes higher level of consistency.




Figure 9: The impact of the size of the question translation data on multilingual reasoning accuracy.

cess of the initial output token, we further analyze step-by-step answers in CoT, revealing the larger impact of the unified representation space on the reasoning process. We evaluate the consistency among them when the model is presented with the same question expressed in different languages. Specifically, we extract intermediate computation results as lists from CoT and compute the Jaccard similarity between them to evaluate the consistency of the reasoning paths (illustrated in Table 5, Appendix A). The quantitative results are depicted in Figure 8. The alignment-enhanced models (QAlign→RAlign) generally have higher consistency compared to their unaligned counterparts (RAlign), particularly in low-resource languages. This evidence further demonstrate that the question alignment approach can facilitate the sharing of reasoning abilities across languages.

The impact of the size of question translation data

Another important factor that influences

the effectiveness of the question alignment approach is the size of the question translation data. To analyze this factor, we uniformly downsample the multilingual question translation data from 8k pairs per language to 1k per language. Generally, question alignment does not significantly affect the model’s proficiency in English but does impact its performance on non-English tasks. For high-resource languages, the performance peak is usually achieved at smaller data scale, indicating that language alignment can be established in a more data-efficient way for these languages. For low-resource languages, such as Bengali, Thai, and Swahili, scaling up the question translation data always yields substantial improvement, indicating the potential of this approach to empower LLMs in supporting long-tail low-resource languages.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we build upon the pioneering work of Zhu et al. (2024a) and delve deeper in multilingual reasoning to broaden the scope and provide deepened insights. We demonstrate the two-stage training framework can be extended to a variety of challenging reasoning scenarios and the framework scales well with extremely large language models. Employing either vanilla fine-tuning or the efficient alternative proxy tuning, we can enhance the multilingual reasoning performance of those most powerful open-source LLMs to new heights. In the mechanism analysis section, we provide in-depth analysis on the representation space, step-by-step answers and question translation data scales. This analysis illuminates how the training regime influences LLM’s multilingual working pattern.

Acknowledgement

Shujian Huang is the corresponding author. This work is supported by National Science Foundation of China (No. 62376116, 62176120), the Liaoning Provincial Research Foundation for Basic Research (No. 2022-KF-26-02), research project of Nanjing University-China Mobile Joint Institute. This project has also received funding from UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) under the UK government’s Horizon Europe funding guarantee (UTTER grant numbers 10039436). Wenhao Zhu is also supported by China Scholarship Council (No.202306190172).

References

- Mikel Artetxe, Gorka Labaka, and Eneko Agirre. 2020. Translation artifacts in cross-lingual transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Terra Blevins and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Language contamination helps explain the cross-lingual capabilities of English pretrained models. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Laurie Burchell, Alexandra Birch, Nikolay Bogoychev, and Kenneth Heafield. 2023. An open dataset and model for language identification. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Nuo Chen, Zinan Zheng, Ning Wu, Linjun Shou, Ming Gong, Yangqiu Song, Dongmei Zhang, and Jia Li. 2023. Breaking language barriers in multilingual mathematical reasoning: Insights and observations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20246*.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2023. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*.
- Kazuki Fujii, Taishi Nakamura, Mengsay Loem, Hiroki Iida, Masanari Ohi, Kakeru Hattori, Hirai Shota, Sakae Mizuki, Rio Yokota, and Naoaki Okazaki. 2024. Continual pre-training for cross-lingual llm adaptation: Enhancing Japanese language capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17790*.
- Naman Goyal, Cynthia Gao, Vishrav Chaudhary, Peng-Jen Chen, Guillaume Wenzek, Da Ju, Sanjana Krishnan, MarcAurelio Ranzato, Francisco Guzman, and Angela Fan. 2022. The Flores-101 evaluation benchmark for low-resource and multilingual machine translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics (TACL)*.
- Haoyang Huang, Tianyi Tang, Dongdong Zhang, Wayne Xin Zhao, Ting Song, Yan Xia, and Furu Wei. 2023. Not all languages are created equal in llms: Improving multilingual capability by cross-lingual-thought prompting. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, Lelio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothee Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. *Mistral 7b*.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, Lelio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Theophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothee Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. *Mixtral of experts*. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*.
- Tannon Kew, Florian Schottnmann, and Rico Senrich. 2023. Turning english-centric llms into polyglots: How much multilinguality is needed? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12683*.
- Bill Yuchen Lin, Seyeon Lee, Xiaoyang Qiao, and Xiang Ren. 2021. Common sense beyond english: Evaluating and improving multilingual language models for commonsense reasoning.

- In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Alisa Liu, Xiaochuang Han, Yizhong Wang, Yulia Tsvetkov, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2024. Tuning language models by proxy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08565*.
- Meta. 2024. Llama3. <https://llama.meta.com/llama3/>.
- Mistral. 2024. <https://mistral.ai/news/mixtral-8x22b>.
- Xuan-Phi Nguyen, Wenxuan Zhang, Xin Li, Mahani Aljunied, Qingyu Tan, Liying Cheng, Guanzheng Chen, Yue Deng, Sen Yang, Chaoyun Liu, et al. 2023. Seallms—large language models for southeast asia. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00738*.
- OpenAI. 2022. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>.
- Libo Qin, Qiguang Chen, Fuxuan Wei, Shijue Huang, and Wanxiang Che. 2023. Cross-lingual prompting: Improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning across languages. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.
- Holger Schwenk, Vishrav Chaudhary, Shuo Sun, Hongyu Gong, and Francisco Guzmán. 2021. WikiMatrix: Mining 135M Parallel Sentences in 1620 Language Pairs from Wikipedia. In *Proceedings of Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EACL)*.
- Shuaijie She, Shujian Huang, Wei Zou, Wenhao Zhu, Xiang Liu, Xiang Geng, and Jiajun Chen. 2024. Mapo: Advancing multilingual reasoning through multilingual alignment-as-preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06838*.
- Tom Sherborne, Tom Hosking, and Mirella Lapata. 2023. Optimal transport posterior alignment for cross-lingual semantic parsing. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics (TACL)*.
- Freda Shi, Mirac Suzgun, Markus Freitag, Xuezhi Wang, Suraj Srivats, Soroush Vosoughi, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Sebastian Ruder, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Language models are multilingual chain-of-thought reasoners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Shubham Toshniwal, Ivan Moshkov, Sean Narenthiran, Daria Gitman, Fei Jia, and Igor Gitman. 2024. Openmathinstruct-1: A 1.8 million math instruction tuning dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10176*.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothee Lacroix, Baptiste Roziere, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A Smith, Iz Beltagy, et al. 2023. How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Chris Wendler, Veniamin Veselovsky, Giovanni Monea, and Robert West. 2024. Do llamas work in english? on the latent language of multilingual transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10588*.
- 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 (NAACL-HLT)*.
- Dongkeun Yoon, Joel Jang, Sungdong Kim, Seungone Kim, Sheikh Shafayat, and Minjoon Seo. 2024. Langbridge: Multilingual reasoning without multilingual supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10695*.
- Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chengpeng Li, Guanting Dong, Chuanqi Tan, and Chang Zhou. 2023. Scaling relationship on learning mathematical reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01825*.

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>[Question (English)] There are 27 unicorns left in the world. One third of them are in the Scottish Highlands. Two thirds of the Scottish unicorns are female. How many female Scottish unicorns are there? [Chain-of-thought response] One third of the unicorns are in the Scottish Highlands, so there are $27/3 = 9$ unicorns in the Highlands. Two thirds of the unicorns in the Highlands are female, so there are $9 * 2/3 = 6$ female unicorns in the Highlands. Therefore, there are 6 female Scottish unicorns. The answer is: 6 [Extracted step-by-step answers] $A = [9, 6, 6, 6]$</p> | <p>[Question (Chinese)] 世界上剩下27只独角兽，其中三分之一在苏格兰高地。 苏格兰高地的独角兽的三分之二是雌性。苏格兰雌性独角兽有多少只？ [Chain-of-thought response] If there are 27 remaining unicorns in the world, and one-third of them are in the Scottish Highlands, then there are $27/3 = 9$ unicorns in the Scottish Highlands. If two-thirds of the unicorns in the Scottish Highlands are female, then there are $9 * 2/3 = 6$ female unicorns in the Scottish Highlands. Therefore, there are 6 female unicorns in the Scottish Highlands. The answer is: 6 [Extracted step-by-step answers] $B = [9, 6, 6, 6]$</p> |
| <p>[Reasoning path consistency] $\tilde{A} = \text{set}(A), \tilde{B} = \text{set}(B)$ $J(A, B) = \tilde{A} \cap \tilde{B} / \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B} = 100\%$</p> | |

Table 5: With this case, we illustrate the our computation process for evaluating reasoning path consistency.

Wenhao Zhu, Shujian Huang, Fei Yuan, Shuaijie She, Jiajun Chen, and Alexandra Birch. 2024a. Question translation training for better multilingual reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07817*.

Wenhao Zhu, Hongyi Liu, Qingxiu Dong, Jingjing Xu, Shujian Huang, Lingpeng Kong, Jiajun Chen, and Lei Li. 2024b. Multilingual machine translation with large language models: Empirical results and analysis. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*.

A Illustration of Evaluating the Consistency Between Reasoning Paths

In Table 5, we illustrate how we evaluate the reasoning consistency among reasoning process. Specifically, we extract the last numerical value in each sentence as intermediate computation results and compute the Jaccard similarity between them as the consistency score of the reasoning paths.