

SPHINX: Sample Efficient Multilingual Instruction Fine-Tuning Through N-shot Guided Prompting

Sanchit Ahuja^{†*} Kumar Tanmay^{♡◇*} Hardik Hansrajbhai Chauhan[†]
Barun Patra[†] Kriti Aggarwal^{♣◇} Luciano Del Corro[†]
Arindam Mitra[†] Tejas Indulal Dhamecha[†] Ahmed Awadallah[†]
Monojit Choudhury^{♣◇} Vishrav Chaudhary^{†△} Sunayana Sitaram^{†△}

[†]Microsoft Corporation [♡]Harvard University

[♣]MBZUAI University [♣]Hippocratic AI

{sanchitahuja205,kr.tanmay147}@gmail.com

{vchaudhary,sunayana.sitaram}@microsoft.com

Abstract

Despite the remarkable success of LLMs in English, there is a significant gap in performance in non-English languages. In order to address this, we introduce a novel recipe for creating a multilingual synthetic instruction tuning dataset, SPHINX, which is created by selectively translating instruction response pairs from English into 50 languages. We test the effectiveness of SPHINX by using it to fine-tune two state-of-the-art models, PHI-3-SMALL and MISTRAL-7B and then evaluating them across a comprehensive suite of multilingual benchmarks that test reasoning, question answering, and reading comprehension. Our results show that PHI-3-SMALL and MISTRAL-7B fine-tuned with SPHINX perform better on an average by **4.2%pt** and **5%pt** respectively as compared to the baselines. We also devise a strategy to incorporate N-shot examples in each fine-tuning sample which further boosts the performance of these models by **3%pt** and **10%pt** respectively. SPHINX outperforms other multilingual instruction tuning datasets on the same benchmarks along with being sample efficient and diverse, thereby reducing dataset creation costs. Additionally, instruction tuning with SPHINX does not lead to regression on most standard LLM benchmarks.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have been shown to perform several tasks exceptionally well in English, however, performance in some non-English languages still lags behind (Ahuja et al., 2023; Asai et al., 2023). Further, the gap between the performance of Large Language Models (LLMs) and Small Language Models (SLMs) is more pronounced Ahuja et al. (2024) on

non-English languages. Cui et al. (2023) and Balachandran (2023) follow the approach of training the models further on datasets for specific languages, however this can lead to catastrophic forgetting and hurt the performance on English (Zhao et al., 2024). Several techniques have been proposed to bridge this gap, such as incorporating better pre-training data in various languages and enhancing base tokenizers (Xu et al., 2024; Dagan et al., 2024). However, most of these changes need to be implemented at the pre-training stage which demands extensive data and computational resources, making it practically unfeasible in many scenarios (Brown et al., 2020). Consequently, the most well-studied technique involves fine-tuning models for specific languages and tasks. Instruction fine-tuning (IFT) has become a popular technique for enhancing the performance of language models in specific languages. This method combines the benefits of both the pretrain–fine-tune and prompting paradigms (Wei et al., 2021).

Sample diversity is crucial for instruction tuning in multilingual datasets. Many recent datasets are created by translating English content into other languages or using self-instruct techniques from seed prompts (Li et al., 2023; Taori et al., 2023), both of which can limit diversity. Machine translation can lead to loss of semantic information (Baroni and Bernardini, 2006), while self-instruct methods may produce repetitive and homogeneous samples (Wang et al., 2022). This underscores the importance of having a dataset with diverse set of samples.

Aggarwal et al. (2024) evaluate several models fine-tuned using Parameter Efficient fine-tuning and find that there is a gain in multilingual performance across several SLMs for many low-resource languages, with some high-resource languages per-

* denotes equal contribution, [△]denotes equal advising,
[◇]Work done when the authors were at Microsoft

forming worse after fine-tuning. However, the performance gains often do not match the performance of larger models, such as GPT-4 and Gemini and can be inconsistent across languages. Hence, there is a need to study instruction tuning for better multilingual performance in SLMs.

In this paper, we present a novel recipe for creating a multilingual synthetic instruction tuning dataset, SPHINX. It comprises 1.8M instruction-response pairs in 51 languages, derived by *selectively translating* the Orca instruction tuning dataset (Mukherjee et al., 2023) using GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023). We assess the effectiveness of SPHINX by fine-tuning two models — PHI-3-SMALL and MISTRAL-7B — across a range of evaluation benchmarks that test various language model capabilities like reasoning, question answering, and reading comprehension. We compare models fine-tuned on SPHINX with those using other synthetic multilingual instruction tuning datasets like AYA (Üstün et al., 2024), MULTILINGUAL ALPACA (Taori et al., 2023), and BACTRIAN (Li et al., 2023) and observe significant performance gains.

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We introduce a novel approach to generate synthetic data for multilingual instruction tuning by *selectively translating* the Orca dataset with the assistance of GPT-4 (§3.1)
- We devise *L*anguage-*S*pecific *N*-shot *G*uided *I*nstruction *f*ine-tuning (*LANG*) strategy for enhancing the multilingual capabilities of LLMs (§4.2)
- We conduct an extensive number of experiments on different multilingual instruction tuning datasets to test generalizability in multilingual settings (§5)
- We also conduct an in-depth analysis where we find SPHINX to be more sample efficient and diverse across languages (§3.3)

2 Related Work

2.1 Multilingual LLMs

Recently, there has been interest in developing and improving SLMs such as LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023), Mistral (Jiang et al., 2023), Phi3 (Abdin et al., 2024), and Gemma (Team et al., 2024). In a relatively brief period, researchers have developed numerous monolingual and multilingual versions of these foundational models, either by pre-training from scratch on specific lan-

guages or groups of languages, or by further fine-tuning on them (Nguyen et al., 2023; Gala et al., 2024; Balachandran, 2023; Cui et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023; Qin et al., 2024). Prior work has shown that smaller models show promising results in high-resource languages but perform worse on low-resource ones (Ahuja et al., 2024) compared to larger models. To address this, researchers have proposed using multilingual corpora for pre-training, expanding the vocabulary (Wang et al., 2019) and continual training (Liu et al., 2023), though this increases training costs significantly. fine-tuning for specific tasks, such as translation, has been explored but often struggles with generalization (Mishra et al., 2021). In contrast, instruction tuning has shown to improve generalization to unseen tasks, enhancing the models’ ability to understand and respond to human instructions (Mishra et al., 2021; Ouyang et al., 2022). This makes the models more versatile and capable of handling a wide variety of tasks.

2.2 Multilingual Instruction fine-tuning

Early studies focused on fine-tuning pre-trained models on a variety of languages through data augmentation for a single task (Hu et al., 2020; Longpre et al., 2021; Asai et al., 2022). Currently, the approach has shifted on fine-tuning these models using a wide-variety of tasks (Longpre et al., 2023; Ouyang et al., 2022). Models such as BLOOMZ (Muennighoff et al., 2022) and mT0 (Muennighoff et al., 2022) makes significant strides in improving the multilingual performance of decoder-based models (Ahuja et al., 2023). There have been multiple multilingual instruction datasets and models proposed such as Bactrian (Li et al., 2023), AYA (Üstün et al., 2024), POLYLM (Wei et al., 2023b) after BLOOMZ and mT0. However, these models still do not perform as well as English on other languages, with the gap being particularly large for low-resource languages and languages written in scripts other than the Latin script (Ruder et al., 2021; Ahuja et al., 2023; Asai et al., 2023; Ahuja et al., 2024). In this work, we aim to narrow the performance gap by introducing a strategy for creating datasets for multilingual instruction tuning and recipes for fine-tuning, which we will discuss in the following sections.

2.3 Multilingual Synthetic Data Generation

Most instruction-tuning datasets across multiple languages typically focus on general tasks rather




Figure 1: The above figure describes translating using a Translation API vs Selective Translation

than specific reasoning capabilities. While datasets like Orca (Mukherjee et al., 2023) and Orca 2 (Mitra et al., 2023) exist in English, they highlight a prevalent issue: current methods often prioritize style imitation over leveraging the reasoning abilities found in large foundation models (LFMs). The Orca dataset addresses this by imitating rich signals from GPT-4, including explanation traces and step-by-step thought processes (Wei et al., 2023a), guided by assistance from ChatGPT. In order to create multilingual datasets, researchers commonly use translation APIs or LLMs to translate English-specific datasets into target languages. For example, the Bactrian dataset (Li et al., 2023) translates Alpaca and Dolly instructions into 52 languages using the Google Translator API and generates outputs with GPT-3.5 turbo. However, these translated datasets often struggle to encode semantic information effectively (Baroni and Bernardini, 2006). Our dataset approach aims to tackle these challenges by selectively translating only the essential portions of multilingual inputs. This strategy not only preserves semantic information but also accommodates diverse linguistic contexts, thereby enhancing the overall quality and applicability of instruction-tuning datasets across languages.

3 SPHINX Dataset

In this section, we describe our dataset construction methodology (§3.1), dataset filtering and cleaning pipelines (§3.2), and exploratory analysis (§3.3) for determining diversity of our data in comparison to other instruction tuning datasets.

3.1 Dataset Construction

Mukherjee et al. (2023) illustrate how smaller models can replicate the reasoning processes of LLMs and learn from detailed signals like as explanation traces, step-by-step thought processes, and other

intricate instructions obtained from data annotated by ChatGPT and GPT-4¹. Their dataset consists of 5M ChatGPT and 1M GPT-4 generated instruction-response pairs. Inspired by this work, we utilized 1M GPT-4 generated instruction-response pairs of their dataset and construct our dataset along similar lines by *selectively* translating them into 50 different languages with the help of GPT-4. We categorize them into three groups: high-resource, mid-resource, and low-resource languages as outlined in Table 11. For high resource languages, we randomly sample 100k instruction-response pairs from the Orca 1M dataset and generate the responses from GPT-4 using **Selective Translation** as shown in Figure 1. Similarly, we leverage the same strategy for medium and low resource languages by sampling 50k and 25k pairs respectively. Although GPT-4 performs competitively with commercial translation systems (Google Translate & Bing Translate) it still lags behind on medium and low resource languages (Jiao et al., 2023; Hendy et al., 2023). Furthermore, as highlighted in Chang et al. (2023), fine-tuning with a large set of samples from medium and low-resource languages might lead to catastrophic forgetting of high-resource languages. Therefore, we deliberately create fewer samples for medium and low-resource languages than for high-resource ones.

A fundamental problem with using an off-the-shelf translation API is the lack of semantic and task awareness, in addition to *translationese* (Baroni and Bernardini, 2006)), which can result in poor quality training data. Consider for example the task of Machine Translation as part of the instruction, wherein the language of the source sentence should be retained. However, an off-the-shelf

¹GPT-4 inference hyper-parameters in Azure OpenAI interface set as: temperature=0.0, top_p=1, frequency_penalty=0, presence_penalty=0, stop=["<lim_end>", "<lim_start>"]

| INPUT QUERY | MULTIALPACA DATASET | SELECTIVE TRANSLATION |
|--|--|--|
| {'instruction': 'Find the French equivalent of the following phrase.', 'input': 'Wishing you good luck', 'output': 'Je vous souhaite bonne chance'} | {'instruction': 'निम्नलिखित वाक्यांश के फ्रेंच समकक्ष का पता लगाएं', 'input': 'आपको शुभकामनाएं', 'output': 'Vous avez mes meilleurs vœux.'} | { "system": "निम्नलिखित वाक्यांश का फ्रेंच समकक्ष खोजें", "human": "Wishing you a good luck", "assistant": "Je vous souhaite bonne chance" } |
| {'instruction': 'You are provided with a sentence, edit it in a way that it becomes grammatically correct.', 'input': 'The wind is blowing fast and furious', 'output': 'The wind is blowing fast and furiously.'} | {'instruction': 'आपको एक वाक्य प्रदान किया जाता है, इसे इस तरह संपादित करें कि यह व्याकरणिक रूप से सही हो जाए', 'input': 'हवा तेज और उग्र चल रही है', 'id': 'alpaca-9380', 'output': 'तेज और उग्र हवा चल रही है!} | { "system": "आपको एक वाक्य दिया गया है, इसे इस प्रकार संपादित करें कि यह व्याकरणिक रूप से सही हो जाए", "human": "The wind is blowing fast and furious", "assistant": "The wind is blowing fast and furiously." } |

Figure 2: Some examples of input queries and its counterpart existing in the hindi version of the MULTIALPACA dataset and if it was generated using the Selective Translation strategy

API, without task awareness, would translate it, resulting in an ill defined instruction. To mitigate this issue, we prompt GPT-4 to selectively translate the instructions, so that the tasks are translated into the appropriate language without changing the semantic meaning. Figure 2 illustrates this with concrete examples. The first example demonstrates the aforementioned translation inconsistency issue for an instruction asking for a French equivalent of an English phrase. The second example demonstrates the consequence of direct translations in the MULTIALPACA dataset: wherein the translation of the task input results in the task being ill-defined based on the instructions. As demonstrated, our proposed **Selective Translation** method is able to keep the semantic information of the task intact while translating the instructions. For the exact prompt, please refer to Figure 6 in the Appendix.

3.2 Dataset Filtering and Cleaning

After generating these translations, we analyze how many instruction-assistant pairs were unsatisfactorily translated, such as incomplete or missing translations, by identifying the English content within the instances. We use the NLTK² library to identify the fraction of English words in the sample. The NLTK corpus contains approximately 240,000 English words, making it suitable for our use case. We manually analyzed various proportions of English content in samples of each language and found that the samples were satisfactory when the English content was within 90% for all languages. If the English content exceeded 90% in a language that

²<https://www.nltk.org/>

Algorithm 1: Data Filtering Algorithm

Input: listOfSentences: list of strings

```

1 Function dataFilter(listOfSentences):
2   englishWords ← set of English words from NLTK;
3   foreach sentence in listOfSentences do
4     cleanedSentence ← replace all punctuations, digits, and single characters with a single space;
5     cleanedSentence ← replace all sequences of whitespace with a single space;
6     wordCount ← 0;
7     foreach word in cleanedSentence do
8       if word.lower() in englishWords then
9         wordCount ← wordCount + 1;
10    content ← wordCount / len(cleanedSentence);
11    if content > 0.90 then
12      remove sentence from listOfSentences

```

uses a different script, those samples were removed from our dataset as shown in our data filtering algorithm [here](#). Finally, we manually inspected a small sample of the dataset to ensure the quality of the translations, and found them to be of good quality.

After filtering, the final dataset comprised of 1.8 million samples in 51 languages, divided into three subsets: Train, Test, and Few-shot. We partitioned each language’s dataset to ensure the Test and Few-shot sets contained 2000 and 1000 samples respectively, with the Train set consisting the remaining data. This approach guarantees consistent distributions across languages in the Test and Few-shot sets, ensuring equitable representation regardless of training distribution. The train, test, and few-shot sets are in the ratio of 92 : 5.3 : 2.7.




Figure 3: t-SNE Visualisation of 1000 samples equally distributed in 10 languages

3.3 Data Analysis

A primary issue that we hypothesize (and find preliminary evidence for from basic analysis of prior Multilingual IFT datasets) is the lack of diversity of samples. In order to validate this issue, we use t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) (Cai and Ma, 2022) to visualize the structure of both prior multilingual IFT datasets as well as SPHINX. We use the model paraphrase-multilingual-MiniLM-L12-v2 from huggingface’s sentence-transformers (Reimers and Gurevych, 2020), (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) library³ to generate the embeddings. The hyperparameters were set as follows: learning rate at 200, perplexity at 30, and number of iterations (n_iter) at 1000. Concretely, we use 1000 samples equally distributed in 10 languages. Figure 3 demonstrates that SPHINX

³<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/paraphrase-multilingual-MiniLM-L12-v2>

demonstrates greater diversity compared to prior datasets. Particularly, BACTRIAN and MULTILINGUAL ALPACA appear less diverse, which we hypothesize might be due to their generation method involving translations of the same set of task limited English samples into different languages. By virtue of using a more diverse seed set (Mukherjee et al., 2023), we circumvent this issue by design. Furthermore, one notable differentiating factor of SPHINX is the substantial amount of code-switched data the inherent nature of Selective Translation. This in turn enhances the diversity of samples across multiple languages. Finally, we also observe the Aya dataset to be more diverse than other prior counterparts, though it still shows less diversity across task instructions.

| Dataset | Average Token Length/Sample |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| AYA | 2240 |
| BACTRIAN | 2465 |
| MULTILINGUAL ALPACA | 1620 |
| SPHINX-0s | 544 |
| SPHINX | 3100 |

Table 1: Average Token Length in each dataset

4 Experiments

4.1 Setup

Base Models: We use MISTRAL-7B⁴ (Jiang et al., 2023) and PHI-3-SMALL (Abdin et al., 2024) base model variants and fine-tune them on different datasets based to improve multilingual performance.

Datasets: Apart from the SPHINX dataset, we use BACTRIAN (Li et al., 2023), MULTIALPACA (Wei et al., 2023b) and AYA (Singh et al., 2024) instruction datasets for comparative evaluation §3.1.

- BACTRIAN (Li et al., 2023) is a machine translated dataset of the original alpaca-52k (Taori et al., 2023) and dolly-15k (Conover et al., 2023) datasets into 52 languages. The instructions for this dataset were translated using a Translation API and then GPT-3.5-Turbo was prompted to generate outputs. We fine-tune our models on the complete dataset consisting of 3.4M instances.
- MULTIALPACA (Wei et al., 2023b) is a self instruct dataset which follows the same approach as the English-only ALPACA by translating the seed instructions to 11 languages and then using GPT-3.5-Turbo to generate responses. We fine-tune our models on the complete set of the dataset consisting of 500k datapoints.
- AYA (Singh et al., 2024) consists of human-curated prompt-completion pairs in 65 languages called the **Aya** Dataset. It also consists of an aggregation of 44 monolingual and multilingual templated instruction datasets and 19 translated datasets ranging over 114 languages. The total size of the Aya dataset is around 513M instances. Due to the infeasibility of fine-tuning our models on the

entire dataset, we sampled it down to 2.7M instances, ensuring parity with our SPHINX dataset by selecting equal numbers of samples for each language in our subset.

Evaluation: We evaluate⁵ our fine-tuned models along with the available Instruction fine-tuned model variants of MISTRAL-7B and PHI-3-SMALL (IFT⁶) on XCOPA (Ponti et al., 2020), XStoryCloze (Lin et al., 2022), XWinograd (Muenighoff et al., 2023), (Tikhonov and Ryabinin, 2021), Belebele (Bandarkar et al., 2023), and XQuAD (Artetxe et al., 2020) using the language model evaluation harness (Gao et al., 2023).

- **XCOPA:** A causal commonsense reasoning dataset in 11 languages, evaluated in a 4-shot prompt setting.
- **XStoryCloze:** A professionally translated version of the English StoryCloze dataset (Mostafazadeh et al., 2017) in 10 languages, evaluated in a 4-shot prompt setting.
- **Belebele:** A parallel reading comprehension dataset across 122 languages, with evaluation on a subset of 14 languages in a 0-shot prompt setting.
- **XQuAD:** A QA dataset consisting of professional translations of a subset of SQuAD into 10 languages, evaluated in a 3-shot prompt setting due to context window limitations.
- **XWinograd:** A collection of Winograd Schemas in six languages for cross-lingual commonsense reasoning, evaluated in a 0-shot setting.

4.2 Fine-Tuning Methodology

Inspired from Longpre et al. (2023)’s strategies to instruction tune a model, we devise *Language-Specific N-shot Guided Instruction fine-tuning (LANG)*. With this approach, we augment a training example by prepending N number of samples of same language as that of the original training example randomly selected from the corresponding few shot set. This augmented training example is used for instruction tuning our models. Suppose a training example in language l is a pair of $Instruction(I_{train}^l)$ and $Response(R_{train}^l)$. We need to prepend N number of shots represented

⁵Evaluation prompts and other details in Appendix §A.1

⁶We take the MISTRAL-7B instruction-tuned variant from here and PHI-3-SMALL variant from here.

⁴We specifically use the v1.0 base model from here.

by $(I_{\text{fewshot}_1}^l, R_{\text{fewshot}_1}^l), (I_{\text{fewshot}_2}^l, R_{\text{fewshot}_2}^l), \dots, (I_{\text{fewshot}_N}^l, R_{\text{fewshot}_N}^l)$. For every training example, N is chosen with a probability p as defined in Table 3. \mathcal{T} is the instruction tuning templating function which takes *Instruction* and *Response* and transforms it to user-assistant format by adding the special tokens. Thus, the final training example is:

$$\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^N \mathcal{T}(I_{\text{fewshot}_i}^l, R_{\text{fewshot}_i}^l) \right) \oplus \mathcal{T}(I_{\text{train}}^l, R_{\text{train}}^l)$$

where N is chosen based on the probability distribution $P(N)$. \bigoplus represents combining all few-shot examples, while \oplus indicates concatenating the main training example with the aggregated few-shot examples. Once N is selected, an equivalent number of few-shot examples is sampled uniformly at random from the few shot set. The maximum context token length for training the models is set at 8192. To ensure augmented samples fall within this range, we assign more weights to $N=0$ and $N=1$. This strategy is consistently applied when instruction tuning other datasets for both PHI-3-SMALL and MISTRAL-7B base model. The average token length of samples in each datasets as per PHI-3-SMALL model tokenizer is shown in Table 1. To assess the effectiveness of each instruction tuning dataset on an equal scale, we conducted a comparative analysis of model performance, fine-tuning each on approximately 8 billion tokens from each dataset using *LANG* strategy.

4.3 Hyperparameters and Training Setup

We used 5 nodes with each node containing 8 A100 GPUs with 80GB VRAM. These nodes communicated with each other using InfiniBand⁷. We use DeepSpeed (Rasley et al., 2020) to do distributed fine-tuning over these GPUs. We use the same hyperparameters (Table 2) to fine-tune both MISTRAL-7B and PHI-3-SMALL models.

5 Results

We evaluate the reasoning, question answering, and reading comprehension abilities of the PHI-3-SMALL and MISTRAL-7B models, instruction-tuned on different multilingual datasets, using various benchmarks and find that fine-tuning on SPHINX provides an improvement of **4.2%pt**⁸ and

⁷https://network.nvidia.com/pdf/whitepapers/IB_Intro_WP_190.pdf

⁸A percentage point (pt) is the unit for expressing the absolute difference between two percentage values




Figure 4: Performance of MISTRAL-7B and PHI-3-SMALL when instruction-tuned on 8B tokens across various datasets on different benchmarks.

5%pt respectively (language-wise results are in the Appendix §A.2). Additionally as observed in Figure 4, the SPHINX dataset significantly enhances the multilingual performance of the PHI-3-SMALL and MISTRAL-7B model compared to other datasets even when finetuned on equal number of tokens. Furthermore, during instruction tuning on 8B tokens, the models encountered fewer training samples for SPHINX due to its higher average token length per sample, as illustrated in Table 1.

Due to the code-mixed nature of the instruction along with CoT reasoning explanations, a single sample of SPHINX is notably richer as compared to its counterparts from the other datasets. Consequently, even with fewer samples (keeping the number of the tokens same), models trained on SPHINX achieve better performance; thereby demonstrating the per sample efficiency of SPHINX.

6 Ablation: Improvements from LANG

To demonstrate the effectiveness of our *LANG* strategy, we also instruction-tuned the models on SPHINX without any pre-pended shots, referring to this as SPHINX-0s. As shown in Figure 5 (with detailed results in Appendix §A.2), models fine-tuned on SPHINX especially MISTRAL-7B exhibits superior performance compared to its counterparts fine-tuned on other datasets across all benchmarks. Moreover, fine-tuning both PHI-3-SMALL and the MISTRAL-7B on SPHINX using the *LANG* strategy further boosts the performance by **3.2%pt** and **10%pt** respectively as compared to the base model fine-tuned without this strategy. Surprisingly, even




Figure 5: Overall performance for both MISTRAL-7B and PHI-3-SMALL on our dataset and fine-tuning recipe. Legend: Base_Model: Base Model, IFT: Instruction Fine-Tuned variant of the Base Model available publicly, Bactrian: Base model trained on Bactrian dataset, mAlpaca: Base Model trained on mAlpaca dataset, Aya: Base Model trained on a subset of the Aya dataset, Sphinx-0s: Base Model trained in a 0-shot fashion on the SPHINX dataset, Sphinx: Base model trained using *LANG* on SPHINX dataset

without the *LANG* strategy, models instruction-tuned on SPHINX still perform better than those tuned on other datasets with *LANG*.

Furthermore, employing the *LANG* strategy leads to additional performance improvements indicating that *LANG* can effectively enhance the multilingual capabilities of LLMs. From the detailed results in Appendix §A.2, we observe no performance regression on high resource languages which normally occurs due to catastrophic forgetting (Chang et al., 2023).

We also observe significant performance improvements in medium and low-resource languages such as Arabic, Hindi, Thai, Turkish, Tamil, and Telugu, further showcasing the effectiveness of our dataset and the *LANG* fine-tuning strategy (Appendix §A.2).

6.1 Regression Analysis on Standard LLM Benchmarks

It is well-studied that training on multiple languages cause regression on the performance on English language due to catastrophic forgetting (Chang et al., 2023). We test this by checking for performance of the PHI-3-SMALL model fine-tuned with SPHINX on English in the multilingual benchmarks we evaluate ((Appendix §A.2) and on popular English-only benchmarks.

We find that the PHI-3-SMALL SPHINX model maintains its performance in English on the multilingual benchmarks and is also consistently able to

maintain performance on standard English benchmarks such as MMLU (5-shot) Hendrycks et al. (2021), MedQA (2-shot) Jin et al. (2021), Arc-C (10-shot), Arc-E (10-shot) Clark et al. (2018), PiQA (5-shot) Bisk et al. (2020), WinoGrande (5-shot) Sakaguchi et al. (2021), OpenBookQA (10-shot) Mihaylov et al. (2018), BoolQ (2-shot) Clark et al. (2019) and CommonSenseQA (10-shot) Talmor et al. (2018) (Table 10). We notice some regression in the GSM-8k (8-shot, CoT) Cobbe et al. (2021) benchmark. This indicates that gains in multilingual performance caused by SPHINX do not come at the cost of regression in English performance.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we demonstrated how instruction tuning PHI-3-SMALL and MISTRAL-7B on SPHINX effectively improve their multilingual capabilities. We observed that instruction tuning the models using the SPHINX dataset leads to consistent gains on an average by **4.2%pt** for PHI-3-SMALL and **5%pt** for MISTRAL-7B respectively. We find that the PHI-3-SMALL model instruction tuned on SPHINX is the best performing model on multilingual benchmarks. Moreover, SPHINX exhibits greater sample efficiency and diversity compared to other multilingual instruction tuning datasets.

Additionally, we proposed a method for further enhancing the model’s performance by utilizing

LANG, which supplements the training examples with N samples from a few-shot set, providing the model with additional context to aid in its learning process. This further boosts the performance for both PHI-3-SMALL and MISTRAL-7B by **3.2%pt** and **10%pt** respectively. Models instruction-tuned on SPHINX, exhibit enhanced performance even in languages they have not previously encountered during training. Finally, we evaluate the performance of the PHI-3-SMALL model fine-tuned on SPHINX and find that it is able to maintain English performance, suggesting that gains in multilingual performance do not come at the cost of English performance while fine-tuning with SPHINX. Through our comprehensive experiments, analyses, and findings, we aim to contribute to the progress of LLMs for multilingual purposes, promoting advancements in natural language processing across a broader spectrum of languages.

8 Future Work

We have conducted all experiments using 7B base models in full parameter fine-tuning settings. It would be interesting to study the same effect by adaptive learning using LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) or PEFT (Mangrulkar et al., 2022). We believe that our strategies could also be effective for models with fewer parameters, leading to a notable improvement in multilingual performance.

Our *LANG* strategy involves utilizing N examples from the same language. Other ideas that can be explored are incorporating N examples from the same language script to increase the diversity of the sample. This approach could be particularly beneficial for enhancing the performance of models in low-resource languages.

Limitations

Our study has several limitations that can be considered in future research. Firstly, we conducted an extensive series of experiments, utilizing significant GPU resources and substantial time for model fine-tuning. Due to these resource-intensive processes, it may be difficult to apply our strategies to fully fine-tune a model. Besides, our study is confined to 7B models, explicitly excluding larger models. Despite this limitation, we believe our methodologies are broadly applicable for fine-tuning smaller datasets using techniques like LoRA and PEFT. Secondly, our fine-tuning dataset focuses on reasoning tasks and excludes some low-resource lan-

guages. We evaluated the models' performance against these reasoning benchmarks. However, we did not benchmark our models on generative tasks such as summarization, nor did we evaluate models on hallucination, toxicity, or fairness.

Ethics Statement

Despite our rigorous efforts to ensure that our dataset is free from discriminatory, biased, or false information, there remains a possibility that these problems are present, particularly in multilingual contexts. Hence, it is possible that these issues might propagate to our fine-tuned models as well. We are committed to mitigate such risks and strongly advocate for the responsible use of recipes and prevent any unintended negative consequences.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Orca team at Microsoft Research for sharing the Orca dataset to implement the synthetic dataset creation recipe.

References

- Marah Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Harkirat Behl, Alon Benhaim, Misha Bilenko, Johan Bjorck, Sébastien Bubeck, Martin Cai, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Weizhu Chen, Vishrav Chaudhary, Parul Chopra, Allie Del Giorno, Gustavo de Rosa, Matthew Dixon, Ronen Eldan, Dan Iter, Amit Garg, Abhishek Goswami, Suriya Gunasekar, Emman Haider, Junheng Hao, Russell J. Hewett, Jamie Huynh, Mojan Javaheripi, Xin Jin, Piero Kauffmann, Nikos Karampatziakis, Dongwoo Kim, Mahoud Khademi, Lev Kurilenko, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Chen Liang, Weishung Liu, Eric Lin, Zeqi Lin, Piyush Madan, Arindam Mitra, Hardik Modi, Anh Nguyen, Brandon Norrick, Barun Patra, Daniel Perez-Becker, Thomas Portet, Reid Pryzant, Heyang Qin, Marko Radmilac, Corby Rosset, Sambudha Roy, Olatunji Ruwase, Olli Saarikivi, Amin Saied, Adil Salim, Michael Santacrose, Shital Shah, Ning Shang, Hiteshi Sharma, Xia Song, Masahiro Tanaka, Xin Wang, Rachel Ward, Guanhua Wang, Philipp Witte, Michael Wyatt, Can Xu, Jiahang Xu, Sonali Yadav, Fan Yang, Ziyi Yang, Donghan Yu, Chengruidong Zhang, Cyril Zhang, Jianwen Zhang, Li Lyna Zhang, Yi Zhang, Yue Zhang, Yunan Zhang, and Xiren Zhou. 2024. [Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone.](#)
- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman,

- Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Divyanshu Aggarwal, Ashutosh Sathe, and Sunayana Sitaram. 2024. Maple: Multilingual evaluation of parameter efficient finetuning of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07598*.
- Kabir Ahuja, Harshita Diddee, Rishav Hada, Millicent Ochieng, Krithika Ramesh, Prachi Jain, Akshay Nambi, Tanuja Ganu, Sameer Segal, Maxamed Axmed, et al. 2023. Mega: Multilingual evaluation of generative ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12528*.
- Sanchit Ahuja, Divyanshu Aggarwal, Varun Gumma, Ishaan Watts, Ashutosh Sathe, Millicent Ochieng, Rishav Hada, Prachi Jain, Maxamed Axmed, Kalika Bali, and Sunayana Sitaram. 2024. [Megaverse: Benchmarking large language models across languages, modalities, models and tasks](#).
- Mikel Artetxe, Sebastian Ruder, and Dani Yogatama. 2020. [On the cross-lingual transferability of monolingual representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4623–4637, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Akari Asai, Sneha Kudugunta, Xinyan Velocity Yu, Terra Blevins, Hila Gonen, Machel Reid, Yulia Tsvetkov, Sebastian Ruder, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. Buffet: Benchmarking large language models for few-shot cross-lingual transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14857*.
- Akari Asai, Shayne Longpre, Jungo Kasai, Chia-Hsuan Lee, Rui Zhang, Junjie Hu, Ikuya Yamada, Jonathan H Clark, and Eunsol Choi. 2022. Mia 2022 shared task: Evaluating cross-lingual open-retrieval question answering for 16 diverse languages. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Multilingual Information Access (MIA)*, pages 108–120.
- Abhinand Balachandran. 2023. Tamil-llama: A new tamil language model based on llama 2. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05845*.
- Lucas Bandarkar, Davis Liang, Benjamin Muller, Mikel Artetxe, Satya Narayan Shukla, Donald Husa, Naman Goyal, Abhinandan Krishnan, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Madian Khabsa. 2023. [The belebele benchmark: a parallel reading comprehension dataset in 122 language variants](#).
- Marco Baroni and Silvia Bernardini. 2006. A new approach to the study of translationese: Machine-learning the difference between original and translated text. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 21(3):259–274.
- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. 2020. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- T Tony Cai and Rong Ma. 2022. Theoretical foundations of t-sne for visualizing high-dimensional clustered data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(301):1–54.
- Tyler A Chang, Catherine Arnett, Zhuowen Tu, and Benjamin K Bergen. 2023. When is multilinguality a curse? language modeling for 250 high-and low-resource languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09205*.
- Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Boolq: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10044*.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Mike Conover, Matt Hayes, Ankit Mathur, Jianwei Xie, Jun Wan, Sam Shah, Ali Ghodsi, Patrick Wendell, Matei Zaharia, and Reynold Xin. 2023. [Free dolly: Introducing the world’s first truly open instruction-tuned llm](#).
- Yiming Cui, Ziqing Yang, and Xin Yao. 2023. [Efficient and effective text encoding for chinese llama and alpaca](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08177*.
- Gautier Dagan, Gabriele Synnaeve, and Baptiste Rozière. 2024. Getting the most out of your tokenizer for pre-training and domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01035*.
- Jay Gala, Thanmay Jayakumar, Jaavid Aktar Husain, Mohammed Safi Ur Rahman Khan, Diptesh Kanojia, Ratish Puduppully, Mitesh M Khapra, Raj Dabre, Rudra Murthy, Anoop Kunchukuttan, et al. 2024. Airavata: Introducing hindi instruction-tuned llm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15006*.
- Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Alain Le Noac’h, Haonan Li, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Chris Ociepa, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Hailey Schoelkopf, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. 2023. [A framework for few-shot language model evaluation](#).

- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*.
- Amr Hendy, Mohamed Abdelrehim, Amr Sharaf, Vikas Raunak, Mohamed Gabr, Hitokazu Matsushita, Young Jin Kim, Mohamed Afify, and Hany Hassan Awadalla. 2023. How good are gpt models at machine translation? a comprehensive evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09210*.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. **LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models**. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Junjie Hu, Sebastian Ruder, Aditya Siddhant, Graham Neubig, Orhan Firat, and Melvin Johnson. 2020. Xtreme: A massively multilingual multi-task benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual generalisation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4411–4421. PMLR.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. **Mistral 7b**.
- Wenxiang Jiao, Wenxuan Wang, Jen-tse Huang, Xing Wang, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2023. Is chat-gpt a good translator? yes with gpt-4 as the engine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08745*.
- Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. 2021. What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams. *Applied Sciences*, 11(14):6421.
- Haonan Li, Fajri Koto, Minghao Wu, Alham Fikri Aji, and Timothy Baldwin. 2023. **Bactrian-x : A multilingual replicable instruction-following model with low-rank adaptation**.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Mikel Artetxe, Tianlu Wang, Shuohui Chen, Daniel Simig, Myle Ott, Nanman 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.
- Junpeng Liu, Kaiyu Huang, Hao Yu, Jiuyi Li, Jinsong Su, and Degen Huang. 2023. **Continual learning for multilingual neural machine translation via dual importance-based model division**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12011–12027, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, and Adam Roberts. 2023. The flan collection: designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’23*. JMLR.org.
- Shayne Longpre, Yi Lu, and Joachim Daiber. 2021. Mlqa: A linguistically diverse benchmark for multilingual open domain question answering. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1389–1406.
- Sourab Mangrulkar, Sylvain Gugger, Lysandre Debut, Younes Belkada, Sayak Paul, and Benjamin Bossan. 2022. Peft: State-of-the-art parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods. <https://github.com/huggingface/peft>.
- Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2018. Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02789*.
- Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2021. **Cross-task generalization via natural language crowdsourcing instructions**. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Arindam Mitra, Luciano Del Corro, Shweti Mahajan, Andres Coda, Clarisse Simoes, Sahaj Agarwal, Xuxi Chen, Anastasia Razdaibiedina, Erik Jones, Kriti Aggarwal, et al. 2023. Orca 2: Teaching small language models how to reason. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11045*.
- Nasrin Mostafazadeh, Michael Roth, Annie Louis, Nathanael Chambers, and James Allen. 2017. Lsdsem 2017 shared task: The story cloze test. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Linking Models of Lexical, Sentential and Discourse-level Semantics*, pages 46–51.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Hailey Schoelkopf, Xiangru Tang, Dragomir Radev, Alham Fikri Aji, Khalid Almubarak, Samuel Albanie, Zaid Alyafeai, Albert Webson, Edward Raff, and Colin Raffel. 2023. **Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15991–16111, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng-Xin Yong, Hailey Schoelkopf, et al. 2022. Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01786*.
- Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. 2023. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02707*.
- Xuan-Phi Nguyen, Wenxuan Zhang, Xin Li, Mahani Aljunied, Qingyu Tan, Liying Cheng, Guanzheng Chen, Yue Deng, Sen Yang, Chaoqun Liu, et al. 2023. Seallms—large language models for southeast asia. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00738*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Edoardo Maria Ponti, Goran Glavaš, Olga Majewska, Qianchu Liu, Ivan Vulić, and Anna Korhonen. 2020. **XCOPA: A multilingual dataset for causal commonsense reasoning**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2362–2376, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Libo Qin, Qiguang Chen, Yuhang Zhou, Zhi Chen, Yinghui Li, Lizi Liao, Min Li, Wanxiang Che, and Philip S Yu. 2024. Multilingual large language model: A survey of resources, taxonomy and frontiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04925*.
- Jeff Rasley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. **DeepSpeed: System optimizations enable training deep learning models with over 100 billion parameters**. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '20*, page 3505–3506, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. **Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks**. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. **Making monolingual sentence embeddings multilingual using knowledge distillation**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sebastian Ruder, Noah Constant, Jan Botha, Aditya Siddhant, Orhan Firat, Jinlan Fu, Pengfei Liu, Junjie Hu, Dan Garrette, Graham Neubig, et al. 2021. Xtreme-r: Towards more challenging and nuanced multilingual evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07412*.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106.
- Shivalika Singh, Freddie Vargus, Daniel Dsouza, Börje F. Karlsson, Abinaya Mahendiran, Wei-Yin Ko, Herumb Shandilya, Jay Patel, Deividas Matciunas, Laura OMahony, Mike Zhang, Ramith Hettiarachchi, Joseph Wilson, Marina Machado, Luisa Souza Moura, Dominik Krzemiński, Hakimeh Fadaei, Irem Ergün, Ifeoma Okoh, Aisha Alaagib, Oshan Mudannayake, Zaid Alyafeai, Vu Minh Chien, Sebastian Ruder, Surya Guthikonda, Emad A. Alghamdi, Sebastian Gehrmann, Niklas Muennighoff, Max Bartolo, Julia Kreutzer, Ahmet Üstün, Marzieh Fadaee, and Sara Hooker. 2024. **Aya dataset: An open-access collection for multilingual instruction tuning**.
- Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2018. Commonsenseqa: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00937*.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.
- Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, Pouya Tafti, Léonard Hussenot, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Adam Roberts, Aditya Barua, Alex Botev, Alex Castro-Ros, Ambrose Slone, Amélie Héliou, Andrea Tacchetti, Anna Bulanova, Antonia Paterson, Beth Tsai, Bobak Shahriari, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Clément Crepy, Daniel Cer, Daphne Ippolito, David Reid, Elena Buchatskaya, Eric Ni, Eric Noland, Geng Yan, George Tucker, George-Christian Muraru, Grigory Rozhdestvenskiy, Henryk Michalewski, Ian Tenney, Ivan Grishchenko, Jacob Austin, James Keeling, Jane Labanowski, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Jeff Stanway, Jenny Brennan, Jeremy Chen, Johan Ferret, Justin Chiu, Justin Mao-Jones, Katherine Lee, Kathy Yu, Katie Millican, Lars Lowe Sjoesund, Lisa Lee, Lucas Dixon, Machel Reid, Maciej Mikuła, Mateo Wirth, Michael Sharrman, Nikolai Chinaev, Nithum Thain, Olivier Bachem, Oscar Chang, Oscar Wahltinez, Paige Bailey, Paul Michel, Petko Yotov, Rahma Chaabouni, Ramona Comanescu, Reena Jana, Rohan Anil, Ross McIlroy, Ruibo Liu, Ryan Mullins, Samuel L Smith, Sebastian Borgeaud, Sertan Girgin, Sholto Douglas, Shree Pandya, Siamak Shakeri, Soham De, Ted Klimenko, Tom Hennigan, Vlad Feinberg, Wojciech Stokowiec, Yu hui Chen, Zafarali Ahmed, Zhitao Gong, Tris Warkentin, Ludovic Peran, Minh Giang, Clément Farabet, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Koray

- Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis, Zoubin Ghahramani, Douglas Eck, Joelle Barral, Fernando Pereira, Eli Collins, Armand Joulin, Noah Fiedel, Evan Senter, Alek Andreev, and Kathleen Kenealy. 2024. [Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology](#).
- Alexey Tikhonov and Max Ryabinin. 2021. [It's all in the heads: Using attention heads as a baseline for cross-lingual transfer in commonsense reasoning](#).
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Ahmet Üstün, Viraat Aryabumi, Zheng-Xin Yong, Wei-Yin Ko, Daniel D'souza, Gbemileke Onilude, Neel Bhandari, Shivalika Singh, Hui-Lee Ooi, Amr Kayid, et al. 2024. [Aya model: An instruction finetuned open-access multilingual language model](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07827*.
- Hai Wang, Dian Yu, Kai Sun, Janshu Chen, and Dong Yu. 2019. [Improving pre-trained multilingual models with vocabulary expansion](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12440*.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hananeh Hajishirzi. 2022. [Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023a. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#).
- Xiangpeng Wei, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Tianhao Li, Pei Zhang, Xingzhang Ren, Mei Li, Yu Wan, Zhiwei Cao, Binbin Xie, et al. 2023b. [Polylm: An open source polyglot large language model](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06018*.
- Yuemei Xu, Ling Hu, Jiayi Zhao, Zihan Qiu, Yuqi Ye, and Hanwen Gu. 2024. [A survey on multilingual large language models: Corpora, alignment, and bias](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00929*.
- Shengyu Zhang, Linfeng Dong, Xiaoya Li, Sen Zhang, Xiaofei Sun, Shuhe Wang, Jiwei Li, Runyi Hu, Tianwei Zhang, Fei Wu, et al. 2023. [Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10792*.
- Jun Zhao, Zhihao Zhang, Luhui Gao, Qi Zhang, Tao Gui, and Xuanjing Huang. 2024. [Llama beyond english: An empirical study on language capability transfer](#).

A Appendix

A.1 Prompt Templates

Figure 6 is the template for **Selective Translation** that was used to generate the synthetic data. Our reference dataset is in English and the {language} is the target language to generate the data in. Figure 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are the prompts used to evaluate XQuAD, XstoryCloze, Xwinograd, XCOPA and Belebele respectively.

A.2 Detailed Results

Tables 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 show the granular results on our models and dataset.

```
Please carefully convert a conversation between a human and an AI assistant from English to language. The dialogue will be presented in JSON format, where 'system' denotes system instructions, 'human' indicates user queries, and 'assistant' refers to the AI's response. You should approach this task as if the 'human' original language is {language}. Translate the 'system' instructions fully into {language}. For the 'human' input, however, carefully discern which segments require translation into {language}, while leaving other parts in their original form.
For instance: 1. If the human contains a mix of languages, only translate the instruction part.
2. If the task is about language correction do not translate the target passage.

For the 'assistant' part, generate the 'assistant' response as you were prompted with this newly translated system and assistant instructions. The outcome should retain the JSON format. Your response should solely contain the JSON. Do not translate the JSON keys. {"system": "System text here", "human": "User text here", "assistant": "Assistant text here" }
```

Figure 6: Prompt for Selective Translation using GPT-4

```
The task is to solve reading comprehension problems. You will be provided questions on a set of passages and you will need to provide the answer as it appears in the passage. The answer should be in the same language as the question and the passage.
Context:
{context}
Question:
{question}
Referring to the passage above, the correct answer to the given question is {answer}
```

Figure 7: XQuAD evaluation prompt

```
{input_sentence_1} {input_sentence_2}
{input_sentence_3} {input_sentence_4}
What is a possible continuation for the story given the following options?
Option1: {sentence_quiz1} Option1: {sentence_quiz2}
```

Figure 8: XstoryCloze evaluation prompt

```
Select the correct option out of option1 and option2 that will fill in the _ in the below sentence:
{sentence}
Choices:
-option1: {option1}
-option2: {option2}
```

Figure 9: Xwinograd evaluation prompt

```
The task is to perform open-domain commonsense causal reasoning. You will be provided a premise and two alternatives, where the task is to select the alternative that more plausibly has a causal relation with the premise. Answer as concisely as possible in the same format as the examples below: Given this premise:
{premise}
What's the best option?
-choice1 : {choice1}
-choice2 : {choice2}
We are looking for{% if question == 'cause%' } a cause {% else % } an effect {% endif %}
```

Figure 10: XCOPA evaluation prompt

```
The task is to perform reading comprehension task. Given the following passage, query, and answer choices, output only the letter corresponding to the correct answer. Do not give me any explanations to your answer. Just a single letter corresponding to the correct answer will suffice.
Passage: {flores_passage}
Query: {question}
Choices:
A: {mc_answer1}
B: {mc_answer2}
C: {mc_answer3}
D: {mc_answer4}
```

Figure 11: Belebele evaluation prompt

| Hyperparameter | Value |
|----------------|---------------|
| Batch Size | 512 |
| Context length | 8192 |
| Learning Rate | $10 * e^{-5}$ |
| Scheduler | Cosine |
| Epochs | 10 |
| Weight Decay | 0.1 |
| Optimizer | AdamW |

Table 2: Hyperparameters for model fine-tuning

| N | $p(N)$ | N | $p(N)$ |
|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| 0 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.1 |
| 1 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.1 |
| 2 | 0.1 | 6 | 0.1 |
| 3 | 0.1 | | |

Table 3: Probabilities of selecting number of shots in the LANG strategy

| Language | en | fr | jp | pt | ru | zh | avg |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MISTRAL-7B | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.52 | 0.47 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.50 | 0.52 |
| IFT | 0.61 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.58 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.61 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.58 |
| AYA | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.56 | 0.54 | 0.55 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.61 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.58 |
| SPHINX-0s | 0.75 | 0.65 | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.65 | 0.68 |
| SPHINX | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.72 | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.71 |
| PHI-3-SMALL | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.86 | 0.67 | 0.73 | 0.77 | 0.74 | 0.72 | 0.75 |
| IFT | 0.86 | 0.78 | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.77 | 0.75 | 0.78 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.87 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.71 | 0.81 |
| AYA | 0.79 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.66 | 0.69 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.83 | 0.72 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.70 | 0.68 | 0.73 |
| SPHINX-0s | 0.89 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.76 | 0.80 |
| SPHINX | <u>0.89</u> | <u>0.76</u> | <u>0.79</u> | 0.78 | <u>0.82</u> | <u>0.77</u> | <u>0.84</u> |

Table 4: Language-wise performance of instruction-tuned MISTRAL-7B and PHI-3-SMALL models evaluated on XWinograd (0-shot). Metric: Accuracy. The best performing IFT dataset for each model is indicated in bold, and the overall best performing IFT model is indicated with an underline.

| Language | ar | de | el | en | es | hi | ro | ru | th | tr | vi | zh | avg |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MISTRAL-7B | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.62 | 0.81 | 0.64 | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.65 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.59 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.76 | 0.74 |
| IFT | 0.42 | 0.68 | 0.33 | 0.92 | 0.66 | 0.5 | 0.71 | 0.61 | 0.38 | 0.63 | 0.71 | 0.68 | 0.60 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.10 | 0.75 | 0.15 | 0.86 | 0.82 | 0.12 | 0.62 | 0.68 | 0.12 | 0.38 | 0.52 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| AYA | 0.33 | 0.73 | 0.65 | 0.85 | 0.8 | 0.63 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 0.57 | 0.61 | 0.75 | 0.59 | 0.66 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.67 | 0.76 | 0.26 | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.59 | 0.69 | 0.77 | 0.65 | 0.69 |
| SPHINX-0s | 0.54 | 0.76 | 0.7 | 0.88 | 0.84 | 0.69 | 0.77 | 0.66 | 0.52 | 0.64 | 0.71 | 0.60 | 0.69 |
| SPHINX | 0.74 | 0.87 | 0.76 | 0.93 | 0.90 | 0.79 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.63 | 0.76 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.80 |
| PHI-3-SMALL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.68 | 0.90 | 0.77 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.61 | 0.84 | 0.80 | 0.55 | 0.73 | 0.86 | 0.69 | 0.78 |
| IFT | 0.71 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.64 | 0.84 | 0.80 | 0.44 | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.76 | 0.75 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.55 | 0.92 | 0.74 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 0.68 | 0.87 | 0.85 | 0.50 | 0.73 | 0.88 | 0.66 | 0.77 |
| AYA | 0.61 | 0.89 | 0.84 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 0.82 | 0.73 | 0.83 | 0.92 | 0.79 | 0.83 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.81 | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.80 | 0.91 | 0.84 | 0.74 | 0.82 | 0.92 | 0.79 | 0.85 |
| SPHINX-0s | 0.75 | 0.89 | 0.81 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.75 | 0.87 | 0.79 | 0.63 | 0.77 | 0.88 | 0.78 | 0.82 |
| SPHINX | <u>0.84</u> | <u>0.93</u> | <u>0.87</u> | <u>0.96</u> | <u>0.96</u> | <u>0.81</u> | <u>0.91</u> | <u>0.86</u> | <u>0.73</u> | <u>0.84</u> | <u>0.92</u> | <u>0.81</u> | <u>0.87</u> |

Table 5: Granular results for XQuAD (3-shot) on our model. Metric: F1. The best performing IFT dataset for each model is indicated in bold, and the overall best performing IFT model is indicated with an underline.

| Language | et | ht | id | it | qu | sw | ta | th | tr | vi | zh | en | avg |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MISTRAL-7B | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.54 | 0.51 | 0.72 | 0.81 | 0.49 | 0.52 | 0.50 | 0.53 | 0.58 | 0.62 | 0.78 | 0.93 | 0.63 |
| IFT | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.69 | 0.79 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.54 | 0.57 | 0.63 | 0.75 | 0.90 | 0.62 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.63 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.55 |
| AYA | 0.57 | 0.54 | 0.64 | 0.67 | 0.53 | 0.56 | 0.57 | 0.62 | 0.56 | 0.61 | 0.64 | 0.78 | 0.61 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.52 | 0.50 | 0.53 | 0.60 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.71 | 0.54 |
| sPHINX-0s | 0.54 | 0.5 | 0.58 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.57 | 0.64 | 0.8 | 0.58 |
| sPHINX | <u>0.64</u> | 0.54 | 0.73 | 0.80 | 0.53 | 0.61 | 0.59 | 0.63 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.80 | 0.91 | 0.68 |
| PHI-3-SMALL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.55 | 0.51 | 0.80 | 0.93 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.46 | 0.56 | 0.61 | 0.66 | 0.86 | 0.98 | 0.64 |
| IFT | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.81 | 0.93 | 0.53 | 0.58 | 0.48 | 0.60 | 0.62 | 0.69 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 0.68 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.53 | 0.54 | 0.80 | 0.92 | 0.49 | 0.54 | 0.51 | 0.59 | 0.64 | 0.68 | 0.87 | 0.99 | 0.68 |
| AYA | 0.60 | 0.55 | 0.72 | 0.83 | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.62 | 0.59 | 0.69 | 0.75 | 0.89 | 0.65 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.62 | 0.56 | 0.83 | 0.91 | 0.54 | 0.62 | 0.52 | 0.66 | 0.65 | 0.71 | 0.86 | 0.99 | 0.71 |
| sPHINX-0s | 0.59 | 0.58 | 0.85 | 0.94 | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.54 | 0.63 | 0.69 | 0.72 | 0.89 | 0.96 | 0.71 |
| sPHINX | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.85 | 0.94 | 0.52 | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.71 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 0.72 |

Table 6: Granular results for XCOPA (4-shot) on our model. Metric: Accuracy. The best performing IFT dataset for each model is indicated in bold, and the overall best performing IFT model is indicated with an underline.

| Language | ar | en | es | eu | hi | id | my | ru | sw | te | zh | avg |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MISTRAL-7B | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.65 | 0.89 | 0.83 | 0.56 | 0.62 | 0.76 | 0.52 | 0.81 | 0.56 | 0.52 | 0.80 | 0.68 |
| IFT | 0.70 | 0.96 | 0.92 | 0.54 | 0.69 | 0.79 | 0.57 | 0.90 | 0.58 | 0.54 | 0.88 | 0.73 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.53 | 0.73 | 0.7 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.57 | 0.50 | 0.66 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.71 | 0.59 |
| AYA | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.81 | 0.56 | 0.71 | 0.73 | 0.60 | 0.82 | 0.67 | 0.60 | 0.81 | 0.71 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.69 | 0.82 | 0.74 | 0.52 | 0.59 | 0.76 | 0.54 | 0.73 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 0.76 | 0.67 |
| sPHINX-0s | 0.57 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.47 | 0.56 | 0.61 | 0.50 | 0.62 | 0.56 | 0.52 | 0.69 | 0.58 |
| sPHINX | 0.83 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 0.57 | 0.84 | 0.87 | 0.61 | 0.91 | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.94 | 0.81 |
| PHI-3-SMALL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.80 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.61 | 0.72 | 0.92 | 0.53 | 0.96 | 0.61 | 0.55 | 0.94 | 0.78 |
| IFT | 0.81 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.61 | 0.75 | 0.92 | 0.56 | 0.96 | 0.61 | 0.53 | 0.94 | 0.79 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.81 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.58 | 0.76 | 0.93 | 0.52 | 0.97 | 0.64 | 0.54 | 0.96 | 0.79 |
| AYA | 0.77 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 0.57 | 0.77 | 0.93 | 0.53 | 0.96 | 0.74 | 0.56 | 0.94 | 0.79 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.61 | 0.83 | 0.94 | 0.54 | 0.97 | 0.79 | 0.63 | 0.94 | 0.82 |
| sPHINX-0s | 0.84 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 0.64 | 0.77 | 0.95 | 0.52 | 0.96 | 0.74 | 0.57 | 0.95 | 0.81 |
| sPHINX | 0.86 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.61 | 0.82 | 0.96 | 0.54 | 0.98 | 0.74 | 0.61 | 0.97 | 0.82 |

Table 7: Granular results for XStoryCloze (4-shot) on our model. Metric: Accuracy. The best performing IFT dataset for each model is indicated in bold, and the overall best performing IFT model is indicated with an underline.

| Language | ar | de | es | en | fi | fr | hi | it | jp | ko | ta | te | vi | zh | avg |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MISTRAL-7B | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.26 | 0.24 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.24 |
| IFT | 0.32 | 0.60 | 0.62 | 0.74 | 0.36 | 0.62 | 0.32 | 0.61 | 0.43 | 0.47 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.39 | 0.58 | 0.47 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.32 | 0.50 | 0.53 | 0.56 | 0.45 | 0.51 | 0.27 | 0.51 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.41 |
| AYA | 0.34 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.48 | 0.38 | 0.47 | 0.35 | 0.44 | 0.4 | 0.36 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.37 | 0.42 | 0.38 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.28 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.34 | 0.28 | 0.26 |
| SPHINX-0s | 0.64 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.66 | 0.79 | 0.53 | 0.73 | 0.69 | 0.66 | 0.48 | 0.44 | 0.66 | 0.75 | 0.67 |
| SPHINX | 0.69 | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.87 | 0.71 | 0.82 | <u>0.60</u> | 0.79 | 0.73 | 0.73 | <u>0.56</u> | <u>0.48</u> | 0.70 | 0.80 | 0.71 |
| PHI-3-SMALL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.54 | 0.87 | 0.85 | 0.92 | 0.58 | 0.86 | 0.41 | 0.86 | 0.70 | 0.58 | 0.26 | 0.30 | 0.62 | 0.82 | 0.65 |
| IFT | 0.63 | 0.89 | 0.88 | 0.93 | 0.63 | 0.88 | 0.48 | 0.88 | 0.77 | 0.68 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.68 | 0.85 | 0.70 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.65 | 0.92 | 0.90 | 0.94 | 0.74 | 0.91 | 0.54 | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.47 | 0.45 | 0.72 | 0.84 | 0.75 |
| Aya | 0.58 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 0.91 | 0.65 | 0.87 | 0.50 | 0.86 | 0.76 | 0.67 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.69 | 0.84 | 0.70 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.67 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.70 | 0.88 | 0.51 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.70 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.74 | 0.86 | 0.72 |
| SPHINX-0s | 0.73 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 0.75 | 0.92 | 0.57 | 0.91 | 0.82 | <u>0.82</u> | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.76 | 0.89 | 0.77 |
| SPHINX | 0.74 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.94 | 0.77 | 0.93 | 0.58 | 0.92 | 0.84 | 0.76 | 0.46 | 0.40 | 0.78 | 0.89 | 0.79 |

Table 8: Granular results for Belebele (0-shot) on our model. Metric: Accuracy. The best performing IFT dataset for each model is indicated in bold, and the overall best performing IFT model is indicated with an underline.

| Model | XC | XS | XW | XQ | BL |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MISTRAL-7B | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.63 | 0.68 | 0.52 | 0.74 | 0.24 |
| IFT | 0.62 | 0.73 | 0.54 | 0.60 | 0.47 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.55 | 0.59 | 0.51 | 0.46 | 0.41 |
| AYA | 0.68 | 0.71 | 0.54 | 0.66 | 0.38 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.54 | 0.67 | 0.54 | 0.69 | 0.26 |
| SPHINX-0s | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.68 | 0.69 | 0.67 |
| SPHINX | 0.68 | 0.81 | 0.71 | 0.80 | 0.71 |
| PHI-3-SMALL | | | | | |
| Base Model | 0.64 | 0.78 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.65 |
| IFT | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.78 | 0.75 | 0.70 |
| M-ALPACA | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.77 | 0.75 |
| AYA | 0.65 | 0.79 | 0.69 | 0.83 | 0.72 |
| BACTRIAN | 0.71 | 0.82 | 0.73 | 0.85 | 0.77 |
| SPHINX-0s | 0.71 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.82 | <u>0.79</u> |
| SPHINX | <u>0.72</u> | <u>0.84</u> | <u>0.87</u> | <u>0.87</u> | <u>0.79</u> |

Table 9: Performance of MISTRAL-7B and PHI-3-SMALL instruction-tuned for 10000 training steps on various datasets. Abbreviations: XC - XCOPA, XS - XStoryCloze, XW - XWinograd, XQ - XQuAD, BL - Belebele. The best performing IFT dataset for each model is indicated in bold, and the overall best performing IFT model is indicated with an underline.

| Benchmarks | Base Model | SPHINX |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| MMLU (5-shot) | 0.76 | 0.75 |
| HellaSwag (5-shot) | 0.81 | 0.83 |
| GSM-8k (8-shot, CoT) | 0.85 | 0.77 |
| MedQA (2-shot) | 0.64 | 0.66 |
| Arc-C (10-shot) | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Arc-E (10-shot) | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| PIQA (5-shot) | 0.84 | 0.89 |
| WinoGrande (5-shot) | 0.77 | 0.82 |
| OpenBookQA (10-shot) | 0.86 | 0.88 |
| BoolQ (2-shot) | 0.82 | 0.87 |
| CommonSenseQA (10-shot) | 0.80 | 0.81 |

Table 10: Performance of the PHI-3-SMALL base model and the SPHINX tuned model on standard English LLM benchmarks.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| High-Resource (100k) | Spanish, Chinese Simplified, Japanese French, German, Portuguese, Italian |
| Mid-Resource (50k) | Dutch, Swedish, Danish Finnish, Russian, Norwegian Korean, Chinese Traditional, Polish Turkish, Arabic, Hebrew Portuguese, Czech, Hungarian |
| Low-Resource (25k) | Indonesian, Thai, Greek Slovak, Vietnamese, Slovenian Croatian, Romanian, Lithuanian Bulgarian, Serbian, Latvian Ukrainian, Estonian, Hindi Burmese, Bengali, Afrikaans Punjabi, Welsh, Icelandic Marathi, Swahili, Nepali Urdu, Telugu, Malayalam Russian, Tamil, Oriya |

Table 11: Language distribution and samples across three tiers

| Code | Languages | Script | Data |
|---------|---------------------|--------------|--------|
| af | Afrikaans | Latin | 20206 |
| ar | Arabic | Arabic | 26803 |
| bn | Bengali | Bengal | 20165 |
| bg | Bulgarian | Cyrillic | 17300 |
| my | Burmese | Burmese | 12123 |
| zh-Hans | Chinese_Simplified | Han | 100650 |
| zh-Hant | Chinese_Traditional | Hant | 32363 |
| hr | Croatian | Latin | 17340 |
| cs | Czech | Latin | 32711 |
| da | Danish | Latin | 36348 |
| nl | Dutch | Latin | 36586 |
| en | English | Latin | 199900 |
| et | Estonian | Latin | 17207 |
| fi | Finnish | Latin | 33622 |
| fr | French | Latin | 100337 |
| de | German | Latin | 100265 |
| el | Greek | Greek | 17317 |
| he | Hebrew | Hebrew | 24483 |
| hi | Hindi | Devanagari | 20240 |
| hu | Hungarian | Latin | 31999 |
| is | Icelandic | Latin | 20164 |
| id | Indonesian | Latin | 17297 |
| it | Italian | Latin | 85175 |
| jp | Japanese | Japanese | 98366 |
| ko | Korean | Hangul | 30890 |
| lv | Latvian | Latin | 17247 |
| lt | Lithuanian | Latin | 17232 |
| ml | Malayalam | Malayalam | 19817 |
| mr | Marathi | Devanagari | 20069 |
| ne | Nepali | Devanagari | 20092 |
| nb | Norwegian | Latin | 36811 |
| or | Oriya | Oriya | 19153 |
| pl | Polish | Latin | 34711 |
| pt | Portuguese | Latin | 37229 |
| pa | Punjabi | Gurmukhi | 20026 |
| ro | Romanian | Latin | 17149 |
| ru | Russian | Cyrillic | 20108 |
| sr | Serbian | Latin | 17165 |
| sk | Slovak | Latin | 17255 |
| sl | Slovenian | Latin | 17300 |
| es | Spanish | Latin | 100351 |
| sw | Swahili | Latin | 20170 |
| sv | Swedish | Latin | 36533 |
| ta | Tamil | Tamil | 19807 |
| te | Telugu | Telugu | 19947 |
| th | Thai | Thai | 17322 |
| tr | Turkish | Latin | 34405 |
| uk | Ukrainian | Cyrillic | 17282 |
| ur | Urdu | Perso-Arabic | 20162 |
| vi | Vietnamese | Latin | 17358 |
| cy | Welsh | Latin | 20207 |

Table 12: Language Distribution in Sphinx Dataset