

SynDARin: Synthesising Datasets for Automated Reasoning in Low-Resource Languages

Gayane Ghazaryan^{†1} Erik Arakelyan^{†2} Pasquale Minervini³ Isabelle Augenstein²

¹American University of Armenia ²University of Copenhagen

³University of Edinburgh

gayane_ghazaryan2@edu.aua.am erik.a@di.ku.dk

p.minervini@ed.ac.uk augenstein@di.ku.dk

Abstract

Question Answering (QA) datasets have been instrumental in developing and evaluating Large Language Model (LLM) capabilities. However, such datasets are scarce for languages other than English due to the cost and difficulties of collection and manual annotation. To mitigate this, we propose SynDARin, a method for generating and validating QA datasets for low-resource languages. We utilize parallel content mining to obtain *human-curated* paragraphs between English and the target language. We use the English data as context to *generate* synthetic multiple-choice (MC) question-answer pairs, which are automatically translated and further validated for quality. Combining these with their designated non-English *human-curated* paragraphs we obtain the final QA dataset. We show that the method allows content quality to be maintained, reduces the likelihood of factual errors, and circumvents the need for costly annotation. To test the method, we created a QA dataset with 1.2K samples for the Armenian language. The human evaluation shows that 98% of the generated English data maintains quality and diversity in the question types and topics, while the translation validation pipeline can filter out ~ 70% of data with poor quality. We use the dataset to benchmark state-of-the-art LLMs, showing their inability to achieve human accuracy with some model performances closer to random chance, showing that the dataset is a non-trivial evaluation benchmark for the low-resource language.

1 Introduction

Question Answering (QA) has been a hallmark task for testing reading comprehension and reasoning capabilities in NLP systems. The availability of numerous English benchmarks that frame the problem

as extractive, cloze-style, or open-domain reasoning tasks (Yang et al., 2015; Rajpurkar et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2017), along with novel pre-trained language models (PLMs, Devlin et al., 2019; Lewis et al., 2020a; Touvron et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023; Achiam et al., 2023) has allowed for the development and granular evaluation of QA systems that occasionally boast human-like or better performance (Devlin et al., 2019; Min et al., 2023; Rogers et al., 2023). Although some concentrated effort has been made to create multilingual QA resources (Lewis et al., 2020b; Asai et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2019), the datasets remain rather scarce and usually cover a small selected set of languages due to the labour-intensive annotation costs. The proposed methods suggest using direct machine translation (Lewis et al., 2020b; Carrino et al., 2020) or multilingual synthetic data generation (Riabi et al., 2021; Agrawal et al., 2023; Shakeri et al., 2021). However, these approaches are directly bound to introduce biases and hallucinations during translation (Artetxe et al., 2020), cross-lingual transfer (Lauscher et al., 2020; Guerreiro et al., 2023) or generation (Ahuja et al., 2023). These limitations directly hinder the possibility to *develop* and *evaluate* the multilingual QA capabilities of language models in low-resource languages.

In this work, we propose a novel method for producing QA datasets in low-resource languages that circumvents the above-mentioned obstacles and test it by creating a QA dataset for the Armenian language, which has virtually no presence of structured NLP datasets (Avetisyan and Broneske, 2023). We mine parallel English and Armenian introductory paragraphs from the same diverse set of Wikipedia articles, ensuring that the contents match by comparing their relative length. Similar mining approaches have been shown to be efficient for this task (Lewis et al., 2021; Artetxe and Schwenk, 2019). This allows us to obtain human-curated text from diverse topics while bypassing a wide

[†]Equal contribution




Figure 1: The proposed framework is comprised of three components: (i) a module for mining parallel paragraphs using wiki-API and length matching; (ii) generating a synthetic question-answering dataset with an LLM using the mined English paragraphs; (iii) translating the question-answer pairs and Filtering/Validating them for obtaining a high-quality synthetic QA dataset in the low-resource language.

chunk of direct content translation and annotation. Given the English subset of this data, we generate MC question-answer pairs by prompting an LLM to produce queries with an answer explicitly mentioned within the paragraph. Following Lewis et al. (2020b), we filter out examples that do not contain the answer substring verbatim in the paragraph and additionally perform a human evaluation on a subset of 50 examples and show that 98% of these question-answer pairs are answerable and maintain quality. The produced question-answers are subsequently translated using an automated tool and further validated by answer substring and semantic matching in the parallel Armenian paragraph. This allows us to mitigate the likelihood of hallucinated, biased, and inconsistent entries in the final QA dataset. Our human evaluation with native Armenian speakers shows that 70% of such corrupted examples are removed. We use the dataset as a reasoning benchmark for Armenian and evaluate several LLMs in zero-shot, few-shot, and fine-tuned modes. We show that the dataset cannot be trivially solved, thus highlighting it as a useful resource for measuring model performance. In sum, our contributions are as follows: (i) a novel method for QA dataset construction in low-resource languages, (ii) a QA dataset in Armenian, (iii) ablations showing the quality of the generated samples and (iv) an evaluation of several LLM families on the QA dataset.

2 Methodology

An outline of the method can be seen in Fig. 1.

2.1 Parallel Data Mining

Given parallel English and Armenian introductory paragraph tokens $\mathcal{P}_{En} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$, $\mathcal{P}_{Arm} = (T_1, \dots, T_m)$ obtained from a diverse set of Wiki articles, we want to save the segments that contain the same content. As the introductory paragraphs in Wikipedia contain highly similar information (Lewis et al., 2020b), we found that filtering out the paragraph pairs based on their relative amount of tokens, i.e. length, is sufficient. To do this, we simply define a conditional rejection process $|||\mathcal{P}_{En}|| - ||\mathcal{P}_{Arm}|| \leq K_{DM}$, where K_{DM} is the threshold for the length difference. A higher length difference would imply that the contents of the paragraphs are misaligned, thus making us reject such samples. Consequently, we are able to obtain naturally written human-curated parallel paragraphs that cover a diverse set of topics.

2.2 QA Generation

After obtaining the parallel data, we prompt an LLM \mathcal{M} with instructions $\mathcal{I} = (T_1, \dots, T_{|\mathcal{I}|})$ and 10 in-context example demonstrations $\mathcal{E} = (E_1, \dots, E_{10})$, where $\forall i, E_i = (T_1, \dots, T_{|E_i|})$, to generate diverse English MC question-answer pairs $\mathcal{K}_{Eng} = \{(q_1, a_1) \dots (q_N, a_N)\}$ given an English

Who	Where	What	When	Which	How	General	Why
304	128	1536	215	473	244	76	16

Table 1: Frequency of Question Types in the generated English question-answer pairs.

context paragraph \mathcal{P}_{En} :

$$q_i, a_i \sim \prod_{t=1}^{|\mathcal{K}_i|} P_{\mathcal{M}} \left(T_t^{(i)} \mid T_1^{(i)}, \dots, T_{t-1}^{(i)}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P}_{\text{En}} \right) \quad (1)$$

We filter out all repeating questions, $\forall \{i, j : i \neq j\}, q_i \neq q_j$, and question-answers pairs where the answer span is not exactly mentioned within the text, i.e. $a_i \not\subset \mathcal{P}_{\text{En}}$. An example input used for generation can be seen in Fig. 1. Our generation and validation pipeline resembles the ones in Lewis et al. (2021); Agrawal et al. (2023), who have shown successful question-generation results for the English language. Several examples of produced questions are available in Appendix A.

2.3 Translation and Validation

We transfer the generated question-answer pairs \mathcal{K}_{Eng} into Armenian by using the Google Translate API to obtain \mathcal{K}_{Arm} . To mitigate the inconsistencies introduced during the translation process, we save only the samples where the translated answer $a_i \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Arm}}$ is contained within and semantically related to the paragraph \mathcal{P}_{Arm} . To do this, we use a fuzzy substring matching function $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, along with a multilingual language model $\mathcal{M}_{\text{sim}} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^d$ to measure semantic similarity, where \mathcal{T} is an arbitrary set of tokens and d is the dimensionality of the embedding space of the model. Samples below a certain threshold, $\mathcal{F}(a_i, \mathcal{P}_{\text{Arm}}) \leq K_{\text{Fuzz}}$ and $\cos(\mathcal{M}(a_i), \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{Arm}})) \leq K_{\text{Sim}}$ are filtered out. Note that exact matching is insufficient, as the morphology of the translated answer tokens can vary in the low-resource language. The multiple-choice answers are balanced uniformly in the final dataset so as not to introduce a bias toward any particular answer ordering.

3 Experimental Setup

QA generation Our question-answer generation pipeline uses a prompted GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023) model, as it has been shown to be proficient in generating high-quality human-like text (Zhou et al., 2023) and synthetic data (Hämäläinen et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023).




Figure 2: The similarity heatmap from the BERTopic embeddings of the top 6 frequent topics present within the mined English paragraphs.

Substring Matching and Semantic Similarity

We use simple Levenshtein distance for constructing our fuzzy substring matching function \mathcal{F} , along with a multilingual sentence embedding language model (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) \mathcal{M}_{sim} for calculating the semantic similarity of the sentences as the cosine distance between their embeddings.

Armenian QA Benchmarking We use the generated Armenian QA dataset to benchmark GPT-3.5 (Achiam et al., 2023), CMD-R and CMD-R+ (Cohere, 2024) with $\{0, 2, 4, 6\}$ in-context examples by standard few-shot prompting (Brown et al., 2020). We further frame the task as classification with MC answers and perform supervised fine-tuning with a recipe (Mosbach et al., 2021) on XLM-RoBERTa-base (Conneau et al., 2020), with $\{32, 64, \dots, 980\}$ training samples and benchmark it on the testing set of the Armenian QA dataset. To explore if the dataset contains statistical biases or allows degenerate solutions, similar to Poliak et al. (2018), we explore the performance of XLM-RoBERTa-base trained on *question-only* and *paragraph-only* inputs.

4 Results

4.1 English QA Dataset Generation

We initially mine and match 300 parallel English and Armenian paragraphs from Wikipedia. In our generation method, we use the English data as context and produce 10 diverse questions for each paragraph with 4 MC answers per question, thus creating 3000 English question-answer pairs.

Dataset Diversity We analyse the diversity of the generated dataset by looking at the type of questions asked, presented in Table 1. We see meaning-

Filter	Accuracy			
	128	256	512	987
<i>Complete</i>	30.1%	33.5%	38.7%	39.5%
<i>paragraph-only</i>	<u>26.7%</u>	<u>28.3%</u>	<u>23.9%</u>	<u>28.3%</u>
<i>question-only</i>	<u>22.1%</u>	<u>22.7%</u>	<u>19.4%</u>	<u>23.5%</u>
<i>Random performance</i>	25.0%			

Table 2: The results of fine-tuning XLM-Roberta on the Armenian QA dataset with a varying number of training samples in different degeneracy testing scenarios.

ful variation in the generated questions in line with prior human-curated datasets (Lewis et al., 2020b; Rajpurkar et al., 2016). We further perform topic modelling with BERTopic (Grootendorst, 2022) on the mined English data and validate the diversity of the covered subjects, presented in Fig. 2. A more granular analysis of the diversity within the dataset is presented in Appendix A.

Human Evaluation To assess the data quality, we follow Lewis et al. (2021) and ask a human annotator to manually inspect 50 randomly chosen samples from the English QA dataset, showing that 98% of examples contain sufficient details to answer the question while accurately capturing contextual information.

4.2 Automatic Translation and Validation

We translate the 3000 question-answer samples into Armenian and use our validation pipeline that produces 1234 filtered examples.

Armenian QA dataset We use these samples and their designated Armenian paragraphs to form the QA dataset. We split the data into 80/20 *train/test* buckets with 987 samples in training and 247 in testing. We ensure that the paragraphs in the testing set are not contained in the train set to avoid any data leakage. We maintain a uniform distribution of MC questions within the answers, avoiding bias towards any answer ordering.

Human Evaluation To evaluate the quality of the translation validation pipeline and the overall produced datasets, we employ two native-speaking annotators tasked with investigating the produced *test* set, which is anonymously mixed with 100 random samples that were flagged as poor during validation. The annotations show that, on average, 72% of the examples marked as poor during validation were unanswerable as they either lacked sufficient context or had translation degenerations

Model Name	Accuracy			
	0	2	4	6
Command-R	58.7%	68.4%	<u>64.8%</u>	64.0%
Command-R+	39.3%	67.2%	<u>69.6%</u>	70.9%
GPT-3.5	56.3%	<u>56.3%</u>	59.1%	54.3%

Table 3: Model Accuracy with a varying number of provided in context samples before generation.

or hallucinations. The annotators, on average, were able to identify the answer correctly in 75% of cases for the *test* set of the QA dataset. We measure the inter-annotator agreement using Cohen’s $\kappa = 0.8$. These results confirm the ability of our validation pipeline to maintain the dataset quality.

Benchmarks To show the value of the created dataset, we investigate if the dataset suffers from statistical biases or degenerate solutions by training an XLM-RoBERTa model on inputs that contain only the paragraph or the question, excluding everything else from the sample. The results in Fig. 5 show that regardless of the number of training samples, the models trained with question and paragraph-only samples behave similarly to random chance, while training with complete data gradually increases the performance, highlighting that the dataset is unlikely to suffer from inconsistencies and degenerate solutions and can be used for developing QA capabilities for Armenian. We further benchmark several state-of-the-art LLMs on the produced dataset in supervised fine-tuning, *zero-shot* and *few-shot* settings. We see in Fig. 4 that even the largest models do not trivially solve the dataset, showing its utility as a benchmarking tool.



5 Conclusion

We propose a novel method for constructing QA datasets for low-resource languages and produce a dataset for the Armenian language. Systematic studies of the reliability of the individual modules to produce diverse QA samples that maintain answerability and quality show the effectiveness of the method. We further use the produced Armenian QA dataset to benchmark state-of-the-art LLMs and show the value of the proposed resource in evaluating QA reasoning capabilities in the low-resource language.

Limitations

The proposed methods have currently been tested only for a smaller-scale QA dataset creation in Armenian, thus not allowing us to complete a wider cross-lingual study. The study benchmarks should be extended and analyzed further in more multilingual, low-resource languages. In the case of extremely rare low-resource languages, the automatic translation part within our pipeline would require either the development of such a translation method, robust cross-lingual transfer from a similar language or direct manual effort, all of which are bound to introduce either qualitative or logistic complications while creating the final QA resource.

Acknowledgments

  Erik is partially funded by a DFF Sapere Aude research leader grant under grant agreement No 0171-00034B, as well as by a NEC PhD fellowship, and is supported by the Pioneer Centre for AI, DNRf grant number P1. Pasquale was partially funded by ELIAI (The Edinburgh Laboratory for Integrated Artificial Intelligence), EPSRC (grant no. EP/W002876/1), an industry grant from Cisco, and a donation from Accenture LLP. Isabelle’s research is partially funded by the European Union (ERC, ExplainYourself, 101077481), and is supported by the Pioneer Centre for AI, DNRf grant number P1. This work was supported by the Edinburgh International Data Facility (EIDF) and the Data-Driven Innovation Programme at the University of Edinburgh.

References

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*.

Priyanka Agrawal, Chris Alberti, Fantine Huot, Joshua Maynez, Ji Ma, Sebastian Ruder, Kuzman Ganchev, Dipanjan Das, and Mirella Lapata. 2023. **QAMELEON: Multilingual QA with Only 5 Examples**. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:1754–1771.

Kabir Ahuja, Harshita Diddee, Rishav Hada, Millicent Ochieng, Krithika Ramesh, Prachi Jain, Akshay Nambi, Tanuja Ganu, Sameer Segal, Mohamed Ahmed, Kalika Bali, and Sunayana Sitaram. 2023. **MEGA: Multilingual evaluation of generative AI**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages

4232–4267, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

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)*, pages 7674–7684, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Mikel Artetxe and Holger Schwenk. 2019. **Massively multilingual sentence embeddings for zero-shot cross-lingual transfer and beyond**. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:597–610.

Akari Asai, Akiko Eriguchi, Kazuma Hashimoto, and Yoshimasa Tsuruoka. 2018. Multilingual Extractive Reading Comprehension by Runtime Machine Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.03275*.

Hayastan Avetisyan and David Broneske. 2023. **Large Language Models and Low-Resource Languages: An Examination of Armenian NLP**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: IJCNLP-AACL 2023 (Findings)*, pages 199–210, Nusa Dua, Bali. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. **Language Models are Few-Shot Learners**. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.

Casimiro Pio Carrino, Marta R. Costa-jussà, and José A. R. Fonollosa. 2020. **Automatic Spanish Translation of SQuAD Dataset for Multi-lingual Question Answering**. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 5515–5523, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.

Danqi Chen, Adam Fisch, Jason Weston, and Antoine Bordes. 2017. **Reading Wikipedia to Answer Open-Domain Questions**. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1870–1879, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Cohere. 2024. Command r: Retrieval-augmented generation at production scale. <https://txt.cohere.com/command-r>.

Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco

- Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. [Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maarten Grootendorst. 2022. [BERTopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based TF-IDF procedure](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05794*.
- Nuno M. Guerreiro, Duarte M. Alves, Jonas Waldendorf, Barry Haddow, Alexandra Birch, Pierre Colombo, and André F. T. Martins. 2023. [Hallucinations in Large Multilingual Translation Models](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:1500–1517.
- Perttu Hämäläinen, Mikke Tavast, and Anton Kunnari. 2023. [Evaluating Large Language Models in Generating Synthetic HCI Research Data: a Case Study](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '23*, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Matthew Honnibal, Ines Montani, Sofie Van Landeghem, and Adriane Boyd. 2020. [spacy: Industrial-strength natural language processing in python](#). If you use spaCy, please cite it as below.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Anne Lauscher, Vinit Ravishankar, Ivan Vulić, and Goran Glavaš. 2020. [From Zero to Hero: On the Limitations of Zero-Shot Language Transfer with Multilingual Transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4483–4499, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020a. [BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Patrick Lewis, Barlas Oguz, Ruty Rinott, Sebastian Riedel, and Holger Schwenk. 2020b. [MLQA: Evaluating Cross-lingual Extractive Question Answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7315–7330, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Patrick Lewis, Yuxiang Wu, Linqing Liu, Pasquale Minervini, Heinrich Küttler, Aleksandra Piktus, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. 2021. [PAQ: 65 Million Probably-Asked Questions and What You Can Do With Them](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1098–1115.
- Zhuoyan Li, Hangxiao Zhu, Zhuoran Lu, and Ming Yin. 2023. [Synthetic Data Generation with Large Language Models for Text Classification: Potential and Limitations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10443–10461, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiahua Liu, Yankai Lin, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2019. [XQA: A Cross-lingual Open-domain Question Answering Dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2358–2368, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bonan Min, Hayley Ross, Elior Sulem, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Thien Huu Nguyen, Oscar Sainz, Eneko Agirre, Ilana Heintz, and Dan Roth. 2023. [Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing via Large Pre-trained Language Models: A Survey](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 56(2).
- Marius Mosbach, Maksym Andriushchenko, and Dietrich Klakow. 2021. [On the Stability of Fine-tuning BERT: Misconceptions, Explanations, and Strong Baselines](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Adam Poliak, Jason Naradowsky, Aparajita Haldar, Rachel Rudinger, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2018. [Hypothesis Only Baselines in Natural Language Inference](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 180–191, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. [SQuAD: 100,000+ Questions for Machine Comprehension of Text](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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 and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages

3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Arij Riabi, Thomas Scialom, Rachel Keraron, Benoît Sagot, Djamé Seddah, and Jacopo Staiano. 2021. [Synthetic Data Augmentation for Zero-Shot Cross-Lingual Question Answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7016–7030, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Anna Rogers, Matt Gardner, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2023. [QA Dataset Explosion: A Taxonomy of NLP Resources for Question Answering and Reading Comprehension](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(10).

Siamak Shakeri, Noah Constant, Mihir Kale, and Linting Xue. 2021. [Towards Zero-Shot Multilingual Synthetic Question and Answer Generation for Cross-Lingual Reading Comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 35–45, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. [Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.

Yi Yang, Wen-tau Yih, and Christopher Meek. 2015. [WikiQA: A Challenge Dataset for Open-Domain Question Answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2013–2018, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jiawei Zhou, Yixuan Zhang, Qianni Luo, Andrea G Parker, and Munmun De Choudhury. 2023. [Synthetic Lies: Understanding AI-Generated Misinformation and Evaluating Algorithmic and Human Solutions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '23*, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.




Figure 3: The similarity heatmap of the top 6 frequent topics present within the mined English paragraphs.

A Appendix

Generated Question-Answer pairs We show case examples of generated and validated question-answer pairs along with their designated English paragraph \mathcal{P}_{Eng} in Table 5. These are representative samples of the generation process, further reinforced by the fact that human evaluation of the quality of the generation showed that 98% of the examples are answerable and maintain quality.

What are the questions about? To understand the type of inquiries asked within the questions, we employ a pre-trained model for Named Entity Recognition (NER) from spaCy¹ and detect all the entity types mentioned within the question-answer pairs. The results can be seen in Table 4, showing that the object of the inquiries can vary massively from people (PERSON) and locations (LOC) to organization (ORG), numeric values (DATE, ORDINAL, TIME), etc. This further ensures that we are able to generate high-quality questions with diverse compositions and object of inquiry types.

Topic Distribution the parallel paragraphs To estimate the overlap within the topics found in the mined paragraphs, we perform unsupervised topic modelling with BERTopic (Grootendorst, 2022) to segment the 5 most frequently occurring segments. We measure the overlap between these by calculating the averaged cosine distance of the topic embeddings obtained from BERTopic. The results can be seen in Fig. 3, validating our hypothesis that we are able to cover diverse themes using our parallel paragraph mining method.

Benchmarking with Armenian QA dataset To show the usefulness of the created dataset, we benchmark several SOTA LLMs on it in supervised

¹<https://spacy.io/api/entityrecognizer>




Figure 4: Accuracy of each model with a varying number of in-context examples given before generation.




Figure 5: The results of fine-tuning XLM-Roberta on the Armenian QA dataset with a varying number of training samples while using only paragraphs, questions or random data.

fine-tuning, *zero-shot*, and *few-shot* settings. We further investigate if the dataset suffers from statistical biases or degenerate solutions by training an XLM-RoBERTa model on inputs that contain only the paragraph or the question, excluding everything else from the sample. The results in Fig. 5 show us that regardless of the amount of provided training samples, the question and paragraph-only evaluations behave similarly to random chance, highlighting that the dataset is unlikely to suffer from inconsistencies and degenerate solutions.

We benchmark several LLMs, shown in Fig. 4, using produced Armenian QA benchmark and show that while increasing the number of model parameters and in-context samples helps the overall model performance, still even very large models are unable to solve the dataset trivially, thus showing its value as a benchmarking resource.

OTHER	NORP	GPE	PERCENT	PERSON	DATE	ORG	WORK OF ART	LANGUAGE	QUANTITY	EVENT	MONEY	LOC	ORDINAL	TIME	FAC	PRODUCT
3178	172	223	8	397	335	327	14	10	25	21	9	52	38	9	9	3

Table 4: Distribution of Entities within question-answer pairs in the generated English QA dataset. The Entity labelling scheme follows [Honnibal et al.](#)

Example 1: UEFA Champions League

Since the rebranding of the European Champion Clubs’ Cup as the UEFA Champions League in 1992, 107 different players from 37 countries have scored three goals or more in a single match (a hat-trick) on 152 occasions, representing 53 clubs from 17 leagues. The first player to achieve the feat was Juul Ellerman, who scored three times for PSV Eindhoven in a 6–0 victory over Žalgiris on 16 September 1992. Lionel Messi and Cristiano Ronaldo have scored three or more goals in a match eight times each in the Champions League, more than any other player, followed by Robert Lewandowski with six, and Karim Benzema with four.

Question: What was the original name of the UEFA Champions League?

Answers: 1. European Champion Clubs’ Cup, 2. European Premier League, 3. UEFA Football Cup, 4. European Soccer Championship

Correct Answer: 1. European Champion Clubs’ Cup

Example 2: Sign Languages

Sign languages (also known as signed languages) are languages that use the visual-manual modality to convey meaning, instead of spoken words. Sign languages are expressed through manual articulation in combination with non-manual markers. Sign languages are full-fledged natural languages with their own grammar and lexicon. Sign languages are not universal and are usually not mutually intelligible, although there are also similarities among different sign languages.

Question: What is the primary modality used to convey meaning in sign languages?

Answers: 1. Auditory-vocal, 2. Visual-manual, 3. Tactile-kinesthetic, 4. Olfactory-gustatory

Correct Answer: 2. Visual-manual

Table 5: Examples of English paragraphs along with their generated question-answer pairs