

Bucket Pre-training is All You Need

Hongtao Liu¹, Qiyao Peng², Qing Yang¹, Kai Liu³, Hongyan Xu³

¹ Du Xiaoman Financial, Beijing, China

² School of New Media Communication, Tianjin University, China

³ College of Intelligence and Computing, Tianjin University, China

¹{liuhongtao01, yangqing}@duxiaoman.com

²{qypeng}@tju.edu.cn

³{kedixa, hongyanxu}@tju.edu.cn

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated exceptional performance across various natural language processing tasks. However, the conventional fixed-length data composition strategy for pretraining, which involves concatenating and splitting documents, can introduce noise and limit the model’s ability to capture long-range dependencies. To address this, we first introduce three metrics for evaluating data composition quality: padding ratio, truncation ratio, and concatenation ratio. We further propose a multi-bucket data composition method that moves beyond the fixed-length paradigm, offering a more flexible and efficient approach to pretraining. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our proposed method could significantly improve both the efficiency and efficacy of LLMs pretraining. Our approach not only reduces noise and preserves context but also accelerates training, making it a promising solution for LLMs pretraining.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable accomplishments across various natural language processing, coding and math benchmarks (Brown et al., 2020), as well as in tackling intricate real-world challenges (Ouyang et al., 2022). The significant advancements in large language models are attributed to their extensive pre-training on an extensive corpus of unlabeled documents. Since the amount of data for pre-training large language models is huge, it is crucial to organize the input data effectively during training.

Theoretically, the optimal training approach would involve treating each document as an independent training instance, eliminating noise and truncation entirely. However, practical considerations such as training efficiency, context length, and batch processing make this approach infeasible. Currently, most existing methods organize the massive documents in the following two ways:




Figure 1: Data Length Distribution.

(1) **Each document is used as independent training data.** During batch training, shorter sequences are padded with [PAD] tokens to match the length of the longest text in the batch, ensuring consistent input length. While common in traditional pretraining tasks, this method faces scalability challenges in the era of large language models, where datasets often reach terabyte scale. The significant amount of padding tokens introduced can reduce training efficiency.

(2) **All data are randomly concatenated, and then split (with a special token) according to fixed sequence lengths, e.g., 8192** (Rae et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023; Pouransari et al., 2024). And hence, each of input data has a fixed length after segmentation, which is convenient for input into the model for batch training. However, we analyze the length distributions of three common pretraining corpora: web corpus, Wikipedia articles, and GitHub code. As shown in Figure 1, a significant majority of documents in these datasets are relatively short, with most falling within the 2k token range. This finding exposes a potential inefficiency in traditional fixed-length pretraining approaches. Using fixed lengths of 4096, 8192, or longer necessitates concatenating a substantial portion of short documents to fill the input sequence, potentially introducing noise during training. Additionally, long texts must be split into multiple segments, potentially hindering the model’s ability to effectively model long-range dependencies.

Recently, some works try to alleviate the prob-

lem of data incomplete caused by the concatenate or split. For example, Ding et al. (Ding et al., 2024) propose Best-fit Packing to packs documents into training sequences through length-aware combinatorial optimization for eliminating unnecessary truncation. While these methods demonstrated promising results, they lack comprehensive analyses and explicit definition of what constitutes “high-quality” data composition for LLM pretraining.

Therefore, in this paper, we introduce three quantitative indicators to evaluate the quality of data composition for LLM pretraining: (1) **Padding ratio**: The proportion of padding tokens in the training data. (2) **Truncation ratio**: The proportion of the documents that are truncated. (3) **Concatenation ratio**: The ratio to indicate how many documents in one training sample. The smaller these indicators, the better the data composition for pretraining. A detailed discussion of these metrics is provided in Section 2.

Based on these observations, beyond fixed context length training paradigm, we propose a novel multi bucket data composition method for large language model pretraining. By composing data into different buckets according to length, our method significantly optimizes the aforementioned metrics to achieve a high quality data composition for LLMs pretraining.

In summary, our contributions are threefold:

1.Data Composition Quality Metrics: To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to propose a comprehensive set of metrics for measuring data composition quality in LLMs pretraining.

2.Bucket-Based Method: We introduce a novel data bucketing method beyond fixed length paradigm which could achieve a better data composition of the three quantitative metrics.

3.Empirical Validation: We conduct extensive experiments to empirically quantify the benefits of our proposed method, demonstrating its effectiveness in improving LLMs pretraining.

2 Preliminary

To assess the effectiveness of different data composition strategies, we explore to quantify the quality of the resulting training data. Our primary considerations are: 1. we aim to minimize truncation, ensuring that as much of the original information as possible is retained in the training data. 2.we strive to limit the number of documents concatenated within a single training sample. This reduces noise

introduced by auto-regression training. 3.we seek to minimize the use of padding tokens, as excessive padding can reduce computational efficiency. In the following, we formally define these three metrics and discuss their implications for LLM pretraining.

Algorithm 1 Bucket Data Composition

Require: Documents D , preset bucket set B with capacities, padding threshold P

Ensure: Training buckets T

```

1: Sort  $D$  in descending order by length
2: while  $D$  is not empty do
3:    $b \leftarrow$  Select bucket from  $B$  to fit  $d_1$ 
4:   for each  $d_i$  in  $D$  do
5:     if  $len(d_i) \leq b$  then
6:       Add  $d_i$  to bucket,  $b \leftarrow b - len(d_i)$ ,
        $d_i \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
7:     else if bucket is empty then
8:       Add  $d_i[0 : b]$  to bucket
9:        $d_i \leftarrow d_i[b : ]$  {Update document}
10:    end if
11:  end for
12:   $r \leftarrow$  bucket capacity  $- b$  {Remaining space}
13:  if  $r$ /bucket capacity  $> P$  then
14:    Add  $D[-1][0 : r]$  to bucket {Chunk from shortest document}
15:     $D[-1] \leftarrow D[-1][r : ]$ 
16:  else
17:    Add  $[pad\_id] \times r$  to bucket
18:  end if
19:  Add bucket to  $T$ 
20:  Remove empty documents from  $D$ 
21: end while

```

Then, we introduce in detail the calculation of the proposed metrics, including: padding ratio, truncation ratio, and concatenate ratio.

(1) padding ratio: indicates the proportion of the padding token in the processed training data, which is defined as:

$$r_{pad} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N count(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N len(i)}, \quad (1)$$

where N represents the total number of input data, $count(i)$ represents the number of [PAD] in the i -th data, and $len(i)$ refers to the length of the i -th data. The lower the r_{pad} , the more effective training.

(2) truncation ratio: the ratio of the original train-

ing data to be split, which is defined as:

$$r_{tru} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^M J(i)}{M}, \quad (2)$$

where M represents the total number of original documents, and $J(i)$ represents if i -th original documents is split, $J(i)$ is 1. The lower the r_{tru} , the more data is fully trained, and less information is lost.

(3) concatenate ratio: the ratio of original data contained in a piece of processed training data.

$$r_{cat} = \frac{M}{C}, \quad (3)$$

where M represents the total number of original documents, and C represents the number of the training samples. The lower the r_{cat} , the less the number of original data concatenated in the training data and the less noise during training.

3 Method

In this section, based on the above discussion, to efficiently compose buckets for pretraining, we propose Algorithm 1, which aims to optimize the above designed three metrics r_{pad} , r_{trunc} and r_{cat} .

First we need to predefined the bucket sets with different capacity (e.g., four kinds buckets of 2048, 4096, 8192, 16384). The proposed method first sorts the input documents in descending order of length. It then iteratively selects a bucket to fit the longest remaining document. Documents are added to the current bucket until it’s full or no remaining document fits. If the bucket has remaining capacity, the algorithm prioritizes filling it with a chunk of the shortest document to minimize padding, only resorting to padding tokens if necessary according to the predefined padding ratio. This process repeats until all documents are assigned to buckets.

The key advantage of this algorithm are its ability to minimize truncation and concatenation through a greedy strategy that prioritizes placing each document into the most suitable bucket. Additionally, the use of multiple buckets allows for effective modeling of both long and short texts simultaneously. In this way, we optimize the pre-training process, achieving efficient training while preserving the integrity of the original data.

4 Experiments

To evaluate our proposed bucket pretraining method, we first apply our approach to compose pretraining documents. We then pretrain a

transformer-based LLM, following the LLaMA2-13B architecture from scratch.

4.1 Bucket Data Performance

We randomly sampled 100GB of documents from the Refine-Web dataset for pretraining. For our method, we predefine four buckets with commonly used sequence lengths: 2048, 4096, 8192, and 16384. To assess the effectiveness of our bucket data composition method, we evaluate three key metrics: padding ratio r_{pad} , truncation ratio r_{trunc} , and concatenation ratio r_{cat} .

We compare our method against two types of baselines:

(1) Fixed Length: The standard approach of concatenating all documents and then splitting them into fixed-length samples for training. We experiment with four fixed lengths: Fixed-2048, Fixed-4096, Fixed-8192, and Fixed-16384.

(2) Multi-Bucket (Baseline): A simple multi-bucket composition method where documents are placed into buckets based on their length. Documents shorter than 2048 tokens go into the 2048 bucket, documents between 2048 and 4096 tokens go into the 4096 bucket, and so on for 8192 and 16384 buckets.

As shown in Table 1, we can find that:

Significant Reduction in Truncation Ratio:

Our method achieves a remarkably low truncation ratio (r_{trunc}) of 0.18%, substantially outperforming both Fixed Length and Multi-Bucket approaches. While the truncation ratio for Fixed Length decreases with increasing length, even Fixed-16384 reaches 4.25%. This indicates that our method maximizes the preservation of original document information, minimizing information loss due to truncation.

Effective Reduction in Concatenation Ratio:

Our method’s concatenation ratio is lower than all Fixed Length methods and Multi-Bucket approaches. High concatenation ratios can lead to batches containing too many documents, increasing the difficulty of model training. Our method excels in controlling the concatenation ratio, contributing to improved training efficiency with less data noise.

Marginal Increase in Padding Ratio: The padding ratio of our method is slightly higher than other methods, and it seems it may lower the training efficiency. In fact, our multi-bucket data training method would improve the whole training speed (see in Section 4.2).

Table 1: Data Statistic.

	Fixed-2048	Fixed-4096	Fixed-8192	Fixed-16384	Multi-Bucket	Our Method
r_{pad}	0.03%	0.05%	0.08%	0.1%	0.07%	0.28%
r_{tru}	28.39%	15.65%	8.26%	4.25%	26.8%	0.18%
r_{cat}	2.85	5.70	11.39	22.74	3.78	2.31

Table 2: Bucket Experiment Settings.

bucket	data ratio	batch size	speed(tokens/s)
2,048	74.61%	24	2045 (+24.6%)
4,096	17.52%	12	1814 (+10.5%)
8,192	5.37%	6	1641 (+0.00%)
16,384	2.49%	3	1450 (-11.6%)



Figure 2: Loss Curve Under Different Buckets.

In summary, our proposed method demonstrates superior performance in data composition compared to both Fixed Length and Multi-Bucket baselines corresponding to our defined three metrics to evaluate the data quality.

4.2 Training Performance

In this section, we utilize the previously described bucketing strategy to organize the pretraining data and train a transformer-based LLM from scratch, following the LLaMA2-13B architecture. Our experimental setup comprises 16 nodes, each equipped with 8 A800 GPUs. We leverage the DeepSpeed framework and Flash Attention V2 to accelerate training and optimize memory usage. Notably, we implement a bucket sampling algorithm to ensure that data across all GPUs of the same step consistently resides within the same bucket, facilitating efficient training.

Efficiency: Table 2 presents the data distribution across different bucket sizes, along with the corresponding batch sizes and training speeds. All buckets maintain a consistent global batch size of 6 million tokens (2048 tokens/ * 24 samples/ * 16

nodes * 8 GPUs).

The majority of data (74.61%) falls into the 2048 bucket, enabling the highest training speed of 2045 tokens/second. As input length increases, the data ratio decreases, resulting in reduced per-GPU batch sizes and lower training speeds. Compared to the widely used Fixed-8192 data composition method, our bucket pretraining significantly improves training efficiency. This is primarily attributed to the concentration of data within the 2048 bucket, enabling larger per-GPU batch sizes and a 24% speedup in training. Although our method introduces slightly more padding tokens, the overall training efficiency remains significantly improved due to the bucket distribution.

Effectiveness: Figure 2 illustrates the loss curves for different bucket sizes during training. Notably, all bucket sizes exhibit a similar convergence behavior, indicating that our method does not compromise model performance despite varying sequence lengths. The loss curves consistently decrease over training steps, demonstrating the effectiveness of our bucketing strategy in facilitating stable and efficient model training.

Overall, our proposed bucket pretraining method not only optimizes data composition but also demonstrates efficient and effective training dynamics for both long and short context length simultaneously. The ability to handle varying sequence lengths while maintaining consistent training performance underscores the adaptability and robustness of our approach.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we first design three quantitative indicators, namely padding ratio, truncation ratio, and concatenate ratio, to measure the quality of data composition. We propose a novel multi-bucket data composition method that moves beyond the fixed-length paradigm. Compared with existing fixed length training methods, our method can not only obtain more high quality pertaining data samples in our evaluation metrics but also achieve efficient and effective training performance for LLMs.

6 Limitation

While our bucket pretraining method demonstrates significant advantages, it is important to acknowledge that the greedy nature of the bucket composition algorithm may not yield the absolute optimal solution for minimizing all three metrics (padding, truncation, and concatenation) simultaneously. Future work could explore alternative optimization strategies that consider the interplay of these metrics to further refine the pretraining process. In addition, during space limited, we don't report the model performance on downstream tasks except for the loss. We will explore more comprehensive experiments in future.

References

- 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.
- Hantian Ding, Zijian Wang, Giovanni Paolini, Varun Kumar, Anoop Deoras, Dan Roth, and Stefano Soatto. 2024. Fewer truncations improve language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10830*.
- 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.
- Hadi Pouransari, Chun-Liang Li, Jen-Hao Rick Chang, Pavan Kumar Anasosalu Vasu, Cem Koc, Vaishaal Shankar, and Oncel Tuzel. 2024. Dataset decomposition: Faster llm training with variable sequence length curriculum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13226*.
- Jack W Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, et al. 2021. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11446*.
- 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*.
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*.