
OPEN LLAMA2 MODEL FOR THE LITHUANIAN LANGUAGE

A PREPRINT

Artūras Nakvosas , Povilas Daniušis , Vytas Mulevičius 

Neurotechnology, Laisvės pr. 125A, LT-06118, Vilnius, Lithuania

August 26, 2024

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we propose and describe the first open Llama2 large language models (LLMs) for the Lithuanian language, including an accompanying question/answer (Q/A) dataset and translations of popular LLM benchmarks. We provide a brief review of open regional LLMs and detailed information on the proposed LLMs and their training process. We also conduct an empirical evaluation, comparing the perplexities of the proposed LLMs with those of other modern open LLMs. In addition, benchmarking the proposed LLMs against language understanding tasks reveals that high-quality pretraining datasets may be essential for achieving models that perform efficiently on these benchmarks. The full realisations of the described LLMs are available in the accompanying open repository <https://huggingface.co/neurotechnology>.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs), relying on Transformer architecture [47] have shown remarkable effectiveness in many natural language processing (NLP) tasks [28, 30]. This has primarily been fuelled by increasingly large model parameterisations and training datasets, which are deemed essential according to neural scaling laws [16]. On the other hand, with the consistent advancement of computational linguistics and NLP, there were recently released open LLMs with performance characteristics comparable with their state-of-the-art (SOTA) commercial counterparts [45], [19], [20], [1], [12]. Although these open models are useful for further fine-tuning for various downstream problems, training of LLMs usually requires both massive datasets and considerable computational resources.

In the context of the current SOTA, open and commercial LLMs are usually trained on largely English texts [45], which results in the lack of performance for less common languages. In addition, commercial LLMs as a rule are not fully accessible (e.g. they are exposed only via APIs, which do not include the model’s parameters nor its intermediate representations). Consequently, there have been multiple recent attempts to achieve efficient open LLMs, tailored for various regional languages other than English (e.g., Section 2, Table 1). Besides an improved performance for corresponding regional languages, compared to their predecessor LLMs, such open models also are potentially useful for research, as their internal mechanism is fully transparent, and there are related applications, both inside and outside the scope of NLP [28].

This article describes Neurotechnology’s ¹ contribution to the direction of regional LLM research, encompassing

- Llama2-based [45] 7 and 13 billion parameter LLMs for the Lithuanian language, and their empirical evaluation,
- a new dataset, consisting of 13, 848 Q/A pairs primarily about Lithuania and Lithuanian history (in the Lithuanian language) [31],
- translations of popular LLM benchmarks to the Lithuanian language,
- open repository, containing all the mentioned components.

¹<http://www.neurotechnology.com>

We will structure our paper starting with a short review of the related work in Section 2. Section 3 describes our models based on Llama2 architecture and their empirical evaluation. Finally, the conclusive Section 4 summarises the conducted research from different perspectives.

2 Related work

Llama2 model. Transformer-based Llama2 is available in different parameter sizes (e.g. *7B*, *13B*, and *70B* parameters), and modifications (e.g. it also includes Llama2-chat version, which is optimised for dialogue use cases). The model is first pretrained using a 2 trillion token set, collected from public sources, and utilising a self-supervised autoregressive approach with cross-entropy loss. Afterwards, it is fine-tuned using publicly available instruction datasets, augmented with human-annotated data, and Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF) methodologies [45].

This model can support the maximum context length of 4096 tokens. According to benchmarks, Llama2 generally performs on par with many open alternatives (e.g. Falcon [1], Mistral [19], Mixtral [20], PaLM [4], etc.). As is common with large foundational models, it can be further successfully tuned for various downstream tasks, including regional language modelling.

LLMs for regional languages. Table 1 summarises LLMs tailored for common European languages, reflecting the recent contributions from the research and engineering community working in this direction. We include only those regional LLMs, that meet the following criteria:

- The model should be published in an open repository (e.g. Hugging Face²),
- It should contain at least a minimal description (architecture, training data, and other details).

According to Table 1, open LLMs are released for the majority of common European languages. Table 1 shows that Llama2 [45] and Mistral [19] are the leading architectures for open LLMs for regional European languages, and 7 billion parameter models are the most common. Table 1 also reveals that full-parameter training is conducted in the majority of cases (19 cases from 20), instead of the parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) based approach. However, in some instances (2 cases from 20) regional LLMs were trained using PEFT methods (e.g., LoRA [17], MoRA [21]), which may result in less accurate models compared to full-parameter training, although with the lower computational costs. In addition, quite often only the model itself is published (11 out of 20 cases), without an accompanying citable document (e.g. technical report/peer-reviewed publication), or training and evaluation datasets. In our opinion, the lack of accompanying scientific documentation limits the potential usefulness of the released regional LLMs in various important aspects, including their reproducibility, empirical performance assessment, and establishing a connection to the existing related results.

3 Proposed open LLMs and their evaluations

Proposed open LLMs and their training details. The proposed models (including tokenizers) are trained from Llama2 7³ and 13⁴ billion parameter checkpoints (further denoted by Llama2-7B and Llama2-13B, correspondingly). The training consists of two phases: the first one is standard autoregressive pretraining on the Lithuanian component of the CulturaX dataset [32], and the second one is fine-tuning on the Alpaca [43] dataset, which has been translated into Lithuanian using ChatGPT (gpt-4-1106-preview) and [31] dataset. We train the full model without using PEFT. Figure 5 shows the source distribution of the Lithuanian component of the CulturaX dataset, and Figure 6 shows the record length distribution in tokens. We use 2048 token context length during model training for both models. The models are trained on 8xH100 GPUs. Figure 1 shows loss during the model pretraining process. The training details for both LLMs are provided in Table 2 and the fine-tuning was conducted with the same parameters, except the learning rate, which was set to 0.00001. The download links for all the proposed LLMs are provided in Table 5.

Proposed open Q/A dataset [31]. This dataset was constructed from the ChatGPT [34] summarisations of a set of Lithuanian Wikipedia pages, and represents a collection of 13, 848 Q/A pairs primarily about Lithuania and Lithuanian history. It was not used during pretraining process. Table 3 showcases a set of examples from this dataset.

²<https://huggingface.co/>

³<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-7b>

⁴<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-13b>

Language	Architecture	Size	Ref.	F/P	Doc.
Bulgarian	Mistral	7B	[18]	F	No
Danish	Mistral	7B	[29, 26]	F	No
Dutch	Mistral	7B	[38]	F	No
French-English	Llama	1.3B	[9]	F	Yes
German	Llama2	7B,13B	[36]	F	No
Greek	Mistral	7B	[41]	F	No
Hungarian-English	Llama2	7B	[6]	F	Yes
Finnish and other	Llama2	7B-33B	[25]	F	No
Icelandic	RoBERTa		[40]	F	Yes
Italian	Llama2	7B,13B	[2]	P	Yes
Lithuanian	Llama2	7B,13B	Ours	F	Yes
Norwegian	Mistral	7B	[33]	F	No
Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian	Mistral	7B	[14]	F	No
Spanish	Falcon	7B	[37]	F	No
Swedish	GPT-SW3	126M-40B	[8]	F	Yes
Slovenian	RoBERTa		[46]	F	Yes
Polish	Mistral	7B	[42]	F	No
Ukrainian	Mistral	7B	[3]	F	Yes
Portuguese	Phi-2B	1.3B-7B	[11]	P	Yes
Romanian	Llama2	7B	[27]	F	Yes

Table 1: Open LLM models for regional European languages. The F/P column denotes whether the model was full-parameter trained (F), or trained via PEFT (P). Doc. column shows whether the corresponding model has an accompanying publication.

Learning parameter	Llama2-7B	Llama2-13B
Number of epochs	1	1
Learning rate	0.0002	0.00004
Warmup ratio	0.05	0.05
Weight decay	0.07	0.05
Per-device batch size	8	4
Gradient accumulation steps	2	4
Duration in seconds for a single H100 GPU	1722.0	2980.5
Total number of tokens	14761219995	
Records in dataset	13339785	
Mean number of tokens per record	1106.5560	
Standard deviation of tokens per record	697.0089	

Table 2: Training details.

3.1 Perplexity evaluation benchmarks

We further conduct an empirical evaluation of the proposed Lithuanian LLMs using an open Lithuanian language dataset [31]. We analyse LLMs by examining their perplexity, which is defined as

$$P(W) := \exp \left(-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log p(w_i | w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{i-1}) \right), \quad (1)$$

where

- $W = w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N$ is the sequence of tokens,
- N is the number of tokens in the sequence,




Figure 1: Losses (y-axis) vs training steps (x-axis) during the model’s pretraining.

Question	Answer
Koks yra Vilniaus miesto statusas Lietuvoje?	Vilnius yra Lietuvos sostinė.
Kur yra Gedimino pilis?	Gedimino pilis yra Vilniuje, ant Gedimino kalno.
Kas buvo vadinamas „Lito tėvu“?	Vladas Jurgutis buvo vadinamas „Lito tėvu“, nes jam buvo patikėta spręsti visus naujos valiutos įvedimo niuansus.
Kokios upės teka per Vilnių?	Per Vilnių teka Neris ir Vilnia.
Kada buvo įkurtas Vilniaus universitetas?	Vilniaus universitetas buvo įkurtas 1579 metais, Vilniuje, po Lietuvos didžiojo kunigaikščio Stepono Batoro privilegijos suteikimo jėzuitų ordino kolegijai.
Kada ir kur įvyko Žalgirio mūšis?	Žalgirio mūšis įvyko 1410 m. liepos 15 d. netoli Tanenbergo ir Griunvaldo (Žalgirio) kaimelių, dabartinės Lenkijos teritorijoje, į pietvakarius nuo Oištyno.

Table 3: Examples from the accompanying Q/A dataset.

- $p(w_i \mid w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{i-1})$ is the conditional probability of the token w_i given the previous tokens w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{i-1} .

It can be interpreted as the model’s ability to predict the next token. From the definition (Eq. 1), the lower perplexity values indicate better performance, and for any input sequence W , $P(W) \geq 1$. The selection of input perplexity was motivated by [13], where the authors reveal that for a wide range of tasks, the lower the perplexity of the prompt is, the better the prompt can perform the task. We analyse the average perplexity (averaged over all Q/A concatenations) as the performance measure. We compare empirical perplexities of five LLMs, further denoted as Llama2-7B, LT-Llama2-7B, Llama2-13B, LT-Llama2-13B, and Llama3-8B. Llama2-7B and Llama2-13B correspond to the default Llama2 models with 7 and 13 billion parameters, and Llama3-8B denotes the default 8 billion parameter Llama3 LLM [7]. This model was trained on a multilingual dataset that also includes a significant proportion of Lithuanian data. The proposed 7 and 13 billion parameter Llama2 LLMs, trained for the Lithuanian language are denoted as LT-Llama2-7B and Llama2-13B. Table 4 shows the average perplexities of the aforementioned LLMs. According to it, the proposed LT-Llama2-7B and LT-Llama2-13B models exhibit significantly lower average perplexity values compared to the Llama3-8B.

Proportion of pretraining data versus average perplexity. In this experiment with the same [31] dataset, we investigate the association of the average perplexity measured on [31], and the percentage of the data from CulturaX Lithuanian component, used in the pretraining process. We conduct this experiment using both LT-Llama2-7B and LT-Llama2-13B models, saving the model’s parameters every 10% of the total number of iterations during a pretraining epoch. Figure 2 reveals that with the inclusion of additional training data, the perplexity tends to decrease, although, in the end, increasing saturation is visible in both cases. According to Table 4, the initial perplexities are 17.4613 and 13.8849, correspondingly. Interestingly, pretraining even with 10% of data results in models with smaller perplexity (measured on [31]) than that of the Llama3 model. The perplexities of the LT-Llama2-13B are also uniformly lower compared to those of the smaller LT-Llama2-7B model.

Model	Average perplexity
Llama2-7B	17.4613
LT-Llama2-7B	3.8096
Llama2-13B	13.8849
LT-Llama2-13B	3.4520
Llama3-8B	5.9795

Table 4: Average perplexities.




Figure 2: Percentage of the Lithuanian component of the CulturaX dataset used in the pretraining (x-axis) vs. corresponding average perplexity (y-axis).

3.2 Language understanding benchmarks

In this experiment, we evaluate the proposed LLMs using LM evaluation harness (LMEH) language understanding benchmarks [10] translated into Lithuanian language (see Table 5 for the download links). These benchmarks are created to assess LLMs across a wide range of evaluation tasks including Massive Multitask Language Understanding (MMLU) set [15], primarily covering diverse academic disciplines. Figure 3 and Figure 4 showcases the accuracies for a sequence of checkpoints, which correspond to the percentage of the pretraining data from CulturaX Lithuanian component, starting with 0% (which corresponds to the initial Llama2-7B), with the step of 10%. Similarly, Figure 7 and Figure 8 provide information about individual benchmarks from the MMLU set.

Although for some tasks (e.g., `arc_easy_lt`, `hellaswag_lt`, `winogrande_lt`) we see consistent improvement throughout the entire pretraining process, this benchmark surprisingly reveals that in most cases of MMLU (see Figure 7 and Figure 8), there is no improvement compared to the initial model. We hypothesise that this may be because the Lithuanian component of CulturaX is almost exclusively collected through web crawling of common websites (see Figure 5), which does not include data that is relevant to those specific tasks. Therefore, the extensions of regional components of CulturaX with high-quality data may improve LLMs, tailored for the corresponding regional languages.

4 Conclusions

We presented the first Llama2-based open LLMs tailored especially for the Lithuanian language. Our model is released with the accompanying QA dataset [31] and translated standard LLM benchmarks.

The motivation for our research was to achieve Lithuanian LLMs, which were either nonexistent (e.g., Llama2 [45]) or quite weak (e.g., Llama3 [7]). Although the latest open multilingual models (e.g., Llama3.1 [7], Gemma2 [44]), released during our research, have a strong Lithuanian component, we trained our model based on Llama2 to investigate whether an efficient Lithuanian LLM can be trained from an LLM without any Lithuanian component.

We also conducted an overview of the existing regional LLMs. It shows that most regional models follow Llama2 or Mistral architecture. In addition, some authors do not train a full parameter set but instead rely on PEFT approaches




Figure 3: Accuracies (y-axis) of LMEH benchmarks for LT-Llama2-7B model, pretrained with different proportions of Lithuanian component of CulturaX dataset (x-axis). The MMLU benchmarks are summarized in mmlu_lt.




Figure 4: Accuracies (y-axis) of LMEH benchmarks for LT-Llama2-13B model, pretrained with different proportions of Lithuanian component of CulturaX dataset (x-axis). The MMLU benchmarks are summarized in mmlu_lt.

(e.g. [17]), which are less computationally demanding, but also potentially less efficient in performance. On the other hand, PEFT methods partially allow to retain the original parameter structure, and thereby they may be beneficial for achieving more efficient regional LLMs from the perspective of language understanding benchmarks, such as MMLU. Table 1 also reveals a lack of scientific documentation of the published open regional LLMs. We also conducted benchmarks of our model with [31], evaluating average perplexities during its pretraining on different proportions CulturaX dataset. The results show that in these benchmarks our model surpasses the default Llama3. In addition, we evaluated the proposed LLMs with LMEH, which includes a conceptually diverse set of language model benchmarks. The results of these experiments hint that the Lithuanian component of CulturaX may not be sufficiently rich for

modern LLM architectures. We also translated these benchmarks into Lithuanian and published them in an open repository (see Table 5), contributing to the standardisation of Lithuanian language model evaluation.

In the context of regional LLMs, the proposed models open further research perspectives not only for NLP, but also for other directions since LLM representations are potentially useful in various scenarios (e.g. sentiment analysis [49], robotics [22], causality [24], and multimodality [35]). Our future work will include fully trained small language models tailored for Baltic languages and English.

Acknowledgement

This research was funded by Neurotechnology. We are grateful to Neurotechnology for providing resources and support for this research. We also thank Rasa Kundrotaitė for editing the English language, Ignas Mataitis, and other colleagues for useful remarks and discussions.

References

- [1] Ebtesam Almazrouei, Hamza Alobeidli, Abdulaziz Alshamsi, et al. *The Falcon Series of Open Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2311.16867 [cs.CL].
- [2] Andrea Bacciu, Giovanni Trappolini, Andrea Santilli, et al. *Fauno: The Italian Large Language Model that will leave you senza parole!* 2023. arXiv: 2306.14457 [cs.CL].
- [3] Tiberiu Boros, Radu Chivoreanu, Stefan Daniel Dumitrescu, et al. “Fine-tuning and Retrieval Augmented Generation for Question Answering using affordable Large Language Models”. In: *Proceedings of the Third Ukrainian Natural Language Processing Workshop, LREC-COLING*. Torino, Italy: European Language Resources Association, May 2024.
- [4] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, et al. *PaLM: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways*. 2022. arXiv: 2204.02311 [cs.CL].
- [5] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, et al. “Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems”. In: (2021). arXiv: 2110.14168 [cs.LG]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168>.
- [6] Zoltan Csaki, Bo Li, Jonathan Li, et al. *SambaLingo: Teaching Large Language Models New Languages*. 2024. arXiv: 2404.05829 [cs.CL].
- [7] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, et al. *The Llama 3 Herd of Models*. 2024. arXiv: 2407.21783 [cs.AI]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>.
- [8] Ariel Ekgren, Amaru Cuba Gyllensten, Felix Stollenwerk, et al. *GPT-SW3: An Autoregressive Language Model for the Nordic Languages*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.12987 [cs.CL].
- [9] Manuel Faysse, Patrick Fernandes, Nuno M. Guerreiro, et al. *CroissantLLM: A Truly Bilingual French-English Language Model*. 2024. arXiv: 2402.00786 [cs.CL].
- [10] Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, et al. *A framework for few-shot language model evaluation*. Version v0.4.0. Dec. 2023. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10256836. URL: <https://zenodo.org/records/10256836>.
- [11] Gabriel Lino Garcia, Pedro Henrique Paiola, Luis Henrique Morelli, et al. *Introducing Bode: A Fine-Tuned Large Language Model for Portuguese Prompt-Based Task*. 2024. arXiv: 2401.02909 [cs.CL]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.02909>.
- [12] Paolo Glorioso, Quentin Anthony, Yury Tokpanov, et al. *Zamba: A Compact 7B SSM Hybrid Model*. 2024. arXiv: 2405.16712 [cs.LG].
- [13] Hila Gonen, Srini Iyer, Terra Blevins, et al. “Demystifying Prompts in Language Models via Perplexity Estimation”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*. Ed. by Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2023, pp. 10136–10148. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.679. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.679>.
- [14] Aleksa Gordić. *YugoGPT Model*. Accessed: 2024-07-15. 2024. URL: <https://huggingface.co/gordicaleksa/YugoGPT>.
- [15] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, et al. *Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding*. 2021. arXiv: 2009.03300 [cs.CY]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03300>.
- [16] Danny Hernandez, Tom B. Brown, Tom Conerly, et al. “Scaling Laws and Interpretability of Learning from Repeated Data”. In: *ArXiv abs/2205.10487* (2022). URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:248986979>.
- [17] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, et al. *LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models*. 2021. arXiv: 2106.09685 [cs.CL].
- [18] INSAIT Institute. *BgGPT-7B-Instruct-v0.1*. Accessed: 2024-07-17. 2024. URL: <https://huggingface.co/INSAIT-Institute/BgGPT-7B-Instruct-v0.1>.
- [19] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, et al. *Mistral 7B*. 2023. arXiv: 2310.06825 [cs.CL].
- [20] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, et al. *Mixtral of Experts*. 2024. arXiv: 2401.04088 [cs.LG].

- [21] Ting Jiang, Shaohan Huang, Shengyue Luo, et al. *MoRA: High-Rank Updating for Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning*. 2024. arXiv: 2405.12130 [cs.CL].
- [22] Yeseung Kim, Dohyun Kim, Jieun Choi, et al. *A Survey on Integration of Large Language Models with Intelligent Robots*. 2024. arXiv: 2404.09228 [cs.R0]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.09228>.
- [23] Viet Dac Lai, Chien Van Nguyen, Nghia Trung Ngo, et al. *Okapi: Instruction-tuned Large Language Models in Multiple Languages with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback*. 2023. arXiv: 2307.16039 [cs.CL]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.16039>.
- [24] Xiaoyu Liu, Paiheng Xu, Junda Wu, et al. *Large Language Models and Causal Inference in Collaboration: A Comprehensive Survey*. 2024. arXiv: 2403.09606 [cs.CL]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.09606>.
- [25] LumiOpen. *Viking 13B Model*. Accessed: 2024-07-15. 2024. URL: <https://huggingface.co/LumiOpen/Viking-13B>.
- [26] Mabeck. *Heidrun-Mistral-7B-chat*. Accessed: 2024-07-20. 2024. URL: <https://huggingface.co/Mabeck/Heidrun-Mistral-7B-chat>.
- [27] Mihai Masala, Denis C. Ilie-Ablachim, Dragos Corlatescu, et al. *OpenLLM-Ro – Technical Report on Open-source Romanian LLMs*. 2024. arXiv: 2405.07703 [cs.CL].
- [28] Shervin Minaee, Tomas Mikolov, Narjes Nikzad, et al. *Large Language Models: A Survey*. 2024. arXiv: 2402.06196 [cs.CL].
- [29] Danish Foundation Models. *Munin-7B-alpha*. Accessed: 2024-07-20. 2024. URL: <https://huggingface.co/danish-foundation-models/munin-7b-alpha>.
- [30] Humza Naveed, Asad Ullah Khan, Shi Qiu, et al. *A Comprehensive Overview of Large Language Models*. 2024. arXiv: 2307.06435 [cs.CL].
- [31] Neurotechnology. *Lt-QA-V1 dataset*. Dec. 2024. URL: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/neurotechnology/lithuanian-qa-v1>.
- [32] Thuat Nguyen, Chien Van Nguyen, Viet Dac Lai, et al. *CulturaX: A Cleaned, Enormous, and Multilingual Dataset for Large Language Models in 167 Languages*. 2023. arXiv: 2309.09400 [cs.CL].
- [33] Norallm. *Normistral-7B-Warm*. Accessed: 2024-07-20. 2024. URL: <https://huggingface.co/norallm/normistral-7b-warm>.
- [34] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, et al. *GPT-4 Technical Report*. 2024. arXiv: 2303.08774 [cs.CL].
- [35] Jayneel Parekh, Pegah Khayatan, Mustafa Shukor, et al. *A Concept-Based Explainability Framework for Large Multimodal Models*. 2024. arXiv: 2406.08074 [cs.LG]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.08074>.
- [36] Björn Plüster and Christoph Schuhmann. *LAION LeoLM: Linguistically Enhanced Open Language Model*. <https://huggingface.co/LeoLM>. Accessed: 2024-07-17. 2024.
- [37] Projecte AINA. *Aguila 7B Model*. Accessed: 2024-07-15. 2024. URL: <https://huggingface.co/projecte-aina/aguila-7b>.
- [38] Leon Rijgersberg. *GEITje*. Accessed: 2024-07-17. 2024. URL: <https://github.com/Rijgersberg/GEITje>.
- [39] Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, et al. “WinoGrande: An Adversarial Winograd Schema Challenge at Scale”. In: (2019). arXiv: 1907.10641 [cs.CL]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.10641>.
- [40] Vésteinn Snæbjarnarson, Haukur Barri Símonarson, Pétur Orri Ragnarsson, et al. *A Warm Start and a Clean Crawled Corpus – A Recipe for Good Language Models*. 2022. arXiv: 2201.05601 [cs.CL]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.05601>.
- [41] SPAHE. *Meltemi-7B-Instruct-v1-GGUF*. <https://huggingface.co/SPAHE/Meltemi-7B-Instruct-v1-GGUF>. Accessed: 2024-07-17. 2024.
- [42] Speakleash. *Bielik-7B-Instruct-v0.1*. Accessed: 2024-07-20. 2024. URL: <https://huggingface.co/speakleash/Bielik-7B-Instruct-v0.1>.
- [43] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, et al. *Stanford Alpaca: An Instruction-following LLaMA model*. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca. 2023.
- [44] Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, et al. *Gemma 2: Improving Open Language Models at a Practical Size*. 2024. arXiv: 2408.00118 [cs.CL]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00118>.
- [45] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, et al. *Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2307.09288 [cs.CL].
- [46] M. Ulčar and M. Robnik-Šikonja. “SloBERTa: Slovene Monolingual Large Pretrained Masked Language Model”. In: *24th International Multiconference Information Society 2021, Volume C. Data Mining and Data Warehouses*. Google Scholar. Ljubljana, 2021.
- [47] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, et al. “Attention is All you Need”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, et al. Vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- [48] Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, et al. “HellaSwag: Can a Machine Really Finish Your Sentence?” In: *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 2019.
- [49] Wenxuan Zhang, Yue Deng, Bing Liu, et al. “Sentiment Analysis in the Era of Large Language Models: A Reality Check”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*. Ed. by Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard. Mexico City, Mexico: Association for Computational Linguistics, June 2024, pp. 3881–3906. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-naacl.246>.

Appendix




Figure 5: Source distribution of the Lithuanian component of the CulturaX dataset.




Figure 6: Distribution of the record length of the Lithuanian component of the CulturaX dataset (in tokens).

Download links for the proposed LLMs
LT-Llama2-7B (pretrained)
LT-Llama2-7B (pretrained and fine-tuned)
LT-Llama2-13B (pretrained)
LT-Llama2-13B (pretrained and fine-tuned)
Download links for the translated data sets
LT-Arc [23]
LT-Winogrande [39]
LT-MMLU [15]
LT-Truthful-qa [23]
LT-Hellaswag [48]
LT-GSM8K [5]

Table 5: Download links for proposed LLMs and data.



Figure 7: Accuracies (y-axis) of individual MMLU benchmarks for LT-Llama2-7B model, pretrained with different proportions of Lithuanian component of CulturaX dataset (x-axis).



Figure 8: Accuracies (y-axis) of individual MMLU benchmarks for LT-Llama2-13B model, pretrained with different proportions of Lithuanian component of CulturaX dataset (x-axis).