

Tiny Transformers Excel at Sentence Compression

Peter Belcak

ETH Zurich

belcak@ethz.ch

Roger Wattenhofer

ETH Zurich

wattenhofer@ethz.ch

Abstract

It is staggering that words of the English language, which are on average represented by 5–6 bytes of ASCII, require as much as 24 kilobytes when served to large language models. We show that there is room for more information in every token embedding. We demonstrate that 1–3-layer transformers are capable of encoding and subsequently decoding standard English sentences into as little as a single 3-kilobyte token. Our work implies that even small networks can learn to construct valid English sentences and suggests the possibility of optimising large language models by moving from sub-word token embeddings towards larger fragments of text.

1 Introduction

An average English Wikipedia word can be represented by 5.4 characters (ASCII bytes), with humans experiencing no difficulty in comprehending this representation at speed. This is in stark contrast with the 24 kilobytes required to represent *sub*-word tokens that may be fed into GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), the first language model widely lauded for the plausibility of its outputs. The scaling factor of 4500 prompts a natural question: could we have language models operating on more efficient representations of their inputs, thus decreasing their training and inference cost?

Recent work on the Funnel-Transformer and hierarchical text transformers (Dai et al., 2020; Nawrot et al., 2021) proposed to introduce information bottlenecks on the sequence length into the original transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017). It found that shortening and subsequently expanding sequences of hidden states throughout the transformer leads to a significant decrease in demands on resources while coming at little cost to the model performance.

We explore a related line of research, investigating whether it is feasible for transformers to

operate on inputs that are more information-rich than the apparently oversized token embeddings. In particular, we ask and answer the following:

Question. *Are transformer models capable of synthesising more condensed representations of text and subsequently decomposing them back with little loss in information?*

The significance of this question is the following: if transformers can perform generalising compression with low loss, there is a hope they could implicitly operate on semantically higher-level units of language (e.g. sentences) with little change to the spirit of the usual pre-training procedures. This is because to operate on higher-level representations of text one needs to be able to internally decompose the representation into individual parts in order not to miss any semantic payload. A positive answer would then mean (a) an immediate decrease in the resources necessary to train and employ these models in practice, and (b) could have benefits for the quality of model outputs on the grounds of the transformer being able to focus on sentence cohesion rather than token cohesion.

The next natural and easily discernible unit of language above word is sentence. We aim to answer the above question, and to that end, we show that the following is true:

Claim. Even very small transformers are already capable of compressing sentences into a single token and decompressing them back with little loss.

Contributions. We demonstrate that the claim is true by training BERT-like (Devlin et al., 2018) transformers consisting of only 1–3 layers to perform sentence compression on standard English language corpora. We evaluate their accuracy when compressing and subsequently decompressing sentences, showing good reconstruction abilities. We further give an analysis of the impact of changing model dimension, depth, and decoder input width on the quality of the sentence reconstructions.

Our work has numerous implications, namely on the nature of unsupervised language model pre-training, transformer model efficiency, and the possibility of a sentence-level transformer architecture.

Unsupervised language learning. Masked and causal language modelling as pre-training methods do not distinguish between the internalisation of language rules and the learning of factual knowledge. Our work empirically shows that transformers can turn information compressed to a single token into a grammatically correct English sentence with as little as two BERT layers. This indicates that much of the representational power of large language models (frequently in the order of dozens of layers) might be dedicated to the memorisation of factual knowledge and its surrounding contexts.

Efficiency of the transformer architecture. Our results indicate that as far as capturing semantic information carried by words is concerned, the size of language model token embeddings is unjustified. It is therefore likely that the need for large token embedding stems from elsewhere in the transformer architecture.

Sentence-level transformers. Our work suggests that a future language model architecture could consist of a transformer encoding sentences or sentence fragments into single-token embeddings, feeding them into a large, core transformer, and the decompressing the outputs of the core transformer with a decoder before passing the hidden embeddings into a language modelling head.

In the interest of full reproducibility, we make all our code, training setup, and data immediately available (see Appendix E). A demo is further available through institutional servers¹.

2 Related work

Token embedding size. In its naive form, every dimension of a token embedding requires 4 bytes. Prior to the introduction of word2vec, it was “popular” to use word embeddings with 50-100 dimensions (Mikolov et al., 2013). Word2vec proposed to increase this to 640, but subsequent work demonstrated that embeddings of dimension 100-300 possess the same desirable properties (Pennington et al., 2014). The first transformer used 512 dimensions per token (Vaswani et al., 2017), which was increased to 768 in GPT (Radford et al., 2018), BERT-base (Devlin et al., 2018), and DistilBERT

(Sanh et al., 2019); to 1024 in BERT-large; to 1600 in GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019); to 12288 in GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) and OPT-175bn (Zhang et al., 2022); and to 18432 in PaLM (Chowdhery et al., 2022). In sum, there is an unbroken trend towards larger token embeddings. Surprisingly, an early effort to comprehensively optimise pre-trained transformers (Sanh et al., 2019) found that “variations on the token embedding dimension have smaller impact on computation efficiency than variations on other factors”.

Neural text compression. Existing research has demonstrated success of using neural networks to compress textual data. Goyal et al. (2018) introduced an RNN-based lossless compressor for sequential data, and demonstrated that it achieves a 20% compression improvement over Gzip (a standard baseline for text compression) on textual and genomic documents. Further, Bellard (2019) presented a transformer-based compressor performing 50% better against Gzip on the enwik8 benchmark. In both works, the goal was to compress entire documents rather than sentences or paragraphs, and the minimality of the compression size was the sole optimisation goal. Note also that both works resorted to overfitting to the input data and including the weights with the compressed documents to achieve the desired reduction in compression size.

Sentence embeddings. A related line of research focuses on producing sentence embeddings that are of high quality for downstream tasks such as semantic textual similarity scoring, semantic search, and paraphrase mining. This effort is concerned with the utility of the sentence embeddings to downstream tasks rather than reconstructibility into the original sentence. As a result, majority of its approaches use contrastive methods that are destructive to original information to arrive at useful sentence embeddings (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019; Thakur et al., 2020). Wang et al. (2021) proposed TSDAE, a BERT-sized transformer autoencoder trained with the masked language modelling task, whose encoder can be contrastively finetuned to yield good downstream performance. None of these works, however, investigate the option of reconstructing original sentences from their embeddings and focus solely on the downstream tasks at hand. As such, they do not set any baselines for our effort. Curiously, it has also been found that the downstream performance of representations that are “dense” (more compressed) decreases quicker

¹link anonymised

than for “sparse” representations when the search space expands (Reimers and Gurevych, 2020).

Shortening transformers. Dai et al. (2020) proposed the Funnel-Transformer architecture, which gradually compresses sequences of hidden states to shorter ones and hence reduces the overall computation cost. The narrowing-down of the transformer is achieved by pooling the output hidden representations by subsequent layers, while the performance is aided by long-range inter-layer skip connections. Funnel transformer has been shown to outperform the standard transformer of comparable FLOPs on a wide variety of sequence-level prediction tasks.

More recently, Nawrot et al. (2021) used an approach similar to Dai et al. (2020) to extend their work to autoregressive transformers. The authors claim that the resulting “Hourglass” architecture improves language modeling efficiency, referring to perplexity scores on a Wikipedia dataset.

Our work differs from both of the above. Instead of shortening the internal sequences of hidden states, we hope to compress elements of text before feeding them into a transformer in a way that the transformer can operate with fewer data of possibly higher semantic value.

3 Data

We use the sentences of a standard language model pre-training corpus (Devlin et al., 2018; Sanh et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2019) combining the English Wikipedia as of the 1st of March 2022 and Book-Corpus (Bandy and Vincent, 2021). The 6.5 million documents are then decomposed into 229.4 million sentences using the Punkt sentence tokeniser of NLTK (Bird et al., 2009).

Apart from 81 000 exceptionally long or erroneous entries (amounting to $\sim 0.04\%$ of the raw dataset), the vast majority of the sentences in our dataset are shorter than 512 characters (about 91 words or 120 tokens). We therefore considered only entries shorter than 512 characters as we believe them to be better representative of English sentences. Detailed statistics of the final corpus can be found in Tables 2–3 of Appendix A.1, and Appendix A.2 lists corresponding length histograms.

We split off 1 million sentences for the testing set and use a 96-million subset of the above dataset for training. We make our data easily accessible².

²link anonymised

4 Model

We tokenise individual sentences using the uncased variant of the BERT tokeniser (Devlin et al., 2018), and then feed them into a transformer network providing one sentence per input.

The network under training is a transformer autoencoder formed by stacking two groups of transformer layers without cross-attention on top of each other, appended with a language modelling head. This is illustrated in Figure 4 of Appendix B. We refer to the two groups as *encoder* and *decoder*, respectively. Both encoder and decoder have the same number of layers $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. The basic configuration of the transformer layers is aligned with that of BERT: token embedding size is $d \in \{768, 1024, 2048\}$ (depending on the experiment), the number of attention heads used one of $\{12, 16\}$ (depending on divisibility), with the remaining parameters (hidden dimension, dropout, activation) set exactly as in BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) for ease of comparison. The encoder is connected to the decoder only through the embedding of its leading token. This embedding is listed $m \in \{1, 2, 4, \infty\}$ times in a row, and then padded by the constant 1 to the length of the input sentence before being fed into the decoder. ∞ denotes that the embedding is listed as many times as there are tokens in the input sentence (resulting in no padding being applied). Note that our architecture is similar to that of TSDAE (Wang et al., 2021) but is much smaller (in fact, smallest possible) and differs in the use of noise and the direction of input into the decoder.

The training task is to reconstruct the ground truth sentence under the cross entropy loss on the outputs of the language modelling head. We train for 1 epoch – every entry in the dataset is seen only once. Further parameters and the computational cost are described in Appendix E.

5 Experiments

For each experiment run, we evaluate the ability of the given trained model to compress input sentences into a single embedding and then reconstruct the original sequence. For the evaluation metric, we look at per-token accuracy.

Preliminary experiments. Prior to the focused experimentation below, we tried modifying the number of attention heads and the dropout. We hypothesised that the increased number of attention heads would lead to better results in small

		1			2			4			∞		
ℓ	m	d			d			d			d		
		768	1024	2048	768	1024	2048	768	1024	2048	768	1024	2048
1	mean	76.05	77.56	83.37	79.50	83.42	84.21	73.76	83.95	86.44	81.01	82.43	<i>87.49</i>
	weighted	65.31	67.19	74.08	68.88	74.14	75.09	62.62	74.33	77.60	70.84	72.64	<i>79.42</i>
2	mean	94.45	95.81	97.28	95.33	95.55	<i>97.62</i>	96.39	95.64	97.47	96.15	96.41	97.20
	weighted	87.99	90.42	93.07	89.44	89.89	<i>93.53</i>	91.10	89.92	93.41	90.88	91.43	93.08
3	mean	97.76	97.84	98.50	97.80	97.92	98.41	97.87	97.96	<i>98.54</i>	97.84	97.84	98.42
	weighted	93.70	93.98	95.44	93.79	94.13	95.20	93.94	94.18	<i>95.44</i>	94.01	93.92	95.36

Table 1: The results of the experiments described in Section 5, in percentage points. “mean” indicates mean accuracy of token reconstruction taken across all sentences, “weighted” the mean accuracy weighted by sentence length. **Emphasis** and *emphasis* mark the best performance per m and ℓ , respectively.

transformers due to the transformer being allowed to do a larger number of separate computations in the individual heads without mutual interference. Likewise, we thought the increase in dropout could encourage the network to construct more robust representations of sentences. Neither turned out to be the case: increasing the number of attention heads and dropout both led to a noticeable deterioration in performance across the board. Furthermore, we tried introducing masking noise to the inputs and tasking the transformers to perform denoising reconstructions. We found that this too led to decrease in sentence reconstruction accuracy, which we attribute to the small size of our networks.

Experiments on ℓ . As per our goal, we train *small* transformers with both encoders and decoders 1–3 layers in depth, observing the effect of transformer depth on the sentence reconstruction accuracy. Deeper transformers have more representational power, hence the natural hypothesis that they will be able to internalise more of the frequent sentence constructs.

Experiments on d . For each transformer depth, we experiment with token embeddings ranging from 768 (BERT-base) to 2048 (2x GPT-2). Larger token embeddings allow for more sentence information to fit into a single token, and they also increase the number of trainable parameters in the feedforward layers of the transformer. Therefore, we expect larger embeddings to lead to better sentence reconstruction scores.

Experiments on m . Our preliminary experimentation showed that the number of times the embedding of the first token coming from the encoder is listed before being put into the decoder has a noticeable impact on the quality of the sentence reconstructions. We therefore also investigate the effect of m on the sentence reconstructions.

6 Discussion

The summary quantitative results are listed in Table 1, with the relationship to sentence length and a qualitative analysis given in Appendices C–D.

More layers help. We observe that consistently across all parameters, the accuracy of the reconstructions improves with the increasing transformer depth ℓ . Note also that the jump in accuracy is much more significant on $\ell = 1 \rightarrow 2$ than on $\ell = 2 \rightarrow 3$.

Bigger embeddings lead to marginal improvements. We find that the effect of increasing embedding size on the quality of reconstructions is consistently positive but mostly marginal (1-3 ppts.) and of significance only for $\ell = 1$.

Decoder input multiplier plays a role. We see that increasing m improves the accuracy, but not always. The effect of increasing m is most easily spotted for $\ell = 1$, but note that for most configurations of ℓ, d the optimal m is 2 or 4.

Compression performance for $\ell = 2, 3$ is high. We see that the best 2–3-layer configurations can compress and subsequently decompress an average sentence with 98% accuracy, and that over the whole test datasets 95% of individual tokens are correctly reconstructed at their ground-truth position within the sentence.

Considering the diversity of the data (various Wikipedia articles and books), the size of the encoder networks considered (8-25% of BERT/GPT bodies for $d = 768, \ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, cf. Appendix F), and the fact that the sentences are compressed into a single token embedding, this is an extraordinarily good performance in the context of the growing token embedding size in language modelling. We mention the implications and make the comparisons in Sections 1–2.

7 Limitations

Our work focuses on demonstrating that it is viable for transformers to compress entire sentences into vectors corresponding to a single input token, and that this can be achieved even with very small transformers. Our experimentation supports this claim.

While we do study how the loss of compression depends on several parameters of the architecture, we do not investigate whether the resulting representations can be feasibly used for downstream tasks. This is an intentional limitation given the scope of this format. We believe it possible that the compressed sentence representations obtained by the minimalistic approach will actually perform significantly worse than the larger sentence embeddings produced by large transformer architectures tailored specifically to that end.

We note that the datasets used in our study consist mostly of well-formed English sentences and give results specific to English. It is possible that the compression of sentences of less-structured language (such as transcripts of spontaneous speech) would be more difficult to achieve.

We do not include hidden feedforward layer width as a parameter of our experimentation – since there is a well-documented interplay between width of hidden layers and depth of the network (Goodfellow et al., 2016), we keep the hidden layer width fixed and vary only the depth of the network. This ensures and also limits the direct interpretation of the first implication of Section 1 to BERT, DistilBERT, and GPT models.

References

- Jack Bandy and Nicholas Vincent. 2021. Addressing "documentation debt" in machine learning research: A retrospective datasheet for bookcorpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.05241*.
- Fabrice Bellard. 2019. Lossless data compression with neural networks. URL: <https://bellard.org/nncp/nncp.pdf>.
- Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. 2009. *Natural language processing with python*. O'Reilly Media Inc.
- 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.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2022. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*.
- Zihang Dai, Guokun Lai, Yiming Yang, and Quoc Le. 2020. Funnel-transformer: Filtering out sequential redundancy for efficient language processing. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:4271–4282.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. 2016. *Deep learning*. MIT press.
- Mohit Goyal, Kedar Tatwawadi, Shubham Chandak, and Idoia Ochoa. 2018. Deepzip: Lossless data compression using recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.08162*.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Piotr Nawrot, Szymon Tworowski, Michał Tyrolski, Łukasz Kaiser, Yuhuai Wu, Christian Szegedy, and Henryk Michalewski. 2021. Hierarchical transformers are more efficient language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.13711*.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084*.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. The curse of dense low-dimensional information retrieval for large index sizes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14210*.

Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.

Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Johannes Daxenberger, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. Augmented sbert: Data augmentation method for improving bi-encoders for pairwise sentence scoring tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.08240*.

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.

Kexin Wang, Nils Reimers, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Tsdae: Using transformer-based sequential denoising auto-encoder for unsupervised sentence embedding learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.06979*.

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*.

A Dataset details

A.1 Statistics

Table 2 gives the document-level statistics of the datasets used for the training and testing of our models. Table 3 gives the sentence-level statistics per dataset used.

A.2 Distributions

Figures 1–3 show the distribution of sentences in the resulting (combined) corpus as a function of character, word, and token lengths. We observe that each distribution appears to follow a Gamma distribution, and that very long sentences (>70 words) are a clear rarity in the data.




Figure 1: The distribution of sentence lengths in characters in the *combined* corpus. The horizontal axis shows the sentence length in characters, the vertical axis shows the number of sentences in the resulting corpus having that length.




Figure 2: The distribution of sentence lengths in NLTK words in the *combined* corpus. The horizontal axis shows the sentence length in words after tokenising with NLTK, the vertical axis shows the number of sentences in the resulting corpus having that length.




Figure 3: The distribution of sentence lengths in uncased BERT tokens in the *combined* corpus. The horizontal axis shows the sentence length in words after tokenising with the BERT tokeniser, the vertical axis shows the number of sentences in the resulting corpus having that length.

B Model diagram

Figure 4 shows the diagram of the model used to perform the sentence compression.




Figure 4: A diagram of the model described in Section 4.

Dataset	WIKI	BCO	<i>combined</i>
# of documents	6 458 670	17 868	6 476 538
# of sentences	136 547 563	90 921 888	227 469 451
# of characters	17 337 280 117	6 373 876 249	23 711 156 366
# of words	3 225 292 505	1 400 517 565	4 625 810 070
# tokens	4 023 124 041	1 718 789 836	5 741 913 877
characters per word	5.38	4.55	5.13
characters per token	4.31	3.71	4.13
tokens per word	1.25	1.23	1.24

Table 2: A summary of document-level statistics of the datasets used (after filtering out 81 000 overly long or erroneous entries). “Token” and “word” denote BERT-uncased token and NLTK word as in Section 3.

Dataset	WIKIPEDIA			BOOKCORPUSOPEN			<i>combined</i>		
	characters	words	tokens	characters	words	tokens	characters	words	tokens
mean	127.0	23.6	29.5	70.1	15.4	18.9	104.2	20.3	25.2
stddev	76.2	13.6	16.5	54.8	10.6	12.5	73.9	13.1	15.9
median	113	31	26	57	13	16	90	18	22
$Q(25\%)$	74	14	18	31	8	11	51	11	14
$Q(75\%)$	163	30	37	94	20	24	140	27	32
IQR	89	16	19	63	12	13	89	16	18
$Q(95\%)$	271	49	60	173	35	41	243	45	54
$Q(99\%)$	309	56	68	200	40	47	279	51	62

Table 3: A summary of sentence-level statistics for the datasets used. “Token” and “word” denote BERT-uncased token and NLTK word as in Section 3. $Q(N\%)$ denotes the Nth percentile, “IQR” the inter-quartile range, and “stddev” the standard deviation.

C Reconstruction Accuracy as a Function of Sequence Length

To investigate the nature of sentence reconstruction errors, we plotted the reconstruction accuracy against the sentence length in tokens. Figures 5–7 show the results for a range of models with embedding multiplier $m = 1$ and token embedding size $d = 768$. We observe that the increase in layer depth extends the range of sentence lengths that are reconstructed with very high (>95%) accuracy, before the accuracy begins to fall.

We note, however, that increases in transformer depth also lead to the increase in the reconstruction accuracy for the longest of sequences, and that even for the one-layer compression transformer, the accuracy stands at about 35 – 40%.




Figure 5: The reconstruction accuracy of a model with $\ell = 1, m = 1, d = 768$ on the test set plotted against the token length of test sentences. The horizontal axis shows the sentence length in tokens, the vertical axis shows the mean reconstruction accuracy for that length.




Figure 6: The reconstruction accuracy of a model with $\ell = 1, m = 1, d = 768$ on the test set plotted against the token length of test sentences. The horizontal axis shows the sentence length in tokens, the vertical axis shows the mean reconstruction accuracy for that length.




Figure 7: The reconstruction accuracy of a model with $\ell = 1, m = 1, d = 768$ on the test set plotted against the token length of test sentences. The horizontal axis shows the sentence length in tokens, the vertical axis shows the mean reconstruction accuracy for that length.

D Qualitative Analysis of Sentence Reconstructions

Figure 8 gives examples consisting of original sentences and their reconstructions by a model that achieves an overall $\sim 97\%$ reconstruction accuracy. We observe that many incorrectly predicted tokens are simply a repetition of a token that has previously occurred in the sentence. Furthermore, we find that while models do not struggle with reconstructing terms or expressions that are clearly rare in the language corpus, they might make an occasional mistake if too many such expressions appear in a single sentence, suggesting that the limits on the information content of the embeddings are being hit. In such cases, the tokens predicted tend to be tokens that more statistically plausible in the language as a whole.

O: she is a golden dinosaur robot.
R: **is** is a golden dinosaur robot.

O: some traditional sets use **肆** for both colours.
R: some traditional sets use **suites** for both colours.

O: an annual procession commemorating the image occurs every october.
R: an annual procession **procession** the image occurs every october.

O: even mega - nightmares she couldn't even remember.
R: even **nightmares** - nightmares she couldn't even remember.

O: dual nationality was prohibited under section 26 for all namibians.
R: dual nationality was prohibited under section 26 for all **parenthesens**.

O: ambrus smiled broadly, but the statement was less sincere.
R: ambrus **needed** broadly, but the statement was less sincere.

O: she is a cofounder of the mathematical sciences research institute undergraduate program.
R: she is a cofounder of the mathematical sciences research institute **mathematical** program.

O: the grassy hilltop between the upright stones turned slick with splattered brains and spilled intestines.
R: the grassy hilltop between the **fingers** stones turned slick with splattered brains and spilled intestines.

O: the council of mathura under the presidency of skandila who seems to have revised the sacred knowledge.
R: the council of mathura under the presidency of skandila, seems to have revised the sacred knowledge.

O: among their smaller projects, the two count involvement in my big fat greek wedding, saving grace and leopold bloom.
R: among their smaller projects, the two **engagements** involvement in my big fat greek wedding, saving grace and leopold bloom.

O: in 1960 he published an edition of bishop richard de bury's philobiblon, one of the earliest studies of librarianship.
R: in 1960 he published an edition of bishop richard de **evelyn's** philobiblon, one of the earliest studies of librarianship.

Figure 8: Examples of original sentences and their reconstructions, randomly selected from examples of token length between 10 and 30 and containing at least one erroneous token prediction. The model used had $\ell = 3, m = 1, d = 768$. **O** denotes the original sentence, **R** the result of the reconstruction after passing through the model. Background indicates incorrectly predicted token(s).

E Reproducibility effort

The following has been compiled according to the EMNLP 2023 reproducibility criteria.

E.1 Experimental results

A clear description of the mathematical setting, algorithm, and/or model is provided in Section 4, Appendix B, and references to related models are provided where relevant.

Submission of a .zip file containing source code, with specification of all dependencies, including external libraries, or a link to such resources (while still anonymized) is provided through OpenReview. All seeds and other parameters are meticulously noted and easily configurable through a console-line interface. The link to the anonymised repository is <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/CAE2>.

A live demo is further available through institutional

servers (*link anonymised*).

Description of computing infrastructure used. We run all our experiments on NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPUs (allocating one GPU per experiment). Our code is written using the PyTorch library.

Training parameters. We train with batch size of 128 (simulated through batch size of 16 and 8 gradient accumulation steps). Our training is performed with Adam optimiser, with learning rate $1e - 4$ if $d = 768$ and $5e - 5$ for $d = 1024, 2048$. We leave all other parameters to the optimiser’s PyTorch defaults.

Model parameter counts are given in Appendix F.

The average runtime for each model or algorithm (e.g., training, inference, etc.). We find that our training takes 36-48 hours to complete (depending on the model size), and that testing on the test dataset requires between 25 and 40 minutes.

Explanation of evaluation metrics used. Both our loss (cross entropy) and main quality metric (reconstruction accuracy) are classical to the field.

We do not perform hyperparameter searches as a part of our reported experimentation.

E.2 Datasets

Relevant details such as languages, and number of examples and label distributions, as well as details of train/validation/test splits are given in Section 3 and the references to the original dataset publications.

Explanation of any data that were excluded, and all pre-processing steps are also given in Section 3.

Our data consists of the English Wikipedia and BookCorpusOpen datasets, both freely available from multiple sources. Furthermore, we make our particular processed data and splits readily available through a popular platform at *anonymised*.

F Model sizes

Table 4 lists the sizes of the various parts of the models used. Note that the vocabulary size is fixed by the uncased BERT tokeniser, but that the sizes of token embedding tables and language modelling heads vary depending on the size of the token embedding, and that both constitute a major part of the final parameter count.

BERT-base (110 million parameters, $\ell = 12, d = 768$), RoBERTa-base (125 million, $\ell = 12, d = 768$), BERT-large (345 million, $\ell =$

$24, d = 768$), and GPT (117 million, $\ell = 12, d = 768$) models can be directly compared with the sizes in the first column. There, the bodies of our transformers are between $\frac{1}{12}$ and $\frac{1}{4}$ for 12-layer transformers and correspondingly half that for the 24-layer variants.

Model part	d	768	1024	2048
token embedding table		23.44	31.25	62.51
body with $\ell = 1$		5.36	7.41	17.04
body with $\ell = 2$		10.72	14.82	34.09
body with $\ell = 3$		16.08	22.23	51.13
language modelling head		23.44	31.25	62.51

Table 4: A summary of parameter counts of different parts of the models used, in millions. “Body” denotes the body of encoder/decoder transformers positioned between the token embedding table on the input size and language modelling head on the output side of the model.