

How Much is Enough? The Diminishing Returns of Tokenization Training Data

Varshini Reddy[†] Craig W. Schmidt[†] Yuval Pinter[§] Chris Tanner^{†,¶}

[†]Kensho Technologies [§]Ben-Gurion University [¶]MIT
Cambridge, MA Beer Sheva, Israel Cambridge, MA
{varshini.bogolu,craig.schmidt,chris.tanner}@kensho.com, uvp@cs.bgu.ac.il

Abstract

Tokenization, a crucial initial step in natural language processing, is often assumed to benefit from larger training datasets. This paper investigates the impact of tokenizer training data sizes ranging from 1GB to 900GB. Our findings reveal diminishing returns as the data size increases, highlighting a practical limit on how much further scaling the training data can improve tokenization quality. We analyze this phenomenon and attribute the saturation effect to the constraints imposed by the pre-tokenization stage of tokenization. These results offer valuable insights for optimizing the tokenization process and highlight potential avenues for future research in tokenization algorithms.

1 Introduction

Tokenizers are a foundational component of any NLP pipeline, as they are responsible for converting raw text into useful sequences of indexed tokens. Practitioners often default to standard tokenization algorithms such as Byte-Pair Encoding (BPE; Sennrich et al., 2016), UnigramLM (Kudo, 2018) or WordPiece (Schuster and Nakajima, 2012; Devlin et al., 2019), sourced directly from libraries such as Hugging Face.¹ The training process of a tokenizer involves using a corpus of training data and a specific tokenization algorithm to generate a fixed-size vocabulary, usually containing between 32,000 and 128,000 tokens.

Extensive research explores the influence of a *model's* training data on LLM performance (Pearce et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Hoffmann et al., 2022; Kaplan et al., 2020). However, the impact of a *tokenizer's* training data remains relatively unexplored. Recent work has begun to address the importance of tokenizers' vocabulary sizes and the training data domains (Dagan et al., 2024). Prior work has also explored various aspects of tokeniza-

tion, including the influence of different tokenization algorithms (Schmidt et al., 2024; Ali et al., 2024; Mielke et al., 2021; Rai and Borah, 2021), vocabulary size optimization (Gowda and May, 2020), and the interplay between data type and tokenization strategy, especially in multi-lingual applications (Limisiewicz et al., 2023; Rust et al., 2021). Yet, to the best of our knowledge, we are the first to investigate how much training data is needed for a tokenizer, and how this affects performance.

We address this by examining the impact of scaling tokenizer training data with sizes ranging from 1GB to 900GB. We use English BPE, UnigramLM, and WordPiece tokenizers with vocabulary sizes of 40,960, 64,000, 128,000, and 256,000. For each tokenization, we examine the proportion of vocabulary tokens that are shared with the 900GB reference case, and we use intrinsic metrics to measure the quality of tokenization on a fixed evaluation corpus.

Our results demonstrate that increasing the amount of tokenizer training data leads to diminishing returns, indicating a saturation point where further data provides minimal to no improvements in tokenization quality. Finally, we examine the proportion of pre-tokenization chunks that exactly match a single token in the tokenizer vocabulary, and suggest that this very high proportion is a possible explanation for these diminishing returns.

2 Effect of Training Corpus Size on Tokenization

Our training corpus combines the de-duplicated PILE (Gao et al., 2020) and RedPajama (Weber et al., 2024) datasets, totaling 900GB of text. We train three tokenizers – BPE,² UnigramLM,³ and

²We use a custom BPE tokenizer based on <https://github.com/karpathy/minbpe> as a starting point.

³https://github.com/huggingface/tokenizers/blob/main/bindings/python/py_src/tokenizers/implementations/sentencepiece_unigram.py

¹<https://github.com/huggingface/tokenizers>

WordPiece⁴ – on progressively larger subsets of the randomly shuffled 900GB corpus.

For smaller dataset sizes, we used 1GB, 5GB, and 15GB subsets. For larger scales, we started with a 30GB subset of our 900GB corpus and cumulatively increased the training data in 30GB intervals up to the full 900GB. This resulted in 33 distinct training runs for each of the four vocabulary sizes for each of the three tokenizers, leading to a total of 396 trained tokenizers. See Appendix A for a complete description of the pre-tokenization process and our scaling methodology.

2.1 Vocabulary analysis

Figure 1 shows the fraction of shared vocabulary between tokenizers trained on varying amounts of data and a 900GB-trained reference tokenizer using the same algorithm, for a vocabulary size of 40,960. Vocabulary similarity increases with training data, rising from approximately 58% to 97% for BPE, from 40% to 97% for UnigramLM, and from 4% to 92% for WordPiece. This trend is consistent across the other vocabulary sizes of 64,000, 128,000, and 256,000, as shown in Appendix B. Thus, larger training datasets consistently yield more similar vocabularies across algorithms, though BPE and UnigramLM exhibit a more rapid convergence than WordPiece. These results suggest that a substantial portion of the vocabulary learned from the full 900GB dataset can be obtained from tokenizers trained on significantly smaller fractions of the data. For example, a tokenizer trained on roughly 150-180GB of data captures over 90% of the vocabulary present in the 900GB-trained counterpart for BPE and UnigramLM, and over 80% for WordPiece.

2.2 Intrinsic metrics analysis

While we have seen that there are significant differences in the vocabularies of tokenizers trained on, for example, 30GB versus 900GB of data, it is important to examine these differences to determine whether they translate into meaningful improvements in tokenization quality. To evaluate the trained tokenizers without the additional computational overhead of training full LLMs, we use the intrinsic tokenizer metrics collected by Uzan et al. (2024), summarized below:

- **Morphological alignment:** Measures how well a tokenizer’s word segmentations match

⁴https://github.com/huggingface/tokenizers/blob/main/bindings/python/py_src/tokenizers/implementations/bert_wordpiece.py




Figure 1: Proportion of common vocabulary for BPE, UnigramLM, and WordPiece tokenizers (vocabulary size: 40,960) trained with cumulatively increasing data, relative to the vocabulary of the corresponding tokenizer trained with 900GB of data.

gold-standard morphological segmentations. Higher scores indicate a greater ability to capture word structure.

- **Cognitive score:** Assesses the correlation between a tokenizer’s output and human performance in lexical decision tasks, evaluating how well the tokenizer’s behavior aligns with human lexical processing.
- **Entropy score:** Evaluates token distribution quality by penalizing excessively high- or low-frequency tokens, aiming for a balanced representation.

Figure 2 gives results on intrinsic metrics for BPE for each of the four vocabulary sizes included in our study. Contrary to our expectations, these intrinsic measures do not reveal substantial performance gains with increasing data size. In fact, for BPE, performance plateaus in the 150GB to 180GB range. Despite the observed vocabulary shifts, the core properties reflected by these metrics remain relatively stable across the range of training data volumes. Thus, simply increasing the training data size may not inherently lead to substantial improvements in a tokenizer’s effectiveness. A discussion of the observed patterns for the remaining two kinds of tokenizer is presented in Appendix C.

2.3 Evaluation dataset analysis

To reconcile the apparent discrepancy between observed vocabulary shifts and stable intrinsic scores, we analyzed the impact of our trained tokenizers on a diverse, multi-domain evaluation dataset. This dataset spans several domains: biology, code, finance, history, legal, mathematics, and general text. This diverse composition mitigates potential tokenizer biases that arise from the influence




Figure 2: Intrinsic measures of BPE tokenizers trained for each of the four vocabulary sizes with scaled training data. ‘Average F1’ is calculated over morphological benchmarks.

of domain-specific vocabulary prevalence. Each domain-specific corpus contains 1.5 million characters. The sources of the evaluation set are discussed in Appendix D.

We assessed the impact of scaling training data for vocabulary construction on the evaluation set by computing the Jaccard Index between the actual tokens used in the evaluation text using each trained tokenizer and the same text tokenized with the 900GB-trained reference tokenizer:

$$J(U, V) = \frac{|U \cap V|}{|U \cup V|}, \quad (1)$$

where U and V are the vocabularies of the reference tokenizer and the current tokenizer.

We also computed a weighted version of the Jaccard Index using the normalized token counts over the evaluation data, to account for the differences in the training set sizes:

$$J_w(U, V) = \frac{\sum_{t \in U \cap V} \min(w_U(t), w_V(t))}{\sum_{t \in U \cup V} \max(w_U(t), w_V(t))}, \quad (2)$$

where $w_U(t)$ and $w_V(t)$ are the normalized token frequencies for token t in vocabularies U and V .




Figure 3: Jaccard Index (open markers) and Weighted Jaccard Index (WTD; filled markers) for BPE, UnigramLM, and WordPiece tokenizers (vocabulary size 40,960) across varying data sizes, averaged over all evaluation domains.

Figure 3 presents the standard (open markers) and weighted (filled markers) Jaccard Index for tokenizers of 40,960 vocabulary size. The weighted scores consistently exceed the unweighted scores, highlighting the significant influence of token frequency on vocabulary overlap. This suggests that high-frequency tokens exhibit greater consistency across varying data sizes, and they account for a significant fraction of the training token counts.

Our analysis revealed that over 80% of our evaluation text is represented by approximately 20% of the tokenizer vocabulary (see Appendix D for detailed results across individual domains of our evaluation dataset and vocabulary sizes). This finding suggests that the majority of tokens that are added with increasing training data are low-frequency and thus less consequential. While the specific composition of the vocabulary evolves with an increase in training data, the core set of tokens responsible for representing the majority of the text remains relatively stable. This observation is consistent with Zipf’s law (Zipf, 1949), which postulates an inverse relationship between word frequency and rank in natural language corpora. Thus, increasing a tokenizer’s training data beyond a certain point primarily adds low-frequency tokens to the vocabulary, which has a limited impact on the overall tokenization characteristics captured by the intrinsic metrics. This is one explanation as to why the intrinsic metrics are largely unaffected by increases in training data.

3 The Limiting Role of Pre-Tokenization

Pre-tokenization is the initial step in tokenization, which uses regular expressions to split a document

into chunks, which are then tokenized separately. Velayuthan and Sarveswaran (2025) recently noted that pre-tokenization can have a greater effect on the resulting tokenization than the choice of tokenization algorithm. They call the chunks resulting from the pre-tokenization phase *pre-tokens*.

The weighted Jaccard results in the previous section show that tokenizers produce a core set of common tokens across the range of tokenizer training data. We hypothesize that this is due to pre-tokenization. The highest frequency pre-tokens are prevalent enough that all three tokenization algorithms have a strong incentive to find a single token that exactly matches the pre-token. To investigate this, we go back to the aggregated pre-tokens with their associated counts.⁵ We calculate the proportion of pre-tokens represented as a single token within each tokenizer’s vocabulary. Figure 4 displays this proportion for BPE, UnigramLM, and WordPiece tokenizers, for varying vocabulary sizes.




Figure 4: Proportion of pre-tokens represented as single tokens in BPE, UnigramLM and WordPiece vocabularies of varying sizes (40,960, 64,000, 128,000, and 256,000) with increasing training data.

The prevalence of these common pre-tokens within the tokenizers’ vocabularies is remarkably

⁵See Appendix A for more details on the pre-tokenization aggregation process.

high across all algorithms, increasing with vocabulary size. This proportion remains relatively stable with more training data at smaller vocabulary sizes and is essentially overlapping at vocabulary sizes of 128,000 and 256,000. The curves are flat because they represent frequent pre-tokens, which are easily found even with very little training data. Larger vocabularies naturally have more capacity to include a greater number of pre-tokens as single tokens, accounting for the overlapping curves.

These observations support our hypothesis that the plateauing intrinsic metrics (Figure 2) and high weighted Jaccard (Figure 3) observed with varying training data can at least be partially attributed to the constraints imposed by pre-tokenization. The pre-tokenization step prioritizes the inclusion of commonly occurring pre-tokens as single tokens in the training process. The tokenizers are limited to optimizing the smaller remaining fraction of the tokenized corpus. This limits the tokenizers’ ability to fully leverage larger training datasets, as the core vocabulary is largely predetermined by the pre-tokenization process. The additional tokens produced from larger datasets are primarily low-frequency items (i.e., rare words), which have a smaller overall impact on the vocabulary composition and tokenization quality as measured by our intrinsic metrics.

4 Conclusion

In this work, we have systematically investigated the impact of tokenizer training data size on the characteristics of trained tokenizers. Our findings reveal diminishing returns as the tokenizer training data increases beyond 150GB to 180GB. Our analysis indicates that tokenization algorithms incorporating pre-tokenization may be fundamentally limited in their ability to fully leverage extremely large datasets. Therefore, rather than focusing solely on *more data*, we advocate for a shift towards developing and employing better vocabulary training methods that are less susceptible to the limitations of pre-tokenization. Methods that incorporate contextual signals, such as SaGe (Yehezkel and Pinter, 2023), offer a promising direction for future research.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, both our training corpus and most of our evaluation data are English-centric. This monolingual focus re-

stricts the generalizability of our findings, as the observed trends in tokenizer performance with increasing data size may not be extrapolated to other languages with different morphological structures or tokenization needs. Future work should explore the impact of data scaling on tokenizers trained and evaluated on diverse language corpora. Second, our reliance on intrinsic tokenizer metrics as a primary means of evaluation, while enabling efficient analysis, may not fully capture the complex interplay between tokenizer characteristics and downstream LLM performance. While these metrics provide valuable insights into tokenizer quality, they serve as a proxy for true downstream effectiveness. Future research should investigate the correlation between intrinsic metrics and downstream task performance across a wider range of language models and tasks to establish a more comprehensive evaluation framework.

Ethics Statement

We train our tokenizers on the commonly used public datasets The Pile (Gao et al., 2020) and RedPajama (Weber et al., 2024), which have not undergone a formal ethics review. While our evaluation set was manually anonymized and checked for abusive language, it may still contain personal opinions that reflect cultural, political, or demographical biases.

Acknowledgments

We thank Seth Ebner for many notes and discussions. This research was supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation (grant No. 1166/23).

References

- Mehdi Ali, Michael Fromm, Klaudia Thellmann, Richard Rutmann, Max Lübbering, Johannes Leveling, Katrin Klug, Jan Ebert, Niclas Doll, Jasper Buschhoff, Charvi Jain, Alexander Weber, Lena Jurkschat, Hammam Abdelwahab, Chelsea John, Pedro Ortiz Suarez, Malte Ostendorff, Samuel Weinbach, Rafet Sifa, Stefan Kesselheim, and Nicolas Flores-Herr. 2024. [Tokenizer choice for LLM training: Negligible or crucial?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 3907–3924, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gautier Dagan, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Baptiste Rozière. 2024. [Getting the most out of your tokenizer for pre-training and domain adaptation.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.01035.
- 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.
- Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, Shawn Presser, and Connor Leahy. 2020. [The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2101.00027.
- Thamme Gowda and Jonathan May. 2020. [Finding the optimal vocabulary size for neural machine translation.](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 3955–3964, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Tom Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Erich Elsen, Jack W. Rae, Oriol Vinyals, and Laurent Sifre. 2022. [Training compute-optimal large language models.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2203.15556.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Scaling laws for neural language models.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2001.08361.
- Taku Kudo. 2018. [Subword regularization: Improving neural network translation models with multiple subword candidates.](#) In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 66–75, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tomasz Limisiewicz, Jiří Balhar, and David Mareček. 2023. [Tokenization impacts multilingual language modeling: Assessing vocabulary allocation and overlap across languages.](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 5661–5681, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sabrina J. Mielke, Zaid Alyafeai, Elizabeth Salesky, Colin Raffel, Manan Dey, Matthias Gallé, Arun Raja, Chenglei Si, Wilson Y. Lee, Benoît Sagot, and Samson Tan. 2021. [Between words and characters: A brief history of open-vocabulary modeling and tokenization in nlp.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2112.10508.
- Tim Pearce, Tabish Rashid, Dave Bignell, Raluca Georgescu, Sam Devlin, and Katja Hofmann. 2024. [Scaling laws for pre-training agents and world models.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2411.04434.

- Abigail Rai and Samarjeet Borah. 2021. Study of various methods for tokenization. In *Applications of Internet of Things*, pages 193–200, Singapore. Springer Singapore.
- Phillip Rust, Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulić, Sebastian Ruder, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. [How good is your tokenizer? on the monolingual performance of multilingual language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3118–3135, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Craig W Schmidt, Varshini Reddy, Haoran Zhang, Alec Alameddine, Omri Uzan, Yuval Pinter, and Chris Tanner. 2024. [Tokenization is more than compression](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 678–702, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mike Schuster and Kaisuke Nakajima. 2012. [Japanese and korean voice search](#). In *2012 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5149–5152.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. [Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1715–1725, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Omri Uzan, Craig W. Schmidt, Chris Tanner, and Yuval Pinter. 2024. [Greed is all you need: An evaluation of tokenizer inference methods](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 813–822, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Menan Velayuthan and Kengatharaiyer Sarveswaran. 2025. [Egalitarian language representation in language models: It all begins with tokenizers](#). In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 5987–5996, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maurice Weber, Daniel Fu, Quentin Anthony, Yonatan Oren, Shane Adams, Anton Alexandrov, Xiaozhong Lyu, Huu Nguyen, Xiaozhe Yao, Virginia Adams, Ben Athiwaratkun, Rahul Chalamala, Kezhen Chen, Max Ryabinin, Tri Dao, Percy Liang, Christopher Ré, Irina Rish, and Ce Zhang. 2024. [Redpajama: an open dataset for training large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2411.12372.
- Shaked Yehezkel and Yuval Pinter. 2023. [Incorporating context into subword vocabularies](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 623–635, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Biao Zhang, Zhongtao Liu, Colin Cherry, and Orhan Firat. 2024. [When scaling meets LLM finetuning: The effect of data, model and finetuning method](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- George Kingsley Zipf. 1949. *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort*. Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, MA.

A Scaling Tokenizer Training using Pre-tokenization

To enable training tokenizers on datasets ranging to hundreds of gigabytes, we implemented a parallel pre-tokenization step, which used a regular expression to break the documents into chunks. Then we aggregated the counts of each pre-tokenized chunk over all the documents. This pre-tokenized corpus of chunks and counts served as the input for all subsequent tokenizer training. This approach significantly reduces the computational overhead of tokenizer training by avoiding tokenizing common chunks more than once.

We based our BPE implementation on MinBPE,⁶ modified to work with aggregate chunk counts. It was also modified to efficiently compute the change in pairwise counts, rather than recomputing them from scratch after each merge. We used these same aggregate chunks and counts in training UnigramLM and WordPiece, rather than their native pre-tokenization routines.

Listing 1 is the regular expression used by GPT-4 for pre-tokenization⁶, which we also used for our parallel pre-tokenization.

```
r"(?i:[sdmt]|ll|ve|re)|[^\r\n\p{L}\p{N}]?+\p{L}+|\p{N}{1,3}|_?[^\s\p{L}\p{N}]++[\r\n]|\s[\r\n]|\s+(?!\\S)|\s+"
```

Listing 1: GPT-4 pre-tokenizer regular expression

Here is an explanation of each branch of the regular expression:

- `(?i:[sdmt]|ll|ve|re)`
Matches English language contractions or possessives
- `[^\r\n\p{L}\p{N}]?+\p{L}+`
Matches one or more Unicode letters, optionally preceded by a punctuation or symbol character
- `\p{N}{1,3}`
Matches one to three Unicode digits (some languages such as Thai and Tamil use different Unicode symbols for digits)
- `?[^\s\p{L}\p{N}]++[\r\n]*`
Matches one or more punctuation or symbol characters, optionally preceded by a space, and succeeded by zero or more carriage returns or linefeeds

⁶<https://github.com/karpathy/minbpe>

- `\s*[\r\n]`

Matches a single carriage return or linefeed, optionally preceded by zero or more characters of whitespace

- `\s+(?!\\S)`

Matches one or more characters of whitespace not immediately followed by non-whitespace, thus matching trailing whitespace of a line, up to the line break

- `\s+`

Finally, this matches one or more characters of whitespace

This regular expression requires the more flexible regex package in Python rather than the default re package, in order to support Unicode character groups and the possessive quantifiers `?+` and `++`.


Note that this expression has the necessary property to match all characters in any valid UTF-8. This is because `[^\s\p{L}\p{N}]` in the fourth branch will match any character that is not a letter, number, or whitespace, which are all handled by other parts of the regex. Dagan et al. (2024) had a similar explanation of this same regex, plus other possible regular expression choices.⁷

B Analysis of Common Vocabulary


As seen in Figures 1 and 5, as the vocabulary size increases from 40,960 to 256,000, we observe a consistent trend where the proportion of common vocabulary stabilizes at a higher value for larger datasets. BPE and Unigram tokenizers exhibit similar convergence patterns, with BPE maintaining a slightly higher proportion of common vocabulary across all vocabulary sizes. WordPiece shows a more gradual increase, particularly at larger vocabulary sizes, suggesting a higher sensitivity to increasing data volume. In particular, at a vocabulary size of 256,000, initial fluctuations are more pronounced, but all tokenizers eventually converge as data scales.

Figures 6, 7, and 8 present heatmaps visualizing the proportion of shared vocabulary among all trained tokenizers for BPE, Unigram, and WordPiece, respectively. Within each figure, subplots correspond to different vocabulary sizes: 40,960, 64,000, 128,000, and 256,000.


⁷See <https://tokencontributions.substack.com/p/pre-tokenization-on-punctuation-in> for other discussions on peculiarities of this particular regular expression.



(a) Vocabulary size 64,000



(b) Vocabulary size 128,000



(c) Vocabulary size 256,000

Figure 5: Proportion of common vocabulary for BPE, Unigram, and WordPiece tokenizers, trained with cumulatively increasing data, relative to the vocabulary of the corresponding tokenizer trained with 900GB of data.

A key observation for both BPE (Figure 6) and UnigramLM (Figure 7) is the decreasing proportion of shared vocabulary between consecutively trained tokenizers as the vocabulary size increases. For instance, with BPE and a 40,960 vocabulary, the vocabulary overlap between tokenizers trained on 30GB and 900GB of data is 0.57. This overlap decreases to 0.49, 0.41, and 0.23 for vocabulary sizes of 64,000, 128,000, and 256,000, respectively. UnigramLM tokenizers exhibit a similar trend, with overlap decreasing from 0.58 to 0.51, 0.34, and 0.2 across the same vocabulary sizes.

This trend suggests that as vocabulary size increases for a fixed training data size (e.g., 30GB), the added tokens become progressively less frequent and more specialized. These less frequent

or more niche tokens are also more susceptible to variation between tokenizers trained on slightly different subsets of data drawn from the same overall distribution. Essentially, with limited training data, larger vocabularies are populated with progressively less consequential tokens, leading to lower agreement between trained tokenizers. However, WordPiece (Figure 8) does not exhibit any trend with a change in vocabulary size.

C Performance Analysis using Intrinsic Metrics

Figure 9 displays the intrinsic metrics for the Unigram tokenizers trained with varying data sizes and vocabulary sizes. Similar to the observations with BPE, the Unigram tokenizers do not show a substantial and consistent improvement in intrinsic scores with increasing data size. While the Cognitive Score score exhibits a slight upward trend initially, it plateaus beyond approximately 180GB, suggesting that further increases in training data do not significantly enhance the tokenizer’s alignment with morphological segmentations. The Average F1, calculated over the morphological benchmarks, while showing some fluctuations, does not demonstrate a clear and sustained improvement with larger datasets. The Entropy Score, similar to the other metrics, plateaus relatively early, indicating that the balance of token frequencies stabilizes with increasing data size.

For WordPiece (Figure 10), a similar pattern emerges. While slightly higher variations exist, particularly in Cognitive Score, the intrinsic scores do not substantially improve with increasing data size.

D Analysis on Evaluation Data

D.1 Data Source

Our tokenizer training data spans from 2021 to early 2023. To prevent data leakage into our evaluation set, we sourced documents from various domains specifically dated 2024. We manually de-anonymized and removed any offensive language from this dataset. The following describes the composition of our evaluation data for each domain:

- *Biology*: We utilized research papers and clinical trial data from the National Library of Medicine.⁸

⁸<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>





Figure 6: Heatmaps showing the proportion of common vocabulary across all BPE tokens as a function of cumulatively increasing training data. Each heatmap, in the grid from the top left, represents a different vocabulary size (40,960, 64,000, 128,000, 256,000).

- **Code:** Code was generated using GPT-4 for randomly selected programming problems drawn from IIT9 homework assignments and LeetCode.⁹ The code corpus contains a mixture of popular programming languages including Python, Java, JavaScript, Ruby, and Go, further enhancing diversity.
- **Finance:** This dataset comprises SEC filings¹¹ from various companies filed in 2024, downloaded and extracted from PDF to text format.
- **History:** We used papers from Oxford Academic Historical Research.¹²

- **Legal:** This dataset consists of 2024 - Opinions of the Court released by the Supreme Court of the United States.¹³
- **Math:** Mathematics papers from arXiv,¹⁴ all released in 2024, were used.
- **General Conversation:** We employed general conversation data from the same population as our tokenizer training data, ensuring no overlap between training and evaluation sets.

⁹ <https://www.cse.iitk.ac.in/users/nitin/courses/CS681-2019-20-II/problemsets.html>
¹⁰ <https://leetcode.com/>
¹¹ <https://www.sec.gov/>

¹² <https://academic.oup.com/histres/>
¹³ <https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/slipopinion/24>
¹⁴ <https://arxiv.org/archive/math>



(a) 256,000

Figure 7: Heatmaps showing the proportion of common vocabulary across all **UnigramLM** tokenizers as a function of cumulatively increasing training data. Each heatmap, in the grid from the top left, represents a different vocabulary size (40,960, 64,000, 128,000, 256,000).

D.2 Analysis

As mentioned in Section 2.3, we assess the impact of scaling training data for tokenizer training on the evaluation set by computing the Jaccard Index and weighted version to the Jaccard Index between the actual tokens used in the evaluation text using each trained tokenizer and the same text tokenized with the 900GB-trained reference tokenizer. Within the evaluated vocabulary size of 40,960 (see Figure 11), slightly different trends emerge across different tasks. However, both Byte Pair Encoding (BPE) and Unigram tokenizers exhibit a near-immediate plateau in performance, around 120GB to 180GB. This suggests that, at this vocabulary size, frequent

tokens contribute substantially to the overall token overlap and that these tokenizers quickly converge to a stable segmentation of these frequent terms. This early plateau indicates that further increases in training data provide diminishing returns for these tokenization algorithms.

Although WordPiece demonstrates a similar trend of a much lower Jaccard Index compared to its weighted counterpart, it exhibits the widest gap between the two Jaccard Index values. A large difference between the Jaccard Index and the Weighted Jaccard Index indicates that the overlap between vocabulary usage is primarily due to less frequent tokens, while the more frequent tokens are




Figure 8: Heatmaps showing the proportion of common vocabulary across all **WordPiece** tokenizers as a function of cumulatively increasing training data. Each heatmap, in the grid from the top left, represents a different vocabulary size (40,960, 64,000, 128,000, 256,000).

not consistently shared. This could mean that the change in vocabulary might have higher implications for text, relative to BPE and UnigramLM. These patterns remain consistent across WordPiece for the remaining vocabulary sizes, as seen in Figures 11 to 14.




Figure 9: Intrinsic measures of **Unigram** tokenizers trained for each of the four vocabulary sizes with scaled training data




Figure 10: Intrinsic measures of **WordPiece** tokenizers trained for each of the four vocabulary sizes with scaled training data




Figure 11: Jaccard Index (open markers) and Weighted Jaccard Index (WTD; filled markers) for BPE, UnigramLM, and WordPiece tokenizers (vocab size **40,960**) across varying data sizes, for different domains.




Figure 12: Jaccard Index (open markers) and Weighted Jaccard Index (WTD; filled markers) for BPE, UnigramLM, and WordPiece tokenizers (vocab size **64,000**) across varying data sizes, for different domains.




Figure 13: Jaccard Index (open markers) and Weighted Jaccard Index (WTD; filled markers) for BPE, UnigramLM, and WordPiece tokenizers (vocab size **128,000**) across varying data sizes, for different domains.




Figure 14: Jaccard Index (open markers) and Weighted Jaccard Index (WTD; filled markers) for BPE, UnigramLM, and WordPiece tokenizers (vocab size **256,000**) across varying data sizes, for different domains.