MUFU: MULTILINGUAL FUSED LEARNING FOR LOW-RESOURCE TRANSLATION WITH LLM

Anonymous authors
Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

Multilingual large language models (LLMs) are great translators, but this is largely limited to high-resource languages. For many LLMs, translating in and out of low-resource languages remains a challenging task. To maximize data efficiency in this low-resource setting, we introduce Mufu, which includes a selection of automatically generated multilingual candidates and an instruction to correct inaccurate translations in the prompt. Mufu prompts turn a translation task into a postediting one, and seek to harness the LLM's reasoning capability with auxiliary translation candidates, from which the model is required to assess the input quality, align the semantics cross-lingually, copy from relevant inputs and override instances that are incorrect. Our experiments on En-XX translations over the Flores-200 dataset show LLMs finetuned against Mufu-style prompts are robust to poor quality auxiliary translation candidates, achieving performance superior to NLLB 1.3B distilled model in 64% of low- and very-low-resource language pairs. We then distill these models to reduce inference cost, while maintaining on average 3.1 chrF improvement over finetune-only baseline in low-resource translations.

1 INTRODUCTION

The most advanced of large language models (LLM) have demonstrated remarkable competence in translation-related tasks (Robinson et al., 2023; Hendy et al., 2023; Alves et al., 2024; Kocmi & Federmann, 2023; Raunak et al., 2023), but lag behind in translations involving lower-resource languages (Robinson et al., 2023; Hendy et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2024), compared to specialized neural machine translation (NMT) systems like NLLB (Costa-jussà et al., 2022). This performance gap is caused primarily by scant pre-training data in these languages (Wei et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2024; Alves et al., 2024), and is difficult to overcome despite growing efforts to support translations of long-tail languages (Kudugunta et al., 2024; Bapna et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2024).

In this work, we introduce multilingual fused learning (Mufu), which combines multilingual context and a postediting task when translating into lower-resource languages using LLMs.[1] Mufu-style prompts (see Table 1, top block) include several multilingual translation candidates along with a postediting target, from which a model learns "in-context" to translate from languages with which the target language is more closely aligned due to cultural relevance, geographical and genealogical proximity. We rely on a larger, more competent multilingual teacher model to generate auxiliary translations in these languages, which help disambiguate inputs and improve cross-lingual semantic alignment in a translation task. Given a task to postedit, LLMs are capable of "translating" better by iteratively improving the fluency and naturalness of the translation candidates (Chen et al., 2023).

The goal is to induce in LLMs multi-step reasoning akin to chain-of-thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), as the models are required to assess the input quality, align the candidates cross-lingually, and improve the final translation by drawing from the correct input and overriding incorrect instances. Translating this way can be challenging for small models with limited reasoning capacity. Inspired by Wang et al. (2023), we further propose finetuning against Mufu prompts, which allows the models to learn how to best exploit and benefit from the multilingual context.

[1]We borrow the name from 幕府 (mù fǔ), a secretariat for the imperial Chinese officers dating back to 229 BC (Wikipedia contributors, 2024).

0 The English sentence has been translated into Malay, Javanese, Sundanese, Indonesian, Minangkabau and Achinese. These translations may contain errors. Correct the translation from English to Achinese. 1 English: The proposed amendment already passed both houses in 2011. 2 Automatic Malay: Pindaan yang dicadangkan telah diluluskan oleh kedua-dua dewan pada tahun 2011. 3 Automatic Javanese: Amandemen sing diusulake wis ditampa dening loro omah ing taun 2011. 4 Automatic Sundanese: Amandemen anu diusulkeun parantos lulus duanana imah dina 2011. 5 Automatic Indonesian: Amandemen yang diusulkan sudah disahkan oleh kedua majelis pada tahun 2011. 6 Automatic Minangkabau: Amandemen nan diusulkan alah disetujui dewan legislatif pado taun 2011. 7 Automatic Achinese: Amandemen nyang geupeugah nyan ka geupeugot bak keu-2 bak thôn 2011. 8 Corrected Achinese:
Reference: Amandemen nyang geuusong ka geuteurimoeng lé banduwa majeulis bak thôn 2011.
Baseline instruction: Translate from English to Achinese.

Table 1: Prompt template for `mufu5` (top block) with Achinese as an example, which includes an instruction (line 0), an input (line 1, blue), five multilingual candidates (lines 2-6, orange) and a postediting target (line 7, red). For baseline we omit lines 2-7, replacing *Corrected Achinese* with *Achinese* and the initial instruction with the baseline instruction in purple. In `postediting`, we remove auxiliary languages (teal) in the instruction along with the multilingual candidates, retaining only the postediting target.

We show that the best Mufu model, finetuned only with hundreds of parallel examples in each language pair, is competitive against the teacher model and the benchmark NLLB 1.3B distilled model, scoring on average 2.7 higher chrF on FLORES-200 devtest and 0.7 on NTREX test sets in En-XX translations.[2] Importantly, Mufu works well on a range of pre-trained models including PaLM2 and Gemma, despite limited data and the fact that Gemma models are English-centric models that have not been trained for multilingual capabilities (Anil et al., 2023; Gemma Team et al., 2024). Our experiments further demonstrate knowledge distillation on Mufu models to be effective in reducing the inference cost, while maintaining competitive advantage against benchmark.

2 Multilingual fused learning

2.1 Combining two learning paradigms

Few-shot in-context learning (ICL) is incredibly effective for eliciting translations from an LLM (Winata et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2022), but is usually less performant than more compute- and data-intensive finetuned models (Zhang et al., 2023b; Vilar et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2024). On one hand, ICL improves translations of LLMs by allowing for informative contexts that induce reasoning processes in the model, and prompt the model to reach a latent feature space that is otherwise difficult to access with shorter input (Wei et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023; Vilar et al., 2023; Puduppully et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2023a). On the other hand, LLMs produce higher quality final predictions with parameter tuning. Motivated by Wang et al. (2023), our work combines the strengths of both learning paradigms by finetuning LLMs with reference output against multilingual prompts, and substantially improves the overall quality of LLMs' translations over finetuned-only models, under a low-data condition.

2.2 Maximizing data efficiency with multilingual auxiliary translations

Beyond providing few-shot examplars in a translation prompt, we incorporate translations in other languages as auxiliary information to the task. Learning to translate this way facilitates semantic alignment beyond the lexical level, by allowing the encoding of rich knowledge network embedded in the multilingual translations. This multilingual context includes a draft translation in the target language, thus turning the difficult task of translating from scratch into a postediting task. Taken together, this approach can be considered similar to CoT rationales, as we expect LLM to be able to disambiguate words and align across multilingual context, to copy from high-quality inputs and to disregard instances that are less informative or are of poor quality. Unlike typical CoT, however, Mufu models do not predict the chain of thought and is instead provided as a rich context for intermediate reasoning in translation.

[2]Based on the performance of PaLM2 XXS–NTL (mufu20), further details in Section 3.3.



Figure 1: Mufu involves two iterations. First, a teacher model generates a set of multilingual auxiliary translations and a postediting target. These translations then become part of the input during the second iteration, where the student model learns in-context to produce the corrected target translation. We then finetune the student model against target references.

In practice, to obtain and to incorporate the auxiliary translations and postediting target in context, Mufu requires two iterations. During the first iteration, a teacher model is required to generate the intermediary translations. These translations are later included as part of the input for a student model, which learns in-context to correct the target translation in the second iteration.[3] We illustrate an example of this process in Figure 1, where the teacher model first translates the same input from English to auxiliary translations in Malay, Sundanese, Javanese, Indonesian, Minangkabau and Achinese (the target language).[4] These outputs are then added as part of the in-context prompt for the student model, along with an instruction to correct the target translation.

3 Experiments

3.1 Data and evaluation

As a low-data setup, we train and validate on the FLORES-200 dev split (Costa-jussà et al., 2022), which differs from the usual practice of reserving the split entirely for validation.[5] Out of 997 source sentences in the split, we randomly sampled 787 sentences as the train set, 100 sentences as the validation data, and another 100 sentences to perform initial prompt selection. We reserve the remaining ten source sentences, from which we sample five-shot exemplars used in generating auxiliary translations in the first iteration. Each of the source sentences is paired with translations in 203 languages, from which we finetune the student models to translate from English into a subset of 201 target languages.[6] Some languages use more than one writing systems—for example, Achinese can be written in Latin and Arabic scripts; we treat translations into different scripts as individual language pairs.

We evaluate our approach using chrF, a character overlap statistic (Popović, 2015). The finetuned models are tested on FLORES-200 devtest split for the ideal in-domain setting where train and test conditions are closely matched. The source sentences of FLORES-200 are sampled from Wikipedia—to assess our finetuned models out of domain, we use NTREX (Federmann et al., 2022), which comprises translations of English news data, on which we evaluate 112 languages, the subset of languages also found in FLORES-200.[7]

3.2 Prompt style and auxiliary languages

We test a variety of prompts with a one-shot prompting and choose an instruction that list all auxiliary languages (e.g., *... from English to Malay, Sundanese, Javanese, ...*) over an instruction for the model to infer these languages from the prompt (e.g., *... from English to several languages as specified*). We also prepend *Automatic/Corrected* labels to the language tags in the auxiliary translations instead

[3]The student may be the same model as the teacher in this setup.
[4]See Section 3.2 for details on how the intermediate languages are chosen.
[5]As described in Costa-jussà et al. (2022).
[6]The two languages omitted are Akan and Twi.
[7]The languages from FLORES-200 not supported in NTREX are shown as dashed entries in Table 8 (Appendix A.5).

of *Candidate/Reference* pair. We show in Table 1 an example template of a Mufu instruction, in contrast with the `baseline` setup where we provide only an instruction to translate in the prompt, without any multilingual context or postediting target. Further details on prompt selection can be found in Appendix A.1.

To select the most relevant auxiliary languages in Mufu, we rely on language data from URIEL (Littell et al., 2017) to select the closest languages by geological and genetic distance (equally weighted) for each target language, and arrange them by the farthest to closest in the prompt. Several languages are not included in the URIEL repository, in which case we sampled their auxiliary languages randomly.[8] For the full list of auxiliary languages used in Mufu prompts, see Appendix A.2.

We finetune with Mufu prompt over a varying number of auxiliary translations: `postediting` (`mufu0`) contains only a postediting target and does not include any multilingual context; `mufu`N incorporates $N \in \{5, 10, 20\}$ auxiliary multilingual translations in addition to a postediting target.

3.3 Models

The teacher model, PaLM2 S (also known as Bison), has shown excellent multilingual and translation capability (Anil et al., 2023), but there remains a significant performance gap between higher-resource and lower-resource languages—we report the teacher performance in Section 4 and show the gap can be largely reduced by the student models through Mufu. During the first iteration, the teacher model generates auxiliary translations for each instance with 5-shot prompting. For all prompt setups described in the previous section, we perform supervised finetuning jointly over 201 languages for En-XX translation over a range of student models: PaLM2 XXS (Gecko), PaLM2 XS (Otter), Gemma 2B-IT and Gemma 7B-IT; given the same auxiliary translations generated previously.

When comparing the performance across student models, it is worth noting that PaLM2 are multilingual LLMs with superior initial translation capacity compared to Gemma models, which have not received any specialized training on multilingual tasks (Gemma Team et al., 2024). We also further pre-train PaLM2 XXS, the smallest model from PaLM2 family, on a corpora derived from the Next-Thousand-Language (NTL) effort, which comprise monolingual and parallel sentences in 1000+ languages (Caswell et al., 2020; Bapna et al., 2022). We refer to this version of the model as PaLM2 XXS–NTL henceforth.

4 Results

We present our results primarily in chrF, as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) heavily relies on tokenization that is underdeveloped for many low-resource languages.[9] Table 2 shows the mean chrF across 201 En-XX language pairs of all teacher, student and benchmark models; and Win%, the percentage of language pairs where the model outperforms a benchmark. NLLB models only support 198 of these language pairs—to facilitate comparison, we therefore report also the average chrF and win percentages over just these languages.[10]

When tested with in-domain FLORES devtest data, Mufu finetuned models gain substantially over their baselines. Turning a translation task to a postediting one is advantageous to the output quality, and we see further improvements with multilingual context in Mufu prompts. Mufu models also show superior performance compared to the teacher, with PaLM2 XXS–NTL exceeding teacher performance in 54.2% translation pairs respectively. The exception is regular PaLM2 XXS, which score better than the baseline but underperforms compared to the teacher and the smaller NLLB model, presumably due to its limited capacity.

In theory, it is possible for the student to be at least as good as the teacher through word-for-word copying from the postediting target. However, some Mufu translations are worse than the teacher.

[8]The languages not found in URIEL include Latgalian, Swahili, Kongo, Kanuri, Kanuri in Arabic script, Silesian, Pashto, Oromo, Guarani, Kabuverdianu, Tumbuka, Kimbundu, Filipino, Friulian, Dinka, Mongolian, Azerbaijani, Fulfulde, South Levantine Arabic, Uzbek, Sardinian, Limburgan, Persian, Tamazight, Crimean Tatar in Latin script, Dzongkha, Lombard and Dari.

[9]Nonetheless, we report the corresponding results in BLEU scores in Appendix A.4, which largely corroborates our main findings.

[10]The languages not supported by NLLB are Minangkabau in Arabic script, Arabic in Latin script and Santali.

		FLORES-200 devtest					NTREX		
		chrF ↑ (n=201)	chrF ↑ (n=198)	Win% vs. teacher	Win% vs. NLLB 1.3B	Win% vs. NLLB 54B	chrF ↑ (n=112)	Win% vs. teacher	Win% vs. NLLB 1.3B
PaLM2 S (teacher)		43.3	43.7	-	58.1	43.2	48.6	-	73.2
NLLB 1.3B distilled		-	46.0	41.3	-	4.0	48.1	26.8	-
NLLB 54B MoE		-	48.9	56.2	96.0	-	-	-	-
PaLM2 XXS –NTL	baseline	39.2	39.4	32.8	11.6	8.0	36.3	8.9	0.9
	postedit	42.5	42.8	34.8	19.2	10.6	40.6	9.8	3.6
	mufu5	47.1	47.3	46.8	57.1	24.6	46.5	17.0	21.4
	mufu10	48.0	48.3	52.2	75.3	32.7	47.7	17.0	35.7
	mufu20	**48.4**	**48.7**	54.2	76.8	39.7	48.8	20.5	61.6
	mufu5hrl	42.9	43.1	34.3	20.7	10.6	41.0	10.7	3.6
	mufu5tr	44.4	44.6	42.3	33.8	19.1	43.0	11.6	7.1
	mufu20+5hrl	47.1	47.4	47.3	63.1	23.1	46.9	15.2	25.9
	distilled	45.1	45.5	42.8	35.4	17.1	**49.0**	45.5	48.2
PaLM2 XXS	baseline	35.8	35.9	26.9	7.6	5.5	34.2	5.4	1.8
	postedit	41.7	42.0	28.9	22.2	9.0	**43.4**	6.2	8.9
	mufu5	**41.9**	**42.2**	30.8	20.2	11.6	43.1	7.1	8.9
	mufu10	41.0	41.1	30.8	14.1	9.0	40.2	8.0	4.5
	mufu20	41.1	41.2	30.8	14.1	9.5	40.3	8.0	4.5
PaLM2 XS	baseline	31.7	31.9	21.9	2.5	1.0	31.3	5.4	0.0
	postedit	43.8	44.1	36.8	28.3	16.6	43.3	8.9	10.7
	mufu5	44.5	44.6	40.8	33.8	17.6	43.6	8.9	11.6
	mufu10	44.5	44.7	40.3	36.9	19.1	43.6	9.8	13.4
	mufu20	**44.7**	**44.8**	43.3	36.9	19.1	**43.8**	9.8	13.4
PaLM2 S	baseline	32.9	33.0	27.4	4.5	2.5	30.7	7.1	0.0
	mufu20	47.0	47.1	51.2	58.6	27.6	45.6	17.9	26.8
	mufu20lora	**47.2**	**47.5**	99.0	72.2	59.8	**50.1**	91.1	83.9
Gemma 2B	baseline	34.4	34.4	28.9	9.1	4.0	29.2	6.2	0.9
	postedit	44.1	44.3	32.8	37.9	16.1	41.4	8.0	7.1
	mufu5	45.1	45.3	37.8	49.5	22.1	43.2	9.8	9.8
	mufu10	45.4	45.5	39.3	47.0	21.1	43.3	9.8	10.7
	mufu20	**45.5**	**45.6**	39.3	47.5	22.6	**43.6**	10.7	13.4
Gemma 7B	baseline	39.9	40.0	33.3	15.7	9.5	35.1	7.1	0.9
	postedit	46.3	46.5	41.8	54.0	24.6	43.2	9.8	12.5
	mufu5	47.2	47.3	49.3	60.6	27.6	43.4	9.8	11.6
	mufu10	47.2	47.3	49.3	61.6	27.1	43.2	9.8	14.3
	mufu20	**47.6**	**47.7**	51.7	63.6	29.6	43.6	11.6	17.9
	distilled	44.4	44.5	41.3	26.8	18.1	**47.2**	33.9	41.1

Table 2: Mean chrF scores and win percentages against PaLM2 S as teacher model for 201 En-XX language pairs; NLLB 1.3B distilled model and NLLB 54B MoE model for 198 language pairs. **Bold** values are the best chrF scores in a given model class. Red values are win rates above 50%. Mufu{5, 10, 20} indicate the number of non-target multilingual candidates in the prompt. We also report the distillation performance of PaLM2 XXS–NTL and Gemma 7B finetuned with mufu20.

We attribute this phenomenon to the limited amount of supervision in each language pair and autoregressive modeling objective with gold-standard translation—a strategy known to be inferior to distilling from model outputs (Kim & Rush, 2016; Wang et al., 2021; Finkelstein & Freitag, 2023). Mufu is effective for under-resourced languages with low-quality postediting candidates. However, improving high-quality translations in high-resource languages is harder and requires the student model to also learn the subtle differences between model- and human-generated output (Sizov et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Kocmi et al., 2024). It is also possible that the teacher model surpasses human for some translations in high-resource languages—in which case, learning from the human translations could be detrimental.

Compared to NLLB 1.3B distilled, PaLM2 XXS–NTL finetuned with mufu20 translates better in nearly 77% language pairs. The best Mufu models also outperform NLLB 54B MoE in up to nearly 40% of the translation pairs, despite being an order of magnitude smaller than the benchmark model.



Figure 2: Mean chrF across languages of the same resource level. Mufu outperforms the baseline consistently, and improves upon translations by the teacher model in low and very-low resource languages. Mufu is also competitive against NLLB 1.3B distilled in translating into very low resource languages, and consistently outperforms the latter in low, medium and high resource setting. Note that the scales of y-axes are different for the top and bottom rows. Error bars shown are 95% confidence intervals across the language pairs.

The result thus suggests the potential advantage in using higher-quality multilingual candidates produced by NLLB for Mufu.[11]

While we expect a decline in performance due to distribution shift when translating out-of-domain sentences of NTREX, Mufu models hold up well in comparison with the baseline. Most Mufu models no longer outperform the teacher model and NLLB 1.3B distilled, but PaLM2 XXS–NTL with mufu20 maintains an advantage over the NLLB model, scoring higher on average with 48.8 chrF, and is better in 62% language pairs.

The full results of PaLM2 XXS–NTL (mufu20) and Gemma 7B (mufu20) are reported in Appendix A.5. To generalize the performance of Mufu beyond PaLM2 and Gemma models, we additionally report the translation results of finetuned BLOOMZ 1B7 (Muennighoff et al., 2023) in Appendix A.6, which show significant improvement over baseline and postedit only.

4.1 Performance in low-resource languages

Figure 2 shows the mean chrF of Mufu models in four language categories: very-low resource ($n = 68$), low resource ($n = 45$), medium resource ($n = 68$) and high resource ($n = 17$) languages.[12] Again, we compare against the teacher and NLLB 1.3B distilled models, indicated by the red and black dashed lines respectively.

We are most interested in the very-low-resource languages, where we observe all Mufu models obtain substantial gains over the teacher model. This shows Mufu is capable of overcoming noisy auxiliary candidates, since most low-resource target languages are in proximity with other low-resource languages, as included in the prompt. The best Mufu models are also competitive against NLLB 1.3B distilled, and maintain these advantages in low-, medium- and high-resource settings.

[11] We also extract translations from PaLM2 XXS–NTL by five-shot prompting (without any parameter updates), and find the translation quality to be worse than baseline finetuning, supporting Zhang et al. (2023b).

[12] The resource levels of each language were based on our subjective judgements on the accessibility of data and the competency of current translation systems to and from English. We report the resource levels of the languages in Appendix A.5, Table 8.

		FLORES-200 devtest			NTREX	
		teacher	NLLB 1.3B	NLLB 54B	teacher	NLLB 1.3B
PaLM2 XXS –NTL	baseline	56.9	16.8	11.4	32.3	0.0
	postedit	60.3	23.9	13.2	35.5	3.2
	mufu5	78.4	56.6	28.9	54.8	19.4
	mufu10	85.3	65.5	35.1	54.8	12.9
	mufu20	85.3	63.7	36.0	64.5	38.7
	distilled	73.3	40.7	21.1	77.4	41.9
Gemma 7B	baseline	57.8	23.9	14.9	25.8	0.0
	postedit	71.6	42.5	27.2	25.8	6.5
	mufu5	81.0	50.4	30.7	25.8	6.5
	mufu10	81.9	51.3	29.8	22.6	6.5
	mufu20	84.5	53.1	33.3	29.0	6.5
	distilled	71.6	33.6	26.3	61.3	25.8

Table 3: Win percentages measured over the 113 low and very-low resource languages for models shown in rows against, as columns, the teacher model, NLLB 1.3B distilled and NLLB 54B MoE. Win rates above 50% are in red.

In medium- and high-resource languages, Mufu models improve the most relative to the baseline, but fall short compared to the teacher model.

The win percentages of the best Mufu models, PaLM2 XXS–NTL and Gemma 7B, against the teacher model and NLLB models in low and very-low resource languages are reported in Table 3, which largely corroborate the results in Figure 2. Mufu models outperform the teacher in 78–85% of these languages on FLORES devtest and up to 64.5% on NTREX. Among the Mufu models, PaLM2 XXS–NTL is the most consistent, outscoring NLLB 1.3B in 64% and 39% languages. It is also impressive that the Mufu model beats NLLB 54B MoE in more than one third of the languages on FLORES devtest, given the substantial difference in training and capacity.

4.2 Cross-lingual alignment with attention and the effect of auxiliary translations in closely related languages

We present cross-lingual attention alignment of the finetuned models across Mufu input as a mechanistic explanation of the improvement in translation performance. Table 4 compares the translations by Gemma 2B finetuned with mufu5 prompt and the baseline prompt. *Tenth* is translated as *Keupulôh* by mufu5, which is close in form to the reference (*kesiploh*) and is untranslated in the postediting target and skipped entirely by the baseline model. The top block highlights parts of the input attended by the mufu-finetuned model, immediately before the production of *Keupulôh*, indicating transfer of the form from these auxiliary translations. The model also fixates on *Achinese*, the target language in this example.

Beyond outright copying, Mufu models are also capable of transliterating and translating from attention-aligned input that are dissimilar in form. Transliteration from Latin to Arabic script is observed in Achinese—an example where the model transliterates *Jamaika* into the correct Arabic form جامايكا, a word unseen in the postediting target and the baseline translation, is shown in Table 10 in Appendix A.7; whereas the translation of *minimum* to Mizo involves attention to Bengali, which differs from Mizo in form and script, as shown in Table 11.

We provide quantitative evidence in Figure 3, showing the sum of mean multi-head attention of all layers directed to different parts of mufu5 inputs from the generated candidate (normalized by length), across validation examples of a sample of language pairs. Apart from the postediting target, Indonesian auxiliary input is the most useful when translating into Achinese in both Latin and Arabic script; Myanmar receives the most attention relative to the other auxiliary inputs during the translation into Mizo; auxiliary translation in Rundi is helpful to the translations into Kinyarwanda, as Zulu is to Swati—some of these auxiliary translations receive comparable attention to the English source during the process.

The English sentence has been translated into Malay, Sundanese, Javanese, Indonesian, Minangkabau and Achinese. These translations may contain errors. Correct the translation from English to Achinese.

English: In an ambush east of Bardia, the British captured the Italian Tenth Army's Engineer-in-Chief, General Lastucci.

Automatic Malay: Dalam satu serangan hendap di timur Bardia, British berjaya menangkap Ketua Jurutera Tentera Itali, Jeneral Lastucci.

Automatic Javanese: Ing serangan ing sisih wétan Bardia, Inggris nyekel Insinyur-ing-Kepala Tentara Italia Sepuluh, Jenderal Lastucci.

Automatic Sundanese: Dina hiji tewak di wétan Bardia, Inggris néwak Insinyur-in-Chief Tentara Italia, Jenderal Lastucci.

Automatic Indonesian: Dalam sebuah penyergapan di sebelah timur Bardia, Inggris menangkap Insinyur-in-Chief Angkatan Darat Italia Kesepuluh, Jenderal Lastucci.

Automatic Minangkabau: Dalam suatu penyergapan di timur Bardia, Inggris manawan Insinyur Kapalo dari Tentara Italia ka-10, Jenderal Lastucci.

Automatic Achinese: Bak sèngkeu bak timu Bardia, ureueng Inggeris geupeunan ureueng Italia Tenth Army's Engineer-in-Chief, General Lastucci.

Corrected Achinese:Lam seubap senyeurôh di sebelah timu Bardia, Inggreh neukapol roh Insinyur-in-Chief Angkatan Darek Italia

mufu5	Lam seubap senyeurôh di sebelah timu Bardia, Inggreh neukapol roh Insinyur-in-Chief Angkatan Darek Italia **Keupulôh**, Jeneral Lastucci.
baseline	Bak saboh sembuh kira-kira Bardia, Ureueng Inggreh ipeumeunangan Enreng Italia Jumat Pkat Teuntra-dalam-Cahya, Jendral Musoh Lekka.
reference	Lam penyerangan di timu Bardia, ureueng Inggréh geudrop panguleë insinyur angkatan darat **kesiploh** Italia, Jenderal Lastucci.

Table 4: Translations from English to Achinese. The word *Tenth* in English is untranslated in the postediting target and baseline, but is translated into *Keupulôh* (cf. *kesiploh* in reference) by Gemma 2B finetuned with mufu5 prompt. The highlighted text shows the aligned attention across mufu5 prompt right before the production of *Keupulôh*, indicating form transfer from the multilingual input (*Sepuluh* in Javanese, *Kesepuluh* in Indonesian, *ka-10* in Minangkabau). Note that the attention presented here is the mean value across multiple heads and layers. Tokens with aggregated attention values under .01, .06, .13, .22 are colored in white, light gray, dark gray and black respectively.



Figure 3: Sum of self-attention from the tokens of generated candidate (e.g., "Corrected Achinese: ...") to the instruction, input, auxiliary translations and the postediting target. Some auxiliary translations receive more attention than the input (e.g., Indonesian vs. input in translating into Achinese in Latin and Arabic scripts; Zulu vs. input in translating into Swati). Note that a significant portion of attention is placed at the generated sequence itself, which is omitted from the plot.

4.3 Ablation

Mufu iteratively improves translations where teacher and student are the same model. We report the results of finetuned PaLM2 S (baseline and mufu20) in Table 2 and Figure 2 to demonstrate the efficacy of Mufu in setups where the student and teacher are the same model.

Mufu mitigates overfitting. PaLM2 XS and PaLM2 S finetuned with the baseline method overfit and perform worse than PaLM2 XXS (Table 2).[13] Mufu is largely resistant to the problem, showing consistent improvement with increasing model size. To further reduce overfitting, we experiment with LoRA finetuning ($r = 16$) (Hu et al., 2022) on PaLM2 S with mufu20 (`mufu20lora`). This setup

[13] It is possible that the models overfit to translations in high-resource languages, but not in low-resource languages. Thus, a reasonable approach would be to terminate high-resource-language training early (i.e., as a form of curriculum learning). We leave this experiment to future work.

pushes the model's win rates to 99% and 91% in FLORES-200 test and NTREX; and leads to better performance than NLLB 54B in nearly 60% translation directions (Table 2). Figure 2a, however, reveals that mufu20 with LoRA, while being highly resistant to overfitting with few parameter updates, is less effective than full finetuning on very-low-resource languages. The result is presumably related to recent findings that LoRA with low-rank perturbation underperforms compared to full finetuning in newly acquired skills (lower-resource languages), but forgets less of the prior knowledge gained during pre-training (higher-resource languages) (Biderman et al., 2024).

Mufu works best with closely related auxiliary languages. To test if Mufu is still effective without these careful selection of auxiliary languages, we additionally finetune PaLM2 XXS–NTL with mufu5 prompt consisting of only five high-resource languages chosen to simulate colonial influence: Dutch, Russian, French, Chinese and Spanish; and report the result in Table 2 (`mufu5hrl`).[14] While having less relevant multilingual context is better than having no context at all, the improvement is far below the model's upper threshold of translation capacity that we observe in the other Mufu variants. Adding these languages to mufu20 (`mufu20+5hrl`, Table 2) also undermines Mufu's performance, and detracts the model from highly informative candidates in relevant languages.[15]

Mufu's performance is predominantly driven by multilingual candidates. In `mufu5tr`, we remove the postediting target and instruct the model (PaLM2 XXS–NTL) to translate given the other auxiliary candidates. Table 2 shows mufu5tr to be better than the postediting task alone, but combining both conditions (mufu5) yields the best performance.

Distilling Mufu models reduces inference cost and retains accuracy gains. Translating with Mufu admittedly incurs a high inference cost given the need to generate auxiliary translations. Thus, we propose distilling Mufu models with the best performance in low-resource languages to reduce the cost to the baseline level (Kim & Rush, 2016). For distillation data, we use the 6193 English sentences from NLLB seed data (Costa-jussà et al., 2022), and sample 6000 English sentences from past WMT General Tasks test sets (2009–2018) that are not found in NTREX.[16] We use the simple sequence knowledge distillation method from Kim & Rush (2016), which involves supervised fine-tuning of the student model against teacher-predicted sequences.

We choose to distill PaLM2 XXS–NTL and Gemma 7B finetuned with mufu20 for their strong performance in low resource languages. Our results show competitive performance of the `distilled` models against baseline and the teacher model across all languages (Table 2), as well as in low-resource languages (Figure 2, Table 3). Given the mixture of domains in the distillation data, it is not surprising to see the distilled model outperforming the initial model in NTREX, in spite of the latter having never been exposed to gold translation output from the news domain. This signals strong potential to improve out-of-distribution performance of other Mufu models without additional parallel data source.

4.4 Failure cases

Although translation quality improves in most languages pairs, there are a few cases where Mufu underperforms the baseline. One reason is the use of randomly sampled auxiliary languages for some target languages (Section 3.2). In practice, however, only four out of these 28 target languages has auxiliary languages that diverge sufficiently from the target languages and hurt the translation performance consistently.[17] Another major cause is the inclusion of auxiliary inputs of extremely poor quality—with three or more bad auxiliary translations, the input becomes more of a distraction than providing informative context. We provide an example of such input in Appendix A.8.

5 Related Work

ICL for translation. Vilar et al. (2023), Zhang et al. (2023a) and Zhu et al. (2024) find exemplar quality plays a more important role than semantic relevance in prompting for good translations.

[14]Where the target language is one of these languages, we replace the auxiliary input with a translation candidate in Arabic.

[15]For target languages with high-resource languages also appearing in the related auxiliary languages, we include additional related languages such that there are 25 distinct auxiliary candidates in total in the context.

[16]`https://github.com/facebookresearch/flores/blob/main/nllb_seed/README.md`.

[17]The languages are Kanuri in Arabic script, Fulfulde, Tamazight and Kimbundu.

Few-shot ICL is however less effective in translating out of English than into English, contributing to the huge performance gap between low-resource and high-resource languages (Robinson et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2024). Ghazvininejad et al. (2023) improve LLM's translation of rare words by providing multiple word-word hints derived from bilingual dictionaries. Mufu does not require bilingual dictionaries, which can be hard to obtain for very-low-resource languages; and has shown remarkable improvement over baselines when translating into low-resource languages, which are among the harder translation directions.

Multilingual CoT reasoning for translation. LLMs are capable of chain-of-thought reasoning with multilingual prompts (Shi et al., 2023; Chai et al., 2024). Zhu et al. (2024) find cross-lingual translation exemplars to improve translations from lower-resource languages to English. Puduppully et al. (2023) iteratively combines chunks of zero-shot translated input, assuming monotonicity between the source and target languages. He et al. (2024) translate with LLM using synthetic keyword pairs, input topics and semantically related exemplars extracted from the same model, but rely on quality estimators to select the final predictions.

Low-resource translation with LLM. Low-resource languages are notoriously difficult for LLMs. Claude Opus, an LLM nearly three orders of magnitude larger than Mufu models (Anthropic, 2024), outscores NLLB 54B in only 33% pairs of languages in the En-XX directions (Enis & Hopkins, 2024). This is in spite of the fact that the model shows signs of contamination from FLORES-200 (Enis & Hopkins, 2024). A growing body of work has nonetheless shown progress in the effort to reduce the translation performance gap across language pairs, as well as that between LLMs and supervised NMT models (Tanzer et al., 2024; Zhu et al., 2024; Bansal et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2024; Enis & Hopkins, 2024; Bapna et al., 2022; Hendy et al., 2023). LLMs are comparable to human in translations of unseen low-resource languages, when given the same language material (Tanzer et al., 2024; Reid et al., 2024). Bansal et al. (2024) augments an LLM with a smaller LLM of higher expertise in multilinguality to improve low-resource XX-En translation, adding only a small set of trainable parameters. Lu et al. (2024) extend the vocabulary of LLaMa models (Touvron et al., 2023; Dubey et al., 2024) and continually pre-train the models with large-scale monolingual, parallel and synthetic data involving 102 languages. The pretrained models are superior to M2M-100 (Fan et al., 2021) in En-XX translations, but are nevertheless outmatched by NLLB 1.3B, which is more advanced than M2M-100.

6 Discussion

We present Mufu in this work, a method that maximizes data efficiency in low-resource translations with multilingual ICL and finetuning. Our analysis on cross-attention behaviour in Mufu-finetuned models provides evidence that the method extends LLM's capability in multilingual reasoning. That is, given any Mufu-style prompt, the finetuned models are capable of discerning input quality from multilingual candidates, aligning the input semantics across languages beyond orthographic similarity, and improving the candidate translation drawing only from informative context. Mufu models are stronger than the teacher model in low-resource languages and achieve consistent improvement over baseline finetuned models.

Mufu showcases a practical application of multilingual CoT to serve under-resourced languages, but the method carries two limitations. First, while it is largely robust against imperfect multilingual candidates, there seems to be a minimum quality threshold under which Mufu translates worse than the baseline. It would be, however, possible to extract higher-quality auxiliary translations from a stronger teacher (e.g., NLLB 54B), or to perform simple automated checks (e.g., for repetitions) to remove poor auxiliary candidates, to ensure the usefulness of the multilingual context. Second, relative to NMT models, Mufu trade off substantial latency for accuracy. The tradeoff is also evident in knowledge distillation with small-scale data on Mufu models, which necessarily incurs some performance loss. Thus it is up to the practitioners to train using a more comprehensive data set, or to consider the acceptable tradeoff in their use cases. There are nevertheless alternative LLM distillation methods that learn from model-generated text with substantial gains in generalization performance (Finkelstein & Freitag, 2023; Agarwal et al., 2024; Gu et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024).

References

Rishabh Agarwal, Nino Vieillard, Yongchao Zhou, Piotr Stanczyk, Sabela Ramos Garea, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Bachem. On-policy distillation of language models: Learning from self-generated mistakes. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Duarte M Alves, José Pombal, Nuno M Guerreiro, Pedro H Martins, João Alves, Amin Farajian, Ben Peters, Ricardo Rei, Patrick Fernandes, Sweta Agrawal, et al. Tower: An open multilingual large language model for translation-related tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17733*, 2024.

Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*, 2023.

Anthropic. Introducing the next generation of claude, Mar 2024. URL `https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family`.

Rachit Bansal, Bidisha Samanta, Siddharth Dalmia, Nitish Gupta, Sriram Ganapathy, Abhishek Bapna, Prateek Jain, and Partha Talukdar. LLM augmented LLMs: Expanding capabilities through composition. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Ankur Bapna, Isaac Caswell, Julia Kreutzer, Orhan Firat, Daan van Esch, Aditya Siddhant, Mengmeng Niu, Pallavi Baljekar, Xavier Garcia, Wolfgang Macherey, et al. Building machine translation systems for the next thousand languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.03983*, 2022.

Dan Biderman, Jacob Portes, Jose Javier Gonzalez Ortiz, Mansheej Paul, Philip Greengard, Connor Jennings, Daniel King, Sam Havens, Vitaliy Chiley, Jonathan Frankle, Cody Blakeney, and John Patrick Cunningham. LoRA learns less and forgets less. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024. ISSN 2835-8856. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=aloEru2qCG`. Featured Certification.

Isaac Caswell, Theresa Breiner, Daan van Esch, and Ankur Bapna. Language ID in the wild: Unexpected challenges on the path to a thousand-language web text corpus. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 6588–6608, 2020.

Linzheng Chai, Jian Yang, Tao Sun, Hongcheng Guo, Jiaheng Liu, Bing Wang, Xiannian Liang, Jiaqi Bai, Tongliang Li, Qiyao Peng, et al. xcot: Cross-lingual instruction tuning for cross-lingual chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07037*, 2024.

Pinzhen Chen, Zhicheng Guo, Barry Haddow, and Kenneth Heafield. Iterative translation refinement with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03856*, 2023.

Marta R Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, et al. No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*, 2022.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.

Maxim Enis and Mark Hopkins. From LLM to NMT: Advancing low-resource machine translation with claude. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13813*, 2024.

Angela Fan, Shruti Bhosale, Holger Schwenk, Zhiyi Ma, Ahmed El-Kishky, Siddharth Goyal, Mandeep Baines, Onur Celebi, Guillaume Wenzek, Vishrav Chaudhary, et al. Beyond English-centric multilingual machine translation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(107):1–48, 2021.

Christian Federmann, Tom Kocmi, and Ying Xin. NTREX-128–news test references for MT evaluation of 128 languages. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Scaling Up Multilingual Evaluation*, pp. 21–24, 2022.

Mara Finkelstein and Markus Freitag. Mbr and qe finetuning: Training-time distillation of the best and most expensive decoding methods. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. Gemma: Open models based on Gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*, 2024.

Marjan Ghazvininejad, Hila Gonen, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Dictionary-based phrase-level prompting of large language models for machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07856*, 2023.

Yuxian Gu, Li Dong, Furu Wei, and Minlie Huang. Minillm: Knowledge distillation of large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Zhiwei He, Tian Liang, Wenxiang Jiao, Zhuosheng Zhang, Yujiu Yang, Rui Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Shuming Shi, and Xing Wang. Exploring human-like translation strategy with large language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:229–246, 2024.

Amr Hendy, Mohamed Abdelrehim, Amr Sharaf, Vikas Raunak, Mohamed Gabr, Hitokazu Matsushita, Young Jin Kim, Mohamed Afify, and Hany Hassan Awadalla. How good are gpt models at machine translation? a comprehensive evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09210*, 2023.

Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=nZeVKeeFYf9`.

Yoon Kim and Alexander M Rush. Sequence-level knowledge distillation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1317–1327, 2016.

Tom Kocmi and Christian Federmann. GEMBA-MQM: Detecting translation quality error spans with GPT-4. In Philipp Koehn, Barry Haddow, Tom Kocmi, and Christof Monz (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pp. 768–775, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.wmt-1.64. URL `https://aclanthology.org/2023.wmt-1.64`.

Tom Kocmi, Eleftherios Avramidis, Rachel Bawden, Ondřej Bojar, Anton Dvorkovich, Christian Federmann, Mark Fishel, Markus Freitag, Thamme Gowda, Roman Grundkiewicz, et al. Findings of the WMT24 general machine translation shared task: the LLM era is here but MT is not solved yet. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pp. 1–46, 2024.

Sneha Kudugunta, Isaac Caswell, Biao Zhang, Xavier Garcia, Derrick Xin, Aditya Kusupati, Romi Stella, Ankur Bapna, and Orhan Firat. Madlad-400: A multilingual and document-level large audited dataset. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Mikel Artetxe, Tianlu Wang, Shuohui Chen, Daniel Simig, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Shruti Bhosale, Jingfei Du, et al. Few-shot learning with multilingual generative language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 9019–9052, 2022.

Patrick Littell, David R Mortensen, Ke Lin, Katherine Kairis, Carlisle Turner, and Lori Levin. Uriel and lang2vec: Representing languages as typological, geographical, and phylogenetic vectors. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pp. 8–14, 2017.

Yinquan Lu, Wenhao Zhu, Lei Li, Yu Qiao, and Fei Yuan. LLaMAX: Scaling linguistic horizons of LLM by enhancing translation capabilities beyond 100 languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05975*, 2024.

Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Hailey Schoelkopf, et al. Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 15991–16111, 2023.

Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. BLEU: A method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2002.

Maja Popović. chrF: character n-gram F-score for automatic MT evaluation. In *Proceedings of the tenth workshop on statistical machine translation*, pp. 392–395, 2015.

Ratish Puduppully, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Raj Dabre, Aiti Aw, and Nancy Chen. Decomt: Decomposed prompting for machine translation between related languages using large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 4586–4602, 2023.

Vikas Raunak, Amr Sharaf, Yiren Wang, Hany Awadalla, and Arul Menezes. Leveraging GPT-4 for automatic translation post-editing. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 12009–12024, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.804. URL `https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.804`.

Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.

Nathaniel Robinson, Perez Ogayo, David R Mortensen, and Graham Neubig. ChatGPT MT: Competitive for high-(but not low-) resource languages. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pp. 392–418, 2023.

Freda Shi, Mirac Suzgun, Markus Freitag, Xuezhi Wang, Suraj Srivats, Soroush Vosoughi, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Sebastian Ruder, Denny Zhou, et al. Language models are multilingual chain-of-thought reasoners. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

Fedor Sizov, Cristina España-Bonet, Josef van Genabith, Roy Xie, and Koel Dutta Chowdhury. Analysing translation artifacts: A comparative study of LLMs, NMTs, and human translations. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pp. 1183–1199, 2024.

Garrett Tanzer, Mirac Suzgun, Eline Visser, Dan Jurafsky, and Luke Melas-Kyriazi. A benchmark for learning to translate a new language from one grammar book. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.

David Vilar, Markus Freitag, Colin Cherry, Jiaming Luo, Viresh Ratnakar, and George Foster. Prompting PaLM for translation: Assessing strategies and performance. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*, 2023.

Fusheng Wang, Jianhao Yan, Fandong Meng, and Jie Zhou. Selective knowledge distillation for neural machine translation. 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)*, pp. 6456–6466, 2021.

Jun Wang, Eleftheria Briakou, Hamid Dadkhahi, Rishabh Agarwal, Colin Cherry, and Trevor Cohn. Don't throw away data: Better sequence knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10456*, 2024.

Xinyi Wang, John Wieting, and Jonathan H Clark. Fiat: Fusing learning paradigms with instruction-accelerated tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04663*, 2023.

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.

Xiangpeng Wei, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Tianhao Li, Pei Zhang, Xingzhang Ren, Mei Li, Yu Wan, Zhiwei Cao, Binbin Xie, et al. Polylm: An open source polyglot large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06018*, 2023.

Wikipedia contributors. Mufu — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. `https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Mufu&oldid=1218674437`, 2024. [Online; accessed 12-September-2024].

Genta Indra Winata, Andrea Madotto, Zhaojiang Lin, Rosanne Liu, Jason Yosinski, and Pascale Fung. Language models are few-shot multilingual learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07684*, 2021.

Haoran Xu, Young Jin Kim, Amr Sharaf, and Hany Hassan Awadalla. A paradigm shift in machine translation: Boosting translation performance of large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Fei Yuan, Shuai Yuan, Zhiyong Wu, and Lei Li. How vocabulary sharing facilitates multilingualism in LLaMA? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pp. 12111–12130, 2024.

Biao Zhang, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. Prompting large language model for machine translation: A case study. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 41092–41110, 2023a.

Ran Zhang, Wei Zhao, and Steffen Eger. How good are llms for literary translation, really? literary translation evaluation with humans and llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18697*, 2024.

Xuan Zhang, Navid Rajabi, Kevin Duh, and Philipp Koehn. Machine translation with large language models: Prompting, few-shot learning, and fine-tuning with QLoRA. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pp. 468–481, 2023b.

Wenhao Zhu, Hongyi Liu, Qingxiu Dong, Jingjing Xu, Shujian Huang, Lingpeng Kong, Jiajun Chen, and Lei Li. Multilingual machine translation with large language models: Empirical results and analysis. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pp. 2765–2781, 2024.

A Appendix

A.1 Prompt selection

Prior to conducting experiments reported in the main text, we tested several versions of Mufu prompt on 100 sentences from FLORES-200 dev split reserved for prompt selection (see Section 3.1). We focused on a handful of target languages in the preliminary experiment: Achinese, Balinese, Buginese, Banjar and Minangkabau; using a fixed set of auxiliary languages: Indonesian, Malay, Javanese, Sundanese and Arabic. Auxiliary candidates for prompt selection were first generated by PaLM2 S via one-shot prompting:

> Translate from English to <target language>.
>
> English: Maybe one day, your great grandchildren will be standing atop an alien world wondering about their ancient ancestors?
> <target language>: <reference translation>
>
> English: <input>
> <target language>:

We then evaluated different versions of the prompt using the same model during the second iteration, where auxiliary candidates were included in the instruction similar to the template shown in Table 1 in the main text. We swapped out listed languages in the instruction with "... *several languages as specified*", and discovered it to be sub-par compared to the original prompt. We also experimented with prepending "*Candidate/Reference*" to the language tags in place of "*Automatic/Corrected*", and found the latter to yield superior performance. Note that these preliminary experiments on prompt variation do not involve finetuning, and we arrive at a final prompt template based on results derived entirely from zero-shot prompting.

A.2 Auxiliary languages

Table 5 lists the custom set of auxiliary languages for each target language included in Mufu-style prompt. The languages are selected based on URIEL repository as described in Section 3.2, and are arranged from farthest to closest. Target languages assigned with random auxiliary languages are marked with †.

Target language	Auxiliary languages
Achinese	Buginese, Samoan, Shan, Vietnamese, Malagasy, Ilocano, Myanmar (Burmese), Fijian, Maori, Sinhala, Lao, Khmer, Thai, Balinese, Banjar, Malay, Javanese, Sundanese, Indonesian, Minangkabau
Achinese in Arabic script	Buginese, Samoan, Shan, Vietnamese, Malagasy, Ilocano, Myanmar (Burmese), Fijian, Maori, Sinhala, Lao, Khmer, Thai, Balinese, Banjar, Malay, Javanese, Sundanese, Indonesian, Minangkabau
Afrikaans	Bemba (Zambia), Danish, Xhosa, Swedish, Sesotho, Norwegian, Chichewa, Faroese, Icelandic, Tswana, Shona, Yiddish, Swati, Tok Pisin, Luxembourgish, Zulu, Sepedi, German, Tsonga, Dutch
Albanian	Slovenian, French, Finnish, Romanian, Sicilian, Ewe, Basque, Italian, Croatian, Bengali, South Azerbaijani, Serbian, Hungarian, Egyptian Arabic, Bosnian, Amharic, Macedonian, German, Greek, Bulgarian
Amharic	Sango, Hausa, Kinyarwanda, Rundi, Luo, Kamba (Kenya), Tunisian Arabic, Luganda, Kikuyu, Maltese, Nuer, North Levantine Arabic, Mesopotamian Arabic, Najdi Arabic, Arabic, Hebrew, Egyptian Arabic, Somali, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Tigrinya
Arabic	Bulgarian, Turkish, Tamasheq, Somali, Hausa, Armenian, Georgian, Tunisian Arabic, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Amharic, Sorani Kurdish, Maltese, South Azerbaijani, Tigrinya, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Hebrew, Egyptian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Najdi Arabic, Mesopotamian Arabic
Arabic in Latin script	Bulgarian, Turkish, Tamasheq, Somali, Hausa, Armenian, Georgian, Tunisian Arabic, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Amharic, Sorani Kurdish, Maltese, South Azerbaijani, Tigrinya, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Hebrew, Egyptian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Najdi Arabic, Mesopotamian Arabic
Armenian	Romanian, Lithuanian, Turkmen, Kashmiri, Najdi Arabic, Icelandic, Turkish, Hindi, North Levantine Arabic, Irish, French, Mesopotamian Arabic, South Azerbaijani, German, Sorani Kurdish, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Georgian, Bengali, Greek, Bulgarian
Assamese	Marathi, Myanmar (Burmese), Sanskrit, Gujarati, Kachin, Sinhala, Mizo, Santali, Kashmiri, Bhojpuri, Tibetan, Magahi, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Awadhi, Punjabi, Hindi, Nepali, Maithili, Odia (Oriya), Bengali
Asturian	Luxembourgish, Romanian, German, Sicilian, Kabyle, Welsh, Irish, Haitian Creole, Esperanto, Italian, Venetian, Papiamento, Basque, Ligurian, Occitan, French, Catalan, Spanish, Galician, Portuguese
Awadhi	Meiteilon (Manipuri), Sindhi, Marathi, Tibetan, Sinhala, Sanskrit, Santali, Urdu, Assamese, Gujarati, Magahi, Kashmiri, Odia (Oriya), Bhojpuri, Bengali, Maithili, Punjabi, Chhattisgarhi, Nepali, Hindi
Ayacucho Quechua	Kabiyè, Finnish, Tamasheq, Basque, Mossi, Greek, Dyula, German, Bambara, Wolof, Bulgarian, Yiddish, Bengali, Haitian Creole, South Azerbaijani, Papiamento, Egyptian Arabic, Aymara, Amharic, Ewe
Aymara	Finnish, Hausa, Tamasheq, Basque, Mossi, Greek, Dyula, German, Bambara, Wolof, Bulgarian, Yiddish, Bengali, Haitian Creole, South Azerbaijani, Papiamento, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Ayacucho Quechua, Ewe
Azerbaijani†	Buginese, Cebuano, Chokwe, Icelandic, Fulfulde, Wolof, Norwegian, Luba-Lulua, Malayalam, Uyghur, Sorani Kurdish, Bambara, Myanmar (Burmese), Mandarin Chinese, Kabyle, Urdu, Tamazight, Zulu, German, Luxembourgish
Balinese	Vietnamese, Thai, Lao, Samoan, Khmer, Malagasy, Fijian, Maori, Pangasinan, Waray (Philippines), Ilocano, Cebuano, Buginese, Minangkabau, Malay, Javanese, Banjar, Achinese, Sundanese, Indonesian
Bambara	Kabyle, Finnish, Igbo, Basque, Greek, Yoruba, Fon, German, Bulgarian, Bengali, Kabiyè, Mossi, South Azerbaijani, Egyptian Arabic, Tamasheq, Amharic, Wolof, Hausa, Ewe, Dyula
Banjar	Thai, Vietnamese, Samoan, Lao, Malagasy, Khmer, Fijian, Maori, Pangasinan, Waray (Philippines), Ilocano, Cebuano, Minangkabau, Achinese, Buginese, Sundanese, Javanese, Balinese, Indonesian, Malay
Banjar in Arabic script	Thai, Vietnamese, Samoan, Lao, Malagasy, Khmer, Fijian, Maori, Pangasinan, Waray (Philippines), Ilocano, Cebuano, Minangkabau, Achinese, Buginese, Sundanese, Javanese, Balinese, Indonesian, Malay
Bashkir	Lithuanian, Latvian, German, Belarusian, Bulgarian, Bengali, Finnish, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Tajik, Georgian, Armenian, Turkish, Russian, Uyghur, Turkmen, South Azerbaijani, Kyrghyz, Kazakh, Tatar
Basque	Luxembourgish, Finnish, Ligurian, Esperanto, Ewe, Greek, Occitan, Irish, Galician, Bulgarian, Bengali, Catalan, South Azerbaijani, Asturian, Spanish, Egyptian Arabic, German, Portuguese, Amharic, French
Belarusian	Greek, Danish, Macedonian, Swedish, Hungarian, Bosnian, Romanian, German, Estonian, Slovenian, Russian, Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Slovak, Latvian, Lithuanian, Czech, Polish, Ukrainian
Bemba (Zambia)	Xhosa, Umbundu, Lingala, Sesotho, Swati, Afrikaans, Luo, Tswana, Tsonga, Chokwe, Luba-Lulua, Sepedi, Zulu, Kamba (Kenya), Rundi, Kikuyu, Luganda, Shona, Kinyarwanda, Chichewa

Target language	Auxiliary languages
Bengali	Chhattisgarhi, Marathi, Gujarati, Myanmar (Burmese), Sanskrit, Tibetan, Sinhala, Punjabi, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Bhojpuri, Kashmiri, Mizo, Magahi, Santali, Awadhi, Hindi, Nepali, Maithili, Odia (Oriya), Assamese
Bhojpuri	Sindhi, Mizo, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Gujarati, Marathi, Sanskrit, Sinhala, Chhattisgarhi, Tibetan, Santali, Kashmiri, Punjabi, Assamese, Odia (Oriya), Hindi, Awadhi, Bengali, Nepali, Magahi, Maithili
Bosnian	Sicilian, Romanian, Lithuanian, Belarusian, Hungarian, German, Venetian, Polish, Russian, Italian, Greek, Ukrainian, Czech, Slovak, Albanian, Bulgarian, Slovenian, Macedonian, Serbian, Croatian
Buginese	Thai, Vietnamese, Lao, Khmer, Samoan, Malagasy, Minangkabau, Fijian, Maori, Pangasinan, Waray (Philippines), Malay, Achinese, Banjar, Ilocano, Cebuano, Balinese, Indonesian, Sundanese, Javanese
Bulgarian	Latvian, Venetian, German, Lithuanian, Turkish, Hungarian, Belarusian, Russian, Albanian, Romanian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Greek, Slovenian, Ukrainian, Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, Macedonian
Cantonese	German, Bulgarian, Waray (Philippines), Thai, South Azerbaijani, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Shan, Bengali, Khmer, Lao, Ilocano, Tibetan, Pangasinan, Vietnamese, Mizo, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Kachin, Myanmar (Burmese), Mandarin Chinese
Catalan	Bulgarian, Bengali, Romanian, Luxembourgish, German, Esperanto, Haitian Creole, Papiamento, Kabyle, Sicilian, Basque, Venetian, Italian, Galician, French, Asturian, Ligurian, Portuguese, Occitan, Spanish
Cebuano	Lao, Vietnamese, Samoan, Khmer, Minangkabau, Malagasy, Cantonese, Fijian, Maori, Malay, Achinese, Indonesian, Banjar, Balinese, Sundanese, Pangasinan, Buginese, Javanese, Ilocano, Waray (Philippines)
Chhattisgarhi	Mizo, Kannada, Santali, Sinhala, Punjabi, Kashmiri, Assamese, Urdu, Telugu, Bhojpuri, Maithili, Magahi, Gujarati, Nepali, Marathi, Bengali, Sanskrit, Odia (Oriya), Awadhi, Hindi
Chichewa	Lingala, Malagasy, Luo, Xhosa, Luba-Lulua, Sesotho, Chokwe, Afrikaans, Luganda, Tswana, Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Rundi, Swati, Tsonga, Bemba (Zambia), Kinyarwanda, Sepedi, Shona, Zulu
Chokwe	Sesotho, Sango, Swati, Luo, Tsonga, Afrikaans, Kamba (Kenya), Tswana, Sepedi, Kikuyu, Bemba (Zambia), Zulu, Rundi, Luganda, Shona, Kinyarwanda, Chichewa, Lingala, Luba-Lulua, Umbundu
Crimean Tatar in Latin script†	Sanskrit, Fulfulde, Tamil, South Levantine Arabic, Sundanese, Limburgan, Azerbaijani, Guarani, Latvian, Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Irish, Tatar, Egyptian Arabic, Lingala, Hausa, Friulian, Maori, Tamazight, Oromo
Croatian	Latvian, Romanian, Lithuanian, Greek, Belarusian, Albanian, Italian, Russian, Venetian, Polish, Hungarian, German, Ukrainian, Bulgarian, Czech, Macedonian, Slovak, Serbian, Slovenian, Bosnian
Czech	Italian, Romanian, Dutch, Macedonian, Danish, Luxembourgish, Lithuanian, Venetian, Hungarian, Belarusian, Russian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Serbian, Ukrainian, German, Croatian, Slovenian, Polish, Slovak
Danish	Greek, Scottish Gaelic, Bulgarian, Bengali, Norwegian Nynorsk, Yiddish, Lithuanian, Tok Pisin, Esperanto, Afrikaans, Polish, Czech, Faroese, French, Icelandic, Luxembourgish, German, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian
Dari†	Japanese, Aymara, Pangasinan, Maltese, Ilocano, Turkmen, Faroese, Oromo, Igbo, Yoruba, South Levantine Arabic, Guarani, Kikuyu, Ayacucho Quechua, Lao, Balinese, Latvian, Fijian, Belarusian, Kabuverdianu
Dinka†	Umbundu, Uyghur, Arabic, Fijian, Catalan, Sorani Kurdish, Mandarin Chinese, Bulgarian, Bengali, Japanese, Ilocano, Spanish, Korean, Balinese, Kabuverdianu, Achinese, Tsonga, Macedonian, Friulian, Polish
Dutch	Bulgarian, Bengali, Ligurian, Occitan, Swedish, Scottish Gaelic, Faroese, Czech, Icelandic, Welsh, Yiddish, Tok Pisin, Irish, Esperanto, Afrikaans, Norwegian, French, Danish, German, Luxembourgish
Dyula	Finnish, Sango, Basque, Greek, Wolof, Igbo, German, Yoruba, Fon, Bulgarian, Bengali, South Azerbaijani, Egyptian Arabic, Hausa, Kabiyè, Amharic, Tamasheq, Mossi, Ewe, Bambara
Dzongkha†	Cantonese, Kashmiri, Fon, Aymara, Ayacucho Quechua, Albanian, Swati, Lingala, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, South Levantine Arabic, Georgian, Italian, Norwegian Nynorsk, Crimean Tatar in Latin script, Kannada, Maltese, Fijian, Welsh, Shona, Igbo
Egyptian Arabic	Somali, South Azerbaijani, Albanian, Hausa, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Tigrinya, Amharic, Sorani Kurdish, Macedonian, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Bulgarian, Greek, Tunisian Arabic, Turkish, Maltese, Najdi Arabic, Arabic, Hebrew, Mesopotamian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic
Esperanto	Venetian, Finnish, Catalan, Danish, Ewe, Greek, Ligurian, Occitan, Bulgarian, Welsh, Bengali, Dutch, South Azerbaijani, Luxembourgish, Egyptian Arabic, Irish, Amharic, Basque, German, French
Estonian	Ewe, Basque, Czech, Greek, Danish, Polish, Norwegian Nynorsk, Bulgarian, Bengali, Belarusian, South Azerbaijani, Norwegian, Egyptian Arabic, Lithuanian, Amharic, Latvian, Swedish, German, Hungarian, Finnish
Ewe	Umbundu, Kamba (Kenya), Wolof, Luganda, Kinyarwanda, Bambara, Hausa, Tamasheq, Luba-Lulua, Kikuyu, Dyula, Chichewa, Zulu, Sango, Lingala, Mossi, Kabiyè, Yoruba, Igbo, Fon
Faroese	Greek, Estonian, Bulgarian, Bengali, Esperanto, Yiddish, Tok Pisin, French, Welsh, Afrikaans, Norwegian Nynorsk, German, Scottish Gaelic, Luxembourgish, Irish, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Icelandic
Fijian	Cantonese, Korean, Japanese, Minangkabau, Malagasy, Malay, Achinese, Tok Pisin, Pangasinan, Banjar, Indonesian, Waray (Philippines), Sundanese, Javanese, Balinese, Buginese, Ilocano, Cebuano, Samoan, Maori
Filipino†	Magahi, Sepedi, Luba-Lulua, Czech, Khmer, Tswana, Tamazight, Lithuanian, Lingala, Aymara, Swahili, Tajik, Chichewa, Venetian, Swedish, Ewe, North Levantine Arabic, Finnish, Fon, Mandarin Chinese
Finnish	Tatar, Basque, Faroese, Greek, Polish, Danish, Belarusian, Bulgarian, Bengali, Lithuanian, South Azerbaijani, Norwegian, Egyptian Arabic, Latvian, German, Norwegian Nynorsk, Amharic, Swedish, Hungarian, Estonian

Target language	Auxiliary languages
Fon	Umbundu, Kamba (Kenya), Wolof, Luganda, Kinyarwanda, Bambara, Tamasheq, Hausa, Luba-Lulua, Kikuyu, Dyula, Chichewa, Zulu, Sango, Lingala, Mossi, Kabiyè, Igbo, Yoruba, Ewe
French	Romanian, Sicilian, Irish, Papiamento, Italian, Welsh, Basque, German, Dutch, Galician, Luxembourgish, Haitian Creole, Esperanto, Asturian, Spanish, Venetian, Portuguese, Catalan, Occitan, Ligurian
Friulian†	Spanish, Chichewa, Italian, Chhattisgarhi, Mossi, Uyghur, Macedonian, Slovak, Odia (Oriya), French, Haitian Creole, Sorani Kurdish, Tok Pisin, Indonesian, Latgalian, Nepali, Icelandic, Samoan, Ayacucho Quechua, Dari
Fulfulde†	Santali, Catalan, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Esperanto, Basque, Mandarin Chinese, Arabic in Latin script, Balinese, Myanmar (Burmese), Kachin, Xhosa, Albanian, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Italian, Dari, Dzongkha, Norwegian, Pangasinan, Assamese, Swati
Galician	Luxembourgish, Romanian, German, Sicilian, Kabyle, Haitian Creole, Esperanto, Welsh, Irish, Italian, Venetian, Basque, Papiamento, Ligurian, Occitan, French, Catalan, Spanish, Asturian, Portuguese
Georgian	Finnish, Arabic, Turkmen, Ewe, Turkish, Basque, Najdi Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, German, Mesopotamian Arabic, Hebrew, Sorani Kurdish, Bengali, Greek, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Amharic, Bulgarian, Armenian, Egyptian Arabic, South Azerbaijani
German	Italian, French, Swedish, Ligurian, Hungarian, Norwegian, Faroese, Polish, Croatian, Icelandic, Yiddish, Tok Pisin, Slovak, Venetian, Danish, Slovenian, Afrikaans, Czech, Dutch, Luxembourgish
Greek	Punjabi, Turkish, Lithuanian, Croatian, Kashmiri, Hungarian, Icelandic, Ukrainian, Armenian, Bosnian, Hindi, Irish, French, Albanian, Serbian, Macedonian, German, Bengali, Romanian, Bulgarian
Guarani†	Malayalam, Lingala, Ukrainian, Aymara, Galician, Luba-Lulua, Zulu, Bashkir, Sepedi, Chhattisgarhi, Arabic, Tok Pisin, Thai, Tigrinya, Japanese, Arabic in Latin script, Mizo, Najdi Arabic, Malay, Egyptian Arabic
Gujarati	Malayalam, Assamese, Magahi, Kannada, Sinhala, Telugu, Bhojpuri, Odia (Oriya), Maithili, Bengali, Nepali, Sanskrit, Marathi, Kashmiri, Sindhi, Chhattisgarhi, Punjabi, Awadhi, Urdu, Hindi
Haitian Creole	Sicilian, Scottish Gaelic, Italian, Bambara, Occitan, Icelandic, Catalan, Wolof, Irish, Aymara, Ayacucho Quechua, Ligurian, Venetian, Yiddish, Spanish, French, Asturian, Portuguese, Galician, Papiamento
Hausa	Bambara, Lingala, Arabic, Dyula, Mesopotamian Arabic, Sango, North Levantine Arabic, Mossi, Somali, Ewe, Kabiyè, Fon, Hebrew, Igbo, Egyptian Arabic, Maltese, Amharic, Yoruba, Tunisian Arabic, Tamasheq
Hebrew	Somali, Hausa, Georgian, Greek, Amharic, Armenian, Bulgarian, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Sorani Kurdish, Turkish, South Azerbaijani, Tigrinya, Tunisian Arabic, Maltese, Najdi Arabic, Arabic, Mesopotamian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Egyptian Arabic
Hindi	Kannada, Santali, Telugu, Assamese, Sinhala, Magahi, Odia (Oriya), Sindhi, Bhojpuri, Maithili, Bengali, Kashmiri, Marathi, Nepali, Sanskrit, Urdu, Chhattisgarhi, Punjabi, Gujarati, Awadhi
Hungarian	Basque, Polish, Venetian, Czech, Bosnian, Ukrainian, Bengali, Slovenian, South Azerbaijani, Egyptian Arabic, Romanian, Amharic, Greek, Serbian, Croatian, Estonian, Finnish, Slovak, German, Bulgarian
Icelandic	Greek, Bulgarian, Finnish, Bengali, Esperanto, Yiddish, Tok Pisin, Afrikaans, Welsh, French, Norwegian Nynorsk, Luxembourgish, German, Scottish Gaelic, Irish, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Faroese
Igbo	Tamasheq, Sepedi, Dyula, Umbundu, Sango, Rundi, Kamba (Kenya), Mossi, Kabiyè, Hausa, Kikuyu, Luganda, Ewe, Fon, Kinyarwanda, Chichewa, Zulu, Luba-Lulua, Lingala, Yoruba
Ilocano	Thai, Samoan, Malagasy, Balinese, Khmer, Lao, Fijian, Malay, Achinese, Indonesian, Vietnamese, Cantonese, Sundanese, Maori, Banjar, Buginese, Waray (Philippines), Cebuano, Javanese, Pangasinan
Indonesian	Vietnamese, Samoan, Lao, Thai, Malagasy, Khmer, Fijian, Pangasinan, Maori, Waray (Philippines), Ilocano, Cebuano, Buginese, Achinese, Javanese, Minangkabau, Malay, Banjar, Balinese, Sundanese
Irish	Galician, Kashmiri, Asturian, Basque, Armenian, Hindi, Danish, Luxembourgish, Greek, Faroese, Portuguese, Dutch, Bulgarian, Esperanto, Icelandic, Bengali, German, French, Welsh, Scottish Gaelic
Italian	Papiamento, Serbian, Hungarian, Romanian, Asturian, Haitian Creole, Albanian, Galician, Croatian, Spanish, German, Bosnian, Portuguese, Slovenian, French, Catalan, Occitan, Ligurian, Venetian, Sicilian
Japanese	Finnish, Kachin, Ewe, Lao, Vietnamese, Basque, Greek, Cebuano, Waray (Philippines), German, Pangasinan, Bulgarian, Bengali, Ilocano, Cantonese, South Azerbaijani, Mandarin Chinese, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Korean
Javanese	Vietnamese, Thai, Lao, Samoan, Khmer, Malagasy, Pangasinan, Waray (Philippines), Fijian, Maori, Minangkabau, Cebuano, Ilocano, Malay, Banjar, Balinese, Buginese, Achinese, Indonesian, Sundanese
Kabiyè	Umbundu, Kamba (Kenya), Luganda, Kinyarwanda, Wolof, Bambara, Kikuyu, Hausa, Luba-Lulua, Tamasheq, Chichewa, Dyula, Zulu, Lingala, Sango, Igbo, Yoruba, Fon, Ewe, Mossi
Kabuverdianu†	Albanian, Achinese in Arabic script, Venetian, Malagasy, Najdi Arabic, Fulfulde, Marathi, Tamil, Xhosa, Sicilian, Slovak, Bashkir, Italian, Irish, Georgian, Samoan, Achinese, Fijian, Magahi, Tigrinya
Kabyle	Asturian, Arabic, Italian, Portuguese, Mesopotamian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Somali, Basque, Ligurian, Occitan, Hebrew, Hausa, Sicilian, Spanish, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Catalan, Tamasheq, Maltese, Tunisian Arabic
Kachin	Nepali, German, Vietnamese, Magahi, Bulgarian, Odia (Oriya), Maithili, South Azerbaijani, Santali, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Mandarin Chinese, Assamese, Shan, Cantonese, Bengali, Tibetan, Mizo, Myanmar (Burmese), Meiteilon (Manipuri)

Target language	Auxiliary languages
Kamba (Kenya)	Chokwe, Tsonga, Tswana, Swati, Lingala, Amharic, Sesotho, Sepedi, Nuer, Somali, Luba-Lulua, Zulu, Luo, Shona, Bemba (Zambia), Chichewa, Rundi, Kinyarwanda, Luganda, Kikuyu
Kannada	Ewe, Sindhi, Basque, Greek, Odia (Oriya), German, Gujarati, Bulgarian, Chhattisgarhi, South Azerbaijani, Hindi, Sinhala, Bengali, Sanskrit, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Marathi, Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam
Kanuri†	Tsonga, Tunisian Arabic, Norwegian Nynorsk, Khmer, Dutch, Urdu, Macedonian, Lingala, Ewe, Fijian, Dinka, Odia (Oriya), Faroese, Marathi, Belarusian, Wolof, Tigrinya, Banjar in Arabic script, Mesopotamian Arabic, Estonian
Kanuri in Arabic script†	Urdu, Uzbek, Persian, Odia (Oriya), Tsonga, Kashmiri, Irish, Achinese, Maori, Dari, North Levantine Arabic, Slovak, Lingala, Kikuyu, Banjar in Arabic script, Banjar, Mandarin Chinese, Telugu, Kyrghyz, Ilocano
Kashmiri	Marathi, Magahi, Sanskrit, Uyghur, Assamese, Kazakh, Odia (Oriya), Bhojpuri, Sinhala, Maithili, Urdu, Kyrghyz, Bengali, Gujarati, Tajik, Awadhi, Nepali, Hindi, Sindhi, Punjabi
Kashmiri in Devanagari script	Marathi, Magahi, Sanskrit, Uyghur, Assamese, Kazakh, Odia (Oriya), Bhojpuri, Sinhala, Maithili, Urdu, Kyrghyz, Bengali, Gujarati, Tajik, Awadhi, Nepali, Hindi, Sindhi, Punjabi
Kazakh	Kurdish (Kurmanji), Sindhi, German, Armenian, Bulgarian, Georgian, Bengali, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Punjabi, Russian, Turkish, Kashmiri, Tajik, Tatar, South Azerbaijani, Uyghur, Turkmen, Bashkir, Kyrghyz
Khmer	Kachin, Javanese, Basque, Myanmar (Burmese), Greek, German, Malay, Cantonese, Bulgarian, Minangkabau, Shan, South Azerbaijani, Achinese, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Bengali, Thai, Santali, Lao, Vietnamese
Kikuyu	Chokwe, Tsonga, Tswana, Swati, Sesotho, Amharic, Lingala, Somali, Sepedi, Luba-Lulua, Nuer, Zulu, Shona, Luo, Bemba (Zambia), Chichewa, Rundi, Kinyarwanda, Luganda, Kamba (Kenya)
Kimbundu†	Irish, Chhattisgarhi, Swahili, Nepali, Kongo, Pashto, Tunisian Arabic, Norwegian Nynorsk, Uzbek, Xhosa, Bemba (Zambia), Tswana, Kashmiri in Devanagari script, South Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Azerbaijani, Kinyarwanda, Javanese, Morrocan Arabic, Latvian
Kinyarwanda	Umbundu, Tsonga, Tswana, Sango, Swati, Sesotho, Nuer, Sepedi, Chokwe, Zulu, Luo, Lingala, Luba-Lulua, Shona, Bemba (Zambia), Chichewa, Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Luganda, Rundi
Kongo†	Bosnian, Serbian, Kashmiri, Kyrghyz, Arabic, Waray (Philippines), Amharic, Dutch, Tamazight, Marathi, Luba-Lulua, Umbundu, Mesopotamian Arabic, Samoan, Najdi Arabic, Achinese, Zulu, Tsonga, Indonesian, Balinese
Korean	Finnish, Lao, Ewe, Cebuano, Basque, Kachin, Greek, Vietnamese, Waray (Philippines), German, Pangasinan, Bulgarian, Ilocano, Cantonese, South Azerbaijani, Bengali, Mandarin Chinese, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Japanese
Kurdish (Kurmanji)	Awadhi, Turkmen, Assamese, Hebrew, Odia (Oriya), Nepali, North Levantine Arabic, Arabic, Sinhala, Najdi Arabic, Punjabi, Kashmiri, Armenian, Georgian, Hindi, Bengali, Mesopotamian Arabic, South Azerbaijani, Tajik, Sorani Kurdish
Kyrghyz	German, Hindi, Nepali, Bulgarian, Sindhi, Bengali, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Awadhi, Punjabi, Russian, Turkish, South Azerbaijani, Kashmiri, Tajik, Tatar, Turkmen, Bashkir, Uyghur, Kazakh
Lao	Achinese, Ewe, Basque, Minangkabau, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Greek, Mizo, German, Kachin, Bulgarian, Myanmar (Burmese), Cantonese, South Azerbaijani, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Khmer, Vietnamese, Bengali, Shan, Thai
Latgalian†	Indonesian, Kinyarwanda, Nuer, Telugu, Finnish, Polish, Balinese, Arabic in Latin script, Turkish, Sesotho, Cebuano, Tsonga, Kamba (Kenya), Awadhi, Magahi, Hungarian, Achinese, Tunisian Arabic, Malayalam, Occitan
Latvian	Macedonian, Norwegian Nynorsk, Bosnian, German, Danish, Norwegian, Finnish, Serbian, Swedish, Slovak, Russian, Slovenian, Croatian, Estonian, Bulgarian, Ukrainian, Czech, Belarusian, Polish, Lithuanian
Ligurian	Romanian, Bosnian, Basque, Croatian, Papiamento, Esperanto, Asturian, Luxembourgish, Galician, Sicilian, Slovenian, Portuguese, Haitian Creole, German, Spanish, Italian, Catalan, Occitan, French, Venetian
Limburgan†	South Azerbaijani, Morrocan Arabic, Albanian, Tok Pisin, Sinhala, Assamese, Sundanese, Khmer, Ilocano, Georgian, Somali, Sorani Kurdish, Tatar, Kabuverdianu, Irish, Romanian, Turkish, Latgalian, Kongo, Telugu
Lingala	Sesotho, Yoruba, Luo, Shona, Sepedi, Hausa, Bemba (Zambia), Nuer, Igbo, Zulu, Chichewa, Kamba (Kenya), Sango, Kikuyu, Rundi, Luganda, Umbundu, Kinyarwanda, Chokwe, Luba-Lulua
Lithuanian	Macedonian, Norwegian, Romanian, Bosnian, Hungarian, Danish, German, Swedish, Serbian, Russian, Estonian, Slovenian, Croatian, Bulgarian, Slovak, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Czech, Polish, Latvian
Lombard†	Sanskrit, Tajik, Bashkir, Myanmar (Burmese), Armenian, Spanish, Sepedi, Kyrghyz, Uyghur, Xhosa, Dzongkha, Lithuanian, Kamba (Kenya), Urdu, Ilocano, Haitian Creole, Maithili, Bhojpuri, Indonesian, Dutch
Luba-Lulua	Swati, Nuer, Tsonga, Sesotho, Tswana, Luo, Sepedi, Sango, Zulu, Shona, Bemba (Zambia), Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Rundi, Chichewa, Luganda, Kinyarwanda, Umbundu, Chokwe, Lingala
Luganda	Tsonga, Tswana, Sango, Amharic, Swati, Chokwe, Sesotho, Sepedi, Nuer, Zulu, Lingala, Shona, Luo, Luba-Lulua, Bemba (Zambia), Chichewa, Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Rundi
Luo	Chichewa, Finnish, Ewe, Luba-Lulua, Basque, Somali, Greek, Bemba (Zambia), German, Bulgarian, Bengali, Kinyarwanda, Kamba (Kenya), South Azerbaijani, Rundi, Egyptian Arabic, Luganda, Kikuyu, Amharic, Nuer
Luxembourgish	Bulgarian, Welsh, Bengali, Slovenian, Venetian, Swedish, Czech, Norwegian, Faroese, Ligurian, Icelandic, Occitan, Yiddish, Tok Pisin, Afrikaans, Esperanto, French, Danish, Dutch, German

Target language	Auxiliary languages
Macedonian	Latvian, German, Sicilian, Lithuanian, Italian, Belarusian, Hungarian, Romanian, Polish, Russian, Czech, Slovak, Albanian, Ukrainian, Greek, Slovenian, Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian
Magahi	Myanmar (Burmese), Meiteilon (Manipuri), Gujarati, Mizo, Marathi, Sanskrit, Tibetan, Sinhala, Chhattisgarhi, Kashmiri, Santali, Punjabi, Assamese, Hindi, Awadhi, Odia (Oriya), Nepali, Bengali, Bhojpuri, Maithili
Maithili	Myanmar (Burmese), Marathi, Gujarati, Mizo, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Sanskrit, Chhattisgarhi, Sinhala, Tibetan, Kashmiri, Santali, Punjabi, Odia (Oriya), Assamese, Hindi, Awadhi, Nepali, Bengali, Bhojpuri, Magahi
Malagasy	Sesotho, Buginese, Balinese, Kamba (Kenya), Bemba (Zambia), Samoan, Indonesian, Sepedi, Shona, Ilocano, Afrikaans, Fijian, Swati, Achinese, Zulu, Sundanese, Tsonga, Maori, Chichewa, Javanese
Malay	Vietnamese, Thai, Lao, Samoan, Malagasy, Fijian, Maori, Khmer, Pangasinan, Waray (Philippines), Ilocano, Cebuano, Minangkabau, Achinese, Buginese, Sundanese, Balinese, Javanese, Indonesian, Banjar
Malayalam	Ewe, Basque, Magahi, Greek, Odia (Oriya), German, Gujarati, Bulgarian, Chhattisgarhi, Sanskrit, South Azerbaijani, Hindi, Marathi, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Bengali, Sinhala, Telugu, Kannada, Tamil
Maltese	Occitan, Tigrinya, Ligurian, Amharic, Venetian, Croatian, Hebrew, Macedonian, Najdi Arabic, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Bosnian, Arabic, Italian, Mesopotamian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Albanian, Egyptian Arabic, Sicilian, Kabyle, Tunisian Arabic
Mandarin Chinese	Pangasinan, Greek, Japanese, German, Bulgarian, South Azerbaijani, Lao, Egyptian Arabic, Assamese, Amharic, Shan, Vietnamese, Korean, Bengali, Mizo, Myanmar (Burmese), Tibetan, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Kachin, Cantonese
Maori	Amharic, Khmer, Japanese, Minangkabau, Malagasy, Malay, Pangasinan, Tok Pisin, Waray (Philippines), Banjar, Achinese, Ilocano, Cebuano, Javanese, Buginese, Indonesian, Sundanese, Balinese, Samoan, Fijian
Marathi	Bhojpuri, Urdu, Assamese, Maithili, Tamil, Magahi, Nepali, Kannada, Kashmiri, Sindhi, Telugu, Awadhi, Chhattisgarhi, Bengali, Punjabi, Sinhala, Odia (Oriya), Gujarati, Sanskrit, Hindi
Meiteilon (Manipuri)	Nepali, Bhojpuri, German, Magahi, Bulgarian, Maithili, Odia (Oriya), South Azerbaijani, Shan, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Santali, Mandarin Chinese, Cantonese, Assamese, Bengali, Tibetan, Kachin, Myanmar (Burmese), Mizo
Mesopotamian Arabic	Turkmen, Greek, Hausa, Turkish, Bulgarian, Amharic, Armenian, Georgian, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Tigrinya, Tunisian Arabic, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Maltese, Sorani Kurdish, South Azerbaijani, Hebrew, Egyptian Arabic, Arabic, Najdi Arabic, North Levantine Arabic
Minangkabau	Buginese, Samoan, Vietnamese, Malagasy, Shan, Ilocano, Fijian, Maori, Myanmar (Burmese), Sinhala, Balinese, Lao, Khmer, Thai, Banjar, Indonesian, Malay, Javanese, Sundanese, Achinese
Minangkabau in Arabic script	Buginese, Samoan, Vietnamese, Malagasy, Shan, Ilocano, Fijian, Maori, Myanmar (Burmese), Sinhala, Balinese, Lao, Khmer, Thai, Banjar, Indonesian, Malay, Javanese, Sundanese, Achinese
Mizo	Nepali, Bhojpuri, German, Magahi, Bulgarian, Maithili, South Azerbaijani, Odia (Oriya), Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Shan, Mandarin Chinese, Santali, Assamese, Cantonese, Tibetan, Bengali, Kachin, Myanmar (Burmese), Meiteilon (Manipuri)
Mongolian†	Chhattisgarhi, Welsh, Kachin, Norwegian, Marathi, Punjabi, Catalan, Kabiyè, Magahi, Tibetan, Umbundu, Faroese, Cantonese, Armenian, Russian, Dzongkha, Georgian, Turkmen, Egyptian Arabic, Shan
Morrocan Arabic	Bulgarian, Turkish, Tamasheq, Somali, Hausa, Armenian, Georgian, Tunisian Arabic, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Amharic, Sorani Kurdish, Maltese, South Azerbaijani, Tigrinya, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Hebrew, Egyptian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Najdi Arabic, Mesopotamian Arabic
Mossi	Kinyarwanda, Tunisian Arabic, Kamba (Kenya), Luganda, Wolof, Luba-Lulua, Kikuyu, Hausa, Bambara, Chichewa, Zulu, Tamasheq, Dyula, Lingala, Igbo, Yoruba, Sango, Fon, Ewe, Kabiyè
Myanmar (Burmese)	Greek, Thai, German, Magahi, Bulgarian, Maithili, South Azerbaijani, Santali, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Odia (Oriya), Mandarin Chinese, Assamese, Shan, Cantonese, Bengali, Tibetan, Kachin, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Mizo
Najdi Arabic	Tamasheq, Bulgarian, Somali, Turkish, Hausa, Armenian, Georgian, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Tunisian Arabic, Amharic, Sorani Kurdish, Maltese, South Azerbaijani, Tigrinya, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Hebrew, Egyptian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Arabic, Mesopotamian Arabic
Nepali	Mizo, Sindhi, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Gujarati, Marathi, Chhattisgarhi, Sanskrit, Tibetan, Santali, Sinhala, Magahi, Kashmiri, Punjabi, Bhojpuri, Odia (Oriya), Assamese, Maithili, Hindi, Awadhi, Bengali
North Levantine Arabic	Somali, Hausa, Georgian, Greek, Tigrinya, Amharic, Armenian, Bulgarian, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Sorani Kurdish, South Azerbaijani, Turkish, Tunisian Arabic, Maltese, Arabic, Najdi Arabic, Hebrew, Mesopotamian Arabic, Egyptian Arabic
Norwegian	Irish, Bulgarian, Polish, Bengali, Scottish Gaelic, Yiddish, Finnish, Tok Pisin, Lithuanian, Afrikaans, Latvian, Estonian, Luxembourgish, German, Norwegian Nynorsk, Icelandic, Dutch, Faroese, Danish, Swedish
Norwegian Nynorsk	Dutch, Ewe, Lithuanian, Basque, Irish, Scottish Gaelic, Greek, Latvian, Faroese, Danish, Bulgarian, German, Bengali, South Azerbaijani, Estonian, Egyptian Arabic, Swedish, Amharic, Norwegian, Finnish
Nuer	Finnish, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Somali, Ewe, Basque, Sango, Greek, Kamba (Kenya), German, Kinyarwanda, Rundi, Bulgarian, Bengali, Tigrinya, South Azerbaijani, Kikuyu, Luganda, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Luo
Occitan	Kabyle, Romanian, Croatian, Slovenian, Sicilian, Basque, Haitian Creole, Esperanto, Luxembourgish, Papiamento, Asturian, German, Galician, Portuguese, Italian, Venetian, Spanish, French, Ligurian, Catalan

Target language	**Auxiliary languages**
Odia (Oriya)	Tibetan, Myanmar (Burmese), Meiteilon (Manipuri), Gujarati, Marathi, Mizo, Sanskrit, Sinhala, Punjabi, Kashmiri, Santali, Chhattisgarhi, Bhojpuri, Awadhi, Hindi, Magahi, Nepali, Maithili, Assamese, Bengali
Oromo†	Filipino, Shan, Tunisian Arabic, Tibetan, Mongolian, South Levantine Arabic, Crimean Tatar in Latin script, Kongo, Luba-Lulua, Silesian, Lingala, Ligurian, Kinyarwanda, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Latvian, Lao, Turkmen, Egyptian Arabic, Maori, Maithili
Pangasinan	Thai, Samoan, Malagasy, Balinese, Khmer, Indonesian, Lao, Fijian, Achinese, Vietnamese, Malay, Cantonese, Sundanese, Maori, Banjar, Buginese, Waray (Philippines), Cebuano, Javanese, Ilocano
Papiamento	Dyula, Sicilian, Italian, Ligurian, Venetian, Icelandic, Irish, Bambara, Occitan, French, Wolof, Catalan, Aymara, Yiddish, Ayacucho Quechua, Spanish, Asturian, Portuguese, Haitian Creole, Galician
Pashto†	Kongo, Malagasy, Kabiyè, Galician, Belarusian, Sinhala, Mossi, Korean, Sorani Kurdish, Friulian, Tatar, Tunisian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Japanese, Luba-Lulua, Malay, Xhosa, Swati, Sanskrit, Mandarin Chinese
Persian†	Luxembourgish, Wolof, Ukrainian, Bengali, Sesotho, Spanish, Tamasheq in Tifinagh script, Scottish Gaelic, Tamazight, Telugu, Marathi, Luba-Lulua, Sundanese, Buginese, Italian, Ligurian, Kashmiri in Devanagari script, Nuer, Chichewa, Silesian
Polish	Swedish, Bengali, Venetian, Macedonian, Romanian, Danish, Bosnian, Hungarian, Russian, Bulgarian, Latvian, German, Serbian, Croatian, Lithuanian, Slovenian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Slovak, Czech
Portuguese	Romanian, Luxembourgish, German, Welsh, Sicilian, Irish, Kabyle, Haitian Creole, Esperanto, Italian, Venetian, Papiamento, Basque, Ligurian, Occitan, French, Catalan, Spanish, Asturian, Galician
Punjabi	Kyrghyz, Santali, Tajik, Chhattisgarhi, Assamese, Marathi, Sinhala, Odia (Oriya), Magahi, Sanskrit, Bengali, Bhojpuri, Urdu, Maithili, Gujarati, Awadhi, Nepali, Hindi, Sindhi, Kashmiri
Romanian	Albanian, Bosnian, Sicilian, Croatian, Occitan, Macedonian, Haitian Creole, Slovak, Galician, Hungarian, Venetian, Italian, Catalan, Spanish, Portuguese, Serbian, Ukrainian, Greek, French, Bulgarian
Rundi	Xhosa, Sango, Tsonga, Tswana, Swati, Sesotho, Sepedi, Nuer, Chokwe, Zulu, Lingala, Luo, Luba-Lulua, Shona, Bemba (Zambia), Chichewa, Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Luganda, Kinyarwanda
Russian	Georgian, Bosnian, Latvian, Armenian, Serbian, Kashmiri, Slovenian, Turkmen, Polish, Tajik, Tatar, Croatian, Kazakh, Czech, Kyrghyz, Bulgarian, Uyghur, Ukrainian, Bashkir, Belarusian
Samoan	Cantonese, Korean, Minangkabau, Malagasy, Malay, Japanese, Achinese, Banjar, Tok Pisin, Pangasinan, Indonesian, Sundanese, Waray (Philippines), Javanese, Balinese, Buginese, Ilocano, Cebuano, Maori, Fijian
Sango	Sepedi, Chokwe, Luo, Kamba (Kenya), Chichewa, Zulu, Rundi, Nuer, Mossi, Hausa, Fon, Kikuyu, Luba-Lulua, Luganda, Kinyarwanda, Ewe, Yoruba, Kabiyè, Lingala, Igbo
Sanskrit	Tamil, Urdu, Assamese, Bhojpuri, Maithili, Kannada, Magahi, Sinhala, Kashmiri, Sindhi, Telugu, Nepali, Bengali, Chhattisgarhi, Punjabi, Odia (Oriya), Awadhi, Gujarati, Marathi, Hindi
Santali	Awadhi, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Basque, Greek, Mizo, German, Tibetan, Nepali, Bulgarian, Odia (Oriya), South Azerbaijani, Assamese, Bhojpuri, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Magahi, Vietnamese, Maithili, Khmer, Bengali
Sardinian†	Friulian, Kashmiri, Assamese, Haitian Creole, Chichewa, Armenian, Occitan, Tumbuka, Gujarati, Bemba (Zambia), Umbundu, Mizo, Mesopotamian Arabic, Tunisian Arabic, Shan, Punjabi, Maltese, Catalan, Kabiyè, Luxembourgish
Scottish Gaelic	Lithuanian, Swedish, Luxembourgish, Kashmiri, Norwegian Nynorsk, Armenian, Hindi, Esperanto, Greek, Norwegian, Danish, Dutch, Bulgarian, Faroese, Bengali, German, Icelandic, French, Welsh, Irish
Sepedi	Lingala, Malagasy, Umbundu, Luba-Lulua, Luganda, Chokwe, Rundi, Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Afrikaans, Bemba (Zambia), Shona, Chichewa, Xhosa, Tsonga, Tswana, Sesotho, Swati, Zulu
Serbian	Latvian, Italian, Venetian, Lithuanian, German, Belarusian, Russian, Albanian, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, Czech, Slovak, Greek, Ukrainian, Slovenian, Croatian, Bosnian, Macedonian, Bulgarian
Sesotho	Lingala, Malagasy, Umbundu, Luba-Lulua, Chokwe, Luganda, Rundi, Kamba (Kenya), Afrikaans, Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Bemba (Zambia), Shona, Chichewa, Tsonga, Xhosa, Tswana, Zulu, Swati, Sepedi
Shan	Finnish, Santali, Ewe, Basque, Tibetan, Greek, Vietnamese, German, Bulgarian, South Azerbaijani, Assamese, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Mizo, Kachin, Myanmar (Burmese), Bengali, Lao, Thai
Shona	Luo, Lingala, Umbundu, Luba-Lulua, Chokwe, Xhosa, Rundi, Luganda, Kamba (Kenya), Afrikaans, Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Sesotho, Swati, Tswana, Bemba (Zambia), Tsonga, Sepedi, Zulu, Chichewa
Sicilian	Greek, Asturian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Kabyle, Haitian Creole, Macedonian, Galician, Bosnian, Spanish, Albanian, Portuguese, French, Tunisian Arabic, Maltese, Ligurian, Occitan, Catalan, Venetian, Italian
Silesian†	Chhattisgarhi, Scottish Gaelic, Morrocan Arabic, Banjar in Arabic script, Haitian Creole, Japanese, Kongo, Ilocano, Aymara, Venetian, Telugu, Guarani, Latgalian, Hungarian, Tigrinya, South Azerbaijani, Sardinian, Gujarati, Luo, Sanskrit
Sindhi	Turkmen, Magahi, Telugu, Bhojpuri, Assamese, Chhattisgarhi, Maithili, Tajik, Odia (Oriya), Sinhala, Bengali, Nepali, Marathi, Sanskrit, Awadhi, Urdu, Gujarati, Hindi, Kashmiri, Punjabi
Sinhala	Achinese, Minangkabau, Maithili, Magahi, Awadhi, Assamese, Nepali, Telugu, Punjabi, Kannada, Kashmiri, Chhattisgarhi, Malayalam, Tamil, Gujarati, Sanskrit, Marathi, Bengali, Odia (Oriya), Hindi

Target language	Auxiliary languages
Slovak	Italian, Bengali, Greek, Latvian, Venetian, Romanian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Russian, Hungarian, German, Belarusian, Bosnian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Ukrainian, Slovenian, Croatian, Polish, Czech
Slovenian	Latvian, Lithuanian, Albanian, Occitan, Belarusian, Ligurian, Russian, Italian, Ukrainian, Hungarian, Macedonian, Venetian, Bulgarian, Polish, German, Slovak, Czech, Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian
Somali	Bemba (Zambia), Kinyarwanda, Rundi, Tunisian Arabic, Luganda, Mesopotamian Arabic, Tamasheq, Nuer, North Levantine Arabic, Luo, Maltese, Hebrew, Kikuyu, Kamba (Kenya), Hausa, Egyptian Arabic, Arabic, Tigrinya, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Amharic
Sorani Kurdish	Awadhi, Turkmen, Assamese, Hebrew, Odia (Oriya), Nepali, North Levantine Arabic, Arabic, Sinhala, Najdi Arabic, Punjabi, Kashmiri, Armenian, Georgian, Hindi, Bengali, Mesopotamian Arabic, South Azerbaijani, Tajik, Kurdish (Kurmanji)
South Azerbaijani	North Levantine Arabic, Hebrew, Greek, Amharic, Bulgarian, Arabic, Uyghur, Najdi Arabic, Mesopotamian Arabic, Armenian, Georgian, Sorani Kurdish, Kyrghyz, Egyptian Arabic, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Tatar, Bashkir, Kazakh, Turkish, Turkmen
South Levantine Arabic†	Kamba (Kenya), Ilocano, Dutch, Bemba (Zambia), Mossi, Norwegian, Sorani Kurdish, Cebuano, Kyrghyz, Bambara, Turkish, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Kannada, Samoan, Spanish, Sesotho, Crimean Tatar in Latin script, Tsonga, Tamil, Bosnian
Spanish	Bengali, Romanian, German, Tunisian Arabic, Luxembourgish, Esperanto, Haitian Creole, Sicilian, Kabyle, Papiamento, Venetian, Basque, Italian, Ligurian, French, Occitan, Catalan, Galician, Asturian, Portuguese
Sundanese	Vietnamese, Samoan, Lao, Malagasy, Thai, Pangasinan, Waray (Philippines), Khmer, Fijian, Maori, Ilocano, Cebuano, Buginese, Minangkabau, Malay, Banjar, Javanese, Achinese, Balinese, Indonesian
Swahili†	Danish, Balinese, Thai, Irish, Yoruba, Arabic in Latin script, Russian, Yiddish, Bosnian, Tumbuka, Waray (Philippines), Arabic, Malagasy, Korean, Portuguese, Occitan, Sundanese, Indonesian, Galician, Basque
Swati	Lingala, Malagasy, Umbundu, Luba-Lulua, Chokwe, Luganda, Rundi, Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Afrikaans, Bemba (Zambia), Shona, Chichewa, Tswana, Sesotho, Xhosa, Tsonga, Sepedi, Zulu
Swedish	Bulgarian, Bengali, Czech, Polish, Yiddish, Belarusian, Tok Pisin, Finnish, Afrikaans, Luxembourgish, Latvian, Norwegian Nynorsk, Lithuanian, Icelandic, Estonian, Dutch, German, Faroese, Danish, Norwegian
Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic	Rundi, South Azerbaijani, Tamasheq, Hausa, Luganda, Luo, Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Tunisian Arabic, Nuer, Maltese, North Levantine Arabic, Hebrew, Mesopotamian Arabic, Egyptian Arabic, Somali, Tigrinya, Arabic, Amharic, Najdi Arabic
Taiwanese Mandarin in Traditional script	Pangasinan, Greek, Japanese, German, Bulgarian, South Azerbaijani, Lao, Egyptian Arabic, Assamese, Amharic, Shan, Vietnamese, Korean, Bengali, Mizo, Myanmar (Burmese), Tibetan, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Kachin, Cantonese
Tajik	South Azerbaijani, Assamese, Russian, Odia (Oriya), Sinhala, Uyghur, Gujarati, Turkmen, Urdu, Bengali, Sindhi, Kyrghyz, Awadhi, Nepali, Kazakh, Sorani Kurdish, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Hindi, Punjabi, Kashmiri
Tamasheq	Arabic, Igbo, Wolof, Mesopotamian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Somali, Yoruba, Ewe, Fon, Hebrew, Bambara, Egyptian Arabic, Kabiyè, Amharic, Dyula, Mossi, Maltese, Tunisian Arabic, Kabyle, Hausa
Tamasheq in Tifinagh script	Arabic, Igbo, Wolof, Mesopotamian Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Somali, Yoruba, Ewe, Fon, Hebrew, Bambara, Egyptian Arabic, Kabiyè, Amharic, Dyula, Mossi, Maltese, Tunisian Arabic, Kabyle, Hausa
Tamazight†	Estonian, Somali, Afrikaans, Kabyle, Samoan, Punjabi, Indonesian, Buginese, Egyptian Arabic, Icelandic, Magahi, Belarusian, Norwegian Nynorsk, Sango, Persian, Oromo, Tumbuka, Norwegian, Umbundu, Kashmiri in Devanagari script
Tamil	Ewe, Basque, Magahi, Greek, Gujarati, German, Odia (Oriya), Bulgarian, Chhattisgarhi, Hindi, Sanskrit, South Azerbaijani, Marathi, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Sinhala, Bengali, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam
Tatar	Ukrainian, Bengali, Bulgarian, Georgian, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Armenian, Uyghur, Estonian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Belarusian, Finnish, Turkmen, Kyrghyz, Russian, Turkish, South Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Bashkir
Telugu	Ewe, Basque, Magahi, Greek, Gujarati, Odia (Oriya), German, Sinhala, Bulgarian, South Azerbaijani, Egyptian Arabic, Chhattisgarhi, Amharic, Hindi, Sanskrit, Bengali, Marathi, Malayalam, Tamil, Kannada
Thai	Cantonese, Ewe, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Basque, Greek, Kachin, Mizo, German, Achinese, Bulgarian, Minangkabau, South Azerbaijani, Myanmar (Burmese), Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Vietnamese, Khmer, Bengali, Shan, Lao
Tibetan	Odia (Oriya), German, Bulgarian, Awadhi, South Azerbaijani, Egyptian Arabic, Magahi, Amharic, Bhojpuri, Mandarin Chinese, Nepali, Maithili, Santali, Cantonese, Assamese, Kachin, Myanmar (Burmese), Bengali, Mizo, Meiteilon (Manipuri)
Tigrinya	South Azerbaijani, Rundi, Tamasheq, Kamba (Kenya), Hausa, Luo, Luganda, Kikuyu, Tunisian Arabic, Maltese, Nuer, North Levantine Arabic, Mesopotamian Arabic, Somali, Najdi Arabic, Egyptian Arabic, Arabic, Hebrew, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Amharic
Tok Pisin	Indonesian, Danish, Pangasinan, Swedish, Norwegian, Ilocano, Malay, Faroese, Icelandic, Banjar, Luxembourgish, Balinese, Yiddish, Fijian, Dutch, Waray (Philippines), Afrikaans, Buginese, German, Cebuano
Tsonga	Lingala, Malagasy, Umbundu, Luba-Lulua, Chokwe, Luganda, Rundi, Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Bemba (Zambia), Afrikaans, Shona, Chichewa, Sesotho, Xhosa, Tswana, Sepedi, Swati, Zulu

Target language	Auxiliary languages
Tswana	Lingala, Malagasy, Umbundu, Kamba (Kenya), Luba-Lulua, Kikuyu, Chokwe, Rundi, Luganda, Kinyarwanda, Bemba (Zambia), Afrikaans, Shona, Chichewa, Xhosa, Tsonga, Swati, Sesotho, Zulu, Sepedi
Tumbuka†	Papiamento, Odia (Oriya), Irish, Achinese in Arabic script, Kachin, Faroese, Cantonese, Ligurian, Banjar in Arabic script, Kimbundu, Bengali, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Fijian, Chokwe, Nuer, Morrocan Arabic, Hebrew, Mongolian, Afrikaans, Tswana
Tunisian Arabic	Hausa, Bosnian, Tigrinya, Amharic, Albanian, Hebrew, Spanish, Najdi Arabic, Occitan, Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic, Ligurian, Italian, Arabic, Mesopotamian Arabic, Catalan, North Levantine Arabic, Sicilian, Egyptian Arabic, Kabyle, Maltese
Turkish	Albanian, Georgian, Bengali, Armenian, Amharic, Serbian, Romanian, Uyghur, Turkmen, Tatar, Kazakh, Macedonian, Hebrew, Bashkir, Kyrghyz, North Levantine Arabic, South Azerbaijani, Greek, Egyptian Arabic, Bulgarian
Turkmen	German, Urdu, Bulgarian, Bengali, Mesopotamian Arabic, Egyptian Arabic, Kashmiri, Amharic, Armenian, Sorani Kurdish, Georgian, Tatar, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Turkish, Uyghur, Tajik, Bashkir, Kyrghyz, Kazakh, South Azerbaijani
Ukrainian	French, Albanian, Bengali, Latvian, German, Lithuanian, Greek, Hungarian, Bosnian, Macedonian, Romanian, Russian, Slovenian, Croatian, Czech, Slovak, Polish, Serbian, Belarusian, Bulgarian
Umbundu	Sango, Swati, Sesotho, Kamba (Kenya), Igbo, Tsonga, Afrikaans, Kikuyu, Luganda, Rundi, Bemba (Zambia), Sepedi, Tswana, Kinyarwanda, Zulu, Shona, Chichewa, Lingala, Luba-Lulua, Chokwe
Urdu	Magahi, Assamese, Odia (Oriya), Telugu, Bhojpuri, Maithili, Turkmen, Sinhala, Tajik, Bengali, Nepali, Marathi, Sanskrit, Chhattisgarhi, Sindhi, Awadhi, Kashmiri, Punjabi, Gujarati, Hindi
Uyghur	German, Bhojpuri, Bulgarian, Tibetan, Egyptian Arabic, Amharic, Awadhi, Bengali, Nepali, Tatar, Punjabi, Russian, Turkish, Kashmiri, Tajik, South Azerbaijani, Bashkir, Turkmen, Kazakh, Kyrghyz
Uzbek†	Bhojpuri, Hebrew, Fijian, Romanian, French, Tumbuka, Spanish, Irish, Banjar in Arabic script, Sundanese, Swati, Thai, Lao, Maori, Bulgarian, Finnish, Tamasheq in Tifinagh script, Slovak, Ayacucho Quechua, Danish
Venetian	Slovak, Papiamento, Hungarian, Romanian, Sicilian, Asturian, Czech, Galician, Bosnian, Spanish, Portuguese, Croatian, Haitian Creole, Slovenian, French, Catalan, German, Occitan, Italian, Ligurian
Vietnamese	Ewe, Meiteilon (Manipuri), Basque, Greek, Ilocano, Pangasinan, German, Myanmar (Burmese), Bulgarian, Kachin, South Azerbaijani, Shan, Cantonese, Egyptian Arabic, Thai, Amharic, Lao, Santali, Bengali, Khmer
Waray (Philippines)	Minangkabau, Lao, Samoan, Khmer, Vietnamese, Malagasy, Cantonese, Fijian, Achinese, Maori, Balinese, Malay, Indonesian, Banjar, Sundanese, Pangasinan, Buginese, Javanese, Ilocano, Cebuano
Welsh	Lithuanian, Galician, Kashmiri, Icelandic, Armenian, Asturian, Basque, Hindi, Danish, Luxembourgish, Greek, Dutch, Bulgarian, Portuguese, Esperanto, Bengali, German, French, Scottish Gaelic, Irish
Wolof	Kamba (Kenya), Spanish, Galician, Sango, Kabyle, Luganda, Lingala, Hausa, Kikuyu, Chichewa, Tamasheq, Zulu, Dyula, Bambara, Mossi, Fon, Yoruba, Igbo, Kabiyè, Ewe
Xhosa	Lingala, Malagasy, Umbundu, Luba-Lulua, Chokwe, Luganda, Rundi, Kamba (Kenya), Afrikaans, Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Bemba (Zambia), Shona, Chichewa, Tswana, Tsonga, Sepedi, Sesotho, Zulu, Swati
Yiddish	Bengali, Portuguese, Swedish, Asturian, Galician, Welsh, Danish, Scottish Gaelic, French, Tok Pisin, Luxembourgish, Papiamento, Afrikaans, Norwegian, Haitian Creole, German, Irish, Dutch, Faroese, Icelandic
Yoruba	Sango, Rundi, Umbundu, Bambara, Tamasheq, Kamba (Kenya), Dyula, Hausa, Luganda, Mossi, Kinyarwanda, Kikuyu, Chichewa, Kabiyè, Luba-Lulua, Zulu, Ewe, Fon, Lingala, Igbo
Zulu	Lingala, Malagasy, Umbundu, Luba-Lulua, Chokwe, Luganda, Rundi, Kamba (Kenya), Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Afrikaans, Bemba (Zambia), Shona, Chichewa, Tswana, Sesotho, Xhosa, Tsonga, Sepedi, Swati

Table 5: Auxiliary languages sorted from furthest to closest, based on genealogical and geographic distance documented in URIEL repository (Littell et al., 2017). Languages marked with '†' are not included in the database, for which we sample the auxiliary languages in random. Languages without script notation are in the dominant script—Achinese in Latin script, Hindi in Devanagari script, etc.

		FLORES-200 devtest					NTREX		
		BLEU ↑ (n=201)	BLEU ↑ (n=198)	Win% vs. teacher	Win% vs. NLLB 1.3B	Win% vs. NLLB 54B	BLEU ↑ (n=112)	Win% vs. teacher	Win% vs. NLLB 1.3B
PaLM2 S (teacher)		17.4	17.7	-	58.6	44.2	20.2	-	75.9
NLLB 1.3B distilled		-	16.9	40.8	-	7.0	18.7	24.1	-
NLLB 54B MoE		-	19.4	55.2	92.9	-	-	-	-
PaLM2 XXS –NTL	baseline	11.8	11.9	35.3	18.2	12.6	9.2	10.7	6.2
	mufu0	14.3	14.5	39.8	23.7	16.1	12.1	11.6	8.0
	mufu5	18.7	18.9	53.2	63.1	32.7	17.5	21.4	25.9
	mufu10	19.8	20.0	64.7	80.8	46.2	18.9	25.0	45.5
	mufu20	**20.2**	**20.5**	66.2	83.8	52.8	20.1	31.2	61.6
	mufu5hrl	14.5	14.7	39.3	27.3	17.1	12.3	11.6	8.0
	mufu5tr	16.2	16.3	45.3	40.9	27.1	14.5	17.0	12.5
	mufu20+5hrl	18.8	19.0	56.2	67.7	33.7	18.0	21.4	28.6
	distilled	17.2	17.4	50.2	44.9	28.1	**20.2**	53.6	54.5
PaLM2 XXS	baseline	9.7	9.8	28.9	10.6	10.1	8.1	6.2	6.2
	mufu0	**14.9**	**15.1**	32.8	27.8	18.1	**15.1**	12.5	15.2
	mufu5	14.7	14.9	34.8	25.3	17.1	14.5	10.7	9.8
	mufu10	13.4	13.6	34.3	18.2	14.6	11.9	8.0	7.1
	mufu20	13.6	13.8	34.8	18.2	14.6	12.1	8.0	7.1
PaLM2 XS	baseline	2.9	2.9	8.0	3.5	2.5	2.7	1.8	2.7
	mufu0	15.6	15.8	41.3	32.8	20.1	13.8	12.5	12.5
	mufu5	16.1	16.3	44.3	36.4	22.1	**14.2**	12.5	13.4
	mufu10	**16.1**	**16.3**	45.3	35.4	21.6	14.1	12.5	12.5
	mufu20	16.1	16.3	45.3	34.8	21.1	14.1	11.6	13.4
PaLM2 S	baseline	3.9	3.9	15.4	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.8	2.7
	mufu20	18.5	18.6	56.7	59.1	31.2	16.1	18.8	25.9
	mufu20lora	**20.5**	**20.7**	98.0	73.2	63.3	**21.7**	81.2	83.9
Gemma 2B	baseline	9.5	9.5	33.8	14.6	12.6	6.9	12.5	8.0
	mufu0	16.8	16.9	40.3	43.4	25.1	14.5	16.1	16.1
	mufu5	17.4	17.6	45.8	51.0	28.6	15.3	17.0	17.9
	mufu10	17.6	17.7	46.3	56.1	30.2	15.3	19.6	19.6
	mufu20	**17.7**	**17.9**	46.8	53.0	28.1	**15.5**	19.6	20.5
Gemma 7B	baseline	13.2	13.3	38.8	25.8	16.1	9.6	11.6	9.8
	mufu0	18.6	18.8	50.7	59.1	32.7	15.4	16.1	22.3
	mufu5	19.1	19.3	56.2	67.2	36.2	15.4	18.8	20.5
	mufu10	19.3	19.4	58.2	67.7	37.2	15.4	17.9	20.5
	mufu20	**19.6**	**19.7**	59.2	71.2	39.7	15.7	19.6	23.2
	distilled	16.6	16.7	45.8	36.4	25.1	**18.8**	38.4	52.7

Table 6: Mean BLEU scores, analogous to chrF scores reported in Table 2. **Bold** values are the best scores in a given model class. Red values are win rates above 50%.

A.3 Experimental details

We perform full parameter updates for 25 epochs across all models, and select the final checkpoints with the best chrF scores for very-low- and low-resource languages over the validation split, which is partitioned from FLORES-200 devtest as described in Section 3.1. All Gemma models are finetuned at a learning rate of 1e-5. We set the initial learning rate to 1e-4 for PaLM2 models. When the models fail to converge, we reduce the rate to 1e-5 in the reruns. During evaluation, we greedily decode from the finetuned models and compute chrF based on the generated sequence and reference translation.

A.4 BLEU scores

We report mean BLEU and overall win rates against benchmarks in Table 6, which is analogous to Table 2 in the main text. Figure 4 and Table 7 report Mufu's performance in very-low- and low-resource languages, and are analogous to Figure 2 and Table 3 respectively.



Figure 4: Mean BLEU across languages of the same resource level, analogous to Figure 2. Note that the scales of y-axes are different for the top and bottom rows. Error bars shown are 95% confidence intervals across the language pairs.

		FLORES-200 devtest			NTREX	
		teacher	NLLB 1.3B	NLLB 54B	teacher	NLLB 1.3B
PaLM2 XXS –NTL	baseline	61.2	24.8	14.9	35.5	6.5
	mufu0	66.4	30.1	18.4	35.5	9.7
	mufu5	81.0	64.6	39.5	54.8	25.8
	mufu10	92.2	73.5	52.6	58.1	35.5
	mufu20	92.2	75.2	50.9	64.5	41.9
	distilled	80.2	54.9	33.3	83.9	48.4
Gemma 7B	baseline	64.7	35.4	20.2	32.3	9.7
	mufu0	77.6	50.4	37.7	35.5	19.4
	mufu5	86.2	60.2	42.1	35.5	9.7
	mufu10	85.3	59.3	42.1	35.5	9.7
	mufu20	87.9	64.6	44.7	38.7	12.9
	distilled	76.7	47.8	30.7	58.1	45.2

Table 7: Win percentages by BLEU scores, analogous to Table 3, measured over the 113 low and very-low resource languages for models shown in rows against, as columns, the teacher model, NLLB 1.3B distilled and NLLB 54B MoE. Win rates above 50% are in red.

A.5 Mufu results by language pairs

The full results (chrF) by language pairs for PaLM2 XXS–NTL and Gemma 7B finetuned on mufu20 is reported in Table 8. The models are mostly better than the teacher and NLLB 1.3B distilled when translating into languages classified as very-low- or low-resource.

		FLORES-200 devtest				NTREX			
target	resource	PaLM2 S (teacher)	NLLB 1.3B distilled	PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	Gemma 7B (mufu20)	PaLM2 S (teacher)	NLLB 1.3B distilled	PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	Gemma 7B (mufu20)
Achinese	VL	31.8	40.7	**47.6**	**46.7**	-	-	-	-
Achinese in Arabic script	VL	5.9	18.0	**27.1**	**36.6**	-	-	-	-
Afrikaans	M	70.7	65.0	70.2	70.1	70.7	68.7	68.4	62.5
Albanian	M	62.1	58.4	60.4	59.0	59.7	57.8	57.6	52.3
Amharic	L	41.3	37.0	39.6	35.9	26.4	26.6	25.4	21.4

		FLORES-200 devtest				**NTREX**			
target	resource	PaLM2 S (teacher)	NLLB 1.3B distilled	PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	Gemma 7B (mufu20)	PaLM2 S (teacher)	NLLB 1.3B distilled	PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	Gemma 7B (mufu20)
Arabic	M	60.7	56.5	59.2	59.8	55.3	51.6	53.2	49.2
Arabic in Latin script	VL	27.8	-	**33.5**	**44.1**	-	-	-	-
Armenian	M	58.7	52.5	56.8	56.7	53.5	50.2	51.5	47.7
Assamese	L	41.6	37.9	**42.5**	40.6	-	-	-	-
Asturian	VL	61.5	50.5	60.0	60.2	-	-	-	-
Awadhi	VL	50.8	49.3	**56.0**	**59.5**	-	-	-	-
Ayacucho Quechua	VL	23.6	28.0	**38.3**	**32.8**	-	-	-	-
Aymara	VL	14.5	31.7	**33.6**	29.4	-	-	-	-
Azerbaijani	M	47.8	45.0	46.0	43.8	49.0	48.2	46.0	41.6
Balinese	VL	40.5	48.3	**53.8**	**51.2**	-	-	-	-
Bambara	VL	10.6	32.1	31.9	28.8	-	-	-	-
Banjar	VL	48.6	50.7	**54.5**	**54.0**	-	-	-	-
Banjar in Arabic script	VL	14.5	17.5	**30.3**	**36.6**	-	-	-	-
Bashkir	L	47.4	48.3	**51.7**	**50.0**	39.6	42.0	**42.9**	39.3
Basque	M	57.0	52.2	54.0	53.6	52.6	49.3	49.9	41.0
Belarusian	M	45.7	43.2	43.8	44.5	54.4	54.5	50.0	45.6
Bemba (Zambia)	VL	35.8	37.9	**42.0**	**39.0**	37.1	40.9	**41.2**	36.9
Bengali	M	52.5	50.7	51.9	51.6	52.2	51.5	50.9	43.3
Bhojpuri	VL	41.1	43.7	**45.0**	41.9	-	-	-	-
Bosnian	M	62.6	58.6	61.5	61.4	58.5	56.8	57.2	53.8
Buginese	VL	20.5	37.2	**37.8**	34.2	-	-	-	-
Bulgarian	M	68.3	64.1	66.6	64.6	59.3	56.9	57.6	52.7
Cantonese	M	40.1	18.0	38.3	31.7	26.2	18.1	24.9	22.1
Catalan	M	67.2	63.8	66.3	65.1	62.9	61.0	61.6	52.0
Cebuano	M	60.0	57.8	**61.8**	57.7	-	-	-	-
Chhattisgarhi	VL	50.6	55.8	**57.6**	**58.8**	-	-	-	-
Chichewa	M	49.2	48.3	48.7	44.8	52.2	51.0	50.5	44.8
Chokwe	VL	9.2	25.7	17.8	**27.2**	-	-	-	-
Crimean Tatar in Latin script	VL	38.0	47.3	39.2	42.1	-	-	-	-
Croatian	M	60.6	56.1	59.0	59.5	59.4	57.2	57.7	51.6
Czech	H	60.3	56.1	58.8	55.6	58.9	55.9	56.4	52.3
Danish	H	71.1	65.0	69.3	69.2	64.1	60.5	63.0	63.1
Dari	M	54.9	53.2	54.3	49.3	44.3	42.6	43.7	36.4
Dinka	VL	9.1	23.2	22.8	**23.8**	-	-	-	-
Dutch	H	59.7	56.3	58.3	55.1	63.7	60.7	61.1	53.3
Dyula	VL	8.0	18.0	**18.4**	**21.3**	-	-	-	-
Dzongkha	L	32.0	41.1	**42.8**	41.0	28.3	36.5	**37.6**	31.6
Egyptian Arabic	VL	49.1	47.9	**51.2**	48.3	-	-	-	-
Esperanto	M	63.4	62.7	62.8	**63.6**	-	-	-	-
Estonian	M	62.4	54.5	59.8	59.0	59.3	54.6	56.8	49.9
Ewe	VL	8.0	38.9	33.8	29.6	9.0	38.7	33.5	26.3
Faroese	L	46.0	45.8	**49.6**	**48.1**	48.7	50.5	**51.9**	44.8
Fijian	L	28.4	46.2	46.0	41.0	29.7	49.4	**50.7**	38.5
Filipino	M	64.0	59.9	63.4	59.1	64.0	60.9	61.5	53.0
Finnish	H	61.1	53.8	58.1	57.0	56.3	50.0	54.1	50.2
Fon	VL	4.2	20.0	**20.1**	18.0	-	-	-	-
French	H	73.1	68.9	72.4	69.7	64.3	60.4	62.1	50.7
Friulian	VL	49.2	57.1	56.5	54.2	-	-	-	-
Fulfulde	VL	5.7	23.8	21.8	**24.1**	6.0	27.6	22.0	22.0
Galician	M	62.5	60.0	**62.6**	61.8	63.7	62.6	62.6	59.1
Georgian	M	54.1	48.4	52.2	52.2	49.8	45.5	47.2	44.4

target	resource	FLORES-200 devtest PaLM2 S (teacher)	FLORES-200 devtest NLLB 1.3B distilled	FLORES-200 devtest PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	FLORES-200 devtest Gemma 7B (mufu20)	NTREX PaLM2 S (teacher)	NTREX NLLB 1.3B distilled	NTREX PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	NTREX Gemma 7B (mufu20)
German	H	67.1	61.8	66.1	61.5	62.1	58.5	60.8	53.2
Greek	M	54.4	52.3	53.7	54.3	59.4	58.1	57.6	49.7
Guarani	VL	24.3	39.1	38.8	34.5	-	-	-	-
Gujarati	M	53.6	53.5	**54.4**	53.4	48.4	49.3	48.0	44.6
Haitian Creole	M	54.5	52.7	**56.8**	54.4	-	-	-	-
Hausa	L	52.9	51.8	51.5	49.8	54.1	54.1	51.9	45.5
Hebrew	M	61.6	57.0	59.5	58.0	54.2	51.5	51.7	47.1
Hindi	M	59.7	56.0	58.8	59.5	52.3	51.3	51.0	43.2
Hungarian	M	57.8	53.5	56.2	55.9	49.7	46.2	47.7	42.0
Icelandic	M	52.8	47.9	50.6	49.7	54.1	50.2	52.0	47.3
Igbo	L	42.4	41.8	41.3	38.8	47.6	48.0	45.2	37.3
Ilocano	L	46.0	53.7	**55.8**	51.8	-	-	-	-
Indonesian	M	72.3	69.0	71.4	70.6	67.4	65.0	66.5	62.9
Irish	M	58.7	53.8	56.2	58.4	55.0	51.7	52.2	48.9
Italian	H	60.1	58.0	59.8	57.9	62.8	62.0	61.5	54.5
Japanese	H	46.6	30.0	44.0	38.8	37.9	27.7	34.9	28.0
Javanese	L	57.0	56.0	56.9	52.6	-	-	-	-
Kabiyè	VL	11.6	28.2	**29.4**	26.8	-	-	-	-
Kabuverdianu	VL	43.2	44.7	**47.8**	**58.3**	-	-	-	-
Kabyle	VL	15.2	32.1	**32.7**	31.4	-	-	-	-
Kachin	VL	14.0	37.5	**39.9**	35.9	-	-	-	-
Kamba (Kenya)	VL	11.2	28.5	18.6	**30.8**	-	-	-	-
Kannada	M	56.0	55.2	54.8	54.9	52.2	53.0	50.8	44.1
Kanuri	VL	10.6	25.2	**27.2**	24.7	-	-	-	-
Kanuri in Arabic script	VL	10.9	13.1	10.8	**19.4**	-	-	-	-
Kashmiri	VL	16.9	37.1	36.6	34.3	-	-	-	-
Kashmiri in Devanagari script	VL	13.6	18.7	**26.6**	**29.2**	-	-	-	-
Kazakh	M	58.1	50.1	56.9	57.1	48.9	45.2	48.4	43.7
Khmer	M	46.5	37.9	45.5	43.8	50.5	49.0	48.0	44.1
Kikuyu	VL	11.4	37.2	33.6	35.5	-	-	-	-
Kimbundu	VL	13.6	28.5	**31.2**	**35.1**	-	-	-	-
Kinyarwanda	L	26.3	48.6	45.2	38.0	27.9	47.9	43.4	33.8
Kongo	VL	21.3	46.9	**48.8**	41.0	-	-	-	-
Korean	H	40.6	34.4	37.7	36.5	37.7	30.2	33.5	31.1
Kurdish (Kurmanji)	M	40.5	39.1	**40.7**	38.6	39.2	39.2	38.3	34.1
Kyrghyz	L	47.6	44.6	47.5	45.2	43.6	43.4	**43.6**	39.1
Lao	M	51.4	49.2	**53.7**	**52.3**	37.0	38.9	**39.6**	**46.2**
Latgalian	VL	31.6	48.1	**50.5**	46.9	-	-	-	-
Latvian	M	60.4	50.3	58.0	57.0	52.8	45.9	50.5	49.4
Ligurian	VL	45.2	48.5	**55.3**	**54.2**	-	-	-	-
Limburgan	VL	49.7	46.8	48.4	48.4	-	-	-	-
Lingala	L	27.1	49.6	**49.7**	45.8	-	-	-	-
Lithuanian	M	60.0	53.2	57.5	56.5	55.1	50.6	52.4	50.5
Lombard	VL	36.3	36.0	**38.9**	**40.6**	-	-	-	-
Luba-Lulua	VL	15.0	37.5	**38.3**	31.9	-	-	-	-
Luganda	L	20.5	40.8	38.7	31.7	-	-	-	-
Luo	VL	15.9	40.0	38.5	34.4	-	-	-	-
Luxembourgish	M	59.1	55.2	58.5	**59.6**	53.4	52.5	51.2	49.4
Macedonian	M	65.0	60.3	63.1	62.5	62.7	60.2	60.6	59.8
Magahi	VL	55.2	58.1	**60.5**	**63.0**	-	-	-	-
Maithili	L	50.8	48.9	**58.7**	**61.5**	-	-	-	-

target	resource	FLORES-200 devtest				NTREX			
		PaLM2 S (teacher)	NLLB 1.3B distilled	PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	Gemma 7B (mufu20)	PaLM2 S (teacher)	NLLB 1.3B distilled	PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	Gemma 7B (mufu20)
Malagasy	M	57.6	52.4	55.1	52.7	52.1	49.5	49.8	43.4
Malay	M	70.2	66.7	69.1	66.8	66.2	63.6	65.1	65.6
Malayalam	M	58.1	50.4	55.8	55.5	49.6	44.2	47.7	45.9
Maltese	M	71.2	66.0	68.9	69.5	66.9	62.2	64.3	61.1
Mandarin Chinese	H	42.3	23.6	40.2	37.0	34.5	18.8	32.3	24.3
Maori	L	48.2	47.4	**48.8**	**48.7**	51.8	49.5	50.9	45.0
Marathi	M	52.2	47.6	50.7	52.1	47.7	45.5	46.2	45.8
Meiteilon (Manipuri)	VL	12.6	40.2	39.3	39.2	-	-	-	-
Mesopotamian Arabic	L	52.2	48.4	**53.6**	**53.4**	-	-	-	-
Minangkabau	VL	51.1	52.0	**57.4**	**55.0**	-	-	-	-
Minangkabau in Arabic script	VL	16.8	-	**34.8**	**44.8**	-	-	-	-
Mizo	VL	19.7	38.0	**38.2**	33.9	-	-	-	-
Mongolian	M	51.4	41.9	50.8	49.4	45.8	40.2	44.5	36.1
Morrocan Arabic	L	42.7	40.7	**43.4**	42.2	-	-	-	-
Mossi	VL	3.7	23.5	11.9	22.6	-	-	-	-
Myanmar (Burmese)	M	51.7	37.8	50.4	49.1	18.0	17.8	17.6	17.4
Najdi Arabic	VL	59.7	53.5	58.3	**60.1**	-	-	-	-
Nepali	M	58.4	50.4	57.2	56.9	47.4	44.1	46.0	42.9
North Levantine Arabic	L	52.6	49.3	**57.8**	**59.9**	-	-	-	-
Norwegian	H	62.5	59.6	61.6	60.1	64.3	61.1	63.5	52.8
Norwegian Nynorsk	M	61.4	53.6	**61.6**	**63.2**	60.3	53.8	**60.4**	51.9
Nuer	VL	6.9	28.7	28.3	26.1	-	-	-	-
Occitan	L	63.1	61.2	**65.6**	**65.7**	-	-	-	-
Odia (Oriya)	L	45.8	47.6	**49.3**	46.1	-	-	-	-
Oromo	VL	17.1	39.1	**40.0**	30.4	17.2	35.4	33.6	26.9
Pangasinan	VL	31.3	48.5	48.3	40.7	-	-	-	-
Papiamento	L	56.2	56.1	**60.9**	**59.4**	-	-	-	-
Pashto	L	36.3	38.8	35.3	33.1	33.2	36.3	33.2	27.5
Persian	M	56.3	49.6	55.5	53.7	49.8	43.8	48.6	44.8
Polish	H	53.1	49.0	51.9	47.6	54.6	51.5	52.5	44.0
Portuguese	H	72.3	68.6	71.4	69.3	65.8	63.4	64.9	56.8
Punjabi	M	48.0	48.9	48.6	**50.3**	44.1	48.9	45.7	46.6
Romanian	M	65.9	60.5	64.9	63.0	60.3	55.4	58.8	54.3
Rundi	VL	21.4	43.9	38.4	31.7	-	-	-	-
Russian	H	60.5	55.8	59.1	55.6	56.2	54.7	54.8	40.2
Samoan	L	53.1	48.6	**55.2**	51.5	54.6	53.1	52.7	43.7
Sango	VL	12.1	36.7	35.3	31.7	-	-	-	-
Sanskrit	L	33.2	28.3	**36.2**	**34.7**	-	-	-	-
Santali	VL	11.4	-	**16.8**	**37.7**	-	-	-	-
Sardinian	VL	53.1	56.9	56.7	56.6	-	-	-	-
Scottish Gaelic	L	54.4	50.0	53.4	50.4	-	-	-	-
Sepedi	L	37.6	51.1	**54.7**	48.7	35.2	37.4	35.1	31.7
Serbian	M	61.2	57.6	60.0	61.2	46.2	44.5	44.9	**51.0**
Sesotho	M	54.5	47.9	**55.2**	54.0	-	-	-	-
Shan	VL	2.9	39.3	33.5	34.3	-	-	-	-
Shona	M	47.1	47.8	45.9	41.1	48.2	50.1	47.1	39.7
Sicilian	VL	46.7	42.7	**51.6**	**46.7**	-	-	-	-
Silesian	L	42.2	51.6	41.5	48.5	-	-	-	-
Sindhi	L	45.7	48.1	**49.5**	**49.8**	37.8	39.8	39.4	31.2
Sinhala	L	53.4	45.1	50.4	51.5	50.4	44.7	47.7	45.5
Slovak	M	62.0	57.9	60.5	59.0	60.0	56.9	57.4	50.2

target	resource	FLORES-200 devtest				NTREX			
		PaLM2 S (teacher)	NLLB 1.3B distilled	PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	Gemma 7B (mufu20)	PaLM2 S (teacher)	NLLB 1.3B distilled	PaLM2 XXS pt. NTL (mufu20)	Gemma 7B (mufu20)
Slovenian	M	58.9	54.2	56.8	54.7	58.0	53.6	55.4	54.2
Somali	M	46.6	46.0	45.5	42.8	51.7	50.7	49.1	40.6
Sorani Kurdish	L	44.3	48.7	45.0	44.5	41.5	45.3	41.1	34.6
South Azerbaijani	VL	28.1	26.7	**35.7**	**32.7**	-	-	-	-
South Levantine Arabic	VL	55.9	53.7	55.3	53.7	-	-	-	-
Spanish	H	57.2	55.2	57.1	50.4	64.9	64.1	62.7	52.3
Sundanese	L	54.5	48.6	53.6	52.2	-	-	-	-
Swahili	M	66.0	60.0	64.6	62.8	65.7	62.7	64.6	54.3
Swati	VL	39.6	47.0	46.4	40.6	41.0	50.2	47.4	37.6
Swedish	H	70.6	64.8	69.3	69.8	67.0	64.1	65.8	59.1
Ta'izzi-Adeni Arabic	VL	51.8	48.5	**53.4**	**55.0**	-	-	-	-
Taiwanese Mandarin in Traditional script	M	34.8	13.7	33.2	29.8	27.0	11.3	24.7	16.2
Tajik	L	52.3	49.8	49.8	49.2	43.9	43.1	42.3	39.8
Tamasheq	VL	4.3	23.7	17.7	**24.8**	-	-	-	-
Tamasheq in Tifinagh script	VL	6.8	17.7	17.5	**27.2**	-	-	-	-
Tamazight	VL	8.4	30.4	24.3	**32.2**	-	-	-	-
Tamil	M	59.5	56.6	57.6	58.7	48.8	48.3	47.7	47.8
Tatar	L	48.6	48.1	**50.9**	**49.3**	45.7	48.4	**49.1**	42.9
Telugu	M	59.5	56.4	57.3	**59.8**	46.6	45.6	45.5	39.3
Thai	H	57.9	43.6	56.9	55.7	52.7	43.8	51.7	44.0
Tibetan	L	32.4	34.7	**39.0**	**36.7**	28.9	33.9	**36.0**	30.5
Tigrinya	L	15.8	25.5	24.8	16.9	15.1	24.1	23.3	15.9
Tok Pisin	L	41.5	41.7	**54.2**	**54.3**	-	-	-	-
Tsonga	L	19.4	51.8	49.2	40.7	-	-	-	-
Tswana	L	37.9	49.3	48.3	41.2	39.8	54.5	48.2	38.3
Tumbuka	VL	24.3	36.3	**39.9**	34.9	-	-	-	-
Tunisian Arabic	VL	45.0	40.8	**47.5**	**48.2**	-	-	-	-
Turkish	M	63.4	58.2	61.9	60.8	54.3	51.9	53.4	49.5
Turkmen	L	49.0	41.9	**53.1**	**50.9**	43.5	38.4	**44.9**	40.6
Ukrainian	M	60.8	54.5	58.9	58.6	54.7	51.5	52.7	52.6
Umbundu	VL	9.8	28.0	24.2	**32.0**	-	-	-	-
Urdu	M	48.4	48.7	**49.0**	46.6	50.7	50.6	50.3	**51.4**
Uyghur	L	38.6	46.4	44.0	41.0	32.4	39.9	37.9	30.8
Uzbek	M	59.7	54.1	58.7	57.1	46.8	45.8	46.0	41.6
Venetian	L	49.3	50.1	**54.2**	**53.7**	-	-	-	-
Vietnamese	M	61.4	57.2	60.2	59.4	61.8	59.3	60.2	57.1
Waray (Philippines)	VL	55.0	56.2	**64.1**	**62.1**	-	-	-	-
Welsh	M	73.1	63.9	70.2	72.3	62.2	57.9	60.1	55.8
Wolof	VL	14.1	27.1	25.2	27.0	15.1	30.2	26.7	24.0
Xhosa	L	51.7	52.7	50.0	47.7	48.7	49.2	48.0	43.6
Yiddish	L	52.3	38.6	**52.5**	**56.7**	-	-	-	-
Yoruba	L	25.7	25.7	**26.5**	**26.1**	19.0	17.9	18.4	12.5
Zulu	M	55.9	56.7	54.6	53.9	55.5	56.8	53.9	48.6

Table 8: ChrF by 201 language pairs in FLORES-200. VL, L, M and H refer to very-low-, low-, medium- and high-resource languages respectively. Bold values are higher than both the teacher model (PaLM2 S) and NLLB 1.3B.

		FLORES-200 devtest					NTREX		
		chrF ↑ (n=201)	chrF ↑ (n=198)	Win% vs. teacher	Win% vs. NLLB 1.3B	Win% vs. NLLB 54B	chrF ↑ (n=112)	Win% vs. teacher	Win% vs. NLLB 1.3B
All language pairs	baseline	28.0	28.0	21.9	2.0	0.5	23.6	5.4	0.0
	postedit	38.6	38.7	23.4	10.6	1.5	36.8	5.4	0.9
	mufu5	40.6	40.7	24.9	14.1	3.5	38.5	6.2	0.9
	mufu10	**41.0**	**41.1**	25.4	15.2	3.5	**38.9**	7.1	1.8
	mufu20	38.8	38.9	24.4	12.6	3.0	37.1	6.2	1.8
Low-resource language pairs	baseline	28.2	28.2	37.9	3.5	0.9	24.0	19.4	0.0
	postedit	33.1	33.2	40.5	6.2	1.8	30.8	19.4	0.0
	mufu5	35.3	35.4	43.1	8.0	4.4	31.8	22.6	0.0
	mufu10	**35.8**	**35.9**	44.0	9.7	4.4	**32.2**	25.8	0.0
	mufu20	33.8	33.9	42.2	8.8	3.5	31.7	22.6	3.2

Table 9: Mean chrF of BLOOMZ 1B7 finetuned on Mufu, which is analogous to Table 2 in the main text. **Bold** values are the highest chrF scores. Mufu models consistently translate better than baseline and postedit-only.

A.6 Mufu with BLOOMZ

Using the same Mufu prompts, we finetune BLOOMZ 1B7 and report the mean chrF across language pairs in Table 9.[18] The results corroborate our key findings in the main text, that Mufu-finetuned models are consistently ahead of baseline and postedit-only and achieve the most competitve performance against the teacher in low-resource languages.

A.7 Mufu self-attention

Tables 10 and 11 are analogous to Table 4, where the attention weights placed over the input by Gemma 2B (mufu5) are highlighted. The examples demonstrate that Mufu models are capable of overriding the postediting target accurately based on semantic alignment across languages beyond orthographic mapping.

A.8 Failure example: Bad auxiliary input

We identified a few failure cases in Section 4.4 and attribute them partially to poor auxiliary candidates in Mufu input. For example,

> *English: Bird flu, or more formally avian influenza, can infect both birds and mammals.*
> *Automatic Luganda: Enfuba y'enyonyi, oba awamu ey'enfuba y'enyonyi, ey'enyonyi n'ensolo eziyitibwa ennyama.*
> *Automatic Kinyarwanda: Ibirori byamahoro, cyangwa uko byatangiye ibinyamurenge, byatera indwara mu nyamaswa n'ibindi binyabutabire.*
> *Automatic Umbundu: "Otsiku tsiku, tsiku tsiku, tsiku tsiku, tsiku tsiku, tsiku tsiku ...*
> *Automatic Chokwe: Flu wa ndege, nhi cindji cindji cindji cindji cindji cindji cindji ...*
> *Automatic Luba-Lulua: Bu tshisuku tshia nsuku, ni bu tshisuku tshia nsuku tshia nsuku ...*
> *Automatic Lingala: Nzela ya nzoto, to ndenge ya ndenge ya nzoto ya nzoto, ezalaki kozala na nzoto mpe na ndenge ya ndenge ya nzoto.*

Note that Mufu models produce overall worse translations in Lingala than baseline, except for PaLM2 XXS–NTL (Table 8) and PaLM2 XS.

[18]BLOOMZ 1B7 model card, see `https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloomz-1b7`

The English sentence has been translated into Malay, Sundanese, Javanese, Indonesian, Minangkabau and Achinese in Arabic script. These translations may contain errors. Correct the translation from English to Achinese in Arabic script.

English: Imagine, if you will, a Mancunian, Bostonian, Jamaican and Sydneysider sitting around a table having dinner at a restaurant in Toronto.

Automatic Malay: Bayangkan, jika anda mahu, seorang Mancunian, Bostonian, Jamaican dan Sydneysider duduk di sekeliling meja makan di sebuah restoran di Toronto.

Automatic Javanese: Mbayangno, yen sampeyan bakal, Mancunian, Bostonian, Jamaika lan Sydneysider lungguh ngubengi meja mangan nedha bengi ing restoran ing Toronto.

Automatic Sundanese: Bayangkeun, upami anjeun badé, aya Mancunian, Bostonian, Jamaika sareng Sydneysider anu calik di sabudeureun méja tuang di réstoran di Toronto.

Automatic Indonesian: Bayangkan, jika Anda mau, seorang Mancunian, Bostonian, Jamaika dan Sydneysider duduk di sekitar meja makan di sebuah restoran di Toronto.

Automatic Minangkabau: Bayangkan, apobilo indak salah, urang Mancunian, Bostonian, Jamaika jo Sydneysider duduak di sakitar meja makan di restoran di Toronto.

Automatic Achinese in Arabic script: كمڠك ي ، كمڠكي، كمڠكي، كمڠكي، كمڠكي، كمڠكي، كمڠكي، كمڠكي، كمڠكي، كمڠكي، كمڠكي، كمڠكي

Corrected Achinese in Arabic script: ڤ ا ڠ سيڠ , مڠيو ن اك ه , سيدري اورڠ منچونيا , باسكتوسيا ,

reference	نڤيكير, مڠيو ݢتا جد, سيدري مانچونيا, بوستونيا, جامايكا, ڠن سيدنيسيدر ݢدوق بك سابوه ميجا ݢڤاجوه بو مالم بك سابوه تمڤت سماجوه د تورونتو. *Nvykyr, mw t Jadu, sydry mnjwny, bwstwny, jmyk, n sydnysydr dwq Bik sbwh myj vjwh B Mlam Bik sbwh tmvt smjwh D twrwntw.*
mufu5	ڤاڠسيڠ, مڠيو ناكه, سيدري اورڠ منچونيا, باسكتوسيا, جامايكا ڠن سديڠسيدير ترڤوڠ جڤوڠ بك سليڠكر ميجا ماكن بك سابوه رينستوران بك تورونو *Vsy, mw nkh, sydry awr mnjwny, bsktwsy, jmyk n sdysydyr trvw jvw Bik slykr myj mkn Bik sbwh rynstwrn Bik twrwnw.*
baseline	ڤيكير, مڠيو درينه جد, سابوه اورڠ ماءين, اورڠ بوستون, اورڠ كاامان ڠن اورڠ سيدنيسا جك د كرجا بك تمڤت ڤاجوه بك رومه توروڤنس. *Vykyr, mw drynh Jadu, sbwh awr mayn, awr bwstwn, awr kmn n awr sydnys jk D krj Bik tmvt vjwh Bik Rmah twrwvns.*

Table 10: Translations from English to Achinese in Arabic script and their romanized form by mufu5 and the baseline Gemma 2B models. جامايكا is correctly transliterated from Jamaika in mufu5, which is attended by the model during its production and is absent in both the postediting target and the baseline translation. Tokens with aggregated attention values under .02, .06, .14, .24 are highlighted in white, light gray, dark gray and black respectively.

The English sentence has been translated into Tibetan, Kachin, Bengali, Myanmar (Burmese), Meiteilon (Manipuri) and Mizo. These translations may contain errors. Correct the translation from English to Mizo.

English: At a minimum, you need footwear with suitable soles. Summer shoes are usually very slippery on ice and snow, even some winter boots are deficient.

Automatic Tibetan: མ་མཐའ་ཡང་། ཁྱོད་རང་ལ་རྐང་པའི་འོག་གི་རྐང་རྗེས་དགོས་པ་ཞིག་འདུག ། དབྱར་གྱི་མགོ་པོ་རྣམས་གྲང་ངར་དང་གངས་ལ་གཡོལ་མི་ཐུབ་པ་ཞིག་ཡིན། དེ་བཞིན་དུ་དགུན་གྱི་མགོ་པོ་ཁ་ཤས་ཀྱང་དེ་ལྟར་ཡིན།

Automatic Bengali: অন্তত, তোমার উপযুক্ত সোলযুক্ত জুতোর প্রয়োজন। গ্রীষ্মের জুতো সাধারণত বরফ ও তুষারের উপর খুবই পিচ্ছিল, এমনকি কিছু শীতকালীন বুটও অপ্রতুল।

Automatic Kachin: Hku sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha sha

Automatic Myanmar (Burmese): အနည်းဆုံးအနေဖြင့် သင်သည် သင့်လျော်သော ကြိုးခံနိုင်သည့် အောက်ခံများပါဝင်သည့် ဖိနပ်များ လိုအပ်ပါသည်။ နွေရာသီဖိနပ်များသည် ရေခဲနှင့် နှင်းများပေါ်တွင် အလွန်ချော်လဲလွယ်ပြီး အချို့သော ဆောင်းရာသီဖိနပ်များသည်ပင် ချို့တဲ့နေပါသည်။

Automatic Meiteilon (Manipuri): লৈবাক থৌবাদা, মখোয়না লৈবাক থৌবা লৈবাক থৌবা লৈবাক থৌবা লৈবাক থৌবা লৈবাক থৌবা লৈবাক থৌবা লৈবাক থৌবা লৈবাক থৌবা লৈবাক

Automatic Mizo: A tlang tlang chuan, kan tlang tlang a rawn tlang tlang chuan, kan tlang tlang a rawn tlang tlang chuan, kan tlang tlang a rawn tlang tlang chuan, kan tlang tlang a rawn tlang tlang chuan,

Corrected Mizo:Thil buaithlak

reference	A lo **berah**, I pheikhawk bun chuan kephah siam bik a mamawh a nga.Nipui laia bun thin pheikhawkte hi chu vurah an nal tlangpui a, thlasik laia bun thin pheikhawk thenkhatte pawh hi an la tawk lo cheu a ni.
mufu5	Thil buaithlak **berah** chuan, hotu ropui tak nei ni pe a ngai a, a luahna hotu ring gyhoeddwyd tak te hi tlem leh lus veivah tak te pawh hi a chiang lo a ni.
baseline	A tlem chuan, foot hreuh tak hi a thil tih chiang tur a ni. A ver sawh chuan a hmuh a, vur zuah leh vur liah hi a che.

Table 11: Translations from English to Mizo by mufu5 and the baseline Gemma 2B. The mufu5 model generates *berah* (the most) for the source word "minimum" as it attends to multiple auxiliary translations—some of which are of low quality. The corresponding translations of the word in Bengali (অন্ততত) and Myanmar (အနည်းဆုံး) are partially attended to by the model. Tokens with aggregated attention values under .01, .05, .10, .18 are highlighted in white, light gray, dark gray and black respectively.