

Towards Linguistically-Aware and Language-Independent Tokenization for Large Language Models (LLMs)

Abrar Rahman
Cognitive Computing Platform
Epic Systems
Verona, WI
abrar@epic.com

Garry Bowlin
Cognitive Computing Platform
Epic Systems
Verona, WI
garry@epic.com

Binit Mohanty
Cognitive Computing Platform
Epic Systems
Verona, WI
binit@epic.com

Sean McGunigal
Cognitive Computing Platform
Epic Systems
Verona, WI
smcgunig@epic.com

Abstract— This paper presents a comprehensive study on the tokenization techniques employed by state-of-the-art large language models (LLMs) and their implications on the cost and availability of services across different languages, especially low resource languages. The analysis considers multiple LLMs, including GPT-4 (using `cl100k_base` embeddings), GPT-3 (with `p50k_base` embeddings), and DaVinci (employing `r50k_base` embeddings), as well as the widely used BERT base tokenizer. The study evaluates the tokenization variability observed across these models and investigates the challenges of linguistic representation in subword tokenization. The research underscores the importance of fostering linguistically-aware development practices, especially for languages that are traditionally under-resourced. Moreover, this paper introduces case studies that highlight the real-world implications of tokenization choices, particularly in the context of electronic health record (EHR) systems. This research aims to promote generalizable Internationalization (I18N) practices in the development of AI services in this domain and beyond, with a strong emphasis on inclusivity, particularly for languages traditionally underrepresented in AI applications.

Keywords—Large Language Models, Tokenization, Electronic Health Records, Internationalization, Low-resource languages

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background & Motivation

Subword tokenization techniques, such as Byte-Pair Encoding (BPE) [1] and WordPiece [2], have been instrumental in powering the subword-level tokenization approach adopted by modern large language models (LLMs). However, the prevailing tokenization methodologies raise fundamental challenges in capturing linguistically meaningful units, as they may not correspond to morphemes, the smallest units of meaning recognized by linguists [3]. The consequences of this linguistic misalignment are far-reaching, potentially resulting in suboptimal representation of languages and linguistic nuances.

Furthermore, the representation of various writing systems, encoded differently, poses technical challenges in LLM use cases, especially when aiming for global accessibility. To underscore the real-world implications, this paper reveals

instances of disproportionate language tokenization costs. These challenges and disparities not only underscore the urgency for more equitable linguistic representation but also highlight the pressing need for fostering generalizable internationalization (I18N) practices in AI development that transcend language barriers and promote the inclusion of low-resource languages.

B. Scope and Objectives

This paper's research focuses on the discrepancies in tokenization lengths across languages and tokenizers used by LLMs. The paper explores how these disparities impact various healthcare applications and clinical workflows, and the potential consequences for the quality, fairness, and accessibility of healthcare services. We aim to shed light on the ethical and technical dimensions of tokenization inequalities and future directions for the field to mitigate linguistic disparities.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In early natural language processing (NLP) systems, tokenization was typically based on whitespace, where words were separated by spaces. This simplistic approach had limitations when dealing with languages that do not use spaces between words or languages with complex word forms (ex: advanced tense systems, agglutination, vowel harmony, etc). For instance, this is the default tokenizer for NLTK, a widely used NLP library [4], merely tokenizes on whitespace and gives no insight into semantically-meaningful word subunits.

A. Subword Tokenization

- **WordPiece Tokenization:** WordPiece is an early subword tokenization method. It breaks words into smaller units, allowing the model to represent out-of-vocabulary words by combining smaller subword units [3]. However, it does not necessarily split words into semantically meaningful subunits.
- **Byte-Pair Encoding (BPE):** Originally developed for data compression [1], this has become a widely adopted subword tokenization method in modern NLP models. BPE segments text into subword units based on character-level patterns. It dynamically generates a vocabulary of subword tokens, allowing the model to

handle out-of-vocabulary words and represent morphological variations effectively.

Note that WordPiece is incredibly similar in design to BPE, albeit with a different reward function. Byte-Pair Encoding (BPE) and WordPiece are subword tokenization methods used in NLP. BPE is more flexible and identifies subword units at the character level. This allows it to better handle complex languages and out-of-vocabulary words. BPE provide more fine-grained representations and is easier to implement than WordPiece. BPE is language-agnostic and can achieve smaller vocabulary sizes. In summary, BPE is often preferred for its flexibility, representations, and language support. However, WordPiece can be a good choice depending on the task and languages. The optimal method depends on the requirements of the specific NLP application.

B. Other Tokenization Methods

- **SentencePiece:** SentencePiece is a popular alternative to WordPiece. It is an unsupervised text tokenizer and detokenizer, which uses subword units for various NLP tasks [2]. SentencePiece provides a simpler unified interface, whereas WordPiece requires separate tokenization steps. It allows flexible segmentation strategies and operates at the character level—WordPiece uses a fixed algorithm and works at the word level. SentencePiece was designed for multilingual NLP and offers text normalization, while WordPiece originated for translating rare words without normalization.
- **Unigram Language Model (ULM):** A tokenization method that combines ideas from BPE and language modeling. It generates subword units based on a unigram language model, optimizing the tokenization scheme according to the Minimum Description Length (MDL) principle [5].
- **Subword Regularization (SWR):** A method for subword segmentation that aims to improve the generalization ability of NLP models. [6] It combines subword units and words, potentially offering a more intuitive representation for morphemes.
- **Sentence-BERT:** Sentence-BERT is a modification of BERT designed for sentence embeddings [7]. While not a tokenization method per se, it showcases the evolution of BERT-like models for embedding entire sentences and documents.

C. The State of the Art for Tokenizers

OpenAI's transition from p50k_base (GPT-3) to cl100k_base (GPT-4) signifies an expansion in vocabulary size and granularity [8, 9]. These changes allow the model to handle a larger, more diverse set of subword units, enhancing its ability to represent a wider range of words and linguistic variations. This expansion is crucial for improving the model's performance, particularly when working with languages that have complex word forms, rich morphologies, and diverse writing systems.

Note that the r50k_base embedding (GPT-2) is near identical to p50k_base, with every tokenization in our analysis being completely identical between the two. Thus, r50k_base is included in the token counts but excluded for the character / token calculation.

TABLE I. COMPARISON OF EMBEDDING VOCABULARY

LLM	Embeddings Data	
	Embedding	Vocabulary Size (tokens)
BERT	bert_base	~30,000
GPT-2	r50k_base	~50,000
GPT-3	p50k_base	
GPT-4	cl100k_base	~100,000

BERT base uses a subword tokenization method that is based on WordPiece, which generates subword units without direct consideration of linguistic morphemes. In contrast, cl100k_base uses BPE.

D. Language Systems and Technical Challenges [3]

- **Variable-Length Encoding:** UTF-8 is a variable-length encoding, meaning that different characters use a variable number of bytes for representation. While this encoding efficiently represents characters from various languages, it can make processing more complex. This complexity can lead to parsing and indexing challenges, particularly when handling multi-byte characters, which are common in some languages.
- **Multibyte Characters:** Languages with complex scripts, such as East Asian languages (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean) or Arabic (written in a calligraphic style), often have characters represented by multiple bytes in UTF-8. Processing these multibyte characters requires special handling to ensure correct indexing, substring extraction, and text manipulation. This can add computational overhead and complexity to text processing tasks.

E. Low Resource Languages

In NLP research, a "low resource language" refers to a language for which there is limited availability of linguistic resources and data for natural language processing tasks [10]. These languages typically lack comprehensive text corpora, annotated datasets, linguistic tools, and pre-trained models.

There is no objective criterion or official list categorizing a given language as "low resource". The term can encompass several factors, including the size of the L1 (first language) speaker population. Other factors that can contribute to a language being considered low resource include the availability of digital text, linguistic diversity, and the presence of linguistic features that pose challenges for NLP, such as complex morphology or scripts. While less commonly spoken languages often face resource scarcity, it is essential to consider multiple aspects beyond just speaker population when assessing a language's resource level in NLP research. An instructive

example is Bengali, a language with over 300M speakers and ranked as the 6th most spoken L1 in the world, but with relatively scant NLP research until the past five years or so [10].

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Data Selection

Our heuristic for selecting content for analysis has several components: it must be widely available in languages across language families, strictly adhere to consistency of content, and preferably have some kind of literary or sociopolitical significance. With these factors in mind, we selected the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) [11] and Genesis 1:1-3 from the Old Testament of the Bible [12-17]. We selected languages that Epic, the leading EHR in the USA, is offered in abroad [18], as well as the native Bengali of one of our authors to complete our dataset with a low-resource language. We further validated our findings on the FLORES-200 dataset. This dataset, compiled and made public by Meta Research, comprises translations of Wikimedia web articles in 200 languages of 842 articles, totaling 3001 sentences [19-21].

We considered using clinical notes, but publicly-available anonymized datasets are not available across our selection of target languages. Additionally, care as delivered is very different from national health system to health system, and thus it would not represent a true apples-to-apples comparison. Thus, the UDHR and Genesis selections highlight differences for semantically-identical strings, whereas the FLORES-200 dataset is intended to be a larger corpus of representative texts in each language.

B. Data Analysis Methods

Given the corpora listed above, we did a straightforward calculation of the number of characters per string. We then used OpenAI’s free TikToken API [9] and the BERT base tokenizer [2] to generate token counts. We then divided columns to find the characters per token, giving us a metric for tokenization density which is a proxy for cost disparities, latency issues, and resource constraints around the size of the context window. This methodology can be extended to calculate “language premiums” as defined in [3], though we prefer having the raw data density metric as opposed to the more comparative emphasis of the language premium statistic.

IV. RESULTS & ANALYSIS

A. Tokenization Variability on Short Excerpts

See Appendix I.

B. FLORES-200 Dataset

See Appendix I.

C. Impacts on LLM Cost and Availability

At Epic, we are building and deploying LLM workflows at scale, both within the US and to international customers. In doing so, the resource constraints inherent in the context windows and token allocations associated with OpenAI use cases became apparent rather quickly, which was the impetus for the internal research which gave rise to this very paper. These challenges are not restricted to healthcare workflows, but these are the example problem spaces we are currently immersed in.

- **Cost Disparities:** Tokenization premiums, as seen in LLMs charging per token, result in significant cost differences for users across languages. Processing text in languages like Bengali can cost over four times more than in English. The per-character pricing approach also leads to proportional cost disparities due to variations in character lengths across languages. An InBasket generated draft response may cost more for our Dutch customers than our American ones.
- **Latency Challenges:** High tokenization lengths in certain languages lead to longer processing times and higher latency in real-time interactions. This can result in suboptimal user experiences, miscommunication, and delays. An LLM-powered medical intake bot that you call over a phone line may be significantly slower and less usable for non-English-speaking users.
- **Long Context Processing Limitations:** Transformers models struggle to process long inputs, and tokenization directly impacts input size. For languages with high tokenization density, this limitation can significantly reduce the content processed, potentially affecting performance in any and every relevant workflow. A doctor may have to wait longer to summarize the patient’s chart in Lebanon than in the US.

V. DISCUSSION

A. I18N and Inclusivity in AI Services

- **Inclusivity:** We emphasize the need for AI services to be inclusive and representative of linguistic and cultural diversity. It is crucial to ensure that the representation is not biased toward dominant languages or cultures. Inclusivity should extend to under-resourced languages and marginalized communities.
- **Affordability & Access:** Researchers and developers alike must work towards AI services with larger context windows that are cost-effective and accessible, especially in regions and communities with varying economic resources.

B. Other Ethical Considerations

- **Preservation of Linguistic Diversity:** The advancement of AI services should not inadvertently contribute to the erosion of linguistic diversity. We seek to promote and preserve linguistic diversity by accurately representing and respecting languages with smaller speaker populations and training datasets available. Moreover, languages change over time. They are organic, living things like the people who speak them. Once a tokenization set is created and deployed broadly, they will encounter blind spots as new terms enter the lexicon.
- **Transparency and Accountability:** Developers and organizations responsible for AI services must maintain transparency in their development processes and be accountable for the impact of their technologies. Internationalization guidelines and standards should be incorporated into LLM development from early stages.

VI. CONCLUSION

A. Summary of Key Findings

The analysis of tokenization inequality challenges the conventional assumption that large language models (LLMs) can seamlessly process text in various languages. It reveals that even when intentionally trained for multilingual support, tokenization inequalities persist, leading to variations in the understanding, representation, and accessibility of different languages. This is particularly relevant for low-resource language processing because it underscores the disparities in language support, information availability, and economic costs for languages with fewer resources and smaller speaker populations. As LLM-powered workflows, in the healthcare world and far beyond, continue to scale to new markets, these problems turn more and more pressing with every passing day.

B. Future Directions and Recommendations

- **Research and Development:** Invest in research to understand and mitigate tokenization inequalities, focusing on low-resource languages, and develop novel subword tokenization methods that prioritize fairness and inclusivity.
- **Data Collection and Collaboration:** Collaborate with linguists and language experts to curate and standardize language data for low-resource languages, improving the performance of LLMs. The field ought to work towards comprehensive transparency standards for datasets used to train tokenizers.
- **Multilingual Training:** Integrate more low-resource languages into the training pipeline of LLMs to enhance their support for linguistic diversity [22]. Engage with underrepresented language-speaking communities to better understand their unique needs and ensure that LLMs are accessible and relevant to a global audience.
- **Pricing Transparency:** Seeing as these systematic differences in tokenization and the problems they cause will not be solved overnight, we should at least be transparent about pricing and performance differences. We strongly recommend publishing “model cards” to let end users and institutions alike anticipate the cost to run a model for a given workflow on their language.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thank you to our many wonderful colleagues at Epic who made this paper possible: our friends Jack Dahms and Matthew Wiese

on the InBasket Team; Nick Krueger on the Nebula team; and of course, our R&D Lead, Seth Hain.

REFERENCES

- [1] Gage, Philip. *A New Algorithm for Data Compression*, The C Users Journal, Feb. 1994, www.pennelynn.com/Documents/CUJ/HTML/94HTML/19940045.HTM.
- [2] Devlin, Jacob, et al. "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding." arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805 (2018).
- [3] Petrov, Aleksandar, et al. "Language Model Tokenizers Introduce Unfairness Between Languages." arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15425 (2023).
- [4] <https://www.nltk.org/api/nltk.tokenize.html>
- [5] E. Arisoy, M. Saraclar, B. Roark and I. Shafran, "Discriminative Language Modeling With Linguistic and Statistically Derived Features," in *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 540-550, Feb. 2012, doi: 10.1109/TASL.2011.2162323.
- [6] Kudo, Taku. "Subword regularization: Improving neural network translation models with multiple subword candidates." arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.10959 (2018).
- [7] Reimers, Nils, and Iryna Gurevych. "Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks." arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084 (2019).
- [8] Jurafsky, Dan, and James H Martin. "Speech and Language Processing (3rd Ed. Draft)." *Speech and Language Processing*, 7 Jan. 2023, web.stanford.edu/~jurafsky/slp3/.
- [9] <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/embeddings>
- [10] Rakib, Mohammed, et al. "Bangla-Wave: Improving Bangla Automatic Speech Recognition Utilizing N-gram Language Models." *Proceedings of the 2023 12th International Conference on Software and Computer Applications*. 2023.
- [11] *UDHR - First Article, All Languages*, Unicode Standard, 2009, unicode.org/udhr/assemblies/first_article_all.html.
- [12] <https://bibleineverylanguage.org/>
- [13] <https://studybible.info/Danish/Genesis%201:1>
- [14] <https://biblehub.com/svg/genesis/1.htm>
- [15] <https://sainte bible.com/dar/genesis/1.htm>
- [16] <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=%D0%91%D1%8B%D1%82%D0%B8%D0%B5%20%2CGenesis%201&version=RUSV;NR;T;NIV>
- [17] <https://www.biblica.com/bible/niv/genesis/1/nub/>
- [18] *Country-Specific Integrations for Use Cases Specific to Outside the United States.*, Epic Systems, 2023, open.epic.com/CountrySpecific.
- [19] Costa-jussà, Marta R., et al. "No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation." arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672 (2022).
- [20] Goyal, Naman, et al. "The flores-101 evaluation benchmark for low-resource and multilingual machine translation." *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2022): 522-538.
- [21] Guzmán, Francisco, et al. "The flores evaluation datasets for low-resource machine translation: Nepali-english and sinhala-english." arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01382 (2019).
- [22] Wang, Wenxuan, et al. "All Languages Matter: On the Multilingual Safety of Large Language Models." arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00905 (2023).

APPENDIX

TABLE II: Summary Statistics for UDHR / Genesis / FLORES-200

	Dataset	char_count	cl100k_base	p50k_base	r50k_base	bert_base	char_per_cl100k_base	char_per_p50k_base	char_per_bert_base
Arabic (Modern Standard)	UDHR	116	88	120	120	94	1.318182	0.966667	1.234043
	Genesis	254	214	279	279	128	1.186915888	0.910394265	1.984375
	FLORES	111590	78247	113455	113455	90101	1.426124963	0.983561765	1.238499018
English	UDHR	170	33	33	33	32	5.151515	5.151515	5.3125
	Genesis	250	55	55	55	55	4.545454545	4.545454545	4.5454545
	FLORES	126191	25809	26738	26738	25679	4.88941842	4.719537737	4.914171113
Bengali	UDHR	168	212	337	337	128	0.792453	0.498516	1.3125
	Genesis	183	225	359	359	132	0.813333333	0.509749304	1.3863636
	FLORES	124272	151475	248271	248272	89449	0.820412609	0.500549802	1.389305638
Chinese (Simplified)	UDHR	42	51	84	84	42	0.823529	0.5	1
	Genesis	46	58	94	94	45	0.793103448	0.489361702	1.0222222
	FLORES	43181	48832	83407	83407	39030	0.884276704	0.517714341	1.106354087
Danish	UDHR	162	57	67	67	62	2.842105	2.41791	2.612903
	Genesis	194	70	78	78	74	2.771428571	2.487179487	2.6216216
	FLORES	130281	41899	49752	49801	46817	3.109405952	2.618608297	2.782771216
Dutch	UDHR	187	53	70	70	71	3.528302	2.671429	2.633803
	Genesis	204	69	74	74	72	2.956521739	2.756756757	2.8333333
	FLORES	140123	41022	51282	51282	49754	3.415801277	2.732401232	2.816316276
Finnish	UDHR	175	68	74	74	67	2.573529	2.364865	2.61194
	Genesis	183	75	81	81	77	2.44	2.259259259	2.3766233
	FLORES	134948	51456	59474	59474	50533	2.622590174	2.26902512	2.670492549
French	UDHR	186	50	61	61	61	3.72	3.04918	3.04918
	Genesis	240	74	83	83	84	3.243243243	2.891566265	2.8571428
	FLORES	149788	40882	52028	52028	46372	3.663910768	2.878988237	3.230138877
German	UDHR	164	44	60	60	57	3.727273	2.733333	2.877193
	Genesis	202	60	72	72	71	3.366666667	2.805555556	2.845070423
	FLORES	147555	40644	56056	56056	49893	3.630425155	2.632278436	2.957428898
Norwegian (bokmal)	UDHR	166	52	67	67	60	3.192308	2.477612	2.766667
	Genesis	181	65	79	79	68	2.784615385	2.291139241	2.6617647
	FLORES	127887	40382	48758	48758	45955	3.166930811	2.622892654	2.782874551
Russian	UDHR	160	74	172	172	133	2.162162	0.930233	1.203008
	Genesis	160	82	171	171	126	1.951219512	0.935672515	1.2698413
	FLORES	139099	64429	149244	149244	114648	2.158950162	0.932024068	1.213270184
Spanish	UDHR	171	44	58	58	57	3.886364	2.948276	3
	Genesis	235	74	88	88	91	3.175675676	2.670454545	2.5824175
	FLORES	150230	39968	52117	52117	48128	3.758757	2.882553	3.121468
Swedish	UDHR	163	56	73	73	58	2.910714	2.232877	2.810345
	Genesis	170	66	82	82	66	2.575757576	2.073170732	2.575757576
	FLORES	127480	40770	51269	51316	44132	3.126808928	2.486492812	2.888606907
Tagalog	UDHR	192	66	81	81	71	2.909091	2.37037	2.704225
	Genesis	259	90	100	100	98	2.877777778	2.59	2.6428571
	FLORES	159100	53148	59256	59378	55784	2.993527508	2.684960173	2.852072279
Vietnamese	UDHR	215	134	191	191	72	1.604478	1.125654	2.986111
	Genesis	237	118	224	224	96	2.008474576	1.058035714	2.46875
	FLORES	132988	62913	117465	117465	51048	2.113839747	1.132150002	2.605155932