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**Abstract**

Pre-training Transformer-based models such as BERT and ELECTRA on a collection of Arabic corpora, demonstrated by both AraBERT and AraELECTRA, shows an impressive result on downstream tasks. However, pre-training Transformer-based language models is computationally expensive, especially for large-scale models. Recently, Funnel Transformer has addressed the sequential redundancy inside Transformer architecture by compressing the sequence of hidden states, leading to a significant reduction in the pre-training cost. This paper empirically studies the performance and efficiency of building an Arabic language model with Funnel Transformer and ELECTRA objective. We find that our model achieves state-of-the-art results on several Arabic downstream tasks despite using less computational resources compared to other BERT-based models.

**1 Introduction**

The introduction of Transformer and attention mechanism (Vaswani et al., 2017) have achieved significant success by exploiting transfer learning. Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), builds upon the idea of pre-training a Transformer with self-attention on large amounts of unlabeled text. Then, leverage the idea of transfer learning to fine-tune the pre-trained language model on downstream tasks. BERT has achieved impressive performance gains against its predecessor Bi-LSTM (Huang et al., 2015) on many downstream tasks. In the Arabic domain, both AraBERT (Antoun et al., 2020) and AraELECTRA (Antoun et al., 2021) have adapted BERT and ELECTRA (Clark et al., 2020b) models to the Arabic language and show impressive results on downstream tasks.

However, pre-training Transformer-based models, especially at a large scale, requires enormous computational resources. This issue motivates us to investigate a solution to reduce the cost of pre-training Transformer-based models. Reducing the cost to train Arabic language models will help accelerate research advancement in Arabic language processing. Additionally, this will help researchers with limited resources to fine-tune large models.

Several techniques in the literature have suggested solutions to reduce the cost of pre-training and fine-tuning, including cross-layer parameter sharing with ALBERT (Lan et al., 2020) and distillation (Sanh et al., 2020). Distillation and similar techniques have a detrimental effect on performance since they aim to reduce the parameter size. On the other hand, the fine-tuning and inference time for the ALBERT model, especially for ALBERT$_{xlarge}$ and ALBERT$_{xxlarge}$ scale is significantly higher than BERT$_{Large}$ and ELECTRA$_{Large}$ as a result of having more hidden layer size. Thus, we seek alternative architectures that could increase the scale of the model without adding additional cost to the pre-training.

Funnel Transformer (Dai et al., 2020) introduces a novel solution to address the cost of pre-training by reconstructing the Transformer architecture using pooling and up-sampling techniques. Additionally, ELECTRA speeds up the pre-training by introducing a new objective function, employing a small generator model trained with maximum likelihood. This study investigates the effect of pre-training Funnel Transformer with ELECTRA objective on the performance of Arabic downstream tasks. Our results show that we achieve state-of-the-art results with less computational resources than existing Arabic language models described in the literature. Thus, our contributions in this paper include :

- We pretrain ArabicTransformer on a large collection of unlabeled Arabic corpora with Funnel Transformer and ELECTRA objective that requires significantly less time and resources than state-of-the-art models.
• We fine-tune and evaluate our model on a suite of Arabic downstream tasks, including question answering and sentiment analysis tasks showing that we achieve state-of-the-art performance on several downstream tasks.

• We released our models to the research community along with our GitHub repository ¹.

2 Related Work

2.1 ELECTRA

The loss function inside the BERT model consists of semi-supervised learning objectives that aim to capture the contextual representation of an unstructured unlabeled dataset. This loss function in BERT has two objectives: Masked Language Model MLM and Next Sentence Prediction NSP. Several studies have investigated the effect of those two objectives on language model perplexity (Liu et al., 2019), (Lan et al., 2020). ELECTRA (Clark et al., 2020b), reconstructed the BERT model’s loss function based on game theory concepts, particularly the GAN (Goodfellow et al., 2014) and MaskGAN (Fedus et al., 2018) models. In ELECTRA, the loss function is formed as a zero-sum game where the goal of the discriminator and generator is to reach the Nash equilibrium point. This point represents the convergence of the language model to the optimal solution. As a result of having a binary loss function, the ELECTRA model’s learning curve is higher than the MLM objective.

2.2 Funnel Transformer

The ELECTRA paper only introduces novelty to the loss function without significant changes to the Transformer architecture. The major problem with Transformer architecture is the sequential redundancy within its structure. This redundancy adds additional pre-training cost to the language model. Funnel Transformer reconstructed the Transformer’s architecture to address the redundancy issue.

The key idea is to use a pooling technique to compress the full sequence of hidden states in the encoder part through a series of blocks. Then recover the full sequence representation in the decoder part using an up-sampling technique. A common configuration for the block layout, as shown by (Dai et al., 2020) consists of 3 blocks and a hidden layer size of 768 for base-scale models. For example, an architecture with B6-6-6 design has three blocks where each has 6 layers of a hidden size of 768. A model with a B4-4-4 design consists of three blocks where each has 4 layers of hidden size of 768. Figure 1 shows a high-level illustration of Funnel Transformer architecture.

Funnel Transformer with this novel design managed to save more FLOPs. The saved FLOPs can be used either to increase the model parameters or to speed up the pre-training process (Dai et al., 2020). Results of Funnel Transformer on English domain show significant performance leap, especially at base scale. These results motivate us to investigate the cost and efficiency of pre-training Funnel Transformer in the Arabic domain.

3 Pre-Training the Language Model

3.1 Dataset

We pretrain our models using a collection of large Arabic corpora (45GB) including:

• Arabic Wikipedia dump 1.3GB.
• Abu El-Khair corpus 14GB (El-khair, 2016).
• Unshuffled Arabic Oscar dataset 30GB (Ortiz Suárez et al., 2020).

¹We released our code and our models at https://github.com/salrowili/ArabicTransformer.
Table 1: The structure and hyperparameters of ArabicTransformer models compared to AraELECTRA and AraBERT. Computational Ratio (C ratio) represents the training steps multiplied by the batch size where the AraELECTRA model is the baseline. AraBERT follows a similar approach to (Devlin et al., 2019) by pretraining AraBERTv0 initially for 250K steps with a maximum sequence length of 128 and batch size of 13440. Then, they continue the pre-training for an additional 300K steps with a maximum sequence length of 512 and batch size of 2056. Both AraBERTv2 and AraBERTv02 have similar hyperparameters except for the use of pre-segmentation.

3.2 Environmental Setup
We pretrain our models using the Google cloud compute engine and TensorFlow units (TPUs). We use TensorFlow 1.15 (Abadi et al., 2015) and the open-source code of Funnel Transformer.

3.3 Pre-Training Hyperparameters
Table 1 provides our choice of pre-training hyperparameters for our models against both AraELECTRA (Antoun et al., 2021) and AraBERT (Antoun et al., 2020). We build our base model with a structure that consists of a 6-6-6 block layout and 768 hidden layer size. This block layout increases the model parameters up to 1.39x compared to BERTBase and ELECTRABase (Dai et al., 2020). Additionally, we pretrain a smaller model with a 4-4-4 block layout. This model has a similar parameter size to ELECTRAbase.

Instead of using a batch size of 256 as proposed in the original paper of ELECTRA and AraELECTRA, we increase the batch size to 1024 and the learning rate to 4e-4 for our B6-6-6 model. Several studies in the literature support the idea of using large batch size since it improves the language model’s perplexity (Liu et al., 2019), (You et al., 2020). On the other hand, we use similar pre-training hyperparameters to (Dai et al., 2020) for our B4-4-4 model. We build our vocabulary file with a size of 50K without using Farasa segmenter (Abdelali et al., 2016). Farasa segmenter is a tool that breaks words into stems, suffixes, and prefixes (Antoun et al., 2020).

4 Fine-tuning on Downstream Tasks
4.1 Question Answering
To compare our model with existing models in the literature, we use ARCD (Mozannar et al., 2019) and the Arabic portion of TyDi QA (Clark et al., 2020a). Both ARCD and TyDi QA are in format of SQuADv1.1 dataset (Rajpurkar et al., 2016). Similar to the AraELECTRA and AraBERT approach, we fine-tune our model on both ArabicSQuAD and ARCD training datasets. Then, we evaluate our model on the test portion of the ARCD dataset. Moreover, as is a common practice, we use a preprocessing script developed by the AUB MIND lab, which fixes the position of text spans and handles special characters in the ARCD dataset.

Our baseline models for QA tasks including AraBERTv2large, AraBERTv2large (Antoun et al., 2020), Arabic-ALBERTxlarge (Safaya, 2020) and AraELECTRA. We follow the same split of training and development dataset used by AraELECTRA, summarized in Table 2. We only include models that have reported results in the literature for ARCD and TyDi QA in our baseline models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCD Mozannar et al. (2019)</td>
<td>49,037</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TyDiQA Clark et al. (2020a)</td>
<td>14,805</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of Question Answering datasets.
4.2 Sentiment Analysis

Sentiment analysis (SA) task is a text classification task where we classify each sentence (sequence) with a (sentiment) label. Those labels can be either binary or categorical. Our choice for sentiment analysis task including Hotel Arabic-Reviews Dataset (HARD) (Elnagar et al., 2018), Arabic Jordanian General Tweets (AJGT) (Dahou et al., 2019) and ArScarcasmv2 (sentiment shared task) (Abu Farha et al., 2021). Our baseline models for sentiment analysis tasks including XLM-R\textsubscript{Base};XLM-R\textsubscript{Large} (Conneau et al., 2020), AraBERTv2\textsubscript{Large};AraBERTv02\textsubscript{Large} (Antoun et al., 2020), AraELECTRA (Antoun et al., 2021), ARBERT and MARBERT (Abdul-Mageed et al., 2021). Table 3 summarize the details of the dataset we use for SA tasks.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Task & Labels & Train/Test \\
\hline
HARD & [neg, pos] & 84.5k \hspace{1cm} 21.1k \\
ArSarcasm & [neg, neut, pos] & 12.5k \hspace{1cm} 3K \\
AJGT & [neg, pos] & 1.4k \hspace{1cm} 360 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Summary of sentiment analysis (SA) datasets. (neg: negative , pos:positive , neut: neutral)}
\end{table}

4.3 Fine-tuning Hyperparameters

We extensively conduct a grid search to find the best hyperparameters for each task using the TPUv3-8 unit and Tensorflow 1.15. Our grid search space range is : learning rate (2e-5, 3e-5, 4e-5, 5e-5, 6e-5) , batch size (16, 24, 32, 40, 48, 64), lay-erwise decay (0.75, 0.8, 1.0), max sequence length (384, 512) and epochs number (2-12). For sentiment analysis tasks, we use 256 as the maximum sequence length. We report our result as the best result out of five different runs for each task, which is a similar approach used by both ELECTRA (Clark et al., 2020b) and BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). We use the following seeds: 123, 1234, 12345, 666, 42 for each run. We define our choices of seeds to improve the reproducibility of results.

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 Pre-Training

Table 4 shows the pre-training time of our models against AraELECTRA. The reduction in cost for both B6-6-6 and B4-4-4 models is a result of using a 0.5x C ratio (batch x steps) compared to AraELECTRA. Additionally, Funnel-transformer architecture contributes to additional reduction from

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Model & Hardware & Time & Cost \\
\hline
AraELECTRA & TPUv3-8 & 24d & 1.00x \\
B6-6-6 (Ours) & TPUv3-32 & 2d \hspace{1cm} 10h \hspace{1cm} 0.40x \\
B4-4-4 (Ours) & TPUv3-8 & 7d \hspace{1cm} 11h \hspace{1cm} 0.31x \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Pretraining cost of our models compared to AraELECTRA.}
\end{table}

0.5x to 0.4x (B6-6-6) and from 0.5x to 0.31x for (B4-4-4) model. We have also evaluated our pre-trained models on a random Arabic sample (2.5M words with a size of 25MB) from CCNet dataset (Wenzek et al., 2020). Our evaluation shows that the B4-4-4 model has a loss score of 11.58% against 11.12% for the B6-6-6 model.

5.2 Question Answering

Table 5 shows the performance of our models on QA tasks compared to state-of-the-art models reported by (Antoun et al., 2021).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Model & TyDiQA & EM & F1 & ARCD & EM & F1 \\
\hline
AraBERT02\textsubscript{L} & 73.72 & 86.03 & 36.89 & 71.32 \\
AraBERT2\textsubscript{L} & 64.49 & 82.15 & 34.19 & 68.12 \\
ArabicALBERT\textsubscript{xl} & 71.12 & 84.59 & \textbf{37.75} & 68.03 \\
AraELECTRA\textsubscript{B} & 74.91 & 86.68 & 37.03 & 71.22 \\
Ours B4-4-4 & 74.70 & 85.89 & 31.48 & 67.70 \\
Ours B6-6-6 & \textbf{75.35} & \textbf{87.21} & 36.89 & \textbf{72.70} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Evaluation results of ArabicTransformer compared to SOTA models on QA tasks. We use F1 and exact match (EM) score for both tasks which is a common practice to evaluate task in format of SQuAD1.1. We use reported number by (Antoun et al., 2021) for our baseline models results.}
\end{table}

Our base-scale model (B6-6-6) outperforms AraELECTRA on both TyDi QA and ARCD tasks. This performance improvement is due to the fact that B6-6-6 has larger parameter size (1.39x) than ELECTRA\textsubscript{Base} architecture. Furthermore, our small model (B4-4-4) has a competitive performance against AraELECTRA and AraBERT\textsubscript{L} on the TyDi QA task, especially on the exact match (EM) metric. The discrepancy in performance between ARCD and TyDi QA tasks is due to the poor quality of the training dataset that we use for the ARCD task. This training dataset uses the Arabic Translation of SQuAD1.1 dataset (Antoun et al., 2021).
5.3 Sentiment Analysis

Table 6 summarizes the performance of Arabic-Transformer against SOTA models on sentiment analysis tasks. In both HARD and ArScarcasm tasks, our models perform better than other state-of-the-art models, including larger models such as XLM-R_{L} and AraBERT_{2L}. However, our models perform worse on the AJGT task. We attribute this performance to the fact that the AJGT task has a relatively smaller dataset than HARD and ArScarcasm. Therefore, it is more sensitive to hyperparameter tuning, leading to a significant performance fluctuation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>HARD</th>
<th>AJGT</th>
<th>Scarasm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>Acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLM-R_{B}</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLM-R_{L}</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AraBERT_{02L}</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AraBERT_{2L}</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBERT_{B}</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARBERT_{B}</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AraELECT_{B}</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours B4-4-4</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours B6-6-6</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Evaluation results of our models compared to SOTA models. F1_{PN} score takes only positive and negative classes in calculation excluding neutral class. For HARD and AJGT tasks, we use reported numbers of XLM-R, ARBERT and MARBERT (Abdul-Mageed et al., 2021). For ArScarcasm task we use the reported numbers by (Farha and Magdy, 2021). We reproduced AraELECTRA results on all tasks and AraBERT_{L} models on HARD and AJGT tasks.

5.4 Pre-Segmentation

AraBERT_{2L}, in contrast to other models in Table 5 and Table 6, uses Farasa segmenter. Although AraBERT_{2L} outperforms AraELECTRA on the ArScarcasm task, AraBERT_{2L} performs worse on QA tasks despite having a 7.5x computational ratio compared to AraELECTRA. The performance of AraELECTRA, AraBERT_{02L} and our models against AraBERT_{2L} on the QA task suggests that pre-segmentation do not always lead to better performance on span-based QA tasks. In contrast, pre-segmentation contributes to the performance improvement of AraBERT_{2} on sentiment analysis tasks against AraBERT_{02}, especially on the ArScarcasm task.

5.5 Efficiency of Fine-Tuning

Table 7 shows the fine-tuning time of our models compared to AraELECTRA_{base}. In addition to improvement in fine-tuning speed, we also observe that B4-4-4 uses less memory consumption than AraELECTRA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Time / Ratio</th>
<th>#Params</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AraELECTRA_{B}</td>
<td>25:31 (1.00x)</td>
<td>1.00x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours (B4-4-4)</td>
<td>18:27 (0.72x)</td>
<td>1.00x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours (B6-6-6)</td>
<td>27:24 (1.07x)</td>
<td>1.39x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Fine-Tuning time of our models compared to SOTA models. We finetune all models on HARD dataset for 3 epochs and with a batch size of 32 using V100 16GB Tesla GPU with PyTorch ( FP16 - O2 ). Parameters ratio does not include embedding matrix.

6 Conclusion

We introduce Arabic Transformer, a pretrained Arabic language representation model based on Funnel Transformer and ELECTRA objective. We show that we achieve state-of-the-art results on several Arabic downstream tasks, including question answering and sentiment analysis tasks. Additionally, we show that our models are computationally efficient and pretrained using significantly less resources than state-of-the-art models. For future work, we plan to investigate different designs of the Funnel Transformer, including larger models such as (B8-8-8).
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