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ABSTRACT

Improved speech recognition performance can often be obtained by combining multiple systems together. Joint decoding, where scores from multiple systems are combined during decoding rather than combining hypotheses, is one efficient approach for system combination. In standard joint decoding the frame log-likelihoods from each system are used as the scores. These scores are then weighted and summed to yield the final score for a frame. The system combination weights for this process are usually empirically set. In this paper, a recently proposed scheme for learning these system weights is investigated for a standard noise-robust speech recognition task, AURORA 4. High performance tandem and hybrid systems for this task are described. By applying state-of-the-art training approaches and configurations for the bottleneck features of the tandem system, the difference in performance between the tandem and hybrid systems is significantly smaller than usually observed on this task. A log-linear model is then used to estimate system weights between these systems. Training the system weights yields additional gains over empirically set system weights when used for decoding. Furthermore, when used in a lattice rescoring fashion, further gains can be obtained.

Index Terms— Joint decoding, tandem system, hybrid system, log-linear model, structured SVM

1. INTRODUCTION

In general, different systems have various characteristics, make different errors, and are expected to provide complementary advantages. Thus, state-of-the-art speech recognisers typically utilise multiple systems to make ensemble decisions. Two system combination approaches called recogniser output voting error reduction (ROVER) [1] and confusion network combination (CNC) [2] are commonly used in speech recognition. The difference between these two is that ROVER uses the 1-best output, whereas CNC uses confusion networks [3]. In these schemes, multiple passes of decoding are required. In joint decoding [4], the systems to be combined can be trained separately possibly with different features (e.g. MFCC or filter bank) and training criteria (e.g. ML or MPE), but they share the same hidden Markov model (HMM) topology, and the frame level acoustic log-likelihoods from different systems are combined. Assume there are $K$ different systems to be combined, given a speech frame (an observation) $\alpha_t$, in decoding the “log-likelihood” score corresponding to state $s_i$ can be described as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha_t|s_i) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \eta_k \log p_k(\alpha_t|s_i)$$ (1)

where $\log p_k(\alpha_t|s_i)$ is the log-likelihood given by the $k$th system, and the scalar $\eta_k$ is the corresponding combination weight. In work [4] combination of two forms of deep neural network (DNN) based systems were investigated, namely the tandem and hybrid systems [5, 6]. However, in [4] these combination weights are set empirically, and only system-dependent, which means the weights corresponding to different states for a system are set to be the same. Since in joint decoding the log-likelihoods from different systems are linearly combined with corresponding combination weights, it would be a natural extension by modelling these weights with a log-linear model and relaxing these weights to be state or phone dependent, which will be studied in this paper. In experiments, the phone dependent weights learnt by log-linear models will be examined. In addition to joint decoding, decoding with log-linear models based on the segment level features derived from different systems [7] also will be studied. By using a lattice, decoding then can be operated in a lattice rescoring fashion [8].

2. LOG-LINEAR MODELS

In speech recognition the possible number of classes for an utterance can be exponentially large. For example, the possible number of classes for a 6-digit length utterance is $10^6$. One solution to this problem is to segment the continuous speech into segments, and then classify each (independent) segment in an acoustic code breaking fashion [9]. Another solution is to introduce structure by breaking the sentence label down into sub-sentence units, such as words or phones with associated segmentation of the sentence. In a structured model such as the HMM, the structure of the class label is considered, and the parameters for any class (sentence) can be constructed from a common set of basic units [10]. In a structured discriminative model, the conditional distribution of the class label (sentence) $W$ given an input $O$ can be can be described as:

$$P(W|O, \eta) = \frac{1}{Z(\eta, O)} \sum_{\rho \in \rho_W} \exp \left( \eta^T \Phi(O, W, \rho) \right)$$ (2)

1It is worth noting that only the segment level log-linear models will be used in experiments.
where $\rho$ is one possible segmentation of $O$. $Z(\eta, O)$ is the normalisation term that ensures $P(W|O, \eta)$ is a valid probability. The set $P_W$ consists of all possible segmentations corresponding to the hypothesis $W$. Vector $\eta$ is the parameter of the model and $\Phi(O, W, \rho)$ is the joint feature, which characterises the dependence between the input $O$ and hypothesis $W$, and maps the input $O$ with variable length to a fixed dimension [10]. The definition of the joint feature will be discussed in detail in the following section.

This type of structured discriminative model described in equation (2) is known as the conditional augmented (CAug) model [11] or segmental conditional random fields (SCRF) [12]. In this model, the summation over all possible segmentations makes training complicated. Alternatively, a variant of Viterbi training [13] could be used, where the most likely segmentation $\rho$ from the HMM can be used instead of summing over all possible segmentations [14]. Then the structured discriminative model described in (2) can be approximated as a log-linear model:

$$P(W|O, \eta) \approx \frac{1}{Z(\eta, O)} \exp(\eta^T \Phi(O, W, \rho))$$  (3)

As an alternative to using the most likely segmentations from HMMs [15], optimal segmentations can be obtained from discriminative models [16].

3. FEATURE SPACE

Normally the features for structured discriminative models can be divided into two groups, namely the frame level and segment level features. In this work the two type of features based on log-likelihoods will be discussed.

Given one possible segmentation (or alignment) $\rho = \{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^{|\rho|}$ which segments the sentence into sub-sentence units, the input utterance and sentence can be decomposed into $O = \{O_k\}_{k=1}^{|\rho|}$ and $W = \{w_i\}_{i=1}^{|\rho|}$, where $|\rho|$ is the number of segments. One general form of the joint feature $\Phi(O, W, \rho)$ based on $K$ different systems can be described as [10, 14]:

$$\Phi(O, W, \rho) = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^{\rho_1} \phi_1(O_i, \rho_i) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{i=1}^{\rho_k} \phi_K(O_i, \rho_i) \\ \phi_{\text{lm}}(W, \rho) \end{bmatrix} ; \eta = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \eta_K \\ \eta_{\text{lm}} \end{bmatrix}$$  (4)

where $\phi_k(\cdot)$ denotes the acoustic features for one segment from the $k$th system, and $\eta_k$ are the corresponding weights. $\phi_{\text{lm}}(\cdot)$ denotes the language features which provide pronunciation probabilities, word statistics, etc., and $\eta_{\text{lm}}$ are the corresponding weights.

For the segment level features, various forms can be used, e.g. the log-likelihood [16] and derivative features [17]. In this work, the (segment level) acoustic features from the $k$th system are based on log-likelihoods:

$$\phi_k(O_i, \rho_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta(w_{i_1}, v_{i_1}) L_k(O_{i_1}) \\ \vdots \\ \delta(w_{i_t}, v_{i_t}) L_k(O_{i_t}) \end{bmatrix}$$  (5)

where $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{t}$ denotes all possible sub-sentence units (such as triphones) in the dictionary. $L_k(O_{i_j})$ is the log-likelihood given by the tri-phone model from the $k$th system:

$$L_k(O_{i_j}) = \log p_k(O_{i_j}|w_{i_{j-1}}w_{i_j}w_{i_{j+1}})$$  (6)

For robust parameter estimation it is important to tie the parameters $\eta_k$. If these parameters are tied at the global central phone level then yields phone dependent weights. Alternatively, it is possible to use automatic approaches based on phonetic decision trees [18]. In the definition of the joint feature (4), the language feature $\phi_{\text{lm}}(\cdot)$ for the segment level features can be defined as:

$$\phi_{\text{lm}}(W, \rho) = \log P(W) ; \eta_{\text{lm}} = \eta_{\text{lm}}$$  (7)

where $P(W)$ is given by the language model. The corresponding weight $\eta_{\text{lm}}$ described in (4) is a scalar $\eta_l$, which functions as scaling language model. In this work, the log-linear model based on the segment level features is called the segment level log-linear model.

More analysis of the segment level features can be found in our previous work [7]. In experiments, only the segment level features will be examined, but a brief discussion of the frame level features is also given in the rest of this section.

For the frame level features, normally another level of hidden information is introduced [10, 19], namely the state sequence $\theta = \{\theta_t\}_{t=1}^T$ corresponding to the input utterance $O = \{o_t\}_{t=1}^T$, where $o_t$ is the $t$th frame of the utterance. Then for one segment the (frame level) acoustic features from the $k$th system can be described as:

$$\phi_k(O_{i_j}, \rho_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta(\theta_{t_1}, s_{1}) L_k(o_{t_1}) \\ \vdots \\ \delta(\theta_{t_s}, s_{s}) L_k(o_{t_s}) \end{bmatrix}$$  (8)

where $\{\rho_i\}$ denotes the indexes of the frames associated with the $i$th segment. $\{s_j\}_{j=1}^s$ denotes all possible states, and $\theta_t$ takes value from this set. $L_k(o_{t_j})$ is the frame feature from the $k$th system. This feature can have various forms, e.g. the Gaussian sufficient statistics [19] and HMM mean and variance statistics [20]. One of the simplest forms for $L_k(o_{t_j})$ is a log-likelihood:

$$L_k(o_{t_j}) = \log p_k(o_{t_j}|\theta_{t_j})$$  (9)

For the frame level features, in the definition of the joint feature (4), the language features $\phi_{\text{lm}}(\cdot)$ can be described as:

$$\phi_{\text{lm}}(W, \rho) = \begin{bmatrix} \log P(\theta) \\ \log P(W) \end{bmatrix} ; \eta_{\text{lm}} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_l \\ \eta_{\text{lm}} \end{bmatrix}$$  (10)

where $\log P(\theta)$ is given by the state transition probabilities. As discussed in section 1, in joint decoding different systems share the same HMM topology, here the state transition probabilities are shared with systems. Analogous to the weight $\eta_l$ that scales language models, $\eta_{\text{lm}}$ is used to scale the transition probabilities. In order to ensure valid state transition probabilities, this weight can be fixed to one. In this work, the log-linear model based on the frame level features is called the frame level log-linear model.

4. TRAINING CRITERIA

In the previous sections, the log-linear model and the forms of features were discussed. For a log-linear model, it can be trained with various training criteria, and the most commonly used ones will be discussed in this section. Given a training set consisting of utterance and reference pairs $D = \{(O_n, W_n)\}_{n=1}^N$, the log-linear model parameters can be estimated by maximising the conditional maximum likelihood (CML) training criterion:

$$F_{\text{CML}}(\eta) = \sum_{n=1}^N \log P(W_n|O_n, \eta)$$  (11)
Normally, prior information of the model parameters is available, e.g., the weights set empirically in joint decoding as described in (1). Thus a prior can be introduced in training. A Gaussian prior, 

\[ \log p(\eta) = \log \mathcal{N}(\mu_\eta, \Sigma_\eta) \propto -\frac{1}{2} ||\eta - \mu_\eta||^2, \]

is usually used [14]. Then the CML criterion described in (11) becomes:

\[ F_{\text{CML}}(\eta) = -\frac{1}{C}||\eta - \mu_\eta||^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \log P(W_n|O_n, \eta) \]

(12)

In speech recognition, another frequently used criterion is the minimum Bayes risk (MBR), which minimises the expected loss on the training data. Similar to CML estimation, a Gaussian prior can be introduced in training, then the MBR criterion can be described as minimising:

\[ F_{\text{MBR}}(\eta) = \frac{1}{C}||\eta - \mu_\eta||^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{W} P(W|O_n, \eta) \mathcal{L}(W, W_n) \]

(13)

where \( \mathcal{L}(W, W_n) \) is the loss function, which measures how different the hypothesis \( W \) and the reference \( W_n \) are. When the loss function is computed between phone sequences, the MBR criterion is known as the minimum phone error (MPE) criterion [21], which is the criterion used in training the baseline systems in section 6.

Large margin training has been studied in speech recognition, and the state-of-the-art performance can be achieved with this criterion [7, 10], given its advantage in generalisation [22]. Analogous to CML estimation, a Gaussian prior is also introduced in training. The parameters of the log-linear model can be estimated by minimising:

\[ F_{\text{LM}}(\eta) = \frac{1}{C}||\eta - \mu_\eta||^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \max_{W \neq W_n, \rho_n} \left\{ \mathcal{L}(W, W_n) - \log \left( \frac{P(W_n|O_n, \eta)}{P(W|O_n, \eta)} \right) \right\} \]

(14)

where \( \mathcal{L}(W, W_n) \) is the loss function same as that in the MBR criterion (13). Segmentation \( \rho_n \) corresponding to reference \( O_n \) is the most likely segmentation obtained from the 1-best output of joint decoding described in section 1. The number of all possible hypotheses for an utterance is exponentially large, but a lattice can be used to limit the search space of hypotheses. Thus, in practice the best competing hypothesis \( W \) for each instance can be found in a denominator lattice [21]. Substituting the definition of the log-linear model (3) into criterion (14), the denominator term of the log-linear model can be cancelled out. Then large margin criterion (14) can be further written as minimising:

\[ F_{\text{LM}}(\eta) = \frac{1}{C}||\eta - \mu_\eta||^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \max_{W \neq W_n, \rho_n} \left\{ \mathcal{L}(W, W_n) + \eta^T \Phi(O_n, W, \rho) - \eta^T \Phi(O_n, W_n, \rho_n) \right\} \]

(15)

This is the training criterion of the structured SVM [8], and it can be efficiently solved with the cutting-plane algorithm [23].

5. DECODING

Different training criteria were discussed in the previous section. By using these training criteria, the optimal model parameters \( \hat{\eta} \) can be estimated. Given the optimal parameters \( \hat{\eta} \) and an input \( O \), decoding with the log linear model defined in (3) can be described as:

\[ \hat{W} = \arg \max_W P(W|O, \hat{\eta}) \]

As discussed in section 2, in the log-linear model the most likely segmentation is used. Then decoding yields both the optimal word sequence \( \hat{W} \) and segmentation \( \hat{\rho} \) [16]:

\[ \hat{W} = \arg \max_W \left\{ \max_\rho \eta^T \Phi(O, W, \rho) \right\} \]

(16)

This is equivalent to decoding with structured SVM. Normally, the hypothesis and corresponding segmentation can be found from a lattice, which gives the information about possible word sequences and segmentations in a reasonable size. Then, decoding with the log-linear model based on the segment level or frame level features becomes a lattice rescoring approach. In experiments, only decoding with the log-linear model based on the segment level features will be examined.

When the segment level features are used, the log-linear model parameters \( \eta \) could be considered as phone dependent acoustic model scales [24]. Then, these phone dependent weights can be applied to joint decoding, and this approach will be examined in experiments. In the rest of this section, decoding with log-linear models based on the frame level features also will be discussed, but this approach will not be studied in experiments.

When the frame level features are used, substituting the definitions of the frame level features (4), (8) and (10) in, decoding described in (17) becomes:

\[ \hat{W} = \arg \max_W \left\{ \max_\theta \eta^T \log P(\theta) + \eta^T \log P(W) + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{l} \delta(\theta_t, s_i) \sum_{k=1}^{K} \eta_k \log p_k(\alpha_t|\theta_t) \right\} \]

(18)

where \( P(\theta) \) is the state transition probability and \( P(W) \) is the probability given by language model. \( t \) is the index for frames, \( i \) is the index for states, and \( k \) is the index for parameters. \( \eta_k \) is the \( k \)th elements of the parameters \( \eta \) corresponding to the \( k \)th system described in (4). For the \( t \)th frame, in decoding described in (18), the score computed for state \( s_i \) can be described as:

\[ \mathcal{L}(\alpha_t|s_i) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \eta_k \log p_k(\alpha_t|s_i) \]

(19)

This is the same as the combined score used in joint decoding described in (1), but with more general state dependent weights \( \eta_k = [\eta_{k,1}, \ldots, \eta_{k,I}] \) for the \( k \)th system. When \( \eta_k = 1 \), decoding with log-linear models becomes HMM Viterbi decoding, and it is equivalent to standard joint decoding described in section 1.

6. EXPERIMENTS

The experiments were conducted on AURORA 4 corpus, which is a noise-corrupted medium vocabulary corpus. In experiments the multi-condition training set was used. This set is artificially corrupted from the clean training set with different noise and channel...
A tandem and hybrid system combination was studied in this work ($K = 2$). Both systems were trained and decoded using HTK V3.5 [25]. $L_2$ regularisation was used for cross entropy (CE) training with a scaling factor of 0.001. Parameter updates were averaged over a mini-batch with 200 frames and were smoothed by adding a "momentum" term of 0.9 times the previous updates. Single epoch discriminative pre-training was performed with a learning rate of $1.0 \times 10^{-5}$ [6]. The "fine-tuning" stage used a modified NewBob learning rate scheduler [25], with the initial learning rate $2.0 \times 10^{-4}$ and a minimum epoch number 16.

The tandem and hybrid systems were built with 13d PLP and 40d log-Mel filter bank (FBK) coefficients. A triphone state set with 3063 tied-states produced by the decision tree tying approach was used by each system [25]. A MPE trained GMM-HMM system with 52d PLP+$\Delta$+$\Delta^2$+$\Delta^3$ features were used to produce the frame-to-state alignments for CE based bottleneck (BN) DNN training. The BN DNN structure is $720 \times 2000^4 \times 39 \times 2000 \times 3064$, whose input vector is formed by stacking 80d FBK+$\Delta$ features according to a context shift set $c = [-4, -4]$ (to stack the current frame with 4 frames in its left and right contexts) [25]. The 39d BN feature vectors were de-correlated with semi-tied covariance (STC) [26] matrix and then combined with 52d to 39d heteroscedastic linear discriminant analysis (HLDA) projected PLP+$\Delta$+$\Delta^2$+$\Delta^3$ [27].

The MPE trained speaker independent tandem system has 32 Gaussian components for each of the 3 silence states and 16 Gaussian components per state for the others. For the hybrid system, the DNN acoustic model with sigmoid activation function, whose structure is $720 \times 2000^5 \times 3066$, was initially trained with CE using the alignments generated by the tandem system. Once the hybrid system was trained, it was refined with MPE based sequence discriminative training [25], with a fixed learning rate of $1.0 \times 10^{-5}$ for 6 epochs.

To form the joint decoding system, the MPE trained tandem and hybrid systems were combined using HTK joint decoder [25] based on frame-level log-likelihood linear combination (as described in equation (1)) and system dependent weights $\{0.2, 1.0\}$.

As tabulated in Table 1, the baseline results of the MPE trained tandem and hybrid systems are considerably better than the previously published numbers [7, 28, 29]. The performance gains are mainly due to the use of 40d FBK rather than 24d FBK features, regularised discriminative pre-training rather than generative pre-training, as well as the MPE discriminative sequence training (based on a high performance CE hybrid system with 11.64% WER on average). In joint decoding, 2% relative WER performance gain was achieved over the hybrid system, from 11.24% to 11.04%.

### 6.1. Tandem, Hybrid, and Joint Decoding Baseline Systems

In this paper, the state-of-the-art training approaches and configurations for the tandem, hybrid and joint decoding systems have been detailed on AURORA 4 task. By using the (phone dependent) weights learnt by the segment level log-linear model, decoding with log-linear models in a lattice rescoring fashion yields good performance gains over joint decoding with empirically set weights. These phone dependent acoustic model weights also have been successfully applied to joint decoding. This motives training of the state dependent acoustic model weights for joint decoding as the future work.

### 6.2. Log-linear Model Combination

In experiments, only segment level log-linear models (LLM) described in sections 2 and 3 were examined. Two training criteria were used in training the log-linear models, namely the conditional maximum likelihood (CML) and large margin (LM) training criteria. In training, as described in section 4, a Gaussian prior over the log-linear model parameters $\eta$ was used. The mean of the prior is set to be the combination weights for the joint decoding baseline system, namely the weights corresponding to the hybrid and tandem systems are 1.0 and 0.2 respectively. With this prior, the log-linear model can start with a good configuration by using a small variance (small value of $C$), and the optimal configuration can be obtained by gradually increasing $C$.

In Table 1, “Joint” denotes joint decoding as discussed in section 1. “LLM” denotes decoding with the segment level log-linear model in a lattice rescoring fashion as described in section 5. "CML" and "LM" means the (phone dependent) weights were estimated by the segment level log-linear models with CML and LM training criteria.

As described in the 2nd block of Table 1, compared with joint decoding using the empirically set weights, when the weights were estimated by the segment level log-linear model (with the CML or LM criterion), performance gains can be achieved. As tabulated in the 3rd block of Table 1, when applying these (CML or LM trained) weights to log-linear model decoding that operates in a lattice rescoring fashion, further performance gains can be achieved. The possible reason is that in joint decoding different models are constrained to be state synchronised. By introducing lattices, the constraint is relaxed to phone level and the log-likelihoods for each phone are allowed to be computed with forward algorithm. Another reason is that in joint decoding, these phone dependent weights are treated as acoustic model scales, whereas, by using lattices which provide segmentation information, decoding with the segment level log-linear model can result in the form of lattice rescoring [14]. As tabulated in the 3rd block of Table 1, when the weights were estimated with LM criterion, the best average WER 10.79% can be achieved by the segment level log-linear model, with 2% relative performance gain over joint decoding using the empirically set weights (the 3rd line).

### 7. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the state-of-the-art training approaches and configurations for the tandem, hybrid and joint decoding systems have been detailed on AURORA 4 task. By using the (phone dependent) weights learnt by the segment level log-linear models, decoding with log-linear models in a lattice rescoring fashion yields good performance gains over joint decoding with empirically set weights. These phone dependent acoustic model weights also have been successfully applied to joint decoding. This motives training of the state dependent acoustic model weights for joint decoding as the future work.

### Table 1. The WER performance on AURORA 4 corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Test Set WER(%)</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandem</td>
<td>MPE</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CML</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CML</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\)In all experiments, lattices are generated by the joint decoding system with empirically set weights.
8. REFERENCES


